

Summary of the OneSC Project Team Responses to the Recommendations from the Lehman-Gunn Review

A) Overall Summary of the OneSC Team Responses

The OneSC Project responses to the 43 Lehman-Gunn Review Committee recommendations were placed in one of the following categories:

Category	Category Definition	Number of Recommendations
Accept	OneSC Project Team agrees with the recommendation and appropriate actions are identified as part of the OneSC Project Team response	22
No new action required	OneSC Project Team believes the recommendation involves an activity that is either underway or was already planned and no new specific actions are required; this category is a form of agreement on the recommendation	17
Reject	OneSC Project Team does not agree with the recommendation or does not believe that the recommendation is consistent with the scope and/or requirements identified in the OneSC Project Plan	4

This data indicates that the OneSC Project rejected 4 (9%) of the recommendations, accepted 22 (51%), and found that the essence of 17 (40%) of the recommended actions were planned but not yet accomplished or for various reasons required no additional action. The OneSC Project Team believed that the Review Committee recommendations were generally constructive and actions being taken by the OneSC Project Team are responsive. The OneSC Project Team accepted twenty-two of the twenty-six recommendations where project action was required. The overall objective of the OneSC project is to ensure that the project deliverables are acceptable to the Project sponsor.

There were seventeen recommendations where the OneSC Project Team believed that no new action was needed. This is an indication that the Review Committee and the OneSC Project Team were in essential agreement but it may not have been clear during the review that this was the case. The OneSC Team believes that one or more of the following may have caused this:

- 1) the OneSC Team was not able to effectively communicate what it was doing and/or what it planned to do to complete a deliverable(s) for the project
- 2) the Review Committee supported what the OneSC Team was doing or planned and this recommendation was a documented agreement or endorsement of what the OneSC Team was doing or planned to do
- 3) the Review Committee heard what the OneSC Team was doing, agreed that the actions were correct, but believed that a recommendation was needed to ensure that the actions were actually completed as stated (particularly if the

- project could not produce a sheet of paper with the deliverable or plan to produce the deliverable)
- 4) based only on the presentation materials and hand-outs, the Review Committee was unable to visualize the final OneSC products adequately and they believed that a recommendation was necessary

B) Further Categorizing of the 43 Recommendations

While there are 43 separate recommendations, the 43 recommendations can be summarized by five major themes. These themes are consistent with the questions to be addressed in the Charge Letter to the Review Committee. Two of the themes (project schedule and overall project progress) are directly related to one another and were combined for this summary analysis. These major themes, with a very short summary of the combined recommendations, are as follows:

Major Themes	Summary of recommendations associated with the major theme	Number of Recommendations
Project scope	refined or expanded scope needed for the project (may include an expansion of the project beyond the OneSC Project Plan)	19
Project schedule and overall Project Progress	amount of remaining work is not consistent with a end of November completion for Phase I; the Project is unlikely to meet schedule deadlines	4
Project resources	some areas could use additional assistance including the use of support contractors	4
Communication	project efforts need to be greatly enhanced	12
Overall project management	additional oversight mechanisms needed	4

This data indicates that the largest number of recommendations (19 or 44%) were associated with issues on the project scope. Many of these recommendations were associated with a need to limit the Phase I deliverables to only those essential to meet the Phase I restructuring schedule. On the other hand, several of these project scope recommendations proposed a greatly enhanced project scope (beyond that in the OneSC Project Plan) that would add considerable time and effort to the schedule. These two sets of recommendations appeared to be inherently inconsistent to the OneSC Project Team. The OneSC Project Team did not accept those recommendations that suggested an enhanced scope because they did not provide a corresponding benefit for the increased effort and schedule slippages.

The second largest number of recommendations (12 or 28%) were associated with enhanced communications. This is an important element of the project. Effective communication within the Project Team clearly enhances the quality of deliverable products. The Review Committee was generally satisfied with internal communications. External communications also has an impact on the quality of the product because the entire SC staff has to be involved for this restructuring to be successful. In particular,

good external communication has a direct impact on the acceptance of the final products. The OneSC Project Team was assisted by its Communications subteam, which includes several communications experts, in evaluating the Review Committee recommendations. The OneSC Team agreed with many of the concerns that the Review Committee expressed and agreed that the current Communications Plan is not yet a detailed plan. At the same time, however, the Team judged that the actions already planned within the Project were responsive to most of the recommendations from the reviewers. The Project Manager agrees with this conclusion which results in the large number of “no new action required” disposition of the recommendations (8 of 12 recommendations).

The OneSC Project Team does not believe that the allocation of project resources and the issues associated with overall project management were considered major issues by the Review Committee based on the number and content of the recommendations with the exception of the recommendation to establish a steering committee which is discussed in Section E of this report.

C) Overall Summary of Recommendation

Combining the disposition category and the major themes of the recommendations provides a final summary of the report.

