

Critical Chain Project Management: Motivation & Overview

Robert Richards, Ph.D. Project Manager Stottler Henke Associates, Inc.

Hilbert Robinson President Afinitus Group LLC



Motivation

- < 45% of all projects finish on schedule or before
- < 17% software projects completed on-time / on-budget.
- IT related projects
 - 23%+ of projects will be canceled before they ever get completed. Further results indicate
 - 50%+ of projects cost > 150% original estimates

• Ref: www.it-cortex.com/Stat_Failure_Rate.htm www.pqa.net/ProdServices/ccpm/W05002001.html

Results: Switching to Critical Chain

- Lucent Technologies
 - Outside Plant Fiber Optic Cable Business Unit reduced its product introduction interval by 50%, improved on-time delivery, and increased the organization's capacity to develop products.
- Seagate
 - Brings 1st 15,000 rpm disc drive to market ahead of its competition, causing all competition to pull out of the market. (circa 2000).
- Lord Corporation
 - Capacity has increased, cycle time improved, and operating expense remained the same.

Are You A Responsible Person?

When asked for task estimate, or asking for one:

What do you supply? What do you assume is supplied?

How often is the "Three Point Estimation" used?

How do you work when assigned to a task?



Presentation Outline

Introduction

Problem [What to Change]

- Localized Risk Management
 - Task Level Insurance Policy
 - Student Syndrome
 - Parkinson's Law
 - Multi-tasking

Solution [What to Change to]

- Governing Principle Global Risk Management
 - Project Level Protection
 - Systems Perspective
 - Execution Control

Problem: Localized Risk Management Strategy



Self-fulfilling prophecy [good estimating?]

2. Multi-tasking [absence of priorities]

Problem: Localized Risk Management

One Resource, Four Tasks, from Four Different Projects



Multi-tasking / task switching has overhead causing more delays to spread across all projects.

Presentation Outline

Background

- Governing Principle or Paradigm Shift
- Triple Constraints
- Complexity
- Murphy's Law

Problem [What to Change]

- Localized Risk Management
 - Task Level Insurance Policy
 - Student Syndrome
 - Parkinson's Law

Solution [What to Change to]

- Global Risk Management
 - Project Level Protection
 - Systems Perspective
 - Execution Control

Solution

Governing Principle Behind CCPM is:

Aggregation of risk...

Benefits:

- Lower overall protection needed
- Higher degree of "coverage" achieved
- Leading to lower incidence of "failure"

Solution: Global Approach to Risk Management

- 1. Planning
 - 1. Project Level vs. Task Level Protection
 - 2. Systems Perspective for Multiple Projects Pipeline projects with overlapping resources
- 2. Execution Control
 - 1. Promote and encourage team culture
 - 2. Controlled work queues
 - 3. No multi-tasking work rules
 - 4. No batch processing work rules
 - 5. Task assignment prioritization
 - 6. Management by Exception

Critical Chain Planning Process

From Task to Project Protection



Critical Chain Planning Process



Aggregation Principle

The Concept of Risk Pooling: Can someone explain why this works?

Health Care Example: Larger pool = Lower cost

Aggregation Principle

Insurance is designed to work by spreading costs across a large number of people. Premiums are based on the average costs for the people in an insured group. This risk-spreading function helps make insurance reasonably affordable for most people.

http://www.insurance.wa.gov/legislative/factsheets/PoolingRiskReducingCost.asp

Critical Chain Planning



PB = Project Buffer FB = Feeding Buffer

Aggregation Principle [where did some of the safety go?]:

- 1. Pooled protection provides more coverage
- 2. Location is just as important as amount
- 3. Sizing Rule of Thumb \rightarrow Buffer is $\frac{1}{2}$ of preceding chain

Critical Chain Planning

Schedule shown in Aurora



Proj_Buf = Project Buffer FB = Feeding Buffer

Schedule Before Execution Starts

T1	T2 FB	T3	14///15/// T6	РВ	1
17	T8				
	Т9	<mark>T10 </mark> T11	FB	132 h	nours



- 1. T8 experiences increase in scope or delay
- 2. First portion of delay absorbed by gap between T3 & T4
- 3. Rest of delay impacts the project buffer
- 4. E.g., So as of date project my be \rightarrow 7% Complete with 14% Buffer Consumed





Schedule Before Execution Starts



- 1. T8 experiences increase in scope or delay
- 2. First portion of delay absorbed by gap between T3 & T4
- 3. Rest of delay impacts the project buffer
- 4. E.g., So as of date project my be \rightarrow 7% Complete with 14% Buffer Consumed

Perspective on Buffers

- Not "rear view mirror watching"
- Predictive/Preventative/Leading Indicator
- Mechanism to Promote and encourage Team Work
- Collaboration / Communication Incentive Mechanism
- Measuring device Neutral, Normalized Metrics
- Real-time Risk Meter
- Encourages an holistic/goal oriented perspective

Critical Chain Priority Metric



LRC = Longest Remaining Chain

Project Status Trend Chart or "Fever" Chart

Critical Chain Priority Metric

Project Status Trend Chart or "Fever" Chart



Results (2)

- Harris Corporation:
 - construction of its \$250 million wafer fabrication plant – 3 days ahead of 13 month schedule (originally 18 months) & 4% over budget.
- Balfour Beatty
 - Civil engineering projects ahead of schedule and under budget.
- FMC Energy Systems
 - Sub sea systems on-time performance went from < 50% to >90%.
- Phillips
- US Navy

Questions ???

Robert Richards Ph.D., Stottler Henke Associates, Inc. Aurora@stottlerhenke.com

Hilbert Robinson President Afinitus Group LLC