



Carnegie Mellon
Software Engineering Institute

Pittsburgh, PA 15213-3890

Guidelines for Acquisition Planning

Ceci Albert

John Bergey

Wolf Goethert

Ed Morris

Sponsored by the U.S. Department of Defense
© 2004 by Carnegie Mellon University

Report Documentation Page

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

| | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| 1. REPORT DATE JAN 2004 | | 2. REPORT TYPE | | 3. DATES COVERED 00-00-2004 to 00-00-2004 | |
| 4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Guidelines for Acquisition Planning | | | | 5a. CONTRACT NUMBER | |
| | | | | 5b. GRANT NUMBER | |
| | | | | 5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER | |
| 6. AUTHOR(S) | | | | 5d. PROJECT NUMBER | |
| | | | | 5e. TASK NUMBER | |
| | | | | 5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER | |
| 7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Carnegie Mellon University, Software Engineering Institute, Pittsburgh, PA, 15213 | | | | 8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER | |
| 9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) | | | | 10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S) | |
| | | | | 11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) | |
| 12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited | | | | | |
| 13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES | | | | | |
| 14. ABSTRACT | | | | | |
| 15. SUBJECT TERMS | | | | | |
| 16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF: | | | 17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT | 18. NUMBER OF PAGES | 19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON |
| a. REPORT unclassified | b. ABSTRACT unclassified | c. THIS PAGE unclassified | | | |



System Acquisition Approach -1

“We Got it Covered” Approach



What software? I am buying a system – my contractor will take care of all of the implementation issues!

System Acquisition Approach -2

“Let’s Cross that Bridge When We Come to It” Approach



Software is inherently flexible – so define the rest of the system first and then we can define and build the software



System Acquisition Approach -3

“Attack the High Risk Issues at the Outset” Approach



Software poses major system risk – give software issues full consideration and adequately address them from the start



Purpose of the Guidelines

Help project managers select and defend acquisition strategies that explicitly consider and mitigate the software risks in their software-intensive system acquisition

- **Provide a framework for effectively reasoning about the software risks in the project**
- **Provide the insights necessary to mitigate those risks in design of the project's acquisition strategy**
- **Create a shared understanding of why specific strategies have been selected from among the myriad of possibilities**



To Mitigate Software Risks

Profile the software risk in the project early - and continuously - so that stakeholders can make reasonable mitigation decisions

Create - and update - the program's acquisition strategy based on an understanding of the program's exposure to software risk

Reason about and defend the efficacy of a given acquisition strategy based on its ability to mitigate the software risk



Determining Exposure to Software Risk

A primary concern in acquisition planning is understanding the degree to which software components in the system pose risk.

The level of software risk depends on

- The amount of software in the system**
- The importance of software performance to system operation**
- The precedence or difficulty of a given software component to build and/or integrate with other system component**



System Software Risk Elements

Scale of Software



Dependence on Software




Complexity of Software






System Software Risk Elements




The arrows represent the judgment of the program manager



Elements of Software Risk




Risk Elements





Risk and Acquisition Strategies



| Acquisition Planning Sub Strategies | Low Risk | Program A | High Risk |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| | Requirements | <i>Sub-Strategies</i> | <i>Sub-Strategies</i> |
| Project Office | | | |
| Contract | | | |
| Life Cycle | | | |

The table illustrates the relationship between acquisition planning sub-strategies and risk levels for Program A. The 'Requirements' row shows 'Sub-Strategies' for Low Risk, Program A, and High Risk. Vertical arrows point from the 'Requirements' row down to the 'Life Cycle' row for each risk level: a dark blue arrow for Low Risk, a green arrow for Program A, and a dark blue arrow for High Risk.



For Example: Specification Risks

Stable, fully defined, unambiguous, consistent, complete, testable software requirements are rare.

- **Some requirements are firm from the start**
- **Some requirements cannot be defined until other things about the system are known**
- **Some requirements may be in a constant state of flux as technology, off-the-shelf product, mission needs (or the understanding of what is needed) evolve.**

Trying to fully define software requirements too early or trying to limit requirements changes in a changing environment may be riskier than having flexible requirements.

The acquisition strategy needs to accommodate the degree to which requirements can or should change.





Well-defined, complete,
and stable

Incomplete or volatile

Specification

| | Well defined and stable | Incomplete or volatile |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| Reqmts | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Implement strong process oversight to control changes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Flexible, prioritized and negotiated requirements § Nimble process to manage and communicate changes |
| Project Office | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Limited oversight required | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Increased need for engineering staff to monitor system design/progress |
| Contract | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Consider fixed price contract | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Avoid completion contracts (use Cost-plus services contract?) § Offer incentives for delivered system performance |
| Life Cycle | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> § “Waterfall” approach § Favorable terms for O&M may be defined with development contract | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Spiral approach § May not be able to award an O&M contract better understood |






| | Well defined and stable | Strategy A2 | Incomplete or volatile |
|----------------|--|--|--|
| Reqmts | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Implement strong process oversight to control changes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Isolate the affected requirements so the changes are obvious | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Flexible, prioritized and negotiated requirements § Nimble process to manage and communicate changes |
| Project Office | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Limited oversight required | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Track technology evolution to identify commitment point | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Increased need for engineering staff to monitor system design/progress |
| Contract | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Consider fixed price contract | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Separately price unknown requirements – incentivize low cost | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Avoid completion contracts (use Cost-plus services contract?) § Offer incentives for delivered system performance |
| Life Cycle | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> § “Waterfall” approach § Favorable terms for O&M may be defined with development contract | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan and budget for changes across the life of the system | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Spiral approach § May not be able to award an O&M contract better understood |



Project Profile (Composite of Elements)





Next Steps in Use of Sliders

Validate the approach and the set of sliders by profiling the software risk in selected Army programs using the sliders

Show how each program's current acquisition strategy relates to their identified software risk

Pilot use of Guidelines in a new start

Document the Guidelines



Carnegie Mellon
Software Engineering Institute

Contact Information

Ceci Albert
cca@sei.cmu.edu