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Objectives

- Present a Case Study
  - A CMMI® Level 5 Assessment
  - Focusing on a Team Software Process (TSP)SM Team
- Provide Guidance for TSP Teams
  - Does TSP Guarantee CMMI Level 5?
  - How can TSP be used to support a CMMI Level 5 Assessment?
  - What did this team do to meet CMMI Level 5 objectives?

The audience should be familiar with the concepts of the TSP and the Personal Software Process (PSP)SM

©CMMI is a Registered Trademark of Carnegie Mellon University
SMTeam Software Process, TSP, Personal Software Process, and PSP are Service Marks of Carnegie Mellon University
TSP Supports CMMI

- In the late 1980s and early 1990s the SEI developed the Capability Maturity Model (CMM) which captured organizational best practices for software development.
- SEI Fellow, Watts Humphrey, decided to apply the underlying principles of the CMM to the software development practices of a single developer.
- The result of this effort was the Personal Software Process (PSP), designed to be a CMM level 5 process for individual software developers.
- Humphrey then developed the Team Software Process (TSP) for the smallest operational unit in most organizations, the project team. TSP was designed to be a CMM level 5 process for project teams.

Source: TSP and CMMI: A Brief History (http://www.sei.cmu.edu/tsp/history.html)
SEI’s TSP to CMMI Mapping – 1

TSP and CMMI Process Categories

Source: James McHale and Daniel S. Wall Mapping TSP to CMMI (CMU/SEI-2004-TR-014)
SEI’s TSP to CMMI Mapping – 2

Source: James McHale and Daniel S. Wall
Mapping TSP to CMMI
(CMU/SEI-2004-TR-014)
SEI’s TSP to CMMI Mapping – 3

Source: James McHale and Daniel S. Wall
Mapping TSP to CMMI
(CMU/SEI-2004-TR-014)
309 SMXG Background

- Large Cadre of Talented People:
  - 700+ Civilian Personnel
  - Average over 10 years technical experience
  - Growing by ~50 PEs/Year

![The graphic shows the breakdown of the workforce by role, with Engineers/Computer Scientists constituting 73%, Support Staff 7%, Administration 2%, and Technicians 9%.]
Focused on process improvement since 1991

Assessed in 1998 to be Capability Maturity Model (CMM) - Level 5

Earned AS9100 & ISO 9001 Registration in 2006

Assessed in 2006 to be Capability Maturity Model Integration (CMMI) – Level 5
SMXG & CMM / CMMI

Assessed CMMI Level 5

Began CMMI Initiative

Assessed
CMM Level 4

Began
CMM Initiative

Assessed
CMM Level 3

SMXG & CMM

Assessed
CMM Level 2

SMXG & CMM

Began
CMMM Initiative

Focus Project: GTACS

CMMI Level 5

Focus Project for CMMI Assessment

**CMMI**: Capability Maturity Model Integration improves the organization’s capability; management focus

**TSP**: Team Software Process improves team performance; team and product focus

**PSP**: Personal Software Process improves individual skills and discipline; personal focus
GTACCS Overview

- Ground Theater Air Control System (GTACCS)
  - Modular Control Equipment (MCE) & Tactical Air Operations Modules (TAOM) create a ground-based computer network systems that coordinate radar and communications data signals. GTACCS modules coordinate ground, airborne, and naval elements to plan, execute, and evaluate joint operations.
GTACS MCE Software Updates

309 SMXG provides Module Control Equipment (MCE) software updates for:

New Features:
- Updates to MIL-STD Communications Protocols
- User-Initiated Switch Action & Display Changes
- Interfaces with New Weapons and Systems

Defect Corrections:
- Software Development Defects
- Government Acceptance Test Defects
- Field-discovered Problem Reports
GTACS TSP Tracking Tools

- GTACS Uses The Process Dashboard Tool to:
  - support individuals and the team in using high-maturity processes for software development
  - simplify the work involved in following a high-maturity process
  - help individuals to follow a defined process and collect metrics data
  - improve the accuracy of collected metrics
GTACS & TSP: Productivity

- **TSP Schedule Improvement**
  - Zero missed deadlines
  - Zero “returned” workload

- **TSP Quality Improvement**
  - Zero integration defects
  - Zero integration rework

- **TSP Productivity Improvement**
  - 417% increase in SLOC/Hour!
  - Completely recouped TSP investment cost after about 1 month!

