

IEEE Life Cycle Standards and the CMMI[®]—Implementation Considerations

16 June 2008

Dr. Peter Hantos
Software Acquisition and Process Department
Software Engineering Subdivision

Prepared for:
Space and Missile Systems Center
Air Force Space Command
483 N. Aviation Blvd.
El Segundo, CA 90245-2808

Contract No. FA8802-04-C-0001

Authorized by: Engineering and Technology Group

PUBLIC RELEASE IS AUTHORIZED; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED

IEEE Life Cycle Standards and the CMMI[®]—Implementation Considerations

16 June 2008

Dr. Peter Hantos
Software Acquisition and Process Department
Software Engineering Subdivision

Prepared for:
Space and Missile Systems Center
Air Force Space Command
483 N. Aviation Blvd.
El Segundo, CA 90245-2808

Contract No. FA8802-04-C-0001

Authorized by: Engineering and Technology Group

PUBLIC RELEASE IS AUTHORIZED; DISTRIBUTION UNLIMITED

IEEE Life Cycle Standards and the CMMI[®]—Implementation Considerations

Approved by:



Dr. Leslie J. Holloway, Director
Software Acquisition and Process
Department
Software Engineering Subdivision
Computers and Software Division
Engineering and Technology Group



Donna M. Speckman, Director
Research and Program Development
Office
Engineering and Technology Group

7th Annual CMMI® Technology Conference

IEEE Life Cycle Standards and the CMMI®- Implementation Considerations



Dr. Peter Hantos
Senior Engineering Specialist
The Aerospace Corporation

© 2007. The Aerospace Corporation. All Rights Reserved.



Acknowledgements

- This work would not have been possible without the following:
 - ❖ **Reviewers**
 - Suellen Eslinger, Software Engineering Subdivision
 - Dr. Leslie J. Holloway, Software Acquisition and Process Department
 - Mary A. Rich, Software Engineering Subdivision
 - ❖ **Sponsor**
 - Michael Zambrana, USAF Space and Missile Systems Center, Engineering & Architecture Directorate
 - ❖ **Funding source**
 - Mission-Oriented Investigation and Experimentation (**MOIE**) Research Program (Software Acquisition Task)
 - ❖ **Inspiration**
 - Dr. Barry Boehm, USC/CSSE

Agenda

- **Presentation Objective**
- **Problem Statement**
- **The Organizational Context**
- **Developing Life Cycle Processes**
- **Organizational Standard Processes**
- **Life Cycle Models**
- **Process Mapping**
- **Implementation Pathways**
- **Conclusions**
- **Acronyms**
- **Bibliography**
- **Backup Slides**
- **Contact Information**

Presentation Objective

- Explore some common perceptions about the SEI CMMI® and the IEEE* Life Cycle Standards
 - ❖ CMMI® can be leveraged for IEEE Standards
 - ❖ IEEE Standards support CMMI®-based process improvement
- Define a feasible approach for using the SEI CMMI® and the IEEE Life Cycle Standards together
 - ❖ Key questions:
 - How to exploit the synergy?
 - How to resolve the differences?

Life Cycle Standards to be covered in this presentation will be referred as:

[IEEE 1997] IEEE 12207, Software Life Cycle Processes
[IEEE 1998] IEEE 1062, IEEE Recommended Practice for Software Acquisition
[IEEE 2005] IEEE 15288, System Life Cycle Processes
[IEEE 2006] IEEE 1074, IEEE Standard for Developing a Software Project Life Cycle Process

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

* IEEE – Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers

Acquisition – Government Perspective

- Two key elements of successful acquisition of software-intensive systems
 - ❖ Selecting the right suppliers
 - **Capability assessment** of the potential suppliers is a key element of the acquisition process, and the current, widely embraced recommendation is the reliance on the **CMMI®** [SEI 2007]
 - ❖ Assuring mission success
 - Aerospace experience shows that mission success is achieved via the use of **robust development standards*** [Eslinger 2006].
 - Eslinger demonstrates that even the use of so-called “mature” processes, such as the CMMI® is inadequate, and the government must make a robust software standard contractually compliant
- ❖ It seems that we need both the CMMI® and the IEEE standards

* Note that Eslinger's development standard recommendation is based on IEEE 12207

Acquisition - Supplier (Contractor) Perspective

- It seems that we need both the CMMI® and the IEEE standards...
 - ❖ CMMI®
 - It is the de-facto process improvement standard
 - ❖ IEEE Standards
 - The government is using them to define a framework for development planning and engineering
- **Contractors' main concerns**
 - ❖ Finding the most effective/efficient ways to ensure dual compliance
 - ❖ Be pro-active and prepared for rapid tailoring of the standards
 - Simultaneously with compliance though, need to find out how to ensure agility and competitiveness from the development process' perspective
 - ❖ Last but not least, to make a profit

(Light-hearted) Problem Statement

- “We are from the SEI and the IEEE and we are here to help you”
 - *Paraphrased use from Ronald Reagan*
- “Standards are always out of date. That's why we call them standards.”
 - *George F. Will*

(More Serious) Problem Statement

- Regarding “Help”, all the mentioned sources have noble goals; however, their objectives are different ...

