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PREFACE

PREFACE

1. INTRODUCTION. This SUPSHIP community Project office Self-Assessment Guide was developed in conjunction with a “Back to Basics” effort conducted in 2009-2011 of a review of the policies and requirements affecting the performance of SUPSHIP project offices.

2. PURPOSE. Specific guidance for operation of the project office is contained in the SUPSHIP Operations Manual (SOM) and each key process cited in this guide refers to the appropriate paragraph in the SOM. Additionally, individual SUPSHIPs may have additional requirements placed upon them for execution of specialized programs including submarine safety, deep submergence, fly-by-wire, aircraft launch and recovery safety, etc. Self-assessments are designed to review the processes, controls, procedures, and associated functions/controls used in the performance of specific tasks. In most cases, they are not oriented to a specific ship, but are intended to determine how the factors being reviewed impact the performance of the project office. The goal of this self-assessment is to provide all levels of management at the activity with an independent, objective, and constructive evaluation of the effectiveness and efficiency with which control responsibilities are being implemented.

3. SCOPE. The SUPSHIP Project office Self-Assessment will, as a minimum, review establishment and implementation of, and compliance with, the following processes and procedures: project oversight/control, organization, functions and responsibilities, qualifications/training, certification program (on/off-site), audit/surveillance program, trend analysis, control of data, configuration management, interface management, change control, and testing. A representative sample of required records and supporting documentation will be required in a form suitable for review.

4. CHECKLIST. The attribute checklist provides detailed questions on specific requirements applicable to the activity being assessed and identifies the associated requirements documents. The checklist is divided into separate sections for each applicable process (i.e., contractor performance evaluation) although the actual functional areas reviewed during the assessment may vary if NAVSEA determines a need to focus attention on a specific area of concern.

4.1. The questions provided in the attribute checklist are intended to serve as starter questions or items to review. These are not intended to be the only attributes for an assessor’s use. They are intended as points of departure for an in-depth assessment. It is fully expected that the answers to most of the questions will generate additional questions. Pull each thread until you are completely satisfied, or you have identified a valid finding. Use direct observation to verify that the project office is functioning the way the policies and procedures dictate..

4.2. Each assessor is an experienced individual of proven capability. This information is provided as a catalyst to integrate your experience with the program objectives. As you develop questions or suggestions, share them. Your question or suggestion may be just the thing that another assessor needs to help him/her. This sharing of knowledge and experience will provide a synergistic effect on the self-assessment, resulting in enhanced benefits to the activity as well as the individual assessors.

4.3. The evaluation of each attribute should be done across a spectrum of performance – from identification of a best practice (BP), satisfactory full performance of the process (SAT), identification of opportunities for improvement (OFI), to unsatisfactory performance (UNSAT) or a not applicable process (NA). Each process has one or more basic areas of interest, as well as the area of Measures Taken to Ensure Effectiveness. Each area has one or more attributes to be evaluated. It is left to the discretion of the assessor as to the level of documentation recorded for each attribute, but if an attribute is evaluated as OFI or UNSAT, there should be sufficient documentation to ensure the responsible project office is aware of the problem, and be provided recommendations on how to initiate improvement.

5. PRIORITIES. Table 5.1 depicts the processes found in the SUPSHIP Operations Manual (SOM) Chapter 5, along with the relative priority of each process with 5 as the highest, to 1 as the lowest. The table has a proposed cross reference to the NAVSEA Command Inspection process areas. This information should be used to focus the scheduling of self-assessments and to gain the most beneficial assessment within the available resources of each SUPSHIP command.

6. CONDUCT OF ASSESSMENTS.

6.1 As outlined in SOM Section 5.5.3.2.1 there is no specific required interval between conduct of self-assessments. As a best practice, it is generally recommended that each project office conduct a self-assessment of all applicable processes on an annual basis.

6.2 Lessons learned have shown the development of internally generated means for trending is the most effective means of tracking individual process performance effectiveness and improvements. Each project office is encouraged to develop their own means for trending process performance, and to share these methods with other project offices across entire SUPSHIP community.

* 1. Upon completion of the self-assessment, part III of this guide should be completed to support the command’s management control program assessment of the project office assessable unit for the assessed project office, to determine overall risk related to the following criteria:

1. The likelihood of process control failures in five categories of failure causes.
2. The consequences of process control failures by considering five categories of undesirable outcome. Table 5.1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MAJOR FUNCTIONS** | **SOM Chapter** | **Ownership Primary - P Secondary - S** | **KEY PROCESSES** | **CRITICAL PROCESSES: Drive Contractor Performance** | **CRITICAL PROCESSES: Customer Needs** | **Consolidated Weighting of Shipbuilder / Customer Impact** | **Ranking**  **1 = Low,**  **3 = Moderate, 5 = High** |
|  |  |  |  | 1 = Low,  3 = Moderate,  5= High | |  |  |
| Project Contract Oversight (5.3.1) | 5.3.1.1 | S | Contract Pre-Award Support | 3 | 3 | 6 | 3 |
| 5.3.1.2 | S | FAR/DFAR/Non-CAS Function Management/Accountability | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 5.3.1.3 | P | Shipbuilder Contract Performance Evaluation | 5 | 3 | 8 | 5 |
| Command Coordination (5.3.2) | 5.3.2.1 | P | Work Priority Management | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| 5.3.2.2 | P | Functional Code Deployment | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 5.3.2.3 | S | Design & Production Planning Support | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| 5.3.2.4 | P | Project Team Development | 3 | 1 | 4 | 3 |
| Government Interface Management (5.3.3) | 5.3.3.1 | P | Project Execution External Communications | 1 | 5 | 6 | 5 |
| 5.3.3.2 | P | Project Oversight Knowledge Sharing | 3 | 3 | 6 | 3 |
| 5.3.3.3 | P | Management of Changes to the Scope of SUPSHIP Workload | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| 5.3.3.4 | S | PM Acquisition Strategy Implementation | 3 | 5 | 8 | 3 |
| Change Management (5.3.4) | 5.3.4.1 | S | Claims Avoidance & Entitlement Determination Support | 1 | 5 | 6 | 1 |
| 5.3.4.2 | S | Contract Change Authorization | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| 5.3.4.3 | S | Funds and Project Budget Management | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| Production Oversight and Test Program Coordination (5.3.5) | 5.3.5.1 | P | Contractor Interface Management | 5 | 3 | 8 | 5 |
| 5.3.5.2 | P | Test Program Coordination | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| 5.3.5.3 | P | Shipbuilder Portfolio Review | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| 5.3.5.4 | S | Production Surveillance | 3 | 3 | 6 | 3 |
| 5.3.5.5 | P | Independent Project Assessment | 3 | 5 | 8 | 5 |
| 5.3.5.6 | P | Non-Shipyard Work Integration Oversight | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| Delivery, Sail-Away, Post Delivery Management (5.3.6) | 5.3.6.1 | P | Non-Nuclear Crew Preparation for Sail-Away | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| 5.3.6.2 | P | Nuclear Crew Integration Into Shipbuilding | 3 | 5 | 8 | 5 |
| 5.3.6.3 | P | Certification Coordination | 1 | 5 | 6 | 3 |
| 5.3.6.4 | P | INSURV Support | 1 | 5 | 6 | 3 |
| 5.3.6.5 | P/S | Preliminary Ship Acceptance | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| 5.3.6.6 | P | Guarantee Work Management | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 |

7. GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ACO Administrative Contracting Office | NOC Notification of Change |
| AIT Alteration Installation Team | NRRO Naval Reactor Representative Office |
| AP Acquisition Plan | OFI Opportunity for Investment |
| BP Best Practice  CAR Corrective Action Request  CAO Contract Administration Office  CAS Contract Administration Services  CCT Customer Contracted Team  CHENG Chief Engineer  CPARS Contractor Performance Assessment Report System  CAQAP Contract Administration Quality Assurance Program  DAWIA Defense Acquisition Workforce Improvement Act  DCAA Defense Contract Audit Agency  DCMA Defense Contract Management Agency  DOD Department of Defense  ERP Enterprise Resource Planning  EVMS Earned Value Management System  FAR Federal Acquisition Regulation  GSI Government Source Inspection  HRO Human Resource Office  INSURV Board of Inspection and Survey  J&A Justification and Authorization  LAR Liaison Action Request  MOA Memorandum of Agreement  NA Not Applicable | PCU Pre-Commissioning Unit  PE Procedure Evaluation  PMS Preventative Maintenance System  PR Procedure Review  PVI Product Verification Inspection  QA Quality Assurance  RFP Request for ProposalQ  RMMCO Regional Maintenance & Modernization  Coordination Office  SAT Satisfactory  SHIPALT Ship Alteration  SOM SUPSHIP Operations Manual  TAR Technical Analysis Report  TEMPALT Temporary Alteration  TYCOM Type Commander  UNSAT Unsatisfactory  URO Unrestricted Operation  URU Unrestricted Use |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
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PART II

KEY PROCESS ATTRIBUTE CHECKLISTS

For SUPSHIP \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Project office \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Completed by \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Internal Audit Number: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

***Section 5.3.1.1***

***Contract Pre-Award Support***

#### SOM Section 5.3.1.1: Contract Pre-Award Support

**Process Ownership:** The project offices provide support to this overall process that is the responsibility of the Procurement Contracting Officer (PCO) and the PEO/NAVSEA program manager.

**Responsibility:** Make recommendations to the government Program Office Acquisition Plan, and to the PCO for development of the government negotiating position.

**Products and Services:** Provide shipbuilding experience and subject matter expertise to the NAVSEA contracting officer, PEO/PM, and TYCOM in the development of the program Acquisition Plan (AP), Justification and Approval (J&A), pre-award survey, Request for Proposal (RFP), associated Technical Analysis Report (TAR), and Source Selection Board participation in support of contract award.

| **5.3.1.1:**Contract Pre-Award Support | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | **REMARK/COMMENT** |
| **A. Acquisition Strategy Development**  1. Since the last SUPSHIP project office self-assessment, has any PEO/NAVSEA program office initiated an acquisition plan, Request for Proposal (RFP), or requested an RFP evaluation?  a. Has senior management assumed a proactive role in providing support to the PEO/NAVSEA program office?  b. Was feedback provided on said acquisition plan, RFP, or RFP Evaluation?  c. How is this documented? Were changes incorporated? | PEO/PMS – SOS MOA (as applicable) |  |  |
| 2. Was specification development necessary to support a contract solicitation package?  a. Has senior management assumed a proactive role in providing support to the PEO/NAVSEA program office?  b. Was feedback provided on the specifications package?  c. How is this documented? | PEO/PMS – SOS MOA (as applicable) |  |  |
| 3. Was the proposed contract reviewed by SUPSHIP?  a. Were the recommendations for scope changes or contract wording revisions provided?  b. Did SUPSHIP provide recommendations for additions to scope based on previous contract scope changes (FMRs) or lessons learned in contract administration of previous contracts?  c. Was the contract technical baseline distributed to cognizant SUPSHIP departments?  d. How is this documented? |  |  |  |
| **B. Measures Taken to Ensure Effectiveness**  1. Were the products and services (see p. 2) completed in a timely manner?   1. Is the schedule for products being followed? 2. Does the quality of the product meet or exceed the customer’s expectations? 3. What is being done to make the product better? |  |  |  |
| 2. Is the process used to deliver products and services the best to practice?   1. How is this process being made better? 2. How is the time taken for the process being reduced? |  |  |  |
| 3. How do the results of this work?   1. Is the procedure for product development effective? 2. What is being done to make the final products better? |  |  |  |
| 4. What is being done to improve the trend for the overall product quality? |  |  |  |
| 5. Has there been any change in the behavior of the shipbuilder? |  |  |  |
| 6. Are project office and command instructions related to this process current and effective? |  |  |  |

***Section 5.3.1.2***

***FAR/DFAR/Non-CAS Function Management/Accountability Support Process***

#### SOM Section 5.3.1.2: FAR/DFAR/Non-CAS Function Management/Accountability Support Process

**Process Ownership:** The project offices provide support to this overall process that is the responsibility of the SUPSHIP Administrative Contracting Officer (ACO).

**Responsibility:** Ensure the contractor complies with FAR/DFAR and associated non-Contract Administration Services (CAS) requirements assigned to the project offices.

