Time Phasing Cost Estimates in MS Excel Model

Will Black, Jeff Jaekle, & Matt Reiley



Scitor Corporation

Disclaimer

Introduction

- \circ Overview
- Existing Methods

Enhanced Model

- Highlights
- · Walkthrough

Next Steps

• Phase Three

> • The views expressed in this paper and in our remarks are our own and <u>do not</u> imply endorsement by the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI) or any other US Government agency



Introduction

• Goals

- Review and update tools and techniques used by the ODNI CAIG to phase space and ground cost estimates
- Develop a workbook that acts as a central repository for enhanced time phasing methods for application in ODNI/CAIG cost models and estimates

Process

- Phase One
 - Review existing methods and applications
 - Simplify complex functions
 - Consolidate tools and methods
 - Explore additional applications
- Phase Two
 - Enhance functions and replace macros
 - Build-out constraint mechanism
 - Simplify user interface
- Phase Three
 - Update phasing functions
 - · Improve cost model integration & usability
 - · Examine schedule achievability

Space/Ground Phasing Model

- Developed by Eric Burgess for the NRO CAIG in 2003 using cost data from 30 NRO, Air Force, and NASA programs
- Utilizes a two-step process to phase acquisition costs for space and ground systems
 - Step One: Create an expenditure curve based on historical outlays
 - Step Two: Employ an outlay profile and inflation index to convert the expenditure curve into a budget profile
- Model has been updated multiple times since 2003 (most recently in 2009)
 - Basic structure has remained static, but phasing equations have been refined

Constraint Mechanism

- Developed by Matt Reiley for the ODNI CAIG in 2004
- Allows cost estimators to perform trades inside of MS Excel cost models to account for budgetary limitations/constraints
 - Step One: Adjust annual estimates based on user-specified constraints (e.g., fixed budget profiles
 - Step Two: Determine the cumulative impact of the annual constraints
 - Step Three: Re-phase the delta across the remainder of the cost estimate

Presented at the 2010 ISPA/SCEA Joint Annual Conference and Training Workshop - www.iceaaonline.com Space/Ground Phasing Model

