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## Introduction

This document describes the process and approach used to develop the cost and schedule contingency estimates included in the proposed baseline for the National Compact Stellarator Experiment (NCSX) Project. The contingency estimate is based on inputs of all key members of the project team using a structured process based on established DOE and industry methodologies. The contingency estimates are intended to reflect the inherent uncertainty associated with the current NCSX estimates-to-complete (ETC) and the currently identified project risks.

## Overview of Methodology and Approach

The NCSX Project Team employed a structured process developed and implemented with the support of a consultant with extensive DOE and industry experience. The objective of this process was to assess and analyze all areas of risk and uncertainty that might affect the cost and schedule estimates for the project. Probabilistic Risk Analysis Techniques (Monte Carlo Analysis) were used to derive recommended contingency allowances that provide 90\% confidence that the proposed baseline estimate will not be exceeded. (Since overall probability profiles are the result of the analysis used, alternative levels of confidence can also be identified and selected, at management discretion.)

Separate models were constructed to account for inherent uncertainty of the cost and schedule estimates as well as the potential residual impact of identified project risks. Each of these models is described in the following sections of this document.

## Cost Estimate Uncertainty Model

All cost estimates have inherent uncertainty. In general, the level of such uncertainty is a direct result of the degree of design maturity and the complexity of the elements involved - in effect, how much definition exists to provide a basis for the estimates. For this reason, standard cost estimating practice describes uncertainty levels in terms of ranges around the point estimates which, in the case of NCSX, were developed by Job Managers and the Project Management team.

The NCSX Project relied on standard industry and DOE cost estimate classifications to describe the expected range of individual job estimates. In particular, a combination of design maturity and complexity was used to equate each job estimate to a particular cost estimate classification level which could then be used to assign an expected estimate range to each estimate. This process is described below.

Each job estimate was assigned a design maturity and complexity rating based on the definitions shown in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1
Design Maturity Definition

| High | Final design available. All design features/requirements well <br> known. No further design development or evolution expected that <br> will impact estimate. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Medium | Preliminary design available. Some additional design evolution <br> likely. Further developments can be somewhat expected or <br> anticipated and reflected in estimate. |
| Low | No better than conceptual design basis currently available. Design <br> details, procedures, etc. still need much development and <br> evolution of requirements beyond estimate basis is likely and <br> expected. |

Table 2
Design Complexity Definition

| Low | Work is fairly well understood -- either standard construction or <br> repetition of activities performed in past. Little likelihood of <br> estimate not being well understood and requirements not being <br> well defined. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Medium | More complex work requirements that have potential to impact <br> cost and schedule estimates. Limited experience performing <br> similar tasks, so ability to estimate accurately is somewhat suspect |
| High | Extremely challenging tasks and/or requirements. Unique or first- <br> of-a-kind assembly or work tasks. No good basis for estimating <br> work exists so there is a high degree of estimate uncertainty. |

Based on standard industry and DOE estimate classifications (Per AACEI Recommended Practice 18R-97, Cost Estimate Classification System - As Applied to Engineering, Procurement, and Construction in the Process Industries), the NCSX estimates were equated to the appropriate class of estimate based on the design maturity and complexity ratings, as shown in Table 3. The standard industry estimate ranges were then used as a basis to describe the expected range of each NCSX job estimate, using the maturity and complexity ratings shown in Table 4.

Table 3
NCSX Estimate Classification

| Estimate Class | Level of Definition | Accuracy Range | NCSX Definition |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| $5-$ ROM <br> DOE CD-0 | $0-2 \%$ | Low: $-20 \%$ to $-50 \%$ <br> High: $+30 \%$ to $+100 \%$ | L Maturity <br> H Complexity |
| $4-$ Conceptual <br> DOE CD-1 | $1-15 \%$ | Low: $-15 \%$ to $-30 \%$ <br> High: $+20 \%$ to $+50 \%$ | MH and LM |
| $3-$ Preliminary <br> DOE CD-2 | $10-40 \%$ | Low: $-10 \%$ to $-20 \%$ <br> High: $+10 \%$ to $+30 \%$ | LL, MM, and HH |
| 2 <br> DOE CD-2 or 3 | $30-70 \%$ | Low: $-5 \%$ to $-15 \%$ <br> High: $+5 \%$ to $+20 \%$ | ML and HM |
| 1-Definitive <br> DOE CD-3 | $50-100 \%$ | Low: $-3 \%$ to $-10 \%$ <br> High: $+3 \%$ to $+15 \%$ | H Maturity <br> L Complexity |

Table 4
NCSX Estimate Ranges

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 든 } \\ & \frac{7}{2} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | Design Complexity |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Low |  | Medium |  | High |  |
|  | Low | -15\% | +25\% | -20\% | +40\% | -30\% | +60\% |
|  | Medium | -10\% | +15\% | -15\% | +25\% | -20\% | +40\% |
|  | High | -5\% | +10\% | -10\% | +15\% | -15\% | +25\% |

Table 5 summarizes the distribution of the NCSX Estimates to Complete (ETC) by WBS into the estimate accuracy groupings resulting from the approach described above and the ranges shown in Table 4.

Table 5
NCSX ETC by Estimate Accuracy Range

|  |  |  |  | Design Maturity/Complexity |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WBS | Description | ETC | Frozen | HL | $\frac{\text { ML \& }}{\mathrm{HM}}$ | MM,LL,HH | $\frac{\text { MH \& }}{\text { LM }}$ | LH | $\frac{\% \text { of }}{\text { ETC }}$ |
|  | Assumed Estimate Accuracy Range |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & -5 \text { to } \\ & +10 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -1 \overline{0 \text { to }} \\ & +15 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -15 \text { to } \\ & +25 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -20 \text { to } \\ & +40 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -30 \text { to } \\ & +60 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 12 | Vacuum Vessel | 1,428 |  | 220 | 1,208 |  |  |  | 2.31\% |
| 13 | Conventional Coils | 4,256 |  | 2,087 | 2,169 |  |  |  | 6.89\% |
| 14 | Modular Coils | 2,563 | 4 | 139 | 1,356 | 1,035 | 29 |  | 4.15\% |
| 15 | Structures | 1,530 |  |  | 1,530 |  |  |  | 2.48\% |
| 16 | Coil Services | 1,082 |  | 337 | 745 |  |  |  | 1.75\% |
| 17 | Cryostat \& Base Support Structure | 1,500 |  | 920 |  |  |  | 580 | 2.43\% |
| 18 | Field Period Assembly | 14,407 |  |  | 6,777 | 1,323 | 6,307 |  | 23.31\% |
| 19 | Stellarator Core Mgmt \& Integr | 2,250 |  | 2,250 |  |  |  |  | 3.64\% |
| 2 | Auxiliary Systems | 1,017 |  |  |  | 1,017 |  |  | 1.65\% |
| 3 | Diagnostics | 806 |  | 520 | 29 | 257 |  |  | 1.30\% |
| 4 | Electrical Power Systems | 2,719 |  | 1,637 | 1,082 |  |  |  | 4.40\% |
| 5 | I\&C Systems | 2,095 |  | 65 | 1,301 | 729 |  |  | 3.39\% |
| 6 | Facility Systems | 2,422 |  |  | 222 |  | 633 | 1,567 | 3.92\% |
| 7 | Test Cell Prep \& Machine Assy | 8,582 |  | 618 |  |  | 7,964 |  | 13.89\% |
| 8 | Project Management \& Integration | 15,137 | 193 | 10,786 |  | 3,617 | 541 |  | 24.50\% |
|  | Total NCSX ETC | 61,794 | 197 | 19,579 | 16,419 | 7,978 | 15,474 | 2,147 | 100.00\% |
|  |  | 100\% | 0\% | 32\% | 27\% | 13\% | 25\% | 3\% |  |

The ranges shown in Table 4 were used with the job manager's point estimate to describe a probability profile for each estimate as an input to a Monte Carlo analysis using Crystal Ball ${ }^{\circledR}$ and Microsoft Excel software. Each job estimate was treated as an independent variable (except for a few job estimates which were correlated to each other) with cost outcomes described as a triangular distribution where the base or point estimate is the most likely value, the low end of the range is the minimum value, and the high end of the range is the $80 \%$ confidence level value (there is a $20 \%$ chance the actual costs could exceed this upper end value).

In addition to the ranges around each job estimate used for the model, the uncertainty model also includes a factor for overall estimate uncertainty. This is to account for estimate errors and omissions or other uncertainties not captured within the scope of an individual job estimate. For the NCSX estimate uncertainty model this was assumed to add no cost for the most likely case. At the low end of the range a $1 \%$ reduction was assumed; and in the maximum case (with no chance of overrun) a $3 \%$ adder was assumed. These values were modeled using a triangular distribution in the Monte Carlo model.

Appendix A shows each job point estimate, the rating of design maturity and complexity, and the resultant ranges used as the inputs to the Monte Carlo probabilistic analysis. Information on individual estimate probability profiles, correlation factors, etc. can be found in the Crystal Ball ${ }^{\circledR}$ Report included as Appendix G of this document (these are called "assumptions" in Crystal Ball ${ }^{\circledR}$.)

