

# **9th Annual International Cost Schedule Performance Management Conference**



**October 19-23, 1997, Tysons Corner, Virginia**

**REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE**

Form Approved OMB No.  
0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.

<b>1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY)</b> 19-10-1997	<b>2. REPORT TYPE</b> Conference papers and presentations	<b>3. DATES COVERED (FROM - TO)</b> 19-10-1997 to 23-10-1997
--	--	---

<b>4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE</b> 9th Annual International Cost Schedule Performance Management Conference Unclassified	<b>5a. CONTRACT NUMBER</b>
	<b>5b. GRANT NUMBER</b>
	<b>5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER</b>

<b>6. AUTHOR(S)</b>	<b>5d. PROJECT NUMBER</b>
	<b>5e. TASK NUMBER</b>
	<b>5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER</b>

<b>7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS</b> OUSD(A&T) XXXXX XXXXXX, XXXXXXXX	<b>8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER</b>
--	---

<b>9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS</b> OUSD(A&T) ,	<b>10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)</b>
	<b>11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)</b>

<b>12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT</b> APUBLIC RELEASE
---

<b>13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</b>
--------------------------------

<b>14. ABSTRACT</b> See report.
------------------------------------

<b>15. SUBJECT TERMS</b>
--------------------------

<b>16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:</b>	<b>17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT</b> Public Release	<b>18. NUMBER OF PAGES</b> 129	<b>19. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON</b> <a href="http://www.acq.osd.mil/pm/paperpres/1097conf/97co">http://www.acq.osd.mil/pm/paperpres/1097conf/97co</a> (blank) lfenster@dtic.mil
			<b>19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER</b> International Area Code Area Code Telephone Number 703767-9007 DSN 427-9007

<b>a. REPORT</b> Unclassified	<b>b. ABSTRACT</b> Unclassified	<b>c. THIS PAGE</b> Unclassified
----------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------------



# ***Earned Value Management***

---

## **Future Directions in DoD**


***Wayne Abba***

***Office of the Under Secretary of Defense  
(Acquisition & Technology)***

# Earned Value Management

---


- ◆ **The facts of (DoD procurement) life**
- ◆ **EVM beginnings**
  - **DoD contracting requirement**
- ◆ **EVM status**
  - **Government/Industry best practice**
- ◆ **EVM future**
  - **DoD's role**



## 1961 Pentagon Spending:

- 40% of Federal Budget
- 8% of GDP

\$\$\$




## 1997 Pentagon Spending:

- 15% of Federal Budget
- 3% of GDP

## Military Procurement Budget:

- Down 67% since 1985 peak

\$



# DoD Responses

---

- ◆ **Acquisition Reform**
- ◆ **“The Last Supper”**
  - 1993 SecDef dinner
  - Fewer, larger companies
- ◆ **Improved Defense Project Management**
  - Better integrate cost, schedule, technical perf.
  - Earned Value Management



**“And then there were 3”**

**Lockheed**  
**GD Mil. Jets**  
**Sanders Assoc.**

**Lockheed**

**Martin Marietta**  
**GD Rockets**  
**GE Aerospace**

**Martin Marietta**

**Loral**  
**Unisys Defense**  
**IBM Fed. Systems**  
**LTV Missiles**  
**Ford Aerospace**  
**Goodyear Aerospace**

**Loral**

**Lockheed Martin**

**Northrop**  
**LTV Aircraft**  
**Grumman**  
**Westinghouse Def**

**Northrop Grumman**

**Boeing**  
**Rockwell Def & Space**  
**McDonnell Douglas**

**Boeing**  
**Rockwell Def & Space**  
**McDonnell Douglas**

**Boeing**

**Raytheon**  
**E-Systems**  
**Texas Instruments Def**

**Raytheon**  
**Texas Instruments Def**

**Raytheon**

**Hughes Aircraft**  
**Magnavox Def**  
**CAE Link**  
**GD Missiles**

**Hughes Aircraft**

# Industrial Base Concerns

---

- ◆ **Market forces**
  - Monopsony
  - Monopoly
  - Price gouging
- ◆ **Vertical integration**
- ◆ **Innovation**
- ◆ **Quality**




“The late 1990s and the early 21st Century will mark a difficult and expensive procurement era.”



# Earned Value Management: Origins

---

Industry Best  
Practices



Government  
Requirements

**1967: DoD Instruction 7000.2**  
**35 Cost/Schedule Control  
Systems Criteria (C/SCSC)**

## ***Criterion-based Management***

- Brief statements of attributes
- Not “how-to manage”
- Not a system
- Minimum acceptable standard

**1997: DoD Regulation 5000.2-R**  
**32 Earned Value Management  
Systems (EVMS) Criteria**

# Earned Value Management: Implementation Problems

---

- ◆ “Financial Management”
- ◆ Audit-like reviews
- ◆ Government-required reporting
- ◆ Too many “surprises”
  - A-12 (Navy)
  - AAWS-M (Army)
  - C-17 (Air Force)
- ◆ Challenge: keep good principles, stop bad practices



# Earned Value Management: DoD Improvements

---

- ◆ **Redefined Earned Value Ownership**

- From finance to project management
- From reporting to management
- From government to industry

- ◆ **Better management tools**


- ◆ **Integrated Baseline Reviews**

- Planning process
- Better technical/risk management



# DoD Earned Value Policy

---




- ◆ **Examined & Reaffirmed**
  - 1984 - Arthur D. Little Study**
  - 1991 - DoD Instruction 5000.2**
  - 1993 - Inspector General Report**
  - 1994 - Coopers & Lybrand Study**
  - 1996 - DoD Regulation 5000.2-R**
  - 1996 - Office of Management & Budget Circular A-11 Part 3**
  - 1997 - General Accounting Office Report**

**Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Sweden, United Kingdom**

# Integrated Product Teams: The Key to Success

---




**Management systems don't manage - people do!  
EVM is used to identify, communicate and MANAGE  
the resource effect of technical and schedule problems**

# The Really Nice Thing About Not Planning

---

**Failure comes as a complete surprise and is not preceded by long periods of worry and depression!\***



**\*Micro Planning International**

# Integrated Baseline Reviews

---

- ◆ **Mutual understanding of plan for**
  - Scope
  - Schedule
  - Resources
- ◆ **Emphasis on risk**
- ◆ **Planning process vs. review**
- ◆ **PM leads; EVM staff supports**
  - Management system reviews effectively eliminated



# Putting it all together:

$$\text{IPT} + \text{IBR} + \text{EVM} = \text{IPM}$$

---

- ◆ **Involve earned value specialists and cost estimators on program IPTs**
- ◆ **Tailor reports - limit levels and analysis**
- ◆ **Do Integrated Baseline Reviews**
- ◆ **Encourage active, forward-looking management**

