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About Robbins-Gioia

▲ Our mission:

*We enable customers to achieve results and improve performance through program management disciplines*

▲ Our mission statement defines why we exist and describes the value we bring to our customers

▲ The key concepts in our mission statement are:

- Enable customers: our mission begins with our customers, our focus is on their success
- Achieve results: the results that our customers need
- Improve performance: our goal is sustaining improvement for repeatable results
- Program management disciplines: encompasses a broad range of disciplines well beyond traditional project management and project control
Premise

▲ Traditional notions of project management -- scheduling and control -- are no longer sufficient to ensure project funding and success.

▲ Project managers must develop a practical understanding of a broader set of disciplines to ensure their projects obtain funding and demonstrate results in an increasingly competitive budget environment:
  - Strategic Planning,
  - Enterprise Architecture,
  - Information Security,
  - Business Case Development,
  - IT Portfolio Management.
Objectives

▲ Identify drivers and enablers expanding the scope of project management
▲ Present a perspective on how various planning and project disciplines interact
▲ Highlight strengths and weaknesses of the respective disciplines as a basis for improving project performance
Drivers & Enablers for Expanded PM

Drivers
▲ 1993 – (GPRA) Government Performance and Results Act
▲ 1994 – (FASA) Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act Title V
▲ 1995 – (PRA) Paperwork Reduction Act
▲ 1996 – (FFMIA) Federal Financial Management Improvement Act
▲ 1996 - Clinger-Cohen
▲ 2002 - (FISMA) Federal Information Security Management Act
▲ 2002 - E-Government Act

Enablers
▲ OMB Circular A-11
▲ 2001 - (PMA) President’s Management Agenda / (EBMS) Executive Branch Management Scorecard
▲ 2001 - (ITIM) Information Technology Investment Management
▲ 2002 - (FEA) Federal Enterprise Architecture
▲ 2002 - (PART) Program Assessment Rating Tool
Change Discipline Interdependencies

1) Strategic Planning - establishes vision, mission, goals, objectives, & enterprise performance measures

2) Enterprise Architecture - aligns organization components, processes, systems, & technologies with plans & identifies transition dependencies

3) Capital Planning & Investment Control – Documenting, selecting, evaluating, & controlling investments supporting mission performance

4) Budgeting – Appropriating (and rescinding) resources

5) Program Management – Translates investments into action

6) Project Management – Delivers change to the operational environment

7) Scorecards communicate both direction and feedback
PM Knowledge, Skills, Abilities, and Competencies

▲ Strategic Planning
  a. Organizational Awareness

▲ Enterprise Architecture
  a. Information Resources Strategy and Planning
  b. Technology Awareness

▲ Capital Planning & Investment Control
  a. Capital Planning and Investment Assessment
  b. Cost-Benefit Analysis

▲ Budgeting
  a. Financial Management

▲ Program Management
  a. Planning and Evaluating

▲ Project Management
  a. Project Management
  b. Requirements
  c. Risk Management
  d. Quality Assurance

A project is a temporary endeavor undertaken to create a unique product, service, or result. OMB and GAO require qualified Project Managers for major IT investments.

▲ Solution Delivery
  a. Contracting/Procurement
  b. Business Process Reengineering
  c. Systems Life Cycle
  d. System Integration
  e. IT Architecture
  f. Infrastructure Design
  g. IT Performance Assessment
  h. Data Management
  i. Info Systems/Network Security
  j. Configuration Management

▲ Operations
  a. Customer Service

▲ General K, S, A, C
  a. Legal, Government & Jurisprudence
  b. Oral Communication
  c. Writing
  d. Team Building
  e. Leadership
  f. Interpersonal Skills
  g. Flexibility
  h. Reasoning
  i. Problem Solving
  j. Decision Making

