



# Quantitative Prediction and Improvement of Program Execution

Dr. Shawn Rahmani  
Boeing Defense, Space/Security  
Huntington Beach, California

The 26th Annual IEEE Software Technology  
Conference  
March-April 2014



# Agenda

---


- **Problem**
- **Approach**
- **Process**
- **Examples Products**
- **Recommended Practices and Lessons Learned**
- **Summary**

# Problem




**Col Dave Madden:**  
**“. . SW metrics are too rear view mirror -  
want projections into the future that we can measure  
ourselves against . . .”**

# Problem (Software Example)



**Value of the Proposal BOE is ignored/discarded after the Program is awarded**


# Approach: Integrated Model-based PM



# Process

Proposal

Execution



**A close-loop control, full lifecycle approach, for model-based, software project management**

\*BTU - Basic Task Unit, standard task based cost accounting structure

\*\*WP - Work Product

# Improvements

## Before

### Traditional Inputs

- Size
- Environmental Characteristics\*
- Historical Data\*\*

### Advanced Inputs

- Feature Roadmap (agile)
- Team structure

Inputs

## Advanced SW Estimating Toolset (ASET)

- Master Input/Parse
- Calibration Tool
- CER Catalog
- MS Project Templates

Outputs

## Current

### Traditional Outputs

- Effort (hours)
- Schedule (calendar months)


### Advanced Outputs

- Staffing Profiles
- Work Product (Feature) Plans
- MS Project Plans
- EAC Projections
- Defect Predictions

\* Environmental Characteristics include personnel, development / target / integration environments, and program constraints

\*\* Historical Data includes size, effort, schedule, and productivity and Cost Estimating Relationships (CERs)


# Process Cycle






# Capabilities and Products

## Actual & Predicted Cost/Schedule versus Baseline Estimate




6

## Actual Defects versus Baseline Estimate



5

## Technical Metrics/Analysis Including Productivity by Work-Product and Phase




7

## Summary Stoplight

| Schedule Variance | Time Variance | Cost Variance | Scope Growth | Defects |
|-------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------|
| WORSE             | WORSE         | BETTER        | BETTER       | WORSE   |


Rollup: Mission System  
Mission Planning  
Mission Tracking

## Proposal Support, What-if Scenario & Independent Assessment




8

## SPI & CPI (recent & cum)




## Work-Product Execution Profiles



3


## Risk Identification and Analysis

1. Specification Level - Reliability
2. Requirements Volatility (Change)
3. Target System Volatility
4. Test Level
5. Quality Assurance Level
6. Special Display Requirements
7. Real Time Code
8. Development System Volatility
9. Tar Sys Exper/Compl
10. Memory Constraints




4

## Detailed Plans



2

## Staffing Profiles - Default & Constrained




1


9

# Sample Product

## Staffing Profile



# Execution Phase – Prediction Example



## Case: Slow progress

- Observations
  - Reduced performance (green solid)
  - \$ burn rate continues per plan (red solid)
- Projections (EAC)
  - Late to 100% done (green dotted)
  - Over budget (red dotted)

- Based on actual performance data the model predicts cost overrun and late delivery
- 'What if' analysis can help determine path back to within budget
  - Staff level
  - Personnel Characteristics
  - Development Environment
  - Target Environment



# Recommended Practice/ Lessons Learned -1

- **Process used in proposal phase creating representative model of project and plans applicable throughout lifecycle**
  - **Lesson: retrofitting during execution is cumbersome and costly**
- **Metrics Plans – Ensure proper information is available**
  - **Lesson: metric plans may not support desired performance management**



# Recommended Practice/ Lessons Learned -2


- **Process should analyze metrics and cost data ensuring:**
  - **Cost charging alignment to WBS and use of BTUs are correct and support EVM analysis**
  - **Metrics are as planned and provide accurate assessment of program progress**
  - **Accurate and efficient historical data collection**
- **Lesson: actual metric plan and cost charging vary from planned approach and may not provide needed information**



