# *Lean & Agile* Project Management

## For Leading Large & Complex Technology Programs & Projects

#### Dr. David F. Rico, PMP, CSEP, FCP, FCT, ACP, CSM, SAFE, DEVOPS

Twitter: @dr\_david\_f\_rico Website: http://www.davidfrico.com LinkedIn: http://www.linkedin.com/in/davidfrico Agile Capabilities: http://davidfrico.com/rico-capability-agile.pdf Agile Cost of Quality: http://www.davidfrico.com/agile-vs-trad-coq.pdf DevOps Return on Investment (ROI): http://davidfrico.com/rico-devops-roi.pdf Dave's NEW Leadership Video: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=70LRzOk9VGY Dave's NEW Business Agility Video: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hTvtsAkL8xU Dave's NEWER Scaled Agile Framework SAFe 4.5 Video: http://youtu.be/1TAuCRq5a34 Dave's NEWEST Development Operations Security Video: http://youtu.be/X22kJAvx44A DoD Fighter Jets versus Amazon Web Services: http://davidfrico.com/dod-agile-principles.pdf

### **Author Background**

□ Gov't contractor with 35+ years of IT experience □ B.S. Comp. Sci., M.S. Soft. Eng., & D.M. Info. Sys. □ Large gov't projects in U.S., Far/Mid-East, & Europe



→ Career systems & software engineering methodologist
 → Lean-Agile, Six Sigma, CMMI, ISO 9001, DoD 5000
 → NASA, USAF, Navy, Army, DISA, & DARPA projects
 → Published seven books & numerous journal articles
 → Intn'l keynote speaker, 200+ talks to 14,500 people
 → Specializes in metrics, models, & cost engineering
 → Cloud Computing, SOA, Web Services, FOSS, etc.
 → Professor at 7 Washington, DC-area universities

### Project Management — von Moltke



### NO BATTLE PLAN EVER SURVIVES FIRST CONTACT WITH THE ENEIVY

(Because Humans Cannot See Beyond the First Battle)

– Helmuth von Moltke the Elder (~1871)

### **Today's WHIRLWIND ENVIRONMENT**



Pine, B. J. (1993). *Mass customization: The new frontier in business competition*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press. Pontius, R. W. (2012). Acquisition of IT: Improving efficiency and effectiveness in IT acquisition in the DoD. *Second Annual AFEI/NDIA Conference on Agile in DoD, Springfield, VA, USA*.

### **Large TRADITIONAL Projects**

Size vs. Quality 16.00 12.80 DEFECTS 9.60 6.40 3.20 0.00 0 2 25 100 400 6 SIZE











Jones, C. (1991). Applied software measurement: Assuring productivity and quality. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

#### Large TRADITIONAL Projects—Cont'd

DEFECTS



#### **IT PROJECT FAILURES**





**GLOBAL IT PROJECT FAILURES** 



#### What is AGILE PROJECT MGT.?

- □ **A-P-M** (ā-pē-ĕm): Light, flexible, collaborative, and adaptive; <u>Market-centric project management model</u>:
  - Sound, yet flexible process to manage projects using lean thinking, product development flow, & agile methods
  - Adaptable framework for customer collaboration, teamwork, iterative development & responding to change
  - Use of evolutionary, incremental, and iterative delivery methods to converge on an optimal customer solution
  - Lightweight, yet disciplined project management model for building high-quality technology-intensive systems
  - Maximizing BUSINESS VALUE with right sized, justenough, and just-in-time products and service projects

Chin, G. (2004). Agile project management: How to succeed in the face of changing project requirements. Broadway, NY: Amacom.