## PM “Certification” Guidance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description/Complexity</th>
<th>Minimum Experience</th>
<th>Training Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3     | ▲ Large, inter-governmental or government-wide complex IT project  
       ▲ High risk  
       ▲ Example: High interest projects with Congress, GAO, OMB, or the general public, E-GOV | ▲ 2-4 years combined previous, successful PM and technical experience  
       ▲ Prior experience in managing a Level 2 IT Project | ▲ Agencies are expected to identify specific organization and business area training required |
| 2     | ▲ Cross-cutting project or agency-wide system integration project across the Department  
       ▲ High complexity and/or risk  
       ▲ Example: Projects that are part of a portfolio of projects/systems that impact each other and/or impact mission activities, ERP | ▲ 2-4 years combined previous, successful PM and technical experience depending on project complexity | |
| 1     | ▲ Project within a division, bureau or agency  
       ▲ Low-to-moderate complexity and risk  
       ▲ Example: Stand-alone info system | ▲ 1 year previous, successful technical or PM experience | |

Sources: (1) Federal IT Project Management Validation, (2) Federal IT Project Manager Guidance Matrix, OPM
## PMBOK: A Source of Good Practices


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Areas</th>
<th>Initiating</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Executing</th>
<th>Monitoring &amp; Controlling</th>
<th>Closing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Project Integration Management</td>
<td>4.1 Develop Project Charter</td>
<td>4.2 Develop Preliminary Project Scope Statement</td>
<td>4.3 Develop Project Management Plan</td>
<td>4.4 Direct and Manage Project Execution</td>
<td>4.5 Monitor and Control Project Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Project Scope Management</td>
<td>5.1 Scope Planning</td>
<td>5.2 Scope Definition</td>
<td>5.3 Create WBS</td>
<td>5.4 Scope Verification</td>
<td>5.5 Scope Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Project Cost Management</td>
<td>7.1 Cost Estimating</td>
<td>7.2 Cost Budgeting</td>
<td>8.2 Perform Quality Assurance</td>
<td>8.3 Perform Quality Control</td>
<td>7.3 Cost Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Project Quality Management</td>
<td>8.1 Quality Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Project Communication Management</td>
<td>10.1 Communications Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.2 Information Distribution</td>
<td>10.3 Performance Reporting</td>
<td>10.4 Manage Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Programs are ongoing operations that normally provide goods and/or services to the public. 72% of the 794 programs evaluated through FY 2005 are performing.
### Program Assessment Rating Tool


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Purpose &amp; Design</th>
<th>Strategic Planning</th>
<th>Program Management</th>
<th>Program Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Is the program purpose clear?</td>
<td>2.1 Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures...?</td>
<td>3.1 Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information...and use it to manage the program and improve performance?</td>
<td>4.1 Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest, or need?</td>
<td>2.2 Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?</td>
<td>3.2 Are Federal managers and program partners held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?</td>
<td>4.2 Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Is the program designed so that it is not redundant with any other Federal, State, local or private effort?</td>
<td>2.3 Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures...?</td>
<td>3.3 Are funds obligated in a timely manner and spent for the intended purpose?</td>
<td>4.3 Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program’s effectiveness or efficiency?</td>
<td>2.4 Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?</td>
<td>3.4 Does the program have procedures to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?</td>
<td>4.4 Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc. with similar purpose and goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Is the program design effectively targeted so that resources will address the program’s purpose directly and will reach intended beneficiaries?</td>
<td>2.5 Do all partners commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals...?</td>
<td>3.5 Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?</td>
<td>4.5 Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART is another tool to understand:** (1) Is the program serving a priority need? (2) Does it have a reasonable chance of success? (3) Is the program ready to execute? (4) Does it deliver?
Program Accountability

▲ Performance management involves employees in improving organizational effectiveness in the accomplishment of the mission and goals

▲ Part of the President’s Management Agenda calls for agencies to demonstrate they have performance appraisal and awards systems
  - For all SES and managers
  - More than 60% of the workforce
  - That effectively: link to agency mission, goals, and outcomes;
  - Hold employees accountable for results appropriate for their level of responsibility

▲ Additional guidance appears in GAO-03-488, Results-Oriented Cultures: Creating a Clear Linkage Between Individual Performance and Organizational Success

*Programs advocates are responsible for demonstrating program performance.*
# Federal Budget Process

