

Joint Analysis of Cost and Schedule (JACS)

AUW – February 2011

James Johnson – NASA HQ CAD Darren Elliott – Tecolote Research, Inc.



Overview

- NASA JCL Policy and Ensuing Implementation Challenges
- JACS Design
- JACS Demo



Background – NASA JCL Policy and Ensuing Implementation Challenges



What is JCL?

• JCL = Joint Confidence Level

 Identifies probability that a given project or program's cost will be equal or less than the targeted cost AND the schedule will be equal or less than the targeted schedule date

• JCL is More than the Scatter Plot

- Improves project planning by systematically integrating cost, schedule, and risk products and processes
- Facilitates transparency with stakeholders on probabilities of meeting expectations
- Provides a holistic picture of ability to achieve cost and schedule goals and to help the determination of reserves (schedule and cost)

• Provides key decision support information

- Does the project have enough funds?
- Can the project meet the schedule?
- What are areas of risk in the project?
- What mitigation strategies provide best benefit?
- What are project phasing (fund) needs?





Policy History at NASA

- Probabilistic estimating guidance was first mentioned in February 2006 in an email from the NASA Administrator directing NASA's largest program, Constellation, to budget to a 65% confidence level
 - Policy was further honed at NASA Strategic Management Council so that "NASA's standard practices will be to budget projects at a 70% confidence level based on the independent cost estimate. Any proposed deviations from this standard must be brought forward for consideration to the appropriate management council."
- Formally documented guidance a year later in March/April 2007 (NPD 1000.5)
 - NASA flight system projects must submit budgets at a 70% confidence level starting at conception
 - Budgets based on a reconciliation between the project manager's estimate and an independent probabilistic cost estimate
 - An independent organization within the Office of the Administrator completes the independent probabilistic cost estimate during a non-advocacy review for high-level missions; otherwise the operating organization is responsible for obtaining an independent estimate
- January 2009, NASA's cost estimating policy was updated to reflect lessons learned (NPD 1000.5)
 - Programs to be baselined at a 70% joint confidence level
 - Projects to be baselined/budgeted at JCL that supports the program approved JCL
 - Projects to be funded at no less than a 50% JCL or as approved by the decision authority
 - JCLs to be developed and maintained through lifecycle beginning at implementation
 - Programs in extended operations generally not required, but new or upgraded capabilities within ops will develop JCL
 - Program and project proposed cost and schedule baselines will be assessed by an independent review team
 - External commitments will be based on JCL approved by the responsible Agency management council
 - Programs and projects are annually reviewed to confirm that current baselines and JCL are consistent with their annual budget submit. Significant changes to funding are to be reviewed and approved by the responsible Agency management council



Current Policy at NASA

- Final Proposed 7120.5E Language (After the August 2010 Program Management Council)
- Under Section 2.5.4.2, Confidence Level Estimating and Budgeting
- 2.5.4.2.4: Projects with an expected life cycle cost in excess of \$250 million are required to develop cost and schedule estimates and associated confidence levels for meeting those estimates.
- (1) At KDP B, a range of cost and schedule estimates and associated confidence levels of meeting those estimates will be provided at KDP-B for projects and single-project programs (see the footnote for paragraph 2.5.4.2.2). This policy applies to both competed (AO) and directed (non-AO) missions. The decision authority will use this information to guide the formulation activities and to establish the target cost and schedule ranges and resources phasing until KDP-C estimates are developed..
- (2) At KDP C, projects are budgeted to a 70 percent joint cost and schedule confidence level or as approved by the decision authority.

NASA Cost & Schedule Communities Directly Influencing Current Policy

Implementation: Benefits & Challenges



- Incorporates schedule into confidence level calculation
 - Challenge: Schedules are activity/event oriented while Cost is product oriented



- Strengthens risk management for cost & schedule
 - Challenge: Risk Lists are missing items, or missing quantification



- Captures the behavior of costs with TD/TI
 - Challenge: Methodologies to allocate, and/or ways to capture separately (calculation)
- Focus on inputs to project plans instead of the outputs
 - Challenge: Developing a process and tools to support the users, and their increased volume of input data



- Improves project planning by integrating cost, schedule, and risk products and processes
 - Challenge: Projects have the component parts just not integrated
- Calculations are pushing the limits of available toolsets



JACS - Design



JACS Approach

- Leverage COTS technology and recent JCL research coordinated and conducted by JSC LW office
- Create an extensible, NASA controlled toolset to satisfy integrated cost/schedule/risk analysis requirements
- Focus on features that benefit NASA users (analysts, program managers, reviewers)







JACS Design Concept

- Leverage Schedules built within MS-Project
- Leverage ACEIT RI\$K engine
- Leverage NASA developed tools SPOT and R-SAT



