



**Carnegie Mellon
Software Engineering Institute**

Pittsburgh, PA 15213-3890

Using the CMMI[®] in Acquisition Environments

Brian Gallagher
Software Engineering Institute

Presented to
Software-intensive Systems Conference
26 January, 2004

Sponsored by the U.S. Department of Defense
© 2003 by Carnegie Mellon University

SM SCAMPI, SCAMPI Lead Appraiser, and SEI are service marks of Carnegie Mellon University.

© CMMI, Capability Maturity Model, and CMM are registered in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office by Carnegie Mellon University.

page 1

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 26 JAN 2004		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED 00-00-2004 to 00-00-2004	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Using the CMMI in Acquisition Environments				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 2004 Conference on the Acquisition of Software-Intensive Systems, 26-28 Jan, 2004.					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT	b. ABSTRACT	c. THIS PAGE			
unclassified	unclassified	unclassified	Same as Report (SAR)	54	



Carnegie Mellon
Software Engineering Institute

Agenda

SEI Overview

Capability Maturity Model Integration

Use of CMMI in Acquisition Environments

Conclusion



**Carnegie Mellon
Software Engineering Institute**

Carnegie Mellon Univ. Major Units

Software Engineering Institute

Carnegie Institute of Technology

College of Fine Arts

**College of Humanities and
Social Sciences**

**Graduate School of Industrial
Administration**

**H. John Heinz III School of
Public Policy and Management**

Mellon College of Science

School of Computer Science





Carnegie Mellon
Software Engineering Institute

Software Engineering Institute


- Established in 1984 - Applied R&D Laboratory situated as a college- level unit at Carnegie Mellon University
- DoD staff ceiling (FY04): 147; Technical staff of 315
- Offices in Arlington, Va, Pittsburgh, Pa, Red Stone Arsenal, Al, Colorado Springs, Co, Frankfurt, GE
- **Mission:** Provide the technical leadership to improve the practice of Software Engineering so the DoD can acquire and sustain its Software Intensive Systems with predictable and improved Cost, Schedule, and Quality
- **Goal:** Institutionalize new and improved practices in the acquirer and developer communities





SEI Strategy

*Helping others make measured
Improvements in their
software engineering practices*





SEI Research Agenda - Create

*The right software delivered
defect free, on cost, on time, every time*

*High confidence, evolvable,
product lines*

*with predictable and improved
cost, schedule, and quality*

Integration of
SIS

Survivable
Systems

Capability
Maturity
Model
Integration

Team
Software
Process

Performance
Critical Systems

Product
Line Practice

Software
Architecture
Technologies

Predictable
Assembly
with
Certifiable
Components

Software
Engineering
Measurement
& Analysis

**Technical Practice
Initiatives**


**Management Practice
Initiatives**



Apply



*Lessons and Practices
Transitioned Widely*



**Technical
Practice Initiatives**

**Management
Practice Initiatives**



**Acquisition
Support
Program**

Software
Collaborators
Network

MITRE

Universities

APL

OSD/SIS

AMCOM/SED



STSC

Aerospace

DAU

Acquisition Communities of Practice

© 2003 by Carnegie Mellon University



Direct Benefit to Acquisition Programs



Carnegie Mellon
Software Engineering Institute

Agenda

SEI Overview

Capability Maturity Model Integration


Use of CMMI in Acquisition Environments

Conclusion



What's Important?

Operational
Need






Defining the Processes

Operational
Need



Acquirer




Developer





Improving the Processes





CMMI in a Nutshell

CMMI provides guidance for improving an organization's processes and ability to manage the development, acquisition, and maintenance of *products* or *product components*.

CMMI places proven approaches into a structure that

- helps your organization examine the effectiveness of your processes
- establishes priorities for improvement
- helps you implement these improvements

Improving processes for better products



Why Focus on Product Development?

A system's engineering approach is critical for today's extremely complex DoD systems.

