

Compass

VOLUME 4, NUMBER 2

Going Ballistic!

"Sticks and stones might break my bones but words can never hurt me." Common Misconception

There's something about corporate life that seems to encourage a kind of cowardice. Messages get scrubbed before sharing even the simplest tidbit. Meaning gets rendered to an absolutely ambiguous vanilla. I learned to replace every "you" with something less direct and less potentially threatening, to amputate anything over three syllables, and to consider splitting words with two syllables, as well. Communication in the modern corporation is nearly oxymoronic, replaced with spin, deliberate multiple entendre, and bull shit buzzwords. Content-free prose, elevating neither eyebrow or blood pressure, is the ideal. It guarantees an even if mediocre keel.

One client has assigned to all their project managers the formal accountability for being courageous. Most aren't. Most understand too well the cost of courage in their corporate society, especially with the continuing threats of merger, right sizing, and interdepartment competition. Rocking the boat easily becomes an injunction against making waves. Sticks and stones might break bones, but unlike words, they usually leave a reputation intact.

"So, what would happen if you leveled with your project sponsor?" I asked one hopeless-sounding project manager.

"He'd go ballistic!" she exploded. "In the first place, he insisted that we quote him a completion date and budget before validating the project objective. Now that we've defined the requirements and considered some alternative architectures, neither target makes sense. But my boss has ordered me to continue marching toward those ends, just as if we were going to make them. I think even my sponsor knows we can't make these deadlines, but both of our performance bonuses are tied to them. I think my boss thinks that my sponsor will discover some operational barrier to meeting these targets and back down first. If we can just keep moving forward, we won't lose our bonuses."

Against this game of schedule chicken, courage has about as much chance of affecting an outcome as a water balloon does against tectonic shift. A courageous charge against the opposing defenses will yield at best posthumous admiration. It's a fool's mission! The resulting hunkering stance looks like cowardice. Even if it isn't cowardice, it has the same stalemating ef-

fect.


"Well," I replied sympathetically, "your sponsor is just responding in kind." "Responding in kind?" my deadlocked client wondered, scrunching her nose with confused annoyance. "I've never blown up at him! Why do you say he's simply responding in kind?"

"Because ballistic behavior encourages ballistic responses," I explained. "It's like the Cold War strategy called MAD, Mutually Assured Destruction, which for decades kept the world on the edge of nuclear conflagration. If I threaten ballistic action with you, you have to threaten it back or forfeit your role in the game." "But I didn't threaten my sponsor with ballistic behavior and I didn't start out playing any game," my frustrated counterpart insisted!


Ballistic

The threat of ballistic behavior is traditional corporate conduct. Ballistic comes from an ancient Greek word meaning 'to throw' (ballien). Project is also a concept rooted in another ancient Greek term meaning to throw (pro-jacere). And in the above story, both par-

Continued on Next Page...



...Continued from Prior Page



ties started "throwing" or "projecting" from their earliest encounters. Each innocently lobbed words that meant something different than what either intended. Why would either suspect that they were creating the No Man's Land dividing their community?


The sponsor "threw" the expectation that the project manager could determine cost and schedule without due diligence. The project manager 'threw' back a response, as if she could compete without ultimately destroying herself in this game. Now the project, the project manager, and the sponsor are captive to an irrational game of Mutually Assured Destruction, where any attempt to level with the "other side" seems likely to yield only ballistic responses. So, each side waits out the other, hoping their opponent will either forfeit or expose themselves and take the more destructive hit. In the mean time, everyone loses.

When the ancient Greeks used the term *ballien*, they referred to catapult-like throwing machines and their *pro-jacere* described throwing spears! Their opponents were in view, down wind, down hill, and looking into the sun. Most targets these days are out of our field of vision at the start. What hope do stone chucking and spear throwing strategies have in our world?

"What hope do stone chucking and spear throwing strategies have in our world?"

Catapults and spears have one common property, though, the throwing mechanisms have no influence on their missile once it is released. Because of this property, ballistic projects make all of their promises up front, expending their planning and targeting resources at the beginning, when they have the least

information about the effort. Sponsors accuse ballistic projects of over-promising and under delivering because they assume them capable of foreseeing complications when they really cannot. Furthermore, repetition of such experience cannot improve ballistic strategies much. We know as much about cannonball trajectories today as Galileo knew about them in the sixteenth century. The physics: angle, mass, force, and gravity, are as simple as they are inexorable. Ballistics that work within simple situations can't help but fail under more complicated ones.