*Technology runs in background and invisible to user



Conceptual GUIs

 Cost Loading and Uncertainty Input (NEW)

	ask		
5 -	-Operations		
uration:	230	days, % Complete: 0	, w/ remaining: 110400
pending	Detai		
lost (\$):	34500.00	, w/ remaining:	34500
Time-De	pendent Cost		Spending Contour (Phasing)
TD as %	of Total Cost	25 🜲	TI: Late Peak
TD (\$):	8625.00		
TD Burn	Rate (\$/workday):	37.50	TD: Flat
Duratio	ertainty n Uncertainty It Uncertainty	Tri(200,230,3	800) 50)
ask Unc Duratio TI Cos TD Co None	ertainty n Uncertainty It Uncertainty st Uncertainty Normal LogN	Tri(200.230,3	800) 50)) Initorm Constant Discrete
TI Cos Duratio	ertainty n Uncertainty It Uncertainty It Uncertainty Normal LogN	 Tri(200,230,3 Tri(300,100,1 Nor%(100,25 Triangle PERT L 90 	00) 50)) Iniform Constant Discrete % chance below low: 10 ©
TI Cos None	ettainty n Uncertainty tt Uncertainty st Uncertainty Normal LogN Low: Most Likely:	Tri(200.230,3 Tri(300.100,1 Nor%(100.25 Triangle PERT U 90	800) 50)) Initorm Constant Discrete % chance below low: 10 ©
TI Cos TI Cos TD Co	ettainty n Uncertainty t Uncertainty st Uncertainty Normal LogN Low: Most Likely: High:	Tri(200.230,3 Tri(200.230,3 Tri(200.230,3 Tri(200.250,3 Tri(200.250,3 Tri(200.250,3 Nor%(100.25 Triangle PERT L 90 100	800) 50)) Initorm Constant Discrete % chance below low: 10 @ % of chance above high: 90 @
Task Unc Duratio TI Cos TD Co None	ettainty n Uncertainty t Uncertainty st Uncertainty Normal LogN Low: Most Likely: High: V Defined 4	Image: Tri(200,230,3 Image: Tri(300,100,1 Image: PERT L 90 100 150	800) 50) Initom Constant Discrete % chance below low: 10 © % of chance above high: 90 ©
ask Unc Duratio TI Cos TD Co None	ettainty n Uncertainty It Uncertainty st Uncertainty Normal LogN Low: Most Likely: High: Defined of	Tri(200.230,3 Tri(200.230,3) Tri(300,100,1) Nor%(100.25) Triangle PERT 90 100 150 ass percentages of baseline	800) 50)) Initorm Constant Discrete % chance below low: 10 © % of chance above high: 90 € (100%=8L)

• Risk Input (Leverage R-SAT)

Active	Rick ID	Description	Likelihood (71)	Distributi (for Dur)	on	Best Cace (Days)	Most Likely (Davit	Worst Case (Days)	p(Best Case Dui) [3]	p(Worst Case Dur) (11)	Mean (Days)	Std Dev (Days)	Distribution (for Cost)		Best Case (Cost)	Most Likely (Cost)	Worst Care (Cost)	p(Best Case Cost(1%)	p(Worst Case Cost) (3)	Mean (Cost)	Std Dev (Cott)
	Threat_1_1	Poor understanding a	20	tiangu.	v	12	25	37	0	90			triangular	*	12.5	18.75	25	10	90		
2	Threat_1_2	Poor understanding a	20	triangu	¥	12	25	37	0	90			hiangular	٧	12.5	18.75	25	10	90		
2	Threat_1_3	Poor understanding a	20	triangu	¥	12	25	37	0	90			hiangular	¥	12.5	10.75	25	10	90		
	Threat_1_4	Poor understanding a	20	tiangu	۲	12	25	37	0	90			triangular	Y	12.5	18.75	25	10	90		
2	Threat_2	Guidance System Ial.	5	triangu	¥	150	225	300	0	- 90			triangular	M	500	750	1000	10	90		
1	Threat_3	Contract Delay	60	triangu	۷	20	35	50	0	90			hiangidar	Y	10	30	50	10	90		
2	Threat_4_1	Key resource unaval.	60	tiangu	۲	3	5	6	0	- 90			triangular	Y	3.333	10	16.667	10	90		
2	Threat_4_2	Keysecource uneval.	60	lingu	۷	3	5	6	0	90			tiangular	¥	3.333	10	16.667	10	90		
2	Threat_4_3	Key resource unavail	60	triangu	۲	3	5	6	0	90			timple	٧	3.333	10	16.667	10	90		
7	Threat_5	Delivery overun	40	hiangu	۲	50	100	150	0	90			none	۷							
2	Threat_6	Fabrication contractor.	5	triangu	۲	20	75	50	0	90			tiangular	۲	50	75	100	10	90		
2	Threat_7	Rework required for a	40	triangu	۲	20	35	50	0	90			hiangular	*	50	75	100	10	90		
2	Threal_8	Testing fails	20	hingu	۲	10	15	20	0	90			tinglar	۲	10	30	50	10	90		
2	Threat_9	Design changes	60	triangu	¥	20	35	50	0	90			triangular	٧	50	75	100	10	90		

• Scatter Plot (Leverage SPOT)





JACS – Demo





THANK YOU