

COSYSMO 3.0
Data Collection Form
Jim Alstad
GSAW 2016 version of 1 March 2016

Top-Level Table of Contents

Top-Level Table of Contents.....	1
Overview of this Version	2
1. Introductory Material.....	3
1.1 Cover Letter	3
1.2 Project Information	3
1.3 Rater Information.....	3
2. Scale Factors	4
2.1 (Ignore)	4
2.2 Risk/Opportunity Resolution.....	4
2.3 Process Capability	5
2.4 Requirements Volatility	5
3. Reuse Elements	7
3.1 (Ignore)	7
3.2 (Ignore)	7
3.3 Reuse, by Subproject	7
4. Size Elements	10
4.1 System Requirements	10
4.2 System Interfaces.....	11
4.3 Algorithms.....	12
4.4 Operational Scenarios.....	13
5. Cost Drivers	15
5.1 CONOPS and Requirements Understanding.....	15
5.2 (Ignore)	16
5.3 Architecture Understanding.....	16
5.4 Stakeholder Team Cohesion	17
5.5 Level of Service Requirements.....	17
5.6 Technology Risk.....	18
5.7 # of Recursive Levels in the Design	19
5.8 # and Diversity of Installations/Platforms.....	19
5.9 Migration Complexity	21
5.10 Interoperability	21
5.11 Personnel/Team Capability	23
5.12 Process Capability.....	24
5.13 Personnel Experience/Continuity.....	26
5.14 Multisite Coordination	26
5.15 Tool Support	27
5.16 (Ignore).....	28

5.17 DFR 28

Overview of this Version

This version supports the GSAW 2016 meeting. It corresponds to version v35 of the Model.

This is an early draft; there are rough parts, such as TBDs.

1. Introductory Material

1.1 Cover Letter

TBD.

1.2 Project Information

TBD.

1.3 Rater Information

TBD.

2. Scale Factors

The items in this section are properties of the entire project.

2.1 (Ignore)

2.2 Risk/Opportunity Resolution

2.2.1. Definition

Text Definition: This driver captures the project's use of a comprehensive, effective risk management process.

Rating Scale:

Viewpoint	Very Low	Low	Nominal	High	Very High	Extra High
A life cycle-long, funded process for identifying, tracking, and resolving risks is carried out.	No such process, or the process is very weak.	The process is weak.	The process is moderate.	The process is fairly strong.	The process is strong.	The process is very strong.
A culture of risk identification, tracking, and resolution is part of the organization.	Very weak culture.	Weak culture.	Moderate culture, including experience in risk management.	Fairly strong culture, including fairly successful experience in risk management.	Strong culture, including mostly successful experience in risk management.	Very strong culture, including very successful experience in risk management.

Rating: Considering the above table, and combining the viewpoint ratings according to your best judgment, what rating would you give Risk and Opportunity Resolution? _____

2.3 Process Capability

(This attribute is rated in section 5.12.1.)

2.4 Requirements Volatility

2.4.1. Definition

Text Definition: Requirements volatility is defined as unplanned changes in requirements over a given time interval during the system’s life cycle. These changes may include additions, modifications or deletions.

Please fill in the “Your Ratings” column with your rating for each of the Characteristics.

Characteristic	1	2	3	4	5	Your Ratings
	System requirements baselined and agreed to by key stakeholders	Fully	Mostly _____	Generally	Somewhat	No Agreement
Level of uncertainty in key customer requirements, mission objectives, and stakeholder needs	Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High	
Number of co-dependent systems with influence on system requirements	Very Low	Low _____	Moderate	High _____	Very High	
Strength of your organization’s requirements development process and level of change control rigor	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	Very Low	
Precedentedness of the system, use of mature technology	Very High	High _____	Moderate	Low _____	Very Low	
Stability of stakeholders' organizations (developer, customer)	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	Very Low	

Experience level of the systems engineering team in requirements analysis and development	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	Very Low	
---	-----------	------	----------	-----	----------	--

3. Reuse Elements

3.1 (Ignore)

3.2 (Ignore)

3.3 Reuse, by Subproject

Your project may have multiple subprojects with different types of reuse being performed. (Or, it may have only a single subproject.)

