

FRA EVMS Surveillance Review – March 2011

March 7-9, 2011

*The table below contains only the comments applicable to the NOvA Project

No.	Committee Recommendation	NOvA Response
CAR-01	<p>The EAC is being analyzed at the Project level. In interviews with the CAMs, the CAMs indicated they have no input to the EAC. It was found that when the CAMs do their monthly status report, they do not perform an analysis of the project risks (see CAR10) nor do the CAMs include proposed change requests in the EAC.</p>	<p>Closed – Updates to the EAC are made to un-started activities whenever a baseline change is proposed by the CAM’s. BAC changes must be preceded by making changes to the EAC for the tasks involved. CAM’s are intimately involved when costs change. A recent example would be the oil price fluctuations in May & June that resulted in an increase in May and a decrease in June.</p>
CAR-02	<p>CR238 “Schedule Adjustments for Selected Detector Assembly Tasks with Baseline Start Dates in Oct 2010” changes the baseline schedule from having start dates in Oct 2010 to start dates in Jan 2011. The CR was initiated on 11/16/2010, received “preliminary approval” on 11/16/2010” but did not receive final approval until 1/7/2011. According to discussions with the Project Scheduler during the interview process, changes to the PMB were made in Nov 2010 prior to the final approval of the CR. In discussions with Project personnel this practice is implemented in multiple areas within the project.</p>	<p>Closed – This example was one we changed to account for the vendor being 5 months late and gouging a piece out of a part. The task was in progress because we had been making progress. The L2 and Scheduler discussed the best way to handle it, including splitting it into past and future work packages. We decided on this approach, not to eliminate variances but, to better match our expectations of future work activities.</p>
CAR-03	<p>VARs are not completed in a timely manner during the monthly status cycle. VARs were sampled for WBS 2.0.1.2 and resulted in uncovering October, November, and December VARs were not prepared, approved, or fully signed until February. This lag in generation versus final approval implies that the information is not being review in a timely manner and therefore not possibly being used by senior management. After further interviews with the PM, CAMS, and Project Controls it was determined that VARs have no formal deadline for completion or approval at the CAM and PM level. A clear project business process/monthly update cycle regarding the VAR process and utilization of its information for management decision-making is absent from the PEP. Regardless, it does not allow the project to use the VARs effectively.</p>	<p>Closed – Additional personnel have been added to the NOvA Project Office to address this issue. VAR’s are now completed in a more timely manner and turnaround time has decreased.</p>

CAR-04	A Corrective Action Log is not created or maintained as required by the FRA EVM System.	Closed – A Log did exist (DocDB #3614) but it was not current. Additional personnel have been added to the NOvA Project Office to maintain this Log and keep it current.
CIO-05	It is recommended that the actual cost file be validated by the Finance Group and entered into the EV system by a person in Project Controls to ensure the integrity of the Actual Cost data reported on a monthly basis.	N/A – This is a Laboratory issue and cannot be answered by NOvA.
CAR-06	CAMs interviewed that are uncosted scientists stated that they charge an estimated or an average time per week to the project. They do not report time based on the actual hours worked. They indicated that they work more hours for the project than they charge to the project.	Closed – CAM’s have been instructed by the Project Manager, as part of a Technical Board meeting, to report their time based on actual hours worked instead of an estimate or a monthly average.
CAR-07	Control Account Managers (CAMs) are required to undergo CAM Refresher Training on an annual basis per the FRA EVMS System Description. CAM Refresher Training was held over 1 year ago.	N/A – Training is scheduled and administered by the Directorate. NOvA CAM’s will attend when sessions become available.
CIO-08	In the Conventional Construction WBS, Contingency was entered into the Performance Measurement Baseline (PMB) and performance was earned on the task that contained the Contingency. This is in clear violation of the FRA EVM System Description and ANSI standard.	Closed – The word “contingency” was removed from the name of this task and this specific task is complete. This was not contingency in the sense that it represented Project contingency held by NOvA. The task in question was on the Cooperative Agreement building. CA’s are not subject to FRA EVMS requirements nor are they required to follow 413.3. In the MOU with the University of Minnesota (UMN), they agreed to report EVMS information. UMN elected to keep this money under their control rather than hand it up front to the vendor. This task was placed as a line item in our schedule and in COBRA to hold and track budget that represented management reserve held by the far detector building contractor. It could not be assigned to any other particular task in his scope of work at the time we established the baseline. Once the money was applied to the rock claim, we earned performance on it. We had no expectation of this budget being returned to NOvA for use elsewhere and the amount budgeted was required to be included in our PMB to match the contractor’s price for the work.

