

Practical Schedule Risk Analysis

DAVID T. HULETT, PhD

GOWER

Contents

<i>List of Figures</i>		<i>vii</i>
<i>List of Tables</i>		<i>xi</i>
<i>Preface</i>		<i>xiii</i>
Chapter 1	Why Schedule Risk Analysis? Looking Beyond the Critical Path Method	1
Chapter 2	Uncertainty in Activity Durations: Using Probability Distributions	9
Chapter 3	Uncertainty Along a Schedule Path: Using Monte Carlo Simulation	29
Chapter 4	A Good Project Schedule is Needed: Critical Path Method Scheduling 101	47
Chapter 5	Collecting Risk Data: Exploring Methods and Problems	71
Chapter 6	Where Parallel Paths Merge: Introducing the 'Merge Bias' and Risk Criticality	99
Chapter 7	Probabilistic Branching: Analyzing Discrete Risk Events	115
Chapter 8	Using Risks to Drive the Analysis and Prioritize Risks: Introducing the 'Risk Driver' Method	133
Chapter 9	Schedule Contingency Plans: Using Conditional Branching	163
Chapter 10	When Activity Durations Move Together: Incorporating Correlation	179
Chapter 11	Risk Management in the Organization: Identifying the Mature Risk Management Culture	201
Appendix 1	The Problem with PERT	207
<i>Index</i>		<i>219</i>

List of Figures

2.1	Typical risk breakdown structure	13
2.2	Triangular distribution I	16
2.3	Beta distribution I	16
2.4	Normal distribution I	18
2.5	Uniform distribution I	18
2.6	Triangular distribution II	21
2.7	Beta distribution II	21
2.8	Normal distribution II	21
2.9	Uniform distribution II	22
2.10	Comparison of triangular and beta distributions	22
2.11	Comparison of two different beta distributions	23
2.12	Four distributions compared (35 days, 45 days, 70 days)	24
3.1	Simple one-path schedule	31
3.2	Result of simulating the simple 4-activity one path schedule	37
3.3	Input distribution	39
3.4	Cumulative distribution	40
3.5	Simple four-activity schedule simulated with only 25 iterations	41
3.6	Simple four-activity schedule simulated with 5000 iterations	42
3.7	Simulation results in days	44
4.1	Simple two-path one merge point schedule	53
4.2	Risk analysis of a schedule without constraints	54
4.3	Simulation with FNLTL constraint	55
4.4	Simulation with FNLTL constraint	56
4.5	Simulation with FNLTL constraint on begin integration and collecting data on project summary task	56
4.6	Example of dangling activities Design Component A has no successor	58
4.7	Adding days to dangling activities may have no impact on the schedule	58
4.8	Activities with successors may be dangling example with start-to-start successors	59
4.9	Activities with start-to-start successors may be dangling	59
4.10	Activities with successors may be dangling. Example with finish-to-finish successors	60
4.11	Activities with finish-finish predecessors may be dangling	60
4.12	Parallel activities with both start-to-start and finish-to-finish logic	60
4.13	No dangles—right answer when predecessor is longer	61
4.14	No dangles—right answer when successor is longer	61
4.15	General rule about schedule logic to avoid the dangles	62

4.16	Lags may be needed on summary schedules	63
4.17	Lags are inappropriate devices to set successors on dates	64
4.18	Use of a lag to set build on August 24	64
4.19	Use of a SNET constraint to set build on August 24 works better than a 20-day lag when the predecessor's completion date changes	65
4.20	Find a predecessor (Design Review/Approval)	65
4.21	Apply TEST STN to testing activities before leveling	66
4.22	After resource leveling TEST STN	67
4.23	Use summary task for supplier's promise date	68
5.1	Availability bias can lead to an overestimate of risk	79
5.2	Picture of adjusting and anchoring bias producing narrow risk ranges	80
5.3	Adjustment of prior assessment about the project from new information	82
5.4	Path distribution is too narrow if the 10 activities have a range of from 8 days to 16 days	92
5.5	Result of path made up of ten activities with ranges of 4.5 Days, 10 days and 21 days	93
5.6	Comparing the triangle with the trigen with the extreme values interpreted as P-15 and P-85 parameters	94
6.1	Simple two-path schedule	100
6.2	One-path project schedule	102
6.3	Schedule with three-point estimates inserted	103
6.4	Results of a Monte Carlo simulation of the simple single-path schedule	103
6.5	Three-path schedule with the same risk on each path and a merge point	104
6.6	Monte Carlo simulation results for the three-path schedule	104
6.7	Graphical evidence of the merge bias from Monte Carlo simulation cumulative distributions	105
6.8	Three-path schedule with critical Component 2 successfully risk managed	108
6.9	Risk criticality with successful mitigation of the critical path risk	109
6.10	Relative risk of the three paths in the schedule	110
6.11	Duration sensitivity between activities and risk of the total schedule	111
7.1	Probability and impact matrix for threats and opportunities—time objective	117
7.2	One-path project schedule	118
7.3	Results of a Monte Carlo simulation of the simple single-path schedule	119
7.4	Schedule with probabilistic branch activities added	121
7.5	Pure logic diagram of the probabilistic branch	121
7.6	Simulation results for a probabilistic branch with 30 percent probability of occurring	123
7.7	Risk mitigation build takes 20 days longer but reduces the probability of test failure to 10 percent	124
7.8	Effect of taking 20 more days in build to reduce the probability of test failure to 10 percent	125