Generally, the key reuse attributes can be determined by considering these two questions:

- Are artifacts from one or more previous projects being used on this subproject (development with reuse: DWR)? If so, how mature are those artifacts?
- Are artifacts from this subproject planned to be reused on later projects (development for reuse: DFR)? If so, how mature is this subproject going to develop them?

Details of these concepts are given below.

The reuse attributes for each subproject must be the same across the subproject; i.e., the answers to the above questions must be the same for all artifacts on the subproject.

Then, this section and all the following sections need to be filled out for each subproject.

Here are the reuse rating questions for this subproject:

3.3.1. DWR Rating

Rating: What is your rating for the DWR level of the subproject? _____

Here are the DWR levels:

- New (no DWR)
- Design Modified
- Design Implemented
- Adapted for Integration
- Adopted for Integration
- Managed

Here are complete definitions of the DWR levels:

DWR Level	Definition
New	System attribute that is new, which requires developing from scratch; or from previously defined system design or constructed product components but requiring near-complete changes in system architecture as a result of modified or extended system functionalities.
Design Modified	System attribute that is designed and developed by leveraging previously defined system concept, functional and logical reference architecture; or from previously designed physical architecture or constructed product components which requires significant design and implementation changes or refactoring but without major changes in system functionalities
Design Implemented	System attribute that is implemented from an inherited, completed system design or a previously constructed product component that may require only limited design changes in the physical architecture to an extent that it will not impact or change the basic design but that may require reimplementation of the component.
Adapted for Integration	System attribute that is integrated from adaptation or tailoring (by limited modification of interfaces) of previously constructed or deployed product components without changes in the system architecture and design or the physical implementation except for those related to interface changes so that the adapted element can be effectively integrated or form fit into the new system. The effort required is relatively lower than that of the Design Implemented category. This category includes removal of system element from previously developed or deployed system baseline.
Adopted for Integration	System attribute that is incorporated or integrated from previously developed or deployed product components without modification, which requires complete integration, assembly, test and checkout activities as well as V&V testing. This is also known as “black-box” reuse or simple integration.
Managed	System attribute that is inherited from previously developed and validated product components without modification and the integration of such an element, if required, is through significantly reduced V&V testing effort by means of inspection or provided test services, procedures and equipment. Most of the systems engineering effort incurred is a result of technical management.

3.3.2. DFR Rating

Rating: What is your rating for the DFR level of the subproject? _____

Here are the DFR levels:

- No DFR
- Conceptualized for Reuse
- Designed for Reuse
- Constructed for Reuse
- Validated for Reuse

Here are complete definitions of the DFR levels:

DFR Level	Definition
No DFR	This subproject is not developing artifacts for later reuse.
Conceptualized for Reuse	This Level encapsulates a set of front-end systems engineering activities from which reusable resource produced is a logical or functional architecture that must be further developed through a series of detailed design, implementation, verification and validation testing activities to realize the final deployable product.
Designed for Reuse	This Level encapsulates a set of front-end of system design activities from which reusable resource produced is a complete system design or physical architecture that must be further developed through a series of implementation, integration, verification and validation testing activities to realize the final deployable product.
Constructed for Reuse	This Level encapsulates a set of system development activities from which reusable resource produced is a physical product or component that has been implemented and independently verified through verification testing but has not been deployed or used in an end system. This requires all levels of system development activities short of final system-level integration, transition, verification and validation testing.
Validated for Reuse	This Level encapsulates the entire set of system development activities from which reusable resource produced is a physical product or component that has been developed, deployed, and operational validated through its use in an end system.

4. Size Elements

4.1 System Requirements

4.1.1. Definition

Text Definition: This driver represents the number of requirements for the system-of-interest at the system level or the level of “sell-off” to the customer, which may include derived requirements at the same Level. The quantity of requirements includes those related to the effort involved in engineering the system interfaces, system specific algorithms, and operational scenarios. Requirements may be functional, performance, feature, or service-oriented in nature depending on the methodology used for specification. They may also be defined by the customer or contractor. Each requirement must have systems engineering effort associated with it such as verification and validation, functional decomposition, functional allocation, etc. System requirements can typically be quantified by counting the number of applicable “shalls” in the system or marketing specification. Note on “shall”: that word is used by the US Department of Defense to flag requirements. In other contexts other words may be used for this purpose, such as “will”, “must”, “should”, “may”, or “provides”; use a consistent word or combination of words appropriate to your context.