**Products and Services:** Provide shipbuilding experience and subject matter expertise to SUPSHIP ACO.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **5.3.1.2:**FAR/DFAR/Non-CAS Function Management/Accountability Support Process | | | | | | |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | | **REMARK/COMMENT** | |
| 1. **FAR Compliance**    * + 1. For each area noted in SOM Table 5-A, where a project office code is assigned responsibility, is the project office performing the minimum expected actions to provide contractor oversight? | SOM Table 5-A | |  | |  | |
| 1. **Pre-Award Review**   1. Has a review of the contractor's compensation structure been completed? | [FAR 42.302](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/42302-contract-administration-functions):  (1) | |  | |  | |
| 2. Has a review of the contractor's insurance plans been completed? | (2) | |  | |  | |
| 3. Was a Post-Award Orientation Conference completed? | (3) | |  | |  | |
| 4. Was a review/evaluation of contractor's proposals under [FAR 15.4](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/part-15-contracting-negotiation#i1105894) completed?  a. Were the comments & recommendations from this review/evaluation provided to the contracting officer prior to negotiations? | (4) | |  | |  | |
| 5. Were pre-award surveys performed (see [FAR 9.1](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/part-9-contractor-qualifications#i1116049))? | (32) | |  | |  | |
| **C. Pricing/Cost Rates**  1. Were forward pricing rate agreements (see [FAR 15.407-3](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/part-15-contracting-negotiation#id1617MD00W43)) negotiated? |  | |  | |  | |
|  |  | |  | |  | |
| **5.3.1.2:**FAR/DFAR/Non-CAS Function Management/Accountability Support Process | | | | | | |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | **REMARK/COMMENT** | |
| * 1. Were advance agreements applicable to treatment of costs under contracts currently assigned for administration (see [FAR 31.109](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/part-31-contract-cost-principles-and-procedures#i1086218)) negotiated? | [FAR 42.302](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/42302-contract-administration-functions)  (6) | |  |  | |
| * 1. Were any costs suspended or disapproved?   a. Were these suspensions or disapprovals of costs allowable (see [FAR 42.8](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/part-42-contract-administration-and-audit-services#i1074988))?  b. Were Notices of Intent to Disallow or not Recognize Costs (see [FAR 42.8](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/part-42-contract-administration-and-audit-services#i1074988)) issued?  c. Were final vouchers approved? | (7)  (8)  (7) | |  |  | |
| * 1. Did any contractors meet the criteria of [FAR 42.7](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/part-42-contract-administration-and-audit-services#i1075062)?      1. If so, were final indirect cost rates and billing rates established? |  | |  |  | |
| * 1. Were attempts made to resolve issues in controversy using Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) procedures when appropriate (see [FAR 33.2](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/part-33-protests-disputes-and-appeals#i1080175))? Were findings of fact made and decisions issued under the Disputes clause on matters in which the administrative contracting officer (ACO) has the authority to take definitive action? |  | |  |  | |
| * 1. In connection with Cost Accounting Standards (see [FAR 30.601](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/part-30-cost-accounting-standards-administration#i1086580) and [48 CFR Chapter 99](https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CFR-2001-title48-vol7/pdf/CFR-2001-title48-vol7-chap99.pdf) (FAR Appendix)):   a. Were the contractor’s disclosure statements determined to be the adequate?  b. Were all of the contractor’s disclosure statements in compliance with Cost Accounting Standards and [FAR Part 31](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/part-31-contract-cost-principles-and-procedures)? |  | |  |  | |
| * 1. Were any classified contracts administered?      1. Were they delegated to the CAO (see [FAR 4.4](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/part-4-administrative-and-information-matters#i1123044))? | [FAR 42.302](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/42302-contract-administration-functions)  (21) |  | |  | | |
| 1. **Contracts – Supplements/Modifications**   1. Were any supplemental agreements negotiated?  a. Settlement of partial and complete contract terminations for convenience, except as otherwise prescribed by [FAR Part 49](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/part-49-termination-contracts) negotiated?  b. Cancellation charges under multiyear contracts settled?   * 1. Were all necessary screening, redistribution and disposal of contractor inventory completed?   2. Were any contract modifications issued which require the contractor to provide packing, crating and handling services on excess Government property?   a. Were these services secured from a contractor other than the contractor in possession of the property?  b. Is proper documentation available? | [FAR 42.302](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/42302-contract-administration-functions)  (24)  (25)  (28)  (29) |  | |  | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **5.3.1.2:**FAR/DFAR/Non-CAS Function Management/Accountability Support Process | | | |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | **REMARK/COMMENT** |
| * 1. Were there any contractor requests for Government property and/or for changes to existing Government property?   a. Were these requests evaluated and appropriate recommendations provided by the contracting officer?  b. Was Government property screened before acquisition by the contractor?  c. Were payments by the contractor of any rental due completed?  d. Were all items no longer needed for Government production reported?  e. Were these requests/actions documented? | [FAR 42.302](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/42302-contract-administration-functions)  (30) |  |  |
| * 1. Was all surveillance and status reporting completed in a timely manner?   a. Were potential and actual slippages in contract delivery schedules reported? | [FAR 42.302](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/42302-contract-administration-functions)  (31) |  |  |
| * 1. Were any contractor industrial labor relations matters experienced?   a. Did these matters foster the removal of urgently required material from the strikebound contractor's plant?  b. Did this require contractor officer’s authorization?  c. How was this documented? | [FAR 42.302](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/42302-contract-administration-functions)  (34) |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **5.3.1.2:**FAR/DFAR/Non-CAS Function Management/Accountability Support Process | | | |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | **REMARK/COMMENT** |
| * 1. When supplemental agreements were executed, were changes in packaging subcontractors’ or contract shipping points accomplished? | [FAR 42.302](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/42302-contract-administration-functions)  (62) |  |  |
| 1. **Contractor’s Operations**    1. Were the contractor's traffic operations reviewed for adequacy?   a. Provide documentation reflecting the issuance and control of Government bills of lading and other transportation documents. | [FAR 42.302](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/42302-contract-administration-functions)  (36) |  |  |
| * 1. Were the preservation, packaging and packing processes reviewed and evaluated as adequate?   a. How was this documented? | [FAR 42.302](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/42302-contract-administration-functions)  (37) |  |  |
| * 1. Were the contractual quality assurance requirements reviewed and evaluated as adequate?   a. How was this documented? | [FAR Part 46](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/part-46-quality-assurance)  [FAR 42.302](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/42302-contract-administration-functions)  (38) |  |  |
| * 1. Were the contractual safety requirements reviewed and evaluated as adequate?   a. How was this documented? | [FAR 42.302](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/42302-contract-administration-functions)  (39) |  |  |
| * 1. Were the contractual environmental requirements reviewed and evaluated as adequate?   a. How was this documented? | [FAR 42.302](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/42302-contract-administration-functions)  (68) |  |  |
| * 1. Were the government property control requirements reviewed and evaluated as adequate?   a. How was this documented? | [FAR 42.302](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/42302-contract-administration-functions)  (29, 30) |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **5.3.1.2:**FAR/DFAR/Non-CAS Function Management/Accountability Support Process | | | | | |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | | **REMARK/COMMENT** |
| * 1. Were contractual engineering requirements (schedule, cost and technical performance in the areas of design, development and production) reviewed and evaluated as adequate?   a. Were the following included in the review & evaluation?   * + - 1. Contractor’s engineering efforts and management systems that relate to design, development, production, engineering changes, subcontractors, tests, management of engineering resources, reliability and maintainability, data control systems, configuration management and independent research and development.       2. Contractor's logistics support, maintenance and modification programs.       3. Contractor’s cost proposals.       4. Contractor's procedures for complying with procedures regarding restrictive markings on data.       5. Contractor’s value engineering programs.       6. Contractor's purchasing system (see [FAR 44](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/part-44-subcontracting-policies-and-procedures)).   b. How was this documented? | [FAR 42.302](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/42302-contract-administration-functions)  (40, 41, 44, 45, 46, 49) | |  | |  |
| * 1. Were the contractor’s Drug-Free Workplace and Drug-Free Awareness Programs reviewed and evaluated as adequate?   a. How was this documented? | [FAR 42.302](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/42302-contract-administration-functions)  (66) | |  | |  |
|  |  | |  | |  |
| **5.3.1.2:**FAR/DFAR/Non-CAS Function Management/Accountability Support Process | | | | | |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | | **REMARK/COMMENT** | |
| * 1. Does the contractor possess master subcontracting plans for the review, evaluation and approval of approve plant or division-wide small, small disadvantaged and women-owned small business?      1. Was a review and evaluation of this master subcontracting plan completed?         1. How was this documented?      2. Thru periodic surveillance, was the contractor's compliance with small, small disadvantaged and women-owned small business subcontracting plans and any labor surplus area contractual requirements assured?   c. How was this documented? | [FAR 42.302](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/42302-contract-administration-functions)  (51, 52, 53, 54, 55) |  | |  | |
| * 1. Were any amended shipping instructions required?      1. If so, were contractor proposals for any contract price adjustments resulting from amended shipping received and reviewed?      2. Except when the ACO has settlement authority, were these proposals forwarded to the contracting officer for contract modification?      3. How was this documented? | [FAR 42.302](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/42302-contract-administration-functions)  (60, 61, 62) |  | |  | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **5.3.1.2:**FAR/DFAR/Non-CAS Function Management/Accountability Support Process | | | | | |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | | **REMARK/COMMENT** | |
| * 1. Did any contractor environmental practices result in adverse impact on contract performance or contract costs?      1. Were specifications requiring delivery or use of environmentally preferable products, energy-efficient products, products containing recovered materials, and bio-based products monitored for contractor compliance?         1. Was this documented as a part of the quality assurance procedures set forth in [Part 46](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/part-46-quality-assurance)?      2. If required in the contract, did the contractor comply with the reporting requirements relating to recovered material content utilized in contract performance (see [FAR 23.4](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/part-23-environment-energy-and-water-efficiency-renewable-energy-technologies-occupational-safety-and-drug-free-workplace#i1094654))? | [FAR 42.302](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/42302-contract-administration-functions)  (68) |  | |  | |
| 1. **Closeout Procedures**    1. Were purchase orders appropriately canceled upon notification of non-acceptance by the contractor?       1. Was the contracting officer notified of the purchase order cancelation? | [FAR 42.302](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/42302-contract-administration-functions)  (63) |  | |  | |
| * 1. Were any one-time supplemental agreements providing for the extension of contract delivery schedules up to 90 days on contracts (assigned Criticality Designator of C) negotiated and executed?      1. Was the contracting officer notified that the contract delivery schedule was being extended?      2. Were subsequent extensions on any individual contract authorized only upon concurrence of the contracting office? | [FAR 42.302](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/42302-contract-administration-functions)  (64) |  | |  | |
| **5.3.1.2:**FAR/DFAR/Non-CAS Function Management/Accountability Support Process | | | | | |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | | **REMARK/COMMENT** |
| 3. Were administrative closeout procedures accomplished? | [FAR 42.302](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/42302-contract-administration-functions)  (65) | |  | |  |
| * 1. Were commercial financing provisions administered?      1. And was the contractor (financial) security evaluated/monitored to ensure it continued adequacy to cover outstanding payments? | [FAR 42.302](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/42302-contract-administration-functions)  (69) | |  | |  |
| * 1. Were excess funds after final price determination de-obligated? If required.      1. Were funds evaluated for expiration and de-obligated as required? Has the contractor provided billings against all obligated funds? | [FAR 42.302](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/42302-contract-administration-functions)  (70) | |  | |  |
| 1. **Contractor Administration Systems**    1. Was a review and evaluation of the contractor’s estimating systems completed?       1. How was this documented? | [FAR 15.405-5](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/part-15-contracting-negotiation#i1106373)  [DFAR 242.302](https://www.acq.osd.mil/dpap/dars/dfars/html/current/242_3.htm) | |  | |  |
| * 1. Was a review and evaluation of the contractor’s material management and accounting systems competed?   a. How was this documented? | [DFAR 242.72](https://www.acq.osd.mil/dpap/dars/dfars/html/current/242_72.htm) | |  | |  |
| * 1. Were all payments administered in accordance with the applicable payment clauses?   a. How was this documented?  b. Were the procedures at [PGI 242.302(a)(13)(B)](https://www.acq.osd.mil/dpap/dars/pgi/pgi_htm/current/PGI242_3.htm) for designation of paying offices appropriately followed? | [FAR 42.302](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/42302-contract-administration-functions)  (13, 14) | |  | |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **5.3.1.2:**FAR/DFAR/Non-CAS Function Management/Accountability Support Process | | | |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | **REMARK/COMMENT** |
| * 1. With respect to all Single Process Initiative (SPI) Management Council activities; were any facility-wide class contract modifications and agreements for SPI processes negotiated and executed?      1. How was this documented? | [DFARS 211.273](https://www.acquisition.gov/dfars/part-211-describing-agency-needs#211.273) |  |  |
| * 1. Is the project office using EVMS data provided by Code 400 to make informed program decisions?   a. How was this documented? |  |  |  |
| **H. Measures Taken to Ensure Effectiveness**  1. Are management actions done in a timely manner?   1. Is the schedule for actions being followed? 2. Does the quality of the actions meet or exceed the customer’s expectations? 3. What is being done to make the actions better? |  |  |  |
| 2. Is the process used to provide oversight the best to practice?   1. How is this process being made better? 2. How is the time taken for the oversight process being reduced? |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **5.3.1.2:**FAR/DFAR/Non-CAS Function Management/Accountability Support Process | | | |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | **REMARK/COMMENT** |
| 3. How are the results of this work?   1. Is the procedure for oversight effective? 2. What is being done to make the final oversight better? |  |  |  |
| 4. What is being done to improve the trend for the overall oversight rate? |  |  |  |
| 5. Has there been any change in the behavior of the shipyard? |  |  |  |
| 6. Are Project office and command instructions related to this process current and effective? |  |  |  |

***Section 5.3.1.3***

***Shipbuilder Contract Performance Evaluation***

#### SOM Section 5.3.1.3: Shipbuilder Contract Performance Evaluation Support Process

**Process Ownership:** The project offices typically act as the command focal point and coordinate this overall process that is the ultimate responsibility of the Administrative Contracting Officer (ACO).

**Responsibility:** Provide inputs to Award Fee Boards, individual contract incentive fee determinations and Department of Defense Business Transformation Agency (BTA) Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) evaluations.

**Products and Services:** Provide detailed recommendations to the ACO for award/incentive fee and contractor performance ratings.

