NDIA Conference

Tuesday, February 11, 2003

Welcome:
The conference opened with a silent pause for reflection on the Columbia Space Shuttle tragedy. Jim Gasbarro, PMSS Chairman, then welcomed all and followed with introductions of attendees from government and industry.

Key Speaker:
Pam Levesque, Director of EVMS at Pratt & Whitney presented a corporate overview of the Pratt & Whitney Earned Value Management System and "One-Company" approach for EV, ERP, SAP Implementation and the Advance Agreement partnership with the Government.

- The Company Goal is single system EV approach by 2004. Currently 95% of 2002 Programs are under EVMS with a single set of processes and documents and reporting utilizing SAP and wInsight to produce common Program Management Reviews, risk based EACs and common metrics across all programs, including commercial, foreign and military.
- SAP Project Systems EVMS implementation included five "dry runs" to "go live," and now contains all development programs. It is coupled with wInsight for analysis and reporting including:
    - Weekly (hours only) labor calculation to wInsight
    - S&P Hours (only) (monthly ÷ by 4 or 5)
    - Bulls Eye Chart – All programs plotted
- SAP ERP implementation in October 2002 included all modules and touched all major systems in the company, resulting in an all encompassing "go live"
- The JSF Program on SAP required a validation process with comparison to legacy system. System users were surveyed and trained twice. Training was a key factor, including:
    - 70 hours of user training
    - 70 step validation process for user
    - 300 programs converted all scheduled out and statused on "level" completed for three week window
    - 120 cost and schedule personnel
    - SAP Project Systems EV performance techniques include: 0/100, EV M/Stns, % Complete, LOE, Milestones must be sequential in performance; performance cannot be taken out of sequence
    - SAP Scheduled tool – input schedule into SAP
    - Schedule Integration is –accomplished at numerous levels now, and the concern is that planning at too low a detail level adds considerable volume to the project
- The JSF SAP schedule is exported to Microsoft Project for Lockheed Martin

- o Weekly hours labor status reporting and customer (contract requirement)
- Government customer access is not direct access to "real time data;" but is moving toward identification of best government access/SAP data available, with XML wInsight files provided to the customer

Membership

- Jim Gasbarro shared that NDIA has experienced three recent retirements from the NDIA board, including Bob Pattie, Tom Jennings and John Pakiz. Their contributions are greatly appreciated and we'll miss them.
- We need an approach for recruiting new team members to reenergize the organization and generate new views on Program Management Systems for true Industry Ownership.
- A work group is needed to develop ideas for recruiting efforts include all NSA, NASA (OMB Requirements initiative with requirement for EVMS reporting), and Subcontractors.
- Note: The CPM Conference is scheduled for 5/7/03 to 5/9/03
  - o Suggest focus on scheduling in future

Work Group Sessions:
The following Working Group Sessions were conducted throughout the remainder of the morning and early afternoon sessions:
- Corporate System for Compliance, Pete Wynne Team Leader
- Corporate Surveillance/ Problem Resolution, Bob Loop Team Leader
- EDI, Buddy Everage and DCMA Team Leaders
- Risk Management, Gay Infanti Team Leader
- Change Management, Joe Kusick Team Leader for Wayne Day

Government/Industry Informal Discussion:
Jim Gasbarro led the discussion regarding the growing interest of the OMB and Earned Value:
- **DCMA Bob Leach, DoD OSD EV Focal Point** looks forward to results, and finds this to be a great forum. Publication of Best Practices on the DCMA Web Site is planned, indicating resources are now available to reinstate the web site and DCMA looks forward to publishing relevant materials there soon.

  Integrated Program (Or Performance) Management change of title would do a lot to promote this with our Government Program Managers.

- **USAF Pentagon, Lt. Col. Buck Ennulat**: Most representatives here are representatives from the "Big 4." The level of expertise is in pockets (government and industry). We need to start mentoring some of the subcontractors for ACAT 3 and 4 programs. They're nowhere near the knowledge base of this community, and a bridge from prime to subcontractors is needed. (An estimated 50 to 60% of work is done by subs on some contracts.)

Jim Gasbarro commented that this is part of the work of our working teams, the subcontract aspect within compliance change control and surveillance teams.