❖ CMMI®

- The objective of CMMI® for development is to help contractors improve their development and maintenance processes for both products and services
 - Based on [Chrissis 2007]

❖ IEEE Standards

- IEEE Standards’ objective is to eliminate misunderstandings between contractors and procurers
 - Based on [IEEE 1997]

❖ ISO* Standards

- ISO Standards’ objective is to promote a free and fair global trading system via worldwide standardization
 - Based on the ISO website [ISO 2007]

* ISO – International Standards Organization. Note that the discussed key life cycle standards have their origin in ISO standards

Problem Statement (cont.)

- The typical, current IEEE standard development process has some inherent characteristics:
 - ❖ IEEE Standards are developed in isolation
 - Authors in most cases give lip-service only to other IEEE standards
 - The CMMI® has only minor, vague references to IEEE Life Cycle Standards
 - The IEEE Life Cycle Standards have only some vague references to process improvement (nothing specific regarding the CMMI®)
 - ❖ IEEE Standards are developed by volunteers
 - ❖ IEEE Standards' text is finalized and balloted via consensus
- **As a result, most standards share some common characteristics:**
 - ❖ The final material is always a result of major negotiations
 - ❖ The process takes several years
 - ❖ The standards are not consistent with each other
 - ❖ Standards – at most – codify state-of-the-practice, and never reflect the state-of-the-art
- **The CMMI® has not been developed by the IEEE, but with respect to these problems it is not very different**

Why Are These Problems?

- **The use of IEEE standards only makes sense for compliance**
 - ❖ Sure, they can be used as guidance materials by novices, but better, more up-to-date, and widely accessible materials are available for instructional purposes
- **The CMMI® is also about compliance**
 - ❖ It is claimed that the model is for guidance, and only describes “what”-type required characteristics for process improvement, without prescribing the “how”. However,
 - Unconditional satisfaction of all goals is required on every maturity level
 - In reality, during appraisals when the level of institutionalization is determined, the level of compliance with all the pre-defined organizational processes is probed

It is really difficult to simultaneously satisfy so many conflicting compliance requirements

Problems With IEEE Standards That Are Out Of Scope For This Presentation

- **IEEE 1062**
 - ❖ The use of 1062 is not recommended for government acquisitions
 - Various government entities have their own, strictly binding acquisition policies and instructions (e.g., the DOD 5000 series, NSSAP 03-01, etc.)
 - ❖ Acquirers are better off with directly using their respective policies
- **IEEE life cycle standards have serious technical, compliance, and tailoring problems of their own**
- **IEEE life cycle standards are poorly harmonized with each other**
 - ❖ There are some harmonization efforts in progress, but no tangible results yet

A Dazzling Array of Terminology Ambiguities



Unfortunately, IEEE Std. 610.12-1990, IEEE Standard Glossary of Software Engineering Terminology, is so out-of-date that it is not even referenced anymore in the standards.

The Organizational Context

Organizational terms and their hierarchy

IEEE 15288	IEEE 12207	IEEE 1074	CMMI®
Enterprise	Organization	Organization	Organization
Project	Project	Project	Project

- **Concerns:**
 - ❖ The organizational terms and their hierarchical relationship seem to be the same for the IEEE Standards and the CMMI® (IEEE 15288's "Enterprise" is the sole exception); however, the underlying definitions are different
 - E.g., the CMMI® definition of an "organization" is the most constrained
 - ❖ All standards allow for recursive invocation of these terms
 - ... but they don't provide guidance on the details

Organizations and Projects

- **“Project” across the IEEE Standards is not well defined**
 - ❖ In 1074 the term is used to limit the standard’s scope
 - It only implies an endeavor in conjunction with software development and maintenance
- **“Organization” in the IEEE Standards is also only vaguely defined**
 - ❖ In general, it refers to the environment (people and facilities) where the “projects” are executed
- **“Project” in the CMMI® refers to a managed set of interrelated resources delivering one or more products to a Customer***
- **“Organization” in the CMMI® refers to an administrative structure where projects share a Senior Manager** and operate under the same policies**

* “Customer”: The party accepting the product or authorizing payment

** “Senior Managers” focus on the long-term vitality of the organization rather than the short-term pressures of the projects.