| **5.3.1.3:**Shipbuilder Contract Performance Evaluation | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | **BP/SAT/OFI/ UNSAT/NA** | **REMARK/COMMENT** |
| **A. Award/Incentive Fee Determination**  1. Since the last SUPSHIP Project office Functional Audit, have any new contracts been issued that contain award fee or incentive fee provisions?  a. Has senior management assumed a proactive role for implementation of the Award/Incentive Fee Determination Program?  b. How is this documented? |  |  |  |
| 2. How is the Award/Incentive Fee determination process emphasized to all SUPSHIP employees involved in the evaluation process in order to obtain the necessary objective quality evidence to document the government’s determinations? |  |  |  |
| 3. How does SUPSHIP management ensure that:  a. Individual employees are technically competent to perform the assigned assessment?  b. Individual employees have had the necessary training to perform the assigned assessment?  c. Sufficient guidance and direction have been provided to accomplish the assigned assessment? | [FAR 16.4](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/part-16-types-contracts#i1104343) |  |  |
| 4. Has SUPSHIP management provided adequate resources to support evaluation of:   1. The individual contracts that require an Award or Incentive Fee determination? 2. The individual awards and incentives that apply to each of the contracts? | [FAR 16.401](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/part-16-types-contracts#i1104343)  [FAR 16.402](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/part-16-types-contracts#id1617MD00XB1) |  |  |
| 5. What is the process SUPSHIP uses to determine the incentives and awards for each contract? | [FAR 16.402-2](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/part-16-types-contracts#id1617MD00XB1) |  |  |
| 6. What policies and procedures does SUPSHIP use for making awards of indefinite-delivery contracts and establishes a preference for making multiple awards of indefinite-quantity contracts. | [FAR 16.500](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/part-16-types-contracts#i1103875) |  |  |
| 7. Has SUPSHIP management reviewed past performance information to ensure that the contractor:   1. Conforms to contract requirements? 2. Adheres to contract schedules? 3. Shows reasonable and cooperative behavior and commitment to customer satisfaction? | [FAR 42.1501](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/part-42-contract-administration-and-audit-services#id1617MD0L0LE) |  |  |
| **B. CPARS Program Management**  1. Is the CPARS command Focal Point formally assigned responsibilities?  a. Has the Focal Point completed CPARS Training?  b. Does the Focal Point have access to resources to perform his functions?  c. Does the Focal Point act as the central point of contact within SUPSHIP in all matters concerning the CPARS program to ensure a single, unified approach?  d. How is this demonstrated? | [CPARS Guide](https://www.cpars.gov/pdfs/CPARS-Guidance.pdf)  pg. 15 |  |  |
| 2. Is the CPARS Assessing Official Representative (AOR) formally assigned responsibilities?  a. Has the AOR completed CPARS Training?  b. Does the AOR have access to resources to perform his functions?  c. Does the Assessing Official Rep act as the central point of contact within SUPSHIP for developing individual CPARS evaluations to ensure a single, unified approach?  d. How is this demonstrated? | [CPARS Guide](https://www.cpars.gov/pdfs/CPARS-Guidance.pdf)  pg. 16 |  |  |
| 3. Is the CPARS AOR formally assigned responsibilities?  a. Has the AOR completed CPARS Training?  b. Does the AOR have access to resources to perform his functions?  c. Does the Assessing Official act as the central point of contact within SUPSHIP for conducting individual CPARS evaluations to ensure a single, unified approach?  d. How is this demonstrated? | [CPARS Guide](https://www.cpars.gov/pdfs/CPARS-Guidance.pdf)  pg. 16 |  |  |
| 4. Is the CPARS Reviewing Official (RO) formally assigned responsibilities?  a. Has the RO completed CPARS Training?  b. Does the RO have access to resources to perform his functions?  c. Does the RO act as the central point of contact within SUPSHIP for final CPARS resolution to ensure a single, unified approach?  d. How is this demonstrated? | [CPARS Guide](https://www.cpars.gov/pdfs/CPARS-Guidance.pdf)  pg. 18 |  |  |
| 5. Does the Focal Point periodically review contract reporting status?   * 1. How is this documented?   2. Are all CPARS reporting requirements current?   3. Are all required contracts entered into the CPARS system? | [CPARS Guide](https://www.cpars.gov/pdfs/CPARS-Guidance.pdf)  p. 15 |  |  |
| 6. Has the Focal Point assigned access authorization for all personnel involved in the automated workflow for the contract? | [CPARS Guide](https://www.cpars.gov/pdfs/CPARS-Guidance.pdf)  pg. 15 |  |  |
| 7. Has the AOR initiated and updated the assessments?   1. How is this documented? | [CPARS Guide](https://www.cpars.gov/pdfs/CPARS-Guidance.pdf)  pg. 17 |  |  |
| 8. Has the AOR evaluated contractor performance?   1. How is this documented? 2. Has he/she validated the proposed ratings and remarks entered by the AOR? | [CPARS Guide](https://www.cpars.gov/pdfs/CPARS-Guidance.pdf)  pg. 17 |  |  |
| 9. Are all Contractor Representative’s in place?   1. Do all Contractor Reps have access to resources to perform his functions? 2. Is the Contractor Rep processing evaluations in a timely manner? | [CPARS Guide](https://www.cpars.gov/pdfs/CPARS-Guidance.pdf)  pg. 18 |  |  |
| 10. Has the Reviewing Official ensured that the assessment is a fair and accurate assessment of the contractor’s performance? | [CPARS Guide](https://www.cpars.gov/pdfs/CPARS-Guidance.pdf)  pg. 18 |  |  |
| 11. Does the Focal Point maintain contact with other CPARS assigned individuals in the command, the contractor’s representative, and other activities to obtain or present information relative to CPARS? |  |  |  |
| 12. Does the Assessing Official Rep maintain contact with other CPARS assigned individuals in the command, the contractor’s representative, and other activities to obtain or present information relative to CPARS? |  |  |  |
| **C. Measures Taken to Ensure Effectiveness**  1. Is the product done in a timely manner?   1. Is the schedule for production being followed? 2. Does the quality of the product meet or exceed the customer’s expectations? 3. What is being done to make the product better? |  |  |  |
| 1. Is the process used to build the product the best practice?   a. How is this process being made better?  b. How is the time taken for the process being reduced? |  |  |  |
| 1. How are the results of this work?   a. Is the procedure for production effective?  b. What is being done to make the final product better? |  |  |  |
| 1. What is being done to improve the trend for the overall production rate? |  |  |  |
| 1. What is being done to reduce the reclamas and withhold percentage? |  |  |  |
| 6. Has there been any change in the behavior of the shipbuilder? |  |  |  |
| 7. Are project office and command instructions related to this process current and effective? |  |  |  |

***Section 5.3.2.1***

#### *Work Priority Management*

#### SOM Section 5.3.2.1: Work Priority Management

**Process Ownership:** The project office is responsible for coordinating the prioritization process within SUPSHIP to ensure day-to-day operations between the government and contractor are effectively interfaced for each project.

**Responsibility:** Integrate and communicate various government Program Office/TYCOM priorities into a clear picture to both internal SUPSHIP departments and to the shipbuilder.

**Products and Services:** Provide prioritization adjudication services for multiple projects within the command.

| **5.3.2.1:** Work Priority Management | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | **REMARK/COMMENT** |
| **A. Management of Priorities** |  |  |  |
| 1. Does each project office provide regular updates to all the other project offices on upcoming key events? |  |  |  |
| 2. Does each project office provide regular updates to all other departments within the command of upcoming key events?  a. Does the project office provide the contractor’s key event schedule as well as the project office assessment or projection of those key event schedules? |  |  |  |
| 3. Does the command have an effective means to prioritize resources between various projects? |  |  |  |
| 4. Does the command have an effective means to prioritize resources between project requirements, and internal/external command requirements? |  |  |  |
| 5. Does each project office provide regular updates to the shipbuilder program offices on upcoming key events?  a. Does the project office engage with the shipbuilder program office to provide feedback on the shipbuilder’s key event schedule? |  |  |  |
| 6. Does the command have an effective means to evaluate how the shipbuilder prioritizes resources between various projects? |  |  |  |
| **B. Measures Taken to Ensure Effectiveness**  1. Is the prioritization done in a timely manner?   1. Is the schedule for production being followed? 2. Does the quality of the product meet or exceed the customer’s expectations? 3. What is being done to make the product better? |  |  |  |
| 2. Is the process used to build the prioritization the best to practice?  a. How is this process being made better?  b. How is the time taken for the process being reduced? |  |  |  |
| 3. How are the results of this work?  a. Is the procedure for development of priorities effective?  b. What is being done to make the priorities management better? |  |  |  |
| 4. Are project office and command instructions related to this process current and effective? |  |  |  |

***Section 5.3.2.2***

#### *Functional Code Deployment*

#### SOM Section 5.3.2.2: Functional Code Deployment

**Process Ownership:** The project office is responsible for coordinating the prioritization process, within the individual SUPSHIP Command, to ensure day-to-day operations between the government and contractor are effectively interfaced internal to each project.

**Responsibility:** Ensure appropriate data flow between codes (schedules, agendas, etc.) to ensure project priorities are being supported and functional code expertise is engaged at the right time.

**Products and Services:** Coordinate providing program schedule of major events, milestones, mini-plans, weekly staff briefings, weekly program briefing critical paths, and individual program priorities.

| **5.3.2.2:** Functional Code Deployment | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | **REMARK/COMMENT** | |
| **A. Functional Deployment** |  |  |  | |
| 1. Does each project office provide regular updates to all the other project offices on upcoming key events in order to ensue functional resources within the project offices are available? |  |  |  | |
| 2. Does each project office provide regular updates to all other departments within the command of upcoming key events in order to ensue command-wide functional resources are available? |  |  |  | |
| 3. Does the command have an effective means to adjust resources between various departments? |  |  |  | |
| 4. Does the command have an effective means to seek additional resources external to the command? |  |  |  | |
| **B. Measures Taken to Ensure Effectiveness**  1. Is resourcing done in a timely manner?   1. Is the schedule for resource allocation being followed? 2. Does the quality of the resource allocation meet or exceed the customer’s expectations? 3. What is being done to make the resource allocation better? |  |  | |  |
| 2. Is the process used to adjust resources the best to practice?  a. How is this process being made better?  b. How is the time taken for the process being reduced? |  |  |  | |
| 3. How are the results of this effort?  a. Is the procedure for resource allocation effective?  b. What is being done to make resource allocation better? |  |  |  | |
| 4. What is being done to improve the trend for resource allocation effectiveness? |  |  |  | |
| 5. Are project office and command instructions related to this process current and effective? |  |  |  | |

***Section 5.3.2.3***

#### *Design & Production Planning Support*

#### SOM Section 5.3.2.3: Design & Production Planning Support

**Process Ownership:** The project office is responsible for coordinating the internal processes supporting the design and planning efforts to ensure effective interface between the government and contractor.

**Responsibility:** Ensure POCs for all departments are established and incorporated into program developmental activities and program planning processes. Proactively insert SUPSHIP personnel into the up-front efforts.

**Products and Services:** Provide shipbuilding experience and subject matter expertise to NAVSEA, PEO/PM, and TYCOM in order to incorporate lessons learned and avoid pitfalls.

.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **5.3.2.3:** Design and Production Planning Support | | | | |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | **REMARK/COMMENT** | |
| 1. **Pre-Award Support**    1. Did all SUPSHIP departments establish POCs to support program developmental activities and program planning processes?   a. How was this documented? |  |  |  | |
| * 1. While the contractor prepared engineering products, detailed production planning, and began a mobilization of the workforce and required resources necessary to execute the terms and conditions of the contract, did key SUPSHIP personnel, i.e., project office personnel and those supporting CAS functions, become fully engaged with their counterparts in the contractor’s organization so that effective ground rules could be established as early as possible? |  |  |  | |
| **B. Design Phase**   * 1. Based upon the various engineering products, i.e., computer modeling, engineering analysis, finite element analysis, projected weight reports, schematics, detailed drawings, lofting packages, Long Lead Time Material (LLTM) requirements, Material Requirements Listings (MRL’s), etc.; did the contractor’s management team develop an Integrated Master Schedule (IMS) for design product delivery and fabrication that supports overall program funding requirements?   a. Were these products, which are used by the various shipyard trades, reviewed as early as possible by the production planning team and shop personnel in order to develop the production processes, shop floor practices, and construction plans for assembling the ship? |  |  |  | |
| * 1. Did the SUPSHIP project office and assigned naval architects and engineering personnel provide the SUPSHIP Chief Engineer, as the Technical Warrant Holder (TWH), with appropriate support on the following:   a. Integrated Process Teams (IPT) including:  (1) System Integration Teams (SIT)?  (2) Major Area Teams (MAT)?  b. Support includes but was not limited to:   * + - 1. The review of the contractor’s engineering products and drawings,       2. Assessing the contractor’s compliance with the contract’s technical and performance specifications? |  |  |  | |
| 3. Did the SUPSHIP project office provide sufficient management and coordination of Government Furnished Information (GFI) to meet the shipbuilder’s integrated master schedule (IMS)? |  |  |  | |
| 4. Does the SUPSHIP have an MOA with the associated PEO/PMS that is developing a new ship design effort? |  |  |  | |
| 5. Has a new SUPSHIP project office been established to support any new projects?  a. Has the SUPSHIP Workforce Forecasting Technique Pricing Model (SWFT-PM) been updated to reflect the new project?  b. Has a proposed project office organizational chart been approved and submitted to HRO to support the new project?  c. Have Position Descriptions (PD) been developed with HRO to support staffing the project office? |  |  |  | |
| 6. Has the project office been involved with the contractor in development of the new project’s Integrated Master Schedule? |  |  |  | |
| 7. Has the project office been involved in establishing the conditions of the Design Contract? |  |  |  | |
| 8. Has the project office been involved in the development of the ship specifications?  a. Does the project office have a working relationship with the engineering department for coordination of approvals?  b. Does the project office have a plan for support of NAVSEA specification reading sessions? |  |  |  | |
| 9. Has the project office been involved in the development of the Drawing Approval Process (DAP), Work Deferral Process and Ship Test administration procedures and processes? |  |  |  | |
| 10. Does the project office have access to all necessary IT resources?  a. Does the project office have sufficient access to classified networks?  b. Does the project office have sufficient access to shipbuilder databases? |  |  |  | |
| **C. Production Planning Support**  1. Has the project office been involved with the contractor in development of the new project’s Master Assembly Plan (MAP)? |  |  |  | |
| **D. Production Planning and Mobilization**  1. The contractor’s production departments, associated shop trades and material division will begin advanced planning for “start of construction”. During this period did the SUPSHIP Project office provide appropriate support to the following:  a. Work with the design division to incorporate produce-ability recommendations to the production processes?  b. Process control procedure development?  c. Support the application of Lean and Six Sigma principles early in the planning process which would foster their integration into improved shop floor practices?  d. Review drawings to facilitate shop floor planning and mobilization of the required resources?  e. Commence Long Lead Time Material (LLTM) procurement and their associated storage requirements to support production schedules and workflow processes? |  |  |  | |
| 2. The joint development of Schedule A GFM delivery schedule and coordination of material delivery?  a. Monitoring the GFM and CFM reports to identify and help mitigate late material delivery dates?  b. Finalizing subcontracts for support services or fabrication of designated components?  c. Conducting Integrated Baseline Review (IBR) of the PMB, normally six (6) months after contract award and reviewing detailed shop production schedules for all projects that require in-shop and field support, interfacing the production resource requirements and conflict analysis related to all projects, and presenting work planning alternatives for meeting production schedule requirements?  d. Commencing fabrication of manufacturing aids, such as jigs, fixtures, modeling, etc., in preparation for full-scale production?  e. Preparing lifting and handling equipment to meet production requirements?  f. Preparing the panel line and support resources? |  |  |  | |
| 3. During the initial production phase, did the SUPSHIP project team provide appropriate support to the following:   * + 1. Receipt, inspection, storage, and staging of construction materials?     2. Depending upon the IMS; fabrication of special components of the hull structure in advance of the “official” construction start date?     3. Monitoring the design while production controllers begin supervising the start of production?     4. Establish SUPSHIP plan for monitoring critical and new supplier vendor base production of contractor material and fixtures? |  |  |  | |
| 4. After “Start of Construction” did the SUPSHIP project team provide appropriate support for the fabrication of special assemblies, plates and shape items which will be used? |  |  |  | |
| 5. Has the project office established an understanding of the contractor’s facility plan for construction of the new project?  a. Has the project office established a coordinated plan for oversight of any facility construction projects?  b. Has the project office established a coordinate plan for oversight of any prototype construction efforts? |  |  |  | |
| **E. Measures Taken to Ensure Effectiveness**  1. Is design and production planning done in a timely manner?   1. Is the schedule for design and production planning being followed? 2. Does the quality of the product meet or exceed the customer’s expectations? 3. What is being done to make the product better? |  |  |  | |
| 2. Is the process used to adjust design and production planning to the best practice?  a. How is this process being made better?  b. How is the time taken for the process being reduced? |  |  | |  |
| 3. How are the results of this effort?  a. Are the procedures for design and production planning effective?  b. What is being done to make the final product better?  c. Are deliverables to the government on time?  d. Are government deliverables to the contractor on time? |  |  |  | |
| 4. Are project office and command instructions related to this process current and effective? |  |  |  | |

***Section 5.3.2.4 Project Team Development***

#### SOM Section 5.3.2.4: Project Team Development

**Process Ownership:**  Project offices shall be responsible for the process of developing project teams. Individual skill development for team members shall be the responsibility of their parent code.