If you feel a USAF Program Manager is requesting something not consistent with the Criteria, please let me know and we'll try to deal with the issue in a non-attribution mode.

- **NASA, Wes Brown**, believes the NDIA forum says a lot for the Big 4 OMB updates, and asked for industry cooperation in this change period.

- **CCDR, Ron Lile**, inquired as to a way to bring CCDR preparation representatives for updates on CCDR and how they're working in the field.

- **DCMA and other Government Agency Representatives** are encouraged to attend NDIA, to facilitate closure on issues with our customers. Bob Leach indicated he is pursuing identification of the Army Focal Point, and will contact by e-mail prior to the next NDIA meeting to invite Government Agency Representatives.

- **SDE = Sharing Date Environment,** represented by Government Services and Agencies. From an industry standpoint we are affected by all these Government agencies, and it would be beneficial to establish one consistent application; one set of criteria to respond to all. Gary Christle indicated this is a Government issue where an Inter-Agency forum is needed. Wayne Abba shared the CPM Conference work group feedback: A-11 Part 7 documentation strengthened the OMB Guidance, and specifically refers to the ANSI Standard, but the interpretations are legion. Defense Programs are included in the OMB form 300 requirement. One-year requirements were waived, but then compliance is required.

Wednesday, February 12, 2003

Jim Gasbarro discussed the NDIA August meeting, and the need for confirmation of meeting dates and location(s), (possibly CSC in Washington D.C). He also encouraged potential volunteers to host NDIA to please contact a board member.

Work Group Feedback

- **Corporate Systems for Compliance, Pete Wynn**:
  The original requirement for the team was to define the methodology for EVMS to convey ANSI 748 Criteria with existing company processes, develop a white paper on "ownership of EVMS processes" from a Program Management perspective. - Define what's working today; EVMS being a piece of this. Identify core attributes, then define a model and develop recommendations. This will define what's working and put boundaries on the team product.

A decision was made to document an Ownership Model; not initially concerned with government acceptance for conformance or compliance at this time. Rather, take small steps, and then later, move toward the next step; defining what has to be done to gain government acceptance. The plan is to identify all inputs and consolidate these by the next meeting.

- **Surveillance and Problem Resolution, Bob Loop:**
  The team goal was to develop a Surveillance Guide defining Best Practice Surveillance. NIMA, NRO and DCMA were added to the team's scope. The Schedule is: Brief a white paper at the May CPM Conference, complete the draft guide for the Fall Workshop. Currently the draft best practice is in process.

  Draft best practices:
  1. Surveillance should be based on risk
  2. International surveillance is linked to Joint Surveillance
  3. One approach satisfies all
  4. Government Joint Surveillance is best seen as a part of robust internal surveillance
  5. The process owner should chair the surveillance team
  6. Surveillance team should be small and not split up
  7. Roles of members participating should be understood (independence is key)
  8. Process based best Practice; Annual self assessment
  9. Should include a strong resolution process
  10. Should include a normal problem resolution/escalation process
  11. Overall, define a target for "Best Practices" and get "Buy In" of major organizations regarding content

- **Electronic Data Interchange, Buddy Everage and DCMA :**
  The team goal is to define EDI, its current status and issues/problems as well as solutions for improvement. The team focus has changed, evolving from reporting to "sharing of data."

  Survey findings:
  - Standard transaction set and EDI handbook still in use
  - IDE (Integrated Digital Environment), overall paperless environment.
  - SDE (Sharing Data Environment), internal and external; how is this managed?
  - Problems include: format, inconsistent requirements and use, security, standard transaction sets, schedules, software to generate. We need to define: What is IDE and SDE? XML is the new standard. The OSD April 02 letter defines new standard format electronic. DCMA is the XML community manager. It's their job is to "de-conflict" the XML standards

  Recommendation: NDIA PMSS Coordinate with DCMA to establish XML standards for Project Management data. This is a technological issue. Wayne

Abba will develop a white paper on XML Standards. Wayne requested anyone using XML to share their ideas with him in development of XML standard and experience. Next, define IDE/SDE and charter for working group. The purpose of the "shared data environment" is to get away from some formal reporting. It is an initiative of OMB to investigate the implications of this, and publish a white paper on XML Standards. Additional resources to assist with this effort must be identified.