"Seems to me that you're both throwing stones at the sun," I concluded. After I explained these perspectives, my client had another question. "What, short of starting Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty negotiations, can I do about this situation now that we're staring each other down.

Crossing No Man's Land

"The one thing I'm convinced of," I responded, "Is that the ballistics are no longer the problem. They might have started out as the problem, but simply changing strategies won't have much effect now. Besides, the ballistic behavior is more likely just a resonance of the corporate culture. I mean the sponsor's not your enemy, even though the rules of engagement say that he is."

"If he's not the enemy, who is?" she complained. "My management? My team? Me?" "I don't know for sure, but I think it's a pretty good bet that you're your own worst enemy in this situation," I cautiously proposed. "Me!!? After all I've sacrificed for this project, you accuse ME of being the enemy?" "Going ballistic, are we?" I said, narrowly avoiding a poorly-aimed, almost

playful slap.

"The problem isn't the problem, coping is the problem." Virginia Satir

This organization, and thousands like it, unself-consciously engage in ballistic behavior. The ballistic behavior is problematic but the unself-consciousness, their strategy for coping with the effects of their futile ballistics, is the real problem. It's as if the organization and everyone in it becomes a cannonball with each new initiative, unable to make even tiny mid-course corrections between launch and target. Roles are defined and played with MAD passion toward what too often seems like Mutually Assured Destruction. Each engages with ballistic tactics, plotting to outsmart each other with the dumbest of strategies. This, of course, isn't lost on either party, further reinforcing less than generous assessments of their counterpart. In so doing, each, in pursuit of success, shuts off the one thing that might really insure their success.

"...plotting to outsmart each other with the dumbest of strategies"

How does this make any sense? It doesn't. The way to stay engaged when the terms of engagement don't make any sense is to simply go unconscious. Shutting down your judgement resolves the current problem of coping with the futility.

"But staying conscious is not so easy when you're on the brink of the unthinkable, eyeball to eyeball across a No Man's Land," my desperate client replied. "Exactly," I smiled. "Let's step back from the brink for a moment."



Generosity and the Gentle Art of One Downmanship

"What's the most generous interpretation you might make of your sponsor's behavior?" I continued. "Hummm," she considered, "I've never thought of asking that question before. Let's see. He's responding to unreasonable expectations from his management committee." "And what's the most generous interpretation your sponsor could make about your curious behavior?" I poked. "Oh, I think I see where you're going with this," she wrinkled her nose in curiosity this time. "We're both responding to exactly the same threat."

"Really?" I said, feigning incredulity. "How could you be enemies if you're both responding to the same threat?" "How did you do that?"

She looked genuinely puzzled. "You just took the chief adversary out of my project." "No I didn't," I replied. "You did."

My client succeeded in transforming her perspective by doing one, tiny, courageous, unthinkable thing. When stalemated, eyeball to eyeball across a No Man's Land, she considered the one thing that she would never do. She

thought one unthinkable thing.

In a culture steeped in ballistic behavior, considering your competitor with generosity is an unthinkable thought because the object of ballistics is to demolish your opponent, not to ennoble them. Thinking such unthinkable thoughts can emphasize the real nature of your relationship, too often hidden in the shadows of overly convincing role playing. Putting a

human face on an otherwise evil adversary breaks the binding rule of the ballistic game, but more importantly, it disrupts the coping strategy that keeps YOU responding ballistically. The next thing you know, you'll be finding opportunities for making mid-course corrections!

The Gentle Art of One Downmanship, this ability to step down and elevate the apparent adversary, is one strategy for becoming a bit more aware of ourselves and our imprisoning roles. Casting an adversary in an unthinkable role can help us become more aware of just how unimportant these roles are, anyway. This awareness is what's lost in ballistic strategies. With awareness, anything becomes possible. Without it, we're just the same old cannonball following an age old trajectory.

I don't want to suggest that generosity is the one best strategy for dealing with ballistic behaviors. All One Best Strategies are ballistic suggestions. What other unthinkable things might you consider? See our UnthinkableThings discussion on our Heretic's Forum. <<http://pc.wiki.net/UnthinkableThings>>

What if your generosity isn't reciprocated? Sounds like a topic for the next issue of Compass! das

Appreciations

Mark Gray for the quick lesson in Medieval physics.