**Responsibility:** Ensure proper resources and training is in place so that capable personnel exist for all taskings and personnel are able to accept new roles of increasing complexity.

**Products and Services:** The two components of project team development are:

* SUPSHIP Core Project Team Development Plans
* Integrated Project Team Development Plans

| **5.3.2.4:** Project Team Development | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | **REMARK/COMMENT** |
| 1. **Core Project Team Development Plans**    1. Have Project Teams been established by the project office to support new construction and/or maintenance and modernization of ships?   a. Have project office EOB/ROB budgets been submitted to support projected project office manning required for the project? |  |  |  |
| * 1. Do all members possess a basic knowledge of project management fundamentals such as project scheduling (including critical path analysis and theory of constraints (TOC)), earned value management, and resource allocation?   a. Are all required functional skills represented on the core project team?  b. Have all members completed basic SOM training?  (1) Was this training recorded?  c. Have all members completed DAWIA training commensurate with their position description?  (1) Was this training recorded?  d. Have members completed any supplemental project management training?  (1) Was this training recorded?  e. Does each member have a “desk guide” or other applicable documents/website to provide a repository of procedures, policies and guidelines for accomplishment of their job?  f. Have all members completed any required training and qualifications to serve in their assigned roles? |  |  |  |
| * 1. Was refresher training provided to all team members to baseline their project management fundamentals prior to the project’s commencement?      1. Was this training recorded? |  |  |  |
| 1. **Integrated Project Team Development Plans**    1. Were all stakeholders appropriately represented on the project team?       1. SUPSHIP core team?       2. Contractor team?       3. Ship’s Force (where applicable)? |  |  |  |
| * 1. Was an initial kick-off & training meeting held?      1. Were the project’s mission, vision and values established?      2. Was relevant training provided to the team?         1. Was this training recorded?      3. Was additional training specific to each stakeholders’ needs provided?         1. Was this training recorded? |  |  |  |
| * 1. Was follow-up training provided (as necessary) as the project progressed and the team expanded?      1. Was this training recorded? |  |  |  |
| 4. Does the project employ a skill flexibility matrix to identify the abilities and competencies of team members? |  |  |  |
| **C. Measures Taken to Ensure Effectiveness**  1. Is team development done in a timely manner?   1. Is the schedule for team development being followed? 2. Does the quality of the team effort meet or exceed the customer’s expectations? 3. What is being done to make the team better? |  |  |  |
| 2. Is the process used to adjust team performance to the best practice?   1. How is this process being made better? 2. How is the time taken for the process being reduced? |  |  |  |
| 3. How are the results of this effort?  a. What is being done to make the final team products better?  b. Are deliverables to the government on time?  c. Are government deliverables to the contractor on time? |  |  |  |
| 4. What is being done to improve the trend for the overall team development? |  |  |  |

***Section 5.3.3.1***

***Project Execution External Communications***

#### SOM Section 5.3.3.1: Project Execution External Communications

**Process Ownership:** The project offices typically act as the command focal point and coordinate this overall process.

**Responsibility:** Assure effective communication processes and practices exist and are utilized by the Government team to maintain alignment with project execution issues.

**Products and Services:** Communication plans, strategies, reports, etc.

Each SUPSHIP project office will develop a communication plan for their programs that meets the needs of their PM’s and shipbuilder’s needs. Project communications include the processes required to ensure timely and appropriate generation, collection, distribution, storage, retrieval, and disposition of project information. Effective communication ensures all stakeholders have the information they need to support the shipbuilding and repair processes. SOM [Appendix 5-B](#_Types_of_Project) below shows the type of communications that are used with program managers.

| **5.3.3.1:** Project Execution External Communications | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | **REMARK/COMMENT** |
| **A. On-Site Program Manager Representatives (PMR)**  1. Do all designated major weapons systems programs have a PMR assigned?   1. Has the PMR been assigned permanent duty with SUPSHIP and an additional duty to the program manager? | [NAVSEA Instruction 5400.60A](https://www.navsea.navy.mil/Portals/103/Documents/NAVINST/05400-060A.pdf?ver=2015-07-20-133318-203) |  |  |
| **B. Mission, Functions and Tasks of Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Conversion and Repair, USN**  1. Have the mission, functions, and tasks of Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Conversion and Repair, USN been published? | [NAVSEA Instruction 5450.36C](https://www.navsea.navy.mil/Portals/103/Documents/NAVINST/05450-036C.pdf?ver=2018-01-17-075136-647) |  |  |
| 2. Has the mission of Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Conversion and Repair, USN been clearly stated? | [NAVSEA Instruction 5450.36C](https://www.navsea.navy.mil/Portals/103/Documents/NAVINST/05450-036C.pdf?ver=2018-01-17-075136-647) |  |  |
| 3. Program Office Assessment – Does the SUPSHIP Project office provide consistent and predictable interaction with the program office/PEO? Is there agreement on issues and actions that result in an effective “partnering” relationship with the program office/PEO? | [NAVSEA Instruction 5450.36C](https://www.navsea.navy.mil/Portals/103/Documents/NAVINST/05450-036C.pdf?ver=2018-01-17-075136-647) |  |  |
| 4. Are the functions and tasks defined? | [NAVSEA Instruction 5450.36C](https://www.navsea.navy.mil/Portals/103/Documents/NAVINST/05450-036C.pdf?ver=2018-01-17-075136-647) |  |  |
| 5. Has the commanding officer ensured the completion of the mission and tasks that are assigned to SUPSHIP? | [NAVSEA Instruction 5450.36C](https://www.navsea.navy.mil/Portals/103/Documents/NAVINST/05450-036C.pdf?ver=2018-01-17-075136-647) |  |  |
| **C. Communications Plan**  1. Does the project office have a communications plan?   1. Does the communications plan contain all levels of communications recommended by the SOM Appendix 5-B? 2. Is the communication plan current and applicable? 3. Is the communication plan approved by C100? 4. Is there documentation of accomplishment of each facet of the approved plan? | SOM Appendix 5-B |  |  |
| 2. Do the project offices’ communications include the following:   1. Does the PMR write a one-page report daily? 2. Is there a daily telcon between SUPSHIP project office and APM/DPM about the resolution and status of open issues? 3. Is there a twice a week telcon between the PM office, SDM, and SUPSHIP Projects/ Engineering, TYCOM, Ship’s Force, and shipbuilder about the resolution and status of open technical issues? 4. Does the project management office, SDM, SUPSHIP projects/ engineering, and Ship’s Force have a telcon twice a week with the project manager to review the readiness for trials by INSURV category? 5. Is there a weekly face to face meeting or telcon between the PM office, SDM, SUPSHIP project/engineering, TYCOM, and Ship’s Force discussing PSA planning? 6. Is there a weekly senior management meeting where the shipbuilder can provide a detailed status of all work items and issues that impact the schedule and production metrics briefing? 7. Do the project management office, TYCOM, Ship’s Force, and SUPSHIP participate in a weekly project office construction status report about the status of the Key Event Schedule?    1. Does it include executive and upcoming events?    2. EVM snapshots?    3. ILS issues?    4. Project officer concerns and other interest areas? 8. Is there a weekly configuration management team/contract change status meeting for the project management office, SUPSHIP projects/contracts, and shipbuilder to discuss:    1. Status and resolve issues related to change approval?    2. Implementation and documentation? 9. Do SEA04X, SEA04Z, the project management office, and SEA08 participate in a biweekly nuclear repair brief by telcon or power point? 10. Is there a monthly meeting between the project manager, SUPSHIP projects/business for evaluation, analysis and discussion of shipbuilder and EVMS data? 11. Do SEA04X, SEA04Z, and all SUPSHIPs (C100, 101, 102, and 150) attend a monthly telcon to disseminate information and discus the top three issues at each SUPSHIP? 12. Do SEA00, SEA04, SEA04Z, and SUPSHIP participate in a NAVSEA00 telcon in order to flag the level status of all projects at shipyard? 13. Is a quarterly conference held in which contractor provides a Power Point presentation that is a detailed status of all their work items and issues that impact technical and schedule requirements? 14. Has there been a separate government-only meeting prior to the quarterly meeting? 15. Are there weekly meetings/discussion with the ISIC representative to discuss resolution and status of open issues 16. Is there as weekly telcon with the program manager to discuss resolution and status of technical, cost, schedule, and configuration issues? 17. Is there a weekly meeting with Ships Force/PCU to discuss status and concerns? 18. Does the project office make a presentation of concerns at a government only Quarterly Production Progress Conference (QPPC), prior to meeting with the contractor? 19. Are other contract specific meetings held (i.e. Quarterly Quality Meetings, etc.)? |  |  |  |
| **D. Measures Taken to Ensure Effectiveness**  1. Improving shipyard performance – has the communications between the SUPSHIP project office and program office/PEO and other external government activities been effective in improving overall shipyard performance? |  |  |  |
| 2. Communications Plan - Is there an established communication plan? Is the communication plan being followed such that effective communications between the SUPSHIP project office and program office/PEO and other external government activities are consistently established? |  |  |  |
| 3. Timeliness in action item closure – are all action item lists current, overdue items identified, and then is a trend of on-time delivery of action items? |  |  |  |
| 4. Are project office and command instructions related to this process current and effective? |  |  |  |
| 5. Program Office Assessment – Does the SUPSHIP project office provide consistent and predictable interaction with the program office/PEO?   1. Is there agreement on issues and actions that result in an effective “Partnering” relationship with the program office/PEO? |  |  |  |

***Section 5.3.3.2 Project Oversight Knowledge Sharing***

#### SOM Section 5.3.3.2: Project Oversight Knowledge Sharing

**Process Ownership:** The operations officer and the senior project management leadership are responsible for supporting the project oversight knowledge sharing.

**Responsibility:** Pass along lessons learned to the SUPSHIP community through inputs to a consolidated database coordinated and maintained by NAVSEA 04Z.

**Products and Services:** Documentation of lessons learned through formal “hot wash” reviews as well as informal collection efforts.

| **5.3.3.2:** Project Oversight Knowledge Sharing | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | **REMARK/COMMENT** |
| 1. **SUPSHIP Community Knowledge Sharing**     1. Is senior project office leadership actively participating in community knowledge-sharing activities on subjects including best practices, lessons learned, and project specific challenges?       1. What forums are actively being engaged in?          1. Face-to-face meetings,          2. Phone conferences          3. Sharing of emails and instructions/documents. |  |  |  |
| 1. **Team Level Knowledge Sharing**    1. Is senior project office leadership actively participating in applicable Carrier/Submarine Team One knowledge-sharing activities on subjects including policy, best practices, lessons learned, and project specific issues? |  |  |  |

| **5.3.3.2:** Project Oversight Knowledge Sharing | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | **REMARK/COMMENT** |
| **C. Measures Taken to Ensure Effectiveness**  1. Improving shipyard performance – has the knowledge sharing between the SUPSHIP project office, contractor and other external government activities been effective in improving overall shipyard performance? |  |  |  |
| 2. Timeliness in providing knowledge sharing – are all action item lists current, overdue items identified, and then is a trend of on-time delivery of action items? |  |  |  |
| 3. Are project office and command instructions related to this process current and effective? |  |  |  |

***Section 5.3.3.3 Management of Changes to the Scope of SUPSHIP Workload***

#### SOM Section 5.3.3.3: Management of Changes to the Scope of SUPSHIP Workload

**Process Ownership:** The project office provides the information necessary to determine and manage the reimbursable work accepted from a program manager. The SUPSHIP comptroller is responsible for certifying funds and acceptability of the reimbursable basis.

**Responsibility:** The project office is responsible for managing all project-related tasking from the program manager, including work accepted on a reimbursable basis.

**Products and Services:** As tasked by the project sponsor and accepted by the SUPSHIP.

| **5.3.3.3:** Management of Changes to the Scope of SUPSHIP Workload | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | **REMARK/COMMENT** |
| **A. Management of Workload Scope**  1. Does the project office perform any work that is not included in the SUPSHIP Workforce Forecasting Technique Pricing Model (SWFT-PM)?  a. Has the project office coordinated with the command comptroller a review of the decision tree for requesting funding for performance of the work?  b. Was NAVSEA 04Z1 consulted in resolving any tasking that is not clearly addressed by the decision tree?  (1) How was this documented? | SOM Section 4.7 and Figure 4-1 |  |  |
| 2. Does the project office receive any reimbursable funding?  a. Has the project office executed an MOA with the funds provider?  b. Has the project office provided all required documents to the command comptroller to support entry of the funds into ERP?   * 1. Did SUPSHIPs verify that personnel resources were available to perform the work prior to accepting the tasking?      1. If additional full-time personnel were hired to perform the reimbursable work, what plan or actions were taken to address their status once the funding was no longer available?         1. How was this documented?      2. How did the Project office ensure that the work was performed in accordance with the work request?         1. How was this documented?   2. How was this documented? How did the project office ensure that reimbursable funding remained adequate to support the task?      1. What actions were taken to ensure that customer funds were used only to fund work that was outside the scope of the SUPSHIP mission?         1. How was this documented? | SOM Section 4.7 |  |  |
| **B. Measures Taken to Ensure Effectiveness**  1. Improving shipyard performance – has the reimbursable task between the SUPSHIP project office, Contractor and other external government activities been effective in improving customer expectations? |  |  |  |
| 2. Timeliness in providing services – are all action item lists current, overdue items identified, and is there a trend of on-time delivery of action items? |  |  |  |
| 3. Program Office Assessment – Does the SUPSHIP project office provide consistent and predictable services as outlined in the MOA with the requesting activity? |  |  |  |
| 4. Are project office and command instructions related to this process current and effective? |  |  |  |

***Section 5.3.3.4***

***PM Acquisition Strategy Implementation***

#### SOM Section 5.3.3.4: PM Acquisition Strategy Implementation

**Process Ownership:** The PMR is responsible for supporting the implementation of the PM’s acquisition strategy at the SUPSHIP.