- **Risk Management Team, Gay Infanti:**
  The team's mission statement was to engage the customer to explore risk management and EVMS (in connection with risk management plan), and identify and share best practices. This provided an opportunity to engage with broader Program Management Community and promote EVMS as part of the risk management process. The Team's deliverable is a summary of those Best Practices and lessons learned.

  A major topic of discussion included identification of risk issues and giving the customer a comfort level with how contractors are going to deal with these.

  A draft survey will be developed. DAU will assist with development and testing of the survey content, and then distribute it to a broader audience. The Survey audience is anticipated to be Government, Industry electronic per NDIA mailing list, additional relevant personnel identified and the risk management community.

  Survey topics include: Contractor Risk, CPR Analyses, Statistical Analysis and NAVAIR concerns.

  PMCOP (Program Managers Community of Practice)
  - Provides a potential avenue for integrating risk management information
  - An alternative avenue of communication is a Website

  Centers of Excellence for Risk Management include: DoD Risk Management Guide, PMCOP, INCOSE

  Open Issues:
  - Seeking formal NDIA sponsorship for the survey
  - Define the forum for "Best Practices" and communicating this
  - Expansion of the survey audiences to the Risk Management Community

- **Change Management, Joe Kusick** for Wayne Day:

  The original team was formed because government organizations didn't believe contractors were doing a good job managing change (This was the Customer perception.) The Team's deliverable is a summary of those Best Practices to manage and deploy the change management process.

- Approach:
  - Survey approach discarded
  - During the next 30 days industry participants are requested to provide the following to Wayne Day:
  - What has worked and what has not
  - Identification of Best Practices utilized to manage change
  - Consolidate info into white paper
  - Develop White Paper and post on DoD Website to deal with baseline control and change control
  - Complete white paper by August
  - Original issues – NAVAIR – plan and package conversion
  - Reprogramming MR use, interim planning for authorized unpriced work

  A disciplined process for communication of change with good interaction between contracts and engineering technical people is critical. The challenge is to do what is in the contract and maintain baseline control. Weekly change control board meetings tied closely with supply chain and very active communication is a key attribute of change control. Our task is to identify those "Best Practices" utilized to manage this. For example, the introduction of changes through IPTs is an issue that can be difficult to work through. Evolutionary Development and Spiral Development contribute considerably to the problem of change management. Training, consistent communication, and a repeatable process are essential to successful baseline management.

  Summarization of Best Practices: Currently the team does not have sufficient information to compile a summarization. We encourage input from the community in the form of e-mails to Wayne Day over the next 30 days: Wayne.Day@northropgrumman.com

  Timeline:
  - May 3, Team Consensus Analysis and Conclusion
  - August 3, Complete Deliverable: White Paper on Change Management

- **Program Management Systems Sub Committee – ANSI/EIA 748 Standard Status, Walt Berkey:**
  Walt discussed the 5000.2 Cancellation and Interim Guidance OSD Letter, and the Program Managers Guide to the Review of an Integrated Baseline. On 8/28/02 the ANSI Standard was re-affirmed to be retained:

- A three-year review process was introduced with changes to the introduction.
- Elements were changed to seven component fundamental "principles" required
- Expansion to detail of the 32 Criteria for application. This now provides the foundation to put project management in place.
- Scaled EVMS Application: Now we've opened the door and introduced scalability. The C/SSR required a management process but not full 32 Criteria
- Chapter 5, System Evaluation: The next target of opportunity is Compliance and Surveillance, per the general consensus this is the next issue to be dealt with
- Documentation became the focus of investigation
- Building on this, it is recommended that a working team be reconstituted to deal with the compliance issue from all aspects: Industry DCMA and The Services
- We need to integrate our knowledge base and identify what works best:
    1. Tier 1 Compliance
    2. Tier 2 Surveillance

5000.2 Cancellation and Interim Guidance
- The estimated completion date for issuance of the new guidance was 1/15/03, but this date has passed and we're unsure of the current status
- EVMS is now placed in table three
- The OSD letter (draft) supports continuation of EVMS as a management process is intact
- The focus is to craft succinct letter to OSD that the Joint DoD Industry team served a valuable purpose to address documents

