TAKE THE GUESS OUT OF GUESS-TIMATING: Use <u>MILESTONES</u> to Monitor Project Performance ¹

Dr. Kenneth F. Smith, PMP

At a recent PMI Philippines Chapter face-to-face 'Happy Hour' I sat between two young participants – *they are all young nowadays!* – discussing the ever-increasing intricacies in software to manipulate micro data. I interjected, lamenting the loss of an erstwhile app that produced **time-scaled Critical Path charts**; noting flaws embedded in extant scheduling software, as well as their consequent misuse in monitoring project performance. That experience inspired me to write this article to also enlighten the contemporary world-wide community of Project Practitioners.

Evolving from a combination of **Gantt Bar charts** representing **tasks**, and **Milestone charts** representing **checkpoints**, during the late 1950's the **Critical Path Method** (**CPM**) merged both concepts into an interlocking **Network** sequence of 'Activities' and 'Events' – *i.e.* '*Milestones*.'



<u>Figure 1</u> <u>Gantt Chart</u>

¹ How to cite this article: Smith, K. F. (2023). Take the Guess out of Guess-timating: Use <u>Milestones</u> to Monitor Project Performance, advisory article, *PM World Journal*, Vol. XII, Issue VII, July.

Event	Jan	Feb	Mar ,	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug
Subcontracts Signed								
Specifications Finalized			4	$\overline{\nabla}$				
Design Reviewed					\triangle			
Subsystem Tested						\triangle		
First Unit Delivered							Δ	
Production Plan Completed								

Comprised of arrows and milestone nodes, initially these Critical Path networks took one of two forms -- either Precedence, or Time-scaled:



<u>Figure 4</u> <u>Activity on Arrow (AOA) Precedence and Time Scaled Networks</u>



NOTE: Initial network sequencing was by the AOA Precedence format – *then time estimates were developed afterwards*. Subsequent time-scaling combined the best features of Gantt charting, facilitating visible displays highlighting the eponymous 'Critical Path' for baseline scheduling, as well as for detecting variances during performance monitoring, and facilitating adjustments.

However, with the advent of microcomputers, IT programmers were ignorant of the critical path concept, unschooled in the utility of graphic time-scaled networks for scheduling, and oblivious to their facility for monitoring, analysis and updating. Instead, they conceived of the CPM networks as mere flow charts and ignored the time-honored adage "*If it ain't broke, <u>don't fix it</u>*!" Consequently, they created a **3rd format for dedicated software** – such as MS Project -- with **both Activities & Milestones as nodes.** Milestones were also minimal, or even dispensed with -- replaced by numerous computations embedded in the activities as illustrated below.²

<u>Figure 5</u> <u>Activity on Node (*This example is without Milestones*)</u>



Although activity precedence was retained in this format, the *arrows were relegated to mere linkages*. Although the software supplemented this new network format with a traditional Gantt

² [NOTE: I still can't figure out how the DRAG is computed, or its purpose!]

Chart,³ derived from the same data, the **exemplary visual time-scaled network** for planning, monitoring & control was discarded, **so** *graphic scheduled* **representation** -- of merging predecessor activities to milestones at intervals in the process to facilitate analysis -- **was lost.**⁴

These format differences are compared and contrasted in Figure 6.



³ Gantt charts are useful for presentations, but without linkages between activity bars it is impossible to see predecessor-successor relationships, while given those linkages as a software option, still difficult to trace, as well as extremely cumbersome to switch back and forth for analysis in the precedence format.

⁴ For a while, an excellent ancillary software add-on -- **Project Partner** – was available that could create time-scaled Activity on Arrow networks from MS Project files. However, Project Partner eventually fell victim to constant MS Project upgrades.

Milestones⁵ represent definite intervals along a highway from a reference point, as checkpoints for measuring distance traveled. Similarly, Project Milestones at the start and completion of activities and other significant stages in the project can be utilized to measure and assess project implementation performance; i.e. how much of the project has been completed; whether it is On, Ahead or Behind Schedule; and if so, by how much. **Thus milestones provide an objective quantitative basis for performance – usually expressed in percentage terms.**

However, dedicated software drives usage and while various versions of Precedence Diagrams are now the norm, **time-scaled networks are no longer available, so <u>utilization of Milestones</u> for monitoring project implementation performance has fallen by the wayside.**

<u>Relating activity costs to their successor completion milestones</u> also provides a definitive means for measuring <u>Cost performance</u>⁶ when monitoring integrated Schedule & Cost performance with Earned Value methodology (EVM).