Ghada Ijam for testing the waters.



Robert Glass for publishing Maturity.

Ray Steele of Ball State's CICS Program for warm

welcomes.


Cathy Howard for generosity.

Jerry and Dani Weinberg for the continuing dialogue.

Antoinette Hubbard for the introductions!

Wilder Schmalz for the graphics and **Kathy Carey** for the copy editing. das

David's Notes



Robert Glass has most generously published two of my stories. I've enclosed in this issue a sample of his fine newsletter **The Software Practitioner**. He's offering a special subscription deal. Take him up on it!

I'm also enclosing in this issue a second issue of the **PSL Insider**. This is the general circulation newsletter about Weinberg and Weinberg's Problem Solving Leadership workshop, for which I am a faculty member.

Reasonable Expectations

Here's my list of expectations a vendor might set. Details next time!

1- It's not going to turn out the way we think it will turn out.

2- How we respond to discovering the depth of our initial naïveté will be the key to our eventual success.

3- You can have exactly what you want but never exactly how you thought you'd get it.

4- No one can help you as much as you can help yourself. das

Notices:

If your organization has you feeling ballistic, consider enrolling!

For True North pgs' Mastering Projects Workshop Open Enrollment Schedule, see our web site- www.projectcommunity.com for online registration and the most current schedules!

Consider, too enrolling in **Problem Solving Leadership** workshop. See <http://www.geraldweinberg.com> for details.

My colleague Robert Glass publishes a delightful newsletter called **Software Professional**. See the enclosed reprint for a special sub-

scription deal and a piece by me on Maturity! das



About *Compass*

Compass is published periodically by *True North pgs, Inc.*, and is distributed free of charge to a project-oriented community.

Compass is a navigation tool for continuing your process of improving your project experience. *Compass* shares stories and insights to serve as the basis for you to provide more effective leadership to yourself and to your project's community. We enable each other to

improve the quality of our project experiences through sharing our stories and our insights.

All works published in this newsletter are the property of *True North pgs, Inc.*, and may not be reprinted, used, or otherwise distributed without the expressed, written permission of the publisher.

Ask for permission and you'll get it.

David A. Schmaltz, President

True North pgs, Inc.

P. O. Box 68746 Portland, OR


97268-0746

(503) 653-9773

TN@ix.netcom.com

www.projectcommunity.com

***"You are
the most powerful
project management tool
you will ever use."***



Return Address Service Requested

Prsrt. Std
US Postage
Paid
Portland, OR
Permit No. 816

www.projectcommunity.com

Portland, OR 97268-0746

P. O. Box 68746
True North pgs, Inc.





18 for 18!

Attempts to Build a Common Software Architecture Fail

Robert L. Glass

There's a lot of talk these days about component-based development, product-family architectures, design patterns, and other approaches whose primary goal is to reuse elements of a software organization's past in the course of building its future. But unfortunately, to date most of those discussions have been just talk, little more. Why?

The Software Engineering Institute (SEI),

as part of a "lessons learned in technology adoption" thrust, recently set out to attempt to answer that question. They executed a study at a Fortune 100 company that had undertaken serious architecture-reuse attempts.

The bottom line of the SEI study was that there had been 18 attempts to develop a reusable architecture for a family of similar systems, all 18 of which had failed! That statistic is so awesome that it bears repetition - in spite of a corporate thrust toward reusing ar-

chitectures, the company was 18-for-18 on the failure side! Once again, the obvious question is "Why?"

The SEI found that the company had tried two very different approaches, neither of which had been successful:

1. Building commonality in the course of normal project work.
2. Building commonality as a separate effort, with technology transfer at the end.

(continued on page 4)



THE SOFTWARE PRACTITIONER

JULY - AUGUST 2000

The newsletter by and for software professionals.

VOLUME 10, NUMBER 4

Architectural Renewal

How to Spend \$200M and Get Virtually Nothing In Return!

by Hans Wegener

Credit Suisse, Postfach 100, 8070 Zürich, Switzerland

Abstract: How can it happen that a company spends more than \$200 Million without getting anything substantially back? We present the story of a major software architecture overhaul in a large corporation that lasted more than three years and has still not had a tangible effect. The particular organizational setup and history, and the technological approach, are shown to be the most important causes. Some recommendations are given on how to avoid such situations.