Recommendation: Rely on the CMMI® Interpretations

- The first step is always to develop the WBS
 - ❖ There must be at least one product
- Next, map the WBS to contractor relationships
 - ❖ Where there is a Contract, there is a **Customer** and a **Supplier**...
 - ❖ This will also help to determine what should be considered as **Projects**
 - ❖ For determining **Organizations**, use the existence or lack of Senior Managers (by CMMI® definition) to draw up the organizational boundaries for process development, maintenance, and improvement
- The WBS can also be used to determine which standard to use and where
 - ❖ 15288 for Systems Engineering projects
 - ❖ 12207 and 1074 for Software Engineering projects
- Discipline coverage
 - ❖ The CMMI® covers Hardware, Software, and Systems Engineering
 - ❖ IEEE process standards cover only Systems Engineering and Software
 - ❖ Note that there are no applicable, true hardware process standards (Hardware development processes are not Life Cycle Model-driven like Systems or Software Engineering processes)

Clear definition of Organizations is critical because both the IEEE Standards and the CMMI® are referring to so-called **Organizational Process Assets**

Comparing Process Development in IEEE 1074 and in the CMMI®

- The process to develop a **SW Project Life Cycle Process in IEEE 1074** and the process to develop a **Defined Software Process in the CMMI®** look similar*, but there are subtle, critical differences:
 - ❖ IEEE 1074 only specifies Activity Description, Input Information, and Output Information for every Activity
 - ❖ However, a **defined process** in the CMMI® must clearly state the following:
 - Purpose
 - Inputs
 - Entry criteria
 - Activities
 - Roles
 - Measures
 - Verification steps
 - Outputs
 - Exit criteria

* Note backup slides showing the details of both processes

** See [Chrissis 2007], page 152-154 for the distinctions between a **managed** and a **defined** process in the CMMI®

Organizational Standard Processes*

- In terms of reliance on Organizational Standard Processes the CMMI® is stricter than the IEEE Standards
 - ❖ IEEE 1074 does not mandate the use of any existing SPLCP (Software Project's Life Cycle Process) during the creation of the current SPLCP (It doesn't assume their existence)
 - In fact, the recommended Organizational Process Assets are more supporting than defining elements of the “to be created” SPLCP (e.g., policies, metrics, tools, methodologies, etc.)
 - ❖ A CMMI® Defined Process must be tailored from the OSSP (Organizational Set of Standard Processes)

** Note backup slides showing how IEEE 1074 and the CMMI® are dealing with Organizational Standard Processes*

Organizational Standard Processes (Cont.)

- It makes a difference on what CMMI® maturity level the organization is when the decision is made to comply with the IEEE Standards
 - ❖ For a Level-2 organization it is not a problem
 - SPLCP created with the use of the IEEE Standards immediately satisfies the conditions for a Managed Process
 - Eventually these kind of processes could become part of OSSP
 - ❖ For a Level-3 or higher maturity organization there is a conflict
 - Newly created, IEEE Standards-based processes can not be immediately applied because first they would have to be made part of OSSP
 - **Also, appropriate tailoring guidelines would have to be developed and documented**
 - The new processes can also affect (override) existing sub-process selection for quantitative management
 - The undesired side-effect is administrative delays and overhead

Life Cycle Models

- **Good News:**
 - ❖ There is no difference in how the IEEE Standards and the CMMI® treat Life Cycle Models
- **Bad News:**
 - ❖ The same 😊
- **Both expect the availability of a collection of life cycle models**
 - ❖ CMMI®
 - OPD (Organizational Process Definition) SP (Specific Practice) 1.2: Establish Life Cycle Model Descriptions
 - ❖ 1074
 - Clause 4.2.1 shows the existence of a collection of SPLCM's, but it also declares that this collection is out of scope for the standard
- **Nevertheless, neither the CMMI® nor 1074**
 - Specifies where these models supposed to come from
 - Specifies how they should be documented
 - Provides guidance on tailoring
- **IEEE Standards do provide some guidance on selecting a life cycle model for a project, e.g., 12207 for software**
 - ❖ However, guidance is for a limited number of Life Cycle Models only