**Source:** OMB Circular A-11, June 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Formulation Phase (BY-2)</th>
<th>Congressional Phase (BY-1)</th>
<th>Execution Phase (BY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>▲ OMB reviews proposals</td>
<td>▲ OMB reviews proposals</td>
<td>▲ Agencies submit apportionment requests within 10 days of appropriation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▲ OMB briefs President</td>
<td>▲ OMB briefs President</td>
<td>▲ OMB approves/modifies apportionment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▲ Passback</td>
<td>▲ Passback</td>
<td>▲ Agencies incur obligations and make outlays to carry out the funded programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>▲ Agencies may appeal passback</td>
<td>▲ Agencies prepare &amp; OMB reviews congressional budget justifications</td>
<td>▲ Agencies record obligations and outlays pursuant to administrative control of funds procedures, report to Treasury, and prepare financial statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>▲ Agencies may appeal passback</td>
<td>▲ Congress passes budget resolution</td>
<td>▲ Agencies record obligations and outlays pursuant to administrative control of funds procedures, report to Treasury, and prepare financial statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>▲ Agencies prepare &amp; OMB reviews congressional budget justifications</td>
<td>▲ Committees submit “views &amp; estimates” to House &amp; Senate Budget Comm.</td>
<td>▲ Agencies record obligations and outlays pursuant to administrative control of funds procedures, report to Treasury, and prepare financial statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>▲ President transmits budget to Congress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>▲ Committees submit “views &amp; estimates” to House &amp; Senate Budget Comm.</td>
<td>▲ Congress passes budget resolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>▲ Congress passes budget resolution</td>
<td>▲ Congress passes budget resolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>▲ OMB issues spring planning guidance</td>
<td>▲ Congress passes budget resolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>▲ OMB issues spring planning guidance</td>
<td>▲ Congress passes budget resolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>▲ OMB issues A-11</td>
<td>▲ Congress passes budget resolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>▲ OMB issues A-11</td>
<td>▲ Congress passes budget resolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>▲ Agencies submit budget proposals</td>
<td>▲ Appropriation or continuing resolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Program proponents must adjust to impacts from passback, rescission, reprogramming.*
Capital Asset Plan/Business Case


**OMB 300 Outline**

- Screening Questions
- Summary of Spending

**Part I – Capital Asset Plan and Business Case**

- A. Description
- B. Justification
- C. Performance Goals and Measures
- D. Project Management
- E. Alternatives Analysis
- F. Risk Inventory & Assessment
- G. Acquisition Strategy
- H. Project and Funding Plan

**Part II – Additional Criteria for IT**

- A. Enterprise Architecture
- B. Security and Privacy
- C. Government Paperwork Elimination Act

**GAO Findings**

▲ “The weaknesses in the 29 exhibit 300s raise questions regarding the sufficiency of the business cases for these major investments and the quality of the projects’ management”

▲ All exhibit 300s had documentation weaknesses:
  - Lack of supporting documentation or
  - Supporting material did not match information in the 300

▲ Failure to provide evidence of compliance with Federal requirements and policies

▲ Cost data supporting business cases were unreliable

▲ Sections populated just to fulfill reporting requirement

*The exhibit 300 is a format for the integrated project team (IPT) to demonstrate to agency management & OMB that it has employed the disciplines of good project management.*
## Portfolio Management


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maturity\Process</th>
<th>Analyze Inventory and baseline investments</th>
<th>Select Choose investments that best meet mission needs</th>
<th>Control Ensure investments meet needs within cost/risk parameters</th>
<th>Evaluate Compare actual to expected results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 5</strong></td>
<td>▲ Using IT to Drive Strategic Business Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>▲ Optimizing the Investment Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leveraging IT for Strategic Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 4</strong></td>
<td>▲ Managing the Succession of Information Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td>▲ Improving the Portfolio’s Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the Investment Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 3</strong></td>
<td>▲ Defining the Portfolio Criteria</td>
<td>▲ Evaluating the Portfolio</td>
<td>▲ Conducting Post-implementation Reviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a Complete Investment Portfolio</td>
<td>▲ Meeting Business Needs</td>
<td>▲ Creating the Portfolio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 2</strong></td>
<td>▲ Capturing Investment Information</td>
<td>▲ Instituting the Investment Board</td>
<td>▲ Providing Investment Oversight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building the Investment Foundation</td>
<td>▲ Meeting Business Needs</td>
<td>▲ Selecting an Investment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Programs compete for resources and funds. Agencies are responsible for maximizing the value and managing the risks of their major information systems initiatives.
ITIM Assessment