---

**Combined EV Chart**

- **Plan Value**
- **Actual Value**
- **Actual Time**

- **Budget**
- **Actual**
- **EV**

---

**Design**

**Code**

**Test**

**Total**

---

TSP Symposium 2007

**BE AMERICA’S BEST**
GTACS & TSP: Quality

- TSP Promotes High Quality Processes
  - Personal Reviews
  - Team Peer Reviews
  - Integrated Systems Engineering Peer Reviews
- GTACS Team Achieves 99.4% Defect Removal Before Release

Process Yields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Before Compile</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Before Unit Test</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Before Build and Integration Test</td>
<td>99.6%</td>
<td>99.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Before System Test</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>99.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Defect Removal Profile
1998: Assessed SW-CMM Level 5

2001: Evaluated Moving to CMMI vs Another SW-CMM Assessment

2003: Began CMMI Transition

2005: Performed Two SCAMPI B’s on Potential Focus Projects

2006: Performed SCAMPI A on Focus and “Depth” Projects
SCAMPI Family of Appraisals

SCAMPI C: provides a wide range of options, including characterization of planned approaches to process implementation according to a scale defined by the user.

SCAMPI B: provides options in model scope and organizational scope, but characterization of practices is performed on implemented practices.

SCAMPI A: Is the most rigorous method, and is the only method that can result in ratings.
**SCAMPI B #1 Results – 1**

**GTACS Project Only*\**

| Specific Goal 1 | REQM | PP | PMC | SAM | M&A | PPQA | CM | RD | TS | PL | Ver | Val | OPF | OPD | OT | IPM | RSKM | IT | ISM | DAR | GEI | OPP | OPP | QPM | QPM | OID | CAR |
|-----------------|------|----|-----|-----|-----|------|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| SP 1.1          | L    | L  | L   | L   | L   | M    | L  | M  | M  | L  | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | M   | M   | L   | M   | L   | H   |
| SP 1.2          | L    | L  | L   | L   | L   | L    | L  | L  | L  | L  | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | M   | M   | L   | H   |
| SP 1.3          | H    | L  | L   | L   | L   | L    | M  | L  | L  | L  | L   | M   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | M   | M   | H   |
| SP 1.4          | L    | L  | H   | L   | L   | M    | L  | L  | H  |
| SP 1.5          | L    | H  | M   | M   |
| SP 1.6          | L    | L  | L   |
| SP 1.7          | L    |

| Specific Goal 2 | REQM | PP | PMC | SAM | M&A | PPQA | CM | RD | TS | PL | Ver | Val | OPF | OPD | OT | IPM | RSKM | IT | ISM | DAR | GEI | OPP | OPP | QPM | QPM | OID | CAR |
|-----------------|------|----|-----|-----|-----|------|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| SP 2.1          | L    | L  | L   | L   | L   | L    | M  | L  | L  | L  | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | M   | M   | L   | L   | H   |
| SP 2.2          | L    | L  | L   | L   | L   | L    | M  | L  | L  | L  | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | M   | M   | L   | H   |
| SP 2.3          | L    | L  | H   | L   | L   | L    | L  | L  | L  | L  | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | M   | M   | H   |
| SP 2.4          | L    |
| SP 2.5          |
| SP 2.6          |
| SP 2.7          |