**“IPTs must control all the project, technical and functional elements needed for the product or process.”**



# **Earned Value Management: Gov't/Industry Best Practice**

---

- ◆ **Dec. 1996 USD(A&T) accepted 32 EVMS guidelines as replacement for C/SCSC**
- ◆ **Reserved right for government reviews**
  - **As determined by project manager**
  - **“Self-certification” not in public interest**
- ◆ **Encourages evolution to “true” standard**
  - **Industry/International (ISO)**
  - **For now, DoD and industry EVMS are equal**

# Earned Value Management: The Future

---


- ◆ **Office of Management & Budget Guidance**
  - 1996 - Circular A-11 Part 3
  - 1997 - Principles of Budgeting for Capital Asset Acquisitions (FY98 Budget)
  - 1997 - Capital Programming Guide (Supplement to A-11 Part 3)
- ◆ **Government-wide management principles**

*American Project Management Forum*

# Earned Value Management: The Future

---

- ◆ A-11 Part 3 extends DoD-pioneered performance measurement to all agencies
- ◆ It effectively requires Earned Value Management for all contractor performance-based management systems
- ◆ Agency budget approvals will depend on *performance* measured by EVM



*The principles are not new to the Dept. of Defense!*

***EVM: A 30-year old idea is today's best practice!***

# **Earned Value Management: The DoD's Role**

---

- ◆ **Integrated Program Management Initiative**
- ◆ **Monitor industry standards**
- ◆ **Participate in standards-setting bodies**
- ◆ **Continue inter-agency cooperation**
- ◆ **Improve project management education**
  - **Within government**
  - **Cooperate with academia and professions**
- ◆ **Improve in-house management**



**THE WORK BREAKDOWN STRUCTURE  
IN AN ACQUISITION REFORM ENVIRONMENT**

**Prepared For:**

**COST SCHEDULE PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT  
CONFERENCE**

**Prepared By:**

**Neil F. Albert**

**MCR Federal, Inc.**

**700 Technology Park Drive**

**Billerica, MA 01821**

**(978) 670-5800**



## OVERVIEW

- Background
- Acquisition Reform
- Work Breakdown Structure Definition
- Work Breakdown Structure Development Process
- Uses of Work Breakdown Structure
- Contract Business Management Overview
- GAO Review
- Issues in Work Breakdown Structure Development
- Relationship with Contractor Management System
- Summary



## BACKGROUND

- MIL-STD-881 Developed to Standardized Materiel Defense Items Definitions for Planning, Coordinating and Controlling the Technical and Cost Aspects of a Program
- Reflect Importance of:
  - Technology
  - Software
  - Contractor Organization/Practices
- With Acquisition Reform, MIL-STDs no longer applicable
  - MIL-STD-881 remained essentially in effect (Kaminski Letter)
  - Implementation was still required for Program Managers
  - Contractors utilize to ensure complete and accurate reporting
- MIL-HDBK on Work Breakdown Structures replacing MIL-STD
  - Focus on Government vs. Contractor implementation
  - Follows Acquisition Process



## ACQUISITION REFORM

- Implementation of Acquisition Reform includes:
  - Streamline Acquisition (Commercial Practices)
  - Use of Integrated Product Teams
  - EVMS vs. C/SCSC (Insight vs. Oversight)
  - Cost as An Independent Variable (CAIV)
  - Reduction of Government Oversight
    - SOO vs. SOW
    - Elimination of MIL-STDs and MIL-SPECs
    - Addition of Integrated Management Plans and Schedules
- The WBS Remains the Definitive Framework for Government and Industry Communication for Technical, Cost and Schedule Elements





## WORK BREAKDOWN STRUCTURE DEFINITION

### DEFINITION

- A Product Oriented Family Tree of Hardware, Software Services and Data Which Results from Systems Engineering Efforts During Development and Production of a System
- Displays and Defines the Product(s) and Relates the Elements of Work to Each Other and the End Product, and Completely Defines the Program
- Plays a Key Role in Developing/Tracking Costs; Provides a Framework for Financial Reporting
- A Work Breakdown Structure (WBS):
  - Does Not Drive a Program's Requirements
  - Helps Identify the Interfaces Between the Government and Contractor, and Between Contractors
  - Provides the Framework for Integrating the Program Acquisition Requirements



## **WORK BREAKDOWN STRUCTURE DEFINITIONS (CONT'D)**

Two Types of Work Breakdown Structures:

- Program Work Breakdown Structure Encompasses Entire Program and Consists of Atleast Three Levels of the Program
  - Used by Government to Define the Contract WBS
  - Used by Contractors to Develop and Extend a Contract WBS
- Contract Work Breakdown Structure is the Approved WBS for Reporting Purposes and its Discretionary Extension by the Contractor
  - Includes All the Elements for the Products Which are Responsibility of the Contractor
  - Contract Work Statement should Provide the Reporting Requirements




## WBS LEVELS

- Level 1
  - Entire System
  - Program Element, Project or Subprogram
- Level 2
  - Major Elements of the System
  - Top Level Aggregations of Services or Data
- Level 3
  - Subordinate Items to Level 2 Elements
  - Generally Common Across Similar Programs



# PROGRAM WBS (EXAMPLE)





# EXPANDED PROGRAM WBS (EXAMPLE)

PROGRAM WBS				
1	2	3	4	5
FX AIRCRAFT	AIR VEHICLE	AIRFRAME		
		PROPULSION (SK-PW-52D)		
		COMMUNICATIONS/IDENTIFICATION		
		NAVIGATION/GUIDANCE		
		FIRE CONTROL		
		RADAR		RECEIVER
				TRANSMITTER
				ANTENNA
				RADAR APPLICATIONS S/W (TO CSCI LEVEL)
				RADAR SYSTEM S/W (TO CSCI LEVEL)
				RADAR INTEG., ASSEMBLY, TEST AND CHKOUT
		AUTOMATIC FLIGHT CONTROL		
		CENTRAL COMPUTER		
		ELECTRONIC WARFARE		
		WEAPON DELIVERY EQUIPMENT		
		ARMAMENT		
	SYSTEM	TEST AND EVALUATION		
		DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION		
		OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION		
		MOCKUPS		
		TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT		
		TEST FACILITIES		
	SYSTEMS	ENGINEERING/PROGRAM MANAGEMENT		
		SYSTEMS ENGINEERING		
		PROGRAM MANAGEMENT		
		INTEGRATED LOGISTIC SUPPORT		
	PECULIAR	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
		TEST AND MEASUREMENT EQUIPMENT		
		SUPPORT AND HANDLING EQUIPMENT		
	COMMON	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
	TRAINING			
		MAINTENANCE TRAINERS		
		AIRCRAFT TRAINING DEVICE		
		TRAINING COURSE MATERIALS		
	DATA			
		TECHNICAL PUBLICATIONS		
		ENGINEERING DATA		
		MANAGEMENT DATA		
		SUPPORT DATA		
		DATA REPOSITORY		
	OPERATIONAL/SITE	ACTIVATION		
		CONTRACTOR TECHNICAL SUPPORT		
	INITIAL	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		