CIO-09	<p>As a best practice, the CAMs should be required to understand their milestones and inter-dependencies of tasks and how they impact the project. The PM should be encouraged/trained in the development and use of relevant milestones. The NOvA project schedule should be adjusted to incorporate more meaningful internal milestones rather than the external scheduled milestones (e.g. DOE CD4) to allow the CAMs to understand the true critical path. Project controls and the CAMs should work together on the schedule with the CAMs actually taking ownership of the schedule.</p>	<p>Closed - We have over 500 “Internal” milestones to provide information to CAM’s. Plots are generated for all of them every month and distributed for CAM’s to review. These plots are filtered in several different ways and show progress for all WBS sections. We also now discuss the critical path for the Far Detector at every Technical Board meeting. Accelerator work is already discussed at every Project Management Group meeting.</p>
CAR-10	<p>There was no evidence provided to the team that a Risk Management Board exists for the project, nor is there clear evidence that the Level 2 managers are fully integrated into the formal process of risk management.</p> <p>There does not seem to be any evidence of fluctuations in remaining contingency</p>	<p>Closed - Our Risk Management Plan states (pg 2) that we have a Risk Management Board. It is essentially identical to our Technical Board for good reason (these are the people who understand the risks). We do meet routinely and we do discuss risk.</p> <p>As to the issue of fluctuations in remaining contingency, there is a report every month both in the monthly report and at the Project management Group meetings that show the remaining contingency and the change from the previous month.</p>
CIO-11	<p>The WBS Dictionary definitions are not consistent between the highest level of the WBS and the control account (lowest level of the WBS). The scope definitions in the PEP didn’t match the WBS Dictionary posted on the website nor did it match the definitions in the scheduling tool. It is recommended that the team modify the WBS Dictionary so it clearly states the scope at the lowest level (control account). It is recommended that the WBS Dictionary be placed under configuration control (version control) and be posted in a location readily available to the project team. If this information is to be kept in the scheduling tool, it is recommended the definitions be updated in the tool as well.</p>	<p>Closed – The WBS Dictionary will be kept as part of the Open Plan scheduling tool. Updates to the WBS Dictionary will be generated from Open Plan and saved to DocDB so that both remain consistent. Formal configuration control will not be necessary. High level scope definitions in the PEP will be reviewed and evaluated to determine if there is truly a gap in definitions.</p>
CAR-12	<p>Effective, objective measurement was not established for all activities that exceeded a two month duration. This is not in line with FRA’s EVMS System Description, and as a result non compliances exist for those activities without objective performance metrics.</p>	<p>Closed – The measurement methods currently used by NOvA were presented to, and approved by, the DOE (Lehman) Review committees. The actual wording in the FRA EVMS System Description does not mandate a specific method but, instead, only suggests a preferred method.</p>

CIO-13	<p>In order for the Project Controls staff to implement Earned Value management for the benefit of the project, it is recommended that the project controls staff report organizationally to an autonomous group which would allow for the most effective, value added objective assessment of project performance. This recommendation would benefit the project enabling the Project Controls staff to provide objective performance measurement, reporting and oversight to the project. Centralizing Project Controls affords the project and future projects an opportunity to standardize tools, templates, performance assessment and reporting across the Laboratory.</p>	<p>Closed - The Project Controls personnel report through the PPD Chain of Command. This provides the independence the Review team suggests.</p> <p>Saxer and Vendetta (Financial) report to E. Arroyo in PPD Office. Johnson (Admin) reports to E. Phillips in PPD Office. Brown (Project Controls) reports to D. Glenzinski in CDF. Only Freeman (Scheduler), Ferguson, and Sarlina report directly to the Project Manager.</p>
--------	---	---