# Recommended Practice/ Lessons Learned -3

- **Process automation improves time and effort to produce plans, collect/analyze EVM, and prepare proposals**
- **Core SMEs support estimating and proposal development and mentoring of project personnel**
- **Lesson: planning and monitoring is a time consuming activity for management resources, especially when doing re-plans during execution**

# Summary



- **Integrated model-based project estimating, planning, predicting, tracking and management**
- **Carries value of proposal BOE through program execution**
- **Capability applied to software projects, expandable to SE**
- **Best if used in proposal phase and continued during contract execution**
- **Value proposition with metrics collection and process automation**

**Demonstrated Program Executability Improvements**

# Acronyms

- ATP: Authority to Proceed
- BOE: Basis of Estimate
- CPI: Cost Performance Index
- EAC: Estimate To Completion
- EVM: Earned Value Management
- ESLOC: Equivalent/Effective Source Lines OF Code
- SEMPAC: Software Estimation, Measurement, Prediction, And Control
- SME: Subject Matter Expert
- SPI: Schedule Performance Index
- SE: Systems Engineering



# Backup Information

# Abstract

## Quantitative Prediction and Improvement of Program Execution

By: Dr. Shawn Rahmani  
Boeing Defense, Space/Security  
Huntington Beach, California

Flawless execution of programs involving software intensive systems is a challenge. Many large software intensive programs have experienced software related problems, including inaccurate and incorrect estimation of the software effort, lack of adequate and quantifiable definition of the planned work, and insufficient visibility and inaccurate measurement of the work performed. This presentation focuses on a “predictive methodology” that uses program data to provide leading indicators about the health of the program execution throughout the development cycle. While methods based on Earned Value Measurement (EVM) have been in place for some time, they have proved to be insufficient for addressing the above problem. Specifically, the following areas contribute to the problem:

Lack of integrated leading indicators (based on the product size, cost, schedule, quality, and staffing requirements) to predict technical success of the software activities within a program.

Lack of value-added measures that provide predictive program insight while supporting lean improvements.

Lack of ability to effectively package and communicate the predicted program impact and recommended solutions to decision makers throughout the program duration.

This presentation is based on the work done at Boeing to address the above issues. It covers:

A set of predictive metrics for software engineering, consistent with Government’s predictive metrics for Probability of Program Success (PoPS) and Predictive System/Software Measurements (PSM).

A set of raw software measurements that can be used for estimation and measurement of detailed work planned and performed on government contracts.

A technical process that defines how software estimation, measurement, prediction, and control should be handled.

Extensibility of current metrics (e.g., EVM, quality, risk).

Information on how the process contributes to First Time Quality and Lean Program Management/Execution.

Information about the tool that automates the collection of the data and implementation of the process.

Use of the process and tool on trial projects and pilot programs

Lessons learned and future plan.

## **ASSIGNMENT OF COPYRIGHT**

Date of Presentation(s):

March 29 – April 2, 2014

Copyright Form To:

The 26th Annual IEEE Software Technology Conference

Publication Title:

Quantitative Prediction and Improvement of Program Execution

Author(s):

Shawn Rahmani

At least one, but possibly not all, of the authors of the Work is an employee of The Boeing Company or one of its wholly-owned subsidiaries (“BOEING”) preparing the Work within the scope of his or her employment. The Boeing employees in question are not authorized to assign or license Boeing’s rights therein, or otherwise bind Boeing. However, subject to the limitations set forth below, Boeing is willing to assign its copyright in the Work to Publisher.

Notwithstanding any assignment or transfer to the Publisher, or any other terms of this agreement, the rights granted by Boeing to Publisher are limited as follows: (i) any rights granted by Boeing to the Publisher are limited to the work-made-for-hire rights Boeing enjoys in the Work; (ii) Boeing makes no representation or warranty of any kind to the Publisher or any other person or entity regarding the Work, the information contained therein, or any related copyright; and (iii) Boeing retains a non-exclusive, perpetual, worldwide, royalty-free right, without restriction or limitation, to use, reproduce, publicly distribute, display, and perform and make derivative works from the Work, and to permit others to do so.

Candice Jordan

Contracts Specialist

Intellectual Property Management