# AUTOMATED SOFTWARE SYSTEM WORK BREAKDOWN STRUCTURE

## LEVEL 1

Electronic/Automated  
Software System

## LEVEL 2

Prime Mission Product (PMP)

Platform Integration

System Engineering/Program  
Management

System Test and Evaluation

Training

Data

## LEVEL 3

Electronic Subsystem 1 ..n (Specify Names)

PMP Applications Software

PMP System Software

PMP Integration, Assembly, Test and Checkout

Development Test and Evaluation

Operational Test and Evaluation

Mock-ups

Test and Evaluation Support

Test Facilities

Equipment

Services

Facilities

Technical Publications

Engineering Data

Management Data

Support Data

Data Depository



# AUTOMATED SOFTWARE SYSTEM WORK BREAKDOWN STRUCTURE (CONT'D)

## LEVEL 1

## LEVEL 2

## LEVEL 3

Peculiar Support Equipment

Test and Measurement Equipment  
Support and Handling Equipment

Common Support Equipment

Test and Measurement Equipment  
Support and Handling Equipment

Operational/Site Activation

System Assembly, Installation and Checkout on Site  
Contractor Technical Support  
Site Construction  
Site/Ship/Vehicle Conversion

Industrial Facilities

Construction/Conversion/Expansion  
Equipment Acquisition or Modernization  
Maintenance (Industrial Facilities)

Initial Spares and Repair Parts



# AUTOMATED SOFTWARE SYSTEM WORK BREAKDOWN STRUCTURE (CONT'D) Software Extension

## LEVEL 4

Build 1...n

## LEVEL 5

CSCI 1

CSCI 2

CSCI 3

CSCI to CSCI Integration and  
Checkout

## LEVEL 6

CSC 1...n

CSC to CSC Integration and Checkout

CSC 1...n

CSC to CSC Integration and Checkout


CSC 1...n

CSC to CSC Integration and Checkout






# RELATIONSHIP OF PROGRAM WBS WITH CONTRACT WBS






# EVOLUTIONARY REQUIREMENTS DEFINITION



DISPOSAL



# THE EVOLUTION OF WORK BREAKDOWN STRUCTURE





# SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT

## Mission Need and Analysis

### SYSTEMS ENGINEERING


- Pre-Concept
  - Need Analysis Support
  - Identifying Technology
  - Systems Engineering Intensive
  
- Concept Exploration
  - Mission Need Statement
  - Exploratory Trade-Off Studies
  - Preliminary System Level
    - Functions
    - Performance
  - Top Level Specifications

### WBS DEVELOPMENT

- No Formal WBS Defined



# CONCEPT EXPLORATION





## PROGRAM DEFINITION & RISK REDUCTION

### SYSTEMS ENGINEERING


- Operational Requirements Document (ORD)
  - Approved Program
- System Level Performance Requirements
  - Prove Critical Technologies and Processes
  - Type”A” or “B” Specifications
- CAIV Implementation
- Preliminary Configuration Items Within a Functional Architecture
- Preparation of Statement of Objectives

### WBS DEVELOPMENT

- Preparation of:
  - CCDR Plan
  - Preliminary Program WBS to Level 3
  - Schedule and Cost Estimates
- Prepare CAIV Trade-offs for each WBS element



# PROGRAM DEFINITION & RISK REDUCTION





# ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT

## SYSTEMS ENGINEERING

- Updated Operational Requirements Document
- Detailed Design
  - Preliminary Design Review
  - Critical Design Review
  - Lower Level Specification
  - Product and Process/Material Specifications
- Configuration Defined
  - Specification Tree
  - Configuration Items (CI) or Computer Software Configuration Item (CSCI)
- Cost/Performance Trade-offs


## WBS DEVELOPMENT

- Approved Program WBS
- Statement of Work Developed by Contractor
- Approved Contract WBS
- Extension of Contract WBS by Contractor
- Continue CAIV Trade-offs
- Cost/Schedule Performance Measurement






# SYSTEM CONFIGURATION



## LEGEND





## PRODUCTION

### SYSTEMS ENGINEERING

- Produce Prime Mission Product
- Maintain Configuration Management
- Improve Performance through CAIV implementation

### WBS DEVELOPMENT

- Maintain Program and Contract WBS
  - Major Modifications
  - Relationship to Process and Configuration Control
- Continue CAIV Trade-offs
- Cost/Schedule Reporting



## USES OF A WORK BREAKDOWN STRUCTURE

- Technical Management
  - Provides Framework for Defining the Technical Objectives of the Program
  - Together with Contract SOW and Product Specification, Aids in Establishing a Specification Tree, Defining Configuration Items, and Planning Support Tasks
  - Contract Statement of Work (SOW)
  - Describes What Products and Services are to be Delivered
  - An Effective SOW will Facilitate Effective Contractor Evaluation After Contract Award
  - A Standardized WBS is a Template for Constructing the SOW and the Contract Line Items (CLINs) - Streamline the Process
  - Use the WBS to Provide the Framework and Facilitate a Logical Arrangement of the SOW Elements
- Specification Tree
  - Hierarchy of Performance Requirements for Each Component Element of the System for Which Design Responsibility is Assigned
  - Specifications May Not be Written for Each Product
  - May Not Match the WBS



## USES OF A WORK BREAKDOWN STRUCTURE (CONT'D)

- Configuration Management
  - Process of Managing the Technical Configuration of Items Being Developed
  - Need to Designate Which Contract Deliverables are Subject to Configuration Management Controls
    - Configuration Item (CI)
    - Computer Software Configuration Item (CSCI)
  - Framework for Designating the Configuration Items in the WBS
- Financial Management
  - WBS Assists Management in Measuring Cost and Schedule Performance
  - Products are Identified in Terms of Cost and Schedule Performance Goals
  - Serves as the Basis for Estimating and Scheduling Resource Requirements
- Cost Estimating
  - Facilitates Government to Plan, Coordinate, Control and Estimate Various Program Activities
  - Provides Common Framework for Tracking Estimated and Actual Costs



## USES OF A WORK BREAKDOWN STRUCTURE (CONT'D)

- Data Bases
  - Used for Pricing and Negotiating Contracts and Contract Changes, and for Follow-on Procurement
  - Provides Cost Data Base of Similar WBS Elements from Different Programs
    - Used to Develop Learning Curves, Regression and Other Techniques to Estimate the Cost Requirements
    - Provide Comparison to the Original Estimates
    - Assists in Bidding Future Contracts and Budgeting New Work




## RELATIONSHIP TO MANAGEMENT PLAN AND SCHEDULE

- Project Control Is the First Unit of Control
  - Integrated Management Plan (IMP) Ties Contractual Work Scope With Technical Plans and Goals of the Program
- Time or Schedule Is the Second Unit of Control
  - Integrated Management Schedule (IMS) Ties Contractual Work Scope to Schedule or Milestones Goals
  - Understanding the Duration to Go From Step One to Step Two of the Work Scope the Better the Plan and the Better the Control
- Identifying Resources Is the Third Unit of Control
  - Identifying Materials, People and Tools to the Work Scope Definition Will Determine How Well the Project Is Utilizing Resources and How Performance Is Measured.



# INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT



## Integrated Management Plan


Management Plan	Events				Accomplishment Criteria
1. Preliminary Design Review	PDR				1. A. Duty Cycle Defined b. Preliminary Analysis Complete

## Integrated Management Schedule

Detailed Tasks	19XX	19XY	19XZ
Program Events	PDR ▲	CDR ▲	
1. Preliminary Design Complete	▲	▲	
Duty Cycle Defined	▲	▲	




# RELATIONSHIP OF SYSTEM DESIGN AND WBS








# FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT REPORTING STRUCTURE





# INTEGRATING PROGRAM ACQUISITION REQUIREMENTS

- Generated by Government
- Identifies Work to be Performed
- Define the System



- Ties System Definition with Work to be Performed
- Conforms to MIL-HDBK
- Framework for Technical, Cost, Schedule Reporting
- Identifies Contractual Requirements
- Tied to SOO/SOW or WBS



## CONTRACT BUSINESS MANAGEMENT OVERVIEW

- RFPs Identify Significant “Misapplication” of Reporting Requirements
  - Timely Development of CCDR Data Plan
  - CCDRs Not Used; Go To Unknown Staff
  - WBS Changes After Contract Award
  - Drive Reporting to Too Low of Level
  - Tailoring Not Allowed
  - CLINs Cause Separate Allocation
- 50% Have WBS Implementation Problems
  - Poor Software WBS Definition
  - WBS Not oriented to Development Type Contracts
  - Conflicts Between Types of WBS Used
  - Extending WBS Below Reporting Level Requires Permission



## CONTRACT BUSINESS MANAGEMENT OVERVIEW (CONT'D)

- Program Manager Involvement
  - Key Individual in Process
  - Upfront Planning Drives Quality of Output
  - Business Planning Ownership Should Not be Diffused
- Poor Communication
  - Industry/Government Relationship
  - WBS Development Inconsistent Across Services
  - WBS Must be the Tool for Integrating the Functions and Communicating the Needs



# GAO REPORT FINDINGS

## May 1997

- Found contractor systems inconsistent with Government requirements for reporting
- Levels of reporting were often too low
- Disconnect between cost account and development processes
- Estimating and C/S requirements out of sync
- CCDR procedures and processes being revised
- Standardized WBS could provide consistency (but could cause problems if improperly implemented)



## ISSUES IN WORK BREAKDOWN STRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT

- Element of a Program that are Not Products
- Program Phases (e.g., Production), and Types of Funds (e.g., Research, Development, Test and Evaluation)
- Rework, Retesting and Refurbishing
- Non-recurring and Recurring Classifications
- Organizational Structure (Functional vs. IPT)
- Tooling (e.g., Special Test Equipment, and Factory Support Equipment Such as: Assembly Tools, Dies Jigs, Fixtures, Handling Equipment, etc.)
- Production Acceptance Testing of R&D (Including First Article Test) and Production Units



## ISSUES IN WORK BREAKDOWN STRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT

- The Integrated Management Plan (IMP) and Integrated Management Schedule (IMS) should reflect the WBS
- The IMP/IMS data contained within the CWBS framework should be reconcilable into a single IMP/IMS element.
- The WBS will serve multiple functions within the program. Design of the WBS should accommodate the requirements for:
  - Design To Cost (DTC)/Life Cycle Cost (LCC), Cost As an Independent Variable (CAIV)
  - Engineering Bill(s) of Material (EBOM), Manufacturing Bill(s) of Material (MBOM),
  - Product structure of the end items regardless of phase or funding
- Each subcontractor effort will be assigned to a single WBS element
  - Minor subcontractors (i.e., subcontractors with either little or no technical, schedule, and/or cost risk) may be grouped together under a single WBS element



# COMPARISON OF CORRECT AND INCORRECT PROGRAM WBSs

**CORRECT**

**PROGRAM WBS**

1	2	3	4
FX AIRCRAFT	AIR VEHICLE	AIRFRAME	
		WING	
		FUSELAGE	
		EMPOWERAGE	
		FLIGHT CONTROLS SUBSYSTEM	
		HYDRAULIC SYSTEM	
		ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL	
		CREW STATION SYSTEM	
		LANDING AND ARRESTING GEAR SYSTEM	
		INTEG. ASSEMBLY, TEST AND CHECKOUT	
		PROPULSION (SK-PW-52D)	
		COMMUNICATIONS IDENTIFICATION	
		RADIO SYSTEM	
		DATA LINK	
		COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM SOFTWARE	
		NAVIGATION GUIDANCE	
		FIRE CONTROL	
		RADAR	
		COMPUTER	
		CONTROLS AND DISPLAYS	
		SYSTEM SOFTWARE	
		AUTOMATIC FLIGHT CONTROL	
		CENTRAL COMPUTER	
		COMPUTER	
		SYSTEM SOFTWARE	
		ELECTRONIC WARFARE	
		WEAPON DELIVERY EQUIPMENT	
		ARMAMENT	
		SYSTEM TEST AND EVALUATION	
		DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	
		WIND TUNNEL ARTICLES AND TEST	
		STATIC ARTICLES AND TEST	
		FATIGUE ARTICLES AND TEST	
		CONTRACTOR FLIGHT TESTS	
		OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION	
		MOCKUPS	
		TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	
		TEST FACILITIES	
		SYSTEMS ENGINEERING PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	
		SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	
		PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	
		INTEGRATED LOGISTIC SUPPORT	
		REPAIR SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	
		TEST AND MEASUREMENT EQUIPMENT	
		SUPPORT AND HANDLING EQUIPMENT	
		COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	
		TRAINING	
		MAINTENANCE TRAINERS	
		AIRCREW TRAINING DEVICE	
		TRAINING COURSE MATERIALS	
		DATA	
		TECHNICAL PUBLICATIONS	
		ENGINEERING DATA	
		MANAGEMENT DATA	
		SUPPORT DATA	
		DATA DEPOSITORY	
		OPERATIONAL SITE ACTIVATION	
		CONTRACTOR TECHNICAL SUPPORT	
		INITIAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	

