

Project Plan for “ *US Navy FCAP* ”

(*US Navy Facility Condition Assessment Program*)

	<i>Objectives</i>	<i>Measures</i>	<i>Verification</i>	<i>Assumptions</i>
	<i>Goal</i>			
	<i>Purpose</i>			
	<i>Outcomes</i>			
	<i>Inputs</i>			





Adapted from: *Strategic Project Management Made Simple: Practical Tools for Leaders and Teams*

(Wiley, © 2009) by Terry Schmidt



www.ManagementPro.com

The “LogFrame,” a strategic and project planning and action tool, helps leaders and teams design sound projects by systematically answering the *Four Critical Strategic Questions*:

-  1. What are we trying to accomplish and why?
-  2. How will we measure success?
-  3. What other conditions must exist?
-  4. How do we get there?

The answers to these questions are embedded in the LogFrame cells, and the cells interact with each other in a dynamic fashion.

The LogFrame offers a flexible planning and execution framework that links project deliverables with strategic intent.

To learn more, review our 4-page Special Report “*Turn Strategy Into Action*,” free on our website.

US Navy Facility Condition Assessment Program (FCAP)

The US Navy is responsible for maintenance, repair and renewal (MR&R) of building portfolios valued at nearly \$200 billion with approximately half a billion square feet of floor space spread over 100 installations world-wide. To sustain these facilities, Congress allocates over a billion dollars a year for operations and maintenance. Nevertheless, within the Navy, facilities requirements compete with other budget priorities for operations and maintenance dollars. Consequently, the MR&R of Navy facilities is chronically underfunded resulting in an ever-increasing backlog of deferred maintenance.

The Navy also lacks a consistent, repeatable and verifiable measure of facility condition, leaving facility managers with little insight as to how to best invest the scarce funds available for MR&R as well as leaving Congress without a reliable means to conduct their oversight responsibilities. Compounding the situation, the existing facility condition assessment methodology was relatively expensive. The Navy needed a credible and less expensive condition assessment method that enables effective facility investment decisions and provides reliable facility readiness reporting for Navy leadership and congress.

During 2003 and 2004, a Navy working group researched several alternative facility condition assessment methods and conducted market surveys. They completely rethought and redesigned the facility condition assessment process based on their research and industry best practices. They performed a business case analysis among alternative solutions, ultimately deciding upon a life cycle approach and Engineered Management System technology to address the short comings of the existing program. The working group's solution would provide the insight into facility portfolios needed for more effective facility investment decisions while significantly reducing the cost of the facility condition assessment program and facilitate reliable facility readiness reporting. Their solution, however, would require a significant cultural change for the Navy's facility management community.

The working group presented their findings and recommended solution to Navy leadership. While acknowledging significant logistical and cultural challenges, the research and analysis indicated that their solution best addressed the major issues of improving MR&R planning, facility investment, and facility readiness reporting. It also provided the best mechanism for ensuring facility readiness in an era of limited and dwindling financial resources of all alternatives investigated. Navy leadership endorsed the working group's recommended solution, and approved its implementation despite the challenges, both logistical and cultural.

The first stage of implementation was deployment of the facility condition assessment IT tool (FCAT) to Navy installations worldwide and to initialize the FCAT with facility component inventory data and a baseline assessment of those components. The scope and scale of implementing a new and unfamiliar process in the Navy requires strategic thinking and effective planning in order to meet the logistical challenges as well as anticipate and overcome the enormous inertia inherent in an organization the size of the Navy. This LogFrame was a tool to capture and communicate their strategy in a succinct manner.