- Essential for successful Spiral Development and (Evolutionary) Acquisition process
- Critical for successful Technology Insertion and Technology Transition for modern systems

Recent example: Lack of robust systems engineering practices identified as critical factor in SBIRS-High problems (per Lt. Gen. Brian A. Arnold, USAF, CDR, USAF/SMC, 5/6/02 Aviation Week)


CMMI implementation is major forcing function for the needed systems engineering content of today's systems



Complexity in Modern Systems


Many commercial products are the result of a complex mix of subcomponents engineered into a system

Most DoD weapon and information systems are *at least* this complex






Weapon System Complexity





Increasing System Complexity



JSF
•UAVs
•NCW
•Inter-System Operability



Focus of CMMI


CMMI is applied here



SW-CMM is applied here



CMMI SE/SW/IPPD/SS





**Carnegie Mellon
Software Engineering Institute**

CMMI Steering Group

Bob Rassa, Raytheon (Co-chair)

Mike Nicol, USAF (Co-chair)

Ric Sylvester, OUSD(AT&L)

Dave Castellano, OUSD(AT&L)

George Desiderio, OUSD(AT&L)

Brenda Zettervall, USN

vacant, USA

Clyde Chittister, SEI

Bill Peterson, SEI

Hal Wilson, Northrop Grumman

Bob Lentz, General Dynamics

Joan Weszka, Lockheed Martin

Leroy Brown, Motorola

Linda Ibrahim, FAA



Carnegie Mellon
Software Engineering Institute

Agenda

SEI Overview

Capability Maturity Model Integration

Use of CMMI in Acquisition Environments

Conclusion



Environment





Acquisition use of CMMI

Acquisition organizations can use the CMMI to:

- Help discriminate between offerors during a competitive source selection
- Help incentivize contractors to use effective practices and improve those practices after contract award
- Establish an acquisition process improvement program within the program office



Critical Questions for Source Selection

If I require everyone to be Maturity Level 3, is it a discriminator or a non-discriminator?

Is process maturity of the development teams important enough to be a discriminator, can I really find out without checking the behavior of the organization?

If it is important enough, do I have the time and resources to check?




What is Maturity Level 3?

If an organization is a Maturity Level 3 developer, you can expect on their *next project*:

- Team experience as captured in processes is based on organizational guidance
- Estimates are based on historical data
- The organization continually assesses their processes and products to look for improvement
- Training is defined and provided
- Stakeholders are involved
- Engineering, Management, Support, and Process related practices are defined, used, measured, and improved



Real Life



CMMI Math: $3 + 4 + 5 + 1 = ?$



Implications

Maturity Levels are a good starting point

Need to ensure the team's practices are sound and that risks associated with the way the team does business are continually identified and addressed

The acquisition team's practices impact the team's overall performance



Contract Monitoring Example

National Reconnaissance Office

*Freedom's Sentinel in Space: One Team,
Revolutionizing Global Reconnaissance*

Mission of the NRO: Enable U.S. global information superiority, during peace through war. The NRO is responsible for the unique and innovative technology, large-scale systems engineering, development and acquisition, and operation of space reconnaissance systems and related intelligence activities needed to support global information superiority.



System Characteristics

Huge system engineering endeavors encompassing space vehicles and ground infrastructure


Complex software engineering and hardware responsibilities

System development pose big risks in acquisition programs

- Several Million SLOC programs
- Dispersed engineering & development locations
- Multi-contractor teams using different processes
- Combination of legacy re-use, COTS integration and new software development efforts
- Real cost and schedule constraints



Strategic Plan for Insight



Year 0:	Conduct series of source selection appraisals for all Offerors
Year 2/3 :	Conduct <u>baselining</u> appraisals for primes and subcontractors
Year 4:	Conduct “delta” appraisals for primes and subcontractors
Year 5	Conduct “statusing” appraisals for primes and subcontractors
	•
	•
	•

	Source Selection Appraisals
	Baselining Appraisals
	Delta SCE / Statusing Appraisal



Results of Contract Monitoring Appraisals

Findings from all sites combined into a set of “program findings”

- \pm 684 Program Findings (specific problems or strengths)
- (~ 55% program strengths; ~ 45% weaknesses => risk areas)


“Affinity Grouped” Weaknesses to correct systemic problems, not just symptoms

- For example: “Baseline” Management would combine findings from CM, RM, RD, TS, etc.