## Schedule Uncertainty Model

The inherent uncertainty of the schedule duration estimates were evaluated in a similar manner as was the cost estimate uncertainty. For the schedule, a model that focused only on critical and near critical path activities was used. Because the NCSX Project is composed of a fairly sequential series of activities, a full analysis that addresses potential alternative critical paths was not considered necessary. For each activity identified and included in this model, a duration range was established using the same maturity and complexity ratings and resultant estimate uncertainty ranges as were used for costs.

As with the cost uncertainty model, Monte Carlo analysis was used to determine the overall project schedule probability profile. Each critical path (or near critical path) activity was treated as an independent variable; however within the model the schedule and cost estimate uncertainty of individual jobs were correlated (that is, if the costs went up, the schedule duration would likely increase, and vice versa). Triangular distributions were assumed with the base duration estimate being the most likely value, the low end of the range representing the minimum duration, and the high end of the range having a $90 \%$ confidence level (higher than for costs since schedule workarounds are more often possible). In addition, the model capped or limited the durations for some activities to the extent that a second shift could be used to minimize the upper end of potential durations. When this is necessary, the model adds a cost allowance for shift supervision, support and shift differential costs.

The inputs for the schedule uncertainty model are included as Appendix B of this document.

## Risk Model

In addition to the models used to assess and quantify cost and schedule estimate uncertainty, a separate model was used to assess the level of contingency needed to accommodate residual risk impacts - both to project costs or the critical path for the project. The basis for this model is the NCSX Risk Register and the estimated likelihood of occurrence of risks and risk impact estimates included therein. The process used to identify risks and to manage identified risks is described in the NCSX Risk Management Plan. The model used to estimate risk related cost and schedule contingency allowances is described below.

The Risk Model assumes each identified risk has a chance of occurring based on the "likelihood" assessments determined for each risk, as described in Table 6.

Table 6
Likelihood of Risk Occurrence

| Probability of Occurrence | Criteria |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Qualitative | Quantitative |  |
| Very Unlikely | $<0.1$ | Will not likely occur anytime in the project life <br> cycle, or the probability of the occurrence is <br> judged to be less than 10\%. |
| Unlikely | $>0.1$ but <0.4 | Unlikely to occur in the project life cycle, or the <br> probability of the occurrence is judged to be <br> greater than $10 \%$ but less than 40\%. |
| Likely | $>0.4$ but <0.8 | Will likely occur sometime during the project life <br> cycle of the project or its facilities, or the <br> probability of the occurrence is judged to be <br> greater than 40\% but less than $80 \%$. |
| Very Likely | $>0.8$ | Very likely to occur sometime during the project <br> life cycle or the probability of occurrence is <br> judged to be $80 \%$ or greater. |

Within the Monte Carlo analysis model, each likelihood description (likely, unlikely, etc,) is represented by a uniform probability profile (e.g., if "likely", then there is an equal chance of from $40 \%$ to $80 \%$ of the time that risk event will occur). If an event does occur, then the estimated cost and schedule impacts will be realized. These probability profiles were used as the input variables for the Monte Carlo analysis using Crystal Ball ${ }^{\circledR}$ and Microsoft Excel software. The Risk Model inputs are shown in Appendix C of this document.

## Summary of Results

The result of the NCSX uncertainty and risk models is displayed in the figure below (the detailed probability profile of each uncertainty and risk element can be found in Appendix D). The contingency allowances needed to attain a $90 \%$ confidence that the proposed ETC will not be exceeded are summarized in Table 7. Table 8 also depicts the contingency required to achieve $80 \%$ or $95 \%$ levels of confidence. The ETC for the NCSX Project at the $90 \%$ level of confidence is approximately $\$ 85$ million, including an approximate $36 \%$ contingency on the estimate to complete for the project.


Table 7 summarizes the months of schedule contingency needed to achieve $90 \%$ confidence in the schedule end date (CD-4) as a result of both schedule estimate uncertainty (as it impacts the project critical path), and the potential residual impacts of project risk events. The schedule contingency requirements calculated by the uncertainty and risk models were adjusted downwards by assuming that the duration for the project can be reduced by working Saturdays when needed for contingent schedule impacts. Thus the overall schedule contingency was reduced by approximately $83 \%$ ( 6 days worked in a week as compared to the base case of 5 days of work). To the extent this reduction is made, a schedule mitigation cost adder is included to account for the added supervision and support costs needed for Saturday operations. This reduction and cost adder is depicted in Appendix D .

Table 7
Contingency Analysis Results

| Base Schedule | 48.0 | months |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule Uncertainty Contingency at 90\% | 7.2 |  |
| Risk Schedule Contingency at 90\% | 11.8 |  |
| Total Schedule Contingency (90\%) | 19.0 | months |
| Base ETC | 61,794 |  |
| Contingency at 90\% (Std Uncertainty) | 9,350 | 15\% |
| Cost of Schedule Uncertainty Contingency | 3,780 | 6\% |
| Cost of Schedule Risk Mitigation | 270 | 0\% |
| Total Uncertainty Contingency - 90\% Confidence | 13,400 | 22\% |
| Risk Cost Contingency (from Risk Model) at 90\% | 2,840 | 5\% |
| Risk Schedule Contingency (cost of stretch) - 90\% | 6,170 | 10\% |
| Total Risk Contingency - 90\% Confidence | 9,010 | 15\% |
| Total Cost Contingency (90\%) | 22,410 | 36\% |
| ETC with Contingency (@90\%) | 84,204 |  |
|  | \$M | \$M |
| 2008 | 0\% | 0.00 |
| 2009 | 12\% | 2.69 |
| 2010 | 14\% | 3.14 |
| 2011 | 41\% | 9.19 |
| 2012 | 33\% | 7.40 |

Also shown in Table 7 are the cost contingency allowances necessary to attain a $90 \%$ level of confidence in the Estimate to Complete for the NCSX Project. The cost contingency is comprised of the following elements:

- $\quad$ Standard estimate uncertainty allowance
- Cost associated with the schedule uncertainty (project costs that would be incurred as the project schedule is stretched - see Appendix E)
- $\quad$ Cost of Schedule Risk Mitigation representing the added costs to be incurred if and when second shift operations are needed to maintain the project schedule (or limit the amount of schedule stretch) as a result of schedule uncertainty - see Appendix E. Also included is the cost incurred for additional supervision and support when Saturdays are worked to reduce the number of weeks of schedule contingency determined as needed by the probabilistic analysis.
- Risk Contingency which includes both cost impacts and the cost that is incurred as a result of schedule impacts of risk events


## Contingency by Year

Table 7 also depicts the proposed spread of contingency dollars by fiscal year. This proposed distribution of contingency allowance over the remaining project life was derived using a two step process. First, the main contributors to both estimate uncertainty and cost risk were determined using the sensitivity analysis output of the Monte Carlo simulation model. The current projected BCWS profile for each of these contributing elements were also determined and the results of the two inputs (percent contribution of each job and the spread of BCWS for each job by year) were then combined to calculate a possible spread of contingency use over time. Note that all schedule contingency related costs, which represent extension of project fixed costs, are assumed to occur at the end of the project for this analysis. These calculations are shown in Appendix F.

After this analysis was completed, there was a subjective attempt to adjust the resulting contingency spread to more accurately depict when contingency costs will in fact be needed and incurred by the project. This is necessary since it is important to maximize the level of funds available to schedule needed project activities (especially design work and placement of large procurements) as early as feasible to optimize the overall project schedule and retire risks as rapidly as possible. At the same time, it is important not to assume all contingency needs will only occur near the end of the project. The proposed spread assumed for the NCSX project (and shown in Table 7 and Appendix F) is believed to properly balance these two concerns and is based on the systematic analysis described as the first step above.

## Allocation of Contingency by WBS

At the request of DOE HQ, the calculated contingency allowance was subsequently allocated to individual WBS elements. Although the contingency will not be managed in this way, this portrayal is useful for assessing to what degree the various WBS elements contribute to the uncertainty and risks for the NCSX Project. The results of this allocation are shown in Table 9.

The following methodologies were used to derive this contingency allocation:

- Uncertainty was distributed by forecasting the Monte Carlo analysis results for each WBS and determining the $90 \%$ confidence point for each WBS element.
- Schedule cost contingency was allocated to the WBS elements for which those costs will be required - the "standing army" costs associated with schedule stretch that are primarily project management related elements.
- The schedule mitigation cost was assigned to the WBS elements that would require additional shift work if the schedule uncertainty is realized.
- The risk contingency was allocated on the basis of WBS elements that may be impacted by each identified risk., again determining the $90 \%$ confidence point for each summed WBS.

After developing a detailed allocation using the above methodologies, the resulting percentages of the total calculated contingency were determined and these percentages were then applied to the total calculated contingency needed for an overall (rather than for each WBS) $90 \%$ level of confidence. The results of this calculation are shown in Table 9. Also shown in Table 9 is the percentage that this allocated contingency represents of the base ETC estimate for each WBS element.

