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Three Questions for Interactive Session

• Tailoring programs: What are best practices in applying “speed with discipline” when planning and executing programs?

• Customer relations: What are best practices for working with a “difficult” customer or improving customer relations?

• Exerting authority: How can a PM exert authority when the organizational structure doesn’t naturally foster that authority?
Some considerations (discussions at an AF PEO/Executive Roundtable this last Feb):

• **Military acq system optimized to a cold war period**
  – Laws, regs, number of stakeholders, budget systems
  – Laws, regs have built one by one over time due to program problems or failures
    • They never get less, only build
    • Attempting to avoid any mistakes at the price of speed and cost
  – Difficult to tell whose fault it is when a breech occurs
Govt managers are driven to risk averse behavior based on present acq system

These managers need top-cover that assures them they can take measured risk

Industry execs opinions: The one most effective cost saving initiative that could be implemented in mil acq is shortening program lengths

- With the number of people that are required to work all the additional requirements now placed on traditional programs, simply shortening the time they work on a program would yield the best cost savings
- This may imply a schedule driven program, deferring capabilities to spiral in that can’t make the schedule
## Tailoring Programs (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Program</th>
<th>Traditional Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attributes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attributes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-90% solution</td>
<td>Attempt to gain 100% solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close and frequent customer coordination</td>
<td>Coordination through formal reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule driven</td>
<td>Event driven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streamlined testing, limited OT</td>
<td>Extensive testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires customer leadership to tailor acq requirements</td>
<td>Follow all acq requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailored cert and accreditations</td>
<td>Full cert and accreditations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Pros</strong></th>
<th><strong>Cons</strong></th>
<th><strong>Pros</strong></th>
<th><strong>Cons</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quicker to field</td>
<td>May require operational workarounds</td>
<td>Less risk of fielding deficiencies</td>
<td>Higher risk of scope creep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower cost</td>
<td>Higher risk of masked sustainment issues</td>
<td>Full sys engineering artifacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Typographic Elements:**
- **Attributes**: Describes the features and characteristics of each program.
- **Pros** and **Cons**: Lists the advantages and disadvantages of each approach.

**Notes on Table:**
- The table compares the features and outcomes of Special Program and Traditional Program, highlighting the differences in solutions, coordination methods, and decision-making processes.
- Pros for Special Program emphasize quicker implementation with lower cost, while Cons include the potential need for operational workarounds and masked sustainment issues.
- Traditional Program aims for a 100% solution with extensive testing, ensuring full acq requirements are met, but at the cost of higher risk of scope creep.

**Additional Information:**
- The table is structured to facilitate easy comparison and decision-making between the two program types, considering both short-term and long-term implications.
- The use of clear, concise language aids in understanding the nuances between the Special Program and Traditional Program, making it easier for decision-makers to identify the most suitable option for their needs.

**Footer:**
- The footer includes a logo and page number, indicating the source of the document and its position within the presentation.
• How AFSOC tailors acq programs vs the regular AF would be a good study.

• Question #1: What are best practices in applying “speed with discipline” when planning and executing programs?
  – Example: Show customer cost and schedule savings with certain process tailoring
Some considerations:

- **Avoid misunderstandings and scope creep**
  - With more detailed SOWs
  - Freeze requirements as early as possible
- **If customer won’t work with the contractor to resolve and only resorts to “holding the contractor’s feet to the fire,” then issues won’t resolve as quickly as possible or to the best advantage of the customer**
• Good working and trusting relationships with customer are extremely important
• Trust between the customer and contractor is key to optimizing the cost/schedule/performance

• Question #2: What are best practices for working with a “difficult” customer or improving customer relations?
  – Example: Bring the customer onto the team
Some considerations:

- Organization may not naturally afford authority
  - Matrixed
  - Large/geographically distributed

- Can’t depend on PM title to get groups to execute
  - Especially in resource constrained environments
  - Must build professional relationships
    - Groups must gain trust in PMs judgment
Exerting Authority (cont)

- Ensure budgets are flowed down to groups executing and they take ownership of the budgets.
- During proposal phase, development of resource loaded schedule (IMS) that is the frame for the BOEs helps ensure buy-in by executing groups.
- Question #3: How can a PM exert authority when the organizational structure doesn’t naturally foster that authority?
  - Example: Ensure budgets are flowed down.
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