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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
- $60 Billion goal
The 1990’s - Shrinking Industrial Base
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Reengineering EVMS

October 1993 - A Vision

Inspection  →  Management
Earned Value Management: Implementation Problems

- “Financial Management”
- Audit-like reviews
- Reporting focus
- Too many “surprises”
  - A-12 (Navy)
  - AAWS-M (Army)
  - C-17 (Air Force)
- Challenge: keep good principles, stop bad practices
Lesson of the A-12
The “Beach” Report, A-12 Administrative Inquiry, 28 Nov 1990

- Too often, earned value insights remain the sole province of the supporting program control staff of both contractors and the government.
  - Earned value must be an integral part of the performing design and manufacturing organizations.
  - Only when program technical staffs are held accountable for earned value analysis, will they begin to understand its implications.
The Need For Change:
C/SCSC never had a chance!

- RFP Review Results 1991 - 1993
- Significant misapplication of requirements
  - 50% have WBS problems
  - 75% have excessive variance reporting requirements
Unnecessary Cost

December, 1994, Coopers & Lybrand/TASC Study:

“The DoD Regulatory Cost Premium: A Quantitative Assessment”

and

COST/SCHEDULE CONTROL SYSTEMS (C/SCS)
**C&L/TASC Cost Drivers:**

*Cost without a requirement*

- Total DoD Cost Premium is 18%
- C/SCS Cost Premium is 0.9%
  - Nearly 3/4 is in Eng’g/Prog Mgmt
    - Written control account variances
  - Most of Remainder is in administrative and external reporting activities
Good idea, bad implementation
(C&L/TASC Cost Drivers)

• “In general, industry views the general framework and principles of cost/schedule reporting positively.

• However, all contractors subject to C/SCS agree that, as currently required by DoD, cost/schedule reporting is too detailed, repetitive, and voluminous to be used effectively as a management tool by either the government or industry...”
The paradigm must change

- EVMS reporting system is of little value;
- Program Management, not audits;
- The Vision:
  - The quality of a contractor’s management system is determined
  - not by the absence of defects,
  - but by the presence of management value.
Services & industry Challenged

Implement “Model Program”

● Initiated Oct 93

● Shift Ownership From Financial Management to Program Management
  ◆ Change emphasis from government system to contractor systems
  ◆ Reduce the review burden
  ◆ Limit reporting
  ◆ Ensure comprehensive planning and common understanding of the task
  ◆ Integrate cost, schedule, technical performance, and risk management
The Acquisition Executives Take Charge

INTEGRATED PROGRAM MANAGEMENT INITIATIVE
September 1994
Key Building Blocks
Integrated Program Management Initiative

- Model Program Objectives
- WBS
- IPTs
- Integrated Baseline Review (IBR)
- “Right Size” Reporting
- Integrated Digital Environment
- Training
Work Breakdown Structure: The Key to Integration

MIL-HDBK-881
The Control Account: Where the Action is

- Plan
- Budget
- Schedule
- Corrective Action

CAs under IPTs as appropriate
Reengineering EVM: Integrated Baseline Reviews

- Within 6 months of award
- Mutually understand plan:
  - Scope
  - Schedule
  - Resources
- Planning process vs. event
- PM leads
  - EVM staff supports
  - Management system reviews effectively eliminated

IBR Training
- Schedules
- Mgmt. Systems

Risk
Growing Consensus:
Gov’t/Industry Best Practice

- Dec. ‘96 DoD accepted industry EVMS guidelines as C/SCSC replacement
- Reserved right for government reviews
  - As determined by project manager
  - “Self-certification” not in public interest
- Encouraged “true” standard
  - ANSI/EIA 748-98 EVMS issued in 1998
  - DoD and industry EVMS criteria are equal
  - International discussions - Australia, Canada, UK, US
Earned Value Management: Origins

Industry Best Practices

Government Requirements

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

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

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

CANCELLED
DoD Since 1993… Results!

- DoD EVM
  - Value reaffirmed
  - Shifted to Industry; DCMC Exec. Agent
  - OMB policy
  - Trilateral MoU
  - Intl. Perf. Mgmt. Council
  - Commercial
  - In-house

- Prof. associations
- Adopted by NASA, FAA, NRO, FBI, CoE
- Enterprise-wide
  - Boeing
  - Raytheon
  - Lockheed Martin
  - and others...
- No major surprises

Aggregate overrun 5.5% ($1.2B on $72.8B; 66% comp.)
They’re even doing it in industry!

- **Industry**
  - Boeing Defense & Space Group
  - Lockheed Martin Sunnyvale
  - McDonnell Douglas
  - Motorola Iridium™
  - Navistar
  - Delta Airlines
  - Delco Electronics
  - Industry “Standard”
    - ANSI

- **Project Management Institute**
In-house Workshop Tasks

My Opinions

- Validation & Surveillance
  - Policy changes?
  - Who performs?

- Implementation
  - Can in-house meet all 32 criteria?

- Accounting Systems
  - Are DoD, non-CAS systems compliant?

- Data Analysis & Training
  - Do PMs need EV data?
Earned Value Management Systems
Basic requirements

- **COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING PROCESS**
  - Covers entire statement of work
  - Schedules activities
  - Allocates resources

- **FULLY INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS**
  - Scheduling systems integrated with one another, and with work authorization system, accounting system, MRP, work measurement system, etc. For example:
    - Interdependencies between department, functional, and/or IPT schedules (horizontal integration)
    - Interdependencies from lowest level to master schedule (vertical integration)
The quality of a contractor’s management system is determined not by the absence of defects, but by the presence of management value.