

Secure Acquisition

Case 2: Acquisition/SCRM Project Risk Analysis

January 2020

Copyright 2020 The University of Detroit Mercy.

NO WARRANTY

THIS UNIVERSITY OF DETROIT MERCY AND SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE MATERIAL IS FURNISHED ON AN "AS-IS" BASIS. THE UNIVERSITY OF DETROIT MERCY MAKES NO WARRANTIES OF ANY KIND, EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED, AS TO ANY MATTER INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, WARRANTY OF FITNESS FOR PURPOSE OR MERCHANTABILITY, EXCLUSIVITY, OR RESULTS OBTAINED FROM USE OF THE MATERIAL. THE UNIVERSITY OF DETROIT MERCY DOES NOT MAKE ANY WARRANTY OF ANY KIND WITH RESPECT TO FREEDOM FROM PATENT, TRADEMARK, OR COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT.

Use of any trademarks in this report is not intended in any way to infringe on the rights of the trademark holder.

Internal use. Permission to reproduce this document and to prepare derivative works from this document for internal use is granted, provided the copyright and “No Warranty” statements are included with all reproductions and derivative works.

External use. This document may be reproduced in its entirety, without modification, and freely distributed in written or electronic form without requesting formal permission. Permission is required for any other external and/or commercial use. Requests for permission should be directed to the Software Engineering Institute at permission@sei.cmu.edu.

Case 2: Acquisition/SCRM Project Risk Analysis

Utilize the forms taken from NISTIR 7622 document. Identify and assess risks against the Base Practices for that Community of Practice to obtain an overall risk rating for each participant in the supply chain. The risk rating can be used to prioritize the risks. To facilitate this process, it is useful to use a generic checklist as a stimulus to identify what risks may affect components or participants. This is provided for this course.

Examine the portion of the project you have chosen to control. Use the *Capability Maturity Assessment Checklist* provided to evaluate the current status of the relevant community of practice. Then develop mitigation strategies and timelines to address the risk where the level of risk is not acceptable.

For this case we are addressing Detroit Defense's need to upgrade their F-16F aircraft. Specifically as it pertains to updating the current navigation system with an Advanced Global Positioning System (GPS) capability. For this effort the GPS model chosen for this aircraft has been previously utilized in a similar application for the fire control system for the military's AH64D (Apache Longbow helicopter). Consequently, it is considered to be a Commercial off the Shelf (COTS) application.

During the course of our examination of the Prime Contractor (Wild Blue Yonder Technologies Inc (WYBT) and the Sub-Contractors for this effort we have identified the following risk scores¹

Capability Maturity Assessment Checklist -Supplier Community of Practice		Not Done	Performed	Managed	Predictable	Optimized
		0	1	2	3	4
I.	Contractor Name: Wild Blue Yonder Technologies, Inc (WYBT)	0	40	184	81	8
	Role: Sub-Contractor: Updating Current Navigation System with GPS Capability					
II.	Contractor Name: Baseline Defense Technologies, Inc.	0	39	188	72	20
	Role: Sub-Contractor: Updating Current Navigation System with GPS Capability					
III.	Contractor Name: Lafayette Aeronautics	0	38	176	90	17
	Role: Sub-Contractor: Updating Current Navigation System with GPS Capability					
IV.	Contractor Name: Belle Isle Space Administration	0	47	180	75	0
	Role: Sub-Contractor: Updating Current Navigation System with GPS Capability					
V.	Contractor Name: Interlochen Technologies, Inc. (8 (A) Contractor)	0	38	176	96	12
	Role: Sub-Contractor: Updating Current Navigation System with GPS Capability					

¹ Risk scores were utilized using a numerical range that included: Not Done (0), Performed (1), Managed (2), Predictable (3), and Optimized (4).

Based on the examination and analysis of the summary results using the *Capability Maturity Assessment Checklist*, we identified a concern with one of the sub-contractors identified for this effort (Interlochen Technologies, Inc.) The concern relates to the sub-contractor's limited maturity in terms of the number of performance metrics that are not rated as optimized. While this concern exists, the sub-contractor is an 8 (A) Contractor, with preference provided by Detroit Defense. The Prime Contractor will implement additional contract surveillance controls to ensure that all work efforts performed under the contract along with any respective contract modifications will be met and at a level consistent with the performance requirements established for the work effort.