11 Risk areas / Process Improvement Categories identified

- Being used as the basis for project process improvement activities

Weakness Characterization by Process Grouping Across Program



Project Mgmt Processes:

- Project Planning
- Project Monitoring & Control
- Integrated Project Mgmt
- Risk Management

Engineering Processes

- Requirements Mgmt
- Requirements Definition
- Technical Solution
- Product Integration
- Verification (Peer Reviews)

Support Processes

- Measurement & Analysis
- Product and Process Quality Assurance
- Configuration Mgmt
- Decision Analysis

Process Mgmt

- Organizational Process Focus
- Organizational Process Definition



Issues Identified in Appraisals - Program Management

- Use of corporate standard engineering processes on program
- Lack of project plans or having only incomplete, conflicting or out of date project plans
- Ineffective use of Integrated Master Schedule as basis for planning/tracking status across program
- Undefined engineering and management processes on program
- Inability to track and manage actions to closure
- Cost estimation processes, methods, data and tools
- Staffing and training project personnel
- Tracking dependencies between or across teams
- Managing project data
- Ability to proactively identify and manage risks



Issues Identified in Appraisals - Engineering

- Understanding of the program's requirements
- Requirements traceability to architecture/design or to test plans/procedures
- Linkage of functional and performance requirements
- Inconsistent requirements management at different levels
- Criteria for making architectural/design decisions among alternatives
- Capturing entire technical data package (requirements, design and design rationale, test results, etc)
- Efficiency of design process/methods
- Defining integration and test procedures
- Defining/maintaining integration and test environments
- Existence of integration procedures



Issues Identified in Appraisals – Support Processes

Identifying items in configuration management baselines

Ability to manage individual “versions” in incremental development

Effectively managing changes to work products throughout lifecycle

Conducting audits to establish/ensure integrity of baselines throughout
incremental engineering and development

Effectiveness/efficiency of change management process (cycle time,
volume of changes)

Roles/responsibilities of change control boards

Quality Assurance audits of products and processes

QA involvement in system and software engineering processes

Sufficiency of resources for quality assurance/product assurance

Defining, storing, analyzing, using measurement data

Breadth of metrics to manage engineering activities (outside of
cost/schedule data)



Progress In Action-Plan Implementation

Re-Assessed during subsequent appraisals (18 months later)

- Good News: Majority of issues addressed or completely resolved
- One program segment (prime and subcontractor teams)
 - 73 findings resulted in 41 Action Plans through affinity grouping
 - Thirty (30) were implemented within 6 months of appraisal
 - Additional eight (8) implemented within 9 months of appraisal
 - Final 3 resolved prior to return appraisal
 - Program Mgmt (contractor and gov't) briefed weekly on progress
 - Contractors gather “evidence” of process use and effectiveness
- Major Subcontractor:
 - 31 Findings resulted in 24 action plans
 - 24 corrected within 9 months of appraisal
- Additional Subcontractor:
 - 22 findings resulted in 22 action items
 - All 22 corrected within 6 months of appraisal




Bottom Line

In-progress reviews ensure the practices used by the entire team are effective

Early identification and mitigation of common process-related issues and problems



Acquirer/Supplier Mismatch





Some Acquisition Scenarios

Scenario 1: Acquiring a low-risk sub-component

Scenario 2: Acquiring subsystems

Scenario 3: Acquiring whole systems



Scenario 1 – Low Risk Component

Project X is building a mission planning system to manage the tasking of an earth observing sensor.


Subsystems include:

- Scheduling Subsystem
- Planning Subsystem
- Task Management Subsystem
- Reporting Subsystem
- Map Subsystem

The project has decided to procure a commercially available mapping system for their map subsystem. Multiple suppliers have adequate products that require minimum modifications for the purpose. The acquisition team would need to help analyze options, select a supplier, and manage the supplier agreement.




CMMI SE/SW





Scenario 2 – Shared Risk


Project Y is responsible for delivering an integrated ground system for a new earth observing sensor.



Success of Project Y is highly dependent on success of suppliers – risk of failure is high if any one of the suppliers fail – the project needs to proactively manage the supplier relationships.



CMMI SE/SW/IPPD/SS





Scenario 3 – Acquiring Whole Systems

Project Z is an acquisition organization responsible for acquiring an integrated ground system for a new earth observing sensor.



Success of the government/contractor team is highly dependent upon success of both parties. High quality practices required on both sides.



Which Model to Use?

