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Cooperative Appraisals

A definition:

- Government members or representatives participate on a corporate assessment
- Goal is to establish additional confidence in impartiality and objectivity of assessment results
- Results signed by government members to assert that objective appraisal process was used in conformance with the instrument’s method description
- Results (including findings) “registered” with SEI
  - Registration “certificate” confirms “fact of” and receipt of appraisal materials / details / results and compliance with defined appraisal process
  - May be useful in lieu of customer conducting their own evaluation of the appraised organization
Impetus for Initial Interest in Cooperative Appraisals

1. OSD Policy, Jan 2001, requiring Level 3 Evaluation in order to compete for DoD Acquisitions
   - Not corporate assessment, but government (or representative) evaluation
   - ACAT1 programs, but some services applying policy to other programs

2. Discomfort/unwillingness to rely solely on corporate appraisals for understanding corporate capabilities & process maturity

3. Resources and schedule implications on government evaluations during source selections

Program Offices could accommodate best practices / policy influences through increased collaboration in corporate assessments for process improvement
Collaborative or Registered Appraisals

1. Appraisers representing government offices participate on corporate assessments as equal member of appraisal team
   - Trained/qualified appraisers supplied and sponsored by government office

2. Results “registered” with SEI
   - Contractor can make registered results available to prospective customers/government offices
   - Could be used in lieu of SCE-like evaluation for acquisition while retaining objective perspective of appraisers not sponsored by corporate organization
Who can be a “Government” Member of Cooperative Appraisal Team?

1. Government employee
   - Program office member
   - DCAA rep
   - DCMA rep
   - Other

2. FFRDC

3. CAAS/SETA Support to Program Offices or Agencies

As long as no consulting relationship to appraised organization for process improvement implementation

Key Criteria
- Proper training and experience
- Participation Sponsored By (Paid for By) Government Agency
Role of Government Representatives on Appraisal Team

1. Understand corporate objectives for appraisal
2. Bring experience / appraisal knowledge/ model knowledge as full-fledged member of appraisal team
3. Fulfill responsibilities as full-fledged appraisal team member
   - Not merely an observer of the appraisal team
   - Ensure their vote/voice counts as much as every other appraisal team member
4. After appraisal:
   - Sign registered appraisal forms
     - Attesting to completeness/validity of process used for appraisal
   - Respond to questions from prospective “consumers” of appraisal information during next 2 years
     - Government program offices seeking maturity level information in support of acquisition
1st Registered Appraisal -- Context

1. First cooperative appraisal conducted Summer 02
   - Appraisal Method: SCAMPI V 1.1
   - Reference Model: CMMI SE/SW, Staged, Level 5
2. Scope of appraisal, Lockheed Martin, M&D
3. Size of team: 6
   - 3 of the 6 were SEI-authorized lead appraisers
   - 2 of the 6 were SCAMPI lead assessors

"On Site" Window:
- 3 days team training/readiness review
- 10 days of on-site appraisal activities
Factors Affecting Effectiveness of Cooperative Appraisal

1. Early identification and involvement of Government appraisal team members
2. Planning
3. Qualifications of team members
4. Composition/Responsibilities of mini teams
5. Interpersonal dynamics of appraisal team members
6. Readiness of the appraised organization
Lessons Learned

1. Early Identification/Acceptance of Government Appraisal Team Members (6 months or longer before appraisal)
   - Ensure entire appraisal team is balanced/optimized
   - Will drive appraisal team approach
     - Match mini teams to complement experience/expertise of all appraisal team members
     - Organizational overviews and documentation needs
   - Allows for optimized PA assignments
   - Preserves appraisal schedule with early lock-in
   - Allows time to identify and resolve any training needs
   - Allows time to look for alternatives if nominee lacking critical training/experience
Lessons Learned

1. Effective Planning

   - Involve government-sponsored appraisal team members AS EARLY AS POSSIBLE in corporate planning activities
     - Helps build shared understanding of corporate objectives and expectations
       - Senior management’s focus on process improvement and maturity level rating
       - Historical background of organization in their process journey (what has worked, what hasn’t)
     - Address team building, training, appraisal focus issues early without disruption to corporate assessment plans
Lessons Learned

1. Qualifications of Government Team Members
   - Must have strong experience with formal appraisals
     - Must be a lead appraiser or candidate lead appraiser
   - Must have strong foundation with reference model
     - Experience using same model in appraisals
   - Must have ample experience with relevant development & engineering activities
     - 10-15 years system development
     - Similar business/technical domain a plus

