

# Sampling Factor Justification

## Providing Rationale for Factor Relevance

---

### Guidance on reporting sampling factor justifications for SCAMPI A appraisals

When planning a SCAMPI A appraisal, Lead Appraisers are asked to document justifications for the designated relevance of each of the five standard sampling factors (Location, Customer, Size, Organizational Structure, and Type of Work). The purpose of identifying and reporting this information is twofold: (1.) It aids the LA in performing sampling analysis for the Organizational Unit, to properly recognize potential differences in the OU's process implementation; and (2.) it allows a third party to clearly understand how the organization handles variations in their work, if they exist, when reading an ADS or PARS posting.

When a factor is designated as “relevant,” the justification is often as simple as specifying the differences present in the implementations—for example, “Beijing, China facility performs testing differently than Tokyo, Japan facility.” Quality reviewers have more frequently flagged SAS records where one or more of the justifications provided has not given sufficient context to explain a “not relevant” designation. Commonly, this occurs when a justification states that the OU's process does not change based upon a given factor, without explaining *why* no change occurs in the process.

If a factor is not relevant, the justification field should explain the supporting contextual evidence that the LA observed when collecting information about the OU's standard process set. The most common explanation is that only a single iteration of the factor exists: only one location, only one type of customer, only one size for project teams, etc. But if there is variation in the factor, and that variation itself does not cause the process to be altered significantly, then it becomes even more important for the justification to clarify why.

Perhaps there are different processes for different types of project work, but each type is performed by a different part of the organization, and the factor values for “Type of Work” are therefore redundant with those for “Organizational Structure.” If the OU includes some basic units with teams that are much larger than those of other basic units, “Size” may not be relevant due to tailoring in the standard process set that requires big teams to be broken down into smaller components, so that the processes can be performed in a consistent manner. If the OU's work is performed in multiple cities, “Location” may not be relevant if each of those facilities focuses its work on a separate piece of the overall process lifecycle. Each of these explanations would be a suitable justification statement, as they provide context to support a factor having been deemed “relevant” or “not relevant.”

When an appraisal team samples 100% of a very small OU, the justifications for “not relevant” factors are rendered somewhat unessential. If every available basic unit has been sampled, then all implementations are represented in that sample. Some Lead Appraisers still choose to provide contextualized justifications in such instances, as they would in other appraisals. However, when 100% of the OU is sampled, the LA has the option of entering justifications that reference the sample size.

Questions regarding this Quality Tip can be sent to [quality@cmmiinstitute.com](mailto:quality@cmmiinstitute.com).