Rating Scale:

Easy	Nominal	Difficult
Simple to implement	Moderately difficult to implement	Complex to implement or engineer
Traceable to source	Can be traced to source with some effort	Hard to trace to source
Little requirements overlap	Some overlap	High degree of requirements overlap

Rating: Please fill in the table below with the subproject’s number of system requirements at each level of difficulty.

Difficulty Level:	Easy	Nominal	Difficult
# of system requirements at this difficulty level:			

4.2 System Interfaces

4.2.1. Definition

Text Definition: This driver represents the number of shared physical and logical boundaries between system components or functions (internal interfaces) and those external to the system (external interfaces). These interfaces typically can be quantified by counting the number of external and internal system interfaces among ISO/IEC 15288-defined system elements.

Rating Scale:

Easy	Nominal	Difficult
Simple & straightforward	Moderate complexity	Complex protocol(s)
Uncoupled	Loosely coupled	Highly coupled
Strong consensus	Moderate consensus	Low consensus
Well behaved	Predictable behavior	Poorly behaved
Domain or enterprise standards employed	Functional standards employed	Isolated or connected systems with few or no standards

Rating: Please fill in the table below with the subproject's number of system interfaces at each level of difficulty.

Difficulty Level:	Easy	Nominal	
--------------------------	------	---------	--

			Difficult
# of system interfaces at this difficulty level:			

4.3 Algorithms

4.3.1. Definition

Text Definition: This driver represents the number of mathematical algorithms to be derived in order to achieve the system functional and performance requirements. The number can be quantified by counting the number of unique algorithms needed to realize key system requirements specified in the system specification or architecture description document. As an example, this could include a complex aircraft tracking algorithm like a Kalman Filter being derived using existing experience as the basis for the all aspect search function. Another example could be a discrimination algorithm being derived to identify friend or foe function in space-based applications.

Rating Scale:

Easy	Nominal	Difficult
- Algebraic	- Straight forward calculus	- Complex constrained optimization; pattern recognition
- Straightforward structure	- Nested structure with decision logic	- Recursive in structure with distributed control
- Simple data	- Relational data	- Noisy, ill-conditioned data
- Timing not an issue	- Timing a constraint	- Dynamic, with timing and uncertainty issues
- Adaptation of library-based solution	- Some modeling involved	- Simulation and modeling involved

Rating: Please fill in the table below with the subproject's number of algorithms at each level of difficulty.

Difficulty Level:	Easy	Nominal	Difficult
# of algorithms at this difficulty level:			

4.4 Operational Scenarios

4.4.1. Definition

Text Definition: This driver represents the number of operational scenarios that a system must satisfy in order to accomplish its intended mission or mission objectives. An operational scenario must be end-to-end and triggered by an operational event. Such scenarios include both the nominal stimulus-response thread plus all of the off-nominal threads resulting from bad or missing data, unavailable processes, or other exceptional conditions. The number of scenarios can typically be quantified by counting the number of system-level use cases developed as part of the operational architecture or by counting operational modes captured in the user manual.

Rating Scale:

Easy	Nominal	Difficult
- Well defined	- Loosely defined	- Ill defined
- Loosely coupled	- Moderately coupled	- Tightly coupled or many dependencies/conflicting requirements
- Timelines not an issue	- Timelines a constraint	- Tight timelines through scenario network
- Few, simple off-nominal threads	- Moderate number or complexity of off-nominal threads	- Many or very complex off-nominal threads

Rating: Please fill in the table below with the subproject's number of operational scenarios at

each level of difficulty.

Difficulty Level:	Easy	Nominal	Difficult
# of operational scenarios at this difficulty level:			

5. Cost Drivers

Please rank the cost drivers for this subproject.