DeCarlo, D. (2004). *Extreme project management: Using leadership, principles, and tools to deliver value in the face of volatility.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. Highsmith, J. A. (2010). *Agile project management: Creating innovative products.* Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

Augustine, S. (2005). Managing agile projects. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

#### Values of AGILE PROJECT MGT.

Declaration of Interdependence formed in 2005
 Carved out a niche for agile project managers
 Focus on Agile Methods, ROI, and culture



#### **Goals of AGILE PROJECT MGT.**

Traditional project management is scope-based
 Agile project management is primarily time-based
 <u>Early, iterative, & release of valuable features is #1</u>



#### Place of AGILE PROJECT MGT.

"Agility" has many dimensions other than IT
 It ranges from leadership to technological agility
 The focus of this brief is program management agility



### **Models of AGILE PROJECT MGT.**

Dozens of Agile project management models emerged
 Many stem from principles of Extreme Programming
 Vision, releases, & iterative development common



Thomsett, R. (2002). Radical project management. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

DeCarlo, D. (2004). Extreme project management: Using leadership, principles, and tools to deliver value in the face of volatility. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Wysocki, R.F. (2010). Adaptive project framework: Managing complexity in the face of uncertainty. Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

Highsmith, J. A. (2010). Agile project management: Creating innovative products. Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

Layton, M. C., & Maurer, R. (2011). Agile project management for dummies. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Publishing.

#### **APM Model—RADICAL**

Created by Rob Thomsett at Cutter in 2002
 Focus is on scoping, economics, and planning
 <u>Cost/benefit-driven project management approach</u>



Thomsett, R. (2002). Radical project management. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

#### **APM Model—Extreme**

Created by Doug DeCarlo at Cutter in 2004
 Focus is on collaboration, scoping, and speed
 <u>Thinner traditional project management approach</u>



DeCarlo, D. (2004). Extreme project management: Using leadership, principles, and tools to deliver value in the face of volatility. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

#### **APM Model—Adaptive**

Created by Bob Wysocki for consulting in 2010
 Designed to be a generic model for non-IT projects
 Lightweight traditional project management approach



Wysocki, R.F. (2010). Adaptive project framework: Managing complexity in the face of uncertainty. Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

#### **APM Model—AGILE**

Created by Jim Highsmith of Cutter in 2010
 Front-end visions and architectures and final QA
 Light project model wrapped around agile practices



Highsmith, J. A. (2010). Agile project management: Creating innovative products. Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

#### **APM Model—SIMPLIFIED**

Created by Mark Layton at PlatinumEdge in 2011
 Mix of new product development, XP, and Scrum
 Simple codification of common XP-Scrum hybrid



Layton, M. C., & Maurer, R. (2011). Agile project management for dummies. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Publishing.

### **Simplified APM—VISION**

- Description. Product goals aligned with strategy
   Owner. Product Owner
- □ <u>Frequency</u>. At least annually [1-2 hours]

#### **Process Steps**

- 1. Develop product objective.
- 2. Create draft vision statement.
- 3. Validate and revise vision statement.
- 4. Finalize vision statement.

Vision

- For. <target customer>
- Who. <*needs it*>
- The. <product name>
- Is a. < product category>
- That. <product benefit, reason to buy>
- Unlike. <<u>competitors</u>>
- Our product. <a><br/>
   </a>• Our product. differentiator, value added

#### **Example**

- For. Bank customers
- Who. Want mobile banking
- The. Mobile banking application
- Is a. Mobile device enable banking app
- That. Provides secure, 24x7 mobile banking
- Unlike. Brick-and-mortar access points
- Our product. Enable 24-hour a day services

**Product owner identifies product vision**. Vision is project's destination. It defines what product is, how it supports organization strategy, who will use it, and why people will use it.

### Simplified APM—ROADMAP

- Description. Holistic view of product features
   Owner. Product Owner
- □ Frequency. At least biannually [2-4 hours]



**Product owner creates product roadmap**. Roadmap is high-level view of product requirements with loose timeframe for development. Identify, estimate, valuate, prioritize, and schedule themes.

### **Simplified APM—RELEASE PLAN**

- Description. Release timing for product functions
   Owner. Product Owner
- □ Frequency. At least quarterly [4-8 hours]

#### **Process Steps**

- **1. Decompose product features.**
- 2. Create release plan.
  - Establish release goal.
  - Prioritize or order user stories.
  - Set release date.
  - Refine user stories.
  - Verify release plan.