**Responsibility:** Participate in internal and external PM working group efforts to refine and improve PM acquisition strategies.

**Products and Services:** Documentation of strategies and plans are provided in a timely manner.

| **5.3.3.4:** PM Acquisition Strategy Implementation | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | **REMARK/COMMENT** |
| 1. **SUPSHIP Project office**     1. Are all SUPSHIP project office personnel familiar with the program’s Acquisition Strategy?       1. Can they identify the major program elements?          1. Program milestone decision points,          2. Acquisition phases,          3. Test phases,          4. Contract awards,          5. Delivery phases. |  |  |  |
| * 1. Have SUPSHIP project office personnel participated with the PEO/PM in developing and identify relevant key program events?   a. Program milestone decision points  b. Reviews  c. Test activities  d. Production lot/delivery quantities,  e. Operational deployment objectives. |  |  |  |
| **B. SUPSHIP Span of Control**   * 1. Can SUPSHIP personnel identify program elements/events that they can influence? |  |  |  |
| * 1. Can SUPSHIP personnel present examples of when contractor oversight was used to influence program elements/events completion?      1. How was this documented? |  |  |  |
| **C. Measures Taken to Ensure Effectiveness**  1. Improving shipyard performance – has the SUPSHIP project office been effective in improving PM acquisition strategy? |  |  |  |
| 2. Timeliness– are all action item lists current, overdue items identified, and then is a trend of on-time delivery of action items? |  |  |  |
| 3. Program Office Assessment – Does the SUPSHIP project office provide consistent and predictable services as outlined in the MOA with the requesting activity? |  |  |  |
| 4. Are project office and command instructions related to this process current and effective? |  |  |  |

***Section 5.3.4.1***

***Claims Avoidance and Entitlement Determination Support Process***

#### SOM Section 5.3.4.1: Claims Avoidance and Entitlement Determination Support Process

**Process Ownership:** The project offices provide support to this overall process that is the responsibility of the Procuring Contracting Officer (PCO) and the PEO/NAVSEA PM.

**Responsibility:** Track and resolve issues, particularly government responsible issues that have the potential to cause delay and result in a claim, and if a request for contract adjustment is made by the contractor, assist the PCO/ACO in making the entitlement decision, and assist the PM in resolution of the budget impacts resulting from the entitlement determination.

**Products and Services:** Document all aspects of contract execution in order to have a sufficient history to defend the government from a potential claim or insurable event.

| **5.3.4.1:** Claims Avoidance and Entitlement Determination Support Proces**s** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | **REMARK/COMMENT** |
| **A. Claims Avoidance**  1. Does the command have a claims avoidance program?  a. Is the program documented by a process or instruction?  b. Are project specific logs being maintained to support defense of potential claims by the contractor? |  |  |  |
| * 1. Does SUPSHIP utilize a process/system to track all "Significant Events" that have the potential to cause delay and/or result in a claim?      1. Does this tracking process/system offer SUPSHIP personnel the ability to verify, quantify, or refute matters related to a contractor claim?         1. The "Significant Events" records may include correspondence, meeting minutes, labor records, material purchase orders, project schedules, schedule updates, productivity data, and project monitoring information or any other information that will form the basis for asserting or rebutting a claim.         2. Was this documentation completed for all contracts either in excess of $5 million or for which a claim is expected? | [NMCARS 5233.90](https://www.acquisition.gov/nmcars/part-5233-protests-disputes-and-appeals) & NCH 33.90 |  |  |
| * 1. Does the contracting officer identify to the project management team the requirements for maintaining a "Significant Events" file?      1. For each "Significant Event,"         1. Was a corresponding “Delay in Performance” type identified and recorded for the event?         2. Was all related documentation that supports “Delay in Performance” type identification retained?            1. This also includes written records of deficiencies in work progress and accomplishment.         3. Did the Government take the appropriate action based upon the “Delay in Performance” type?            1. I.e.: Support or refute claims, terminations of contracts, settlements, and determinations, or to provide evidence for litigation or investigations. | SOM Appendix 5-C |  |  |
| 4. Has training on defense of claims been provided to members of the project office? | [Preparing & Defending Government Contract Claims](https://www.fedpubseminars.com/DC-Government-Contracts-Week/Preparing-and-Defending-Government-Contract-Claims/?AspxAutoDetectCookieSupport=1) course manual |  |  |
| **B. Entitlement Determination**  1. Were any Notice of Change (NOC) letters or Request for Equitable Adjustment (REA) proposals submitted to the Administrative Contracting Officer (ACO) in accordance with the provisions of a specific contract?   * + 1. Did the ACO request a recommendation from the project office, based on detailed facts of the "Significant Events"?     2. Did the project office provide adequate support to the ACO and legal counsel in order to finalize the government position as part of the technical analysis of the contractor’s allegations? |  |  |  |
| 2. Does the project office make recommendations on how to respond to notifications of changes and requests for equitable adjustments?  a. Are recommendations from the project office for how to respond to the contractor accepted by the ACO/PCO? |  |  |  |
| **C. Measures Taken to Ensure Effectiveness**  1. Has the NAVSEA 02 claims review group or inspector general reviewed the actions taken in any specific cases and made any recommendations for improvements of the command’s overall claims and entitlement processes?  a. Have all corrective action recommendations been implemented? |  |  |  |
| 2. Have the number of notice of changes and requests for equitable adjustments submitted by the shipbuilder been reduced on a year-by-year comparison basis? Have the number of NOCs pending entitlement determination or adjudication been reduced on a year-by-year basis? |  |  |  |
| 3. Are project office and command instructions related to this process current and effective? |  |  |  |

***Section 5.3.4.2***

***Contract Change Authorization***

#### SOM Section 5.3.4.2: Contract Change Authorization

**Process Ownership:** The project office provides support to the Administrative Contracting Officer (ACO).

**Responsibility:** Develop and facilitate contract change authorizations. This may include, but is not limited to, development of a statement of work, pre-award work scoping, contract bid technical evaluations, contractor work coordination and oversight, and work completion certification.

**Products and Services:** Correct, timely and executable statements of work for authorized changes.

| **5.3.4.2:** Contract Change Authorization | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | **REMARK/COMMENT** |
| **A. Change Authorization**  1. Are all identified changes promptly processed by the project office on to the contracts department?  a. Are local changes promptly identified?  b. Are headquarters changes promptly processed upon receipt? |  |  |  |
| 2. Do all Statements of Work (SOW) correctly identify the full scope of changes? |  |  |  |
| 3. Does the project office provide technical reviews of contract proposals in a timely manner to support contract award and definitization? |  |  |  |
| 4. Does the project office monitor the definitization of unpriced contract actions?  a. Are expiring funds identified early, in order to provide for utilization prior to expiration? |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **B. Measures Taken to Ensure Effectiveness** |  |  |  |
| 1. What is the average number of follow-on correction/modifications to previously authorized changes? |  |  |  |
| 2. What is the trend for timely completion of technical reviews of change, and associated backlog? |  |  |  |
| 3. What is the value and trend of the contract change definitization backlog? |  |  |  |
| 4. Are project office and command instructions related to this process current and effective? |  |  |  |

***Section 5.3.4.3***

***Funds and Project Budget Management***

#### SOM Section 5.3.4.3: Funds and Project Budget Management

**Process Ownership:** The project offices provide support to this overall process that is the responsibility of the program manager for budget management and Administrative Contracting Officer (ACO) for funds management.

**Responsibility:** Ensuring sufficient funds are provided to SUPSHIP and keeping track of funds provided for effective contract execution.

**Products and Services:** Coordinate tracking of accepted and obligated funds with the command comptroller, make projections of future needs for funds and resolve expiring fund issues, and coordinate with the funds providers (program office/PEO and Fleet) to ensure timely support to the budget process, and specific congressional reporting requirements (i.e., Nunn-McCurdy Act).

| **5.3.4.3:** Funds and Project Budget Management | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | **REMARK/COMMENT** |
| **Financial Management**Was project funding monitored?Provide documentation. b) Is there an on-going dialog with the funds provider regarding funds execution expectations by the project office? |  |  |  |
| 2. Were there any occurrences of constructive changes during the performance period of the contract?a) Provide documentation. |  |  |  |
| 3. Were all required financial reports submitted? |  |  |  |
| **B. Congressional Restrictions**Were any cost caps or specific program or funding restrictions directed by Congress?Provide documentation.Were any other program-specific requirements or restrictions imposed that effect funds execution (i.e. Defense Acquisition Board Memos, etc.)?a) Provide details and documentation. |  |  |  |
| **C. Nunn-McCurdy Act**Were quarterly Unit Cost Reporting (UCR) requirements met?What was the Program Acquisition Unit Cost (PAUC) associated with this contract?What was the Average Procurement Unit Cost (APUC) associated with this contract?Was there ever an instance in which a significant cost growth or critical cost growth threshold exceeded?If either threshold was exceeded, did the Secretary of the Navy notify Congress?If the Critical Cost Growth threshold was exceeded, did the Secretary of the Navy conduct an assessment of the projected cost of completing the program and certify that the program is essential to national security.Has the SUPSHIP Program Manager’s Representative (PMR) performed all required monitoring of the contract’s EVMS data?Was the PM informed in advance of a potential breach of Nunn-McCurdy requirements? | [10 U.S.C. 2433](https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/10/2433) |  |  |
| **D. Budget Inputs**Was sufficient budgeting collaboration between the project office and the PM to ensure sufficient funding was available throughout the execution of this contract? |  |  |  |
| **E. Funds Execution**1. Was sufficient coordination between the project office, the ACO and the comptroller accomplished to ensure funds are properly committed and obligated?Were any funds for this contract identified for recapture?Were the funds identified early enough to allow for re-use in support of other program objectives? |  |  |  |
| **F. Measures Taken to Ensure Effectiveness** 1. How often has the project office had to request additional funding due to “missed” estimates? |  |  |  |
| 2. What was the amount of lost funds at the end of the last fiscal year? |  |  |  |
| 3. Are project office and command instructions related to this process current and effective? |  |  |  |

***Section 5.3.5.1***

***Contractor Interface Management***

#### SOM Section 5.3.5.1: Contractor Interface Management

**Process Ownership:** The project offices typically act as the command focal point and coordinate this overall process.

**Responsibility:** Participate in and/or initiate verbal or written communications to represent/resolve government concerns or ensure alignment of requirements and expectations.

**Products and Services:** Maintain unified Government voice. Maintain clear and constant lines of communications at all levels with the contractor, including regular meetings, telcons, e-mails, reports, communications, managed solutions, etc.

Effective communication with the contractor is a cornerstone of successful program management oversight. It is the responsibility of the Project office to develop a communication strategy that addresses how and when this communication will take place.

It is understood that informal methods are often the best way to address issues and their use should be maximized. However, it is also important to plan and implement a formal communication plan to ensure all stakeholders, including suppliers, are aligned with regards to program goals, accomplishments and issues.

| **5.3.5.1:** Contractor Interface Management | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | **REMARK/COMMENT** |
| **A. Leadership Communication**  1. Has a clear constant contact been maintained with the contractor? | SOM 5.3.5.1,  Appendix 5-B |  |  |
| * 1. Have there been communications with the contractors and have the sector/enterprise issues been resolved? |  |  |  |
| **B. Communication Processes**  1. Leadership Communications – do they ensure leaders understand and resolve issues that affect all programs/personnel? | SOM 5.3.5.1,  Appendix 5-B |  |  |
| 2. Program Office Communications – Are the contractor’s program office personnel aligned with program risks and actions needed to resolve those risks? |  |  |  |
| 3. Production Status – is there effective resolution of government responsible emergent issues and effective communication of government concerns to the contractor? |  |  |  |
| 4. Test Status - is there effective resolution of government responsible test issues and effective communication of government test issues to the contractor? |  |  |  |
| 5. Ships Force Communications – is there effective knowledge sharing? Are PCO/CO questions and concerns addressed? |  |  |  |
| 6. Technical Status –  a) Is there effective knowledge sharing?  b) Are individual issues/deficiencies addressed?  c) Are negative trends identified and addressed? |  |  |  |
| 7. Event Based Readiness – are all events conducted such that associated exit criterion is successfully met? |  |  |  |
| 8. Quarterly Program Reviews –  a) Is there effective knowledge sharing?  b) Are POA&Ms established to resolve all identified issues? |  |  |  |
| **C. Measures Taken to Ensure Effectiveness**  1. Improving shipyard performance – has the communications between SUPSHIP Project office and Shipbuilder been effective in improving overall shipyard performance? | SOM 5.3.5.1,  Appendix 5-B |  |  |
| 2. Communications Plan - Is there an established communication plan? Is the communication plan being followed such that effective communications between the SUPSHIP project office and shipbuilder are consistently established? |  |  |  |
| 3. Timeliness in action item closure – are all action item lists current, overdue items identified, and then is a trend of on-time delivery of action items? |  |  |  |
| 4. Program Office Assessment – Does the SUPSHIP project office provide consistent and predictable interaction with the shipbuilder?  a. Is there agreement on issues and actions that result in an effective partnering relationship with the shipbuilder? |  |  |  |
| 5. Are project office and command instructions related to this process current and effective? |  |  |  |

***Section 5.3.5.2***

***Test Program Coordination***

#### SOM Section 5.3.5.2: Test Program Coordination

**Process Ownership:** The project office is responsible for the processes that communicate the status and issues associated with the test program and preparations for the conduct of INSURV and sea trials to the PM and other associated activities.

**Responsibility:** Assure that the test program is coordinated in accordance with the contract requirements and all associated technical requirements.