## Appendices

A. Estimate Uncertainty Ranges
B. Schedule Uncertainty Ranges
C. Risk Model Inputs
D. Probabilistic Model Results
E. Schedule Contingency Costing Bases
F. Basis for Spread of Contingency by Fiscal Year
G. Crystal Ball ${ }^{\circledR}$ Report

Table 8

|  | 90\% Confidence |  | 80\% Confidence |  | 95\% Confidence |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Base Schedule | 48.0 | months | 48.0 | months | 48.0 | months |
| Schedule Uncertainty Contingency | 7.2 |  | 5.9 |  | 8.2 |  |
| Risk Schedule Contingency | 11.8 |  | 10.4 |  | 12.9 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Schedule Contingency (90\%) | 19.0 | months | 16.3 | months | 21.1 | months |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base ETC | 61,794 |  | 61,794 |  | 61,794 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contingency (Std Uncertainty) | 9,350 | 15\% | 8,640 | 14\% | 9,990 | 16\% |
| Cost of Schedule Uncertainty Contingency | 3,780 | 6\% | 3,120 | 5\% | 4,320 | 7\% |
| Cost of Schedule Mitigation (incl. 2nd Shift \& Saturdays) | 270 | 0\% | 230 | 0\% | 300 | 0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Uncertainty Contingency | 13,400 | 22\% | 11,990 | 19\% | 14,610 | 24\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Risk Cost Contingency (from Risk Model) | 2,840 | 5\% | 2,550 | 4\% | 3,000 | 5\% |
| Risk Schedule Contingency (cost of stretch) | 6,170 | 10\% | 5,460 | 9\% | 6,770 | 11\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Risk Contingency | 9,010 | 15\% | 8,010 | 13\% | 9,770 | 16\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Cost Contingency | 22,410 | 36\% | 20,000 | 32\% | 24,380 | 39\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ETC with Contingency | 84,204 |  | 81,794 |  | 86,174 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contingency Spread by Year |  | \$M |  | \$M |  | \$M |
| 2008 | 0\% | 0.00 | 0\% | 0.00 | 0\% | 0.00 |
| 2009 | 12\% | 2.69 | 12\% | 2.40 | 12\% | 2.93 |
| 2010 | 14\% | 3.14 | 14\% | 2.80 | 14\% | 3.41 |
| 2011 | 41\% | 9.19 | 41\% | 8.20 | 41\% | 10.00 |
| 2012 | 33\% | 7.40 | 33\% | 6.60 | 33\% | 8.05 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 22.41 |  | 20.00 |  | 24.38 |

Table 9
Contingency Allocation by WBS

| WBS |  |  | Allocation of Contingency Allowances (90\% Confidence) |  |  |  |  | \% of Cont. | Allocated Contingency | \% of <br> ETC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ETC | Uncertainty | Schedule | Sched Mitig | Cost Risk | Total |  |  |  |
| 12 | Vacuum Vessel | 1,428 | 195 |  |  | 60 | 255 | 1.0\% | 222 | 16\% |
| 13 | Conventional Coils | 4,256 | 473 |  |  | 360 | 833 | 3.2\% | 725 | 17\% |
| 14 | Modular Coils | 2,563 | 427 |  |  | 30 | 457 | 1.8\% | 398 | 16\% |
| 15 | Structures | 1,530 | 288 |  |  | 573 | 861 | 3.3\% | 749 | 49\% |
| 16 | Coil Services | 1,082 | 165 |  |  | 60 | 225 | 0.9\% | 196 | 18\% |
| 17 | Cryostat \& Base Support Structure | 1,500 | 498 |  |  | 150 | 648 | 2.5\% | 564 | 38\% |
| 18 | Field Period Assembly | 14,407 | 2,841 | 1,876 | 135 | 1,195 | 6,047 | 23.5\% | 5,262 | 37\% |
| 19 | Stellarator Core Mgmt \& Integr | 2,250 | 232 | 796 |  | 0 | 1,028 | 4.0\% | 894 | 40\% |
| 2 | Auxiliary Systems | 1,017 | 270 |  |  | 0 | 270 | 1.0\% | 235 | 23\% |
| 3 | Diagnostics | 806 | 113 |  |  | 0 | 113 | 0.4\% | 98 | 12\% |
| 4 | Electrical Power Systems | 2,719 | 247 |  |  | 163 | 409 | 1.6\% | 356 | 13\% |
| 5 | I\&C Systems | 2,095 | 306 |  |  | 0 | 306 | 1.2\% | 267 | 13\% |
| 6 | Facility Systems | 2,422 | 1,132 |  |  | 0 | 1,132 | 4.4\% | 985 | 41\% |
| 7 | Test Cell Prep \& Machine Assy | 8,582 | 3,119 | 1,876 | 135 | 730 | 5,861 | 22.8\% | 5,100 | 59\% |
| 8 | Project Management \& Integration | 15,137 | 1,763 | 5,401 |  | 145 | 7,309 | 28.4\% | 6,360 | 42\% |
|  | Total | 61,794 | 12,070 | 9,950 | 270 | 3,465 | 25,755 | 100.0\% | 22,410 | 36\% |