| Specific Goal 3 | REQM | PP | PMC | SAM | M&A | PPQA | CM | RD | TS | PL | Ver | Val | OPF | OPD | OT | IPM | RSKM | IT | ISM | DAR | GEI | OPP | OPP | QPM | QPM | OID | CAR |
|-----------------|------|----|-----|-----|-----|------|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| SP 3.1          | L    | L  | L   | L   | L   | L    | L  | L  | L  | L  | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | M   | M   | L   |
| SP 3.2          | L    | M  | L   | L   | L   | L    | M  | L  | L  | L  | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   |
| SP 3.3          | M    | L  | L   |
| SP 3.4          | L    | L  |
| SP 3.5          |

| Specific Goal 4 | REQM | PP | PMC | SAM | M&A | PPQA | CM | RD | TS | PL | Ver | Val | OPF | OPD | OT | IPM | RSKM | IT | ISM | DAR | GEI | OPP | OPP | QPM | QPM | OID | CAR |
|-----------------|------|----|-----|-----|-----|------|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| SP 4.1          |      |    |     |     |     |      |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| SP 4.2          |      |    |     |     |     |      |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| SP 4.3          |      |    |     |     |     |      |    |    |    |    |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |

| Generic Goal 2 | REQM | PP | PMC | SAM | M&A | PPQA | CM | RD | TS | PL | Ver | Val | OPF | OPD | OT | IPM | RSKM | IT | ISM | DAR | GEI | OPP | OPP | QPM | QPM | OID | CAR |
|-----------------|------|----|-----|-----|-----|------|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| GP 2.1          | L    | L  | L   | M   | L   | L    | L  | L  | L  | L  | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | M   | M   | L   |
| GP 2.2          | L    | L  | L   | L   | L   | L    | L  | L  | L  | L  | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | M   | M   | L   |
| GP 2.3          | L    | L  | L   | L   | L   | L    | L  | L  | L  | L  | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | M   | M   | L   |
| GP 2.4          | L    | L  | L   | L   | L   | L    | L  | L  | L  | L  | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | M   | M   | L   |
| GP 2.5          | M    | M  | M   | M   | M   | M    | M  | M  | M  | M  | M   | M   | M   | M   | M   | M   | M   | M   | M   | M   | M   | M   |
| GP 2.6          | M    | M  | L   | L   | L   | L    | L  | L  | L  | L  | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | M   | M   | L   |
| GP 2.7          | M    | M  | L   | L   | L   | M    | M  | M  | M  | M  | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | M   | M   | L   |
| GP 2.8          | L    | L  | L   | L   | L   | L    | L  | L  | L  | L  | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | M   | M   | L   |
| GP 2.9          | L    | L  | L   | L   | L   | L    | L  | L  | L  | L  | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | M   | M   | L   |
| GP 2.10         | L    | L  | L   | L   | L   | L    | L  | L  | L  | L  | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | M   | M   | L   |

| Generic Goal 3 | REQM | PP | PMC | SAM | M&A | PPQA | CM | RD | TS | PL | Ver | Val | OPF | OPD | OT | IPM | RSKM | IT | ISM | DAR | GEI | OPP | OPP | QPM | QPM | OID | CAR |
|-----------------|------|----|-----|-----|-----|------|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| GP 3.1          | H    | L  | L   | L   | M   | L    | M  | L  | L  | L  | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | M   | M   | L   |
| GP 3.2          | L    | L  | L   | L   | M   | L    | M  | L  | L  | L  | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | L   | M   | M   | L   |

*IPPD PA’s not addressed. PPQA, OPF, ODP, OT and DAR were assessed at the Organizational level. SAM was N/A for GTACS.
SCAMPI B #1 Results – 2
GTACS Project Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Total Risks</th>
<th>Process Risks</th>
<th>Artifact Risks</th>
<th>Document Risks</th>
<th>Non-Team Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Low risks were not categorized in the first SCAMPI B

Definitions

- **Risk Level**
  - the risk that the final SCAMPI A Assessment will have a negative finding

- **Process Risks**
  - the GTACS team had no process in place

- **Artifact Risks**
  - the assessment team found insufficient artifacts to assess

