

Review of Life-cycle Project Baselines for Accelerated Remediation

Deborah D. Griswold

Office of Technical Services
U.S.DOE/NNSA Service Center
(505) 845-4752

dcouchman-griswold@doeal.gov

Ray Wood
U.S. DOE/NNSA Service Center
505-845-5688

Malu Gawthrop
Terradigm, Inc.
505-845-5748

Background

- The Service Center reviewed 16 project baselines in the summer of 2003 (project cost \$100K-\$100M/year).
- Review teams generally had less than 2 weeks to review documentation and less than 1 week for on-site review.
- The majority of reviewers were on several review teams (5-8 people/team).
- The Lessons Learned Report focuses on the review process, not review results.

Purpose of the Reviews

- Ensure projects had life-cycle baselines supporting the Secretary's Top to Bottom Review Report
- Verify baselines supported the Performance Management Plans
- Prepare for independent DOE EM Headquarters team reviews
- Facilitate approval of baseline by EM-1, as required by Congress

Review Process

Established during 15 years of baseline development and validation experience, includes:

- Pre-review Preparation (team selection, logistics, questionnaire)
- Document Review
- On-Site Reviews(Entrance Briefing, Interviews, Closeout Briefing)
- Comment Delivery and Resolution
- Report Development

Scope of Reviews

- Project Execution Plan
- Task Scope Descriptions
- Resource Loaded, Logic Driven, Critical Path Schedule
- Activity Based Life-cycle Cost Estimate
- Work Breakdown Structure
- Contingency Analysis/Management Plan

Scope of Reviews, continued

- Risk Management Plan
- Acquisition Plan
- Government Furnished Services and Items
- Assumptions Documentation
- Technical Strategy
- Project Controls System
- Project Closure Strategy

Lessons Learned Report

- The Report was developed to improve efforts based on experiences gained during the summer of 2003
- Headquarters, project, and review team staff were interviewed to gain diverse insights
- Interviews focused on identifying practices that facilitated or hindered efficient reviews
- Lack of time was the primary issue, but was not in Service Center control

Lessons Learned

1. Reviews are more effective when the process is formal, consistent, and predictable.
2. Well-maintained baselines facilitate more substantive and productive comments than poorly maintained baselines.
3. Project management benefits when federal and contractor staff are knowledgeable about the baseline content and have a stake in its maintenance and use.

Lessons Learned, Continued

4. Reviews are hampered when cost burdens are not consistently applied or presented in baseline documentation.
5. Baseline review teams are most effective when an optimum mix of expertise is represented.
6. Standardizing maintenance and record keeping facilitates use and retrievability of review documentation.

Conclusions

- Reviews added value, supported credible life-cycle baselines.
- Using a consistent approach and experienced reviewers increased effectiveness.
- Using a consistent but flexible approach and capturing lessons learned facilitates continual improvement.