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Challenges in DoD Acquisition

**GAO-09-362T - Actions Needed to Overcome Long-standing Challenges with Weapon Systems Acquisition and Service Contract Management**

- “costs … increased 26% and development costs increased by 40% from first estimates”
- “programs … failed to deliver capabilities when promised —often forcing warfighters to [maintain] legacy systems”
- “current programs experienced, on average, a 21-month delay in delivering initial capabilities to the warfighter”

Although DoD is the largest acquirer in the world, acquisition troubles remain

- 2011 MDAP RDT&E cost growth (mean) 84%
- 2011 MDAP Procurement cost growth (mean) 28%
- Effectiveness (1984-2011) 89%
- Suitability (1984-2011) 72%
- Nunn-McCurdy breach rate from 1997-2011 31%

Root Cause of Poor Program Performance

Inadequate Systems Engineering!

- Finding from *Performance of the Defense Acquisition System 2013 Annual Report*
  - **Dominant root cause** of MDAP Cost Growth
- Finding from *GAO-09-362T*
  - “… managers rely heavily on assumptions about system requirements, technology, and design maturity, which are consistently too optimistic. These gaps are largely the result of a lack of a disciplined systems engineering analysis prior to beginning system development …”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dominant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 of 18 (56%) Poor management performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Systems engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Contractual incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Risk management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Situational Awareness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrequent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 of 18 (28%) Baseline cost and schedule estimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Framing assumptions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 of 18 (22%) Change in procurement quantity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 of 18 Immature technology, excessive manufacturing, or integration risk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 of 18 Unrealistic performance expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 of 18 Unanticipated design, engineering, manufacturing or technology issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None Funding inadequacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. “Performance of the Defense Acquisition System 2013 Annual Report” Table 2-3, page 34
Why Do We Fail to Utilize Good SE Practices?

It’s difficult to justify the costs of SE in terms that project managers and corporate managers can relate to.

- The costs of SE are evident
  - Cost of resources
  - Schedule time
- The benefits are less obvious and less tangible
  - Cost avoidance (e.g., reduction of rework from interface mismatches)
  - Risk avoidance (e.g., early risk identification and mitigation)
  - Improved efficiency (e.g., clearer organizational boundaries and interfaces)
  - Better products (e.g., better understanding and satisfaction of stakeholder needs)

We need to quantify the effectiveness and value of SE by examining its effect on project performance?
The 2012 SE Effectiveness Study

Purpose

• Strengthen the business case for SE by relating project performance to the use of SE practices.

Method

• Contact development projects using the resources of NDIA, AESS, and INCOSE.
• Survey projects to assess their
  – SE activities
  – Project performance
  – Degree of challenge
• Process responses to identify statistical relationships between parameters.

Survey Tenets

• All data is submitted anonymously and handled confidentially by the SEI.
• Only aggregated non-attributable data is released.
The Bottom Line:   SE = Performance

Across ALL projects, 1/3 are at each performance level

For Lower SEC projects, only 15% deliver higher performance

For Middle SEC projects, 24% deliver higher performance

For Higher SEC projects, 57% deliver higher performance

Gamma = 0.49 represents a VERY STRONG relationship
For Challenging Projects
SE is even MORE important

Perf vs. SEC_Total (Low PC)

Gamma = 0.34      p-value = 0.029

A STRONG relationship between Total SE and Project Performance for LOWER CHALLENGE projects

Perf vs. SEC_Total (High PC)

Gamma = 0.62      p-value = 0.000

A VERY STRONG relationship between Total SE and Project Performance for HIGHER CHALLENGE projects
Study Participants

Participant Solicitation

- Contacted key members of major defense contractors to promote study participation
- Contacted the memberships of NDIA SE Division, IEEE AESS, and INCOSE

Collected 148 valid responses

- Which of these best describes your industry or service?

- Please enter the country in which most of the design and development engineering will be/was performed.
SE Deployment and Performance

SYSTEMS ENGINEERING DEPLOYMENT

PROJECT PERFORMANCE
Total SE vs. Project Performance

A **Very Strong** relationship between applied SE and Project Performance for both Defense and non-Defense Projects.
Architecture vs. Project Performance

Perf vs. SEC_ARCH (defense)

A Strong relationship between Architecture activities and Project Performance for Defense Projects

Perf vs. SEC_ARCH (non-defense)

A Very Strong relationship for non-defense projects
Requirements Dev’t & Mg’t vs. Performance

Perf vs. SEC_REQ (defense)

A **Very Strong** relationship between Requirements activities and Project Performance for both Defense and non-Defense Projects.
Risk Management vs. Project Performance

Perf vs. SEC_RSKM (defense)

A Moderate relationship between Risk Management activities and Project Performance for Defense Projects