**Products and Services:** Test program coordination includes all tasks associated with test program oversight that are not the responsibility of the applicable technical authority. The appropriate technical authority, most often the SUPSHIP CHENG at private shipbuilder facilities, is responsible for the technical content within individual test procedures, the technical adjudication of test problems, and acceptance of completed testing.

| **5.3.5.2:** Test Program Coordination | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | **REMARK/COMMENT** |
| 1. **Test Coordination**    1. Are all Test Procedures (TPs), Test Change Proposals (TCPs), Test Problem Reports (TPRs), and Final Test Reports (FTRs) adequately coordinated, reviewed, statused, and approved? |  |  |  |
| 1. **Milestone Readiness Assessments**    1. Was an independent evaluation and assessment of the key criteria conducted prior to concurring with the shipbuilder for conduct of critical test events? |  |  |  |
| 1. **Test Program Status**    1. Was the status of all test program components recorded and reported to the correct “customer”? Components include:       1. Test procedure development status,       2. Test procedure accomplishments/issues,       3. Test witnessing accomplishment/issues, and       4. Test completion status for all tests.       5. Have audits been conducted of test procedure accomplishment issues and documentation of test execution problems?       6. Has SUPSHIP provided adequate oversight of test accomplishment by both government and contractor personnel?       7. Are SUPSHIP personnel adequately trained to conduct oversight of test program administration and execution? |  |  |  |
| **D. Builders Sea Trials**   * 1. Has a sea trails agenda been established for each contract?   2. Was an assessment of milestone readiness conducted prior to the sea trails? |  |  |  |
| **E. Measures Taken to Ensure Effectiveness**  1. Does the project maintain a comprehensive and readily accessible report of test metrics including details on the development, approval, conduct, and reporting of all tests by the shipbuilder, AITs, OEMs and government test teams? |  |  |  |
| 2. Is there a backlog of testing?  a. Does the project office have an effective plan for reduction of the testing backlog? |  |  |  |
| 3. Are project office and command instructions related to this process current and effective? |  |  |  |

***Section 5.3.5.3***

***Shipbuilder Portfolio Review***

#### SOM Section 5.3.5.3: Shipbuilder Portfolio Review

**Process Ownership:** Project office personnel are responsible for accomplishing this task, and for providing cross-program impacts to the appropriate PEO and Program Managers.

**Responsibility:** Know the status of the shipbuilder’s schedule execution and resources for all programs, including commercial work.

**Products and Services:** Establish sufficient awareness and level of detailed knowledge to initiate timely corrective actions with the shipbuilder.

| **5.3.5.3:** Shipbuilder Portfolio Review | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | **REMARK/COMMENT** |
| **A. Portfolio Review**  1. Are portfolio reviews applicable to the shipbuilder? |  |  |  |
| **B. Cross-Contract Assessment**  1. Did SUPSHIP personnel conduct an overall assessment review of the contractor’s management system?  a. Did this cover the contractor’s Integrated Master Schedules (IMS)?  b. Did this balance the needs of all shipbuilding and industrial projects at the facility?  c. Does each of the contractor’s projects’ schedule and resource demands provide the Navy with the best value? |  |  |  |
| **C. Teaming Agreement**  1. Has SUSHIP conducted a review as appropriate amongst the multiple shipbuilders to meet the needs of the associated PEO? |  |  |  |
| 2. Are portfolio reviews being conducted across the entire scope of the shipbuilder’s capability?  a. Is the project office a contributing member of these reviews?  b. Is the project office providing a “government only” pre-review to the portfolio review principles? |  |  |  |
| **D. Measures Taken to Ensure Effectiveness**  1. Are minutes and action items generated from the portfolio reviews? |  |  |  |
| 2. Are project office actions from portfolio reviews completed on time? |  |  |  |
| 3. Are project office and command instructions related to this process current and effective? |  |  |  |

***Section 5.3.5.4***

***Production Surveillance***

#### SOM Section 5.3.5.4: Production Surveillance

**Process Ownership:** The project office is responsible for the processes of collecting and communicating the status and issues associated with ship construction progress and facilitating program issue resolution and emergent change authorization processing.

**Responsibility:** Conduct construction oversight activities.

**Products and Services:** Design and construction status reports, project cost and schedule analysis, emergent change authorizations, problem/issue resolution, and work progressing.

| **5.3.5.4:** Production Surveillance | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | **REMARK/COMMENT** |
| 1. **Progress Reporting (Production or Independent Work)**    1. Is daily monitoring of the shipbuilder’s construction activities, schedule adherence, milestone accomplishment accomplished?       1. Is a daily report/log of these activities maintained? | [FAR 42.302](https://www.acquisition.gov/content/42302-contract-administration-functions)  (31) |  |  |
| * 1. Are weekly status reports of accomplishments developed?      1. Are these weekly status reports submitted to the program manager/PEO? |  |  |  |
| * 1. Are monthly status reports of accomplishments developed?      1. Are these monthly status reports submitted to NAVSEA 04Z/04/00 as applicable? |  |  |  |
| * 1. Are quarterly reports supporting formal program office quarterly reviews, submitted to the program manager/PEO? |  |  |  |
| * 1. Are potential and actual slippages to contract delivery schedules reported to the program manager/PEO? |  |  |  |
| 1. **Problem Resolution**    1. Have all issues been satisfactorily resolved?       1. Were these resolutions within the bounds of the contract so that they are not subject to the “Changes” clause of the contract?       2. Did these resolutions not entail personal services?       3. Did these resolutions result in explicit or implicit changes to the price, quantity, delivery schedule, or other contract terms and conditions? | [NAVSEAINST 4200.17F\*\*](https://navsea.navy.deps.mil/hq/Docs/Instructions/04200-017F.pdf) |  |  |
| 2. Are Corrective Action Reports generated by the Project office to document issues to the shipbuilder relative to performance and program management? | SOM Chapter 9 |  |  |
| 1. **Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) Responsibilities**    1. Are all CORs properly trained and designed?       1. Are the Procuring Contracting Officer (PCO) delegation letters available?       2. Are there any special instructions or conditions noted in the delegation letters? | [NAVSEAINST 4200.17F\*\*](https://navsea.navy.deps.mil/hq/Docs/Instructions/04200-017F.pdf) |  |  |
| * 1. Have all Technical Instructions (TIs) been reviewed and determined to be within the scope of the contract statement of work and available funds, and not individually or collectively found to be subject to the “Changes” clause of the contract?      1. Are all TIs in writing and on-hand?      2. Is a running tally of expended man-hours and dollars compared to the contract award for each TI available/maintained?      3. Is a cumulative tally for the contract available/maintained? | [NAVSEAINST 4200.17F\*\*](https://navsea.navy.deps.mil/hq/Docs/Instructions/04200-017F.pdf) |  |  |
| * 1. Is a record of all deliverables and/or contractor progress with cited disposition available and maintained?      1. Do invoices provided accurately reflect the work specified in the contract and verification of the work being satisfactorily completed? | [NAVSEAINST 4200.17F\*\*](https://navsea.navy.deps.mil/hq/Docs/Instructions/04200-017F.pdf) |  |  |
| * 1. Are copies and/or records of all communications between COR and the contractor(s) available/maintained?      1. Formal correspondence, memos of telephone conversations, etc. | [NAVSEAINST 4200.17F\*\*](https://navsea.navy.deps.mil/hq/Docs/Instructions/04200-017F.pdf) |  |  |
| * 1. For multi-year contracts, has an annual status report of performance been submitted to the PCO? | [NAVSEAINST 4200.17F\*\*](https://navsea.navy.deps.mil/hq/Docs/Instructions/04200-017F.pdf) |  |  |
| * 1. Upon completion of the contract, has a final performance report been completed?      1. Was this report forwarded to the PCO within 60 working days of contract completion? | [NAVSEAINST 4200.17F\*\*](https://navsea.navy.deps.mil/hq/Docs/Instructions/04200-017F.pdf) |  |  |
| **D. Contractor Quality Program**  1. Has SUPSHIP project office reviewed the contractor’s quality management plan and provided feedback as the customer to the SUPSHIP QA department and onto the shipbuilder? | [ISO 9000/2015](https://www.iso.org/obp/ui/#iso:std:iso:9001:ed-5:v1:en)  Sections 7.5 and 8.2 |  |  |
| **E. Measures Taken to Ensure Effectiveness**  1. Does the project office monitor, document, and trend shipbuilder problems? |  |  |  |
| 2. Has the project office identified actions been escalated when problems indicate a declining trend? |  |  |  |
| 3. Has the project office been pro-active in finding both minor and major problems to the attention of the shipbuilder?  a. Has the shipbuilder positively responded to problems and issues identified by the project office? |  |  |  |
| 4. Are project office and command instructions related to this process current and effective? |  |  |  |

***Section 5.3.5.5***

***Independent Project Assessment***

#### SOM Section 5.3.5.5: Independent Project Assessment

**Process Ownership:** The project office is responsible for providing project performance assessments.

**Responsibility:** Evaluate data and metrics to develop independent government assessment of project performance.

**Products and Services:** Periodic analysis and communication within SUPSHIP and to NAVSEA, PEO/PM, and/or TYCOM.

| **5.3.5.5:** Independent Project Assessment | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | **REMARK/COMMENT** |
| 1. **Reporting**     1. Are all reports required by the program office/PEO being submitted? |  |  |  |
| 1. **Analysis**    1. Is the project office providing quarterly independent Program analysis to the program office/PEO? |  |  |  |
| * 1. Is the project office providing weekly project office status reports to the program managers and customers? |  |  |  |
| * 1. Is the project office providing quarterly ship status reports to the program office/PEO? |  |  |  |
| 1. **Measures Taken to Ensure Effectiveness**    1. Is the project office providing an accurate forecast of cost and schedule? |  |  |  |
| * 1. Is the project officer proactively providing identification of problems? |  |  |  |
| * 1. Are the problems being accepted by the program office/PEO for action? |  |  |  |
| * 1. Does the program manager provide an assessment of the project officer, and the overall support provided by the project office? |  |  |  |
| * 1. Does the project office provide independent project assessment in a timely manner? |  |  |  |
| **D. Measures Taken to Ensure Effectiveness**  1. Does the project office monitor, document, and trend shipbuilder problems resulting from their analysis? |  |  |  |
| 2. Has the project office identified actions to be taken when identified problems indicate a declining trend of shipbuilder performance? |  |  |  |
| 3. Has the project office been pro-active in finding and bring both minor and major problems to the attention of the shipbuilder?  a. Has the shipbuilder positively responded to problems and issues identified by the project office? |  |  |  |
| 4. Are project office and command instructions related to this process current and effective? |  |  |  |

***Section 5.3.5.6***

***Non-Shipyard Work Integration Oversight***

#### SOM Section 5.3.5.6: Non-Shipyard Work Integration Oversight

**Process Ownership:** The project office has overall responsibility for non-shipyard work integration oversight. The project office is supported by SUPSHIP QA who provides oversight of Alteration Installation Team (AIT) quality management plans and signs off on work completion documentation.

**Responsibility:** Interface with government sponsors, AIT/Customer Contracted Teams (CCTs), Participating Acquisition Resource Managers (PARM), and other representatives to provide good communications and facilitate resolution of issues.

**Products and Services:** Progress status, coordinate access requests, production service support requests, liaison between AIT/CCTs/PARM, other representatives, and shipbuilder to enforce schedule adherence.

| **5.3.5.6:** Non-Shipyard Work Integration Oversight | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | **REMARK/COMMENT** |
| **A. Non-shipyard Work**  1. Does the project office provide oversight and coordination prior to AITs and CCTs commencement of work including the following areas:  a. Early identification during the planning phase, to notify the shipbuilder of the government’s intention to utilize CCT/AITs.  b. Conduct a pre-availability conference with all CCT/AITs, ships force, sponsors and shipbuilder for the purpose of installation integration and definition of support service requirements and schedule conflicts.  c. Ensure all CCT/AIT support service requests are completed, funded and contractually authorized.  d. Ensure all AITs are completing RMMCO check-in as appropriate.  e. Ensure all CCT/AITs complete MOAs with the shipbuilder and SUPSHIP prior to starting work? |  |  |  |
| **B. Planning Phase**   * 1. Did the project office adequately track progress of work package development prior to the start of the availability? |  |  |  |
| * 1. Did the project office adequately communicate the business rules, overall availability schedule, and other relevant information to each AIT/CCT/PARM to ensure proper planning was accomplished? |  |  |  |
| * 1. Were POAM/MOA established with each AIT/CCT?   a. Were these provided to the shipbuilder?  b. Were these incorporated into the Integrated Master Schedule? |  |  |  |
| **C. Installation Phase**  1. For all alteration installs, did the project office sufficiently liaise between the AITs and the shipbuilder’s production planning and construction personnel, and ship’s force work control team?  a. AITs checked-in?  b. AIT pre-briefs & in-briefs completed?  c. Installation Coordinator monitored and communicated work accomplishment & verification?   * + - 1. Including workmanship and quality verification.   d. Timely resolve of all condition reports generated by an AIT? |  |  |  |
| **D. Completion Phase**  1. Did the project office complete sufficient out-briefs and final task completion reporting? | NAVSEA Tech Spec 9090-310F |  |  |
| 2. Does the project office provide oversight and coordination prior to final completion of AIT and CCT work and departure of the ship, including the following areas:  a. Ensure all CCT/AITs complete logistic support requirements as appropriate.  b. Ensure all CCT/AITs complete ships force checkout including:  (1) Crew training  (2) Work completion out-brief  (3) Submission and approval of Departures from Specification (DFS) if required  (4) Release of work completion messages if required  c. Ensure all CCT/AITs complete RMMCO check-out as appropriate.  d. Ensure all completion certification actions for CCT/AITs is are complete | COMUSFLTFORCOMINST 4790.3 ([JFMM](https://www.navsea.navy.mil/Home/SUBMEPP/Products/JFMM/)) |  |  |
| **E. Measures Taken to Ensure Effectiveness**  1. Does the project office monitor, document, and trend AIT/CCTs problems? |  |  |  |
| 2. Has the Project office identified actions to be taken when identified problems indicate a declining trend of CCT/AITs performance? |  |  |  |
| 3. Has the project office been pro-active in finding and bring both minor and major problems to the attention of the CCT/AITs?  a. Has the CCT/AITs positively responded to problems and issues identified by the project office? |  |  |  |
| 4. Are Project office and command instructions related to this process current and effective? |  |  |  |

***Section 5.3.6.1***

***Non-Nuclear Crew Preparation for Sail Away***

#### SOM Section 5.3.6.1: Non-Nuclear Crew Preparation for Sail Away

**Process Ownership:** The project office is responsible for coordinating the processes supporting the preparation of the Pre-Commissioning Unit (PCU) to move aboard the ship and leave the builder’s shipyard.