5.1 CONOPS and Requirements Understanding

5.1.1. Definition

Text Definition: The extent to which the Stakeholders and Team understand the system's concept of operations. In addition, this cost driver rates the level of understanding of the system requirements by all stakeholders including systems, software, hardware, customers, team members, users, etc. Primary sources of added systems engineering effort are unprecedented systems, unfamiliar domains, or systems whose requirements are emergent with use.

Rating Scale:

Viewpoints:	Very low	Low	Nominal	High	Very High
<i>Degree of Understanding of CONOPS</i>	The Stakeholders and Team have a poor understanding of the CONOPS.	The Stakeholders and Team have a mediocre understanding of the CONOPS.	The Stakeholders and Team have an average understanding of the CONOPS.	The Stakeholders and Team have a good understanding of the CONOPS.	The Stakeholders and Team have a strong understanding of the CONOPS.
<i>Unresolved Issues in the CONOPS</i>	Multiple critical issues are unresolved in Stakeholders' understanding of the CONOPS	One critical issue is unresolved in Stakeholders' understanding of the CONOPS	No critical issues are unresolved in Stakeholders' understanding of the CONOPS, but several significant issues are unresolved	No critical issues are unresolved in Stakeholders' understanding of the CONOPS, but a few significant issues are unresolved	No critical or significant issues are unresolved in Stakeholders' understanding of the CONOPS
<i>Requirements Understanding</i>	Poor: emergent requirements or unprecedented system	Minimal: many undefined areas	Reasonable: some undefined areas	Strong: few undefined areas	Full understanding of requirements, familiar system
<i>User Training</i>	The user community has received little or no training on the new/modified system, including on any	The user community has received a less than average amount of training on the new/modified system,	The user community has received an average amount of training on the new/modified system,	The user community has received a greater than average amount of training on the new/modified	The user community has received a superior amount of training on the new/modified system,

	new technology in use.	including on any new technology in use.	including on any new technology in use.	system, including on any new technology in use.	including on any new technology in use.
--	------------------------	---	---	---	---

Guidance: Whenever the Requirements Volatility scale factor is rated above Very Low, the Requirements Understanding viewpoint should be taken to be “Nominal”; the motivation is to avoid “double-counting” requirements volatility.

Rating: What is your rating for the CONOPS and Requirements Understanding level of the subproject? _____

5.2 (Ignore)

5.3 Architecture Understanding

5.3.1. Definition

Text Definition: This cost driver rates the degree of understanding of determining and managing the system architecture in terms of platforms, standards, new and NDI (COTS/GOTS) components, connectors (protocols), and constraints. This includes tasks like systems analysis, tradeoff analysis, modeling, simulation, case studies, etc.

Rating Scale:

Very low	Low	Nominal	High	Very High
Poor understanding of architecture and NDI, unprecedented system	Minimal understanding of architecture and NDI, many unfamiliar areas	Reasonable understanding of architecture and NDI, some unfamiliar areas	Strong understanding of architecture and NDI, few unfamiliar areas	Full understanding of architecture, familiar system and NDI

Rating: What is your rating for the Architecture Understanding level of the subproject?

5.4 Stakeholder Team Cohesion

5.4.1. Definition

Text Definition: Represents a multi-attribute parameter, which includes leadership, shared vision, diversity of stakeholders, approval cycles, group dynamics, Integrated Product Team framework, team dynamics, trust, and amount of change in responsibilities. It further represents the heterogeneity in stakeholder community of the end users, customers, implementers, and development team.

Rating Scale:

	Very Low	Low	Nominal	High	Very High
<i>Culture</i>	Stakeholders with diverse expertise, task nature, language, culture, infrastructure Highly heterogeneous stakeholder communities	Heterogeneous stakeholder community Some similarities in language and culture	Shared project culture	Strong team cohesion and project culture Multiple similarities in language and expertise	Virtually homogeneous stakeholder communities Institutionalized project culture
<i>Compatibility</i>	Highly conflicting organizational objectives	Converging organizational objectives	Compatible organizational objectives	Clear roles & responsibilities	Strong mutual advantage to collaboration
<i>Familiarity and Trust</i>	Complete lack of familiarity	Willing to collaborate, little familiarity	Some familiarity and trust	Extensive successful collaboration	Very high level of familiarity and trust

Rating: What is your rating for the Stakeholder Team Cohesion level of the subproject?

