



Process In Execution Review (PIER) and the SCAMPI B Method

Lorraine Adams, SEI

Lynda Rosa, MITRE

Fred Schenker, SEI

Dale Swanson, MITRE

November 17, 2005

Sponsored by the U.S. Department of Defense

SM SCAMPI is a service mark of Carnegie Mellon University

®CMMI and Capability Maturity Model are registered in the US Patent and Trade Office

© 2005 by Carnegie Mellon University

© 2005 The MITRE Corporation. All rights reserved



**Carnegie Mellon
Software Engineering Institute**

MITRE



Agenda



Problems and Challenges

Assessment Alternatives

Process In-Execution Reviews

ESC Case Studies

Summary



**Carnegie Mellon
Software Engineering Institute**

MITRE



DOD Weapon Systems Acquisition Continues To Be High Risk Area

While DOD's acquisition process has produced the best weapons in the world, it also yields undesirable consequences in weapon system programs – cost increases, schedule delays, and performance shortfalls

Problems occur because weapon programs do not capture early on the requisite knowledge that is needed to effectively manage risks

Programs move forward with unrealistic cost and schedules estimates, lack clearly defined and stable requirements, use immature technologies, and fail to solidify design and manufacturing processes at appropriate junctures in development

As a result, programs require more resources than planned, the buying power of the defense dollar is reduced, and funds are not available for other competing needs

*Paul Francis, Director
Acquisition and Sourcing Management
U.S. Government Accountability Office
May 18, 2004*





Problem Statement

A statement of organizational process maturity or capability level does not guarantee performance to that same level of proficiency on an individual project

Most DoD contractors claim high maturity/capability levels, yet from the perspective of the acquirer, systems engineering and program management practices are severely lacking

Teaming arrangements further cloud the issue of process execution and proficiency

Associated problems may not be evident until significant cost, schedule, or performance objectives have been missed at a late point in the program where corrective actions are very costly

How can the acquirer gain the necessary insight into process execution and proficiency as well as reinforce desired behaviors?



Development Challenges

Huge system/software engineering endeavors in aircraft, space vehicles, ground systems, C2, C4ISR, battle mgt, etc

Significant risks for acquisition programs

- **Multi-million SLOC programs; “hybrid” systems combining legacy re-use, COTS, new development**
- **Multi-contractor teams using different processes; Dispersed engineering & development locations**
- **New technologies create opportunities/challenges; products change/evolve**
- **Business/operational needs change - often faster than full system capability can be implemented**
- **Contractor and Acquirer skills shortfalls; Cost and schedule constraints**



Acquirers' Concerns

Appraisals are conducted just for the “ratings”

Appraisal team/lead objectivity and expertise is questionable, especially with high maturity appraisals

Appraisals are conducted on dissimilar projects and/or in unrelated organizations/sites

The effect of teaming arrangements on project process performance is not accounted for

There is a lack of insight into contractor process execution on specific projects

The effect of process immaturity in acquiring organizations



High Maturity Organizations




High Maturity Projects

Maturity Levels are indicators of organizational *potential performance*.

They describe how the next project may *perform* based on a sampling of existing projects.

Maturity Levels reside at the organizational level and are not an indication of how an individual project *is performing*.





Acquirer Needs

A means to assess developer process execution on their project

- **Process performance**
- **Process capability**
- **Process adherence**

A means to assess project process execution across large, distanced, and diverse teams

A means to assess all technical and project management process areas

- **Engineering**
- **Project Management**
- **Financial Management**
- **Support Processes**

A means to assess project risks driven by developer process execution

A means to assess the potential process execution risks in source selection



**Carnegie Mellon
Software Engineering Institute**

MITRE



Agenda

Problems and Challenges




Assessment Alternatives

Process In-Execution Reviews

ESC Case Studies

Summary

Standard CMMI Appraisal Method for Process Improvement (SCAMPI)