A Very Strong relationship for non-defense projects

Gamma = 0.28

Perf vs. SEC_RSKM (non-defense)

Gamma = 0.4
Trade Studies vs. Project Performance

**Perf vs. SEC_TRD (defense)**

- Lower SEC (n=27): 19% Higher, 30% Middle, 52% Lower
- Middle SEC (n=25): 36% Higher, 36% Middle, 28% Lower
- Higher SEC (n=23): 48% Higher, 39% Middle, 13% Lower

SE Deployment: Gamma = 0.45

**Perf vs. SEC_TRD (non-defense)**

- Lower SEC (n=7): 14% Higher, 29% Middle, 57% Lower
- Middle SEC (n=15): 27% Higher, 40% Middle, 33% Lower
- Higher SEC (n=9): 44% Higher, 22% Middle, 33% Lower

SE Deployment: Gamma = 0.3

A **Very Strong** relationship between Trade Study activities and Project Performance for Defense Projects

A **Strong** relationship for non-defense projects
Summary of Relationships

Performance vs. SE Capability
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Next Steps: Investigate the differences between SE deployment / effectiveness in defense and non-defense domains to find “transplantable” best practices
Questions for Further Study

On non-defense projects, why are SE activities in Requirements, Architecture, Risk Management, and Verification more effective than those on defense-related projects?

On defense projects, why are SE activities in Trade Studies, IPTs, and Project Monitoring and Control more effective than those on non-defense projects?

Why is the relationship between Project Challenge and Project Performance stronger for non-defense projects?

Why is the relationship between Prior Experience and Project Performance stronger for non-defense projects?
SEI – Your Resource for Software and Systems Engineering

For more information, contact

Software Engineering Institute
4500 Fifth Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15213-2612
info@sei.cmu.edu
412-268-5800
1-888-201-4479
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Joseph P. Elm
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412-268-9132
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IPT Utilization vs. Project Performance

Perf vs. SEC_IPT (defense)

A **Strong** relationship between IPT Utilization and Project Performance for Defense Projects

A **Moderate** relationship for non-defense projects
Project Planning vs. Project Performance

Perf vs. SEC_PP (defense)

A Very Strong relationship between Project Planning activities and Project Performance for both Defense and non-Defense Projects
Verification vs. Project Performance

Perf vs. SEC_VER (defense)

A **Very Strong** relationship between Verification activities and Project Performance for both Defense and non-Defense Projects.
Validation vs. Project Performance

Perf vs. SEC_VAL (defense)

A **Very Strong** relationship between Validation activities and Project Performance for both Defense and non-Defense Projects.
**Product Integration vs. Project Performance**

### Perf vs. SEC_PI (defense)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SE Deployment</th>
<th>Lower SEC (n=12)</th>
<th>Middle SEC (n=48)</th>
<th>Higher SEC (n=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects delivering HIGHER performance</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects delivering MIDDLE performance</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects delivering LOWER performance</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gamma = 0.45

### Perf vs. SEC_PI (non-defense)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SE Deployment</th>
<th>Lower SEC (n=9)</th>
<th>Middle SEC (n=14)</th>
<th>Higher SEC (n=8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects delivering HIGHER performance</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects delivering MIDDLE performance</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects delivering LOWER performance</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gamma = 0.52

**A Very Strong relationship between Product Integration activities and Project Performance for both Defense and non-Defense Projects**
A Very Strong relationship between Configuration Management activities and Project Performance for both Defense and non-Defense Projects
Monitoring & Control vs. Project Performance

Perf vs. SEC_PMC (defense)

A **Very Strong** relationship between Project Monitoring and Control activities and Project Performance for Defense Projects

A **Strong** relationship for non-defense projects
Prior Experience vs. Project Performance

Perf vs. EXP (defense)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Lower EXP (n=24)</th>
<th>Middle EXP (n=40)</th>
<th>Higher EXP (n=11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projects delivering
- HIGHER performance
- MIDDLE performance
- LOWER performance

Perf vs. EXP (non-defense)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Lower EXP (n=12)</th>
<th>Middle EXP (n=12)</th>
<th>Higher EXP (n=7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gamma = 0.1

A **Weak** relationship between Prior Experience and Project Performance for Defense Projects

A **Strong** relationship for non-defense projects
Project Challenge vs. Project Performance

Perf vs. PC (defense)

A **Weak Negative** relationship between Project Challenge and Project Performance for Defense Projects

A **Moderate Negative** relationship for non-defense projects
Early SE vs. Project Performance

Perf vs. Early_SE (defense)

A **Very Strong** relationship between Early SE activities and Project Performance for both Defense and non-Defense Projects

Perf vs. Early_SE (non-defense)

Gamma = 0.61

Gamma = 0.62

Early SE
- Project Planning
- Requirements Development
- Trade Studies
- Product Architecture