**INCORRECT**

**PROGRAM WBS**

1	2	3	4	5
FX AIRCRAFT	AIR VEHICLE	AIRFRAME		
		DESIGN ENGINEERING		
		FABRICATION		
		ASSSEMBLY		
		PROPULSION (SK-PW-52D)		
		COMMUNICATIONS IDENTIFICATION		
		MANUFACTURING		
		ENGINEERING		
		QUALITY ASSURANCE		
		MATERIAL		
		NAVIGATION GUIDANCE		
		FIRE CONTROL		
		NONRECURRING		
		RECURRING		
		AUTOMATIC FLIGHT CONTROL		
		CENTRAL COMPUTER		
		ELECTRONIC WARFARE		
		WEAPON DELIVERY EQUIPMENT		
		ARMAMENT		
		SOFTWARE		
		COMMUNICATIONS IDENTIFICATION SOFTWARE		
		FIRE CONTROL SOFTWARE		
		NAVIGATION GUIDANCE SOFTWARE		
		AUTOMATIC FLIGHT CONTROL SOFTWARE		
		CENTRAL COMPUTER SOFTWARE		
		ELECTRONIC WARFARE SOFTWARE		
		SYSTEM TEST AND EVALUATION		
		PRODUCTION ACCEPTANCE TEST		
		FIRST ARTICLE TEST		
		DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION		
		OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION		
		MOCKUPS		
		TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT		
		TEST FACILITIES		
		SYSTEMS ENGINEERING PROGRAM MANAGEMENT		
		TRAINING COURSE MATERIALS		
		DATA		
		TECHNICAL PUBLICATIONS		
		ENGINEERING DATA		
		MANAGEMENT DATA		
		SUPPORT DATA		
		DATA DEPOSITORY		
		OPERATIONAL SITE ACTIVATION		
		CONTRACTOR TECHNICAL SUPPORT		
		INITIAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		

**WRONG**

These are work efforts, not products.

**WRONG**

These items are functional, not products (Ref. CCDR).

**WRONG**

Nonrecurring and recurring items are not WBS elements (Ref. CCDR).

**WRONG**

Software should be included with the hardware it supports.

**WRONG**

These are system level tests but should be included in the Airframe WBS element.






## RELATIONSHIP WITH CONTRACTOR MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

- Contractor Should Assign Management Responsibility for Technical, Schedule, and Cost Performance (Cost Account Manager)
  - Cost Management System Should Provide the Necessary Visibility of the WBS as it Interfaces with the Organization
  - At Juncture of the WBS Element and Organization Unit, Cost Accounts are Usually Established
  - Performance is Planned, Measured, Recorded and Controlled




# COST MANAGEMENT SYSTEM






# TRANSLATION FROM FUNCTION TO PRODUCT






# TRANSLATION FROM IPT TO PRODUCT






# LINKAGE BETWEEN CONTRACTOR WBS AND CONTRACTOR MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS





# LINKAGE BETWEEN WORK BREAKDOWN STRUCTURE AND PROCESS-ORIENTED BREAKDOWN





## SUMMARY

- Work Breakdown Structure is Product-Oriented Family Tree
- Develop program and Contract Work Breakdown Structure Based on How the System Will be Developed
- Use the Work Breakdown Structure as an Integrating Tool with the SOW, CLIN and System Design
- Acquisition Reform Provides Continued Use of WBS with IPT, CAIV, IMS, IMP, and Other Initiatives
- Extension of WBS at Too Low of Level Will Burden the Contractor Management System
- Use the WBS as a Medium for Communicating the Program Requirements

# THE FUTURE

---



# OF EVMS



# THE FUTURE OF EVMS

October, 1993 - A Vision

---


**“The quality of a contractor’s management system is determined not by the absence of defects, but by the presence of management value”**

# THE FUTURE OF EVMS

October, 1993 - A Vision



**Inspection**



**Management**



# THE FUTURE OF EVMS

## Integration

---


- ➔ **Cost**
- ➔ **Schedule**
- ➔ **Technical Performance**
- ➔ **Risk**

# THE FUTURE OF EVMS

## Work Breakdown Structure - The Key to Integration





COST




SCHEDULE

TECHNICAL




RISK



# THE FUTURE OF EVMS

---

**Integrated Program Management Systems**



**(IPMS)**

# OMB Circular A-11, Part II: Strategic Plans and Annual Performance Plans

Presented By

Mr.. Walter S. Groszyk, Jr..

Office of Management and Budget (OMB)

(202) 395-3172      [groszyk\\_w@a1.eop.gov](mailto:groszyk_w@a1.eop.gov)

At The 9th Annual International  
Cost Schedule Performance Management Conference  
October 19 - 23, 1997

# GPRA

## Lineage:

- Construct outlined in President Reagan's last Management Report.
- First drafted in 1991 by a Republican Senator during the Bush Administration.
- Became law in August 1993. Passed by a Democratic Congress and signed by President Clinton.
  - > Bipartisan sponsorship
  - > Across the political spectrum
  - > Unanimous vote

# Antecedents

- PPBS, MBO, ZBB
- Financial Statements
- Other countries:
  - The Scando-Anglos:  
Australia, New Zealand, United Kingdom,  
Canada, Sweden
- Sunnyvale
- Oregon
- Private sector
  - analog to the bottom



# Coverage

- All Cabinet departments
  - All departmental components
- Nearly every independent agency
- Government-owned or -controlled corporations
- Only the Executive Branch
- Approximately 115 entities
  - 17 were exempted by statute or OMB

# The Basic Construct of GPRA

- Strategic Plans
  - > Foundation
- Annual Performance Plans
  - > Execution
- Government-wide Performance Plan
  - > Overall relationship to budget
- Annual Performance Report
  - > Accountability
- Management Flexibility

# Schedule

## Pilot Phase:

- Performance measurement pilot projects
  - >FY 1994-96
  - >Done
    - All Cabinet departments
    - 14 independent agencies
    - Total of 70+ pilots
- Managerial flexibility pilot projects
  - >FY 1995-96
  - >Annulled

# More Schedule

## Current Phase:

- Government-wide implementation
  - > Beginning in September 1997.
    - Strategic Plans
- Government-wide performance plan
  - > February 1998 and annually thereafter.
- Performance budgeting pilots
  - > Yet-to-be
- Program performance reports
  - > A millennium happening

# What Are We Trying To Do?

- Ask three questions of any manager
  - >What are you trying to achieve?
  - >How well are you doing?
  - >How do you know?

# What Else?

- Focus on program execution
  - > Less emphasis on inputs
    - People, dollars, process
  - > More emphasis on outputs & outcomes
  - > Less emphasis on policy
- Program entirety rather than deltas

# And . . . . ?

- Accountability
- Make GPRA disappear

# Strategic Plans

- September 30, 1997
  - >Due to Congress and OMB
- 100 plans due
  - >94 percent delivered
  - >5 percent delayed
  - >1 percent recalcitrant
- Not since the fall of the Soviet Union . . . .
- Marvel of procrastination
  - >50 months post-enactment



# What's In A Plan?

- Six required elements
  - > Mission statement
  - > General goals and objectives
  - > Means and strategies
  - > Relationship between general goals and annual performance goals
  - > External factors
  - > Program evaluation

# More On Strategic Plans

- Cover at least a six-year period.
- Revised and updated every three years.
  - >By September 2000
  - >Minor adjustments can be made annually.
- Consultation with Congress
- Outreach and opportunity for interested or potentially affected parties, e.g., stakeholders, customers, to provide views

# Getting To September 30th

- OMB Guidance
  - >Issued September 1995
  - >Interagency task group (Jan. 1995)
- OMB Reviews of Draft Plans
  - >Summer 1996, Spring 1997.
- GAO
  - >Checklist
  - >Letter reports
- Congress
  - >House teams
  - >Scorecard

# More on Getting There

- Interagency clearance
  - > OMB checklist
  - > Consistency among goals for cross-cutting programs
  - > Consistency with President's program
    - A strategic plan is not a budget request!
- Transmittal letter
  - > Summary of consultation
  - > Contrary views
  - > Use of contractors/consultants

# What's the Result?

- No perfect plans
  - >No model plans, either.
- Substantial improvement from earlier drafts.
  - >Higher scores
- 94 agency plans that were sent on time, and the met the basic requirements of the statute.
- A likelihood that many agencies will make minor adjustments to these plans next February.
- Continuing selected consultation.