Assessment Alternatives Mapped to Acquirer Needs

SCAMPI Method A


Institutionalization
Organizational focus
Rigorous, expensive
Ratings



Resource Intensive
Limited utility for source selection

SCAMPI Method B


Deployment and execution
Evidence of implementation
What they are doing



Contract Monitoring
Competitive Downselect

SCAMPI Method C

Approach
Plan for execution
What they will do



Contract Monitoring
Source Selection



**Carnegie Mellon
Software Engineering Institute**

MITRE



Agenda

Problems and Challenges

Assessment Alternatives



Process In-Execution Reviews

ESC Case Studies

Summary



PIER Ground Rules

Use the process model – CMMI

- Interview questions based on model

Appraisal of process performance and adherence

Focus on risk assessment – risks associated with process performance, adherence, and capability

Observe strict confidentiality

- Results not attributable to individuals or interview groups

Approach SCAMPI collaboratively

Results in actionable findings by Program Office and/or Contractor



What a PIER Is and Is Not

Is an appraisal (SCAMPI-B) of the execution of and the risks associated with process implementation of the entire project team, including sub-contractors

Is an assessment of whether or not the contractor is operating the specific program at a level of maturity consistent with their organization's maturity level

Is not a formal appraisal (SCAMPI-A)

- No rating

- No multiple projects within the organization; focus on specific project

- No coverage of entire life cycle; focus on phase or near-term milestones



Phase 1: Plan and Prepare for the Appraisal

Appraisal Team/Lead

- Lead assists Sponsor in matching appraisal w/business objectives
- Lead and sponsor agree on details of appraisal plan
- Lead prepares team members
- Prepares in-briefs for contractor
- Lead performs readiness review

SEI/MITRE/ESC

- Templates and guidance on plan preparation & PIER execution
- Assist PMO
- Model scope guidance
- Role definition guidance for customer & contractor
- Security procedures

Contractor

- Coordinates with the PMO
- Identify site coordinator, process lead, and non-voting team member (as appropriate)
- Schedule facilities & resources to support the plan
- Collect relevant objective evidence
- Prepare project to support PIER (schedule interviews, briefings, demos)

PMO

- Establishes contractual arrangement
- Sponsors appraisal
- Establishes business goals
- Coordinates with Contractor
- Coordinates & approves appraisal plan



Phase 2: Conduct Appraisal

Appraisal Team/Lead

- Examines objective evidence
- Verifies the implementation of the organization's practices
- Validates findings
- Generate appraisal results
- Lead collects lessons learned
- Data & artifacts are appropriately archived or destroyed

SEI/MITRE/ESC

- Evidence collection tool
- Findings briefing template and guidance
- On-site scheduling guidance
- Guidance for preparation and delivery of preliminary findings
- Further definition of customer & contractor roles

Contractor

- Provide Project context briefing
- Ensure contractor responsibilities are met to support PIER (briefings, interviewees, demos)
- Support additional evidence requests in a timely manner
- Provide PIER team facilities in accordance with plan requirements

PMO

- Coordinate as necessary with Team Lead & Contractor
- Resolve any appraisal execution issues



Phase 3: Report Results

Appraisal Team/Lead

- Delivers final findings to customer & to contractor
- Reports results to PIER steward as authorized by PMO

SEI/MITRE/ESC

- Findings template
- Final findings delivery guidance
- Disclosure statement guidance
- ESC PIER Custodian who retains information as observations & trends without project or Contractor attribution

Contractor

- Attend outbrief
- Analyze results & incorporate into next cycle of process improvements

PMO

- Attends outbrief
- Owns final findings & authorizes release of information to ESC PIER Custodian
- Analyzes results & integrates into project data for future use in award fee, program reviews, improvement initiatives, etc.



Example

Integrated Supplier Management

Description:

The purpose of Integrated Supplier Management is to proactively identify sources of products that may be used to satisfy the project's requirements and to manage selective suppliers while maintaining a cooperative project-supplier relationship.

Strengths:

- Proactive engagement with suppliers on early Time and Materials subcontracts expedited the creation of supplier requirements documents and SOWs for the program.

