



Code 400
"Rewriting the Future"
Initiative
Status Summary

January 2011





"Rewriting the Future" Objectives

As declared by Code 400 Director, George Morrow, the "Rewriting the Future" objective is to create an organization that:

- *Is 'Open and Inclusive'*
- *Has a 'Diverse cross-section' of people*
- *Is Innovative & Creative ways of thinking*
- *Elevates our performance beyond present level of success*
- *Expands leadership opportunities*
- *Exceeds our performance goals*
- *Attracts the best people*



What Has Happened So Far

- Vanto Group Inc. hired to facilitate proprietary method for 'Rewriting The Future' of Code 400
- A 12 member Code 400 Design Team was formed from a cross section of employees to interview directorate personnel, customers, stakeholders on 'state of code 400' to see if G. Morrow's concerns were confirmed by interview results
- A default / probable future that holds more of the same (the good and the not so good) was distinguished by the Design Team and Senior Code 400 Leadership and deemed 'not acceptable'; thus creating a 'case for action' to alter the default / probable future
- Conducted a three day retreat in June 1010 which was attended by Senior Code 400 Leadership team, and Design Team accomplished:
 - Review of and alignment on Design Team findings
 - Crafted a new Flight Projects Declaration, unencumbered by the human dynamics / mechanisms previously hidden
 - Formed three 'Future Outcome' teams focused on people, processes, and relationships, to craft future outcomes designed to address findings of Design Team and meet objectives of Code 400 'Rewriting the Future' initiative
- Held 1 day retreats in August and October to brief Senior Code 400 Leadership and Design Team on work of the 3 Future Outcome teams, seek alignment on outcomes, comments and edits etc.
- Future Outcome teams have distinguished short term goals and schedules for their respective future outcomes (now seeking others to join the fun!)



Goddard Flight Projects Directorate Declaration

We declare the possibility of the Flight Projects Directorate being the premier organization for program / project management at NASA

We stand for empowering outstanding performance in the execution of Goddard space flight endeavors and honoring our commitments to customers and stakeholders

We are committed to establishing an environment of trust, collaboration and cooperation through open communication both inside and outside the directorate

You can count on us for excellence in leadership and management



Process & Tools Future Outcome Team & Objectives

- ***Dena Butler***
- ***Dan Blackwood***
- ***Pietro Campanella***
- ***Kevin Carmack (Facilitator)***
- ***Nick Chrissotimos***
- ***Liz Citrin***
- ***Mike Donnelly***
- ***Bryan Fafaul***
- ***David Foertschbeck***
- ***Jim Greaves***
- ***Linda Greenslade***
- ***Dave Scheve***
- ***Craig Tooley***
- ***John Wolfgang***

Areas for Breakthroughs:

1. *Look at PM Tools for efficiencies*
2. *Externally driven processes*
3. *Workload management (strategic vs. reactive)*
 - *Size and make-up of project teams*
 - *Too much reporting of similar information*
4. *Reporting process (updating, streamlining, reducing, etc)*
5. *Process for identifying / gathering parts, information*
6. *Inter-project communication process*
7. *External communication*



People Future Outcome Team & Objectives

- ***George Barth***
- ***Mark Brumfield***
- ***Jonathan Bryson***
- ***Sherri Corbo***
- ***Reggie Eason***
- ***Debbie Hamby***
- ***Eleanor Ketchum***
- ***Rick King***
- ***Bob Menrad (Facilitator)***
- ***Dave Mitchell***
- ***Cathy Peddie***
- ***Susan Sparacino***
- ***Donna Swann***
- ***Nicole Turner***

Areas for Breakthroughs:

- 1. Update and enhance the FPD "Our People" framework*
- 2. Increase the transparency and efficiency associated with how the GSFC workforce can leverage FPD-specific opportunities and professional development strategies*
- 3. Promote increased diversity and inclusion primarily through competitively-based processes*
- 4. Promote clarity by illustrating common – but not exclusive – career pathways, including defined entry / exit points, for program / project management, resources management and administrative support practitioners*
- 5. Modernize the professional development toolset available to the workforce including, but not limited to, enhanced mentoring, self-assessments and informational interviews*
- 6. Facilitate a smooth transition to future generations by increasing the number of viable candidates for future leadership positions at all levels*



Relationship Future Outcome Team & Objectives

- ***Mansoor Ahmed***
- ***Jim Barcus***
- ***Preston Burch***
- ***Grettchen Burton***
- ***Cecelia Czarnecki***
- ***Gerry Daelemans***
- ***Debbie Dodson***
- ***Mary Ann Esfandiari***
- ***Michele Gates***
- ***Beth Keer***
- ***George Komar***
- ***Robin Krause (Facilitator)***
- ***Greg Mandt***
- ***George Morrow***
- ***Phil Sabelhaus***
- ***Tim Vansant***

Areas for Breakthroughs:

- 1.Role of directorate vis-à-vis other organizations; the role for programs and/or division and projects*
- 2.Cohesive and articulated identity for the directorate that is recognized, demonstrated (making it true), we believe it, embody it, and there is pride in organization (without arrogance)*
- 3.Development of communications / relationships across the directorate*
- 4.Tapping into experience of other projects /organizations, for knowledge, assignment of people, i.e. cross-pollination among projects and creating mechanisms for that to occur*
- 5.Dissolve 'us vs. them' mentality*
- 6.Breaking down stove-piping to improve working relationships: reassignments, details*

Sample of Processes Survey Spreadsheet

Process	Why is it "broken"?	Suggestion for Improvement	Type	Business			Internal			External		
				Priority	Control / Influence	Comments	Priority	Control / Influence / Control	Comments	Priority	Control / Influence	Comments
Pre-MSR/MSR Process	Added value of review process seems to be degraded.	Reviewers need to be engaged and up to date on Project status.	Rep				1	Control	> Code 400 can restructure to be more efficient / effective. Too many refreshes required to support Program Office, Code 400, Code 100 for MSR process	1	Control	> Code 400 can restructure to be more effective
GOLD Rules	formal signatures are required from all GOLD Rule committee members before formal 'waiver' is approved. Thus, projects can't move forward until formally approved.	allow projects to get verbal or informal 'approval' via e-mail (or other means in order to expedite) from committee members on a waiver request, and follow-up with formal approval documentation. This will allow any given project to move forward with the waiver (assuming all members approve), and not be delayed by 3-6 weeks with getting all committee members to sign the formal documentation before a project can proceed.	Pro				4	Influence	> Must work with Code 500 to minimize the impact of GOLD rules, including waiver process > Similar issue with 7120.5 with the too frequent updates, but have had some improvement as the list has gotten smaller	6	Influence	> Code 400 should be able to influence this process
Reimbursable Appropriation	CAS appropriation limits funds to 1 year(obligation)	Obtain separate appropriation for reimbursables	Pro	8	N/A	> Live with, no chance to change	X			3	Influence	> Code 400 should be able to greatly influence this process
IT support	Neglects Macintosh users	> Need to make sure that IT tools supports Mac users as well as PCs. Some enterprise tools don't work - eg. current calendaring system is unreliable at best > PERHAPS RESHAPE TO INCLUDE IT SECURITY	Pro	9	Influence	> Needs to be re-written to be meaningful	X			X		
Mandatory Training	Every year is too often for refresh training	Every two or three years is plenty. Unless there are changes in policy, then interim training could focus on changes.	Pro				5	Control / Influence	> Combine into more generic training module that hits more than one topic and increase yearly refresh rate to every 2 years	9	Influence	> No ability to change Code 500, but have great influence over what is done within Code 400
Governance Model	Center Management has been 'neutralized', value has been reduced due to HQ interference	HQ has abrogated too much authority from Center Management and the Program offices - the issue is, they are often too removed from the issues facing the Centers and make poor decisions due to lack of experience and knowledge of Center requirements.					3a	Influence / Control	> Need to manage by actively taking back some of the power that was taken away and re establish 400 / Center			

Initial Processes & Tools Overview

Item	Reporting	Personnel	Rules	External to Code 400
1	Pre-MSR/MSR Process	Career Development	7120.5x	Rejection of PR's
2	Monthly Programmatic Status Reviews with HQ/SCaN	Mandatory Training	Governance Model	Information Technology Budget Call
3	Staff Meetings	Office Space "balancing"	Role(s) of Program Offices at GSFC	IT support
4	NOAA-NASA oversight of programs/projects (yes, Both Polar and Geo)	Saturn Records Management	Workforce	KSC LV Preparation
5	HQ/SCaN financial phasing plans/actions	Personnel Evaluation - EPCS	GOLD Rules	New Business Process
6	Reporting to HQ for BPR, GAO, OMB, etc. Reporting		Cost Estimating / Tracking (JCLs, ICEs, EVM)	
7			Reimbursable Appropriation	
8			Reimbursable Processing	
9			Independent Review Process	
10			Lessons Learned	

