

46 Range Control Squadron



Journey from
CMM[®] to CMMI[®]

Kathy Reid

17 May 2011

DISTRIBUTION A. Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

Integrity ★ Service ★ Excellence

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 17 MAY 2011	2. REPORT TYPE	3. DATES COVERED 00-00-2011 to 00-00-2011			
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Journey from CMM to CMMI		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) 46th Test Wing, 46 Range Control Squadron, Eglin AFB, FL, 32542		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 Presented at the 23rd Systems and Software Technology Conference (SSTC), 16-19 May 2011, Salt Lake City, UT					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Same as Report (SAR)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 20	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			




Overview

- Organizational Structure
- Journey Overview
- The Approach
- Challenges
- Lessons Learned



Organizational Structure





Journey Overview



Transitioning from CMMI v1.2 to v1.3

Effort expanded to Services (CM, QA, MA, Meetings, Peer Review, Management Reviews)

Effort expanded to Systems Engineering

OSP Streamlined using AFSSO21 principles, Support Tools enhanced

Defect Prevention & TCM Processes established

PSO and TWGs established

SEPG and ESC established

2000

1999
CMM Level 2 achieved

2002
Quick Look – Level 3 well established, high probability of Level 5

2003
CMM Level 5 achieved

2004
Benchmark Appraisal to establish CMMI transition plan

2005
Benchmark SCAMPI A CMMI Level 3 Appraisal

2006
SCAMPI A CMMI Maturity Level (ML) 5 Appraisal Goal: ML3

2007

2008

2009

2010

2012...

- Return on Investment Demonstrated**
- Higher Productivity (46% increase)
 - Improved Quality (13% less corrective work)
 - Better Estimation (56% improvement in achieving or exceeding organizational goals)



The Approach

- Assess CMMI® Model Delta
- Expand Model Application
- Address the Culture Changes
- Update Processes/Tools
- Measure Performance Quantitatively



Assess CMMI® Model Delta

- Raised the bar:
 - Added a Measurement and Analysis Process Area (PA) at Maturity Level (ML) 2
 - Restructured 7 PAs into 11 PAs at ML 3
 - Renamed 4 PAs at MLs 4 and 5 to provide more focus on the quantitative nature of a high maturity organization
- Replaced *common features* with *generic goals* and *generic practices*
- Expanded software scope to include systems engineering, services as well as integrated process and product development



Expand Model Application

- Defined strategic business goals
 - Quality
 - Cost
 - Timeliness
 - Customer Satisfaction
- Integrated established best practices
 - Systems and Software Technology Conference (SSTC)
 - Software Engineering Process Group (SEPG) Conference
- Tailored/re-used proven processes
 - Change project to work or tasks
 - Change software to standard



Expand Model Application

- Communicated the Philosophy
 - Built a flexible process for adaptation
 - Sought common solutions – do not document each methodology being utilized (i.e. software process, systems engineering process)
- Established Process Improvement Goals
 - Identified the initial environment/scope
 - Defined the target environment/scope
 - Updated the interim environment to track the progress of migrating from the initial to the target environment



Address the Culture Changes

- Developed a Transition Plan
 - Systems Engineering
 - Services (Systems Administration)
- Involved affected personnel
 - Communicated often
 - Coordinated with the “E.F. Hutton” of the team to understand how to add value and mentor to them to serve as the Process Champion
 - Identified aspects of the model that would add value to the day-to-day tasks

Remember when we first started our journey – “we are unique” was said as much as “it depends”



Update Processes/Tools

- **Distributed Process Ownership**
 - Tailored processes to meet business needs for systems engineering and services
 - Empowered software and system engineers to work collaboratively to define, implement, manage and optimize process improvements
 - Encouraged identification of data-analysis based improvements
 - Mandated team members follow the process
- **Instilled a Collaborative Environment**
 - Updated tools to change terminology
 - Shared lessons learned from software development and communicate their applicability to systems engineering and services
 - Established User Group Meetings in a question/answer forum
 - Setup Quality Assurance support for each systems engineering and services task to maximize consistency



Update Processes/Tools

- **Identified Role-Based Training Requirements**
 - Trained core individuals defining the processes in the model versus the entire organization
 - Trained only the applicable processes when expanding the scope
 - Scheduled just in time training based upon planned process utilization



Measure Performance Quantitatively

- Created a Data Repository
 - Centralized project data access and storage
 - Reduced redundant data entry for daily tasks
 - Eliminated the “Big Honkin” binder
 - Automated quantitative analysis tasks
- Identified Measures
 - Created metrics based on strategic goal measures at the organization, management and project levels
 - Initially focused on breadth not depth – depth evolved based on the analysis results



Measure Performance Quantitatively

- Tracked Performance
 - Defined quantitative goals by which to measure performance
 - Identified frequency for reporting performance/status against goals
- Reported Performance
 - Reported metrics for systems engineering early in the transition phase
 - Highlighted differences in systems engineering execution of the processes to identify best practices and engage the systems engineers in the process effectiveness

Initial Perspective: Do not wait until data is needed to collect it - it will be too late

Current Perspective: Do not require data collection if an information need is not being addressed



Challenges

- 73% of the PAs were common between CMM[®] v1.1 and CMMI v1.2[®]
- 30% of the processes were perceived to be common between Software and Systems Engineering personnel
- 90% of the organization's processes were common between Software, Systems Engineering and Services once expansion was completed



Lessons Learned

- Most effort expended in communication with the Systems Engineering and Services personnel to move the 30% perception to the 90% reality
- Data is the best tool for communication as it shows the capability and stability of the processes being used within each discipline



Lessons Learned

- Not formally applying integrated process and product development (IPPD) practices limited the success of our journey – collaboration is critical to the transition
- Sharing past experiences and techniques between software , systems engineering and services personnel proved very effective



Lessons Learned

- Metric data for Services required a different context than Software or Systems Engineering – concept is the same but terminology is VERY different
- Change Agents, Process Champions and Management must create an environment for cultural change
 - Technology change is more readily accepted than process change



Lessons Learned

- Setting a planned, strategic expansion is key
 - Software set a strong foundation
 - Systems Engineering leveraged off that foundation without a significant impact
 - Services practice the activities, but without the formality



Summary

- Setting expectations to eliminate all resistance is unreasonable – effective process improvement program uses resistance to improve processes
- Addressing metrics in terms of breadth versus depth provides increased flexibility in data analysis when initial results vary from expectations
- Involving engineers early in the journey accelerates the process definition and cultural acceptance



Questions?

“Effective change demands continual, forward thinking with a desire to add value. If value is not added by the change, we must be willing to abandon it!”

by Kathy Reid