Government Members represents credibility of appraisal to other Government Agencies

∨ the credibility of their affirmation is limited by their credibility as an appraiser
Lessons Learned

1. Composition/Responsibilities of Mini Teams
   - SCAMPI concept of mini-teams does not directly support concept that government members of cooperative assessments can attest to process and be comfortable with results
     · Mini-team activities can be much more diffused than in CBA-IPI or SCE
       - Allows for more “in-parallel” data gathering and consolidation
     · Make sure Appraisal Plan allows for sufficient “in serial” data gathering and processing to accommodate Registered Appraisal objectives
     · Make sure team data consolidation and consensus activities allow for sufficient time to share information across mini-team
       - Mini Teams responsible for justifying characterizations at project level to rest of the team during consensus…
   1. Not just counting types/pieces of objective evidence
      - “Red-teaming” project characterizations across mini-teams in preparation for team consensus…
Composition/Responsibilities of Mini Teams

- Put considerable thought into how to organize mini teams given participation of government representatives
  - Most controversial PA’s will be those at higher maturity levels
  - Government members will have less familiarity with organizational aspects of processes
- Don’t put government members on same mini team
- Don’t put government members only on less controversial or less stringent PA’s
- Don’t organize mini teams by maturity level
  - Doesn’t balance work across mini teams
- Consider organizing mini teams by process category or some other method to balance appraisal work by a conscious theme
  - Project Mgmt (6)  Engineering (6)
  - Process Mgmt (5)  Support (5)
Lessons Learned

1. Interpersonal Dynamics of Appraisal Team Members
   - High probability government members have not been on an appraisal with rest of team members before
   - High probability government members not as familiar with organization’s policies, standards, processes, terminology, etc as rest of team (which more than likely will have experience appraising this organization)
     - Team building and team communication is crucial to successful appraisal
     - Make time for these tasks during planning and training activities
   - Model interpretations need to be normalized across team
     - Even with team of well-qualified, experienced evaluators
   - Objective evidence interpretations and definitions of sufficiency need to be consistent and reasonable
     - What’s a Direct Artifact versus Indirect Artifact versus Direct Affirmation?
     - What kind of objective evidence is sufficient to demonstrate “fully implemented”?
       - One direct artifact (i.e. minutes from one meeting)? There are many types of direct artifacts… so what will be sufficient
Lessons Learned

1. Readiness/Maturity of the Appraised Organization
   - Meeting the intent of the model as well as the “letter of the law"
     - Conservative Mapping of Organization/Project Processes and Artifacts to Model
     - Organization doesn’t try to stretch processes to apply to higher level process areas
   - Availability of additional objective evidence and people to respond to appraisers’ questions
     - May be more questions/info requests than in typical corporate assessment
   - Organization welcomes an objective appraisal
Output of Registered Appraisal*

SEI Repository for Registered Appraisal Results

Statement of Appraisal Results
- Organization/Division
- Projects Appraised
- Appraisal Model
- Appraisal Method
- Signatures
  - Sponsor
  - Lead Appraiser
  - Government Reps (& contact info)

Appraisal Findings
- Outbrief
- Characterization of Organization by PA
- Significant Strengths and Weaknesses

Registered results valid for 2 years

SEI Repository for Registered Appraisal Results

*For further information contact SEI Customer Relations at 412-268-5800 or customer relations@sei.cmu.edu
Remaining Policy Issues

1. **Degree to which registered appraisals used in source selections**
   - Education/awareness/motivation

2. **FAR implications for competitions**
   - If not all offerors in acquisition have cooperative appraisal results available/registered

3. **Near term staffing drain on government agencies to get initial cooperative appraisals registered**
   - Rely on FFRDCs and CAAS/SETA
Summary

1. Age-old question: Does sponsorship and appraisal team composition affect outcome/results of appraisal?
2. Age-old constraints:
   - Staffing/resource constraints for implementing OSD policy
   - Impact of Government Class A appraisals on acquisition schedules
3. Solution sets:
   - Other than SCAMPI Class A Appraisals
     - SCAMPI Class B Appraisal Evaluation Method *(to be defined early 03)*
     - System / Software Risk Evaluations
     - Process Benchmarking Evaluations
     - ……
   - Cooperative Government/Industry Appraisals with Registered Results