

Contract Management Process Maturity: Analysis of Organizational Assessments

Rene G. Rendon

Naval Postgraduate School

Overview

- Background
- Relevant Literature
- Assessment Tool
- Analysis of Assessments
- Summary

Background

- Organizations are relying on procurement processes for achieving competitive advantage (Quinn, 2005; Patel, 2006; Cohen, Eimicke, 2008)
- DoD contract management is considered a core competency (Kelman, 2001)
- DoD contract management has been listed as a "high risk" area since 1990 (GAO, 2009)

Background

- DoD is emphasizing workforce competence in contract management (Newell, 2007; GAO, 2007)
- Organizations should also emphasize organizational competence to ensure consistent and superior results (Frame, 1999, Kerzner, 2001)

Relevant Literature

 Procurement assessment models have focused on measuring the development of the procurement function's orientation and support of organization's strategy and objectives (Reck & Long, 1988; Leenders and Blenkhorn, 1988; Bhote, 1989; Freeman & Cavinato, 1990; Burt, Dobler, & Starling, 2003)

Relevant Literature

- Organizations have used capability maturity models to assess, measure and improve process capability
 - Organizational competence: an underlying characteristic that is causally related to effective or superior performance (Curtis, Hefley, and Miller, 2001)
 - Process capability: inherent ability of a process to provide planned results (Ahern, Clouse, & Turner, 2001)
 - Maturity: a measure of effectiveness or capability in any specific process (Dinsmore, 1998)

Relevant Literature

- Higher levels of process capability and maturity lead to increased organizational competence (Yueng, Ulrich, Nason, & von Glinow, 1999)
- Capability maturity models have been successfully used in assessing software management and project management processes

(Chrissis, Konrad, & Shrum, 2003; Kerzner, 2001, 2009)

- The CMMM applies the maturity model concept to the contract management process
 - Contract Management (CM): the art and science of managing a contractual agreement throughout the contracting process (Garrett, Rendon, 2005)
 - CM Process Maturity: the measure of effectiveness of an organization's CM processes (Rendon, 2003)

- 62 question survey
- Contract Management process areas
 - Buying process
 - Selling process
- Likert scale
- Purposeful sampling

• Contract Management process areas

Buying Process

- Procurement Planning
- Solicitation Planning
- Solicitation
- Source Selection
- Contract Administration
- Contract Closeout

Selling Process

- Pre-Sales Activity
- Bid/No-Bid Decision-Making
- Bid/Proposal Preparation
- Negotiations and Formation
- Contract Administration
- Contract Closeout

- Likert scale
 - 0. Don't Know
 - 1. Never
 - 2. Seldom
 - 3. Sometimes
 - 4. Usually
 - 5. Always

CM Key Process Areas

Procurement Planning: Determining what to procure and when.

Solicitation Planning: Documenting program requirements and identifying potential sources.

Solicitation: Obtaining quotations, bids, offers, or proposals, as appropriate.

CM Key Process Areas

Source Selection: Choosing from among potential offerors.

Contract Administration: Managing the relationship with the contractor.

Contract Closeout: Completion and settlement of the contract, including resolution of any open items.

- Level 1 Ad Hoc
 - Organization acknowledges that CM processes exist; that these processes are accepted and practiced throughout various industries, and the organization's management understands the benefit and value of using CM processes.
 - Some established CM processes and informal documentation exist and are used within the organization, but applied only on an ad hoc and sporadic basis to various contracts.
 - Managers and CM personnel are not held accountable for adhering to, or complying with any CM processes or standards.

- Level 2 Basic
 - Some basic CM processes and standards are established, but are only required on selected complex, critical, or high-visibility contracts.
 - Some formal documentation has been developed for these established CM process and standards.
 - The CM process and standards are not considered established or institutionalized throughout the organization.
 - There is no organizational policy requiring the consistent use of these CM processes and standards on other than the required contracts.

- Level 3 Structured
 - CM processes are fully established, institutionalized, and mandated throughout the organization.
 - Formal documentation has been developed for these CM processes, and some processes may even be automated.
 - Tailoring of CM processes and documents is allowed in consideration of the unique aspects of each contract.
 - Senior mgt is involved in providing guidance, direction, and even approval of key contracting strategy, decisions, documents and contract Ts & Cs

- Level 4 Integrated
 - CM processes fully integrated with other organizational core processes such as financial management, program management, and systems engineering.
 - In addition to representatives from other organizational functional offices, the contract's enduser customer is also an integral member of the contracts team.
 - Periodical use of metrics to measure various aspects of the CM process and to make contracts-related decisions.

- Level 5 Optimized
 - Systematic use of performance metrics to measure the quality and evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of the CM process.
 - Continuous process improvement efforts used to improve the CM processes.
 - Established Lessons Learned and Best Practices programs to improve CM processes and standards.
 - CM process streamlining initiatives implemented as part of its continuous process improvement program.

Five Process Factors

- Strength
 - Processes are established, documented, standardized
- Results
 - Processes provide effective, successful results
- Support
 - Processes are supported by organizational management
- Integration
 - Processes are integrated and involve integrated teams
- Measurement
 - Processes are measured, continuously improved, and reflect lessons learned and best practices

Recent Assessments

- Ogden Air Logistics Center (OO-ALC)
- Naval Air Systems Command (NAVAIR)
- US Transportation Command (USTRANSCOM)
- Commander, Fleet Industrial Supply Centers (COMFISCS)
- Army Contracting Command Joint Munitions and Lethality (JM&L) Contracting Center

CMMM Assessment Results

- Groups within the same organization have different maturity ratings for the same CM key process area
- Contract Closeout process is consistently the lowest mature CM process in all organizations
- Process Measurement Factor is consistently the lowest in all organizations (questions related to use of metrics and lessons learned/best practices)

CMMM Assessment

- Assessment results identify the CM key process areas and key practice activities which need to be improved
- Assessment results provide a roadmap for implementing CM process improvements
 - Guides the organization in identifying CM training needs
 - Guides the organization in identifying CM process deficiencies as well as best practices throughout the enterprise

CMMM Assessment

- Assessment results can identify knowledge gaps and knowledge deficiencies throughout the enterprise
 - Provides opportunities for knowledge sharing and knowledge transfer throughout the enterprise
- Organizations with higher process maturity should be sharing techniques, best practices, lessons learned with organization with lower process maturity

CMMM Limitations

- CMMM is an assessment of organizational processes, not individual competence
- CMMM is based on subjective survey data
- CMMM should be used as an initial assessment tool, followed by:
 - Review of contract files
 - Review of process documentation
 - Compare with other procurement metrics

Summary

- Organizations are relying on procurement processes as key to achieving competitive advantage (Quinn, 2005, Patel, 2006)
- DoD contract management is receiving extensive emphasis in areas of workforce competence (Newell, 2007; GAO, 2007).
- Organizations should also provide additional emphasis on process capability to ensure consistent and superior results (Frame, 1999, Kerzner, 2001)