## APPENDIX A

## COST ESTIMATE UNCERTAINTY RANGES

|  |  |  |  |  |  | Estimate Uncertainty Range |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WBS2 | Job | WBS4 | Maturity | Complexity | ETC (ML) | Low | High |
| 12 | 1204 - Job: 1204 - VV Sys Procurements (nonVVSA) 1 | 122 - Thermal Insulation | H | L | 220 | 209 | 242 |
|  | 1204 - Job: 1204 - VV Sys Procurements (nonVVSA) 12 | 124 T - Heater Tape for Port Stub | H | L |  |  |  |
|  | 1204 - Job: 1204 - VV Sys Procurements (nonVVSA) 1 | 124 U - T/C and Heater Tape Leads | H | L |  |  |  |
|  | 1204 - Job: 1204 - VV Sys Procurements (nonVVSA) 1 | 124 V - Spacer Flux Loops \& Boxes | H | L |  |  |  |
|  | 1204 - Job: 1204 - VV Sys Procurements (nonVVSA) 1 | 125 - VV Local I\&C | H | L |  |  |  |
|  | 1250 - Job: 1250 - Vacuum Vessel Fabrication**CLO; |  | FROZEN |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1260 - Job: 1260 NB Transition Ducts- GORANSON |  | M | L | 566 | 509 | 651 |
|  | 1270 - Job: 1270-Heater Control System-GORANSC |  | M | L | 642 | 578 | 738 |
| 13 | 1302 - Job: 1302 - PF Design -KALISH |  | H | L | 91 | 86 | 100 |
|  | 1302 - Job: 1302 - PF Design -KALISH | RBLX - FY07 Rebaseline Exercise | FROZEN |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1352 - Job: 1352 - PF Coil Procurement-CHRZANOV 1 | 13P - PF Coil Fabrication | H | L | 1,638 | 1,556 | 1,802 |
|  | 1353- Job: 1353-CS Structure Procurement-DAHLC 1 | 132A - CS Support Structure | H | L | 358 | 340 | 394 |
|  | 1354 - Job: 1354 - Trim Coil Design \&Procurement-K T | TRIM - Trim Coil **Updated estimate** | M | L | 1,433 | 1,290 | 1,648 |
|  | 1355 - Job: 1355 - WBS 13 I\&C Proc and Coil Assy-C 1 | 134 - TF/PF Loacl I\&C | M | L | 109 | 98 | 125 |
|  | 1361 - Job: 1361 - TF Fabrication-KALISH | - | FROZEN |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1361 - Job: 1361 - TF Fabrication-KALISH | 130 - TF Title III and Fabrication Oversight | H | M | 153 | 138 | 176 |
|  | 1361 - Job: 1361 - TF Fabrication-KALISH | 13Y - TF Fabrication Contract | H | M | 474 | 427 | 545 |
|  | 1361 - Job: 1361 - TF Fabrication-KALISH | RBLX - FY07 Rebaseline Exercise | FROZEN |  |  |  |  |
| 14 | 1404 - Job: 1404 - MCWF R\&D 1st Prod Casting**CL |  | FROZEN |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1408 - Job: 1408 - MC Winding Supplies-CHRZANOI | - | L | L | 123 | 105 | 154 |
|  | 1411 - Job: 1411 - MCWF Fabr. S005242-HEITZENR | - | Closed |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1416 - Job: 1416 - Mod Coil Type AB Fnl Dsn-WILLIA M | MCDB - Clamp hardware modifications | H | L |  |  |  |
|  | 1416 - Job: 1416 - Mod Coil Type AB Fnl Dsn-WILLIA M | MCDC - Blanket thermal insulation | H | L |  |  |  |
|  | 1416 - Job: 1416 - Mod Coil Type AB Fnl Dsn-WILLIA N | MCDE - Top level assy models/drawings | H | L | 10 | 10 | 11 |
|  | 1416 - Job: 1416 - Mod Coil Type AB Fnl Dsn-WILLIA N | MCDF - Analysis and closeout documentation | H | L | 122 | 116 | 134 |
|  | 1416 - Job: 1416 - Mod Coil Type AB Fnl Dsn-WILLIA T | TCCO - Type C Design Closeout | H | L | 7 | 7 | 8 |
|  | 1421 - Job: 1421 - Mod Coil Interface Design-WILLIA |  | L | M | 23 | 18 | 32 |
|  | 1421 - Job: 1421 - Mod Coil Interface Design-WILLIA 1 | 142B - Outboard Interface-Bolted Joint Tests-Tension | L | M | 2 | 2 | 3 |
|  | 1421 - Job: 1421 - Mod Coil Interface Design-WILLIA 1 | 142C - Outboard Interface-Bolted Joint Tests-Shear | L | M |  |  |  |
|  | 1421 - Job: 1421 - Mod Coil Interface Design-WILLIA 1 | 142 F - Inboard Interface-AB/BC/AA | L | M | 4 | $3 \mid$ | 6 |
|  | 1421 - Job: 1421 - Mod Coil Interface Design-WILLIA 1 | 142G - Inboard Interface-CC | L | M |  | ncluded above |  |
|  | 1421 - Job: 1421 - Mod Coil Interface Design-WILLIA 1 | 142H - Weld Access test | L | M |  |  |  |
|  | 1421 - Job: 1421 - Mod Coil Interface Design-WILLIA 1 | $142 Z$ - Outboard Interface | L | M |  |  |  |
|  | 1429 - Job: 1429 - MC Interface R\&D-DUDEK | 142D - Outboard Interface-Friction | Closed |  | 4 | FROZ |  |
|  | 1431 - Job: 1431 - Mod. Coil Interface Hardware-DU[B | BLAD - Bladders | H | M | 5 | 5 | 6 |
|  | 1431 - Job: 1431 - Mod. Coil Interface Hardware-DU[B | BUSH - Bushings | H | M | 19 | 17 | 22 |
|  | 1431 - Job: 1431 - Mod. Coil Interface Hardware-Du[P | PUCK - Pucks | H | M | 36 | 32 | 41 |
|  | 1431 - Job: 1431 - Mod. Coil Interface Hardware-DU[S | SHMS - Shims-Outboard | H | M | 593 | 534 | 682 |
|  | 1431 - Job: 1431 - Mod. Coil Interface Hardware-Du[S | SHMT - Shims-Inboard | H | M | 131 | 118 | 151 |
|  | 1431 - Job: 1431 - Mod. Coil Interface Hardware-Du[s | SHMU - Shims- C-C Joint | H | M | 28 | 25 | 32 |
|  | 1431 - Job: 1431 - Mod. Coil Interface Hardware-DU[ | STUD - Studs Washers Nuts | H | M | 143 | 129 | 164 |
|  | 1431 - Job: 1431 - Mod. Coil Interface Hardware-DU[ T | TECH - Misc Tech Shop Support | H | M | 119 | 107 | 137 |
|  | 1451 - Job: 1451 - Mod Coil Winding-CHRZANOWSk 1 | 1 - Station 1 Post VPI | H | H | 912 | 775 | 1,140 |
|  | 1451 - Job: 1451 - Mod Coil Winding-CHRZANOWSk 1 | 1A - Station 1a/4 Casting Prep | H | H |  | ncluded above |  |
|  | 1451 - Job: 1451 - Mod Coil Winding-CHRZANOWSH 2 | 2 - Station 2-Winding Instl Chill Plates Tubing Bag | H | H |  | cluded above |  |
|  | 1451 - Job: 1451 - Mod Coil Winding-CHRZANOWSk 3 | 3 - Station 3-Winding Instl Chill Plates Tubing Bag | H | H |  | cluded above |  |
|  | 1451 - Job: 1451 - Mod Coil Winding-CHRZANOWSK 5 | 5 - Station 5-VPI | H | H |  | cluded above |  |
|  | 1451 - Job: 1451 - Mod Coil Winding-CHRZANOWSk L | LABR - LOE Oversight \& Supervision | H | H |  | cluded above |  |
|  | 1459 - Job: 1459 - Mod Coil Fabr.Punch List-CHRZAl PLC | PLCT - Punchlist- Coil Technicians | M | L | 282 | 254 | 324 |
|  | 1459 - Job: 1459 - Mod Coil Fabr.Punch List-CHRZAl P | PLTS - Punchlist Tech shop/RESA | M | L |  | cluded above |  |
| 15 | 1501 - Job: 1501 - Coil Structures Design-DAHLGRE |  | M | L | 90 | 81 | 104 |
|  | 1550 - Job: 1550 - Coil Struct. Procurement -DAHLG | - | M | L | 1,440 | 1,296 | 1,656 |
| 16 | 1601 - Job: 1601 - Coil Services Design-GORANSOI 1 | 161-161-LN2 Distribution | H | L | 306 | 291 | 337 |
|  | 1601 - Job: 1601 - Coil Services Design-GORANSOI 1 | 162-162-Electrical Leads | M | L | 745 | 671 | 857 |
|  | 1601 - Job: 1601 - Coil Services Design-GORANSOI 1 | 163-163-Coil Protection System | H | L | 31 | 29 | 34 |
|  | 1601 - Job: 1601 - Coil Services Design-GORANSOI | RBLX - FY07 Rebaseline Exercise | H | L |  |  |  |
| 17 | 1701 - Job: 1701 - Cryostat Design-RAFTOPOLOUS | - | L | H | 580 | 406 | 928 |
|  | 1702 - Job: 1702 - Base Support Struct Design-DAHL | - | H | L | 139 | 132 | 153 |
|  | 1751 - Job: 1751 - Cryostat Procurement-RAFTOPOI | - | H | L | 550 | 523 | 605 |
|  | 1752 - Job: 1752 - Base Support Proc-DAHLGREN | 172-172- Base Support Structure | H | L | 231 | 219 | 254 |
| 18 | 1802 - Job: 1802 - FP Assy Oversight\&Support-VIOL A | A - Oversight and Supervision | H | M | 3,826 | 3,443 | 4,400 |
|  | 1803- Job: 1803/1805- FPA Tooling/Constr-BROWN/3 | 3.00 - Station 3-Modular Coil to VVSA Assembly | M | L | 250 | 225 | 288 |
|  | 1803- Job: 1803/1805- FPA Tooling/Constr-BROWN/ 5 | 5.00 - Station 5-Final Field Period Assembly | M | L | 203 | 183 | 233 |
|  | 1803 - Job: 1803/1805- FPA Tooling/Constr-BROWN/ 6 | 6.00-6.00-Final Machine Assembly | L | M | 541 | 433 | 757 |
|  | 1806 - Job: 1806 - FP Assembly specs and drawings- | - | M | M | 54 | 46 | 68 |
|  | 1806 - Job: 1806 - FP Assembly specs and drawings-1 | 1.00-1.00-VV Prep Station | M | M | 19 | 16 | 24 |
|  | 1806 - Job: 1806 - FP Assembly specs and drawings-2. | 2.00-Station 2-Modular Coil Sub-Assembly | M | M | 2 | 2 | 3 |
|  | 1806 - Job: 1806 - FP Assembly specs and drawings-3 | 3.00 - Station 3-Modular Coil to VVSA Assembly | M | M | 30 | 26 | 38 |
|  | 1806 - Job: 1806 - FP Assembly specs and drawings. 5 | 5.00 - Station 5-Final Field Period Assembly | M | M | 114 | 97 | 143 |
|  | 1806 - Job: 1806 - FP Assembly specs and drawings-6. | 6.00-6.00-Final Machine Assembly | M | M | 137 | 116 | 171 |
|  | 1810 - Job:1810-Field Period Assy -Station 123 VICS | SOPO - General Assy Support | H | M | 1,946 | 1,751 | 2,238 |
|  | 1810 - Job:1810-Field Period Assy - Station 123 VICS | S1P1 - Station 1-VV Prep (hard surface components) F | H | M | 552 | 497 | 635 |
|  | 1810 - Job:1810-Field Period Assy - Station 123 VICS | S1P2 - Station 1- WV Prep (hrd surf cmpntsPP\#2 | H | M |  | cluded above |  |
|  | 1810 - Job:1810-Field Period Assy - Station 123 VICS | S1P3 - Station 1- VV Prep (hrd surf cmpntsFP\#3 | H | M |  | cluded above |  |
|  | 1810 - Job:1810-Field Period Assy -Station 123 VICS | S1SP - Station 1-Spool pieces (3) (spacers) | H | M |  | cluded above |  |
|  | 1810 - Job:1810-Field Period Assy - Station 123 VICS | S2H1 - Station 2 MC subassy A1B1C1 | M | H | 414 | 331 | 580 |
|  | 1810 - Job:1810-Field Period Assy - Station 123 VICS | S2H2 - Station 2 MC subassy A2B2C2 | M | H | 314 | 251 | 440 |
|  | 1810 - Job:1810-Field Period Assy - Station 123 VICS | S2H3 - Station 2 MC subassy АЗВЗС3 | M | H | 317 | 254 | 444 |
|  |  | S2ftar.Stataon 2 MC subassy A484C4 | M | H | 311 | 249 | 435 |