# Using Strategic Plans

- Foundation for annual performance plan
  - >Progress in accomplishing long-term goals.
  - >Incremental and derivative.

# Annual Performance Plan

- Three basic elements:
  - > Annual performance goals and indicators
  - > Means and strategies
  - > Description of how data will be verified and validated.
- Distinctions:
  - > All program activities vs. major functions
  - > Tied to specific budget accounts rather than agency aggregate level.

# Sequence of the Annual Performance Plan

- September:  
to OMB with the budget request
- February:  
to Congress, concurrent with the President's budget.  
>revised to reflect budget decisions.
- September/October:  
'operating plan' at agency choice.  
>revised to reflect appropriations.



# Nuances

- Alternative form of measurement
  - > non-qualified goal
  - > authorized by OMB
  - > descriptive statements of satisfactory and minimally effective program
- Aggregation, dis-aggregation, consolidation of program activities
- Budget year funding of future year performance
- Budget year performance funded by past years

# More Nuances

- Use of regulation and tax expenditures
- Managerial Flexibility Waiver Requests
- Management problems
- Capital planning

# Several Examples of Goals

- Improve productivity by 10 percent.
- Promote economic growth in Appalachia.
- Maintain combat forces at a high level of readiness.
- Reduce product defects.
- Eliminate errors.

# Web Sources

**Fedworld:** [www.fedworld.gov/pub/results/results.htm](http://www.fedworld.gov/pub/results/results.htm)

**NPR:** [www.npr.gov/initiati/mfr/](http://www.npr.gov/initiati/mfr/)

**Congressional Institute:** [server.conginst.org/conginst/results/](http://server.conginst.org/conginst/results/)

**Financenet:** [www.financenet.gov/financenet/fed/cfo/gpra/](http://www.financenet.gov/financenet/fed/cfo/gpra/)

**GAO:** [www.gao.gov/special.pubs/gpra.htm](http://www.gao.gov/special.pubs/gpra.htm)

***Government Executive:***

[www.govexec.com/dailyfed/0997/090897b1.htm](http://www.govexec.com/dailyfed/0997/090897b1.htm)

**Mr. Armev:** [armey.house.gov/results/welcome.htm](http://armey.house.gov/results/welcome.htm)



# Cost As An Independent Variable (CAIV) Acquisition Strategies: A Brief Overview

9th International Cost/Schedule Performance Conference  
Tysons Corner, Virginia  
October 22, 1997

Presented by:

Nicholas A. Koreisha  
202/739-8711

Valerie LaPlaca-Mars  
202/467-3397

---



# Overview

---

- What is CAIV?
- CAIV's History and Evolution
- Use of Earned Value Management in CAIV Acquisition
- CAIV's Impact on Acquisition Management
  - Current Trends
  - Future Trends
- Where To Learn More



# What is CAIV?

---

CAIV is DoD's acquisition methodology of making technical and schedule performance a function of available (budgeted) resources.

## *Strategy*

- Aggressively set realistic cost objectives for acquiring and supporting defense systems, and
- Manage programs to meet those objectives.

## *Approach*

- Set realistic but aggressive cost objectives early in each program
- Manage risks to achieve cost, schedule and performance objectives
- Devise metrics for tracking progress in setting and achieving cost objectives
- Motivate/incentivize government/industry to achieve objectives
- Incentivize operating and support cost reductions for fielded systems



## CAIV is...

---


Explained another way...

- Three program performance parameters
  - Technical
    - Schedule
    - Cost (Price)
  - Two of these variables must depend on the third
- Systematic analysis of all life cycle cost elements
  - Acquisition
  - Operations/Support
  - Manpower
  - Modernization
  - Disposal





# Cost/Performance Optimization Process





# CAIV's History and Evolution

---

- Based on commercial practice
- History is in the making, now!
  - 1995 - 1996
    - OSD policy on cost/performance trade-offs
    - Test implementation on flagship Army/Navy/Air Force/Marine Corp programs
  - 1997 - 1998
    - Services' promulgate policy/guidance documents, business plans
- Why CAIV? Improves systems acquisition cost estimating diligence and program controls.



# Use of Earned Value Management in CAIV Acquisition

---

- CAIV's "first diagnostic of risk management".
- Principle method of validating whether expected cost performance will be met
- Tool for adjusting performance requirements to meet cost objectives
- Performance monitoring (expected life cycle cost validation) conducted on an ongoing basis through all Acquisition phases:
  - Concept Exploration
  - Program Definition and Risk Reduction
  - EMD/LRIP
  - Production, Fielding/Deployment, Operational Support



# CAIV's Impact on Acquisition Management: Current Trends

---

- Increasing rigor in cost modeling
- Cost/Performance Integrated Process Teams (CPIPT)
- Existing data quality/granularity - limiting the quality/sophistication of post-acquisition life cycle costing
- New contract incentives
- Program reporting: improved quality



# CAIV's Impact on Acquisition Management: Future Trends

---

- Improved systems engineering - performance tradeoff and cost/performance tradeoff tools
- Renewed interest in VECPs as incentives
- Continued risk management method improvements
- Increased use, improvements to technical performance management (TPM)
- Improvements to historical O&S cost databases
- Increased focus on data quality during the cost data collection process
- Increased focus on industry/contractor process cost data associated with Government systems - ABC/ABM



## Where to Learn More

---

- Web Sites
  - <http://www.acq.osd.mil/ar/>
  - <http://www.acq-ref.navy.mil/wcp/civ.html>
  - [http://www.safaq.hq.af.mil/safaq/acq\\_pol/caiv.html](http://www.safaq.hq.af.mil/safaq/acq_pol/caiv.html)
  - <http://navsea.navy.mil/acquisition-reform/caiv.htm>
  - <http://www.pricystems.com/caivsemi.htm>
- Future military service guidance documents


# Technical Performance Measurement

- The Basics and *Beyond* -


Kathryn Kulick  
9<sup>th</sup> Annual Cost Schedule Performance Management  
Conference  
October 22, 1997