5.5 Level of Service Requirements

5.5.1. Definition

Text Definition: This cost driver rates the difficulty and criticality of satisfying the ensemble of

level of service requirements, such as security, safety, response time, maintainability, Key Performance Parameters (KPPs), system qualities (formerly known as the “ilities”), etc.

Rating Scale:

	Very low	Low	Nominal	High	Very High
<i>Difficulty</i>	Simple; single dominant KPP	Low, some coupling among KPPs	Moderately complex, coupled KPPs	Difficult, coupled KPPs	Very complex, tightly coupled KPPs
<i>Criticality</i>	Slight inconvenience	Easily recoverable losses	Some loss	High financial loss	Risk to human life

Rating: What is your rating for the Level of Service Requirements of the subproject?

5.6 Technology Risk

5.6.1. Definition

Text Definition: The maturity, readiness, and obsolescence of the technology being implemented. Immature or obsolescent technology will require more Systems Engineering effort.

Rating Scale:

	Very Low	Low	Nominal	High	Very High
<i>Lack of Maturity/ Readiness</i>	Technology proven and widely used throughout industry. Mission proven. (TRL 9)	Proven through actual use and ready for widespread adoption. Concept qualified. (TRL 8)	Proven on pilot projects and ready to roll- out for production jobs. Concept has been demonstrated. (TRL 7)	Ready for pilot use. Proof of concept validated. (TRL 5 & 6)	Still in the laboratory. Concept defined. (TRL 3 & 4)

<i>Obsolescence</i>			- Technology is the state-of-the-practice <input type="checkbox"/> - Emerging technology could compete in future	- Technology is stale <input type="checkbox"/> - New and better technology is ready for pilot use	- Technology is outdated and use should be avoided in new systems <input type="checkbox"/> - Spare parts supply is scarce
---------------------	--	--	--	---	---

Rating: What is your rating for the level of Technology Risk of the subproject? _____

5.7 # of Recursive Levels in the Design

5.7.1. Definition

Text Definition: The number of levels of design related to the system-of-interest (as defined by ISO/IEC 15288) and the number of organizations planned to work on the different levels.

Rating Scale:

	Very Low	Low	Nominal	High	Very High
<i>Number of levels</i>	1	2	3-5	6-7	>7

Rating: What is your rating for the # of Recursive Levels in the Design of the subproject?

5.8 # and Diversity of Installations/Platforms

5.8.1. Definition

Text Definition: The number of different platforms that the system will be hosted and installed on. The complexity in the operating environment (space, sea, land, fixed, mobile, portable, information assurance/security, constraints on size weight, and power). For example, in a

wireless network it could be the number of unique installation sites and the number of and types of fixed clients, mobile clients, and servers. Number of platforms being implemented should be added to the number being phased out (dual count).

Rating Scale:

	Nominal	High	Very High	Extra High
Sites/ installations	Single installation site or configuration	2-3 sites or diverse installation configurations	4-5 sites or diverse installation configurations	>6 sites or diverse installation configurations
Operating environment	Existing facility meets all known environmental operating requirements	Moderate environmental constraints; controlled environment (i.e., A/C, electrical)	Ruggedized mobile land-based requirements; some information security requirements. Coordination between 1 or 2 regulatory or cross functional agencies required.	Harsh environment (space, sea airborne) sensitive information security requirements. Coordination between 3 or more regulatory or cross functional agencies required.
Platforms	<3 types of platforms being installed and/or being phased out/replaced	4-7 types of platforms being installed and/or being phased out/replaced	8-10 types of platforms being installed and/or being phased out/replaced	>10 types of platforms being installed and/or being phased out/replaced
	Homogeneous platforms	Compatible platforms	Heterogeneous, but compatible platforms	Heterogeneous, incompatible platforms
	Typically networked using a single industry standard protocol	Typically networked using a single industry standard protocol and multiple operating systems	Typically networked using a mix of industry standard protocols and proprietary protocols; single operating systems	Typically networked using a mix of industry standard protocols and proprietary protocols; multiple operating systems

Rating: What is your rating for the # and Diversity of Installations/Platforms of the subproject?