| WBS2 | Job | WBS4 | Maturity | Complexity | ETC (ML) | Low | High |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1810 - Job:1810-Field Period Assy -Station 123 VIC | S2H5 - Station 2 MC subassy A5B5C5 | M | H | 312 | 250 | 437 |
|  | 1810 - Job:1810-Field Period Assy -Station 123 VIC | S2H6 - Station 2 MC subassy A6B6C6 | M | H | 310 | 248 | 434 |
|  | 1810 - Job:1810-Field Period Assy -Station 123 VIC | S2PM - Pre-Measuring and fitup checks | M | H | 323 | 258 | 452 |
|  | 1810 - Job:1810-Field Period Assy -Station 123 VIC | S2PR - Station 2 Trials \& Development | M | H |  |  |  |
|  | 1810 - Job:1810-Field Period Assy -Station 123 VIC | S2PX - Setup | H | H | 967 | 822 | 1,209 |
|  | 1810- Job:1810-Field Period Assy -Station 123 VIC | S3P0 - Station 3 Setup/Preparations/General | M | H | 188 | 15 | 263 |
|  | 1810 - Job:1810-Field Period Assy -Station 123 VIC | S3P1 - Station 3-Assemble Mod Coils and VVSA-FP\#1 | M | H | 58 | 468 | 819 |
|  | 1810 - Job:1810-Field Period Assy -Station 123 VIC | S3P2 - Station 3-Assemble Mod Coils and VVSA-FP\#2 | M | H | 40 | 326 | 571 |
|  | 1810 - Job:1810-Field Period Assy -Station 123 VIC | S3P3 - Station 3-Assemble Mod Coils and VVSA-FP\#3 | M | H | 398 | 318 | 557 |
|  | 1815 - Job: 1815 - Field Period Assy -Station 5-VIOL | S4P0 - Setup/Preparations/General | L | M | 294 | 235 | 412 |
|  | 1815 - Job: 1815 - Field Period Assy -Station 5-VIOL | S4P1 - Station 5- Final FP Assy -FP\#1 (in NCSX TC) | L | M | 534 | 427 | 748 |
|  | 1815 - Job: 1815 - Field Period Assy -Station 5-VIOL | S4P2 - Station 5- Final FP Assy -FP\#2 (in NCSX TC) | L | M | 534 | 427 | 748 |
|  | 1815 - Job: 1815 - Field Period Assy -Station 5-VIOL | S4P3 - Station 5- Final FP Assy -FP\#3 (in NCSX TC) | L | M | 524 | 419 | 734 |
| 19 | 1901 - Job: 1901 - Stellarator Core Mngtt\&Integr-COL | 191-191-Stellarator Core Management \& Oversight | H | L | 941 | 894 | 1,035 |
|  | 1901 - Job: 1901 - Stellarator Core Mngttilintegr-COL | 192-192-Stellarator Core Integr \& Global Analysis | H | L | 1,309 | 1,244 | 1,440 |
| 21 | 2101 - Job: 2101 - Fueling Systems-BLANCHARD |  | L | L | 334 | 284 | 418 |
| 22 | 2201 - Job: 2201 - Vacuum Pumping Systems-BLANC |  | L | L | 683 | 581 | 854 |
| 31 | 3101 - Job: 3101 - Magnetic Diagnostics-STRATTON | 124 U - T/C and Heater Tape Leads | H | L | 47 | 45 | 52 |
|  | 3101 - Job: 3101 - Magnetic Diagnostics-STRATTON | 124 V - Spacer Flux Loops \& Boxes | H | L | 56 | 53 | 62 |
|  | 3101 - Job: 3101 - Magnetic Diagnostics-STRATTON | MD2 - Modular Coil C-wound Loops | H | L | 18 | 17 | 20 |
|  | 3101 - Job: 3101 - Magnetic Diagnostics-STRATTON | MD3 - Rogowski Coils | H | L | 180 | 171 | 198 |
|  | 3101 - Job: 3101 - Magnetic Diagnostics-STRATTON | MD4 - TF and PF Co-wound Loops | H | L | 46 | 44 | 51 |
|  | 3101 - Job: 3101 - Magnetic Diagnostics-STRATTON | VLPB - Voltage Loops \& Protective Boxes | H | L | 62 | 59 | 68 |
| 36 | 3601 - Job: 3601 - Edge Divertor Diagnostics-STRAT |  | M | L | 29 | 26 | 33 |
| 38 | 3801 - Job: 3801 - Electron Beam Mapping-STRATTC | - | M | M | 257 | 218 | 321 |
| 39 | 3901 - Job: 3901 - Diagnostics sys Integration-STRA | - | H | L | 111 | 105 | 122 |
| 41 | 4101 - Job: 4101 - AC Power-RAMAKRISHNAN | - | FROZEN |  |  |  |  |
|  | 4101 - Job: 4101 - AC Power-RAMAKRISHNAN | 411-411-Auxiliary AC Power Systems | H | L | 120 | 114 | 132 |
|  | 4101 - Job: 4101 - AC Power-RAMAKRISHNAN | 412-412-Experimental AC Power Systems | H | L | 36 | 34 | 40 |
| 43 | 4301 - Job: 4301 - DC Systems-RAMAKRISHNAN | 431-431-C-Site DC Systems | H | L | 577 | 548 | 635 |
| 44 | 4401 - Job: 4401 - Control \& Protection-RAMAKRISH | 441-441-Electrical Interlocks | M | L | 482 | 434 | 554 |
|  | 4401 - Job: 4401 - Control \& Protection-RAMAKRISH | 442-442-Kirk Key Interlocks | M | L | 69 | 62 | 79 |
|  | 4401 - Job: 4401 - Control \& Protection-RAMAKRISH | 443-443-Real Time Control Systems | M | L | 14 | 13 | 16 |
|  | 4401 - Job: 4401 - Control \& Protection-RAMAKRISH | 444-444- Instrument Systems | M | L | 241 | 217 | 277 |
|  | 4401 - Job: 4401 - Control \& Protection-RAMAKRISH | 445-445-Coil Protection Systems | M | L | 276 | 248 | 317 |
| 45 | 4501 - Job: 4501 - Power Sys Dsn \& Integr-RAMAKR | 451-451-System Design \& Interfaces | H | L | 319 | 303 | 351 |
|  | 4501 - Job: 4501 - Power Sys Dsn \& Integr-RAMAKR | 452-452-Electrical Systems Support | H | L | 199 | 189 | 219 |
|  | 4501 - Job: 4501 - Power Sys Dsn \& Integr-RAMAKR | 453-453-System Testing (PTP's) | H | L | 386 | 367 | 425 |
| 51 | 5101 - Job: 5101 - Network and Fiber Infrastruct-SIC |  | M | , | 222 | 200 | 255 |
| 52 | 5201 - Job: 5201- l\&C Systems-SICHTA | - | M | L | 411 | 370 | 473 |
| 53 | 5301 - Job: 5301 - Data Acquisition-SICHTA |  | M | L | 165 | 149 | 190 |
| 54 | 5401 - Job: 5401 - Facility Timing \& Synchron. SICH7 |  | M | M | 357 | 303 | 446 |
| 55 | 5501 - Job: 5501 - Real Time Control System-SICHT |  | M | L | 503 | 453 | 578 |
| 56 | 5601 - Job: 5601 - Central Safety \&Interlock Sys-SIC |  | L | L | 372 | 316 | 465 |
| 58 | 5801 - Job: 5801 - Central I\&C Integr\& Oversight-SIC | - | H | L | 65 | 62 | 72 |
| 61 | 6101 - Job: 6101 - Water Systems-DUDEK | 613-613-Vacuum Pumping System | M | L | 113 | 102 | 130 |
| 62 | 6201 - Job: 6201 - Cryogenic Syst-RAFTOPOLOUS | $621-621-$ LN2 -LHe Supply \& LN2 coil cooling supply | L | H | 803 | 562 | 1,285 |
|  | 6201 - Job: 6201 - Cryogenic Syst-RAFTOPOLOUS | 623-623-GN2 Cryostat Cooling System | L | H | 764 | 535 | 1,222 |
| 63 | 6301 - Job: 6301 - Utility Systems-DUDEK |  | M | L | 9, | 98 | 125 |
| 64 | 6401 - Job: 6401 - PFC/VV Htng/Cooling(bakeout)- K |  | L | M | 633 | 506 | 886 |
| 73 | 7301 - Job: 7301 - Platform Design \& Fab-PERRY | - | H | L | 212 | 201 | 233 |
| 74 | 7401 - Job: 7401 - TC Prep \& Mach Assy Planning-Pi |  | L | M | 2,323 | 1,858 | 3,252 |
| 75 | 7501 - Job: 7501 - Construction Support Crew-PERR | SOPO - General Assy Support | L | M | 1,323 | 1,058 | 1,852 |
|  | 7503 - Job: 7503 - Machine Assembly (station 6)-PEF | 6S1-1.0-Component Preparation | L | M | 4,318 | 3,454 | 6,045 |
|  | 7503 - Job: 7503 - Machine Assembly (station 6)-PEF | 6S10-10.0 - Type-C Shim Sizing/Prep | L | M | Included above |  |  |
|  | 7503 - Job: 7503 - Machine Assembly (station 6)-PEF | 6S11-11.0-Type-C Inboard Shim Installation Check | L | M | Included above |  |  |
|  | 7503 - Job: 7503 - Machine Assembly (station 6)-PEF | 6S12-12.0-Install Remaining TF Coils | L | M | Included above |  |  |
|  | 7503 - Job: 7503 - Machine Assembly (station 6)-PEF | 6S13-13.0- Install PF-4 Lwr \& Solenoid suprt column | L | M | Included above |  |  |
|  | 7503 - Job: 7503 - Machine Assembly (station 6)-PEF | 6S14-14.0 - Move all Periods to installed position | L | M | Included above |  |  |
|  | 7503 - Job: 7503 - Machine Assembly (station 6)-PEF | 6S15-15.0-Move VV Period to final position and Well | L | M | Included above |  |  |
|  | 7503 - Job: 7503 - Machine Assembly (station 6)-PEF | 6S16-16.0 - Move TF Coils to final position | L | M | Included above |  |  |
|  | 7503 - Job: 7503 - Machine Assembly (station 6)-PEF | 6S17-17.0 - Install Lower PF Colis | L | M | Included above Included above |  |  |
|  | 7503 - Job: 7503 - Machine Assembly (station 6)-PEF | 6S18-18.0-Transfer Weight to Final Machine Suppor | L | M |  |  |  |
|  | 7503 - Job: 7503 - Machine Assembly (station 6)-PEF | 6S19-19.0-Vacuum Pump System | L | M | Included above |  |  |
|  | 7503 - Job: 7503 - Machine Assembly (station 6)-PEF | 6S2-2.0- Test Cell Metrology set-up/deflection test | , | M | Included above |  |  |
|  | 7503 - Job: 7503 - Machine Assembly (station 6)-PEF | 6S20-20.0-MC/VVSA Annulus insulation fill | L | M | Included above |  |  |
|  | 7503 - Job: 7503 - Machine Assembly (station 6)-PEF | 6S21-21.0 - Instt Remaining Trim Coils \& Mag struct | L | M | Included above |  |  |
|  | 7503 - Job: 7503 - Machine Assembly (station 6)-PEF | 6 S22-22.0 - Install solenoid \& Remaining PF Coils | L | M | Included above |  |  |
|  | 7503 - Job: 7503 - Machine Assembly (station 6)-PEF | 6S23-23.0 - Inst/Route Mag Leads to Transition Box | L | M | Included above |  |  |
|  | 7503 - Job: 7503 - Machine Assembly (station 6)-PEF | 6S24-24.0 - Install LN2 and I\&C Services | L | M | Included above |  |  |
|  | 7503 - Job: 7503 - Machine Assembly (station 6)-PEF | 6S25-25.0 thru 35.0-Cryostat NB duct \& I\&C Routincs | L | M | Included above |  |  |
|  | 7503 - Job: 7503 - Machine Assembly (station 6)-PEF | 6S3-3.0-Pre-installation set-up and test | L | M | Included above |  |  |
|  | 7503 - Job: 7503 - Machine Assembly (station 6)-PEF | 6S4-4.0- FPA-1 Installation and Assembly Test | L | M | Included above |  |  |
|  | 7503 - Job: 7503 - Machine Assembly (station 6)-PEF | 6S5-5.0-Spool piece installation test | L | M | Included above |  |  |
|  | 7503 - Job: 7503 - Machine Assembly (station 6)-PEF | 6S6-6.0-Spool piece flange machining | L | M | Included above |  |  |
|  | 7503 - Job: 7503 - Machine Assembly (station 6)-PEF | 6S7-7.0-FPA-2 Installation | L | M | Included above |  |  |
|  | 7503 - Job: 7503 - Machine Assembly (station 6)-PEF | 6S8-8.0-FPA-3 Installation | L | M | Included above |  |  |
|  | 7503 - Job: 7503 - Machine Assembly (station 6)-PEF | 659-9.0-Measure Type-C MC Flanges | L | M | Included above |  |  |
| 76 | 7601 - Job: 7601 - Tooling Design \& Fabrication-PER |  | H | L | 406 | 386 | 447 |
| 81 | 8101 - Job: 8101 - Project Management \&Control-AN |  | H | L | 4,156 | 3,948 | 4,572 |
|  | 8101-Job: 8101 -Project Management \& Contol-AN | RELX- FY07 Rebaseline Exercise | FROZEN |  |  |  |  |


