



**Carnegie Mellon
Software Engineering Institute**

Pittsburgh, PA 15213-3890

CMMI[®] Today

Mike Phillips
CMMI Program Manager
Software Engineering Institute
Carnegie Mellon University

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

**Sponsored by the U.S. Department of Defense
© 2003 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 CMMI Today				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 Same as Report (SAR)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 47	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			



Brief History – CMMI

1992 – Software CMM created

1994 – Systems Engineering CMM created

1998 – CMMI Product Suite initiated

2001 – CMMI-SE/SW V1.0 released

2002 – CMMI-SE/SW/IPPD/SS V1.1 Product Suite
released

2003 – 10,000 people trained in “Intro to CMMI;” 150+
SCAMPI benchmark appraisals in at least 12
countries; CMMIweb site “hits” exceed 1M/month



CMMI Today

Stable Version 1.1 CMMI Product Suite was released January 2002.

Errata sheets cover known errors and changes with book publication.

FAQs are generated to cover broader issues.


Yahoo has CMMI Process Improvement and Lead Appraiser Group sites.

CMMI web pages hits have surpassed 1M/month.

Change Request announcement addressed 90 day review period through Dec 12.



SW-CMM v1.1 vs. CMMI Process Areas





CMMI Improvements over the CMM

Emphasis on measurable improvements to achieve business objectives.

Process areas have been added to place more emphasis on some important practices:

- Risk Management
- Measurement and Analysis
- Engineering Process Areas
- Decision Analysis



Adoption—What else is happening now?


Publication of SEI Series Book with Addison-Wesley: others include:

- CMMI Distilled: Second Edition
- Systematic Process Improvement Using ISO 9001:2000 and CMMI
- Balancing Agility and Discipline

Annual NDIA/SEI CMMI User Workshop

- Denver Hyatt Technical Center
- Nov 17-20
- 400+ attendees

Mappings taken on by IEEE





How about SEI Publications?

Technical notes and special reports:

- Interpretive Guidance Project: Preliminary Report
- CMMI and Product Line Practices
- CMMI and Earned Value Management
- Interpreting CMMI for Operational Organizations
- Interpreting CMMI for COTS Based Systems
- Interpreting CMMI for Service Organizations
- Providing Safety and Security Assurance (in progress)
- Interpreting CMMI for Acquisition (in progress)



CMMI Transition Status

As of 12/31/03

Training

Introduction to CMMI – 10103 trained

Intermediate CMMI – 777 trained

Introduction to CMMI Instructors – 219 trained

SCAMPI Lead Appraisers – 379 trained


Authorized

Introduction to CMMI V1.1 Instructors - 176

SCAMPI V1.1 Lead Appraisers – 267




Number of CMMI Students Trained (Cumulative)






Number of Lead Appraisers Authorized (Cumulative)






Intro to the CMM and CMMI Attendees (Cumulative)





Number of Assessments Reported to the SEI by Year
30 September 2003






CMMI® Results Study Framework

Costs

Benefits / Savings / Improvements





Boeing, Australia

Making transition to CMMI from SW-CMM and EIA 731;
early CMMI pilot in Australia

RESULTS on One Project

- 33% decrease in the average cost to fix a defect
- Turnaround time for releases cut in half
- 60% reduction in work from Pre-Test and Post-Test Audits;
passed with few outstanding actions
- Increased focus on product quality
- Increased focus on eliminating defects
- Developers seeking improvement opportunities

Product cost

Schedule /
cycle time

Quality

In Processes is there a Pay-Off? Terry Stevenson, Boeing Australia, Software Engineering Australia 2003 conference.



Lockheed Martin M&DS

SW CMM ML2 (1993) to ML 3 (1996) to CMMI ML5 (2002)

Results

- Award Fees during 2002 are 45% percent of unrealized award fees at ML2

Customer
satisfaction

1996 - 2002

- Increased software productivity by 30%
- 16% reduction in Dollars/KLOC
- Decreased defect find and fix costs by 15%

Productivity

Product cost

Quality

Internal data shared through Collaboration; August 2003.





General Motors Corporation

CMMI focus 2001

Goal is Integration of Supplier Work & GM Project Execution

Results:

- Improved schedule – projects met milestones and were fewer days late



Schedule /
cycle time

Camping on a Seesaw: GM's IS&S Process Improvement Approach. Hoffman, Moore & Schatz, SEPG 2003.