SA-CMM – Focus on acquiring a software system

Acquisition Module for CMMI (new) – Focus on system acquisition



Acquisition Module for CMMI

Focuses on effective acquisition activities and practices that are implemented by first-level acquisition projects (e.g., System Project Office/Program Manager)

Acquisition practices drawn and summarized from existing sources of best practices:

- Software Acquisition Capability Maturity Model (SA-CMM)
- Capability Maturity Model Integration (CMMI)
- FAA Integrated Capability Maturity Model (iCMM)
- Section 804

Intended to be used in conjunction with the CMMI as an acquisition “lens” for interpreting the CMMI in acquisition environments



Process Areas Included*

Configuration Management
Decision Analysis and Resolution
Integrated Project Management
Integrated Teaming
Measurement and Analysis
Organizational Environment for Integration
Process and Product Quality Assurance
Project Monitoring and Control
Project Planning
Requirements Development
Requirements Management
Risk Management
Solicitation and Contract Monitoring
Transition to Operations and Support
Validation
Verification

*Acquisition Module for CMMI expected publish date: mid Feb 04



Solicitation and Contract Monitoring

The purpose of Solicitation and Contract Monitoring is to prepare a solicitation package that identifies the needs of a particular acquisition, to select a supplier who is best capable of satisfying those needs, and to provide leadership throughout the life of the acquisition to ensure those needs are met.



Solicitation and Contract Monitoring

The project is prepared to conduct the solicitation.

- Designate a selection official responsible for making the selection decision.
- Establish and maintain a solicitation package that includes the needs of the acquisition and corresponding proposal evaluation criteria.
- Establish and maintain independently reviewed cost and schedule estimates for the products to be acquired.
- Validate the solicitation package with end users and potential bidders to ensure the approach and cost and schedule estimates are realistic and can reasonably lead to a usable product.

Suppliers are selected based on the solicitation package.

- Evaluate proposals according to the documented solicitation plans.
- Use proposal evaluation results as a basis to support selection decisions.

Contracts are issued based on the needs of the acquisition and the suppliers' proposed approaches.

- Establish and maintain a mutual understanding of the contract with selected suppliers and end users based on the acquisition needs and the suppliers' proposed approaches.
- Establish and maintain communication processes and procedures with suppliers that emphasize the needs, expectations, and measures of effectiveness to be used throughout the acquisition.

Work is coordinated with suppliers to ensure the contract is executed properly.

- Monitor and analyze selected processes used by the supplier based on the supplier's documented processes.
- Evaluate selected supplier work products based on documented evaluation criteria.
- Revise the supplier agreement or relationship, as appropriate, to reflect changes in conditions.



Transition to Operations and Support

The purpose of Transition to Operations and Support is to provide for the transition of the product to the end user and the eventual support organization and to accommodate lifecycle evolution. Eventual disposal of the product should be considered.



Transition to Operations and Support

Preparation for transition to operations and support is conducted.

- Establish and maintain a strategy for transition to operations and support.
- Establish and maintain plans for transitioning acquired products into operational use and support.
- Establish and maintain training requirements for operational and support personnel.
- Establish and maintain initial and life-cycle resource requirements for performing operations and support.
- Identify and assign organizational responsibility for support.
- Establish and maintain criteria for assigning responsibility for enhancements.
- Establish and maintain transition criteria for the acquired products.

Acquired products are transitioned to operations and support based on transition criteria.

- Evaluate the readiness of the acquired products to undergo transition to operations and support.
- Evaluate the readiness of the operational and support personnel to undergo transition to the acquired products.
- Analyze the results of all transition activities and identify appropriate action.



Carnegie Mellon
Software Engineering Institute

Using the Acquisition Module

Guidance on establishing effective processes in a program office

Informal gap analysis



Carnegie Mellon
Software Engineering Institute

Agenda

SEI Overview

Capability Maturity Model Integration

Use of CMMI in Acquisition Environments

Conclusion



CMMI and the Technology Lifecycle

Operational
Need



Acquisition Module for CMMI

Acquirer



Developer



CMMI-SE/SW/IPPD/SS





Carnegie Mellon
Software Engineering Institute

Contact Information

Brian Gallagher
Director, Acquisition Support Program
bg@sei.cmu.edu
412-268-7157