Major Theme	Accept	No New Action	Reject	Total
Project Scope	11	6	3	19
Project Schedule and overall Project Progress	3	1		4
Project Resources	4			4
Communications	4	8		12
Overall Project Management		2	1	4
Total	22	17	4	43

D) OneSC Project Team Observations:

While the Lehman-Gunn Review was based on the Lehman Review process for reviewing line item construction projects, the OneSC is not a construction project but is a “paper” project. Not all aspects of the Lehman Review process worked as effectively on paper projects as they normally do for reviews of construction projects. For example, no site tour or examination of finished products was possible. The site tour reinforces the presentation material (makes it real) or contradicts the presentation material. Seeing finished products helps put the presentation material in proper context. At the time of the review, the OneSC Project was still a work in progress so reviewers had to extrapolate

what the products would look like when they were completed. This is a difficult task to perform. Another example of differences from a typical Lehman Review is the extensive amount of working documents from the SC Organizational Sub-Teams. The supporting material required a CD because it would not fit onto anything smaller. This created a particularly difficult review environment for the Review Committee. In addition, the use of R2A2s as the method of data collection was new to some reviewers. In a Lehman Review the supporting material is more standardized and familiar to reviewers.

Notwithstanding the above, the Project feels strongly that the reviewers took their charge very seriously and provided recommendations that will make the project stronger. In addition, the interaction with the reviewers was an added value to the project and we look forward to a second review now that the committee is familiar with the details of the project.

E) Specific OneSC Responses to Key Review Committee Recommendations

E.1) Rejected Recommendations:

Scope -The Review Committee recommended that the OneSC Project scope be modified significantly leading to the development of a series of options with detailed analyses, accompanied by thorough documentation.

The Review Committee did not identify which significant option(s) were not being examined nor did they identify the advantages of pursuing this potentially extensive effort. The OneSC Project Team stated that this was not consistent with the project scope and requirements. The project requirements, in effect, represent decisions by the sponsor to limit the range of options and thereby eliminate a time-consuming process to identify, analyze, and document a potentially long list of options of little interest to the sponsor. The OneSC Project Team is required to identify and defend the proposed organizational structure that meets the requirements (including analysis of some alternative reporting relationships) and is workable. The project will proceed on that basis unless the sponsor decides to alter the project requirements. In addition, the thrust of this recommendation appears inconsistent with the recommendation that the Project focus only on the essential needs for Phase I.

Scope – (2 recommendations) - The Review Committee requested that both internal SC agreements and agreements between SC and external organizations be included under the Interface Agreements WBS. The Review Committee also recommended that a new set of Interface Agreements, among all of the SC organizations, be developed.

The OneSC Team believes that this proposed WBS re-organization does not contribute to the management of the project or an understanding of the project deliverables. The SC organizational roles, responsibilities, authorities, and accountabilities developed as part of SC Organizational Teams (HQ, Site Offices, and Support Center) eliminate the need for most internal SC agreements except for the Program Execution Agreements the OneSC Team had already proposed for development.

Overall Project Management – the Review Committee recommended that the OneSC Project establish a steering committee to provide policy direction and oversight similar to the NNSA Leadership Coalition.

This recommendation is inconsistent with the formal processes put in place by SC-1 to manage the project. The OneSC Project Plan, approved by the Director, establishes a clear project management process to provide direction to the project through the use of project requirements, assumptions, and management principles. A formal change control process is also in place to manage changes in direction. In addition, guidance and oversight is provided by the Principal Deputy Director, the Deputy Director for Operations and the Chief of Staff through discussions and status briefings. It is also noted that the SC Executive Steering Committee already exists and is an available mechanism for providing feedback on restructuring issues.

E.2) Accepted Recommendations:

Project scope, schedule, and overall project progress - The Review Team stated that they believed insufficient time was available to complete the planned tasks for Phase I. They recommended that the OneSC Project Team identify the essential activities and defer the remaining tasks to later, thereby moving scope out of Phase I.

The OneSC Team is preparing a change control action for an extension of the schedule for Phase 1. It turns out that deferring scope out of Phase 1 (except for a small amount of scope connected with the reengineering effort which is being worked in parallel with restructuring) is self defeating. That is, Phase 1 cannot end until the new organizational structure is fully defined and approved. All the scope must be accomplished to reach that milestone. However, the committee was absolutely correct in its view that the schedule was insufficient to accomplish that scope by the end of calendar year 2002.

Project scope – Define the “sense of the Laboratory”

The OneSC project is developing a working definition of the “sense of the Laboratory” and it will be included as part of the responsibilities of the Site Office Manager.

Communications - The Review Committee believed that a more detailed communication plan was needed and that the OneSC project should continue to pursue and enhance communications within the SC complex and with others who could be impacted with the re-structuring.

The OneSC Team will develop a more detailed communication plan(s). The OneSC Team will continue to pursue opportunities where enhanced communications can be implemented.

F) Specific responses to each of the Review Committee Responses

December 20, 2002

A table (*OneSC Responses to the Recommendations of the OneSC Lehman-Gunn Review*) has been prepared and is attached that includes the Project's planned disposition/responses to the Lehman-Gunn Review Committee Recommendations.