EVMS Variance Analysis - Quality Checklist

PM-30 20181212

CAM: WBS:

For more info refer to EVMS Training Snippet: 5.4 PARS Analysis: Variance Reports

Month:

https://www.energy.gov/projectmanagement/downloads/evms-training-snippet-54-pars-analysis-variance-reports

| | | | Item | Checklist Item Value (2-7) | |
|----------|--------------------|--|---------|----------------------------|----------------------|
| Item | Objective* | Expected Content | Score** | | VAR Quality Comments |
| 1 | CA Trips | Are all Control Account (CA) level variance trips | | 7* | |
| | | explained? | | | |
| | | - Current and/or Cumulative Cost | | | |
| | | - Current and/or Cumulative Schedule | | | |
| | | - Variance At Completion | | | |
| | | - Cost and Schedule explained separately | | | |
| 2 | Big Picture | Is at least 80% of CA variance dollar value explained? | | 5 | |
| 3 | Root Cause | Major drivers of variance explained in terms of root | | 7* | |
| | | cause and clear enough to demonstrate not only the | | | |
| | | what but the drilled down why? Is the schedule | | | |
| | | addressed in terms of days/total float? | | | |
| 4 | Work Package | Significant** anomalies at the WP level should be | | 4 | |
| | (WP) Level Data | reported and explained in CA VAR. | | | |
| | Reviewed | a. BCWP w/o ACWP (or) ACWP w/o BCWP | | | |
| | | b. Any negative BCWS, BCWP or ACWP | | | |
| | | c. Percent Complete < 100% where ETC is zero | | | |
| | | d. Zero or Negative Budget at WP level | | | |
| | | e. TCPI _{eac} delta >10%: future performance | | | |
| <u> </u> | | more than 10% different than past CPI | | | |
| 5 | WP Level Masking | Are WP variances consistent with CA level? | | 4 | |
| | | If not, is WP level masking explained? | | | |
| 6 | Element of Cost | CA VAR should be clear regarding EOC that drives the | | 5 | |
| | | variance. WPs are typically EOC pure (direct labor, | | | |
| | | material, subcontract, ODCs). | | | |
| 7 | Rate/ Usage | Are variances segregated by rate and usage? | | 5 | |
| 8 | BCPs | Have all BCPs that impact CA data been explained in | | 6 | |
| | | VAR? | | | |
| 9 | Freeze Period/ | Retroactive changes must be discussed as an anomaly | | 5 | |
| | Retroactive | in the CA VAR regardless of reporting thresholds. | | | |
| | Changes | Ensure VAR: | | | |
| | | - Identify freeze period/retroactive change | | | |
| | | - Describe overall impact | | | |
| | | - Reference reason for change | | | |
| | | - List BCP number | | | |
| 10 | Anomalies | If there is a significant*** adjustment, such as a rate | | 5 | |
| | | distribution or labor correction, the VAR should | | | |
| | | mention the significant adjustment, and include an | | | |
| | | analysis of the variance excluding the anomaly. | | | |
| 11 | Impact Statement | Is the specific impact on the project for scope, cost, | | 7* | |
| | | and schedule discussed? | | | |
| | | - If "none", explain why no consequence | | | |
| | | - Does impact relate to the root cause? | | | |
| | | - State impact on project schedule including critical | | | |
| | | path and other CAs? | | | |
| 40 | Internation of the | - State impact on EAC? | | 7.4 | |
| | | Outline specific actions to be taken? | | 7* | |
| | Actions | - If "none", explain why | | | |
| | | - When will it be completed? | | | |
| 12 | Corrective Action | - What is the expected outcome? | | Г | |
| 13 | | Are all corrective actions (except where no further | | 5 | |
| | Tracking Log | action is necessary) included in the corrective action | | | |
| | | tracking log? | | | |
| 14 | Corrective Action | - Who, What, When adequately defined? Are corrective actions tracked to closure in the CA | | 5 | |
| 14 | Closure | | | Э | |
| | Ciosure | Tracking log? If incomplete, are all actions statused? If actions are reforecast, is there an explanation in the | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | log? | | | |

| EVMS Variance Analysis - Quality Checklist | CAM: | |
|--|------------------|--|
| PM-30 20181212 | WBS: | |
| For many information to FVMC Training Columnst, F. 4 DADC Application Variance Departs | N / a sa ta la s | |

For more info refer to EVMS Training Snippet: 5.4 PARS Analysis: Variance Reports

https://www.energy.gov/projectmanagement/downloads/evms-training-snippet-54-pars-analysis-variance-reports

| | | | | Checklist Item Value (2-7) | |
|------|-------------------|--|---------|----------------------------|----------------------|
| Item | Objective* | Expected Content | Score** | | VAR Quality Comments |
| 15 | Estimate to | Does the timephased ETC justification indicate | | 7 | |
| | Complete | assumptions applied to future scope that would | | | |
| | | explain the forecast? Trends referenced? | | | |
| 16 | CA level TCPI | Is TCPI within 10% of Cumulative CPI? If more than a | | 5 | |
| | analysis | 10% difference when CA is greater than 10% | | | |
| | | complete, is there an explanation of why future scope | | | |
| | | will perform differently from past scope in the EAC | | | |
| | | section of the VAR? TCPI _{eac} of 1.0 is a red flag | | | |
| | | indicating EAC has not been reviewed. | | | |
| 17 | Consistent Format | Most impacts should be expressed in \$K. | | 3 | |
| | | Mixing of Hours, Quantities and Dollars can be | | | |
| | | confusing. Values should be shown using both | | | |
| | | parentheses and negative signs: | | | |
| | | - favorable variance (+\$40K) | | | |
| | | - unfavorable variance (-\$40K) | | | |
| 18 | Style | Good write-ups use statements that dig down, such as | | 3 | |
| | | "Due to" and "Because of" | | | |
| 19 | Clear language | VAR written at level understood by those with limited | | 3 | |
| | | exposure to project? | | | |
| | | Is language simple and clear as possible? | | | |
| | | Are uncommon acronyms spelled out? | | | |
| | | Avoid phrases "none", "within threshold" which | | | |
| | | typically add no value to the VAR. | | | |
| 20 | Signature | VAR signed by CAM? Submitted on time? | | 2 | |
| | | VAR score (Goal = 100, Fail < 80) | | | Fail |

^{*} The 5 Objectives identified by green background are mandatory and all must pass. If one fails, the VAR fails.

| This checklist captures the basic expe | ectations for var | riance analysis. I | t will be used |
|---|-------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| by PM-30 to evaluate the quality of μ | published VARs, | , CAM feedback a | and training. |

| d | Prepared by: | | | | |
|---|--------------|--|--|--|--|
| | Date: | | | | |

^{**} No partial credit for each Item score (all or nothing).

^{***}Significant defined as contributing to the top 80% of variance.