<u>Unfortunately, software algorithms also compute activity Earned Values incorrectly as unit</u> <u>duration running costs.</u>

For instance, *rather than <u>\$600 on completion of a 2 week activity</u>, a 2 week activity duration for \$600 would be calculated at a 'burn rate' of \$300 per week; dividing the total cost by the duration, Even if/when milestones are incorporated in the project network, milestone durations are <i>-- correctly --* treated as '0' duration. So assigning an activity's cost to its completion milestone (*in accordance with Earned Value Methodology*) results in \$0 cost – i.e. \$600/0 duration, or '*error*'!

The 'workaround' – which I concocted after my shock & chagrin when I discovered the reason for temporarily 'losing' \$75 million on a World Bank project -- is to assign one time unit to milestones, and subtract one time unit from their predecessor activities.

Moreover, the software algorithm 'burn rate' approach incorrectly assigns a <u>proportional</u> earned value to on-going activities, *which defeats the purpose of the methodology*,⁷ and can result in high earned value but nevertheless incomplete 'white elephant' projects.

© 2023 Kenneth F. Smith

⁵ Or 'Kilometer' stones

⁶ i.e. Number of milestones completed vs number of milestones planned, as well as cumulative **Earned Value** vs cumulative **Planned Value** of milestones—expressed as percentages.

⁷ With the Earned Value Methodology (EVM) -- *just like the 'piecework' concept from which it was derived* – <u>you 'earn' 100% of the PV when the work is complete</u>; not an incremental amount when the work is still in progress -- *such as 50% in my example*.

I have also observed on project consulting assignments – as well as witnessed in my innumerable workshops -- that with a paucity of milestones, estimating implementation performance in projects has deteriorated in accuracy by reverting to 'Ceiling Estimating.'⁸

The variance between traditional financial assessment and earned value monitoring is also exacerbated at the outset, as illustrated in Figure 7.



Figure 7

⁸ i.e. looking at the ceiling and hazarding a 'best guess.'

<u>NOTE</u>: Until the project is completed, the traditional budgeted running cost is <u>Greater than</u> the Project's cumulative Planned Value (PV).

During implementation Monitoring & Reporting this gives an *erroneous* impression that the Baseline Budget was *over-estimated; creating false expectations* for higher level management that cost savings can be realized; and also masks any actual cost overruns unless / until the running-cost budget is exceeded!

These defects are all obscured by precedence network diagramming software and Gantt chart portrayals. However they can be readily detected, and overcome, if supplemented with a time-scaled activity-on-arrow, and milestone-on-node network.



Another consideration during planning – emphasized by Dr. Paul Giammalvo and elucidated in his recent PMWJ article⁹ -- is that activity durations are almost always overly optimistic; so merely showing how far you may be behind the baseline schedule on some activities during implementation is insufficient. What is really important for management control is being able to track the *integrated* status of the cumulative Actual Cost and Earned Value¹⁰ in terms of the scheduled *Latest Finish* PV; as once the Earned Value breaches that line, your project is behind schedule and/or over budget; necessitating adjustment – i.e. schedule extension &/or budget increase, or project curtailment.

⁹ Giammalvo, P. D. (2023). Applied Earned Value Management Based on "Cost Engineering Principles"-With Practical Case Studies for Validation Purposes, PM World Journal, Vol. XII, Issue IV, April.

¹⁰ Also known as the Budgeted Cost of Work Performed (BCWP)

Again, a time-scaled Activity-on-Arrow network with Milestones is the most effective format for depicting the Latest Times for the Planned Values, as shown in Figures 9 & 10.







CUMULATIVE PLANNING of ACTIVITIES & MILESTONES BY THEIRLATEST TIMES TO MONITOR IMPLEMENTATION PERFORMANCE bythe EARNED VALUE METHOD RESULTS IN AN ENTIRELY DIFFERENT BASELINE BUDGET (PV) CONFIGURATION



@ 2023 Dr. Kenneth F. Smith, PMP

These Earliest and Latest cumulative PVs can then be incorporated in an excel chart for comprehensive tracking of all the pertinent variables, as depicted in Figure 11.

© 2023 Kenneth F. Smith

Figure 11¹¹



Project Schedule (Weeks)

Unfortunately, until such time as a replica of the defunct 'Project Partner' app is recreated or added to existing scheduling software, a **time-scaled Network** of the 'activity-on-arrow with milestone node' variety must still be created the '*old school*' way – i.e. hand drawn for display and analysis.

© 2023 Kenneth F. Smith

¹¹ NOTE: See the aforementioned April 2023 PMWJ Giammalvo article for a more comprehensive coverage of this aspect and analytical process.

In the meantime, I have developed several excel templates to facilitate and somewhat rectify this situation -- *depicted in the remaining figures*¹² on the following pages -- which are available for free on proof of purchase of my book **Project Management PRAXIS**, available from Amazon.

In conclusion, I strongly advocate that you pepper your project networks with milestones, and use them to improve planning and monitoring your projects.

