



## ***Plenty of tools, too much data, unending meetings, and plans difficult to believe in.***

---

Gantt Charts are 1915 technology. Traditional planning is not geared to the nature of work and industry today. There is a root cause driving our most strategic programs to be poorly forecast, costly, late, and exceedingly frustrating to maintain. We've found a key to fix the problem.

---

Too little coordination kills projects. So does too much coordination. Planning coordination doesn't just mean having meetings, reviews, and gateways; it means using these parts as levers to eliminate rework **and** influence teams to work at proper speed. Too fast, and mistakes are made; too slow, and parts that didn't need to be gold plated end up being solid gold.

Research over the last two decades has steadily uncovered the gap between modern, complex programs and the utility of traditional planning methods. While complexity increases in products and the way organizations join to develop them, planning continues to analyze progress, costs, and risks according to traditional methods. Recent poor performance on critical programs reinforces that estimates of cost, schedule, and risk are less accurate as complexity increases.

**Why?** 35% to 50% of a team's activity in modern programs is coordination – the management of dependencies. Examples of coordination include time spent in meetings, transfer of results, formal and informal communication, waiting on decisions, rework, and travel. Traditional planning does not explicitly estimate nor optimize this significant part of a program's efforts.

In previous generations, knowledge of work and levels of necessary coordination were embedded in professional judgment. Results from previous programs could be leveraged to estimate a new program. A professional's judgment was sufficient as careers were stable and the nature of work remained consistent. However, architectures of modern programs lead to surprising costs, schedule overruns, and poor quality.

Coordination should be designed to match the teams, architecture, and priorities at hand as part of Level I planning. A generic coordination approach may be suitable in small projects, with geographic proximity, the teams have worked together before, and little innovation required. Otherwise, figuring out how much attention – and therefore time and budget -- to spend in coordination is critical. Our experience has shown the value of thinking together & designing coordination as part of early planning. This approach promotes team priorities based on coordination activity that is valuable and efficient. Coordination of little value is removed.

*Project Design* provides a **rapid way to create feasible plans while building team-wide situational awareness**. Over the last 15 years we have developed this breakthrough method, integrating best practices, training, collaborative visual modeling and simulation.

**GPD delivers a rapid collaborative capability  
to design, launch, and maintain high quality plans  
and teams with situational awareness ready to perform.**

Contact: [info@gpdesign.com](mailto:info@gpdesign.com)  
[www.gpdesign.com](http://www.gpdesign.com)

Boston \* Cincinnati \* Denver \* San Francisco \* Tokyo \* Berlin