1. Introduction

About three years ago a large company in Switzerland (whose identity is hidden by the author) started a strategic project to transform its operational systems from a centralized host architecture into a distributed object system based on component technology. At around the same time a large competitor, also from Switzerland, started a similar effort. The two by then ranked first and third in the Swiss market in terms of share and were considered to be some of the world's most important institutions in their field. As is the case for most large organizations, both had reached a point where a major overhaul of their operational systems was considered inevitable.

The one corporation was different from the other players in the country; it had outsourced almost its entire IT staff to a company it had founded. That move turned out to be unwise, at least on this scale.

Management discovered that it had lost control over the fate of the systems that sustained the very survival of the company. Not so much because management could not decide what was done—it owned the spin-off. But the company did not have the knowledge and expertise to assess the directions its IT was taking and to assure a controlled development of the overall architecture.

For that reason, a team of some twenty specialists was built up to define and ensure a set of standards that controlled the architecture at enterprise scale. At the center of concern were not only the operational systems (host, middleware and databases) but also emerging technologies (Intranet and Internet, distributed objects and components). In order to provide appropriate backing the standards body became the bank's sign-off authority.

In December 1997 the two competitors announced their intent to merge. The merger became effective in July 1998, making the renamed company the world's biggest player at that time and with some 65,000 employees in terms of organizational size. The IT departments of the two suddenly faced a challenge not ever met before: There were two entirely incompatible host systems that ran the businesses. Should they be reconciled, or should one wait until the strategic projects would deliver the new platform? How should the two strategic projects be merged into one and proceed further? The decision was particularly difficult due to the fact that it was early 1998. The Euro conversion had not yet been mastered, and the Y2K problem was not

yet solved, either.

The final decision of top management was to migrate the legacy data and applications from the host systems of one to those to the other within a timeframe of 18 months, i.e. in parallel to the Euro and Y2K efforts. To my knowledge this was an unprecedented challenge, since migrations at this size are utterly hard.

Today, in early 2000, the company has

(continued on page 4)

Also In This Issue

LETTERS: Pragmaticus 3
 On Open Source ... and Gun Control!? 7
 IT: Productivity Impact Not In Doubt 7
 New Star of TV Football: A Yellow Line 8
 Maturity, by David A. Schmaltz 9

CONFERENCES: Xtreme Project Management, EASE (UK), STC:Bluetooth, Ratings-Based Web Site Review 10-12

REVIEW: Applied Software Architecture, Hofmeister et al; Software Product-Line Engineering, Weiss and Lai; Mission Critical, Davenport; Why ERP, Jacobs and Whybark; Managing Software Requirements, Leffingwell and Widrig; Experimentation in Software Engineering, Wohlin et al; Hisland, Malti-Douglas .. 13-15

HUMOR: Key Words for the New Millennium 16

Special Issue on Software Architecture

Maturity

“As a tool for understanding psychological maturation, learning theory is straightforward, clear, remarkably simple, and wrong.” – Clifford Anderson, MD; *The Stages of Life*

by David A. Schmaltz, tn@ix.netcom.com

I've become increasingly interested in the curious interpretations people make of the term "maturity". The certifying associations seem to subscribe to the Learning Model, believing that maturity is created by an accumulation of information. The behaviors associated with maturity in the accumulation of knowledge model seem more like the behaviors a compulsive adolescent might imitate to appear mature rather than the behaviors mature adults adopt. Some of the common "mature" behaviors I see on projects attempting to exhibit maturity are: compulsive check listing, insisting upon strictly objective evaluation criteria, holding themselves accountable for predicting unpredictable futures, holding themselves responsible for explaining every difference between expected and actual, expecting work to unfold cleanly, linearly, and satisfyingly. What behaviors might a well-adapted, psychologically mature adult exhibit instead?

In animal and human development, "maturity" means reaching a place where change is minimized. In this world, maturity heralds decline and death. I suppose it used to be possible to accumulate enough knowledge to permanently satisfy the need for acquiring more knowledge. But people who stop learning these days soon become dinosaurs, so work or process maturity cannot be based upon accumulating a critical volume of knowledge. Learning must be continuous.

"The more adapted the system, the less adaptable the system." Fisher's Fundamental Formula

Real maturity must be about adaptability. It's about people better coping with the essential, unavoidable crises common to all projects. Sometimes this means being able to cope with not being able to resolve these crises. These crises are not problems because they have no discrete solution (they might have many solutions, no solution, or some number of partial solutions). These crises are essential because the project connects to its real mission by wrestling these to the ground. Avoiding these crises often yields some form of poor adapting.