- **Document Risks**
  - GTACS process documentation needed to be updated

- **Non-Team Risks**
  - the responsibility of a team other than the TSP team, such as the group’s SEPG or the GTACS CM Team
SCAMPI B #1 Actions

- Addressed Causal Analysis & Resolution (CAR) Findings (High Risk)
  - Focused on executing CAR process
  - Gathered data / created CAR artifacts
- Process Framework & Documentation
  - Identified missing elements (Requirements Management, Project Planning, Project Monitoring & Control)
  - Created/Implemented Process Improvement Proposals
- Team Resources
  - No special resources devoted to CMMI
  - Work was done by the team and led by the team’s process manager (a standard TSP role)
# SCAMPI B #2 Results – 1

GTACS Project Only*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Goal 1</th>
<th>REQM</th>
<th>PP</th>
<th>PMC</th>
<th>SAM</th>
<th>M&amp;A</th>
<th>PPQA</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>RD</th>
<th>TS</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>Ver</th>
<th>Val</th>
<th>OPF</th>
<th>OPD</th>
<th>OT</th>
<th>IPM</th>
<th>RSKM</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>ISM</th>
<th>DAR</th>
<th>OEI</th>
<th>OPP</th>
<th>QPM</th>
<th>OID</th>
<th>CAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP 1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Goal 2</th>
<th>REQM</th>
<th>PP</th>
<th>PMC</th>
<th>SAM</th>
<th>M&amp;A</th>
<th>PPQA</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>RD</th>
<th>TS</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>Ver</th>
<th>Val</th>
<th>OPF</th>
<th>OPD</th>
<th>OT</th>
<th>IPM</th>
<th>RSKM</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>ISM</th>
<th>DAR</th>
<th>OEI</th>
<th>OPP</th>
<th>QPM</th>
<th>OID</th>
<th>CAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP 2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Goal 3</th>
<th>REQM</th>
<th>PP</th>
<th>PMC</th>
<th>SAM</th>
<th>M&amp;A</th>
<th>PPQA</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>RD</th>
<th>TS</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>Ver</th>
<th>Val</th>
<th>OPF</th>
<th>OPD</th>
<th>OT</th>
<th>IPM</th>
<th>RSKM</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>ISM</th>
<th>DAR</th>
<th>OEI</th>
<th>OPP</th>
<th>QPM</th>
<th>OID</th>
<th>CAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP 3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Goal 4</th>
<th>REQM</th>
<th>PP</th>
<th>PMC</th>
<th>SAM</th>
<th>M&amp;A</th>
<th>PPQA</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>RD</th>
<th>TS</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>Ver</th>
<th>Val</th>
<th>OPF</th>
<th>OPD</th>
<th>OT</th>
<th>IPM</th>
<th>RSKM</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>ISM</th>
<th>DAR</th>
<th>OEI</th>
<th>OPP</th>
<th>QPM</th>
<th>OID</th>
<th>CAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP 4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP 4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic Goal 2</th>
<th>REQM</th>
<th>PP</th>
<th>PMC</th>
<th>SAM</th>
<th>M&amp;A</th>
<th>PPQA</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>RD</th>
<th>TS</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>Ver</th>
<th>Val</th>
<th>OPF</th>
<th>OPD</th>
<th>OT</th>
<th>IPM</th>
<th>RSKM</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>ISM</th>
<th>DAR</th>
<th>OEI</th>
<th>OPP</th>
<th>QPM</th>
<th>OID</th>
<th>CAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GP 2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP 2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP 2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP 2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP 2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP 2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP 2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP 2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP 2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP 2.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic Goal 3</th>
<th>REQM</th>
<th>PP</th>
<th>PMC</th>
<th>SAM</th>
<th>M&amp;A</th>
<th>PPQA</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>RD</th>
<th>TS</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>Ver</th>
<th>Val</th>
<th>OPF</th>
<th>OPD</th>
<th>OT</th>
<th>IPM</th>
<th>RSKM</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>ISM</th>
<th>DAR</th>
<th>OEI</th>
<th>OPP</th>
<th>QPM</th>
<th>OID</th>
<th>CAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GP 3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP 3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*For this SCAMPI B, PPQA, OPF, ODP, and DAR were assessed at the Project level. OT was Org level. SAM was N/A for GTACS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Total Risks</th>
<th>Process Risks</th>
<th>Artifact Risks</th>
<th>Document Risks</th>
<th>Non-Team Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Decision Analysis & Resolution (DAR):**
  - 7 High, Artifact
  - 3 Medium, Artifact
  - 1 Low, Document