Aggregated Appraisal Results

	Process Management			Project Management				Engineering							Support				
GG3	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	14%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	9%	0%	0%	0%	GG3
GG2	0%	0%	9%	0%	13%	33%	22%	14%	31%	44%	25%	50%	27%	36%	36%	36%	0%	0%	GG2
GG1	45%	18%	18%	0%	22%	44%	90%	24%	39%	50%	57%	81%	53%	50%	44%	44%	0%	0%	GG1
SG3					56%			41%		56%	100%	88%	88%			56%			SG3
SG2	45%	27%		100%	22%	61%	90%	65%		65%	86%	94%	53%	69%	63%	63%		31%	SG2
SG1	45%	27%	18%	0%	39%	50%	100%	24%	39%	72%	64%	94%	88%	59%	44%	63%	7%	0%	SG1
	OT	OPF	OPD	IPM	PP	PMC	SAM	RISK	RM	RD	TS	PI	VER	VAL	PPQA	CM	DAR	M&A	

Goals		Goal Satisfaction	
	Generic Goal		Majority of organisations appraised achieved Goal Satisfaction
	Specific Goal		Majority of organisations appraised did not achieve Goal Satisfaction
	Process Areas of Immediate Concern		Not Applicable

Results from 18 Defence Community* appraisals conducted over the period Mid 2000 - Present

- *Includes Defence Industry and Department of Defence appraisal results



The Road Ahead....

Formal Review period ends mid-December

CMMI Team will review CRs to determine possible
Change Packages for a V1.2 of model and/or method


CCB will determine which CPs, if any, are needed
(stability goal remains)

Improvement Packages would be an FY 05 effort, with
piloting

V1.2 would be ~FY 06



CMMI Staged and Six Sigma



**Six Sigma is enterprise wide.
Six Sigma addresses product and process.
Six Sigma focuses on “critical to quality” factors.**




Six Sigma and CMMI Continuous

Achieve high capability in PAs that build Six Sigma skills.

- MA, QPM, CAR, OPP

Use capability to help prioritize remaining PAs




Remaining PAs ordered by business factors, improvement opportunity, etc. which are better understood using foundational capabilities. CMMI Staged groupings and DMAIC vs. DMADV are also factors that may drive the remaining order.

[Vickroy 03]



LMC M&DS Process Standard Roadmap



Six Sigma links:

[S-P 03]

Level 2 Measurement & Analysis PA, Level 4/5 PAs




Six Sigma Approach at Northrop Grumman




Linked with Business Planning and Oversight

- Business planning
- Project selection




Enabled by Infrastructure

- Training
- Tools
- Awareness
- Database





Minitab.Ink

StartIt! – a NGMS product Carnegie Mellon University



Quantitatively Driven

- Six Sigma improvements are quantified



Self Assessment & Monitoring
EXAMPLE OF TOOL USAGE

Process	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Process 1	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Process 2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Process 3	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Process 4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Process 5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Process 6	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Process 7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Process 8	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Process 9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Process 10	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Integrated with Quality Program

- Integrated Training, Awareness, & Policies
- Integrated CMMI & Six Sigma projects
- Integrated tracking and reporting via DB, PRA, etc.



Tied to Employee Performance


- Goals, awards
- Job and career paths

Identification Information:

Name:	
Nickname:	
Job Title:	
Unit:	
Location:	
Six Sigma Status:	
Employee ID:	

Engaged with External Customers

- Visibility
- Participation





Northrop Grumman's Six Sigma Implementation

Started implementing Six Sigma in 2001

Trained over 3000 Green Belts (80 hours), and over 200 Black Belts (160 hours)

Completed several hundred projects covering all functional areas


- Customer involvement and award fee citations

About half of the projects are improving an engineering process





3 Keys to Competitive Leverage at Northrop Grumman





Process Maturity Profile

CMMI® v1.1 SCAMPISM v1.1 Appraisal Results

Mike Phillips
CMMI Program Manager
Software Engineering Institute
Carnegie Mellon University

The Software Engineering Institute is a federally funded research and development center sponsored by the U.S. Department of Defense and operated by Carnegie Mellon® University



Carnegie Mellon
Software Engineering Institute



Outline

Introduction

Current Status

Summary

Terms used in this Briefing

How to Report your Appraisal Results to the SEI



Introduction: Purpose

Characterize the adoption of the CMMI

Describe results from Standard CMMI Appraisal Method for Process Improvement (SCAMPI v1.1) Class A appraisals using Capability Maturity Model Integration (CMMI) v1.1 *