| WBS2 | Job | WBS4 | Maturity | Complexity | ETC (ML) | Low | High |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 8102 - Job: 8102 - NCSX MIE Management ORNL-L | - | H | L | 661 | 628 | 727 |
| 82 | 8202 - Job: 8202 - Engr Mgmt \& Sys Eng Sprt-HEITZ | - | H | L | 3,253 | 3,090 | 3,578 |
|  | 8203 - Job: 8203 - Design Integration-BROWN | - | M | M | 2,583 | 2,196 | 3,229 |
|  | 8204 - Job: 8204 - Systems Analysis-BROOKS | - | M | M | 1,034 | 879 | 1,293 |
|  | 8205 - Job: 8205 - Dimensional Control Coordin-ELLI | - | M | H | 541 | 433 | 757 |
|  | 8210 - Job: 8210 - FY07 Rebaseling tasks | RBLX - FY07 Rebaseline Exercise | FROZEN |  |  |  |  |
|  | 8215 - Job: 8215 Plant Design | RBLX - FY07 Rebaseline Exercise | FROZEN |  | 193 | FROZ |  |
| 85 | 8501 - Job: 8501 - Integrated Systems Testing-GENT | PROC - Startup Documentation | H | L | 343 | 326 | 377 |
|  | 8501 - Job: 8501 - Integrated Systems Testing-GENT | SU - Start-up | H | L | 450 | 428 | 495 |
| 89 | 8998 - Job: 8998 - Allocations-STRYKOWSKY | - | H | L | 1,923 | 1,827 | 2,115 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 61,794 | 54,041 | 75,490 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Estimating Process Uncertainty |  |  | - | -1\% | 3\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ETC= | 61,794 | 53,500 | 77,755 |
|  |  |  |  | Cost thru 1/31/08= | 76,365 | -13\% | 26\% |
|  |  |  |  | EAC= | 138,159 |  |  |

## APPENDIX B

## SCHEDULE UNCERTAINTY RANGES

# NCSX Schedule Uncertainty Model 

Duration Range

Base
Duration
(mos) on Estimate Critical Path Uncertainty

Schedul Calc

Schedule Duration $\begin{array}{r}\begin{array}{r}\text { Mitigation } \\ \text { Cost Adder }\end{array} \\ \hline\end{array}$

CP (within $1 / 2$ month of CP)
Job -1810 Field Period Assembly Stations 1,2,3

Job - 1815 Field Period Assembly Station 5 Job 7503 Final Machine Assembly (Station 6) Job 8501 - Integrated System Testing

Station 2 MC Sub-assy A1/B1/C1 tation 2 MC Sub-assy A3/B3/C3 Station 2 MC Sub-assy A6/B6/C6 Station 3 Assemble Mod Coils and VVSA FP\#3 Station 5 Final Assembly FP\#3


MH
MH
MH
MH
LM
LM
HL
4

64.6
10.9
5.5
7.7
7.7
4.6
4.6
4.6
15.7
1.1
1.1
50.1


## APPENDIX C

## RISK MODEL INPUTS

NCSX Risk Register


NCSX Risk Register

| No. | Affected Jobs (absorb the impacts) | Risk Description | Likelihood of Occurrence | Cost Impact (\$k) | Critical Path Schedule Impact (mos) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| e | $\begin{aligned} & 5301 \\ & 5401 \\ & 5501 \\ & 5601 \end{aligned}$ | Loss of staff with experience in specialized software delays operation of Central I\&C system. | VU | \$0 | $+0.50$ |
| f | $\begin{aligned} & 1901 \\ & 8203 \end{aligned}$ | Design integration effort needs to increase to manage space allocations inside the cryostat and in the test cell | VU | \$300 | +0.00 |
| Mgmt-2 | 4501 | Loss of knowledgeable staff delays operation of legacy power supplies. | VU | \$0 | +0.50 |
| Mgmt-3 | 8101 | Labor rates may be significantly lower than projected <br> Opportunity | U | $(\$ 1,000)$ | +1.00 |
| Mgmt-4 | 8101 | GPP projects not completed in time to support project needs | NC | \$0 | +1.00 |
| Mgmt-5 | 8101 | CR may delay funding to project. | U | \$0 | +2.00 |

NCSX Risk Register

| No. | Affected Jobs (absorb the impacts) | Risk Description | Likelihood of Occurrence | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { Cost Impact } \\ (\$ k) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Critical Path Schedule Impact (mos) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TECHNICAL RISK - Generic Assembly Risks |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assy-1 | 1810 | Station 3: cost and schedule grows when Assembly Sequence Plan fully matures | VL | \$240 | +0.68 |
| Assy-2 | 1815 | Station 5: cost and schedule grows when Assembly Sequence Plan fully matures | VL | \$500 | +1.13 |
| Assy-3 | 7503 | Station 6: cost and schedule grows when Assembly Sequence Plan fully matures | VL | \$650 | +2.18 |
| Assy-4 | $\begin{gathered} 1810 / 1815 \\ 7503 \end{gathered}$ | Photogrammetry replaces laser tracker for some operations and saves time and money. (Opportunity) | L | (\$901) | (3.0) |
| Assy-5 | $\begin{gathered} 1810 / 1815 \\ 7503 \end{gathered}$ | Assembly delayed due to metrology equipment breakdowns or anomalies. | L | \$0 | +1.00 |
| Assy-6 | $\begin{aligned} & 1810 \\ & 1815 \\ & 7503 \end{aligned}$ | General purpose tooling/ lifting equipment (e.g. cranes) not available to support the schedule. | U | \$0 | +0.50 |

