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Introduction

• This presentation explains the Space and Airborne Systems (SAS) Opportunity Improvement Board (OIB) and its process for

  – Collecting process improvement proposals
  – Identifying innovations for the organization that will help its quality and process performance
  – Prioritizing and analyzing the proposals with respect to the organization’s objectives
  – Selecting proposals for further consideration
  – Determining the cost and return on investment of the proposal
  – Piloting the implemented proposals to select which ones to deploy to the organization
  – Deploying improvements that provide positive impact to the organization’s objectives
  – Measuring the effects of the deployed improvements
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Benefits of Enterprise Level Improvements

• The desire to help programs and the organization be successful drives organization improvement

• Improvements are implemented to
  – Help programs meet their quality and process-performance objectives
  – Improve the organization’s performance on current and future programs

• A CMMI level 5 organization’s focus is:
  – “… on continually improving the range of process performance through both incremental and innovative improvements.” (Chrissis, p. 77)

Help programs succeed with improvements that are aligned with the organization’s goals and objectives.
Identifying Improvement Opportunities

• Anyone in the organization can identify an enterprise improvement opportunity through
  – Process change requests
  – Data analysis (program level and organization level)
  – Symposiums and conferences (internal and external)
  – Lessons learned (programs and organization)
  – Other feedback to the organization

• Feedback is collected and tracked on-line as part of the SAS Enterprise Management System (EMS)
Prioritizing and Ranking

• The enterprise established an Opportunity Improvement Board (OIB) to prioritize and rank the submitted improvement opportunities with relationship to

  – The organization’s goals and objections

  – The statistical understanding of the organization’s current process capability

  – The estimated cost-to-benefit ratio
Stakeholder Involvement

• The Opportunity Improvement Board (OIB) membership includes key personnel from the Enterprise Process Group
  – EPG Lead is the Chair
  – All disciplines represented
  – All sites represented

• The OIB recommendations are reviewed and approved by the Integrated Process Steering Team (IPST) whose membership includes senior representation from
  – All engineering centers
  – Program management
  – Supply Chain Management
  – Quality
  – The EPG
High Level Opportunity Improvement Flow

- Submitted Process & Technology Improvements
- Opportunity Improvement Board
- Steering Team (IPST)
- EPG
- Programs

Prioritizes and ranks
Reviews and Approves
Executes Improvement

- Define
- Pilot
- Measure
- Deploy
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Detailed Improvement Flow

- Process & Technology Improvement Opportunities
  - Prioritize and identify improvements innovations
    - IPST Review
      - Prioritization Matrix
        - QFD
          - Select for further consideration?
            - Yes
              - Develop Process?
                - Yes
                  - Create BOE
                  - No – reject & document
                - No
                  - No – reject & document
              - No – reject & document
          - Yes
            - Analyze R6σ® Results
              - Pilot
                - Develop Improvement
                  - Concept Brief
                    - Yes
                      - Collect Metrics
                        - Deploy per EMS deployment plan
                          - Yes
                            - Deploy?
                              - No – reject & document
                        - No – reject & document
                    - No – reject & document
              - No
                - Annual Process Improvement planning
                  - EPG IPT Activity
                    - EPG Activity
                      - Improvement Data
                        - OIB Activity
                          - Yes
                            - EPG, Mgmt, Tech
                              - No – reject & document
Prioritization Details

- Prioritize and identify improvements innovations
- Analyze cost & benefit of Proposals
- cost: benefit ratio sufficient?
  - Yes
  - Improves Org’s Processes?  
    - Yes
    - IPST review
    - Prioritization Matrix
- No – reject & document

- EPG IPT Activity
- EPG Activity
- EPG, Mgmt, Tech
- Improvement Data

Process & Technology Improvement Opportunities

Prioritize and identify innovations
IPST Review
Prioritization Matrix

Select for further consideration?

QFD
Improvements are prioritized based on weighted criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supports Business Strategy (Goals/Metrics)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of Improvement</td>
<td>(Expected percentage of programs helped)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urgency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective Data to Substantiate Need for Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probability of Successful Implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal is Supported (by organization metrics)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Return on Investment (ROI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Priority improvements are mapped to Goals (QFD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMML Level 5 Subprocesses</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stabilize Level 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMML Level 3 in HW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One SAS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPDS Alignment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain ISO Compliance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Technical Weights:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Absolute</th>
<th>Relative</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Technical Targets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Competitor Benchmark</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select How to Flow Down to Next Level:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How</th>
<th>keep</th>
<th>keep</th>
<th>keep</th>
<th>keep</th>
<th>discard</th>
<th>keep</th>
<th>keep</th>
<th>discard</th>
<th>discard</th>
<th>discard</th>
<th>discard</th>
<th>discard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Implementation Details

OIB Activity

EPG IPT Activity

EPG, Mgmt, Tech

Improvement Data

No

Pilot?