- **Organizational Process Performance (OPP):**
  - 13 High, Non-Team
  - 1 Medium, Non-Team
  - 1 Low, Non-Team

- **Training:**
  - 1 High, Artifact
  - 2 High, Non-Team
  - 12 Medium, Document
  - 1 Low, Artifact
  - 1 Low, Non-Team

- **Others with GTACS responsibility:**
  - 18 Medium - 17 Low
  - Spread throughout model
  - QPM, CAR, and Risk Management required process changes
DAR Findings

Scope

- During 1st SCAMPI B, DAR was focused at the organizational level
- This proved to be insufficient to produce the necessary artifacts
- An Organization level DAR process was developed by representatives throughout the 309th
- The new DAR process became a requirement for GTACS

Timing

- The majority of the time between the first and second SCAMPI B’s was spent at the Organizational level
- GTACS defined its process, conducted training, but did not execute the process prior to the second SCAMPI B
DAR “Supported” by TSP

- SEI’s Report: All DAR Specific Practices “Partially Addressed”
- Underestimates Risk and Effort for TSP Teams
  - TSP is consistent with DAR philosophy but is nowhere near sufficient
  - TSP as it now stands is insufficient to pass a CMMI assessment
  - TSP DAR procedure is required to produce proper and meaningful artifacts
DAR for GTACS TSP Team

- **Institutionalization**
  - The 309th provided DAR training for GTACS
  - GTACS adapted the Organization level DAR process for use on their team
  - Determined to use the TSP approach
    - Scripts
    - Forms

- **Adaptation**
  - GTACS created a draft operational process in the form of a TSP script
  - The DAR script was then used to analyze several different types of issues
    - product design
    - tool selection
    - process
# DAR TSP Script for GTACS

## DAR Process Script

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Purpose</strong></th>
<th>To guide the team in making formal decisions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entry Criteria</strong></td>
<td>Either</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A Critical measurement exceeds the thresholds defined in the GTACS DAR threshold matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A critical decision needing a formal analysis is identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td>- Critical decisions are ones that have potential impact on the project or project team. Issues with multiple alternative approaches and multiple evaluation criteria are particularly well suited for formal analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tailoring</strong></td>
<td>- This procedure may be used to make and document other decisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Step</strong></th>
<th><strong>Activities</strong></th>
<th><strong>Description</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>- A POC is assigned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The POC may be self assigned if the POC is responsible for the critical decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The team lead assigns the POC otherwise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The team that will perform the DAR analysis and selection activities (the DAR team) is assigned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The POC completes the Entry section of the MXDE Decision Analysis and Resolution Coversheet (section I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The completed MXDE Decision Analysis and Resolution Coversheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Scoring and analysis worksheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CM is notified that the DAR is complete and that the DAR artifacts can be archived to the GTACS data management repository</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exit Criteria**

- The MXDE Decision Analysis and Resolution Coversheet is completely filled out  
- The artifacts produced during the DAR activities have been archived in accordance with the GTACS DMP  

Note: The entire process script can be found in the Crosstalk article “CMMI Level 5 and the Team Software Process”
OPP and QPM

- GTACS Weaknesses in OPP and QPM
  - GTACS data were not analyzed at the sub-process level
  - Data analyses did not address an understanding of process variability

- TSP Paradigm is Not Consistent with CMMI Expectations
  - TSP teams use data for three purposes:
    - project planning
    - project monitoring and oversight
    - process improvement
  - TSP fundamentally considers the software development process as a single entity
GTACS Addressed OPP by