7.9	One probabilistic branch	126
7.10	Two probabilistic branches	127
7.11	Three probabilistic branches	127
7.12	Comparison of none, one, two and three probabilistic branches	128
7.13	Simple existence representation of discontinuous event	129
7.14	Results of probabilistic existence of a test failure	129
8.1	Risk: Probability 100 percent, impact range including opportunities and threats	138
8.2	Construction activity with construction labor risk applied	139
8.3	Risk: Probability 100 percent, impact only threat	139
8.4	Design risk which is entirely a threat	140
8.5	Two risks: Probability less than 100 percent	140
8.6	Activity with risk of 30 percent probability of occurring the spike contains slightly more than 70 percent of the probability	141
8.7	Activity with a threat risk with 60 percent probability the spike contains 40 percent of the probability	142
8.8	Two risks: Probability of 100 percent	142
8.9	An activity that has two risk drivers assigned: 100 percent probability	143
8.10	Two risks with <100 percent probability will affect the same activity	144
8.11	Activity with 2 risk drivers of probability of occurring of less than 100 percent	144
8.12	Tornado chart showing that the technology difficulty risk is more important than the technical labor productivity risk	145
8.13	Example of risks selected and summarized from the risk register	146
8.14	Simplified refinery construction schedule	147
8.15	Refinery schedule with background risks applied	147
8.16	Schedule risk with only estimating risk applied	148
8.17	Risks probability and impact derived from the risk interviews	149
8.18	Table of risk drivers and their assignments to schedule activities	150
8.19	Schedule risk results with all risks considered	151
8.20	Risk driver sensitivity (tornado chart) showing priority risks	155
8.21	Traditional sensitivity (tornado chart) showing priority activities	155
8.22	Schedule risk without Construction Supervision risk	156
8.23	Sensitivity of schedule when Construction Supervision risk is eliminated	157
8.24	Effect on schedule risk as individual risks are removed in priority order	159
9.1	New ship propulsion system summary schedule showing preferred Plan A and backup Plan B	166
9.2	Risk ranges on Alternative A and Alternative B activities show that Alternative A has more schedule risk	167
9.3	Without Plan B the 80 th percentile is September 13, 2011	167
9.4	Schedule with Build and Test Alternative B set with a start-no-earlier-than constraint of March 11, 2009	168
9.5	Schedule risk with trigger set at March 10, 2009	169
9.6	Schedule risk effect of a backup Plan B with a trigger set at March 10, 2009	169

9.7	Criticality analysis shows Plan A is only 32 percent likely with the trigger date set at March 10, 2009	170
9.8	Schedule risk results with trigger set at April 15, 2009	171
9.9	Comparing no backup, early trigger and final 50-50 trigger schedules	171
9.10	Base schedule showing the jacket safely set by April 25	173
9.11	Network diagram showing the logic in the base schedule	173
9.12	Project finish date without considering the weather factor	174
9.13	Uncertainty in the schedule puts setting the jacket in the southern winter	174
9.14	Project completion when setting the jacket does not occur during winter	175
9.15	Mobilization of the barge is 65 percent likely to be delayed until after winter	176
9.16	Comparing cumulative distributions with and without the winter weather condition	177
10.1	One risk driving two activities causing them to be correlated	181
10.2	Perfect positive correlation	182
10.3	The presence of non-common or confounding risks reduces the degree of correlation	183
10.4	Two activities with duration uncertainty but no correlation	184
10.5	One risk driver assigned to design and test activities generates perfect correlation	185
10.6	Three risks with the same parameters	186
10.7	Assignment of three risks will generate partial correlation of 50 percent	186
10.8	Simple schedule for testing correlation	187
10.9	Results without correlation	188
10.10	Schedule risk with high correlation coefficients	189
10.11	Comparison showing the effect of strong correlation on a single-path schedule	190
10.12	Two-path schedule for correlation comparisons	191
10.13	Two-path schedule with no correlation exhibits the merge bias	191
10.14	Two paths: Strong correlation on each path but no correlation between paths	192
10.15	Impact of correlation on two-path schedule	193
10.16	Message from failing the Eigenvalue Test (Crystal Ball®)	196
A.1	Comparison of Two Beta Distributions with the same O, M and P values	211
A.2	Normal distribution. Mean of 220 days and standard deviation of 17.5 days	214
A.3	Checking on the PERT results for the single-path schedule for the 80 th percentile; this is January 20	215
A.4	Results of a Monte Carlo simulation of the simple single-path schedule	215
A.5	Monte Carlo simulation results for the three-path schedule	217