Pilot Improvement

Yes

Develop Improvement

Concept Brief

Create BOE

Develop Process?

Yes

No – reject & document

BOEs include:
• Barriers/Risks
• Cost
• Schedule
• Expected ROI

Create BOE

Deploy per EMS deployment plan

Collect Metrics

No – reject & document

Yes

Develop Improvement

Concept Brief

Yes

Pilot

R6σ Results

No – reject & document

Develop Process?

Yes

Pilot Improvement

Annual Process Improvement planning

Deploy?
Concept Brief

• The Concept Brief describes the proposed implementation including:
  – The benefits to the programs and organization
  – The impact to the practitioners
  – The transition and deployment plans
  – Implementation details
  – Schedule
  – Resources

• Concept briefs are reviewed with the stakeholders prior to implementing the improvement
EPG Oversight

• The Enterprise Process Group (EPG)
  – Implements the selected improvement projects
  – Monitors the status of the improvement projects
  – Manages the deployment of the implemented improvement projects that are chosen for full scale deployment
  – Measures the impact of process improvements on the organization’s capability
  – Manages the OIB process throughout the year
  – Reviews opportunity improvement suggestions as part of its annual planning
Measurement

- Improvements are measured collectively
- The organization’s process capability is measured and analyzed quarterly to understand the impact of the collective improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Range of Values</th>
<th>February 2005</th>
<th>December 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.50 to 1.44</td>
<td>0.62 to 1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSL</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USL</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPI frequency</td>
<td>0.25 0.5 0.75 1 1.25 1.5 1.75</td>
<td>0.25 0.5 0.75 1 1.25 1.5 1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSL frequency</td>
<td>0 10</td>
<td>0 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal frequency</td>
<td>20 30</td>
<td>20 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USL frequency</td>
<td>40 50</td>
<td>40 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Range of Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>0.97, s = 0.16</td>
<td>0.98, s = 0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>133, Cpk = -0.02</td>
<td>185, Cpk = -0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measurement

- Improvements are measured collectively
- The organization’s process capability is measured and analyzed quarterly to understand the impact of the collective improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Range of Values</th>
<th>February 2005</th>
<th>December 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.50 to 1.44</td>
<td>0.62 to 1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSL</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USL</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPI frequency</td>
<td>0.25 0.5 0.75 1 1.25 1.5 1.75</td>
<td>0.25 0.5 0.75 1 1.25 1.5 1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSL frequency</td>
<td>0 10</td>
<td>0 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal frequency</td>
<td>20 30</td>
<td>20 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USL frequency</td>
<td>40 50</td>
<td>40 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Range of Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>0.97, s = 0.16</td>
<td>0.98, s = 0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>133, Cpk = -0.02</td>
<td>185, Cpk = -0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Process Improvement shown in Program Cost and Schedule Performance

Mar 2005 - May 2005
- Structured Decision Making
- Lessons Learned
- Risk and Opportunity Management
- SW Integration & Test
- FRACAS

Nov 2004 - Mar 2005
- Supply Based Optimization
- Objective Evaluations
- Program Planning
- EMS Process Tailoring
- Peer Review
- Defect Logger
- Integrated Mgmt Review
- Work Product Mgmt
- Technical Solution Data
- Statistical Process Control
- Process Assets Library
- HW Development Planning
- Managing with Metrics

May 2005 - Dec 2005
- Interface Management Process
- Qualification by Similarity
- Update Gap Tailoring Tool
- Cost Collection
- FRACAS
- PLE
- RMS
- Mechanical Engineering
- High Reliability
- Systems Safety – Phase I
- COTS
- Updated Lessons Learned Database

*Major ECP authorized last year, not yet reflected in EVMS baseline.
Summary

• The SAS organization improvement process
  – Designed to help the programs succeed
  – Supports the Organization’s goals and objectives
  – Involves appropriate stakeholders
  – Results in improvement to the organization’s process capability
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