The classic project crises are:

The Context Crises: This is where the project manager first comes to grips with their own roles and responsibilities on the project. It is also where they discover "what's in it for me." Then they come to grips with the nature of the project and the nature(s) of the project's sponsoring organization. They define the project's context by answering three ques-

tions: Where Am I?, Where's The Project?, and Where's the Organization? Failing to cope with these crises leaves the project out of context. An out of context manager will manage "as ifs" rather than what's really there.

A project initiation document's assumption section often shows out-of-context thinking. Immature managers assume away known, permanent, unavoidable conditions. "We assume that all decisions affecting this project will be made in a timely manner, so as to not encumber progress." When in the history of the universe was any project so provisioned? Never! I call these "Flat Earth-Benevolent God" assumptions. Would you buy an SUV that had been engineered to operate assuming a flat earth and a benevolent God? I don't think so. Even if God IS benevolent, the earth is not flat — and it won't be flat. Mature managers call these as they are because they are connected to how it is. Immature ones seem unable to accept the world as it presents itself, projecting idealized, flat earth, "how it is supposed to be" notions instead.

The Identity Crises: This is where vision, scope, critical success factors, and high-level risks are identified, where the initiating bright idea is transformed into a reasonably manageable set of objectives. Failing this will leave the project without target and/or boundaries. Also resolved is the who's-us/who's-not-us question, the identification of the Project's Community. Also resolved here is the initial schedule, the shared project model. These three elements, the target, the community, and the shared model create the project's "identity."

Identity-less projects are easy to spot. They are often unable to discuss some unmentionable something. The unmentionable is often about the sponsoring organization's unrealistic expectations. Immaturity usually exhibits the inability to talk about these "not supposed to be discussed" issues. The most mature find their voices in spite of the threatened thunder and lightning- not to blame but to acknowledge, not to stymie but to enable successful adaptation.

The Mid-Life Crises: These are the "Oh my God, everything's falling apart" experiences that occur at some time(s) on every project no matter how well the original context and identity are set. These are the noises the project makes as it learns more about its mission and its possibilities. These experiences usually feel like bad things, like somebody screwed up. Typical mid-life crises include: The Requirements Crisis, where it's acknowledged that the requirements translate into a really different project than the vision

suggested, The Design Crisis, where the design conflicts with some aspect(s) anticipated in the requirements or the vision, and so on. Each of these force a revisit back to the project's context and identity, which is a painful process — made even more painful if these experiences are interpreted as problems rather than as normal dilemmas or if the context or identity crises were poorly coped with the last time through.

The bottom line is that you get better projects not by avoiding these experiences but by getting better at recognizing them, acknowledging them, and adapting to them. Since they offer previously unimagined possibilities, they hold great potential within them when we can recognize their emergence as choice points rather than as cues to punish ourselves for not guessing that this would happen. This is why maturity can never be measured by on-time, on-budget, on-spec criteria. A project that comes in on time, on budget, and on spec probably didn't learn anything and, like a compulsive adolescent, is usually left wondering why no one acknowledges how grown up they've become.

Real maturity brings more choices, not fewer. We can't get smarter if we can't embrace this natural process by which the world teaches us. I think we should ditch the present notions of process maturity and pursue instead the more practical target of adaptability. Becoming more adaptive yields what I think we really want from our search for maturity. We want to be able to see the world as it is and to find our place there. We want to be able to talk about what needs talking about — including even what we're not supposed to mention — so we can represent our own perspective and understand differing ones. We want to be able to acknowledge when it's turning out other than expected, not so we can punish those who caused it, but so we can adapt to reframe a satisfactory objective from the ashes of our unavoidable naiveté.

Real maturity acknowledges how naive we were, not how smart we are.

Copyright – 2000 by David A. Schmaltz; All Rights Reserved. David A. Schmaltz is the founder of True North project guidance strategies, Inc, a Portland, Oregon-based brief consulting and real-world focused training firm. He is the author of the Mastering Projects Workshop and This Isn't A Cookbook, both works focused upon applying adaptive techniques in the real world. He is also a faculty member for the Weinberg and Weinberg Problem Solving Leadership Workshop. His website is www.projectcommunity.com.