- Helping the Organization address Organizational Process Performance requirements by Organizational Subprocess (Process Category)
- Mapping detailed TSP project data to Organizational data structures
- Using Organizational goals to guide data analyses

**MXDE Historical Data Worksheet**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name:</th>
<th>Flight:</th>
<th>TPM:</th>
<th>Number of PEs:</th>
<th>Project Type:</th>
<th>Completion Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Performance Data</th>
<th>MXDE Standard Engineering Process Category</th>
<th>Estimated Effort at Kickoff</th>
<th>Final Negotiated Effort</th>
<th>Actual Effort at Completion</th>
<th>Estimated Schedule Duration at Kickoff</th>
<th>Final Negotiated Schedule Duration</th>
<th>Actual Schedule Duration</th>
<th>Defects Injected in Category</th>
<th>Defects Removed in Peer Review</th>
<th>Defects Removed in Test Event</th>
<th>Effort to Remove Defects</th>
<th>Externally Detected Defects</th>
<th>Category % of Total Effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MXDE Standard Engineering Process Category**

- Planning
- Design
- Development
- Test
- Support
- Overall

**Quality Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MXDE Standard Engineering Process Category</th>
<th>Quality: DPR</th>
<th>Quality: DDR Peer Reviews</th>
<th>Quality: DDR Test Event</th>
<th>Quality: DDR Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Productivity (Size/Hour)**

- Planning: 0.0%
- Design: 0.0%
- Development: 0.0%
- Test: 0.0%
- Support: 0.0%
- Overall: 0.0%
Utilized Existing TSP Data

Earned Value
- For project management, the Projected Completion Date is one of the key items of interest
- GTACS had more than one year’s worth of statistically significant data on Earned Value

Rework
- TSP teams collect a great deal of Defect data, including time spent in the finding and fixing of defects
- GTACS defined Rework as the percent of total project time spent finding and fixing defects (consistent with the Organizational definitions)
- GTACS had more than one year’s worth of statistically significant data on Rework
The Bad News

- The TSP “holistic process” approach is not consistent with CMMI’s requirement for quantitatively managing at the subprocess level
  - The TSP and PSP approach is to manage *projects* using measures and metrics
  - The CMMI approach is to manage *processes*

- The “alternate practice” used in CMMI version 1.1 level 5 assessment was to treat each project module (baseline change request) as a complete PSP subprocess

- This approach was adequate at the time

- Since that time, SEI has increased the rigor of high maturity assessments

- Our approach may not pass a CMMI version 1.2 assessment using the recently implemented high maturity assessment standards
TSP Postmortem Process
- Currently calls for a detailed analysis of project and process data, including identification of improvements
- This provides a great deal of support for CAR

TSP Postmortem Lacks CAR “Formality” and “Feedback”
- CAR artifacts not specifically defined nor required
- No examination of data to determine if implemented process improvements really worked

GTACS Updated the TSP Postmortem Scripts
- Directly addresses Causal Analysis and Resolution
- Created a CAR Report
  - Details the data analysis which was performed
  - Identifies any weaknesses discovered
  - Suggests process improvements to address these weaknesses
  - Requires an analysis of previous project improvements
## TSP Postmortem Script

### Purpose
- To gather, analyze, and record phase and project data
- To analyze project performance against plans and goals
- To identify potential areas for improvement
- To identify and submit GCARs