NCSX Risk Register

| No. | Affected Jobs (absorb the impacts) | Risk Description | Likelihood of Occurrence | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cost Impact } \\ (\$ k) \end{gathered}$ | Critical Path Schedule Impact (mos) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assy-7 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1302 / 1352 \\ 1354 \end{gathered}$ | Permeability of components outside 3 m from machine to test cell walls exceed the permeability limit of $m u=1.2$. | U | \$200 | +0.00 |
| TECHNICAL RISKS - Station 2 Assembly |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stat2-2 | 1810 | Station 2: Unacceptable distortion in a field period when welding modular coil shims requiring rework and or chair installation. | U | \$135 | +1.00 |
| Stat2-3 | 1810 | Station 2. Unacceptable distortion in a field period when welding modular coil shims requiring complete disassembly and redesign and reassembly | VU | \$150 | +3.00 |
| Stat2-5 | 1810 | Station 2. Risk of loss of weld equipment or trained personnel. | NC | + \$0 | +0.25 |
| Stat2-7 | 1810 | Station 2. Shim sets not adequate or fail - need to fabricate more shims and measure and test | U | \$0 | +1.00 |
| Stat2-9 | 1810 | Station 2 - shim bag rupture \& requires replacement | VU | \$200 | +3.00 |
| Stat2-10 | 1810 | Station 2. Nose opens up while tightening outboard bolts | U | \$0 | +0.50 |
| Stat2-11 | 1810 | Station 2. Nose opens up while tightening outboard bolts. Change bolt tightening sequence is not adequate | U | \$0 | +1.00 |

NCSX Risk Register

| No. | Affected Jobs (absorb the impacts) | Risk Description | Likelihood of Occurrence | Cost Impact (\$k) | Critical Path Schedule Impact (mos) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stat2-13 | 1810 | Station 2. Modular coil damaged during assembly requiring significant rework to coil. (Complete coil re-fabrication excluded) | L | \$50 | +0.00 |

NCSX Risk Register

| No. | Affected Jobs (absorb the impacts) | Risk Description | Likelihood of Occurrence | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cost Impact } \\ (\$ k) \end{gathered}$ | Critical Path Schedule Impact (mos) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stat2-14 | 1810 | Station 2. Modular coil damage requiring coil refabrication. | N/A |  |  |
| Stat2-15 | $\begin{aligned} & 1810 \\ & 7503 \end{aligned}$ | Issues reported by W-7X: <br> Loss of bolt tension with time (are we missing something in our tests?) <br> Hot cracking of cast parts due to welding- check with dye penetrant. | VU | \$30 | +0.00 |
| TECHNCIAL RISKS - Station 3 Assembly |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stat3-1 | 1810 | Station 3: vertical weld distortion excessive. Have to take apart, modify design or procedure, re-weld. | L | \$70 | +1.00 |
| Stat3-2 | 1810 | Station 3. Problems installing coils over vacuum vessel. Trajectory following scheme does not work like the concrete block. Have to re-invent. | VU | \$35 | +0.50 |
| Stat3-3 | 1810 | Station 3. VV surface component (coolant tube, flux loop, or TC) damaged during FPA requiring significant rework. (Note: <br> There is only 0.2 " of clearance currently projected.) | VU | \$20 | +0.50 |
| Stat3-4 | 1810 | Station 3. Interferences discovered during assembly; components don't go together as planned. Assemblies have to be taken apart, components moved or re-worked, re-assembled. | U | \$0 | +0.50 |
| Stat3-5 | 1810 | Station 3. Sag distortion while MCHP are vertical in station 3 | U | \$25 | +1.00 |
| Stat3-6 | 1810 | Station 3. Assembly tooling allows too much deflection and has to be redesigned. | VU | \$50 | +1.00 |
| TECHNICAL RISKS - Station 5 Assembly |  |  |  |  |  |

NCSX Risk Register

| No. | Affected Jobs (absorb the impacts) | Risk Description | Likelihood of Occurrence | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cost Impact } \\ (\$ k) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Critical Path Schedule Impact (mos) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stat5-1 | 1815 | Station 5: Trim coils not available when needed in field period assembly sequence. Have to implement workaround. | U | \$0 | +0.50 |
| Stat5-2 | 1815 | Station 5. TF Coils cannot be aligned | U | \$0 | +1.00 |
| Stat5-3 | 1815 | Station 5. TF coils become warped and have to be racked to restore proper geometry. | U | \$60 | $+0.50$ |
| Stat5-5 | 1815 | Station 5. Problems installing ports due to interferences. Have to move components or modify ports. | L | \$250 | +0.00 |
| Stat5-6 | 1815 | Station 5. Interferences discovered during assembly; components don't go together as planned. Assemblies have to be taken apart, components moved or re-worked, re-assembled. | VU | \$30 | +0.00 |
| Stat5-7 | 1815 | Station 5: Multiple vacuum leaks during initial pumpdown | L | \$25 | +0.00 |
| Stat5-8 | $\begin{aligned} & 1815 \\ & 7503 \end{aligned}$ | Station 5. Rework/replacement of high permeability components | U | \$200 | +0.00 |
| Stat5-9 | 1815 | Station 5. Field period damaged during loading, transport, or unloading from TFTR TC to NCSX TC | N/A |  |  |

## TECHNICAL RISKS - Station 6 Assembly

| Stat6-2 | 7503 | Station 6. Original base structure vendor(s) <br> unable to deliver on schedule; not available <br> when needed in machine assembly sequence. <br> Have to implement workaround. | VU | $\$ 50$ | +0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Stat6-3 | 7503 | Station 6. PF 5L \& 6L not available when needed <br> in machine assembly sequence. Have to <br> implement workaround. | NC | $\$ 0$ | +0.25 |

NCSX Risk Register

| No. | Affected Jobs (absorb the impacts) | Risk Description | Likelihood of Occurrence | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cost Impact } \\ (\$ k) \end{gathered}$ | Critical Path Schedule Impact (mos) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stat6-4 | 7503 | Station 6. PF coils out of round or not flat. Supports have to be modified. | NC | \$0 | +0.25 |
| Stat6-5 | 7503 | Station 6. PF 4L, 4U, 5U, 6U not available when needed in machine assembly sequence. Have to implement workaround. | NC | \$0 | +0.25 |
| Stat6-6 | 7503 | Station 6: Trim coils not available when needed in machine assembly sequence. Have to implement workaround. | NC | \$0 | +0.25 |
| Stat6-7 | 7503 | Station 6: Leads not available when needed in machine assembly sequence. Have to implement workaround. | NC | \$0 | +0.25 |
| Stat6-8 | 7503 | Station 6. High temperature Rogowski Loop damaged during installation resulting in loss of toroidal current measurement capability | VU | \$0 | +0.00 |
| Stat6-9 | 7503 | Station 6. Interferences discovered during assembly; components don't go together as planned. Assemblies have to be taken apart, components moved or re-worked, re-assembled. | L | \$50 | +1.00 |
| Stat6-10 | 7503 | Station 6. Problems making up vacuum vessel field joint. Have to re-machine spool piece. | U | \$0 | $+3.00$ |
| Stat6-11 | 7503 | Station 6. Retainer and pucks do not stay on flange during assembly and moving of half field periods. Potential safety risk if individuals are under the machine. | U | \$30 | +1.00 |
| Stat6-12 | 7503 | Station 6. Problems making up C-C joint. Interferences, bolt access problems. | U | \$0 | +0.25 |
| Stat6-13 | 7503 | Station 6. Pourable insulation installation problemss; can't get what we need, don't know if it fills all the voids, leaks out all over the place; have to invent methods to ensure complete fill and seal. | U | \$0 | +0.25 |

NCSX Risk Register

| No. | Affected Jobs (absorb the impacts) | Risk Description | Likelihood of Occurrence | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cost Impact } \\ (\$ k) \end{gathered}$ | Critical Path Schedule Impact (mos) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stat6-14 | 7503 | Station 6. Modular coils are shorted across toroidal break between field periods causing problematic field errors | NC | \$25 | +0.25 |
| Stat6-15 | 7503 | Station 6. Assembly sled for final assembly is not adequately stiff or does not provide repeatable motion | U | \$75 | +0.00 |
| Stat6-16 | 7503 | Station 6. Vacuum leaks occur. Takes time to locate and repair. | U | \$0 | +0.25 |
| Stat6-17 | 7503 | Welding of the Vacuum Vessel pieces to the spool pieces may require the addition of thin Inconel plates to bridge gaps caused by radial and/or angular out-of-tolerance consditions of either the VV or spool pieces. | VU | \$50 | +4.00 |

NCSX Risk Register

| No. | Affected Jobs (absorb the impacts) | Risk Description | Likelihood of Occurrence | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cost Impact } \\ (\$ k) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Critical Path Schedule Impact (mos) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stat6-18 | 7503 | Friction shims in sizes needed for C-C joint not avaialble when needed. | VU | \$0 | +1.50 |
| TECHNICAL RISKS - Startup |  |  |  |  |  |
| S/U-1 | 8501 | Unanticipated problems with cryostat penetrations (icing, excessive condensation). May require warming up the stellarator core to effect repair with consequent impacts to critical path activities. | U | \$30 | +1.00 |
| S/U-2 | 8501 | Coil cooling system fails to cool coil structure down to cryogenic temperature | U | \$0 | +1.00 |
| S/U-3 | 8501 | Insulation on modular coil fails during initial cooldown and testing requiring in situ repair. | VU | \$150 | +2.00 |
| S/U-4 | 8501 | Insulation on modular coil fails during initial cooldown and testing requiring stellarator core disassembly | N/A |  |  |
| S/U-5 | $\begin{aligned} & 7503 \\ & 1352 \\ & 1361 \\ & 8501 \end{aligned}$ | Insulation on TF/PF coil fails during initial cooldown and testing requiring in situ repair | VU | \$150 | +2.00 |