**Product owner creates release plan**. Release plan identifies high-level timetable for releasing functions. Mid-term goals that team mobilizes around. There are many releases in priority order.

### **Simplified APM—Sprint Plan**

Description. Specific iteration goals and tasks
 Owner. Product Owner and Development Team
 Frequency. At the start of each sprint [2-4 hours]

#### **Process Steps**

- 1. Establish goals and choose user stories.
- 2. Decompose stories into tasks and create sprint backlog.

#### Goals & User Stories

- As a mobile banking customer, I want to create an account so I can write personal checks
- Create account.
- Login to account.
- Setup checking account.

#### **Sprint Backlog**

Task	Pri	Status	Who	App.	Μ	Т	W	Т	F
Create acc	count								
- Setup	1	Done	Sue	Joe	4	4	0	0	0
– Install	2	Done	Sue	Joe	4	4	Ō	Õ	Ō
- Schema	3	Done	John	Joe	0	0	8	0	0
- Queries	4	In-work	Bob	-	Ō	0	0	8	0
– Forms	5	N/S	Patty	-	0	0	0	0	0
– Test	6	N/S	Sam	-	0	0	0	0	0
					_	_	_	_	_

**Product owner, Scrum Master, and Developers create sprint plan**. Sprint planning done at start of sprint. Product backlog must be ready. Developers select sprint goal and what can be done.

### **Simplified APM—STANDUP**

Description. Establish & coordinate daily priorities
 Owner. Development Team
 Frequency. Daily [15-minutes]

#### **Process Steps**

- 1. Hold daily standup meeting.
- 2. Update sprint burndown chart.
- 3. Perform design, development, test, and evaluation.



**Developers hold daily standup meetings**. Purpose is to coordinate daily priorities. Identify what was done, what will be done, and impediments. Task boards and Sprint burndown are updated.

100

### Simplified APM—DEMO

Description. Demonstration of working product
 Owner. Product Owner and Development Team
 Frequency. At the end of each sprint [2-4 hours]

#### **Process Steps**

- 1. Prepare sprint review meeting.
- 2. Hold sprint review meeting.
- 3. Collect feedback from stakeholders.

#### **Product Demonstration**

Developers Perform a Live Demo on Target Hardware and Answer Stakeholder Questions

- What was the goal of the sprint?
- What user stories were attempted?
- What user stories were implemented?

#### **Stakeholder Feedback**

Poll Stakeholders One-by-One in Round-Robin Style to Solicit their Feedback

Is the product acceptable as implemented?
Is the product acceptable with modifications?
Is the product unacceptable as implemented?

**Developers hold a sprint review**. Sprint review performed at end of sprint. Developers demo validated code to stakeholders. Stakeholders vote on demo outcome. Product backlog reprioritized.

### **Simplified APM—RETROSPECTIVE**

- Description. Refine environment and processes
   Owner. Development Team
- □ <u>Frequency</u>. At the end of each sprint [1-2 hours]

#### **Process Steps**

- 1. Plan sprint retrospective meeting.
- 2. Hold sprint retrospective meeting.
- 3. Inspect and adapt.

#### **Sprint Retrospective**

- Poll Developers on Team to Answer Three Questions to Reach Group Consensus
- What went well in the last sprint?
- What could be improved in the next sprint?
- What people, process, and tools should change?

#### **Process Improvements**

Scrum Master Records Action Items and Prepares Process Improvement Plan

- Scrum master records suggested improvements.
- Developers prioritize suggested improvements.
- Add high-priority non-functional items to backlog.

**Developers hold sprint retrospective**. *Retrospective held at end of sprint. Developers identify the good and bad. Scrum master records results. Processes, tools, and backlog may be adjusted.* 

#### **Metrics for AGILE PROJECT MGT.**

Lean & agile metrics for agile project mgt. emerging
 Metrics often meet with fierce resistance to change
 Velocity, burndown, defects, & agile EVM popular



Holler, R. (2015). Ninth annual state of agile survey: State of agile development. Atlanta, GA: VersionOne.

