

# Do you develop and implement PBL strategies?

## Then you *really* need to know about DAU's PBL Toolkit.

The Performance-Based Logistics Toolkit is a unique Web-based resource, hosted by the Defense Acquisition University, that provides PMs and logistics managers a step-by-step process and readily available resources to support them in designing and implementing PBL strategies.

### The user-friendly online PBL Toolkit is aligned with current DoD policy and is available 24/7 to provide—

- A clear definition and explanation of each PBL design, development, and implementation process step
- The expected output of each process step
- Access to relevant references, tools, policy/guidance, learning materials, templates, and examples to support each step of the process.

### The PBL Toolkit is an interactive tool that allows you to—

- Contribute knowledge objects
- Initiate and participate in discussion threads
- Ask questions and obtain help
- Network with members of the AT&L community and learn from their experiences.

### To guide you through the development, implementation, and management of performance-based logistics strategies—count on the PBL Toolkit from DAU.

You'll find it at < <https://acc.dau.mil/pbltoolkit> > .

a program manager whose promotions or other career-enhancing changes depend on his or her program—or baby, if you will—successfully being developed or at least being relatively problem-free during the next two or three years. Then into the middle of this stress-soup comes a test and evaluation professional (a tester) who says the program did not have a successful test—the equivalent of saying a PM's baby is ugly. Furthermore, the PM likely perceives that the tester is wasting precious time and money performing tests to show that the baby is or may be ugly!

Know any testers? They have for too long been the Rodney Dangerfields—the comedian known for his “I don't get no respect” phrase—of the engineering community. Why? There are at least two reasons. First, in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s, the test group was where engineers were sent to await their retirement. Now those folks were not usually the majority of the group, but the perception that some testers were biding their time rather than being seriously engaged tainted the image of all testers.

The second reason is bullying by program offices. Testers need system requirements and specifications to use to build their test plans. The PMs, who are the keepers of those documents and keepers of the money, did not want the testers involved until the very last moment—ever—thus diminishing the modicum of respect testers might have otherwise received. Knowing that the PM did not think they were worth their cost, testers were—by golly!—going to show that darn PM that they could find lots of problems that needed fixing. Those are problems they would have found anyway, but when using those problems as a get-even ploy, the tester becomes an unhelpful pain until the problem is fixed.

So given this history—which is actually even more contentious, but you are being spared the gore—it is no surprise that the relationship between PMOs and testers is strained. Yet these two communities have been dueling for decades, and this strained relationship does not explain the recently degenerating IOT&E situation. In fact, there are many contributors to the recent decline in IOT&E results, and the PMOs and testers are uniquely qualified to turn this tide—but this can only happen if there is an end to the distrust and the beginning of trust and mutual respect.

### Complex Systems Need Good Relationships

In a nutshell, system complexity, not the gorilla, is the ultimate culprit behind the decline in IOT&E results. Folks tout budget constraints, schedule pressures, incompetent engineers, slippery contractors, and so forth, but the root cause is the complexity of new and proposed systems; not just the systems themselves, but the environment in which they must perform. This is especially true as we try to benefit by applying new communication, computing,