NCSX Risk Register

| No. | Affected Jobs (absorb the impacts) | Risk Description | Likelihood of Occurrence | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cost Impact } \\ (\$ k) \end{gathered}$ | Critical Path Schedule Impact (mos) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S/U-6 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 7503 \\ & 1352 \\ & 1361 \\ & 8501 \end{aligned}$ | Insulation on TF/PF coil fails during initial cooldown and testing requiring dismantling stellarator core | NC |  |  |
| S/U-7 | 8501 | Coils are hooked up with incorrect polarity | NC | \$0 | +0.25 |
| S/U-8 | 8501 | Ground faults delay coil testing. | VL | \$10 | +0.25 |
| S/U-9 | 8501 | Loop faults delay coil testing. | L | \$10 | +0.25 |
| S/U-10 | 8501 | Control System problems delay testing | L | \$10 | +0.25 |
| S/U-11 | 8501 | Loss of a key component or system delays testing - e.g., pump failure | U | \$50 | +0.50 |

NCSX Risk Register

| No. | Affected Jobs (absorb the impacts) | Risk Description | Likelihood of Occurrence | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cost Impact } \\ (\$ k) \end{gathered}$ | Critical Path Schedule Impact (mos) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S/U-12 | 8501 | Islands detected in e-beam mapping require troubleshooting and repair; delay CD-4. | N/A |  |  |
| S/U-13 | 8501 | Loss of a key component or system delays testing - e.g., turn to turn failure | N/A |  |  |
| S/U-14 | 3801 | E-beam mapping diagnostic is not installed and ready for use during start-up. Risk is possibly complex and challenging interface of hardware borrowed from Auburn University. | VU | \$50 | +1.00 |

NCSX Risk Register

| No. | Affected Jobs (absorb the impacts) | Risk Description | Likelihood of Occurrence | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cost Impact } \\ (\$ k) \end{gathered}$ | Critical Path Schedule Impact (mos) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TECHNICAL RISKS - Components \& Systems |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sys-2 | 1352 | PF vendor produces a non-compliant coil requiring fabrication of an additional coil | VU | \$35 | +0.00 |
| Sys-3 | 1361 | TF vendor produces a non-compliant coil requiring fabrication of an additional coil | VU | + \$35 | +0.00 |
| Sys-4 | 1451 | Failure of major piece of winding equipment (e.g., motor, gear box, etc.) resulting in extended downtime in a winding station | U | \$30 | +0.00 |
| Sys-5 | 1451 | Damage or loss of modular coil during VPI or testing requiring the conductor to be stripped off and re-wound. | N/A |  |  |
| Sys-8 | 4301 | Legacy power supplies unexpectedly require modifications or additional protection as a result of failure modes analysis. | U | \$50 | +0.00 |
| Sys-9 | 4401 | Coil protection system costs grow when requirements fully mature. | U | \$35 | +0.00 |
| Sys-10 | 1260 | NB Transition duct design is vintage and revisit could result in criteria changes, i.e. diagnostic requirements, number of ports, NB alignment, further design review, etc. | U | \$60 | +0.00 |
| Sys-12 | 1601-162 | Design of cables not firmly established, satisfying field error requirements could require more costly solutions and longer lead time. | L | \$60 | +0.00 |
| Sys-13 | 1550 | Escalation of Stainless Sheet and Inconel higher than base escalation rates or due to foreign exchange rates. | VL | \$495 | +0.00 |
| Sys-14 | $\begin{gathered} 13 X X \\ 4, \text { et al. } \end{gathered}$ | Escalation of Copper higher than base escalation rates or due to foreign exchange rates. | VL | \$225 | +0.00 |
| Sys-16 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1501 \\ & 1353 \end{aligned}$ | Coil structure designs have to be modified after FDR to accommodate chanes in interfaces with coil services or cryostat. | L | \$95 | +0.00 |

NCSX Risk Register

| No. | Affected Jobs (absorb the impacts) | Risk Description | Likelihood of Occurrence | Cost Impact (\$k) | Critical Path Schedule Impact (mos) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sys-17 | 1701 | Cryostat costs grow once design matures and requirements are better understood. | U | \$150 | +0.00 |
| Sys-21 | $\begin{aligned} & 1421 \\ & 1431 \end{aligned}$ | The C-C joint may need to be re-designed if it turns out that the 2T, high beta load case is not the worst-case operating condition for the friction shims. | VU | \$50 | +0.00 |
| Sys-22 | $\begin{aligned} & 1501 \\ & 1353 \end{aligned}$ | Coil structure designs may have to be modified after FDR to accommodate fault modes. | U | \$30 | +0.00 |
| TECHNICAL RISKS - Research Operations (post-CD4) => NOT PART OF MIE PROJECT |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ops-1 | 8204 | The operational flexibility of the machine may be limited if it turns out that the 2T, high beta load case is not the worst-case operating condition for the friction shims. | U | \$50 | +0.00 |
| Ops-2 | 7503 | Shield walls found to be inadequate. Limits operation conditions | VU | \$150 | +0.00 |

## APPENDIX D

## PROBABILISTIC MODEL RESULTS

| Percentiles | Total ETC With Uncertainty Contingency | Risk Cost Contingency | Risk Schedule Contingency | Schedule Mitigation Cost Adder | Total Schedule Duration |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0\% | 63,763 | -980.57 | -0.08 | 0.0 | 43.8 |
| 5\% | 66,479 | 615.00 | 4.73 | 26.7 | 46.6 |
| 10\% | 67,009 | 864.43 | 5.73 | 54.5 | 47.4 |
| 15\% | 67,370 | 1,054.43 | 6.48 | 78.2 | 47.9 |
| 20\% | 67,655 | 1,234.43 | 6.98 | 96.3 | 48.4 |
| 25\% | 67,916 | 1,390.00 | 7.48 | 98.4 | 48.8 |
| 30\% | 68,163 | 1,529.43 | 7.98 | 108.7 | 49.2 |
| 35\% | 68,383 | 1,644.43 | 8.48 | 118.7 | 49.6 |
| 40\% | 68,584 | 1,744.43 | 8.73 | 128.5 | 50.0 |
| 45\% | 68,797 | 1,815.00 | 9.23 | 138.2 | 50.3 |
| 50\% | 69,010 | 1,885.00 | 9.73 | 148.2 | 50.7 |
| 55\% | 69,219 | 1,959.43 | 9.98 | 158.2 | 51.1 |
| 60\% | 69,448 | 2,029.43 | 10.48 | 169.2 | 51.4 |
| 65\% | 69,664 | 2,125.00 | 10.98 | 180.7 | 51.9 |
| 70\% | 69,903 | 2,239.43 | 11.48 | 191.5 | 52.3 |
| 75\% | 70,153 | 2,384.43 | 11.98 | 198.2 | 52.9 |
| 80\% | 70,432 | 2,545.00 | 12.48 | 212.8 | 53.5 |
| 85\% | 70,747 | 2,700.00 | 13.23 | 224.8 | 54.2 |
| 90\% | 71,143 | 2,835.00 | 14.10 | 242.3 | 55.0 |
| 95\% | 71,781 | 3,000.00 | 15.48 | 271.5 | 56.3 |
| 100\% | 75,541 | 3,900.00 | 24.73 | 321.1 | 63.4 |
| Schedule Contingency Adjustment (work Saturdays to mitigate) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Unmitigated | Mitigated | Mitigation Cost |  |
| 80\% Uncertainty |  | 7.1 | 5.9 | 7.3 |  |
| 80\% Risk |  | 12.5 | 10.4 | 12.7 |  |
| 90\% Uncertainty |  | 8.6 | 7.2 | 8.8 |  |
| 90\% Risk |  | 14.1 | 11.8 | 14.4 |  |
| 95\% Uncertainty |  | 9.9 | 8.2 | 10.1 |  |
| 95\% Risk |  | 15.5 | 12.9 | 15.8 |  |

## APPENDIX E

## SCHEDULE CONTINGENCY COSTING BASIS

## Standing army calculation

| WBS |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $18 / 7$ |  |
|  | 19 |
|  | 81 |
|  | 81 |
|  | 82 |
|  | 82 |
|  | 82 |
|  | 82 |
|  | 82 |
|  | 89 |

## JOB <br> 1802/1810/7401/7501 <br> Description <br> Field Period Assy \& Machine assy <br> 1901 Stellarator core management

19
81
81
82
82
82
82
82
89
8101 PPPL Management
8102 ORNL Management
8202 Engineering mgt
8203 Design Integration
8204 Systems Analysis
8205 Dimensional control
8215 Plant Design
8998 Allocations
60
492

## Cost/yr

2376
504 912 312 792 660 132
60
1.2 fte
\$17
Crane support, fixture setup, misc support
1.0 fte \$25
Field Supervision
Metrology crews (task dependent)
n/a
\$0
Metrology engineer
.5 fte
\$16
Shift differntial (@ 5fte crew size)

## Second Shift oversight,support, cost dif

## Cost/mo.

198 average of the 2 assy or 42 76
26
66
55
11
5
5
41
525

## APPENDIX F

## BASIS FOR SPREAD OF CONTINGENCY BY FISCAL YEAR



## APPENDIX G

CRYSTAL BALL ${ }^{\circledR}$ REPORT

## (Posted Separately)