5.9 Migration Complexity

5.9.1. Definition

Text Definition: This cost driver rates the extent to which the legacy system affects the migration complexity, if any. Legacy system components, databases, workflows, environments, etc., may affect the new system implementation due to new technology introductions, planned upgrades, increased performance, business process reengineering, etc.

Rating Scale:

	Nominal	High	Very High	Extra High
<i>Legacy contractor</i>	Self; legacy system is well documented. Original team largely available	Self; original development team not available; most documentation available	Different contractor; limited documentation	Original contractor out of business; no documentation available
<i>Effect of legacy system on new system</i>	Everything is new; legacy system is completely replaced or non-existent	Migration is restricted to integration only	Migration is related to integration and development	Migration is related to integration, development, architecture and design

Rating: What is your rating for the level of Migration Complexity of the subproject?

5.10 Interoperability

5.10.1. Definition

Text Definition: How extensive are the interoperability requirements? Interoperability is defined as “The ability of a system to work with another system or group of systems”. External interoperability (interoperability with other systems) is always considered. When the system of interest is a system-of-systems, internal interoperability (interoperability between constituent systems) also applies.

Rating Scales:

There are two different rating scales; the appropriate one should be selected, depending on whether the project is for an existing system or for a new system.

Existing System Rating Scale:

The existing system External Interoperability scale is based on LISI levels [15]; these ratings are to be interpreted this way: “Before being integrated into a system-of-systems, what was the system’s status with regard to interoperability?”.

Viewpoint	Very Low	Low	Nominal	High	Very High
External Interoperability	Isolated.	Connected.	No interoperability requirements; or functional standards employed.	Domain standards employed.	Enterprise standards employed.
Internal Interoperability	There are a very large number of significant inconsistency/incompatibility issues in standards, databases, and interfaces among constituent systems.	There are a large number of significant inconsistency/incompatibility issues in standards, databases, and interfaces among constituent systems.	This is not a system-of-systems; or there are a moderate number of significant inconsistency/incompatibility issues in standards, databases, and interfaces among constituent systems.	There are a few significant inconsistency/incompatibility issues in standards, databases, and interfaces among constituent systems.	There are no significant inconsistency/incompatibility issues in standards, databases, and interfaces among constituent systems.

New System Rating Scale:

The new system External Interoperability scale is based on LCIM conceptual levels [16].

Viewpoint	Very Low	Low	Nominal	High	Very High
External Interoperability	System-specific data.	Documented data.	No interoperability requirements;	Aligned dynamic data.	Harmonized data.

			or aligned static data.		
Internal Interoperability	Existing constituent systems do not interoperate, and they are large and complex.	Existing constituent systems do not interoperate, but they are simple and/or small.	This is not a system-of-systems; or all constituent systems are new; or all existing constituent systems presently interoperate.		

Rating: Considering the type of subproject, what is your rating for the level of Interoperability of the subproject? _____

5.11 Personnel/Team Capability

5.11.1. Definition

Text Definition: Composite systems engineering capability of a team of Systems Engineers (compared to the national pool of SEs) on the attributes of analyzing complex problems and synthesizing solutions, being efficient and thorough, and having the ability to communicate and cooperate.

Rating Scale:

Very Low	Low	Nominal	High	Very High
15 th percentile	35 th percentile	55 th percentile	75 th percentile	90 th percentile

Rating: What is your rating for the level of Personnel/Team Capability of the subproject?

5.12 Process Capability

5.12.1. Definition

Text Definition: The consistency and effectiveness of the project team at performing SE processes. This may be based on assessment ratings from a published process model (e.g., CMMI, EIA-731, SE-CMM, ISO/IEC15504). It can alternatively be based on project team behavioral characteristics, if no assessment has been made.