### **Metrics for AGILE PROJECT MGT. II**

Agile methods are based on traditional measures
 Story points, velocity, and burndown basic metrics
 Experts use Agile EVM, test, ROI & portfolio metrics



Rico, D. F., Sayani, H. H., & Sone, S. (2009). The business value of agile software methods. Ft. Lauderdale, FL: J. Ross Publishing.

#### **Metrics for AGILE PROJECT MGT. III**

Story Points									
Relative Size	Story Points	Staff Hours	Staff Days	Staff Month	Staff Years	2-Week Sprints	3-Sprint Releases		
	1	22	3	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0		
User	2	44	6	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.0		
Story	3	67	8	0.4	0.0	0.2	0.1		
	5	111	14	0.6	0.1	0.3	0.1		
	8	178	22	1.0	0.1	0.4	0.1		
P	13	289	36	1.7	0.1	0.7	0.2		
Feature	21	467	58	2.7	0.2	1.2	0.4		
	34	755	94	4.4	0.4	1.9	0.6		
	55	1,222	153	7.0	0.6	3.1	1.0		
	89	1,977	247	11.4	1.0	4.9	1.6		
Epic	144	3,199	400	18.5	1.5	8.0	2.7		
	233	5,177	647	29.9	2.5	12.9	4.3		





Cohn, M. (2006). Agile estimating and planning. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

80

70

#### **Metrics for AGILE PROJECT MGT. IV**

Adaptation of earned value mgt. for agile projects Value accrues with completed sprints and releases Better measure of value due to agile DoD, RTF, & CI



Sulaiman, T. (2010). AgileEVM: Information for good decision making. San Francisco, CA: CollabNet, Inc.

Sulaiman, T., & Smits, H. (2007). Measuring integrated progress on agile software development projects. Methods & Tools, 5(3), 2-9.

Sulaiman, T., Barton, B., & Blackburn, T. (2006). Agile EVM: Earned value management in scrum projects. Agile 2006 Conference, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA, 7-16.

27 Rico, D. F. (2015). Lean & agile earned value management: How to use EVM to manage projects, programs, & portfolios, Retrieved from, http://davidfrico.com/rico15v.pdf

#### **Tools for Agile Project Mgt.**

There are literally dozens, if not 100s of APM tools
 There are dozens of free open source software tools
 <u>Excel, JIRA, MS Proj., & VersionOne most often used</u>

TOOL	CURRENT TOOL USAGE		USE	Microsoft Excel 68%
2014	2013	2014	2013	Microsoft Project 46%
80%	83%	10%	5%	Atlassian/JIRA 45%
79%	87%	17%	6%	VersionOne 33%
72%	68%	5%	3%	Microsoft TFS
68%	71%	12%	6%	Google Docs 24%
65%	66%	20%	10%	HP Quality Center 23%
65%	65%	21%	12%	In-house/home-grown
65%	60%	20%	10%	Bugzilla 19%
65	05	20	14	Vendor Y 18%
55~	5/~	26~	14~	IBM Rational 13%
52*	43%	15%	9%	Pivotal Tracker 6%
51%	49%	7%	4%	LeanKit 6%
50%	47%	22%	10**	Vendor X 44
48%	47%	32%	14%	
41%	44 <b>%</b>	10%	6%	Target Process
37%	22%	24%	11%	
35*	33%	39%	19*	
34%	47%	29%	14%	
29%	33%	26%	11%	
-	~		100	Axosoft 2%
	CUR TOOL 2014 80% 79% 72% 68% 65% 65% 65% 55% 55% 55% 55% 55% 55% 55	CURRENT TOOOL USAGE         2014       2013         80%       83%         79%       81%         72%       68%         668%       71%         65%       66%         65%       66%         65%       66%         55%       57%         52%       43%         50%       47%         48%       47%         41%       44%         37%       22%         35%       33%         34%       47%         29%       33%	CURRENT TOOL USAGE         FUTURE TO           2014         2013         2014           80%         83%         10%           79%         81%         11%           72%         66%         5%           66%         71%         12%           65%         66%         20%           65%         66%         20%           65%         65%         21%           65%         69%         20%           55%         57%         26%           55%         57%         26%           55%         57%         26%           55%         43%         15%           50%         47%         32%           44%         47%         32%           44%         44%         10%           37%         22%         24%           35%         33%         39%           34%         47%         29%           29%         33%         26%	CURRENT TOOL USAGE         FUTURE PLANS TO USE           2014         2013         2014         2013           80%         83%         10%         5%           79%         87%         11%         66%           72%         68%         5%         3%           68%         77%         12%         6%           65%         66%         20%         10%           65%         66%         20%         10%           65%         66%         20%         10%           65%         66%         20%         12%           65%         69%         20%         12%           55%         57%         26%         14%           55%         57%         26%         14%           55%         57%         26%         14%           55%         43%         15%         9%          55%         47%         22%           50%         47%         32%         14%           48%         47%         32%         14%           41%         44%         10%         6%           37%         22%         24%         11%           34%