	Ex	penditure-P Space S version	Phasing M Segment n 2003	Nodel						Expend Ground	iture-Ph H/W and S version Fe	asing M W Acquisiti	odel on			
	E(t) = E(t) = Cumulative ; t = Fraction of tr a = -4138 + .07 b = 1.79 R = .001477*(mo	= (R*t+1-exp(- percent of cost ex- ptal duration from 29"(#units) + .048 onths duration)	eat ^b))/(R+1- opended at tir contract awa 38*(months d	exp(-a)) ne t ard to last laur uration) + .014	nch 45*(%NR)			Use this model if analogy or build-up data not available E(t) = (R*t+1-exp(-a*T)/(R+1-exp(-a)) E(t) - Constainty parcent of coal expended at lime t 1 = Fractional fraction from contract award to first supported launch 4 4991 b = 2.53 R = 0.6247								
	6 # Units 75 Months dura 25 % NR (0-10 6/1/2006 ATP date 12/1/2012 Last Launch 1000 Total Space 2007 Base Year	tion (to last launc) on Contract Segment Cost (E		67/2006 ATP date 12/2006 Prist Supported Launch 12/2007 Laust Supported Launch 4/2/2007 Laust Supported Launch 4/2/2007 Laust Supported Launch 500 Total Cost (BYS) 500 Total Cost (BYS)												
	Fiscal Year		Fiscal %: thme %: BY cost Annual (1st Launch (=10%) a' Annual Year =100%) 1st launch) Cost (BY\$)													
	20007 2008 2010 2011 2011 2012 2013 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	5% 20% 51% 51% 82% 82% 97% 108% 1 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0%	224% \$ 224% \$ 224% \$ 224% \$ 2219% \$ 48.1% \$ 48.1% \$ 50.7% \$ 99.4% \$ 99.4% \$ 101.4% \$ 0.0% \$ 0	23 193 258 222 150 87 47 20 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	rhese are co expenditure: budget dolla conversion t below.	ontracr 5, not rs. See o budget				2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	9% 38% 67% 95% 114% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0%	3.7% \$ 35.8% \$ 98.1% \$ 104.7% \$ 0.0% \$ 0.0% \$ 0.0% \$ 0.0% \$ 0.0% \$ 0.0% \$ 0.0% \$ 0.0% \$ 0.0% \$	18 / 153 / 203 / 95 / 31 / - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	nese are con xpenditures, r udget dollars. onversion to E elow.	racr not See budget	
Note: Expenditures are incurred through last launch plus 6 months. Note: Expenditures are incurred through IOC plus 6 months. Cost-to-Budget Conversion																
Version:	Final v2b June 2003															
Purpose:	 Compute annual budget i computed above. Apply budget constraints Compute resulting deviat 	required to suppo as necessary lion from underlyi	ort the space	and ground e	xpenditures											
Linked Inputs: 1	Space 2006 2013	Fiscal-year Fiscal-year	start end	Ground 2006 2010												
2	Fiscal Year Space Ground	Expenditures in 2006 23 18	base-year d 2007 193 153	ollars (BY\$): 2008 258 203	2009 222 95	BY 2 2010 150 31	2007 2011 87 0	2012 47 0	2013 20 0	2014 0 0	2015 0 0	2016 0 0	2017 0 0	2018 0 0	2019 0 0	2020 0 0
3	Outlay rates <u>1</u> 58.56%	a: 2 34.53%	<u>3</u> 4.07%	<u>4</u> 1.71%	<u>5</u> 1.13%		lote: AF 360 regardless o	100 outlay rates of choice of raw	s used for all N r inflation index	IRO program	5.					
Computations:	Raw Inflatio 2007 NRO	n indices: 2006 0.971	<u>2007</u> 1.000	<u>2008</u> 1.031	<u>2009</u> 1.062	<u>2010</u> 1.096	<u>2011</u> 1.131	<u>2012</u> 1.168	<u>2013</u> 1.207	<u>2014</u> 1.249	<u>2015</u> 1.291	<u>2016</u> 1.335	<u>2017</u> 1.381	<u>2018</u> 1.429	<u>2019</u> 1.478	2020 1.529
	Weighted In 2007 NRO	flation indices: 2006 0.986	2007 1.016	2008 1.047	2009 1.079	<u>2010</u> 1.114	<u>2011</u> 1.150	<u>2012</u> 1.188	2013 1.228	<u>2014</u> 1.270	<u>2015</u> 1.314	<u>2016</u> 1.359	1.4.5	1.454	<u>2010</u> 1.504	<u>2020</u> 1.556
	Real-dollar TOT Space 1058.70 Ground 514.58	expenditures: <u>2006</u> 22.62 17.23	2007 192.56 153.11	2008 266.34 209.34	2009 236.23 100.44	2010 164.54 34.46	2011 97.88 0.00	2012 54.85 0.00	2013 23.67 0.00	2014 0.00 0.00	2015 0.00 0.00	2016 0.00 0.00	2017 0.00 0.00	<u>2018</u> 0.00 0.00	<u>2019</u> 0.00 0.00	
	Intermediate Space Ground	e Calculations: 2006 38.63 29.42	2007 306.06 244.12	2008 271.66 211.49	2009 220.82 28.98	2010 122.21 19.37	2011 65.91 0.00	2012 34.62 0.00	2013 7.59 0.00	2014 0.00 0.00	2015 0.00 0.00	2016 0.00 0.00	2017 0.00 0.00	2018 0.00 0.00	2019 0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00 0.00

1

2

3

ts:	То	tal Obligatio	on Authority	Required:													
	Space	тот	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
~	% Time		5.1%	20.5%	35.9%	51.2%	66.6%	82.0%	97.4%	107.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
βü	TY\$ (Annual)	1058.70	38.63	306.06	271.66	220.82	122.21	65.91	33.42	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	TY\$ (Cum)		38.63	344.68	616.34	837.16	959.37	1025.28	1058.70	1058.70	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
89	BY\$ (Cum)		39.18	340.51	600.01	804.58	914.32	971.64	999.77	999.77	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Q U		999.77	39.18	301.33	259.49	204.57	109.74	57.32	28.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
		999.77	39.18	301.33	259.49	204.57	109.74	57.32	28.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	% Budget (Cum)		3.6%	32.6%	58.2%	79.1%	90.6%	96.8%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
≻ä≌	Goal for constraini	na hudaete i	e ueually to k	een within a s1	0% of the mo	del cum h	udget et 40	-50% time									
MANUALL CONSTRAIN LINK TO TH	TYS (Annual)	1058 70	38.63	306.06	271.66	220.82	122 21	65.91	33.42	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Cum difference (%	1000.70	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	BY\$ (Annual)	-0.23	39.18	301.33	259.49	204 57	109.74	57.32	28.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	BY% (Annual)	100%	3.9%	30.1%	25.9%	20.5%	11.0%	5.7%	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Ground	TOT	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
œщ	% Time		9.5%	38.0%	66.6%	95.2%	114.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
E S	TY\$ (Annual)	514.58	29.42	244.12	211.49	28.98	0.57	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	TY\$ (Cum)		29.42	273.54	485.03	514.01	514.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
ᇢ뼕	BY\$ (Cum)		29.85	270.19	472.21	499.06	499.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
N N		499.58	29.85	240.35	202.02	26.85	0.52	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
		499.58	29.85	240.35	202.02	26.85	0.52	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	% Budget (Cum)		5.7%	53.2%	94.3%	99.9%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
표 년 년	Goal for constraini	ng budgets is	s usually to k	eep within σ =1	3% of the mo	del cum. b	udget at 40	-50% time.									
- REE	TY\$ (Annual)	514.58	29.42	244.12	211.49	28.98	0.57	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
REF	Cum difference (%	a)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
a s X	BY\$ (Annual)	-0.42	29.85	240.35	202.02	26.85	0.52	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
- 8 =	BY% (Annual)	100%	6.0%	48.1%	40.4%	5.4%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