BCWP

INTEGRITY



Systematic TPM





## Purpose

To ensure that the proper foundation is in place from which to produce the most accurate EV assessment possible for technical development activities

---

Exceedingly relevant, and an important contributor, to EV



Systematic TPM

## Scope

**Broad, very detailed and commonly considered to be an  
“engineering” responsibility.**

---

**Actually crosses over many disciplines and  
their knowledge bases, including:**


**decision theory,  
information management,  
cost analysis,  
scheduling,  
risk analysis,**

**.....as well as engineering**

**Systematic TPM**



## What the Manager Needs to Know

- **How to identify a TPM process that can adequately support EV management, in terms of:**
    - monitoring
    - assessment
    - integrated analysis
  - **The characteristics of effective technical parameters**
  - **The primary components of technical performance baseline plans**
  - **Pro's and con's of assessment techniques**
- 

## Effective TPM

- **Procedurally consistent and, therefore, systematic**
- **Continuously documented, from planning through monitoring and assessment**
- **Provides for direct linkage of technical metrics to associated budgets, whether via WBS, IPT codes, or other structures**
- **Enjoys the support and commitment of key management personnel and a central point of contact, but is procedurally implemented throughout the program**
  - everyone with technical development responsibilities contributes to it

## Effective TPM

- Procedurally consistent and, therefore, systematic
- Continuously documented, from planning through monitoring and assessment
- Provides for direct linkage of technical metrics to associated budgets, whether via WBS, IPT codes, or other structures
- Enjoys the support and commitment of key management personnel and a central point of implementation implemented throughout the organization
  - everyone with technical responsibility contributes to it

**Not a “streamlining” activity**

**Not a process improvement**

**A new process**

## *Effective TPM*


- **Aggregates results of technical measures which clearly indicate the level of technical success achieved toward the Program mission, or MENS, at any given point in time**
  - requires a comprehensive set of *key* metrics
  - can't just do a “little piece” of the program
- **Employs strict baseline planning**
  - not just for measurement expectations and goals, but also for assessment tolerances

## Effective TPM

- Aggregates results of technical measures which clearly indicate the level of technical success achieved toward the

Pr

Code & Unit Test (Numbers of Modules Completed)



En

## *Effective TPM*

- Aggregates results of technical measures which clearly indicate the level of technical success achieved toward the Program mission, or MENS, at any given point in time
  - requires a comprehensive set of *key* metrics
  - can't just do a “little piece” of the program
- Employs strict baseline planning
  - not just for measurement assessment tolerances

**Not a replacement for human reasoning**

**An attempt to assist and improve it**



# Technical Parameters

- General characteristics:
  - Measurable
  - As a group, parameters are measurable throughout the development schedule, but particularly during the early phases of the program
  - Can be directly associated with likely risk areas, or requirements key to success of the program
- Parameter types:
  - Performance
    - Examples: speed, weight (empty and gross), cooling/ambient temp., mission radius, range, velocity, aeroelastic stability, radar cross section, receiver sensitivity, noise, accuracy
    - Highly measurable, but not early in a program unless significant modeling activities are undertaken
    - Easily associated with key program requirements


# Technical Parameters

- Supportability (includes reliability and maintainability):
  - Examples: MTBF, MTTR, MTBCF, % of standard components, level of modularity, upgrade/expansion capability, support equipment availability, avionics fault detection, mechanical deployment reliability
  - Frequently related to common risk areas
- Software
  - Examples: S/W requirements stability, design and code (modules completed), unit test (modules passed), FQT (modules passed), S/W size estimated (SLOC, a measure of efficiency), S/W size delivered (SLOC), memory utilization/reserve (% of capacity), processor throughput
  - Comprise a major risk area on most programs
  - Many are measurable during the early phases of development

# Technical Parameters

- Producibility
  - Examples: critical material avail., special manufacturing equip. avail., special facility avail.
  - If these can be modeled during development, can be very effective indicators of overall program success
- Engineering processes
  - Examples: rework/redesign (% of labor hours), yield (first time production inspection success rate), staffing, design progress (including document prep.), problem reports closed, safety hazards mitigated
  - early indicators of productivity and product quality
- Affordability
  - Examples: design-to-cost (unit recurring), life cycle cost
  - Can be modeled throughout the development
  - Represents an ever-increasing concern to design systems to cost

# Establishing the Technical Performance Baseline



Hierarchy structure establishes relationships and relative importance of parameters

Facilitates aggregation of technical status


Time-phased plan of expected measurement values and the performance objective for each parameter

Time-slice representation of tolerances for each measurement date on a given performance plan

# Air-Deployable Active Receiver (Sonobuoy) Technical Parameter Hierarchy

Sonobuoy  
 Technical  
 Status

System  
 Requirements  
 Level →



ABAF-VHF  
 Transmitter  
 Design

ABFC - RF  
 Transceiver  
 Tests

ABAG-UHF  
 Receiver  
 Design

ABFC - RF  
 Transceiver  
 Tests


ABFE-  
 Beamforming  
 Design,  
 Engineering

ABBI -  
 Beamforming  
 S/W Analysis,  
 Code, Unit  
 Test

ABFI - S/W  
 Validation  
 and Test

ABBI -  
 Beamforming  
 S/W Analysis,  
 Code, Unit  
 Test

Lowest level parameters are  
 linked to WBS elements



**B**

**Transmitter ERP**

**20%**  
**Array Element Position Accuracy (SLL)**  
ABCD-Array Hydrodynamics Design  
ABFB-Salt Water Pool Test  
ABFM-Array Deflection Test  
AKA-Over The Side Test

**20%**  
**Compass Reading Error**  
ABBB-Compass Subsys. Design  
ABBE- Subsurface Sys. I&T  
ABEB-Subsurface Elec. I&T

**20%**  
**Total Buoy Weight**

**25%**  
**Surface Unit**  
**25%**  
**Sub-Surface Elec. Unit**  
**25%**  
**25%**  
**Array Unit**  
**25%**  
**25%**  
**Suspension Unit**

**20%**  
**Out-of-band signal, filter rejection**  
ABBF-Array Interface Design

**20%**  
**Mechanical Self Noise**  
ABFO-Mechanical Noise Design, I&T

**C**

**System Engineering Processes**

**25%**  
**S.E. Staffing**  
**25%**  
**Surface Unit**  
**25%**  
**Sub-Surface Elec. Unit**  
**25%**  
**25%**  
**Array Unit**  
**25%**  
**Suspension Unit**

**50%**  
**System Reqmts Volatility**  
**25%**  
**Surface Unit**  
**25%**  
**Sub-Surface Elec. Unit**  
**25%**  
**25%**  
**Array Unit**  
**25%**  
**Suspension Unit**

**25%**  
**Engineering Analyses**  
AAA-System Partitioning  
AAB-Architectural Trade-off  
AAC-Mechanical Trade-off  
AAD-Hydrodynamics Analysis