Sample of Tools Survey Spreadsheet

DM		
Climate Sensors Project	Tool name	Virtual Systems Design Environment 3 (V3)
	Pros	A dedicated server is not needed to upload documentation. More secure environment so proprietary and cost data can be upload and restricted by permission to view.
	Cons	Since there is no dedicated server to keep documents, e-mailed or scanned documents have to be downloaded to desktop or some other temporary storage before uploading to V3. Complaints system not user-friendly . Changes to the system are very difficult and costly to make
	Comments	There are several DM tracking systems (CDRL, TOARs, ECN, Correspondence) that only the DM has access to that could be "all inclusive" in one tracking system including Configuration Management, Action Items and Risk Reporting.
GOES-R	Tool name	Virtual Systems Design Environment 3 (V3)
	Pros	A dedicated server is not needed to upload documentation. More secure environment so proprietary and cost data can be upload and restricted by permission to view.
	Cons	Since there is no dedicated server to keep documents, e-mailed or scanned documents have to be downloaded to desktop or some other temporary storage before uploading to V3. Complaints system not user-friendly . Changes to the system are very difficult and costly to make
	Comments	There are several DM tracking systems (CDRL, TOARs, ECN, Correspondence) that only the DM has access to that could be "all inclusive" in one tracking system including Configuration Management, Action Items and Risk Reporting.
LDCM	Tool name	Docushare (version 5.3)
	Pros	Docushare permits the sharing of of sensitive and contractor information with outside partners on a separate server. It allows the storage of documents from multiple sources, provides easy access and is very user friendly. You can also control the number of licenses bought.
	Cons	Docushare gets slow and cumbersome as the files get larger. When you copy the same document to many files and later delete it from one of the files, it automatically deletes the
	Comments	Docushare Price: \$49,235 (includes maintenance).
NPP	Tool name	FTP Site, Docu Share
	Pros	All systems are user friendly
	Cons	DM FTP site has problems with external & internal (GSFC) users accessing system; problems with dropping files with external users.
	Comments	FTP Site - good for temporary file sharing, but too many problems, Docu Share - good file

CURRENT TOOLS IDENTIFIED

CM/DM

- Cicero
- Windchill
- VSDE/V3
- Docushare/Sharepoint "CCMS"
- eRooms
- FTP Site/WebDrive
- ECCS/EDIS CCR Control System
- MIS
- NGIN
- Subversion
- **Note: PAAC has other SharePoint-based Toolkits in place for CM & other areas**

PLANNING & SCHEDULING

- Primavera
- MS Project Server
- NASA Schedule Test & Assessment Tool (STAT)
- NASA Planning & Scheduling Community of Practice (formerly P&S Toolkit)
- AEC Fasttrack

REQUIREMENTS TRACEABILITY

- DOORS
- Cradle (mostly Cx)

EVM

- MPM (earned value engine)
- COBRA (earned value engine)
- WinSight (earned value analysis tool)

JCL

- Cost Estimating & Program Assessment (CEPA)
- Oracle risk Manager/PertMaster
- SEER-SEM

RISK MANAGEMENT

- NGIN
- MIS
- IRIS
- Oracle Risk Manager/PertMaster
- Risk +
- @Risk
- Crystal Ball
- Acumen FUSE
- 585 Risk Mgmt Tool
- Primex

DOCUMENT REPOSITORY

- eRoom
- VSDE
- Docushare/Sharepoint "CCMS"
- MIS
- NGIN

Process & Tools Group Outcomes

Outcome #1: Streamlined Reporting		
	Specific Measures/When:	Team Lead
1	The FPD will develop processes for the timely circulation of relevant information	Jim Greaves
2	The FPD will re-structure MSR reporting	Jim Greaves
3	The FPD will develop a combined approach for reporting NOAA projects	Mike Donnelly
4	The FPD will propose a consistent format for MSR, BPR, and other monthly reporting venues	Dan Blackwood
Outcome #2: Internal Process Improvements		
1	The FPD will work with Code 300 to develop tools to expedite the approval process for waivers to the GOLD Rules	Dan Blackwood
2	The FPD will work with HQ and the Systems Review Office to develop a hierarchy of technical and programmatic reviews that satisfies the needs of both the Center and HQ	John Wolfgang
3	The FPD will work with Code 300 to develop a useable Goddard process for Lessons Learned	Linda Greenslade & David Foertschbeck
4	The FPD will develop a database of available tools for a variety of program/project management functions	Dena Butler & Pietro Campanella
Outcome #3: External Process Improvements		
1	The FPD will create a requirements verification database for 7120.5 to aid projects in assessing / controlling mandated Project Management Requirements	Bryan Fafaul
2	The FPD will establish a closed loop requirements / approval / procurement system for controlling EEE parts used by all Goddard Projects	Kevin Carmack
3	The FPD will establish an internal group that will assist projects in consistently and efficiently implementing the rapidly changing IT Security requirements for the flight systems	Bryan Fafaul



Moving Forward

- Complete final 1 day retreat in early February to further refine and detail Future Outcomes
 - The 3 sub-groups will continue to meet on a regular basis to make forward progress on the defined outcomes
- Opportunities to learn more and get involved:
 - Continue visits by Code 400 Directorate Leadership with Divisions
 - Completed visits to Code 401, 403, 407, 420, 430, 440, 443, 450, & 460
 - Still plan to visit Codes 410, 416 & 417
 - FPD Website: Documents and Videos Linked off Code 400 website
 - Brown Bag lunch chat, schedule on FPD website
- Future Outcome teams will need help from across the Directorate to take on other projects not listed here!
 - Contact Future Outcome team leads: Robin Krause (Relationships); Kevin Carmack (Process); Bob Menrad (People)