Holler, R. (2015). Ninth annual state of agile survey: State of agile development. Atlanta, GA: VersionOne.

#### **Benefits of AGILE PROJECT MGT.**

Benefits of agile methods known for decades
 Improves productivity, speed, efficiency, & quality
 Biggest are team morale, customer satisfaction & ROI

		• % GOT BETTER	<b>%</b> NO CHANGE	<b>0% DON'T KNOW</b>	⊖% GOT V	VORSE
	Ability to manage changing priorities				87 2	10
P	Increased team productivity				84 3	12
•	Improved project visibility				82 4	13
	Increased team morale/motivation	£		79	6	12
	Better delivery predictability			79	6	12
	Enhanced software quality			78	6	15
	Faster time to market			77	7	15
	Reduced project risk			76	6	17
	Improved business/IT alignment			75	6	18
	Improved engineering discipline			72 7		20
	Enhanced software maintainability	(		68 9		21
	Better manage distributed teams			59 12		27

Holler, R. (2015). Ninth annual state of agile survey: State of agile development. Atlanta, GA: VersionOne.

#### **Benefits of AGILE PROJECT MGT. II**

Costs based on avg. productivity and quality
 Productivity ranged from 4.7 to 5.9 LOC an hour
 Costs were \$588,202 and benefits were \$3,930,631

Metric	Formula	Trad. Testing	<b>Agile Testing</b>
Costs	(10,000 ÷ <b>5.4436</b> + <b>3.945</b> × 10 × 100) × 100	\$588,202	\$233,152
Benefits	(10,000 × 10.51 – 6,666.67 × 9) × 100 – <b>\$588,202</b>	\$3,930,631	\$4,275,681
B/CR	\$3,930,631 ÷ \$588,202	7:1	<b>18:1</b>
ROI	( <b>\$3,930,631</b> – <b>\$588,202</b> ) ÷ <b>\$588,202</b> × 100%	<b>567%</b>	1,734%
NPV	$(\sum_{i=1}^{5}$ ( <b>\$3,930,631</b> ÷ 5) ÷ 1.05 <sup>5</sup> ) – <b>\$588,202</b>	\$2,806,654	\$3,469,140
BEP	<b>\$588,202</b> ÷ (\$4,509,997 ÷ <b>\$588,202</b> – 1)	\$88,220	\$12,710
ROA	NORMSDIST( <b>2.24</b> ) × <b>\$3,930,631</b> – NORMSDIST( <b>0.85</b> ) × <b>\$588,202</b> × EXP(-5% × 5)	\$3,504,292	\$4,098,159

 $d1 = [ln(Benefits \div Costs) + (Rate + 0.5 \times Risk^2) \times Years] \div Risk \times \sqrt{Years}, d2 = d1 - Risk \times \sqrt{Years}$ 

Rico, D. F., Sayani, H. H., & Sone, S. (2009). *The business value of agile software methods: Maximizing ROI with just-in-time processes and documentation*. Ft. Lauderdale, FL: J. Ross Publishing.