**Responsibility:** Coordinate support requirements for PRECOMUNIT standup. Prepare crew for space turnover/load-out, crew certification assist (with dedicated LOA assist), habitability inspection, etc. Resolve any and all issues. Prepare crew for guarantee responsibilities. Authorize work if needed.

**Products and Services:** Crew preparations for Sail Away, schedules, technical support, funding and communications support.

| **5.3.6.1:** Non-Nuclear Crew Preparation for Sail Away | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | **REMARK/COMMENT** |
| **A. Education**  1. Does the project office provide effective and timely education to the commissioning crew? | COMUSFLTFORCOMINST 4790.3 ([JFMM](https://www.navsea.navy.mil/Home/SUBMEPP/Products/JFMM/)) |  |  |
| **B. Integration**  1. Has the SUPSHIP project office taken the time to educate the crew about the shipbuilder and the turn-over process upon their arrival?   1. Has SUPSHIP provided needed documents, MOU/MOA’s, lessons learned, other resources, and support to allow the crew to perform their tasks? |  |  |  |
| 2. Has SUPSHIP scheduled and assigned action responsibility for crew indoctrination briefings during the manning period? |  |  |  |
| 3. Has SUPSHIP hosted a training period?   1. Does it include topics such as: Crew Move Aboard, SF/contractor integration plan, and force protection requirements? |  |  |  |
| 4. Has there been a training package prepared to present to the crew? Suggested topics:   1. Responsibilities of SUPSHIP 2. Procedures for warranty and deficiencies. |  |  |  |
| 5. Has there been a training package prepared to present to the crew? Suggested topics:   1. Ship work coordination division organization and responsibilities Integrated Test Program; contacts for combat systems problems. |  |  |  |
| 6. Has there been a training package prepared to present to the crew? Suggested topics:   1. Classified Local Area Network (LAN) consideration. |  |  |  |
| 7. Has SUPSHIP provided training to the crew on ship’s drawings and electronic databases? |  |  |  |
| 8. Has SUPSHIP ensured ship force training requirements and drills are incorporated into the shipyard’s delivery schedule?   1. Have appropriate times durations been allotted to allow training and drills? |  |  |  |
| 9. Has SUPSHIP ensured ship’s force action items (PMS requirements, technical manuals revision, etc.) support the shipyard test programs and delivery schedule? |  |  |  |
| 10. Has SUPSHIP provided support to the crew for the habitability space turnover?   1. Have they solved any deficiencies that have come up between the shipbuilder and the crew? |  |  |  |
| 11. Has SUPSHIP provided support to the crew for special inventories (damage control, helo, etc.)?   1. Have they settled any deficiencies that have come up between the shipbuilder and the crew? |  |  |  |
| 12. Is there appropriate crew support as needed to support the shipyard meetings, outfitting, testing, and inspections to support sea trials and delivery? |  |  |  |
| 13. What is SUPSHIP doing to ensure that key events and milestones are being accomplished to support ship delivery? | [OPNAVINST 9080.3G](https://www.secnav.navy.mil/doni/Directives/09000%20General%20Ship%20Design%20and%20Support/09-00%20General%20Ship%20Design%20Support/N9080.3G.pdf) |  |  |
| 14. Does the ship’s force understand and support shipyard prerequisite list and check list for:   1. Sea trials? 2. Delivery? |  |  |  |
| 15. Has SUPSHIP assigned a delivery team member to be to coordinate ship’s safety items and work with the assigned ship safety council? |  |  |  |
| 16. Has SUPSHIP assigned team members to the applicable joint test groups?   1. When SUPSHIP is assigned as a voting team member, is insight and technical support on test procedure conduct provided to the contractor and other applicable government agents? 2. Has the SUPSHIP ensured that there is a mutual understanding of the procedure requirements and identified the effect the test could have in ship conditions and ensured the test can be performed safely? |  |  |  |
| 17. Has SUPSHIP provided a technical review and approval of completed test procedures? |  |  |  |
| 18. Has SUPSHIP made sure that all government activities who will be involved in the acceptance trials, taken appropriate actions to support presentation of the vessel to the Board of Inspection and Survey? |  |  |  |
| 19. Has SUPSHIP prepared an assessment of the shipbuilder’s fuel load out plans? |  |  |  |
| 20. Has SUPSHIP arranged a meeting for the crew with the:   1. Key shipbuilder personnel? |  |  |  |
| 21. Has the crew been provided all necessary shipbuilder procedures? |  |  |  |
| 22. Has the crew been presented with yard access and safety lecture? |  |  |  |
| 23. Has SUPSHIP arranged a tour of the Emergency Control Center for the crew?   1. Has the crew been briefed on the shipbuilder’s Fire and Casualty Control System? |  |  |  |
| 24. Has the crew been informed/trained on the SUPSHIP quality assurance program? |  |  |  |
| **C. Crew Move Aboard (CMA)**   * 1. Were all of ship compartments and systems turned over to the crew?   a. Were all compartments/system inspected jointly by the Ship’s Force, project office, and the contractor?  b. Was a complete listing of all noted deficiencies compiled?  (1) How was this documented?  c. Were all deficiencies resolved prior to CMA?  (1) How was this documented? |  |  |  |
| 2. Was a joint habitability inspection completed by the Ship’s Force, project office, and the contractor?  a. Was a complete listing of all noted deficiencies compiled?   * + - 1. How was this documented?   b. Were all deficiencies resolved prior to CMA?  c. How was this documented? |  |  |  |
| 3. Did the ship’s material load-out get accomplished in an appropriate timeframe to support CMA?  a. Did the project office publish a schedule of events reflecting all participator’s requirements? (FISC, ship’s crew and the shipbuilder) |  |  |  |
| 4. Did the project office and the contractor ensuring the crew understood the requirements and rules of the individual shipbuilder with regard to habitation within the industrial facility? |  |  |  |
| **D. Training and Certification Support**  1. Did the project office attend ship’s force meetings?  a. Did the project office help facilitate problem resolutions that may have arisen? |  |  |  |
| 2. Were crew certification requirements adequately supported?  a. Light Off Assessment (LOA).  b. Shipbuilder deficiency resolution.  c. Government work authorization. |  |  |  |
| **E. Measures Taken to Ensure Effectiveness**  1. Does the project office monitor, document, and trend crew problems? |  |  |  |
| 2. Has the project office identified actions to be taken when identified problems indicate a declining trend of crew performance? |  |  |  |
| 3. Has the project office been pro-active in finding and bringing both minor and major problems to the attention of the crew?  a. Has the crew positively responded to problems and issues identified by the project office? |  |  |  |
| 4. Are project office and command instructions related to this process current and effective? |  |  |  |

#### *Section 5.3.6.2*

#### *Nuclear Crew Integration into Shipbuilding*

#### SOM Section 5.3.6.2 Nuclear Crew Integration into Shipbuilding

**Process Ownership:** The project office is responsible for this overall process which ensures that the Pre-Commissioning Unit (PCU) supports the shipbuilder’s construction and testing key events.

**Responsibility:** Ensure the crew has the facilities and training to conduct daily operations in the shipyard prior to In-Service. Prepare crew for taking over operational control (OPCON) responsibilities of ship systems and spaces, test program operations, deficiency identification and resolution processes, contract administration responsibilities/limitations, organizational interface and responsibilities with the shipyard. Ensure the crew is prepared for key events, such as habitability and salvage inspections, sea trials and acceptance trials.

**Products and Services:** Project specific information, training, qualification materials for crew use in achieving necessary level of knowledge.

| 5.3.6.2: Nuclear Crew Integration into Shipbuilding | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | **REMARK/COMMENT** |
| **A. Education**  1. Does the project office provide effective and timely education to the pre-commissioning crew? | COMUSFLTFORCOMINST 4790.3 ([JFMM](https://www.navsea.navy.mil/Home/SUBMEPP/Products/JFMM/)) |  |  |
| **B. Integration**  1. Has the SUPSHIP project office instructed the PCU about the shipyard and the acquisition environment upon their arrival?   1. Has SUPSHIP provided needed documents, MOU/MOA’s, lessons learned, other resources, and support to allow the crew to perform their tasks? |  |  |  |
| 2. Has SUPSHIP scheduled and assigned action responsibility for crew indoctrination briefings during the initial manning period? |  |  |  |
| 3. Has SUPSHIP hosted a PCU training period? Does it include topics such as:   1. Key event certification, OPCON, Crew Move-Aboard, SF/Contractor Integration Plan, Launch to Delivery Timeline, PCU Funding/Money Issues, LAN migration, and Force Protection Requirements? 2. Responsibilities of: NAVSEASYSCOM, NAVAIRSYSCOM, PEO, TYCOM, SUPSHIP, PCU, and other associated Navy command relations with SUPSHIP project office function; procedures for changes and deficiencies; organization. 3. Ship work coordination division organization and responsibilities Integrated Test Program. 4. Contacts for combat systems problems; Preparations and procedures for launching and docking. 5. PCU LAN (high temperature alarm, client PCs, Contractor Integrated Technical Information Service (CITIS), etc.)? |  |  |  |
| 8. Has SUPSHIP ensured ship force training requirements and drills are incorporated into the shipyard’s construction schedule?   1. Have appropriate time durations been allotted to allow training and drills such as Pre-Reactor Safeguards Examination (RSE), RSE, and Crew Certification Phase I and II? |  |  |  |
| 9. Has SUPSHIP ensured ship’s force action items (PMS requirements, technical manuals revision, etc.) support the shipyard test programs and trials? |  |  |  |
| 10. Has SUPSHIP provided support to the PCU for the habitability inspection period?   1. Have they recommended dates? 2. Have they provided support during the inspection? 3. Have they resolved any deficiencies that have come up between the shipbuilder and the crew? |  |  |  |
| 11. Has SUPSHIP provided support to the PCU for savage inspection period?   1. Have they provided support during the inspection? 2. Have they settled any deficiencies that have come up between the shipbuilder and the crew? |  |  |  |
| 12. Is there appropriate crew support as needed to support the shipyard meetings, construction, outfitting, testing, and inspections to support construction and sea trials? Has SUPSHIP provided crew training for conduct and administration of Fast Cruise, Sea Trials, URO/URU (if applicable) certification and delivery? |  |  |  |
| 13. What is SUPSHIP doing to ensure that key events and milestones are being accomplished to support ship construction and delivery? |  |  |  |
| 14. Does the ship’s force understand and support shipyard prerequisite list and check list for:   1. Launch? 2. Christening ceremony? 3. Initial criticality? 4. Non-critical steaming? 5. Certification of the ship for fast cruise? 6. Sea trials? 7. Delivery and commissioning? |  |  |  |
| 15. Has SUPSHIP assigned a delivery team member to be on the ship’s safety council and work with the crew assigned ship safety council?   1. Is this delivery team member helping to ensure to the council that all requirements of the Industrial Ship Safety Manual for Fire Prevention and Response and Industrial Ship Safety Manual for Submarines have been met? 2. Has the council provided specific requirements for the control of work and testing that could affect ship’s conditions | NAVSEA [S9002-AK-CCM-010/6010](https://www.navsea.navy.mil/Portals/103/Documents/SUBMEPP/Industrial_Ship_Safety_Manual_for_Submarines.pdf),  S0570-AC-CCM-010/8010 |  |  |
| 16. Has SUPSHIP assigned team members to the various joint test groups under their cognizance?   1. Is SUPSHIP a voting team member providing insight and technical support to the crew on test procedures? 2. Has the SUPSHIP ensured that there is a mutual understanding of the procedure requirements and identified the effect the test could have in ship conditions and ensured the test can be performed safely? |  |  |  |
| 17. Has SUPSHIP provided a technical review and approval of completed test procedures? |  |  |  |
| 18. Has SUPSHIP made sure that the ship takes action to present the vessel to the Board of Inspection and Survey for the final acceptable trials and guarantee material inspections? |  |  |  |
| 19. Has SUPSHIP prepared an assessment of the shipbuilder’s Fill Date and advised the PCU and NRRO of expected date. | [OPNAVINST 9080.3G](https://www.secnav.navy.mil/doni/Directives/09000%20General%20Ship%20Design%20and%20Support/09-00%20General%20Ship%20Design%20Support/N9080.3G.pdf) |  |  |
| 20. Has SUPHSIP arranged a meeting with the:   1. NRRO representative? 2. With key shipbuilder personnel through shipbuilder program manager’s officer? |  |  |  |
| 21. Has PCU been provided copies and briefing on applicable shipbuilder procedures?  a. Quality assurance processes?  b. Operation control transfer processes? |  |  |  |
| 22. Have the new crew been presented with yard access and safety lecture?   1. Has the shipbuilder presented training about radiography restrictions? |  |  |  |
| 23. Has SUPSHIP arranged a tour of the Emergency Control Center for the PCU?   1. Has the PCU seen shipbuilder fire and casualty control system presentations? |  |  |  |
| 24. Has the PCU been provided an overview of SUPSHIP quality assurance program?   1. Has surveillance standards package action from SUPSHIP QA been provided? 2. Have the nuclear systems inspection process/guidelines been completed one month prior to initial fill by SUPSHIP QA? 3. Has the submarine tank inspection/closure process been completed? |  |  |  |
| **C. Measures Taken to Ensure Effectiveness**  1. Does the project office monitor, document, and trend crew problems? |  |  |  |
| 2. Has the project office identified actions to be taken when identified problems indicate a declining trend of crew performance? |  |  |  |
| 3. Has the project office been pro-active in finding and bringing both minor and major problems to the attention of the crew?  a. Has the PCU responded to problems and issues identified by the Project office? |  |  |  |
| 4. Are Project office and command instructions related to this process current and effective? |  |  |  |

***Section 5.3.6.3***

***Certification Coordination***

#### SOM Section 5.3.6.3: Certification Coordination

**Process Ownership:** The project offices provide the lead for all activities required for certification of ships, with support provided by other SUPSHIP departments (200, 300, 400 and 500).

**Responsibility:** Coordinate completion of necessary certifications to support the project schedule. Properly adjudicate all deficiencies. Compile all necessary certification documentation. Ensure visibility of certification status is maintained and communicated.

