

Title: Corrective Action Request	Page # of ## 1 of 1	Encode: C1	Rev #: 0
-------------------------------------	------------------------	---------------	-------------

Corrective Action Request

1. Subject: Work Authorizations	2. Guideline Ref: 3, 6	3. Control Number: CAR 1
4. CA#, WBS#, or Functional Area: Across all seven projects that were evaluated during the EVMS Review		5. Major <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> _____ Minor _____
6. Description: Five of the seven projects evaluated did not comply with the work authorization requirements specified in the WSRC Earned Value Management System (EVMS) Description section 3.7 (Work Authorization and Execution). Project 3013 and 247 were the only project that complied with the guideline. The authorizing document between the Department of Energy (DOE) and Westinghouse Savannah River Company (WSRC), is the Environmental Management (EM) Program Contract Performance Baseline. Work authorization then flows through the Work Authorization Execution Plan (WAEP) to the projects, however, authorization from the project manager to the control account manager as specified in the EVMS System Description was not being implemented.		
7. Attachments:		

Prepared By: L. Dissel	Date: 03/04/05	Reviewed By: W. Uribe	Date:	Supplier:	PMO:
---------------------------	-------------------	--------------------------	-------	-----------	------

Title:	Page # of ##	Encode:	Rev #:
Corrective Action Request	1 of 1	C1	0

Corrective Action Request

1. Subject: Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) Dictionary	2. Guideline Ref: 1	3. Control Number: CAR 2
4. CA#, WBS#, or Functional Area: WBS Dictionary		5. Major _____ Minor <u> X </u>
6. Description: The Westinghouse Savannah River Company (WSRC) Earned Value Management System Description requires each project to develop a WBS Dictionary and prescribes specific attributes that are to be included in each WBS Dictionary. The seven projects reviewed provided a WBS Dictionary, or equivalent documentation; however, the documents did not include all of the attributes described in the WSRC EVM System Description (Section 2.1), and there was no consistency in the documentation across all projects.		
7. Attachments: See any project's WBS Dictionary		

Prepared By: D. Ridgely	Date: 03/04/05	Reviewed By: W. Uribe	Date:	Supplier:	PMO:
-----------------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------	------------------	-------------

Ref: C1 Corrective Action Request

Title:	Page # of ##	Encode:	Rev #:
Corrective Action Request	1 of 1	C1	0

Corrective Action Request

1. Subject: Inconsistencies of existing policies and procedure relative to preparation of "bottoms-up" EAC's	2. Guideline Ref: 27	3. Control Number: CAR 3
4. CA#, WBS#, or Functional Area: Frequency of "bottoms-up" EAC calculations		5. Major _____ Minor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
6. Description: <p>There appears to be an inconsistency between WSRC documentation.</p> <p>The <i>WSRC Earned Value Management System Description</i> Glossary states that EAC's should be performed semi-annually or as required by the project PEP. WSRC Manual E-11, Paragraph 2.13, Rev. 8 states that a "bottoms-up" EAC shall be performed on all non-capital equipment every twelve months. The WSRC Guide 1.9 (Performance Measurement, Analysis and Reporting) states that the site contract and the PEP define the frequency for preparing a comprehensive EAC is generally every six to twelve months. Contract Mod 120, section 7.2 item 1 states EAC for active projects shall be evaluated at least semi-annually.</p> <p>Reviews of WSRC project documents found that EAC's are being performed; however, the frequency of EAC updates is inconsistent across the projects.</p>		
7. Attachments: WSRC Manual E-11, Proc 2.13, Rev 8 dated 2/18/04 Contract Mod 120, section 7.2, dated July 8, 2004 WSRC Earned Value Management System Description, WSRC-RR-2004-00730, Rev A, page B-5 and section 5.2.1, page 5-3, dated 11/19/04 Guide 1.9 Performance Measurement, Analysis, and Reporting, Rev B, dated 12/15/04		

Prepared By:	Date:	Reviewed By:	Date:	Supplier:	PMO:
T. Vought L. Belton D. Boyea P. Wilson	3/4/05	W. Uribe			

Title: Corrective Action Request	Page # of ## 1 of 1	Encode: C1	Rev #: 0
-------------------------------------	------------------------	---------------	-------------