#### **Benefits of AGILE PROJECT MGT. III**

Analysis of 23 agile vs. 7,500 traditional projects
 Agile projects are 54% better than traditional ones
 Agile has lower costs (61%) and fewer defects (93%)



Mah, M. (2008). Measuring agile in the enterprise: Proceedings of the Agile 2008 Conference, Toronto, Canada.

#### **Success of AGILE PROJECT MGT.**

Traditional projects succeed at 50% industry avg.
 Traditional projects are challenged 20% more often
 Agile projects succeed 3x more and fail 3x less often



Standish Group. (2012). Chaos manifesto. Boston, MA: Author.

#### **Cases of AGILE PROJECT MGT.**

94% of worldwide IT projects use agile methods
 Includes regulated industries, i.e., DoD, FDA, etc.
 Agile now used for safety critical systems, FBI, etc.

	Industry	Org	Project	Purpose	Size	Metrics
	Electronic Commerce	Google	Adwords	Advertising	<ul><li> 20 teams</li><li> 140 people</li><li> 5 countries</li></ul>	<ul> <li>1,838 User Stories</li> <li>6,250 Function Points</li> <li>500,000 Lines of Code</li> </ul>
	Shrink Wrapped	Primavera	Primavera	Project Management	<ul><li>15 teams</li><li>90 people</li><li>Collocated</li></ul>	<ul> <li>26,809 User Stories</li> <li>91,146 Function Points</li> <li>7,291,666 Lines of Code</li> </ul>
(P)	Health Care	FDA	m2000	Blood Analysis	<ul><li>4 teams</li><li>20 people</li><li>Collocated</li></ul>	<ul> <li>1,659 User Stories</li> <li>5,640 Function Points</li> <li>451,235 Lines of Code</li> </ul>
	Law Enforcement	FBI	Sentinel	Case File Workflow	<ul><li>10 teams</li><li>50 people</li><li>Collocated</li></ul>	<ul> <li>3,947 User Stories</li> <li>13,419 Function Points</li> <li>1,073,529 Lines of Code</li> </ul>
	U.S. DoD	Stratcom	SKIweb	Knowledge Management	<ul><li> 3 teams</li><li> 12 people</li><li> Collocated</li></ul>	<ul> <li>390 User Stories</li> <li>1,324 Function Points</li> <li>105,958 Lines of Code</li> </ul>

#### **Sweetspot of AGILE PROJECT MGT.**

Exploratory or research/development projects
 When fast customer responsiveness is paramount
 In organizations that are highly innovative/creative

	Traditional Project Management		Agile Project Management	
$\bigcap$	Predictable situations		<ul> <li>High levels of uncertainty and unpredictability</li> </ul>	D
>	<ul> <li>Low technology projects</li> </ul>		High technology projects	-
	<ul> <li>Stable, slow moving industries</li> </ul>		<ul> <li>Fast paced, highly competitive industries</li> </ul>	IJ
	<ul> <li>Low levels of technological change</li> </ul>		Rapid pace of technological change	Γ
	Repeatable operations		Research oriented, discovery projects	
	<ul> <li>Low rates of changing project performance</li> </ul>	L	Large fluctuations in project performance	
	<ul> <li>Long term, fixed price production contracts</li> </ul>	1	<ul> <li>Shorter term, performance based RDT&amp;E contracts</li> </ul>	
	Achieving concise economic efficiency goals		Achieving high impact product/service effectiveness	
	Highly administrative contracts		Highly creative new product development contracts	
	<ul> <li>Mass production and high volume manufacturing</li> </ul>		Customer intensive, one off product/service solutions	
	<ul> <li>Highly predictable and stable market conditions</li> </ul>		Highly volatile and unstable market conditions	
	<ul> <li>Low margin industries such as commodities</li> </ul>		High margin, intellectually intensive industries	
	<ul> <li>Delivering value at the point of plan</li> </ul>		Delivering value at the point of sale	

Pine, B. J. (1993). *Mass customization: The new frontier in business competition*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press. Rico, D. F. (2012). *Agile vs. traditional projects*. Retrieved February 6, 2013, from http://davidfrico.com/tpm-vs-apm-ii.pdf

