

Program and Project Management Practices in the Federal Civilian Agencies

04/15/2015





Cautionary Statement

Study results are not based on a statistically representative sampling of the federal civilian agencies, therefore, the results cannot be stratified by Agency

Due to sampling constraints, the survey may not provide an accurate picture of cost and schedule management practices across the federal government

However, the results do suggest important trends that should be investigated on an agency basis



Summary of Findings

- Findings suggest that agencies have, for the most part, instituted comprehensive cost & schedule management policies and procedures
- Additionally, these findings suggest that GAO cost estimating and scheduling best practices have made important inroads in the civilian agencies
- Results also suggest that performance issues exist which are not tied to policy and guidance, but which involve a disconnect between that policy and program management execution
- The top two cost and schedule management issues have remained constant over the years: scope management and requirements management
- Poor contractor performance was the least cited cause for cost overruns and schedule breaches



Additional Work is Needed

- Why do we continue to repeat the errors of the past?
- Is it really all about training and certification levels?
- Is it actually feasible to manage cost, scope, and requirements on large acquisitions?
- Do we set reasonable performance expectations at the beginning of a acquisition?
- What is the role of organizational behavior and have we lost sight of “human factors” involved with program and project management?
- How well do our performance metrics support our need for information?



BACKUP SLIDES



Survey Status

- Initial analysis complete
- 59 responses received from:
 - Department of Commerce (1.8%)
 - Department of Defense (3.5%)
 - Department of Homeland Security (15.8%)
 - Department of Transportation (12.3%)
 - National Aeronautics and Space Administration (45.6%)
 - National Science Foundation (1.8%)
 - Agency for International Development (12.3%)
 - Other (7.0%)



Respondent Roles

- Acquisition Executive (5.2%)
- Contracting Officer (1.7%)
- Contracting Officer Representative (1.7%)
- Cost Estimator/Analyst (6.9%)
- Customer Support (3.4%)
- Deputy Project Manager (6.9%)
- Enterprise Architect (1.7%)
- Financial Manager (1.7%)
- IT Solution Architect (1.7%)
- PMO Staff (17.2%)
- Program Manager (15.5%)
- Project Manager (5.2%)
- System Engineer (3.4%)
- Other (27.6%)
 - EVM Auditor
 - Acquisition Policy
 - Program Control
 - Post-Implementation Review Liaison
 - Acquisition PMO Manager
 - Contract Support/Sr. Program Analyst
 - Oversight, Audit and Evaluation of Program Management
 - Executive/Senior Consultant
 - PMO Support
 - Chief Engineer
 - Budget Team Lead
 - Program Executive
 - Business Manager
 - Self Governance
 - Curriculum Lead
 - Planning & EVM Manager
 - EVM Focal Point
 - Schedule Analyst
 - Programmatic Support Contractor
 - Program and Contract Manager



Other Demographics

- 72.9% of respondents track cost and schedule performance of one or more major investments
- 23.7% of respondents have 30+ years of experience
- Average experience = 20.23 years
- 32.8% hold PMP, 27.6% hold Agency certification, 39.7% are not certified, 24.1% hold “Other” certifications



Characteristics

- 73.2% of respondents report their organizations develop major solutions using contractors with substantial government oversight
- 19.6% of respondents report their organizations purchase “off-the-shelf” solutions and develop solutions using internal resources
- 5.4% of respondents report their organizations develop major solutions using contractors with little or no government oversight
- 1.8% of respondents report their organizations develop major solutions in-house with little or no contractor support



New Investment Budgets

- 10.7%: <\$50M
- 17.9%: \$50M - \$100M
- 10.7% : \$100M - \$500M
- 23.2%: \$500M - \$1B
- 37.5%: >\$1B