1. Subject: EV Data Trace	2. Guideline Ref: 7	3. Control Number: CAR 4
4. CA#, WBS#, or Functional Area: SGCP - TNXOU CA 1109		5. Major _____ Minor <u>X</u>
6. Description: <p>The team examined Work Package 1109-P4-16-0116022. The team was given a report that showed the BCWP for January (current month) of \$62,703 and a cumulative to date BCWP of \$689,732 for that work package (Construction OTSB). The team attempted to perform a trace for the BCWP data for this work package. The CAM and the PC Manager stated that the EV was based on a subjective value for the percent complete for the work package. However, both individuals were unable to describe how the percent complete was derived and how the EV was calculated. The team then attempted to guide the CAM and PC Manager through the derivation of the calculations, but they were still unable to describe how the percent complete was calculated, other than stating that the value was subjective. In addition, it was very apparent that the BCWS for the subcontracted portion of this work package (\$1.6 million) was very different from the deliverables schedule (pay items) for the awarded firm fixed price subcontract. This led to a very unrealistic BCWS profile (e.g., the BCWS for December 2004 and January 2005 were \$1.09 million and \$0.92 million respectively on a \$6.27 million work package that takes over two years to complete).</p> <p>Because of these discrepancies or inability to describe the methods for calculating EV, the team has little confidence that the EVMS data for this work package, and possibly the entire control account are accurate.</p> <p>It was apparent that the CAM needed additional training and experience in the application of EVMS as a project management tool.</p>		
7. Attachments: SGCP GSA Control Account Plan - Page 23 of 98.		

Prepared By: T. Konopnicki	Date: 03/04/05	Reviewed By: W. Uribe	Date: 03/04/05	Supplier:	PMO:
-------------------------------	-------------------	--------------------------	-------------------	-----------	------

Ref: C1 Corrective Action Request

Title:	Page # of ##	Encode:	Rev #:
Continuous Improvement Opportunity (CIO)	1 of 1	C3	0

Continuous Improvement Opportunity

1. Subject: On-going Training Program on EV Determination (Internal Surveillance).	2. Guideline Ref (if applicable): 7	3. Control Number: CIO 1
4. CA#, WBS#, or Functional Area:		
This CIO became CAR 4.		
6. Attachments:		

Prepared By:	Date:	Reviewed By:	Date:	Supplier:	PMO:
T. Konopnicki	03/03/05	W. Uribe	03/03/05		

Title:	Page # of ##	Encode:	Rev #:
Continuous Improvement Opportunity (CIO)	1 of 1	C3	0

Continuous Improvement Opportunity

1. Subject: Standardization among project earned value systems / processes.	2. Guideline Ref (if applicable):	3. Control Number: CIO 2
4. CA#, WBS#, or Functional Area: All projects.		
5. Description: The recommendation is made to migrate toward EVMS consistency among the existing projects, and to proactively apply EVMS processes and outputs uniformly to future projects. Among the benefits of consistent EVMS applications are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved effectiveness of EVMS training for CAMs, Project Controls and Project Management personnel and other users of the EVMS data. • Universal ease of use of standard basic EVMS formats for all levels of project management. This would include documents such as work authorizing documents, control account plans, variance analysis reports, cost performance reports, etc. Use of standard, basic documentation may require implementation of a common cost processor. • Standard formats that improve performance measurement data usability at levels consistent with management need, such as a CAP or work package that provides the basic timephased performance measure elements in a single document as opposed to needing multiple documents. • Helps to minimize non-compliance issues through application of accepted practices to all projects. • Facilitates the cross-utilization of resources among the projects. <p>Secondly, it was apparent that the projects were required to back-fit their existing systems into the requirements established by the system description. While this may have been necessary to demonstrate system compliance, it also appears that generation of additional paperwork may have resulted. As such, a standardization, or consistency of system processes will facilitate a streamlining of the individual project processes and potentially reduce the administrative burden on the individual project systems.</p>		
6. Attachments: None.		