### Model of AGILE PORTFOLIO MGT.

Created by Dean Leffingwell of Rally in 2007
 Knowledge to scale agile practices to enterprise
 <u>Hybrid of Kanban, XP release planning, and Scrum</u>



Leffingwell, D. (2017). Scaled agile framework (SAFe). Retrieved July 4, 2017 from http://www.scaledagileframework.com

### Model of AGILE LEADERSHIP

Created by Sanjiv Augustine at CC Pace in 2005
 Builds agile cultures, mind-sets, & environment
 Leadership model for managing agile projects



Augustine, S. (2005). Managing agile projects. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

### **Summary of AGILE PROJECT MGT.**

Agile methods DON'T mean deliver it now & fix it later
 Lightweight, yet disciplined approach to development
 Reduced cost, risk, & waste while improving quality

	What	How	Result	
	Flexibility	Use lightweight, yet disciplined processes and artifacts	Low work-in-process	
(hand the second	Customer	Involve customers early and often throughout development	Early feedback	-
(here)	Prioritize	Identify highest-priority, value-adding business needs	Focus resources	-
(here)	Descope	Descope complex programs by an order of magnitude	Simplify problem	-
(h)	Decompose	Divide the remaining scope into smaller batches	Manageable pieces	-
	Iterate	Implement pieces one at a time over long periods of time	<b>Diffuse risk</b>	
	Leanness	Architect and design the system one iteration at a time	JIT waste-free design	
(h)	Swarm	Implement each component in small cross-functional teams	Knowledge transfer	-
(hand)	Collaborate	Use frequent informal communications as often as possible	Efficient data transfer	-
(here)	Test Early	Incrementally test each component as it is developed	<b>Early verification</b>	-
(here)	Test Often	Perform system-level regression testing every few minutes	<b>Early validation</b>	-
	Adapt	Frequently identify optimal process and product solutions	Improve performance	

Rico, D. F. (2012). *What's really happening in agile methods: Its principles revisited*? Retrieved June 6, 2012, from http://davidfrico.com/agile-principles.pdf Rico, D. F. (2012). *The promises and pitfalls of agile methods*. Retrieved February 6, 2013 from, http://davidfrico.com/agile-pros-cons.pdf Rico, D. F. (2012). *How do lean & agile intersect*? Retrieved February 6, 2013, from http://davidfrico.com/agile-concept-model-3.pdf

### Project Management—Bob Wysocki



"The world of traditional project management belongs to yesterday"

"Don't warte your time uring traditional project management on 21<sup>st</sup> century project."

### **Resources for AGILE PROJECT MGT.**

Over 15 text books for agile project management
 Many of them stem from Planning XP by Kent Beck
 Highsmith's most complete, but Layton's most simple



Thomsett, R. (2002). *Radical project management*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall. DeCarlo, D. (2004). *Extreme project management: Using leadership, principles, and tools to deliver value in the face of volatility*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. Wysocki, R.F. (2010). *Adaptive project framework: Managing complexity in the face of uncertainty*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education. Highsmith, J. A. (2010). *Agile project management: Creating innovative products*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education. Layton, M. C., & Maurer, R. (2011). *Agile project management for dummies*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Publishing.

#### **Dave's Professional Capabilities**



**STRENGTHS** – Communicating Complex Ideas • Brownbags & Webinars • Datasheets & Whitepapers • Reviews & Audits • Comparisons & Tradeoffs • Brainstorming & Ideation • Data Mining & Business Cases • Metrics & Models • Tiger Teams & Shortfuse Tasks • Strategy, Roadmaps, & Plans • Concept Frameworks & Multi-Attribute Models • Etc.



- Data mining. Metrics, benchmarks, & performance.
- Simplification. Refactoring, refinement, & streamlining.
- Assessments. Audits, reviews, appraisals, & risk analysis.
- Coaching. Diagnosing, debugging, & restarting stalled projects.
- Business cases. Cost, benefit, & return-on-investment (ROI) analysis.
- Communications. Executive summaries, white papers, & lightning talks.
- Strategy & tactics. Program, project, task, & activity scoping, charters, & plans.