Process Mapping

- **Mappings have been carried out on the CMMI® Process Area level***
 - ❖ CMMI® → 15288 (Coverage = 68%)
 - ❖ CMMI® → 12207 (Coverage = 72%)
 - ❖ CMMI® → 1074 (Coverage = 59%)
- **IEEE Standard support/leverage by CMMI® Process Area Category**
 - ❖ Basic Process Management
 - **Weak**
 - ❖ Advanced Process Management
 - **Missing due to lack of quantitative management focus**
 - ❖ Basic Project Management
 - **Well covered**
 - ❖ Advanced Project Management
 - **IEEE Standards do not provide robust enough support**
 - ❖ Engineering
 - **Well covered**
 - ❖ Basic Support
 - **Adequate coverage, except for Measurement & Analysis**
 - ❖ Advanced Support
 - **Partial coverage due to lack of quantitative management focus**

* See detailed mapping at the end of the presentation in the Backup Slides section.
Definition of Coverage [%] = $(22 - \sum \text{"Not covered"}) / 22 * 100$, where 22 is the total number of CMMI® Process Areas

Granularity of Process Mapping

- Should the IEEE Standards be evaluated (mapped) on a lower, CMMI® practice/sub-practice, level?
 - ❖ No, practices and sub-practices are not **required** model components
 - Practices are only **expected**
 - Sub-practices are only **informative**
 - ❖ Process tailoring must be based on specific business goals and mission objectives
 - Equivalency/Adequacy of actual process steps must be assessed on a case-by-case basis
 - Early attempts for low-level evaluations in absence of specific business goals and objectives could be educational, but do not provide an effective/efficient solution

Implementation Pathways

- **(1) Introducing IEEE Standards in a high maturity environment**
 - ❖ The introduction of IEEE Standards-based processes is well facilitated by the robust process development, maintenance, and improvement infrastructure
 - ❖ As it was discussed, there is some ambiguity related to the CMMI® interpretation of a Defined Process, but mission success and the use of robust development standards should be the primary concern
- **(2) Introducing CMMI® where IEEE Standards are the norm**
 - ❖ IEEE Standards-based processes provide a good starting point
 - ❖ Pay attention though to the much stricter process documentation requirements of the CMMI®
- **(3) Ideal situation would be simultaneous introduction**
 - ❖ Use business and mission objectives as primary tailoring drivers
 - ❖ Pay attention to the CMMI® Context

Conclusions

- **IEEE Standards support CMMI®-based process improvement**
 - ❖ IEEE Standards can be helpful in creating both managed and defined CMMI® Process Assets
 - ❖ **However, be prepared that their practical application is time-consuming and requires effective tailoring**
 - ❖ Another caveat: IEEE Standards are weak and need special attention in the following four areas when introduced to support the implementation of CMMI®-based process improvement:
 - Definition of the process management infrastructure
 - Measurement & Analysis Process Area
 - Characterization of defined processes, due to
 - The need for more detailed documentation that provides greater insight into process activity relationships
 - More rigorous execution requirements
 - Process improvement focus
 - Quantitative Management
- **CMMI® can be leveraged for IEEE Standards**
 - ❖ Tailoring of IEEE Standards is more efficient if it is done with the understanding of CMMI® requirements and terminology

Acronyms

CMMI	Capability Maturity Model Integration
CMU	Carnegie Mellon University
COTS	Commercial Off-The-Shelf
CSSE	Center for Software and Systems Engineering (at USC)
DOD	Department of Defense
HW	Hardware
IEEE	Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers
IPT	Integrated Product Team
ISO	International Standards Organization
MOIE	Mission-Oriented Investigation and Experimentation
NSSAP	National Security Space Acquisition Policy
OPA	Organizational Process Assets
OPD	Organizational Process Definition (CMMI® Process Area)
OSSP	Organizational Set of Standard Processes
PDSP	Project's Defined Software Process
PPBE	Planning, Programming, Budgeting, and Execution
SEI	Software Engineering Institute
SP	Specific Practice (of a CMMI® Process Area)
SPLC	SW Project's Life Cycle
SPLCM	SW Project's Life Cycle Model
SPLCP	SW Project's Life Cycle Process
STD	Standard
SW	Software
USAF	United States Air Force
USC	University of Southern California
WBS	Work Breakdown Structure