Rating Scale:

	Very Low	Low	Nominal	High	Very High	Extra High
Assessment Rating	Level 0 (if continuous model)	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Project Team Behavioral Characteristics	Ad Hoc approach to process performance	Performed SE process, activities driven only by immediate contractual or customer requirements, SE focus limited	Managed SE process, activities driven by customer and stakeholder needs in a suitable manner, SE focus is requirements through design, project-centric approach – not driven by organizational processes	Defined SE process, activities driven by benefit to project, SE focus is through operation, process approach driven by organizational processes tailored for the project	Quantitatively Managed SE process, activities driven by SE benefit, SE focus on all phases of the life cycle	Optimizing SE process, continuous improvement, activities driven by system engineering and organizational benefit, SE focus is product life cycle & strategic applications
SEMP Sophistication	Management judgment is used	SEMP is used in an ad-hoc manner only on portions of the project that require it	Project uses a SEMF with some customization	Highly customized SEMF exists and is used throughout the organization	The SEMF is thorough and consistently used; organizational rewards are in place for those that improve it	Organization develop best practices for SEMF; all aspects of the project are included in the SEMF; organizational rewards exist for those that improve it

Rating: Using the table above, and combining the viewpoint ratings according to your best judgment, what rating would you give Process Capability? _____

5.13 Personnel Experience/Continuity

5.13.1. Definition

Text Definition: The applicability and consistency of the staff at the initial stage of the project with respect to the domain, customer, user, technology, tools, etc.

Rating Scale:

	Very low	Low	Nominal	High	Very High
<i>Experience</i>	Up to 1 year experience	3 years of continuous experience	5 years of continuous experience	10 years of continuous experience	20 years of continuous experience
<i>Annual Turnover</i>	48%	24%	12%	6%	3%

Rating: What is your rating for the level of Personnel Experience/Continuity of the subproject?

5.14 Multisite Coordination

5.14.1. Definition

Text Definition: Location of stakeholders, team members, resources, corporate collaboration barriers.

Rating Scale:

	Very Low	Low	Nominal	High	Very High	Extra High
<i>Collocation</i>	International, severe time zone impact	Multi-city and multi-national, considerable time zone impact	Multi-city or multi-company, some time zone effects	Same city or metro area	Same building or complex, some co-located stakeholders or onsite representation	Fully co-located stakeholders
<i>Communications</i>	Some phone, mail	Individual phone, FAX	Narrowband e-mail	Wideband electronic communication	Wideband electronic communication, occasional video conference	Interactive multimedia
<i>Corporate Collaboration Barriers</i>	Severe export and security restrictions	Mild export and security restrictions	Some contractual & Intellectual property constraints	Some collaborative tools & processes in place to facilitate or overcome, mitigate barriers	Widely used and accepted collaborative tools & processes in place to facilitate or overcome, mitigate barriers	Virtual team environment fully supported by interactive, collaborative tools environment

Rating: What is your rating for the level of Multisite Coordination of the subproject?

5.15 Tool Support

5.15.1. Definition

Text Definition: Coverage, integration, and maturity of the tools in the Systems Engineering environment.

Rating Scale:

Very low	Low	Nominal	High	Very High
No SE tools, or simple SE tools with little integration.	Basic SE tools moderately integrated throughout the systems engineering process	Strong, mature SE tools, moderately integrated with other disciplines. Cover many parts of the life cycle.	Strong, mature domain model-based life cycle tools. Cover all important parts of the life cycle. Strong model and consistency checking, integration with management tools.	Very strong, mature, domain model-based, knowledge-based life cycle tools. Cover the complete life cycle. Thorough integration across life cycle and management tools. Advanced knowledge-based diagnosis of leading risk indicators

Rating: What is your rating for the level of Tool Support of the subproject? _____

5.16 (Ignore)

5.17 DFR

5.17.1. Definition

Text Definition: Is the project (or subproject) developing artifacts to be reused on later project(s)? (“Development for Reuse”, or “DFR”.) If so, what is the extent of the planned reuse?

Rating Scale:

Low	Nominal	High	Very High	Extra High
No reuse at all.	Artifacts will be reused only on the current project.	Artifacts will be reused across the program.	Artifacts will be reused across a product line.	Artifacts will be reused across multiple product lines.

Rating: What is your rating for the level of DFR of the subproject? _____