Subparameters and WBS Linkages same as "Power Consumption"

Subparameters and WBS Linkages same as "Power Consumption"

Subparameters and WBS Linkages same as "Power Consumption"

## Technical Parameter Aggregation by WBS

- Facilitates Calculation of Technical Status for Applicable WBS Elements -

ABAD -  
Battery Design  
& Test

- Battery Capacity
- Surface Unit Battery Power Consumption
- SE Staffing (Surface Unit)
- System Requirements Volatility

ABAF - VHF  
Transmitter  
Design

- Tx Pwr Amp Output at 137 MHz
- Tx Pwr Amp Output at 155 MHz
- Tx Pwr Amp Output at 171 MHz
- Surface Unit VHF Transmitter Power Consumption
- SE Staffing (Surface Unit)
- System Requirements Volatility

ABBB - Compass  
Subsystem  
Design

- Compass Reading Error
- Sub-surface Elec. Unit Battery Power Consumption
- SE Staffing (Sub-surface Elec. Unit)
- System Requirements Volatility

ABFC - RF  
Transceiver  
Tests

- Tx Pwr Amp Output at 137 MHz
- Tx Pwr Amp Output at 155 MHz
- Tx Pwr Amp Output at 171 MHz
- Rx Channel 1 Sensitivity
- Rx Channel 2 Sensitivity
- Rx Channel 3 Sensitivity
- Rx Channel 4 Sensitivity
- Rx Channel 5 Sensitivity
- Rx Channel 6 Sensitivity
- Rx Channel 7 Sensitivity
- Rx Channel 8 Sensitivity
- Rx Channel 9 Sensitivity
- Rx Channel 10 Sensitivity

AKA -  
Over-The-Side  
Tests


- Array Element Position Accuracy
- Mechanical Life

**First step toward integration  
with C/S**



# Performance Plans and Tolerances

Code & Unit Test (Numbers of Modules Completed)




# Performance Plans and Tolerances - Data Collection

Name Jane Doe				Date 9/3/97		Next Interview		Page 1 of 1									
Phone 703-555-1212		Bldg 72	Room 220		Interviewer			Tech. Achievement Plan? ID									
TPM Parameter Description Code and Unit Test (Numbers of Modules Completed)				CWBS 1224		Suitable for Simulation? Results?		Notes									
				Risk Item?													
				Status Code													
Type of Risk Curve:	Single <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Double		Other	Custom		Distribution Type										
DATA POINTS	Continuous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Discrete		Step Function?													
Parameter Measurement		Lower Bounds (Tolerance Band)						Profile	Upper Bounds (Tolerance Band)						Line		
		Likelihood of Achieving PV* at next milestone															
Milestones (MS)		10%		50%		90%		100%	90%		50%		10%		Nbr		
MS ID	Date	10% Confidence Value	% of PV	50% Confidence Value	% of PV	90% Confidence Value	% of PV	Planned Value	Value	% of PV	Value	% of PV	Value	% of PV		70% RED Confidence	85% YELLOW Confidence
CDR	8/22/97	0.7	5%	1.5	10%	5.8	40%	14.6							1	3.7	5.3
	9/26/97	2.8	10%	9.8	35%	19.6	70%	28.0							2	14.7	18.4
	10/24/97	10.3	25%	18.5	45%	30.9	75%	41.2							3	24.7	29.4
	11/21/97	20.7	40%	28.4	55%	43.9	85%	51.7							4	36.2	42.0
	12/26/97	35.1	57%	40.0	65%	54.2	88%	61.6							5	47.1	52.4
	1/23/98	47.6	70%	51.0	75%	61.2	90%	68.0							6	56.1	59.9
	2/20/98	57.5	75%	61.4	80%	71.3	93%	76.7							7	66.3	70.1
	3/27/98	66.8	78%	70.3	82%	80.6	94%	85.7							8	75.4	79.3
	4/24/98	77.9	85%	80.6	88%	87.0	95%	91.6							9	83.8	86.2
	5/22/98	84.1	88%	86.0	90%	91.8	96%	95.6							10	88.9	91.1
	6/26/98	87.9	89%	89.9	91%	95.8	97%	98.8							11	92.9	95.1
Int Test	7/24/98	90.0	90%	92.0	92%	98.0	98%	100							12	95.0	97.3


# Performance Plans and Tolerances

- Employs engineering confidence assessment for technical performance planning to quantify each measurement in terms of the probability success of achieving the next expected measurement goal
- Places all parameters on a common unit of measure for summary roll-ups of technical status




- Isolates subjectivity at up-front planning stage, allowing measurement activities/milestones to become objective assessments


Tolerance for: BATT CAP measures on 08/04/92



Tolerance for: BATT CAP measures on 09/30/92




Tolerance for: BATT CAP measures on 10/15/92



## Assessment Techniques & the *Beyond*

- Manual development of tolerances such as risk profiles is limited in its ability to fully establish the relationships between the parameters themselves
- Operating in environments rife with uncertainties, the manual approach leaves holes in the probabilistic assessments of technical status
- Parameter relationships are incomplete, defining only “relative importance” resulting in an impure probabilistic approach
- The use of artificial intelligence techniques such as Belief Networks can fill in these gaps by capturing believed relations between the parameters as part of the baseline process



ABFD- Mechanical Deployment Design & Eng.


ABFJ - Mech. OTS Deploy.

ABFK-Mech. Deploy. Air Drop

ABFB - Saltwater Pool Tests

AKA - OTS Tests

# Belief Network Representation



# Relationship Table

Node: **electrical\_life** ▼

**Chance** ▼

Apply


Okay

Load

Close

buoy_pwr...	battery_ca...	Long	Optimal	Short
Low	Low	10.000	50.000	40.000
Low	Optimal	60.000	40.000	0.000
Low	High	100.00	0.000	0.000
Optimal	Low	0.000	30.000	70.000
Optimal	Optimal	20.000	80.000	0.000
Optimal	High	80.000	20.000	0.000
High	Low	0.000	0.000	100.00
High	Optimal	0.000	20.000	80.000
High	High	30.000	60.000	10.000

# Belief Network Updated with Findings





## Summary of Effective TPM

- **Procedurally consistent and continuously documented**
- **Direct linkage of technical metrics to associated budgets**
- **Has the support and commitment of key management personnel and a focused staff**
- **Aggregates results of technical measures**
  - requires a comprehensive set of *key* metrics
- **Employs strict baseline planning**
- **Key parameters are measurable throughout the development schedule, but particularly during the early phases of the program**
  - should be aggregated by WBS for integration with C/S
- **Parameter relationships must be detailed to the fullest extent possible to obtain sound probabilistic assessments relating to forecasts of technical success**
  - use of AI techniques to aid human reasoning

Technical Performance Measurement Associates, Inc.

P.O. Box 404

Catharpin, VA 20143

(703) 753-2766

(703) 754-4923 FAX

email: [tpma@erols.com](mailto:tpma@erols.com)