Bibliography

- Chrissis 2007 Chrissis, M. B., et al, CMMI® Second Edition – Guidelines for Process Integration and Product Development, Addison-Wesley, 2007
- Eslinger 2006 Eslinger, S., Mission Assurance-Driven Processes for Software-Intensive Ground Systems, Aerospace Technical Report, ATR-2006(8056)-1, September 2006
- Ferguson 1998 Ferguson, J., and Sheard, S., Leveraging Your CMM Efforts for IEEE/EIA 12207, IEEE Software, September/October 1998
- IEEE 1997 IEEE/EIA 12207.0-1997, Industry Implementation of International Standard ISO/IEC 12207:1995, (ISO/IEC 12207) Standard for Information Technology – Software Life Cycle Processes, IEEE March 1998
- IEEE 1998 IEEE Std 1062, 1998 Edition, IEEE Recommended Practice for Software Acquisition, IEEE December 22, 1998
- IEEE 2005 IEEE Std 15288™-2004, Adoption of ISO/IES 15288:2002 Systems Engineering-System Life Cycle Processes, IEEE June 8, 2005
- IEEE 2006 IEEE Std 1074™-2006, IEEE Standard for Developing a Software Project Life Cycle Process, IEEE July 28, 2006
- ISO 2007 <http://www.iso.org/iso/en/aboutiso/introduction/index.html#eight>
- Land 2005 Land, S. K., The Application of IEEE Software and System Engineering Standards in Support of Software Process Improvement, CMMI Conference 2005
- SEI 2007 Understanding and Leveraging a Supplier's CMMI® Efforts: A Guidebook for Acquirers, SEI Technical Report, CMU/SEI-2007-TR-004, March 2007

Backup Slides


15288 System Life Cycle Processes

- **Enterprise Processes**
 - ❖ Enterprise Environment Management
 - ❖ Investment Management
 - ❖ System Life Cycle Process Management
 - ❖ Resource Management
 - ❖ Quality Management
- **Agreement Processes**
 - ❖ Acquisition and Supply
- **Project Processes**
 - ❖ Project Planning
 - ❖ Project Assessment
 - ❖ Project Control
 - ❖ Decision Making
 - ❖ Risk Management
 - ❖ Configuration Management
 - ❖ Information Management
- **Technical Processes**
 - ❖ Stakeholder Requirements Definition
 - ❖ Requirements Analysis
 - ❖ Architectural Design
 - ❖ Implementation
 - ❖ Integration
 - ❖ Verification
 - ❖ Transition
 - ❖ Validation
 - ❖ Operation
 - ❖ Maintenance
 - ❖ Disposal

Software

- **12207 Software Life Cycle Processes**
 - ❖ **Primary Life Cycle Processes**
 - Acquisition
 - Supply
 - Development
 - Operation
 - Maintenance
 - ❖ **Supporting Life Cycle Processes**
 - Documentation
 - Configuration Management
 - Quality Assurance
 - Verification
 - Validation
 - Joint Review
 - Audit
 - Problem Resolution
 - ❖ **Organizational Life Cycle Processes**
 - Management
 - Infrastructure
 - Improvement
 - Training
- **1074 Software Activity Groups**
 - ❖ **Project Management**
 - Project Initiation
 - Project Planning
 - Project Monitoring and Control
 - ❖ **Pre-Development**
 - Concept Exploration
 - System Allocation
 - Software Importation
 - ❖ **Development**
 - Software Requirements
 - Design
 - Implementation
 - ❖ **Post-Development**
 - Installation
 - Operation and Support
 - Maintenance
 - Retirement
 - ❖ **Support**
 - Evaluation
 - Configuration Management
 - Documentation
 - Training

Creating a SW Project Life Cycle Process in 1074




Information Flow

How to Determine What “Organizations” and “Projects” Are

Mapping the WBS into the Organizational Structure

Software-Intensive System WBS (Work Breakdown Structure)

Conceptual WBS




LEGEND

- Software (Light Red Box)
- Hardware (Light Blue Box)
- Activities (Light Green Box)


“Activities” in WBS jargon refer to the creation, integration, and management of the product elements on every level

Space System Terms



Contractor Structure


Example (Simplified) Space System Contractor Relationships



The product's WBS and the contractor relationships **together will determine the actual organizational structure (See next slide)**

Example: Mapping the WBS Into an IPT-Based Organizational Structure


(Simplified) Space System IPT (Integrated Product Team) Structure



The challenge: What are the “organizations” and what are the “projects”?

Comparing the Role of Organizational Processes in IEEE 1074 and in the CMMI®

Developing a SW Project Life Cycle Process in 1074



CMMI® 2007 – Peter Hantos

Slide 35



Acronyms:

LCM: Life Cycle Model


OSSP: Organization's Standard Software Process

PDSP: Project's Defined Software Process

SLCM: Software Life Cycle Model

SW: Software

Developing a Defined Software Process in CMMI®



Mapping CMMI® Process Areas to 15288 Processes

CMMI® Process Areas		Related 15288 Life Cycle Processes
Basic Process Management	Organizational Process Definition	System Life Cycle Process Management
	Organizational Process Focus	Not covered
	Organizational Training	Not covered
Advanced Process Management	Organizational Process Performance	Not covered
	Organizational Innovation & Deployment	Not covered
Basic Project Management	Project Planning	Project Planning
	Project Monitoring & Control	Project Control
	Supplier Agreement Management	Acquisition and Supply
Advanced Project Management	Integrated Project Management	Enterprise Environment Management
	Risk Management	Risk Management
	Quantitative Project Management	Not covered
Engineering	Requirements Development	Stakeholder Requirements Definition, Requirements Analysis
	Requirements Management	
	Product Integration	Integration
	Technical Solution Verification	Architectural Design, Implementation
	Validation	Verification
		Validation
Basic Support	Configuration Management	Configuration Management
	Measurement and Analysis	Not covered
	Process and Product Quality Assurance	Quality Management
Advanced Support	Decision Analysis and Resolution	Decision Making
	Causal Analysis and Resolution	Not covered

Mapping CMMI® Process Areas to 12207 Processes

CMMI® Process Areas		Related 12207 Life Cycle Processes
Basic Process Management	Organizational Process Definition	Improvement, Infrastructure
	Organizational Process Focus	Improvement
	Organizational Training	Training
Advanced Process Management	Organizational Process Performance	Not covered
	Organizational Innovation & Deployment	Not covered
Basic Project Management	Project Planning	Management
	Project Monitoring & Control	Management
	Supplier Agreement Management	Acquisition
Advanced Project Management	Integrated Project Management	Management
	Risk Management	Management
	Quantitative Project Management	Not covered
Engineering	Requirements Development	Development
	Requirements Management	Development
	Product Integration	Development
	Technical Solution	Development
	Verification	Verification
	Validation	Validation
	Configuration Management	Configuration Management
Basic Support	Measurement and Analysis	Not covered
	Process and Product Quality Assurance	Quality Assurance
Advanced Support	Decision Analysis and Resolution	Not covered
	Causal Analysis and Resolution	Not covered

Mapping CMMI® Process Areas to 1074 Activity Groups

CMMI® Process Areas		Related 1074 Activity Groups
Basic Process Management	Organizational Process Definition	Not covered
	Organizational Process Focus	Not covered
	Organizational Training	Not covered
Advanced Process Management	Organizational Innovation & Deployment	Not covered
	Organizational Process Performance	Not covered
Basic Project Management	Project Planning	Project Planning
	Project Monitoring & Control	Project Monitoring & Control
	Supplier Agreement Management	Not covered
Advanced Project Management	Integrated Project Management	Not covered
	Risk Management	Project Monitoring & Control
	Quantitative Project Management	Not covered
Engineering	Requirements Development	Software Requirements
	Requirements Management	Software Requirements
	Product Integration	Implementation
	Technical Solution	Design
	Verification	Evaluation
	Validation	Evaluation
	Configuration Management	Configuration Management
Basic Support	Measurement and Analysis	Project Planning
	Process and Product Quality Assurance	Project Monitoring & Control
	Decision Analysis and Resolution	Evaluation
Advanced Support	Causal Analysis and Resolution	Software Importation
		Not covered

Contact Information

Peter Hantos

The Aerospace Corporation

P.O. Box 92957-M1/112

Los Angeles, CA 90009-2957

Phone: (310) 336-1802

Email: peter.hantos@aero.org

**All trademarks, service marks, and trade names are the
property of their respective owners**

INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

REPORT TITLE

IEEE Life Cycle Standards and the CMMI®—Implementation Considerations

REPORT NO.

TOR-2008(8550)-8029

PUBLICATION DATE

16 June 2008

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION

Unclassified

1. FOR OFF-SITE PERSONNEL, SHOW LOCATION SYMBOL, e.g., JOHN Q. PUBLIC/VAFB

2. IF LIST IS ALTERED, INITIAL CHANGE(S) AND SHOW AFFILIATION
*FOR SECRET REPORTS, SHOW BLDG AND ROOM, NOT MAIL STATION

NAME (Include Initials)

MAIL CODE*

NAME (Include Initials)

MAIL CODE*

L. A.	Abelson	M1-112
S. J.	Alvarado	M1-113
G.	Ayan	M4-943
J. A.	Bannister	M1-101
J.	Betser	M1-025
H. F.	Bittner	ROS
L. R.	Bowers	M1-112
D. J.	Buettner	M5-657
A.	Campbell	M3-218
M. L.	Campbell	M5-689
P. G.	Cheng	M4-905
A.	Chin	M6-227
M. M.	Cutler	M1-178
D. P.	Dayton	M4-992
M.	De Ponte	CH1-610
R. L.	Donnelly	CH1-430
W. D.	Downs III	M1-048
M. K.	Dubas	M1-112
D. B.	Duffin	M5-657
P. C.	Eggan	CH3-320
C. M.	Ellis	M1-043
J.	Ellison	M8-080
S.	Eslinger	M1-112
B. Z.	Faught	M5-687
H.	Follender	CH1-510
A. M.	Foonberg	M1-281
R. P.	Frueholz	M1-933
T. E.	Gallini	M4-956
M. C.	Gechman	M1-106
A. T.	Guillen	M5-584
M. J.	Gura	M1-115
R. N.	Haddad	M5-689
L. F.	Halle	CH1-530
P.	Hantos	M1-112