Weaknesses:

- The lack of monitoring of supplier processes may cause execution of supplier agreements to be compromised. (SG 2)
- The Subcontract Management Plan is still in draft form. (GG 2)



Carnegie Mellon
Software Engineering Institute

MITRE



Example **Integrated Supplier Management**

Notes:

- Issues with critical subcontractors exist and continue to be worked

Example Only



Example Project Management Specific Practices

PA	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.6	1.7	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.6	2.7	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.5	4.1	4.2	4.3
PP	G	G	G	G				G	G	G	G	G		G		G	G					
PMC	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G												
SAM	G	G	G						G	G	B											
IPM	G	G	G	G				G	G	G					G	G				G	G	G
RSK	G		G					Y	Y						G	G						
IT	G	Y	G					G	G	G	G	G										
ISM	G	G						Y	G	G												

KEY

G Green
 Y Yellow
 R Red
 B Blue
 NY Not Yet
 Not Appraised
 Not Applicable



Carnegie Mellon
Software Engineering Institute

MITRE



PIER Commitment

Appraisal Team/Lead

- Ensure team composition is high-caliber
- Everyone shares work load based on team expectations
- Collect lessons learned to improve the PIER (SCAMPI-B) process

SEI/MITRE/ESC

- Support and refine PIER (SCAMPI-B) method
- ESC PIER Custodian
- Work with PMO to ensure appropriate interpretation & use of findings
- Ensure confidentiality of results
- Provide updated templates and materials

Contractor

- Participation
- Evidence prepared with adequate time to review prior to on-site
- Resolution of access to information issues in advance of on-site
- Relevant personnel provided for interviews
- Act on findings

PMO

- Contractual obligation
- Resources
- Act on findings



PIER Lessons Learned

Appraisal Team/Lead

- Have consistent approach among team leads across program PIERs
- Train team on appraisal tools and templates prior to the appraisal
- Complete document review prior to start of the on-site
- Site coordinator needs to know the CMMI model
- Team building activities critical

SEI/MITRE/ESC

- Need guidance and templates to ensure consistency of PIERs
- Capture observations and trends to isolate potential systemic problems
- Plan PIERs to avoid impacting peak or critical activities
- Contractor non-voting team member proved very valuable
- Credibility counts!

Contractor

- Provides feedback on process implementation
- Non-trivial amount of effort to support the PIER activity
- Demonstration of organization's commitment to CMMI

PMO

- Provides confidence in contractor through insight
- Process proficiency and execution varies substantially
- Basis for assessing contractor responsiveness
- PMOs must work internal processes to complement Contractor



**Carnegie Mellon
Software Engineering Institute**

MITRE



Agenda

Problems and Challenges

Assessment Alternatives

Process In-Execution Reviews



ESC Case Studies

Summary



ESC Case Studies

Joint Environmental Tool Kit (JET)

- **Contract monitoring**
- **Risk identification**
- **Competitive downselect**

KG-3X Crypto Modernization Program

- **Contract monitoring**
- **Risk identification**
- **Competitive downselect**

Joint Mission Planning System (JMPS)

- **Contract monitoring**
- **Risk identification**



**Carnegie Mellon
Software Engineering Institute**

MITRE



Agenda

Problems and Challenges

Assessment Alternatives

Process In-Execution Reviews

ESC Case Studies



Summary



Next Steps for PIER

Expand the scope of PIERs

Financial Management

Assess execution of Earned Value Management System (EVMS) practices especially in correlating product maturity and performance to earned value – Technical Performance Measures (TPMs)

Product Quality

Product quality in terms of technical maturity and product performance using models, simulations, prototypes, and early functional assessments

May integrate with the Integrated Baseline Review (IBR) process



Summary

SCAMPI-A appraisals and advertised CMMI ratings do not guarantee that individual projects will perform to those levels of proficiency

PIERs have validated the SCAMPI-B Method in a contract monitoring context


PIERS provide insight into project process execution, both for Program Office and for Contractor

PIERS demonstrate program office commitment to process

PIERs can be complementary components to other reviews and technical interchanges

PIERs can be used to support award fee evaluations

Questions





Carnegie Mellon
Software Engineering Institute

MITRE



For More Information, Contact:

Lorraine Adams

Software Engineering Institute
4500 5th Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15213-3890
412-268-7777
ladams@sei.cmu.edu

Lynda Rosa

ESC ACE Chief Engineer
9 Eglin Street
Hanscom AFB, MA 01731-2100
781-377-5398

Fred Schenker

Software Engineering Institute
4500 5th Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15213-3890
412-268-9145
ars@sei.cmu.edu

Dale Swanson

The MITRE Corporation
202 Burlington Road
Bedford, MA 01730-1420
781-266-9195
swaneed@mitre.org