



Understanding Agile/Lean Adoption Risks: Readiness & Fit Analysis (RFA)

Suzanne Miller

Software Engineering Institute
Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Copyright 2019 Carnegie Mellon University. All Rights Reserved.

This material is based upon work funded and supported by the Department of Defense under Contract No. FA8702-15-D-0002 with Carnegie Mellon University for the operation of the Software Engineering Institute, a federally funded research and development center.

The view, opinions, and/or findings contained in this material are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Government position, policy, or decision, unless designated by other documentation.

References herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trade mark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by Carnegie Mellon University or its Software Engineering Institute.

NO WARRANTY. THIS CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY AND SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE MATERIAL IS FURNISHED ON AN "AS-IS" BASIS. CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY MAKES NO WARRANTIES OF ANY KIND, EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED, AS TO ANY MATTER INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, WARRANTY OF FITNESS FOR PURPOSE OR MERCHANTABILITY, EXCLUSIVITY, OR RESULTS OBTAINED FROM USE OF THE MATERIAL. CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY DOES NOT MAKE ANY WARRANTY OF ANY KIND WITH RESPECT TO FREEDOM FROM PATENT, TRADEMARK, OR COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT.


[DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A] This material has been approved for public release and unlimited distribution. Please see Copyright notice for non-US Government use and distribution.

This material may be reproduced in its entirety, without modification, and freely distributed in written or electronic form without requesting formal permission. Permission is required for any other use. Requests for permission should be directed to the Software Engineering Institute at permission@sei.cmu.edu.


Carnegie Mellon® is registered in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office by Carnegie Mellon University.

DM19-0892

Premises of RFA



Transition Fit Matrix: Mutual Adaptation is a Key




Objectives of RFA

Evaluate the transition fit between the proposed technology and the specified organization.

Specify adaptation requirements to improve the fit to the point where the transition can be managed.

- These adaptations may be on the technology OR the organizational side, depending on the business needs and the areas where fit is not so good

One Page View of Process



Readiness & Fit Analysis Process Overview

Step	Outcome
1. PREPARE Establish scope for analysis and select participants	- Technology and scope of adoption determined - Relevant participants list defined
2. CREATE Refine assumptions table relevant to the candidate Agile and/or DevSecOps approaches	Updated technology assumptions table is available for use
3. CAPTURE Identify and categorize adoption risk ratings and statements	Profile of fit between technology and practitioners
4. ANALYZE Determine fit strengths/ weaknesses for the six risk categories	List of risks particular to the adoption situation
5. RECOMMEND Develop risk mitigation strategies	Prioritized list of risk mitigation strategies


RFA Organizes Typical Adoption Mismatch Areas For You to Analyze/Deal With Explicitly

Readiness/Fit Analysis Categories include:

- Fit of technology with business strategy
- *Fit of technology with current work practices – in this case, typical Agile practices*
- Fit of technology with current organizational climate, system environment, technology and project/customer environments
- Prior history of technology adoption success/failure

A profile that shows the general “fit” of the technology to the organization can be generated by analyzing the technology’s implications for each factor against the organization’s current state

Example Summary of RFA Factors Ratings



Caution—This is a Heuristic, not a Validated Instrument!

The diagram provides a very rough picture of potential risk areas

It does not normalize the data in terms of weighting/relative importance of the risk areas

It does not provide judgment as to what an objectively “good” outcome would be

Greatest value comes in identifying the risks specific to your context, using the framework as a jumpstart for your thinking

The Dimensions of Fit

- Business and Contracting Environment
- *Work practices — Agile practices*
- Organizational Climate
- Project/Customer Environment
- Technology Environment
- System Attributes


Technology Assumptions Table for Agile-1

Fit Dimension	Agile Assumptions
Business & Acquisition	• Program acquisition strategy and practices enable, or at least don't dis-able, differences in developing using Agile approaches
Organizational Climate	• Reward systems, values, skills, sponsorship explicitly support Agile & Lean values and principles
Project & Customer Environment	• Frequent collaboration between development team and customers/end users is actively supported • Program management practices respect team boundaries
System Attributes	• System architecture is loosely-coupled (interfaces are external vs internal among system components) • System solutions benefit from fast user/operational feedback


Technology Assumptions Table for Agile-2

Fit Dimension	Agile Assumptions
Technology Environment	• Technology support for automated testing and continuous integration are in place • Support for information radiators (either physical or electronic) is available
Team Technical Practices	• Technical practices that support high quality code production in small batches from a prioritized product backlog are in place
Team Management/ Coordination Practices	• Decentralized decision making that allows team members to self-organize their work are in place and supported • Team management practices that support short (2-4 week) time boxes are in place
Program Practices	• Synchronization of multiple teams is occurring • Practices that reinforce respecting team management and measurement boundaries are in place


GWE: Risk Categories from Practitioner Workshop




GWE: Prioritized Risk Themes from Practitioner Workshop




GWE: Suggested Risk Mitigations from Practitioner Workshop-2



GWE: Suggested Risk Mitigations from Practitioner Workshop-3



GWE: Suggested Risk Mitigations from Practitioner Workshop-4



Key Points

Treating Agile and Lean Practices as a technology allows consideration of Technology Adoption concepts to improve the chances of successful adoption

RFA helps to understand risk areas that are often ignored and may negatively affect adoption

Analysis is not enough – we must consider appropriate risk mitigation actions as well

Contact Information

Suzanne Miller

Principal Researcher

Life Cycle Innovation & Automation
Directorate

+1 412-268-9143

smg@sei.cmu.edu