Prepared By: J. Talley	Date: 03/04/05	Reviewed By: W. Uribe	Date:	Supplier:	PMO:
---------------------------	-------------------	--------------------------	-------	-----------	------

Title:	Page # of ##	Encode:	Rev #:
Continuous Improvement Opportunity (CIO)	1 of 1	C3	0

1. Subject: Resolution of Minor Data Anomalies (TEF)	2. Guideline Ref (if applicable): 22 and 23,	3. Control Number: CIO 3
4. CA#, WBS#, or Functional Area: TEF Project		
5. Description: <p>The team was provided with a TEC project S-6091 Project Cost Performance Report (CPR). The CPR contained data through December, 2004. Several items requiring explanation were noticed in the report. For example, for three work packages, data were reported for current month BCWS and BCWP, while the ACWP was zero (Work Packages E6091WSTE Waste Disposal Services, E6091AJ22 ROP: Start-up Material, and E6091CALB Breaker & PRV Calibration & Testing). For work package, E6091WSTE (which has been open for a year or more), the percent complete was 90.38%, and yet the ACWP was zero. The BCWS and BCWP for this work package were identical at a value of \$110,565. In addition to these discrepancies, for the E6091CALB work package, the BCWP exceeds the BCWS (\$460,908 vs \$426,078) even though the work package is reported as 100% complete. Thus, the SPI is also 1.08. When the work package is complete, the SPI should be 1.00. For E6091CALB, the CPI is 6.11. This may be an anomaly.</p> <p>Similarly, for work packages E6091AFL1 TEF Recondition Extin and E6091BLBC RHB/TPB Subcontract Backcharge, the work packages are shown as 100% complete, with zero BCWS and BCWP, and actual costs of \$26,327 and \$20,126 respectively.</p> <p>WSRC should establish a monthly process whereby these types of data anomalies are reviewed and corrected in a timely manner for each project utilizing their EVMS.</p>		
6. Attachments: TEF Project S-6091 Project Cost Performance Report pages 9 of 18 and 13 of 18.		

Prepared By: T. Konopnicki	Date: 03/05/05	Reviewed By: W. Uribe	Date: 03/05/05	Supplier:	PMO:
--------------------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------	------------------	-------------

Title:	Page # of ##	Encode:	Rev #:
Continuous Improvement Opportunity (CIO)	1 of 1	C3	0

1. Subject: Change Incorporation	2. Guideline Ref (if applicable): 32	3. Control Number: CIO 4
4. CA#, WBS#, or Functional Area: Not applicable		
5. Description: ANSI/EIA-748 Guidelines, Ref. 32 states: Document changes to the Performance Measurement Baseline (PMB). The Intent Guide for ANSI/EIA-748 suggests that this guideline be implemented using change controls logs that address management reserve, undistributed budget, performance measurement baseline, and contract budget base, reflecting changes from the original contract budget base. In practice it has been found that the use of a Contract Budget Base Change log that includes all of these elements will provide management with a comprehensive tool for identifying each change as it is incorporated into the current baseline and the affect of these changes on the PMB, MR, Contingency, UB, and/or the Budget at Complete (BAC). The WSRC EVMS does not provide for a uniform method of documenting changes to the Performance Measurement Baseline that addresses these areas. We believe that a uniform CBB Log would enhance management's ability to track and control changes to the PMB. Document reviews and interviews found that many different approaches and log formats are being used to document changes to the PMB. Examples of some of these are attached for reference. A sample of a CBB Log which displays all of the elements of PMB changes is also attached as a suggestion of a "best practices" for addressing this CIO.		
6. Attachments: Reports/Presentation Example: 3013 Container Surveillance & Storage Capability 235-F TEF 247F Closure Project Suggested "Best Practices" CBB Log		

Prepared By: Jim Smrha Kurt Fisher Jeannine Bordini Sheron Smith	Date: 3/04/05	Reviewed By: W. uribe	Date:	Supplier:	PMO:
--	------------------	--------------------------	-------	-----------	------

Title:	Page # of ##	Encode:	Rev #:
Continuous Improvement Opportunity (CIO)	1 of 1	C3	0

Continuous Improvement Opportunity

1. Subject: Variance Analysis Report	2. Guideline Ref (if applicable): 25	3. Control Number: CIO 5
4. CA#, WBS#, or Functional Area: Analysis & Management Report		
5. Description: Variance Analysis Report format does not show Current Period or To-date cost and schedule variance. By adding SV and CV for the current period and to-date by dollars and percentage the quality of report will be improved. This will identify variances that have exceeded thresholds.		
6. Attachments: Page 8 of Tritium Extraction Facility Project 98-D-125 Monthly Status Report January 2005. Tritium Extraction Facility-Project S-609 Variance Analysis Report.		

