Acquisition Oversight as a Function of Program Office Capability Determined Using a Model-based Assessment

George R. Winters, PE

28 January 2004

Overview

▲ Background

▲ Assessment Methodology

▲ Typical Findings

▲ What We Learned

▲ Summary & Conclusion

Background

▲ Rapid Improvement Team (RIT) Initiative

▲ RIT Pilots

▲ RIT Assessment Objectives

Rapid Improvement Team Initiative

▲ Sponsored by OSD/NII

▲ Focused on reducing IT program cycle times

▲ Relief from "full-blown" acquisition system requirements

▲ Pilots distributed among components and Defense agencies

▲ Performance to be assessed for effectiveness

RIT Pilots

▲ Twelve pilots originally identified

▲ Significant differences in their characteristics

▲ No two pilots tried exactly the same set of concepts

▲ Pool of twelve decreased over time

RIT Assessment Objectives

▲ Validate RIT initiative concepts

▲ Identify best practices

▲ Determine applicability of maturity models to acquisition organizations

▲ Pilot an assessment methodology that would provide "ground truth" about acquisition organizations and programs

▶ Possible basis for establishing risk associated with "risk based oversight"

Assessment Methodology

▲ Planning & Preparation

▲ Team Composition

▲ Nominal Schedule

▲ Model Selection

Planning & Preparation

▲ Mutually agreeable date; at least six weeks in advance

▲ Program office selects model and approximately twelve Process Areas of interest

▲ Program office appoints focal point for planning & logistics

▲ Team is formed, including one program office member

▲ Detailed agenda is prepared and interviewees scheduled

▲ Documents are made available (preferably electronically)

▲ Interview questions are prepared

Team Composition

▲ Lead Assessor

▲ OSD/NII representative

▲ Component/agency oversight organization representative

▲ Program office representative

▲ Sometimes more than one of the above categories (for orientation, familiarization, etc.)

▲ Split process areas in half for mini-team focus

Nominal Schedule

▲ 72 hour elapsed time

▲ Begins after lunch on day one with in-brief, program manager interview, and team caucus

▲ Second day devoted to interviews and document reviews

▲ Third day allows for follow-up interviews & document reviews followed by findings preparation and validation, then briefing preparation

▲ Fourth day morning devoted to final review, out-brief to program office, and debrief

Model Selection

▲ Focus is on acquisition organization, so program office permitted to choose between SEI's SA-CMM and FAA's iCMM

▲ No ratings of process areas or maturity levels

▲ Although focus was on process areas selected by the program office, findings were briefed if they applied to non-selected process areas

▲ Process area selection guided by the concepts being piloted by the particular program

Typical Findings

▲Strengths

▲Improvement Opportunities

Typical Strengths

▶ The team found evidence that when the customer expresses short term needs, the program office has been able to respond using agile spiral acquisition with rapid costing, reprioritizing, and delivery.

▶ It appears that making DOORS tool requirements data available on [a web site] is an effective way to involve industry and may constitute a <u>RIT Best Practice.</u>

▲ It appears that there are no plans for periodic post-implementation reviews of the evolving [ ] program.

▲ It appears that requirements are not connected explicitly to the high-level needs documented in the Mission Needs Statement (MNS) and Operational Requirements Document (ORD).

What We Learned

▲ About Insight

  ▶ Program Office Level

  ▶ Component/Agency Oversight Level

  ▶ OSD Level

▲ About Acquisition -Focused Maturity Models

▲ About the Possibility of Risk-based Oversight

Program Office Level Insight

▲ Every program office believes the results were worth the effort

▲ Became familiar with component/agency oversight level and OSD concerns

▲ Rare chance to step back and observe status and progress

▲ Several significant "saves:" problems identified with plenty of time to resolve them

▲ Program office team members remained behind as change agents

▲ Able to observe day-to-day operations and meet program office personnel

▲ Insight at a depth not normally associated with periodic reviews of a day or less

▲ Able to bridge program office - OSD communication gap

▲ Exposure to functions and concerns not normally raised to headquarters level

OSD Level Insight

- ▲ "Ground truth" available to OSD, as opposed to typical review of paper products filtered through several levels.

- ▲ Identified potential best practices for adoption across the community

- ▲ Able to bridge program office - OSD communication gap

- ▲ Exposure to functions and concerns not normally raised to OSD level

- ▲ Able to observe impact of policies and directives at the execution level

Acquisition-focused Maturity Models

▲ Both SA-CMM and iCMM provide useful framework for appraising processes and procedures in an acquisition organization

▲ iCMM usable by both acquisition organization and development organization in an integrated product team environment

▲ Use of a maturity model to appraise an acquisition organization enables a repeatable, differentiable approach to risk-based acquisition oversight

Risk-Based Oversight

▲ Use of a maturity model to appraise an acquisition organization enables a repeatable, differentiable approach to risk-based acquisition oversight

▲ The results of a model-based mini-assessment could be used to determine the appropriate level and frequency of oversight for information system programs

▲ The effort associated with periodic mini-assessments may entail no more person hours than traditional document-based oversight

▲ The output associated with periodic mini-assessments is significantly more useful than the output of traditional document-based oversight

Summary

▲ 72-hour pilot mini-assessments provided benefits to all the stakeholders

▲ Acquisition focused maturity models can be useful to acquisition organizations as well as for oversight

▲ Disciplined periodic maturity model-based assessments of acquisition organizations can provide results that could serve as the basis of risk-based acquisition oversight

Conclusion

▲ Acquisition focused maturity models should be supported, adopted, and evolved

▲ Mini-assessments based on acquisition focused maturity models could contribute to significantly enhanced acquisition oversight

▲ The effort associated with mini-assessments as an oversight methodology is no greater than, and may be less than, the effort associated with document-based oversight

▲ Risk-based oversight is possible using the results of mini-assessments as the basis for determining the risk associated with the program office's capability