

Production, Manufacturing & Naval Construction (PMNC) Working Group

January 27, 2015





Major events for the Working Group

•	EVM in a	Production	Environment	Whitepap	er Released
---	----------	-------------------	-------------	----------	-------------

Follow-on Brainstorming

Phase II Scope Proposed

Phase II Scope Defined and Approved by Working Group

Phase II Effort Initiated with inclusion of Naval Construction

Working Group Facilitator Transition

Working Group Facilitator Transition

Out brief Review with PARCA & NAVSEA

Complete Review of Cross Reference Checklist

Reach Consensus on Seven Guideline Templates

Submit Templates to IPMD Board as Appendix to Whitepaper

October 2011

January 2012

March 2012

March 2012

April 2012

May 2012

April 2014

August 2014

September 2014

January 2015

January 2015





PMNC Team Efforts

- Working group identified six Guidelines; 1, 6, 10, 11, 21, 22 and 23 as different for PMNC environment
- Assigned Guideline Authors with Support Members
- Template for Drafts Developed and Distributed to PMNC team
- Drafts reviewed by team during bi-weekly teleconference, when consensus reached, "Draft " replaced with "Final PMNC Team"
- Consensus reached on six of seven Guidelines
- Guideline # 23 currently awaiting concurrence (today)



Start of the Process

	Δ	В	С	D	F	F	G
1				Comme	_		9
2	EVM Inquiries from the Existing DCMA Cross- Reference Checklist		duction from ment?		What is recommended for production?	Relevant Source Document Reference (Doc Title / Chapter / Paragraph) (as	Working Group Assessment
3	EVMS Guidelines/Management Characteristics	YES	NO			Available)	
	c. Are retroactive changes to BCWS and BCWP prohibited except for correction of errors or for normal accounting adjustments?	;;;;Yes;		;;; MRP systems typically use "Part Master Data" that reflect the properties of the labor operations steps and material data. Changes to this data will affect all open orders within the factory, including those that have already been earned. Subsequent failure and rejection of a part after installation could cause a "de-earn" of performance.;	;;; Retroactive changes must be controlled. Any changes within the MRP system that could generate retroactive changes should be summarized and applied to the current month so that prior month BCWS and BCWP are not altered.;	;;; Personal Experience;	Further discussion required
212	 Prevent revisions to the program budget except for authorized changes. 						
213	a. Are procedures established to prevent changes to the contract budget base (see definition) other than those authorized by contractual action?		; ; X; ;x	MRP allows for retroactive changes; ; ;;	BCWS and BCWP need to be controlled and MRP reconcilied with EAC except when base lined. ;;;;	;;;	Concurrence - is further discussion required?
214	b. Is authorization of budgets in excess of the contract budget base controlled formally and done with the full knowledge and recognition of the procuring activity? Are the procedures adequate?		; ; X; ;x	;;;;	;;;;	****	Concurrence - is further discussion required?
	32. Document changes to the performance						
	measurement baseline. a. Are changes to the performance measurement baseline made as a result of contractual redirection, formal reprogramming, internal replanning, application of undistributed budget, or the use of management reserve, properly documented and reflected in the Cost Performance Report?		11-41-	MRP does not have a baseline or ability to controlled changes. ;;;;	Raise level of control to IMS level. ; ; ; ;	;;;	Further discussion required





Cross Reference Checklist Review

Guideline 22. At least on a monthly basis, generate the following information at the control account and other levels as necessary for management control using actual cost data from, or reconcilable with, the accounting system: (1) Comparison of the amount of planned budget and the amount of budget earned for work accomplished. This comparison provides the schedule variance. (2) Comparison of the amount of the work budget earned and the actual (applied where appropriate) direct costs for the same work. This comparison provides the cost variance.

Relevance within Production / Manufacturing & Shipbuilding a. No difference from a development program
Production efforts typically use standards to calculate performance for labor scope and receipt/consumption of the BOM for material.
d. No difference from a development program
e. Clarification: Issues can arise in Production with Out of Station (OOS) or Traveled Work, but the intent of the guideline must still be met. It should not be permissible to earn performance in an account where it is not planned.;



Cross Reference Checklist Review

- From Guideline 21
- Production / Manufacturing Considerations
 - The NDIA PMSC recognizes and identifies differences between material management and material performance measurement in development and production environments.
 - Government Production programs typically have Parts Movement and Scrap and Rework considerations that support the project objectives.

• Additional Shipbuilding Considerations

• Typical Production / Manufacturing & Shipbuilding Attributes

 The contractor's Material Management Accounting System (MMAS) will have the capability to collect and accurately assign material costs to the control accounts where material budgets





Working Group Closeout

- Submit to IPMD Board for approval
- Add as an Appendix to IPMD "EVM in a Production Environment" White Paper
- Use as guidance / clarification when engaged in a manufacturing, production or naval construction environment
- Future input to NDIA Guide updates
 - NDIA Planning & Scheduling Excellence Guide Update
- Influence to other EVM Users
- Re-convene new working group with new charter if need arises