



Navy Implementation of Earned Value Management (EVM)

Gary E. Christle

With contributions by:

Dr. Robert Book

June 2003

Navy Implementation of EVM

Selection of Program Managers for Interview



- NAVAIR – 3
- NAVSEA – 5*
 - Ship construction – 4*
 - Shipboard Systems – 2*
- Cross-section of contractors
 - Boeing
 - Lockheed
 - Raytheon
 - General Dynamics
 - Northrop Grumman

* One program is managing ship construction as well as shipboard systems

Navy Implementation of EVM

Training



- Primary source of EVM training
 - DAU courses (seven of eight PMs)
 - Hands-on experience in current position (five of eight PMs)
 - Hands-on experience in previous position (four of eight PMs)

Navy Implementation of EVM

Perceived quality and value



	Program Manager's perception*	
	Navy	Contractor
Quality contractor's implementation of EVM		
- Very successful	2	5
- Somewhat successful	3	1
- Unsuccessful	4	0
Value of EVM to the program		
- Critical to success	3	5
- Very useful	2	1
- Useful in theory	1	
- Better tools available	2	
Does your counterpart use EVM effectvely?		
- Yes	5	4
- No	4	2

* Recall that eight Navy PMs were surveyed, but nine contracts were addressed. Six contractor PMs were surveyed.

Navy Implementation of EVM

Program management or metrics?



- Nearly all Navy and contractor PMs view EVM as primarily a program management tool
 - But, do they mean the same thing?
- EVM and program management
 - Two views
 - Program oversight
 - Metrics
 - Status
 - Robust planning and organizing process
 - Integrated management systems

Navy Implementation of EVM

EVM Support to program offices – SUPSHIP & DCMA



	Program Manager's perception	
	Navy	Contractor
SUPSHIP		
- Strong	3	3
- Weak	2	0
DCMA		
- Strong	4	2
- Weak	2	2

Navy Implementation of EVM

EVM Support to program offices - SYSCOM



- SYSCOM EVM support
 - NAVAIR (AIR 4.2.6)
 - NAVSEA (SEA 017)
 - SPAWAR (not addressed)
- Only one of eight PMs thought SYSCOM support was strong

Navy Implementation of EVM

Impediments



- Most significant impediments to effective implementation mentioned by the Navy program offices
 - Integrating EVM insights with technical management of the program.
 - Insufficient training
- Other impediments
 - Personnel turnover
 - Lack of routine EV use by higher headquarters
 - Lack of subcontract integration
 - Lack of buy-in by the contractor's management
 - Especially shipbuilders.
 - Unreconciled EACs
 - Unstable program baselines
 - Other Transaction authority

Navy Implementation of EVM

Conclusions

- EVM, differing perspectives
 - Oversight vs. management
- EVM support to program offices
 - Support to the “team” vs. independence
 - SYSCOM, DCMA, SUPSHIP
- Impediments to effective EVM
 - Training
 - Program instability
 - Unreconciled EACs

Navy Implementation of EVM

Recommendations



-
- Develop a Navy policy statement/white paper on EVM implementation
 - Develop a model Memorandum of Agreement for EVM support (DCMA and SUPSHIP)
 - Make an effort to improve EVM implementation by shipbuilders

Navy Implementation of EVM

Recommendations (cont'd)

- Training
 - Develop an “EVM in an IPT environment” course
 - On-site
- Develop on-demand courses
 - IBR course
 - How to get EVM requirements on contract.
 - Developed with industry to include how they use EVM and how customer can adversely impact industry
- Assign EVM responsibility to the Navy “Program Management Council” recommended in CNA’s May 2003 “Navy Program Manager Training” study