### Entry Criteria
- All planned work for the phase has been completed.
- All project and process data are available.
- Team Dashboard with data from the phase being analyzed
- Current Project Notebook
- Note: To meet aggressive schedules, the next phase may be relaunched before the postmortem for the current phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | Meeting Roles | Select the meeting roles  
- The launch coach leads the meeting.  
- The timekeeper tracks time and keeps the meeting on schedule.  
- The recorder notes meeting decisions and actions in the Project Notebook and insures all meeting products are available for archival.  
- The Project Notebook for this meeting is a copy of the most recent Project Notebook, with a meeting agenda matching the agenda for this meeting. |
| 2    | Baseline Evaluation | The support manager leads the team in evaluating the adequacy of the configuration management process, system baseline, and development environment. |
| 3    | Plan Evaluation | The planning manager leads the evaluation of team performance.  
- actual vs. plan for size, resource, and schedule estimates |
| 4    | Quality Performance | The quality manager leads the evaluation of team performance.  
- quality of the products produced  
- team performance vs. the goals and quality plan |
| 5    | Planning Data | Provide updated planning data.  
- size, resource, and productivity data  
- defect, yield, Percent Defect Free, ratio, rate data, and component quality criteria |
| 6    | Process Causal Analysis | The team lead leads the team in an analysis of the team’s process capability  
- A discussion is held of key process capabilities (e.g., estimation accuracy, productivity, quality) and compared with desired numeric goals.  
- A determination is made to identify any process capability deficiencies that exist or if there are process capability improvement opportunities.  
- Key process capabilities are analyzed  
- Where improvement opportunities are identified  
- Identify process, training, tool, support, or management actions  
- Submit GCARs as required |
| 7    | Quality Causal Analysis | The quality manager leads the team in an analysis of the team’s defect data  
- A determination of which defects to analyze is made through an analysis of:  
  - Pareto charts for the most costly and most common defect types  
  - All defect escapes from Unit Test  
- For those defects and defect types selected:  
  - Their defect log entries are analyzed to determine root cause  
  - Where improvement is needed  
  - Identify process (e.g., checklist(s) update), training, tool, support, or management actions  
  - Submit GCARs as required |
1 Selecting Defects for Problem Analysis

During the postmortem phase for V500A an analysis of the defect data was performed in an attempt to find ways to improve our process and our product quality. The focus of the analysis was to find the kind of errors that were the most expensive to correct or perhaps occurred most frequently. We also wanted to look at problems that occurred during the V500A development phase that were possibly not logged as defects but cost the team in terms of schedule.

1.1 Most Common Defect

The initial V500 Defect data showed that the most expensive type of defect was type function.

The GTACS defect type of data is defined to be any defect caused by the improper design or implementation of a data element. This type of error also happens to be the most expensive error type logged by our team for errors in the test development phase.

1.1 Defects by Phase

Another metric that was evaluated was the total number of defects injected in a development phase of our process. The Test Development Phase has the most total defects logged.
Training

TSP Training Covers Many CMMI Requirements
- Personal Software Process Training for Engineers
- Managing TSP Teams for Managers & Team Leader
- Addressed the training requirement (SP 2.5) for:
  - Project Planning
  - Project Monitoring & Control
  - Integrated Project Management
  - Process and Product Quality Assurance
  - Measurement & Analysis
  - Causal Analysis & Resolution
  - Verification (partially addressed)

A Training Plan was Developed for the Remaining Process Areas
Summary

- TSP Does Not Guarantee CMMI Level 5
- SEI’s Mapping of TSP to CMMI is a Good Starting Point
- TSP Teams Should Focus on:
  - Causal Analysis & Resolution
  - Decision Analysis & Resolution
  - Organizational Process Performance
  - Quantitative Project Management
  - Training
- TSP Does Provide All the Data and Discipline Required
- Additional Scripts, Forms and Reports are Needed
Questions?
Contact Information

David R. Webb
309 SMXG
520 Software Maintenance Squadron
Hill Air Force Base, Utah 84056
(801) 586-9330
E-mail: david.webb@hill.af.mil

Jim VanBuren
Draper Laboratory
517 Software Maintenance Squadron
Hill Air Force Base, Utah 84056
(801) 777-7085
E-mail: jim.vanburen@hill.af.mil

Dr. Eugene Miluk
Software Engineering Institute
Carnegie Mellon University
4500 Fifth Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
(412) 268-5795
E-mail: gem@sei.cmu.edu