Encourage continued reporting of results

* Organizations previously appraised against CMMI v1.0 and who have not reappraised against v1.1 are not included in this report

Please visit: http://www.sei.cmu.edu/sema/profile_about.html for additional information or questions you may have about this briefing before contacting the SEI directly



Current Status


SCAMPI v1.1 appraisals conducted since April 2002
release through ~~September 2003~~ **October 2003** and reported to the SEI by

- **136** appraisals
- **123** organizations
- **68** participating companies
- **11** reappraised organizations
- **520** projects
- **44%** offshore organizations

Please refer to: Terms Used in this Report on page 21




Reporting Organizational Types - 1



Based on 123 organizations



Reporting Organizational Types - 2




Based on 123 organizations



Types of Organizations

Based on Primary Standard Industrial Classification (SIC)
Code




Based on 63 organizations reporting SIC code. For more information visit: <http://www.osha.gov/oshstats/sicser.html>



Organization Size


Based on the total number of employees within the area of the organization that was appraised



Based on **122** organizations reporting size data




Use of Model Representations in Appraisals



Based on **136** appraisals




Disciplines Selected for Appraisals



Based on **136** appraisals reporting coverage




Summary Organizational Maturity Profile



Based on most recent appraisal of **87** organizations reporting a maturity level rating



Maturity Profile by Organizational Type




Based on most recent appraisal of **87** organizations reporting organization type and a maturity level rating



Carnegie Mellon
Software Engineering Institute




Countries Where Appraisals Have Been Performed and Reported to the SEI



Australia Canada China Colombia France India
Japan Korea, Republic of Russia Switzerland Taiwan United Kingdom
United States




USA and Offshore Summary Organizational Maturity Profiles



Based on **33** U.S. organizations and **54** offshore organizations reporting their maturity level rating




Process Area Satisfaction – Maturity Level 2



Based on the number of appraisals listed above that rated the process area



Process Area Satisfaction – Maturity Level 3




Based on the number of appraisals listed above that rated the process area

11 of the 83 appraisals rating IPM also examined the IPPD goals. 10 of these 11 appraisals satisfied IPM with the IPPD goals.



Process Area Satisfaction – Maturity Levels 4&5




Based on the number of appraisals listed above that rated the process area



Process Area Profiles - 1

Organizations Appraised at Maturity Level 1

Defined




Based on 12 appraisals reporting a maturity level rating

* None of the 14 appraisals selected the IPPD discipline



Process Area Profiles - 2

Organizations Appraised at Maturity Level 2



Based on 22 appraisals reporting a maturity level rating

* 1 of the 22 appraisals rating IPM also examined the IPPD goals.
That appraisal satisfied IPM.



Summary

Relatively even reporting from the Commercial and Contractor communities, however Commercial organizations are primarily outside of the U.S. and Government Contractors are primarily located in the U.S.

Of U.S. organizations, the services and manufacturing industries reported most appraisals.

Compared to the early reports of the SW-CMM maturity profile, the early data reflects a relatively more mature CMMI profile.

Additional information and charts will be added to this briefing as more appraisals are reported and therefore more data is available to support these breakdowns.



Terms Used in this Report

- Company** - Parent of the appraised entity
A company can be a commercial or non-commercial firm, for-profit or not for-profit business, a research and development unit, a higher education unit, a government agency, or branch of service, etc.
- Organization – a.k.a. Appraised entity**
The organization unit to which the appraisal results apply. An appraised entity can be the entire company, a selected business unit, units supporting a particular product line or service, etc.
- Offshore** - Appraised entity whose geographic location is not within the United States. The parent of the appraised entity may or may not be based within the United States.



Carnegie Mellon
Software Engineering Institute



Report your Appraisal Results to the SEI

The briefing is only possible due to the cooperation of organizations and individuals sending in their appraisal results to the SEI

In order to provide this information and service in the future, it will depend on this continued cooperation

Please visit:

<http://www.sei.cmu.edu/sema/report.html>

for forms, information, and instructions on how to report appraisals to the SEI



Carnegie Mellon
Software Engineering Institute



Contact Information

Please visit:

http://www.sei.cmu.edu/sema/profile_about.html

and review the information provided before contacting:

SEI Customer Relations (412) 268-5800
SEI FAX number (412) 268-5758

Internet Address
customer-relations@sei.cmu.edu

Mailing Address
Customer Relations
Software Engineering Institute
Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213-3890