See figures 12, 13 and 14 on the following pages

¹² Your data is entered in the 'yellow' cells; and the analysis is computed from embedded formulae.

Figure 12

PR for	PROJECT PERFORMANCE MONITORING WITH MILESTONES (MILESTAT) for On-going Implementation Performance Assessment © 2020 2016 Dr. Kenneth F. smith PMP									
During Project Implementation, Managers want to know the Overall Work Status towards Project Completion,										
as well as the <u>Currrent Status</u> : (Whether "On," "Ahead" or "Behind" Schedule) and (if either Ahead or Behind)										
by How Much. Also given the current status a Forecast When the Project will be Completed.										
	This "Quick & Easy" template provides that information.									
	[Other analyses for Planning, Monitoring & Evaluating Projects are contained in my Book "PROJECT									
WA	MANAGEMENT PRAXIS" (Available from AMAZON), and related Tool Kits available from : kenfsmith@aol.com]									
		Date (DDMMMYR)	Current Da	ate (DDMMMYR)	Date (DDMMMYR)					
EN	TER:	1/Jan/23	25	j/Aug/23	30/Jul/24					
			# OF MILESTONES SCHEDULED TO DATE	# OF MILESTONES COMPLETED TO DATE	TOTAL # OF MILESTONES					
		ENTER:	6	5	20					
		*NOTE:	Quality is implicit in	n successful attainment o	f Milestones					
ov	ERAL	L COMPLETION:	25%	Work Variance:	-17%	Behind Schedule				
		NOTE: Work Asses	sment based on Proje	ct's Completed vs Schedu	led Milestones					
FOR	ECAS	T: If implementation	n continues at the <i>Cul</i>	<i>rrent Pace</i> , assuming a	2/Aug/25	Schedule Forecast				
A	IOTE:	Schedule Variance	Assessment based of	n Project's Current Date	81%	Behind Schedule				
	CAUTI	ON: If the developm	ent schedule is not lir	near, the above Forecast C	ompletion Date MAYNO	T BE VALID. The				
		Variance from S	cheduled Completion	Date MAY BE MORE APPR	OPRIATE. [SEE I	BELOW]				
ALT	. FORI	ECAST: If Scheduled	performance is Irreg	ular, Variance from	10/Aug/24	Alternate				
Like	ly Est	timate with ' <i>Work v</i>	s. Schedule Status' G	raph, Below.	15/Aug/24	Schedule Forecast				
1	OTE:	Schedule Variance A	ssessment based on Pro	1%	Behind Schedule					
			Date		470					
Sc	hedu	le Variance Asses	sment if Current Da	te exceeds Scheduled	NA					
			Completion Date							
	WO	RK VS. SCHEDUL	E STATUS	Work & Schedu	le Variance					
	Ah	nead of			th					
25	Sc	hedule		IIS	1 65					
gp	-		13-	276 - 176						
1051			1.00	37%						
14E				3 S26						
≥ 5			Behind	62%						
0		1	Schedule	876	81%					
-5	the lot			92%						
	FEB.	A PR MAY JUL JUL JUL JUL JUUL AUG SEP SEP SEP SEP SEP SEP SEP SEP SEP SEP	10001 8 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00							