J. F.	Harrell	M1-112
M. J.	Hecht	M1-112
T. C.	Hecht	M5-641
G.	Haddock	CH3-320
T. J.	Heigle	CH2-307
M. O.	Hogan	COS-1100
A. C.	Hoheb	M3-035
S.	Hollander	M8-018
L. J.	Holloway	M1-106
D. X.	Houston	M1-112
L. V.	Jankovich	M1-112
M. I.	Johnson	M1-106
R. L.	Johnson	M8-080
S. E.	Jones	CH2-402
N. S.	Kern	M4-929
J. S.	Kerner	M4-992
S. V.	Kerr	M1-102
F. L.	Knight	M5-564
W. C.	Krenz	M1-008
A. K.	Lam	M1-112
J. D.	Lang	CH3-320
V. I.	Lang	M5-560
C. H.	Lavine	M1-055
S.	Lazar	M5-681
C. H.	Ledoux	M5-564
R.	Lewis	M4-929
R. M.	Lollock	M5-687
W. S.	Macaulay	M1-106
J. A.	Maguire	ROS
P. H.	Mak	M8-717
P. A.	Maloney	CH1-430
D. C.	Marvin	M1-003
L. S.	Marvin	M6-204
J. F.	McNeil	M1-178

FINAL APPROVER DRAW LINE(S) ACROSS UNFILLED SPACE AND INITIAL TO PRECLUDE ADDITIONS

APPROVED _____

DATE _____

IF LIST COMPRISES TWO OR MORE SHEETS, COMPLETE ABOVE BLOCK ON LAST SHEET ONLY

INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

REPORT TITLE

IEEE Life Cycle Standards and the CMMI®—Implementation Considerations

REPORT NO.

TOR-2008(8550)-8029

PUBLICATION DATE

16 June 2008

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION

Unclassified

1. FOR OFF-SITE PERSONNEL, SHOW LOCATION SYMBOL, e.g., JOHN Q. PUBLIC/AFB

2. IF LIST IS ALTERED, INITIAL CHANGE(S) AND SHOW AFFILIATION
*FOR SECRET REPORTS, SHOW BLDG AND ROOM, NOT MAIL STATION

NAME (Include Initials)

MAIL CODE*

NAME (Include Initials)

MAIL CODE*

S. S.	Matsunaga	M5-565
S. A.	Meyers	M1-112
R. L.	Murillo	M5-024
D. J.	Naiditch	M1-112
N. A.	Nelson	CH3-310
M. L.	Nichols	M1-107
R. G.	Nishinaga	M5-500
D. M.	Nunez	M8-080
T. M.	Nygren	M3-222
H.	Ojeda	M8-692
K. L.	Owens	M1-112
D. A.	Plunkett	M1-165
F. M.	Pollack	M1-046
R. M.	Rojo	M1-112
J. M.	Tagami	M1-112
J. A.	Quirk	M1-065
R. R.	Razouk	M1-002
H. K.	Reddy	M5-584
M. A.	Rich	M1-106
M. N.	Rochlin	ROS
S. C.	Ruth	M4-925
A. A.	Santiago Jr.	M4-021
R. P.	Sena	M5-688
H. M.	Shao	M8-691
B. E.	Shaw	M5-564
J. S.	Shrater	M3-432
F. J.	Sisti	M8-018
D. M.	Speckamn	M1-003
B.	Springsteen	CH1-402

C. J.	Steele	COS-1200
S. A.	Stoops	CH2-307
J. A.	Strada	CH2-401
D. E.	Town	M1-043
B. R.	Troup	M8-692
T. P.	Troup	M1-043
S. R.	Turner	CH3-320
A. D.	Unell	M1-106
J. K.	Unitis	CH2-220
E. A.	Viscarra	M1-112
J. C.	Wang	M4-967
M. V.	Weiskopf	M1-003
M. J.	Wheaton	M4-161
J. M.	Wilson	CH1-510
	AOLIB (2, 5840, 81, WH)	M1-199

FINAL APPROVER DRAW LINE(S) ACROSS UNFILLED SPACE AND INITIAL TO PRECLUDE ADDITIONS

DISTRIBUTION LIMITATIONS MARKED ON THE COVER/TITLE PAGE ARE AUTHORIZED BY SIGNATURE BELOW

APPROVED
(AEROSPACE)

DATE 6/30/08

APPROVED BY
(AF OFFICE)

DATE 23 July 08

(NOT REQUIRED FOR ATR CATEGORY)

IF LIST COMPRISES TWO OR MORE SHEETS, COMPLETE ABOVE BLOCK ON LAST SHEET ONLY

EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

REPORT TITLE

IEEE Life Cycle Standards and the CMMI[®]—Implementation Considerations

REPORT NO.