- Provide inputs for phasing equations (e.g., start date, launch date)
- Create phased expenditure profile using Eric Burgess' phasing equations
- Apply inflation indices and Air Force 3600 outlay rates to create budget profile/estimate
- Manually adjust phased estimate to re-align constant year dollars



Enhanced Model

Phase One

- Simplified Structure
 - Overall spreadsheet size reduced (82 vs. 156 Excel rows)
 - Redundant tables eliminated
 - Hidden/Special cells removed
- Manual requirements eliminated
- Consistent formatting applied to identify user-inputs, calculations, etc...
- Additional functionality introduced
 - Custom outlay profiles (vs. Air Force 3600)
 - Constraint mechanism

Phase Two

- Streamlined and flexible structure
 - Multiple systems can be estimated in a single spreadsheet
 - Inputs (phasing parameters, outlay rates, and constraints) for each system are independent
- Functions are traceable and employ user-friendly input mechanisms
- Phasing results can be output as either dollars or percentage-of-effort (via toggle)
- Constraint mechanism supports more comprehensive application to a full CES/WBS

Phasing In	puts									
	Phasing			Base	Total Cost	Number	% NR (0-	Expense	System	Follow-On
System	Method	ATP Date	Launch	Year	(BY\$)	of Units	100)	Lag	Туре	(Ground)
System 1										
Space	Space	10/17/2006	8/13/2017	2007	100.00	6	25	6		
Ground	Ground	10/17/2006	7/31/2010	2007	50.00			6	No	No

Phase Estimate (CY07) Doll														ollars		
System	Total	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
System 1																
Space Ground	100 50	0.00 0.00	14.03 14.04	20.61 17.89	19.55 13.12	15.89 4.94	10.90 0.00	7.05 0.00	4.25 0.00	2.77 0.00	1.99 0.00	1.68 0.00	1.29 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00
														\checkmark		
_								-			Function A	arguments	utra			I ("serve" "serv
•	 Current model requires only 10 rows in MS Excel 										First_Year ∮C\$12 Last_Year ∮Q\$12					= 2006 = 2020
•	Functio require	n inte ments	rface	simpl	lifies	user_					Currei Raw_I	nt_Year C\$1 nflation Infl	2 ationIndices		<u> </u>	= 2006 = {1999,2000,20

- Multiple systems may be estimated in a single sheet
- No manual adjustments required

 Inputs
 \$A4:\$K4
 Imputs
 \$C\$12
 Imputs
 \$C\$10
 Imputs
 \$C\$10
 Imputs
 \$C\$12
 Imputs
 \$C\$10
 Imputs
 \$C\$12
 Imputs
 Imputs
 Imputs
 Imputs

×

Presented at the 2010 ISPA/SCEA Joint Annual Conference and Training Workshop - www.iceaaonline.com Enhanced Model (cont'd)

 Users can easily model multiple systems and perform trades using custom outlay profiles



 Constraints may be applied to an estimate, and costs re-phased over any time period



Next Steps

Presented at the 2010 ISPA/SCEA Joint Annual Conference and Training Workshop - www.iceaaonline.com **Phase Three I Corporation**

Expand constraint/re-phase mechanism

- Introduce into lower levels of cost element structure
- Allow modelers to control how re-phasing is handled at lower levels (i.e., fixing certain elements

Improve model integration

- Develop a graphical user interface to guide users through the entire process
- Generate tables and functions automatically based on user inputs
- Verify models include all necessary components (e.g., code modules)

Introduce Schedule Achievability

- Develop bounds for realistic constraints and re-phasing effort
- Develop methods to determine impact of constraining a budget on schedule

Sources



- Burgess, E., "Time Phasing Methods and Metrics," Presented at the 37th Annual DoD Cost Analysis Symposium, Williamsburg, VA, February 2004.
- Lee, David A., Hogue, Michael R., and Gallagher, Mark A. "Determining a Budget Profile from a R&D Cost Estimate," Journal of Cost Analysis, 1997.