Commontary

Figure 13

	INTEG	RATED	PROJE	CT PERF	ORMA	NCE STA	TUS (IPPST	AT)	
le l	or On-go	Project Se	em ental	tion Perfor	mance	Assessme	nt © 2020	2022 Dr. Kenneth F. S	Smith, PMP
Impleme	entation Pe	rformance	, Thirteen	(13) combina	tions of	IPPSTAT	analyzes a Projec	t's current Sched	lule &
the	Triple Var	iables PV	AC & EV -	- are possib	le.	Cost perfo	rmance status (on a numeric sc	ale from
	Planned	Actual	Earned	Budget at	PERFOR.	1 = High t	to 13 = Low) as	an <i>Integrated P</i>	roject
	Value	Cost	Value	Completion	MANCE	"Troffic Lie	nce muex (PP)	highlighted w	ith a
	(PV)	(AC)	(EV)	(BAC)	INDEX	adjacent V	gnt Color code, /ariables (DV, Al	Dased on the Fou	project
	Durdenski		-	Total Cost		managemen	t review and poss	ible corrective activ	on. [The
	Cost of Work	of Work	Cost of Work	Planned for	PPI	PPI is com	patible with the * Be	st Practice ' Eam	ed Value
	Scheduled (BCWS)	(ACWP)	(BCWP)	(BAC)		Methodology	advocated by the in	ternational Project	
ENTER			40	400	42	Manageme	nt Institute (PMI).	Other analyses for	Planning,
ENTER.	20	20	16	100	14	PROJECT N	ANAGEMENT PR	AXIS (Available from	Amazon),
*NOTE: 0	Quality is i	mplicit in s	uccessful	Milestone at	tainment	and PM&E 1	Fool Kit available fr	om: kenfsmith@ao	l.com
BAD: S	pending	as plann	ed, but v	alue is low	, indica	ting a cost	overrun and t	he work is also	behind
schedu	le								
18%	Compl	ete	Scheo	lule Varia	ance :	-10%	Cost Va	riance :	11%
NOTE	Schedt	ILO ASSO	semont is	s hased on	Behind	Schedule	005174	2 0	er Budget
Proie	of Farney	d Value v	s Planne	od Value'	Semile	senedale		~ 01	ver budget
A N	OTCon	nlotod	Miloct	onoc	Project	t Start Date	Current Date	Scheduled Co	mpletion
	01 001	pieteu	miest	ever a.	(D D	MMMYR)	(DDMMMYR)	Date (DDMM	MMYR)
			Land Britania	ENIEK.	1/.	Jan/23	25/A ug/23	30/Jul/	24
SCHE	EDULE FO	DRECAST	<u>1</u> : IF Wo	ork Perform	nance r	ates are Re	gular, Linear	8/Aug/	26
Extra	polation	of the So	nequie	vanance fr	om me	% Complet	e Date Is OK.	A second s	
EARNE	ED SCHE	DULE FO	RECASI	2: How	ever, IF	work Perf	ormance rates		
are Ir	regular,	% Varian	ce from	the Plan T	DDATE	added to ti	he Scheduled	E IO III	
Con	npietion	Date ma	y be mon	e realistic.	COM	PARE BUT	OF THESE	5/Sep/	24
FORE	CASISW	inn a dei		EN USE VO	eaule 3	latus S-Ct	Irve to detect		
co	ST FORE	CAST: B	ased on	Project Pe	rforman	ice to date,	the		
			Budget I	Estimate at	t Compl	letion (EAC	1) is	111	
				and	Varianc	e at Compl	etion (VAC) is	c 11	
_				See G	raphs	Below:			
	PIV	Work	vs. Schedu	ule Status		Financ	ial Mgr Appare	nt Cost	
	1	E	V vs PV		-	1			
	A	head of			1	50		-	
1	100% 💻	chequie				OVE	R		
				1.00	10	00	-		
	50%		-	·		50			
				Behind			-	UNDER	
	0%	and the second		Schedule		0		BUDGET	
	-Wor	k Plan 👉	Work Actua	Forecast	t .	Bud	l <mark>get Plan 🔹</mark> Actua	al Cost	
		D0.0 7		. Durling			Work & Cost	Variance	
		PM //	ue Cost v	/s. Budget					
1	20 - 0	A	to date	VSEV	_	15%	119	6	
1	00 - BUI	DGET		/		10%			
	80					5% Due 5%			
	40		/			ari			
	20					570			
	0			UNDER		-10%	-10%		
	1000			BUDGET		-15%	2.000 00000		
	-	arned Valu	o Actor	alCost		Schedule	Cost	25/Aug/23	
		arried valu	e MACTU	arcost					

Figure 14



About the Author



Dr. Kenneth Smith

Honolulu, Hawaii & Manila, The Philippines

Initially a US Civil Service Management Intern, then a management analyst & systems specialist with the US Defense Department, Ken subsequently had a career as a senior foreign service officer -- management & evaluation specialist, project manager, and in-house facilitator/trainer -- with the US Agency for International Development (USAID). Ken assisted host country governments in many countries to plan, monitor and evaluate projects in various technical sectors; working 'hands-on' with their officers as well as other USAID personnel, contractors and NGOs. Intermittently, he was also a team leader &/or team member to conduct project, program & and country-level portfolio analyses and evaluations.

Concurrently, Ken had an active dual career as Air Force ready-reservist in Asia (Japan, Korea, Vietnam, Indonesia, Philippines) as well as the Washington D.C. area; was Chairman of a Congressional Services Academy Advisory Board (SAAB); and had additional duties as an Air Force Academy Liaison Officer. He retired as a 'bird' colonel.

After retirement from USAID, Ken was a project management consultant for ADB, the World Bank, UNDP and USAID.

He earned his DPA (Doctor of Public Administration) from the George Mason University (GMU) in Virginia, his MS from Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT Systems Analysis Fellow, Center for Advanced Engineering Study), and BA & MA degrees in Government & International Relations from the University of Connecticut (UCONN). A long-time member of the Project Management Institute (PMI) and IPMA-USA, Ken is a Certified Project Management Professional (PMP®) and a member of the PMI®-Honolulu and Philippines Chapters.

Ken's book -- **Project Management PRAXIS** (available from Amazon) -- includes many innovative project management tools & techniques; and describes a "**Toolkit**" of related templates available directly from him at <u>kenfsmith@aol.com</u> on proof of purchase of PRAXIS.