Prepared By: T. Vought L. Belton D. Boyea P. Wilson	Date: 3/4/05	Reviewed By: W. Uribe	Date:	Supplier:	PMO:
--	------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------	------------------	-------------

Title:	Page # of ##	Encode:	Rev #:
Continuous Improvement Opportunity (CIO)	1 of 1	C3	0

Continuous Improvement Opportunity

1. Subject: CPR not consistent	2. Guideline Ref (if applicable): N/A	3. Control Number: CIO 6
4. CA#, WBS#, or Functional Area:		
5. Description: This CIO was rolled into CIO 2.		
6. Attachments:		

Prepared By:	Date:	Reviewed By:	Date:	Supplier:	PMO:

Title:	Page # of ##	Encode:	Rev #:
Continuous Improvement Opportunity (CIO)	1 of 1	C3	0

Continuous Improvement Opportunity

1. Subject: Standardized Reporting	2. Guideline Ref (if applicable): 22	3. Control Number: CIO 7
4. CA#, WBS#, or Functional Area:		
5. Description: This CIO was deleted.		
6. Attachments:		

Prepared By:	Date:	Reviewed By:	Date:	Supplier:	PMO:

Title	Page # of ##	Encode:	Rev #:
Continuous Improvement Opportunity (CIO)	1 of 1	C3	0

Continuous Improvement Opportunity

1. Subject: System Description, Glossary of Terms, Appendix B, Rev. A	2. Guideline Ref (if applicable): N/A	3. Control Number: CIO 8
4. CA#, WBS#, or Functional Area: System Description		
5. Description: Suggest reviewing and revising all definitions to ensure they are in agreement with industry standard definitions. Some definitions included information that is unrelated to the word being defined, some definitions included requirements, some contain redundant statements, and some are incorrect. Many of the words defined are not included in the system description or policy statement. See Attached Examples		
6. Attachments: System Description Glossary		

Prepared By: L. Mucciario	Date: 03/04/05	Reviewed By: W. Urbe	Date:	Supplier:	PMO:
-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	------------------	-------------

Title:	Page # of ##	Encode:	Rev #:
Continuous Improvement Opportunity (CIO)	1 of 1	C3	0

Continuous Improvement Opportunity

1. Subject: Management Reporting – Application of Overhead (ESS) and General & Administrative (G&A) Costs	2. Guideline Ref (if applicable): **26	3. Control Number: CIO 9
4. CA#, WBS#, or Functional Area: Not applicable – Project and Management Reporting		
5. Description: Reviews of WSRC project data and management data found that the reporting systems are structured to gather project status information for all management levels and data inventory is maintained to accommodate different focus areas and crosscuts. However, interviews conducted found that some management reports and presentations consisted of all-in costs, including overheads and G&A, while other management reports excluded these allocations of costs. In several interviews, personnel interviewed could not easily discern whether overheads and G&A had been applied. The reports reviewed did not provide clarification for the reviewers. For internal management reviews and for external distribution, this clarification should be addressed within the report, potentially as a footnote so that there is no possible confusion as to the report content. It is suggested that WSRC mandate that a standard be developed to include this information where overheads or G&A are not specifically identified. **Excerpt from NDIA PMSC ANSI/EIA 78-A Intent Guide 26, P. 35 of 45: “ ... data provided by the EVMS must be available to managers on a timely basis and must be of <u>sufficient quality</u> to ensure that effective management decisions can be made ... “		
6. Attachments: Reports/Presentation Example: 3013 Container Surveillance & Storage Capability 235-F February 28, 2005 Note: “Savannah Site Summary Report” does identify all project direct costs separate from G&A/EM costs.		

Prepared By: L. Lingle	Date: 05/04/05	Reviewed By: W. Uribe	Date:	Supplier:	PMO:
----------------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------	------------------	-------------