TOR-2008(8550)-8029

PUBLICATION DATE

16 June 2008

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION

MILITARY AND GOVERNMENT OFFICES

ASSOCIATE CONTRACTORS AND OTHERS

1. SHOW FULL MAILING ADDRESS: INCLUDE ZIP CODE, MILITARY OFFICE SYMBOL, AND "ATTENTION" LINE.
2. IF LIST IS ALTERED, INITIAL CHANGE(S) AND SHOW AFFILIATION.

Defense Technical Information Center
8725 John J. Kingman Rd., Suite 944
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6218
Attn: DTIC-OCP

None

Air University Library (SE)
Maxwell AFB, AL 36112

Space and Missile Systems Center
Air Force Space Command
483 N. Aviation Blvd.
El Segundo, CA 90245-2808

Attn: Col J. R. Horejsi EA
Lt Col S. M. Brown ISGS
Lt Col L. Pope PIF
Maj J. S. Mizell MCA
Maj J. R. Rapallo SSG
Maj J van Weezendonk SY
Lt M. P. Kim MCX
J. A. Hauland MCMG
E. Shulman EAD
M. Zambrana EAD

NPOESS IPO
E/IP-Center Building
8455 Colesville Road
Suite 1450
Silver Springs, MD 20910

P. Wofsy NOAA/NPOESS
Dr. K. StGermaine NOAA/NPOESS
Dr. V. Grano NOAA/NPOESS

FINAL APPROVER DRAW LINE(S) ACROSS UNFILLED SPACE AND INITIAL TO PRECLUDE ADDITIONS

DISTRIBUTION LIMITATIONS MARKED ON THE COVER/TITLE PAGE ARE AUTHORIZED BY SIGNATURE BELOW

APPROVED
(AEROSPACE)

DATE

APPROVED BY
(AF OFFICE)

(NOT REQUIRED FOR ATR CATEGORY)

DATE

IF LIST COMPRISES TWO OR MORE SHEETS, COMPLETE ABOVE BLOCK ON LAST SHEET ONLY

EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

REPORT TITLE

IEEE Life Cycle Standards and the CMMI[®]—Implementation Considerations

REPORT NO.

TOR-2008(8550)-8029

PUBLICATION DATE

16 June 2008

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION

MILITARY AND GOVERNMENT OFFICES

ASSOCIATE CONTRACTORS AND OTHERS

1. SHOW FULL MAILING ADDRESS: INCLUDE ZIP CODE, MILITARY OFFICE SYMBOL, AND "ATTENTION" LINE.
2. IF LIST IS ALTERED, INITIAL CHANGE(S) AND SHOW AFFILIATION.

National Reconnaissance Office

14675 Lee Rd.

Chantilly, VA 20151-1715

Attn: Lt. Col. P. Morrow NIS/IPD/NSG

D. Grass

Lt. Col. S. Edwards COMM

CDR A. L. Cibula

Lt. Col. E. Robertson DDSIE

M. Cerroni DDSIE

Col. Steven Smith

R. Brunngraber IMINT/IGO

Space and Naval Warfare Systems Center

53560 Hull Street

San Diego, CA 92152

Attn: Maureen Jackson U.S. Navy, PMW-146

Space Radar IPO

4851 Stonecroft Blvd Suite 300N

Chantilly, VA 20151

Attn: Ted Marz SAF/SRW

G. Berg SAF/SRW

FINAL APPROVER DRAW LINE(S) ACROSS UNFILLED SPACE AND INITIAL TO PRECLUDE ADDITIONS

DISTRIBUTION LIMITATIONS MARKED ON THE COVER/TITLE PAGE ARE AUTHORIZED BY SIGNATURE BELOW

APPROVED
(AEROSPACE)

DATE 6/30/08

APPROVED BY
(AF OFFICE)

DATE 23 July 08

(NOT REQUIRED FOR ATR CATEGORY)

IF LIST COMPRISES TWO OR MORE SHEETS, COMPLETE ABOVE BLOCK ON LAST SHEET ONLY