**Products and Services:** Facilitate coordination; status of certifications by ship, including certification dates, completions, and discrepancy details. In conjunction with the program manager, the project office develops a comprehensive matrix of all certifications required by vessel with expected dates certifications are needed. Included with each certification are primary and alternate organizational leads.

| **5.3.6.3:** Certification Coordination | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | **REMARK/COMMENT** |
| 1. **Certification Correlation**    1. Have all necessary certifications been identified for each ship?       1. Was a comprehensive certification matrix developed/used for each ship?       2. Were scheduled certification completion dates identified?       3. Were primary and alternate organizational leads identified? | NAVSEA S9040-AA-GTP-010/SSCR |  |  |
| * 1. Certification Deficiencies.      1. Have all certification deficiencies been recorded?      2. Have all deficiencies been appropriately adjudicated prior to certification completion? |  |  |  |
| * 1. Final Certification Documentation.      1. Were all final certifications reviewed by the appropriate responsible NAVSEA test and evaluation office?      2. Were all final certification documents retained for the requisite 2-year period? | NAVSEA S9095-AD-TRQ-010/TSTP |  |  |
| **B. Measures Taken to Ensure Effectiveness**  1. Have all completed certifications occurred on time, and without delay to the delivery process? |  |  |  |
| 2. Have all completed certifications been conducted such that no certifications had to be withdrawn? |  |  |  |
| 3. Are project office and command instructions related to this process current and effective? |  |  |  |

***Section 5.3.6.4***

***INSURV Support***

#### SOM Section 5.3.6.4: INSURV Support

**Process Ownership:** The project offices are the SUPSHIP lead, with support from other departments (200, 300, 500), and the PCU for nuclear vessels, to ensure readiness and prerequisites necessary for INSURV Trials.

**Responsibility:** Make recommendation to the Supervisor and Program Manager that the vessel meets INSURV prerequisites and is safe for sea. In that evaluation, identify discrepancies and defects and present them to the Program Manager for the INSURV brief. When INSURV arrives for trials, open construction liabilities (i.e., draft trial cards, CARs, etc.) are presented for review by category.

**Products and Services:** Preparing new construction or overhaul ships for evaluation by the INSURV Inspection Team is a primary mission of the project office.

| **5.3.6.4:** INSURV Support | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | **REMARK/COMMENT** |
| 1. **Prior to Trial**    1. Has the Ship been evaluated for “readiness for sea?”       1. Has a Trial Readiness Review Panel been convened?          1. Were all necessary actions completed?             1. Required certifications complete?             2. Required test complete?             3. Compartments completed/closed-out?             4. INSURV categories reviewed as complete?             5. Has SUPSHIP arranged for crew training/briefing by the INSURV board on the conduct of INSURV trials?             6. Has SUPSHIP briefed the crew on INSURV card clearance processes?       2. Prior to trials for non-nuclear ships, the Supervisor is responsible for evaluating the ship’s readiness for sea and proposing dates for the conduct of trials. A proposed schedule of events for conduct of the trial should be provided to the INSURV Board for review and approval at least 30 days in advance of trials.       3. Upon completion of the evaluation, were all discrepancies and defects identified and presented to the program manager for the INSURV brief?       4. Has the project office provided inputs to the program manager on items that should be recommended for waivers in advance of the trials from CNO? | OPNAVINST [4700.8K](https://www.secnav.navy.mil/doni/Directives/04000%20Logistical%20Support%20and%20Services/04-700%20General%20Maintenance%20and%20Construction%20Support/4700.8K.pdf) |  |  |
| * 1. Schedule of Events (SOE)      1. Was a proposed schedule of events provided to the INSURV Board 30 days prior to trials?   2. Was a mock INSURV (Builder Trial (BT) / Acceptance Trial (AT)) completed?      1. Was the trial’s Schedule of Events (SOE) executed and deficiencies documented?   3. For Final Contract Trial (FCT) and AT, was an electronic copy of the ship’s Consolidated Ships Maintenance Plan (CSMP) provided to the Board five days prior to the inspection?   Has the project office ensured any software provided by the Board is operational on the SUPSHIP network? |  |  |  |
| 1. I**NSURV**    1. Was one copy of the ship’s CSMP separated by work center available for the Board upon arrival?    2. Were all open construction liabilities (i.e., trial cards, CARs, etc.) collated by category and presented to the Board for review? |  |  |  |
| 1. **Post-Trial**    1. Was a Card Disposition Conference completed for the ship?    2. Was a resolution completed or waiver from the Chief of Naval Operations obtained for all starred cards? |  |  |  |
| **D. Measures Taken to Ensure Effectiveness**  1. Did the Board provide and feedback to the Supervisor on recommendations for improvements?   * 1. a. Have all Board recommendations been resolved? |  |  |  |
| 2. Does the project office trend the INSURV cards from hull to hull to monitor shipbuilder performance? |  |  |  |
| 3. Are project office and command instructions related to this process current and effective? |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

***Section 5.3.6.5***

***Preliminary Ship Acceptance***

#### SOM Section 5.3.6.5: Preliminary Ship Acceptance

**Process Ownership:** The project office has the SUPSHIP lead for coordinating the Delivery event and the development of the applicable delivery documents. The contracts department has the lead for developing any needed monetary withholdings and maintaining the delivery documents post-delivery based on inputs from the project office. Other SUPSHIP codes, such as quality assurance, logistics and engineering, own the processes that maintain configuration management of open work in their areas of expertise.

**Responsibility:** Project office personnel are responsible for ensuring the contractor captures all open work on the Delivery document as well as coordinating the government review of the contractor’s proposal. Responsibility for delivery document maintenance resides with the ACO, with assistance from project office, quality assurance, logistics and engineering personnel.

**Products and Services:** A completed and signed preliminary acceptance/Delivery document and associated communication letters.

| **5.3.6.5:** Preliminary Ship Acceptance | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | **REMARK/COMMENT** |
| **A. Ship Acceptance**  1. Has the project office provided written direction to the ship’s commanding officer, including excerpts from the contract, on the requirements and responsibilities for acceptance of the ship? |  |  |  |
| 2. Has the project office conducted an assessment and communicated a recommendation for contract withhold to the contracting officer for incomplete work? | SOM Chapter 3 |  |  |
| 3. Has the project office conducted an audit by sample of all work to ensure contract fulfillment? |  |  |  |
| 4. Has the project officer ensured all deficiencies identified during construction are tracked and resolved? |  |  |  |
| 5. Has the Project office coordinate the necessary documents with SUPSHIP Contracts to execute preliminary ship acceptance?  a. Has the schedule of events to execute acceptance been coordinated with the shipbuilder, SUPSHIP and Ship’s Forces? |  |  |  |
| **B. Measures Taken to Ensure Effectiveness**  1. Does the project office validate the correction of all identified deficiencies? |  |  |  |
| 2. Does the project office trend the number of deficiencies by hull to monitor shipbuilder performance? |  |  |  |
| 3. Are project office and command instructions related to this process current and effective? |  |  |  |

***Section 5.3.6.6***

***Guarantee Work Management***

#### SOM Section 5.3.6.6: Guarantee Work Management

**Process Ownership:** The project offices are the SUPSHIP lead with support from the Contracts Department.

**Responsibility:** Identify, adjudicate (determine responsibility, cost, and brokering to TYCOM if required), and manage clearance of shipbuilder guarantee deficiencies.

**Products and Services:** Coordination for tracking, resolution and documentation of guarantee deficiencies.

| **5.3.6.6:** Guarantee Work Management | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | **REMARK/COMMENT** |
| **A. Guarantee Management**  1. Has the project office provided written direction to the ship’s commanding officer, including excerpts from the contract, on the requirements and responsibilities for identification and communication of shipbuilder deficiencies during the contract guarantee period? |  |  |  |
| 2. Has the project office conducted an assessment and communicated a recommendation for contract withhold to the contracting officer for guarantee work if required by the contract? | SOM Chapter 3 |  |  |
| 3. Has the project office developed and executed a budget for correction of guarantee period corrective actions? |  |  |  |
| 4. Has the project officer ensured all deficiencies identified during the guarantee period are tracked and corrected? |  |  |  |
| **B. Deficiency Tracking**  1. How did the project office manage & track all shipbuilder guarantee deficiencies?  a. How was this documented? |  |  |  |
| **C. Deficiency Work**  1. Has the type commander or Immediate Superior In Command (ISIC) provided the contractor with an opportunity to correct deficiencies?  a. How was this documented? |  |  |  |
| 2. For the guarantee deficiencies, has the shipbuilder assigned a warranty engineer to address emergent defects or deficiencies?  a. Does this individual have the authority to obligate the contractor relative to those items that are determined to be contractor responsible during the guarantee period? |  |  |  |
| **D. Contractual Monetary Limitations**  1. Has the project office screened both accepted and rejected Guarantee items?  a. How was this documented?  b. Did the project office verify that the shipbuilder did not charging base contract work to the guarantee limitation of funds?  c. Did the project office verify that the shipbuilder did not incorrectly reject covering guarantee work? |  |  |  |
| **E. Measures Taken to Ensure Effectiveness**  1. Does the Project office validate the correction of all identified deficiencies? |  |  |  |
| 2. Does the project office trend the number of deficiencies by hull to monitor shipbuilder performance? |  |  |  |
| 3. Are Project office and command instructions related to this process current and effective? |  |  |  |

***Section 5.4***

***Personnel Qualification Requirements***

#### SOM Section 5.4: Personnel Qualification Requirements

**Process Ownership:** The project offices are the SUPSHIP lead.

**Responsibility:** Ensure compliance with all applicable requirements for qualification of both military and civilian personnel.

**Products and Services:** Not applicable.

| **5.4: Personnel Qualification Requirements** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ATTRIBUTE** | **SOURCE** | **BP/SAT/OFI/UNSAT/NA** | **REMARK/COMMENT** |
| **A. Individual Employee Development Plans**  1. Has the Project office provided written direction to personnel defining qualification requirements, including new or unique project requirements? | SOM Chapter 5.4 |  |  |
| 2. Has the project office conducted an assessment of personnel qualifications against project assignments? |  |  |  |
| 3. Has the project office developed and executed individual development plans for all personnel? |  |  |  |
| 4. Has the project officer ensured all military personnel are meeting qualification and training requirements? |  |  |  |
| **B. Project office Functional Training Plans**  1. How did the project office manage & track all individual development plans?  a. How was this documented? |  |  |  |
| 2. Does the project office provide cross-training opportunities for personnel to provide professional development?  a. How was this documented? |  |  |  |
| **C. Measures Taken to Ensure Effectiveness**  1. Does the project office validate the correction of all identified deficiencies? |  |  |  |
| 2. Does the project office trend the number of deficiencies by hull to monitor shipbuilder performance? |  |  |  |
| 3. Are Project office and command instructions related to this process current and effective? |  |  |  |

SUPERVISOR OF SHIPBUILDING

PROJECT OFFICE

SELF ASSESSMENT GUIDE

PART III

ASSESSABLE UNIT RISK ASSESSMENT

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SUPSHIP MANAGER'S INTERNAL CONTROL PROGRAM RISK ASSESSMENT FORM | | |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Assessable Unit Title: | SUPSHIP Project office: |  |  |  |
| Risk Assessment Worksheet Part 1: Determine Likelihood of Process Control Failure | | |  |  |
| This worksheet helps predict the likelihood of process control failure in five categories of failure causes. For each category, read the table cells and select a whole number which best describes the contribution of that category in predicting failure. | | | | |
|  | **Score 1 or 2** | **Score 2, 3, or 4** | **Score 4 or 5** | Score |
| Documentation | Process is well documented; controls are usable and understandable. | Process is documented and addresses needed controls, but is not current, complete, is confusing or difficult to understand. | Process is not documented. AU is documented but does not provide needed controls. | x |
| Responsibilities | Most people know their responsibilities are adequately trained, have needed resources to accomplish responsibilities. | Some key people are unclear about their responsibilities or have received training of questionable value. Resources are barely adequate. | Most people do not know their responsibilities are inadequately trained, or do not have needed  resources to accomplish responsibilities. | x |
| Internal Reviews | Controls and processes receive frequent review by the process owner. | Some reviews are done, but they are not well understood, and have minimal value. | Controls and processes receive infrequent or no review. | x |
| Non-Compliance | Non‐compliance instances have been documented, process exists and is used to find them, compliance exists and is used. | Some non‐compliance instances are documented, criteria are used but is not clear; process is not well established. | No non‐compliance instances have been documented, no process exists or is used to find them, no compliance criteria exists or is not used. | x |
| Corrective Action | Corrective actions have been identified, action has been taken, validation has been performed. | Some corrective actions have been identified, but follow‐up is poor or spotty. | Corrective actions have not been identified, action has not been taken, no validation has been performed. | x |
|  |  |  |  | Ave Score |
| Assessable Unit Title: | SUPSHIP Project office: |  |  |  |
| Risk Assessment Worksheet Part 2: Determine Consequence of Process Control Failure | | |  |  |
| This worksheet helps predict the consequence of process control failure by considering five categories of undesirable outcome. For each category, read the table cells and select the rating which best describes the effect of an internal control failure. | | | | |
|  | **Score 1 or 2** | **Score 2, 3, or 4** | **Score 4 or 5** | Score |
| Visibility | A Division‐level (or lower) report of corrective action is likely adequate. | A formal Department‐ or Division level internal critique is likely. | A formal command‐level internal critique, or formal external evaluation is likely. | x |
| Work Stoppage | Process would be briefly stopped or not stopped with little or no cost impact. | Process would be briefly or partially stopped with limited or minor cost impact. | Process would be completely stopped with broad impact. | x |
| Containment | Extent of faulty product or information spill would be known and limited. Costs of containment would be small. | Extent of faulty product or information spill would be moderate or unknown for a short time. Costs of containment would be moderate. | Extent of faulty product or information spill would be broad or unknown for a long time. Costs of containment would be great. | x |
| Discipline | Disciplinary action would be limited to few people, or no disciplinary action. | Disciplinary action would be moderate and limited to few people. | Disciplinary action would be serious. Many people would be disciplined. | x |
| Safety | Few or no people would incur minor injuries only, little or no equipment/plant damage. | Some people would incur minor injuries, some people could incur moderate injuries, some equipment/plant damage. | Some people would incur serious injury, many people would incur moderate injury, serious equipment/plant damage. | x |
|  |  |  | Consequence: | Ave Score |
| Performed By: |  |  |  |  |
|  | Print Name | Signature | Date |  |
| Approved By: |  |  |  |  |
|  | Print Name | Signature | Date |  |