▲ Collectively agencies have less than 50 percent of the information technology investment management (ITIM) practices fully in place

▲ While most agencies have IT investment management boards, no agency has the practices associated with oversight of IT investments fully in place

▲ Agency efforts to improve their IT portfolio management capability should consider:
  – Assessing gaps in existing capabilities relative to ITIM criteria (GAO-04-394G)
  – Leveraging strategic goals and performance measures and EA transition plans to establish criteria for investment selection and portfolio creation
  – Leveraging CPIC tools to automate portfolio reporting and evaluation
  – Leveraging the enterprise program management office (EPMO) to promote awareness and education regarding project stage reviews and earned value management necessary to provide input to portfolio control activities

FEA Reference Models

▲ The Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA) provides a common language and framework to describe and analyze IT investments.

▲ As of 3Q FY05, OMB determined 24 of 25 agency enterprise architectures are “effective” (the average score was 3.19 / 5)
Strategic Planning

▲ Agencies generally have IT strategic plans and goals
  - Goals are not always linked to specific performance measures that are tracked

▲ About half of the agencies had fully documented their strategic planning processes
  - A defined strategic planning process allows an agency to clearly articulate its strategic direction and establish linkages among planning elements such as goals, objectives, and strategies

▲ Exhibit 300s require programs to demonstrate how they contribute to agency strategic goals and objectives
  - I.B. Justification
  - I.C. Performance Goals and Measures

“Without strong strategic management practices, it is less likely that IT is being used to maximize improvement in mission performance” - GAO

## Wrap-up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Discipline</th>
<th>Example “Tools”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Strategic Planning**            | ▲ Agency strategic goals include long-term and annual performance measures (PMA)  
                                    | ▲ OMB 300 I.B Justification score (A-11)  
                                    | ▲ OMB 300 I.C Performance Goals and Measures score (A-11)  |
| **Enterprise Architecture**      | ▲ OMB 300 II.A EA score (A-11)  
                                    | ▲ OMB 300 II.B Security and Privacy score (A-11)  |
| **Capital Planning & Investment Control** | ▲ OMB 300 Score (A-11)  
                                    | ▲ Program performance relative to portfolio (ITIM)  |
| **Budgeting**                    | ▲ Impacts of budget passback, rescission, reprogramming (A-11)  |
| **Program Management**           | ▲ Program manager performance goals tied to agency strategic goals/objectives (PMA)  
                                    | ▲ Program Assessment Rating Tool score (PART)  |
| **Project Management**           | ▲ OMB 300 Score I.D Project Management (A-11)  
                                    | ▲ Project Manager Certification Level / Project Level (OPM)  
                                    | ▲ Earned Value Management (A-11)  
                                    | ▲ Operational Analysis (A-11)  |
| **Solution Delivery**            | ▲ % standard competitions completed in 12-months (PMA)  
                                    | ▲ % streamlined competitions completed in 90-days (PMA)  |
| **Operations**                   | ▲ Agency-specific  |

_A variety of OMB, GAO, OPM “tools” exist that can facilitate program success._
Capabilities measured by the PMA help create an environment for program success.
Recap

Objectives

- Identify drivers and enablers expanding the scope of project management
- Present a perspective on how various planning and project disciplines interact
- Highlight strengths and weaknesses of the respective disciplines as a basis for improving project performance

Direction

Feedback / Results

- Budget Planning Cycle
  - Strategic Planning
  - Enterprise Architecture
    - Capital Planning & Investment Control
    - Budgeting
  - Program Management
  - Project Management
    - Solution Delivery
      - Acquisition
      - Organizational Change
      - Process Improvement
      - Asset / IT Delivery
  - Operations
Questions?
Thank You