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Readiness Defined – The Go/No Go

Appraisal Readiness* is:
• A determination of whether or not the appraisal team and appraised organization are ready to conduct the appraisal as planned. Readiness is reviewed from several aspects:
  – Data:
    • Are the PIIDs complete?
    • Are the PIIDs accurate?
  – Teamwork
    • Are team members operating efficiently (keeping to the schedule)?
    • Are team members playing together nicely – communicating well/being objective?
  – Logistics:
    • Are the facilities and equipment adequate?
    • Are all appraisal participants available?
  – Plans and schedule estimates:
    • Is the planned appraisal schedule commensurate with any constraints?
    • Progress against our data collection plan?
    • Are the risks are adequately captured?

*SCAMPI MDD v1.2
What Were the CMMI Folks Thinking??

Why require Readiness Review activities?

“The certainty of misery is better than the misery of uncertainty” -- Pogo

- Reduces risk, keeps the appraisal team lead employed and appraisal team members happy
- The Readiness Review will reduce the burning to a few small embers
- Verification of the appraisal data collection plan
Range of Activities for Readiness Review

• Criteria to determine Readiness Review time and effort?
  – Any other preparatory activities done?
    • SCAMPI C(s)?
    • PIID workshops with our PIID preparers?
  – Long- vs. Short-term PIID creation?
  – Who mapped the organization’s processes to CMMI practices?
  – What are the lead times between process improvement and appraisal activities?
  – Combine with Appraisal Team Training?
  – Should we hold a separate and focused activity vs. combined with a SCAMPI C/B?
  – Are we preparing for a large-scale or complex SCAMPI A?
What You Get for the $?

• Can reduce the time spent for the SCAMPI B or A onsite

• Reduces the risk of unplanned appraisal overtime
  – Remember those crazy late nights common in “discovery” appraisals

• Answers key questions:
  – Is the existing evidence sufficient?
  – Is there too much evidence?
  – Where/How will we get the objective evidence we need?
More Benefits…

• Identifies specific gaps in data readiness – which will translate to SCAMPI-ruled weakness (no direct evidence – NI, PI…)

• Clarifies gap closure activities and estimation of the timeline until a SCAMPI B or A can be realistically held:
  – What are our weaknesses?
  – Can we fill those gaps with other data gathering techniques?
  – How will we prioritize activities around gap closure?
  – How long will it take to close the gaps and institutionalize the improvement?
  – How do those impact our current SCAMPI schedule?
Yes, Even More Benefits…

- Increases specific awareness for scoping the SCAMPI and may change assumptions guiding the choice of representative projects – those in scope as focus and non-focus.

- Can be combined with team training to:
  - Enable early learning of individual and team capabilities
  - Promote initial teamwork – and allows extra time for norming
    .....before any storming begins
  - Provide insight into the rate of progress of each mini-team.
Questions that Need Answers…

1. What weaknesses do we have? (i.e., gaps in data)

2. Do we have a process gap or an implementation gap?
   - Process is missing, therefore institutionalization within a short timeframe is risky
   - Vs.
   - Process exists, but one or more projects have not adequately implemented

3. What are our opportunities to fix the gaps?
   - Longer timeline for process gaps
   - Project start or in-process fix
Approach

• Establish mini teams and assign work – typically by PA
• Each mini team reviews PIID evidence and provides two scores
  1. Does the PIID link work – does it take us to the appropriate document, document section or directory?
  2. Is the artifact reasonable for each instantiation of each practice?
• Review progress – pace at which mini teams are progressing
• Review cumulative results
Judgment of Readiness

• The fine line of judgment….Appraisal vs. Readiness Review*
  – Do not characterize or judge strength or weakness – this takes to much time and is beyond RR objectives
  • If we begin characterization, then the SCAMPI clock starts ticking
  – Make comments concerning:
    • Appropriate-ness of direct vs. indirect artifact evidence– common to have team debate and discussion here
    • Suggestions for what may be a better evidence artifact
      – Assuming something may exist
      – Using an artifact which we may have seen

*Note: I start with a bogie of three minutes / practice to provide RR “score” and any notes
### Results – Raw Data Aggregation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Management Process Areas</th>
<th>Project Planning</th>
<th>Prog Mon &amp; Control</th>
<th>Supplier Mgt</th>
<th>Integ Prog Mgt *</th>
<th>Risk Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DL</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>IE</td>
<td>DL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max #</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1 #</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 #</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3 #</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4 #</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5 #</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1 %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3 %</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4 %</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5 %</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Projects Total #</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Projects Total %</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Projects Total #</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Projects Total %</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Projects Total #</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Projects Total %</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Can be done with a simple spreadsheet solution
Presentation Data to Tell A Story of “Readiness”

Which projects should we work first?

Which Process Areas should we work first?
Presentation Data to Tell A Story of “Readiness”

Set Your Minimum Goals Based on SCAMPI Class or On-site Schedule Constraints

Need Evidentiary Work

Summary by Category
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Conclusions and decisions?

• Do we hold the SCAMPI as scheduled?
  – Postpone or reschedule?

• Do we need more or less time on our SCAMPI A/B onsite schedule?

• Where are our largest gaps?

• What are the gap priorities?
  – In need of the longest lead time?

• Will any of the gaps affect the selection of focus/non-focus project?
Readiness Review vs. SCAMPI?

**Readiness Review**

- Pace if fast – involves quick decisions and scoring
- Basis of judgments, decisions and follow-on action = preparedness for SCAMPI
- Scope = same as SCAMPI or limited to high risk areas
- May involve one LA or entire team depending on all goals

**SCAMPI C**

- Pace if slower – involves evaluation, declaration of, and rationale for each weakness
- Basis of judgments, decisions and follow-on action = effective process improvement
- Scope can be limited or comprehensive
- May involve just one LA
Lessons Learned

“What we anticipate seldom occurs….. what we least expect generally happens” -- Disraeli

– As in defining quality requirements, if we fail to do a good job in identifying issues early, we will surely pay for it later with hours of unexpected overtime:
  • Even the best “PIID preparers” need a quality review of their work
  • Take the opportunity to move the discussions regarding the designation of direct and/or indirect out in front of the SCAMPI on site
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