Logical Framework for US Navy FCAP Deployment Plan

Objectives <i>Logical hierarchy of If-Then Assumptions</i>	Success Measures <i>Conditions when Objectives are achieved</i>	How to Verify <i>Source of evidence to verify Measures</i>	Assumptions <i>Additional factors necessary for success</i>
<p>Super Goal: Continue to ensure facility readiness in an era of limited financial resources.</p>	<p>Measures of Super Goal Achievement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. FY10 Sustainment (ST) budget reduced by ___% from the previous year with no adverse impact on facility readiness or increase in deferred maintenance. 	<p>Verify Super Goal Measures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. FY 10 PWD ST budget submissions, followed up by financial readiness reports reflecting actual performance throughout the year. 	<p>Assumptions to reach Super Goal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continuing leadership support for cultural change by aligning incentives for compliance with the FCAP process. 2. Program management roles and responsibilities defined. 3. Program management adequately funded.
<p>Goal: Improve maintenance and repair planning, facility investment decision making and facility readiness reporting.</p>	<p>Measures of Goal Achievement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. By 1 Oct 09, all PWDs producing an optimized Maintenance Action Plan (MAP). 2. By 1 Oct 08, FCAP defines the impact of deferred maintenance in terms of facility readiness and future costs. 	<p>Verify Goal Measures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Optimized MAP. 2. The estimated changes in Condition Index (CI) and penalty costs due to deferred maintenance are quantified in an auditable report. 	<p>Assumptions to reach Goal and beyond:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continued funding for training. 2. BOS contractor issues resolved. 3. PWS templates revised. 4. SPM performance issues resolved. 5. PWDs successfully integrate the process into their everyday PW business activities. 6. PWDs perceive program to add value to their M&R operations. 7. DoD does not mandate FCA methods inconsistent with EMS approach.
<p>Purpose: Deploy and initialize FCAP IT tool, (FCAT).</p>	<p>Purpose Measures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. By 30 April 07, FCAT available for use on Navy work stations. 2. By 15 Jun 07, FCAT generating CIs based on modeled Navy asset inventory. 3. By 30 Sep 07, FCAT generating acceptably accurate asset condition assessments in terms of CI and Remaining Service Life (RSL) based on refined Navy asset inventory. 	<p>Verify Purpose Measures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Users able to log on to SPM and access FCAT from Navy work stations. 2. Facility condition and facility readiness reports of Navy buildings. 3. Facility condition and facility readiness reports of Navy buildings. 	<p>Assumptions to achieve Purpose:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The asset inventory refinement necessary to produce results sufficiently accurate to support POM-10 requirements is achievable under time and funding constraints. 2. Advance team is effective in facilitating inventory refinement. 3. Teams coordinate and communicate effectively. 4. No unforeseen glitches or catastrophes.

“If Goal then Super Goal”



“If Purpose then Goal”



“If Outcomes
then
Purpose”



Objectives <i>Logical hierarchy of If-Then Assumptions</i>	Success Measures <i>Conditions when Objectives are achieved</i>	How to Verify <i>Source of evidence to verify Measures</i>	Assumptions <i>Additional factors necessary for success</i>
<p>Outcomes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. FCAT interfaces with iNFADS. 2. FCAT integrated with SPM and deployed for use by Navy users. 3. Parametrically modeled asset inventory for selected Navy facilities. 4. Refined the modeled inventory of exterior enclosure, roof and HVAC assets using readily available installation knowledge augmented by “eyes-on” data as needed. 	<p>Outcome Measures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. By 1 Jun 07, FCAT data exchange with iNFADS is automated as specified. 2. By 1 Sep 07, FCAT deployed on Navy systems. 3. By 15 Jun 07, modeled facility asset inventory for all specified Navy buildings complete. 4. By 1 Sep 07, refined facility asset inventory for all specified Navy building complete. 	<p>Verify Outcome Measures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. iNFADS data elements populated automatically with FCAT generated output. 2. Navy users able to log on to FCAT directly or launch from SPM on Navy work stations, and data interfaces function as specified and required for full functionality of both applications. 3. Facility asset inventory data base populated. 4. Facility asset inventory data base updated to reflect local knowledge. 	<p>Assumptions to produce outcomes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. IATO obtained NLT ____ 2. Contractual vehicles executed in a timely manner. 3. Will not require significant PWD effort, i.e. PWD level of effort required will not precipitate PWD push back. 4. PWD personnel necessary to assist contractor in refining the modeled asset inventory are available when needed for timely completion. 5. Contractor accurately estimates the level of effort necessary to accomplish required tasks. 6. Contractor marshals adequate personnel and equipment to accomplish required tasks in the time available. 7. Teams coordinate and communicate as necessary. 8. No unforeseen glitches or catastrophes.



INPUTS ACTIVITIES:	RESP.	Budget	Schedule (in weeks, months, etc.)												Assumptions for activities	
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
1. Accomplish remaining tasks FCAP contract currently in force	FCAP team	Funds obligated														<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IATO obtained NLT • iNFADS anomalies are resolved.
1.1 insert contractor's project schedule																
2. Accomplish integration and deployment tasks from FCAP contract currently in force	FCAP team	Funds obligated														
2.1 [insert contractor's project schedule]																
3. Parametrically model building asset inventory																
3.1 Assign Team																
3.2 Execute modification to FCAP contract currently in force																
3.3 [insert contractor's project schedule]																
4. Refine modeled inventory of building assets																
4.1 Assign Team																
4.2 Execute Delivery Orders on contracts for Engineering Services currently in force																
4.3 [insert contractor's project schedule]																