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Boeing Information Services in Wichita

- Provide software to support Wichita division.
- Focus on software design, architecture, application development & maintenance, COTS integration, technology evaluation, selection, and transfer.
- Support all Boeing commercial aircraft and some military airplanes (KC135, KC 10, B52, E-3 AWACS etc.)
Why Boeing Information Services, Wichita?

Boeing Wichita is

- Part of a company-wide improvement.
- One of 72 organizations identified in an improvement strategy plan.
- Pilot site for SW-CMM validation study (1991-1994)
- Unique since it was not re-organized during merger.
  - Management commitment is at all levels
  - Data collection is not disrupted
  - SEPG members rotational process is still active
- Leading software activities in Boeing
  - Major contribution to DCAC/MRM program
  - Key contribution to 3D Graphic design of airplane (CATIA)
  - Pilot site for several new technologies
- Activities & Lessons Learned are shared among organizations
  - Templates & Techniques are being used by many organizations
- First IS organization in Boeing to achieve SW-CMM level 4 in 2001
Process Improvement Results

10 year study on process improvement

120 projects in Boeing Information Services in Wichita participated in the validation study of the SW-CMM between 1991-1994

Measurement baseline established in 1991 and re-established in 1996

Pilot site for CMMI Transition

Data collected and analyzed independently by Dr. Kay Nelson of University of Kansas
Process Improvement Context

- Business goals are key drivers
- CMMI is only a guide
- Plan is based on appraisal results
- Data are used to verify improvement results

Organization’s Business Goals
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Plan is based on appraisal results
Measurements Are Key To Success

Core Measurements:

• Defects: Post & Pre-released
• Estimates: Plan vs. Actual (Schedules, Efforts, Costs)
• Cycle Time: Time to complete an activity
• Customer Satisfaction: Monthly Survey
• Employee Satisfaction: Bi-Annual survey
• Number of management decisions based on metrics
It All Started With Project Estimates

- The utilization of historical data will improve project performance by reducing the variation in estimates
- Better estimates will improve project schedules
- Better schedules will improve project management
- Better project management will improve project quality and reduce costs
- Better project quality and reduced costs will improve customer satisfaction
- Satisfied customers will improve relationships
- Better relationships will improve the business
Software Estimates
(Actual vs Planned)

Utilize Historical data for all project estimates

- Over estimates
  - +22%
  - +26%
  - +20%
  - +12%
  - +4%

- Under estimates
  - -148%
  - -125%
  - -24%
  - -18%
  - -7%

(Based on 120 projects in Boeing Information Systems)
Establish Formal Gate Reviews

Implementing Formal Review increased Design effort by 4% and decreased Rework effort by 31%.

Cost: Benefit ratio is 4% : 31% or 1 : 7.75
Total Number Of Defects Per Year
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Defect Prevention Cost Savings
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Increased Software Reuse = Reduced Costs

![Bar Chart]

- Level 1: ?
- Level 2: 10%
- Level 3: 25%
- Level 4: 58%
- Level 5: 64%

Percent of Software reuse
Increased Software Reuse = Reduced Costs

- Code reuse: No modification
- Other reuse: Templates, Test cases etc.
Software Maintenance Cost Savings

- Average percentage of cost savings based on 1997 baseline

204% Increased Cost Savings
Cycle Time = Supported Hours Per Element

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

- Average number of hour required to supported an Elements in maintenance
- Element = Configuration Item

70% More Efficient
Cycle Time

64% Faster response to Customer Change Request

Average days per Change Request per month

Year | Level 3 | Level 4 | Level 5
--- | --- | --- | ---
1996 | 79.8 | 44.6 | 50.2
1997 | 40.8 | 34.5 | 30.9
1998 | 30.6 | 24.7 | 29.1
Flow Time Days Avoided (1996 Baseline)

Flow Time Days Avoided
Customer Satisfaction

Average Customer Satisfaction Index based on monthly survey

Level 3

1997: 3.85
1998: 3.98
1999: 4.08
2000: 4.11
2001: 4.22

Level 4

2002: 4.14
2003: 4.16
2004: 4.05

Level 5
Employee Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Number of Employees Before Process Improvement</th>
<th>Number of Employees After Process Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely satisfied</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Satisfied</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Quite Satisfied</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not excited About</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before Process Improvement: Mean = 5.7

After Process Improvement: Mean = 8.9

74% increased to 96%
Productivity = Less People - More Works

- 55% Reduction in Headcount
- 150% Increase in Statement Of Work

Element: Software Configuration Item
Return On Investment

There is no perfect formula to calculate Return On Investment for Process Improvement. Different organizations use different methods. Our 10 year study indicated a significant return on investment when maturing from a Level 1 to Level 5 as calculated by the following formula:

\[
\text{ROI} = \frac{\text{Benefit realization} - \text{Cost of Process improvement}}{\text{Cost of Process Improvement}} \times 100\%
\]

ROI = 2740%

Where:

Benefits Realization = Labor cost savings

Cost of Process Improvement = Cost of SEPG (Labor + SPI Tools + Training)
Benefit Cost Ratio

Our Benefit Cost Ratio is a measure of how much money is gained from following the CMMI improvement framework. Our 10 year study indicated a significant benefit cost ratio when maturing from Level 1 to Level 5.

Benefit Cost Ratio = 28.5

\[
\text{Benefit Cost Ratio} = \frac{\text{Benefit Realization}}{\text{Cost of Process Improvement}}
\]

Where:

Benefits Realization = Labor cost savings

Cost of Process Improvement = Cost of SEPG (Labor + SPI Tools + Training)
CMMI Transition

We found
• No evidence of difficulty transitioning from SW-CMM to CMMI
• CMMI makes engineering work more visible to management
• The notion that CMMI Level 3 has many processes and is difficult to implement is not true
• Transition from CBA/IPI to SCAMPI is an improvement
• Investment in process improvement can be (and should be) explained in business terms

Process Improvement works
Capability Maturity Models

Based on our 10 year study, we concluded that:

There is a **systematic approach** to improving an organization’s software and systems, and achieving business goals and objectives.

There are **stages of process maturity** in which an organization can significantly improve its products and services by following a **recommended sequence**.

By following an **evolutionary path** of a well defined model the organization can continuously improve its products and services, and at the same time meet or exceed its business goals and objectives.