Integrated Baseline Review Process – PM Guide
- The guide is near completed. In November '01, comments were incorporated and forwarded to OSD for formal comments. In January these were worked through, and in May, the Army and Navy comments were worked out. November '02 the technical edit was completed and comments dispositioned with OSD. The UK is now ahead of us in this process and has built framework; plus each program develop is own document for IBR Review
- OSD final coordination is anticipated in March '03

Forward Plan, Program Management System Sub Committee (PMSS):
- General Farrell endorsement for Industry was received on Feb. 8, 02

- The guide was placed on the NDIA Website in Nov. '02, and printed by NDIA for distribution
- NDIA PPC concurrence to submit a letter to OSD and the IBR Guide to GEIA SSTC on Jan. 9, 2003.
- The Guide will probably be published as a "Engineering Bulletin" as supporting the ANSI Standard, and therefore doesn't have to go through as formalized change process for future updates
- OSD (AT&L) Recommendations
  1. Edward Aldridge approval, near-term estimated completion date
  2. The recommendation to re-instate the working team was approved

- **OTB/OTS Handbook, Randy Steeno (Boeing):**

  The draft OTB/OTS Handbook was developed by Government and EVM Practioners in April '02, then presented and discussed in May '02, and it was decided that NDIA input was needed. Major defense contractor comments were collected and consolidated. Concerns were high lighted: Conformance and compliance with the ANSI Standard was the goal.

  June '02 issues had been identified and in August, Tony Finefield was working with the team to address and disposition these issues. Additional knowledge resources were also contracted. In Oct.'02 it was posted on the PMI website incorporating changes and suggestions and an OTB/OTS workshop conducted at '02 Fall Conference. Boeing comments were completed in Dec. '02. Additional comments were anticipated from NG and Raytheon, as well.

  Eleanor Haupt, President of CPM, provided status and information following the PMI/CPM suggestion to initiate a collaboration on certain EVM documents as part of a strategy with several national and international association:
  - Plans to update PMI/CPM Website
  - Plans to take recommendation for approval 3/03
  - Suggests NDIA take ownership of certain EVM documents, with the OTB/OTS Handbook – being the first such document
  - NDIA/PMSS Charter:
    - Partnering/Inter-relationships for key documents
    - Government and industry working together, it builds on the strengths of both organizations, and also improves influence over the future of these documents
    - Recommendation for next action: The PMSS Executive Committee recommends we formally accepted the PMI/CPM partnership invitation

PMSS needs to establish a person/sub team to work the issues on the OTB Guide, final common ground and make recommendations for modifications, then issue as a "White Paper" similar to other team outputs

Eleanor Haupt would like to:
- Announce our partnership at the Spring Conference in May (New Orleans) and;
- Have an NDIA Member attend CPM Board Meetings
- CPM has also initiated a partnership with PMI College of Scheduling

PMI/CPM Website enhancement is in process:
- Identification of CPM documents to review
    1. EV Practice Standard
    2. EVMS Guide (International Guide)
- Provide on-line reference materials, such as:
    1. UK EV Guide
    2. Australian EV Guide
    3. Government and National Association (NDIA) documents
    4. Note: The NDIA partnering exchange with CPM will continue focus on DoD customer requirements

- **Director of the Defense Cost and Resource Center, CCDR Update, Ron Lile,**
    Ron shared that the new organization name also included an expanded scope, from the CCDR process to cost analysis for DoD as a whole, with the overall objective to improve access to data, not to replace existing systems

    The CCDR Data Library (and future document library) core mission is to collect major program data for joint services and make these available for use by authorized government analysis in a cost effective manner. The organization has been reengineered and fully automated into an internet system through established firewalls, and is currently tracking 96 ACAT 1 Programs, with over 90% non-compliant for numerous reasons:
    - GFE contracts omitted from CCDR requirements
    - Prime contractors do not "roll down" CCDR requirements
    - CCDR requirement not in RFP deleted from contract
    - Reporting is not consistent with various contractor locations

    These problems are being addressed on an individual basis (e.g. SBIRS High, a contract mod was later issued to add the CCDR requirement). DoD Interim Guidance for ACAT 1 Programs contains the requirement for a CCDR. The WBS for CCDR reporting must be the same as the WBS used for Cost Reporting. The CCDR is required for:
    - Contracts and Sub Contracts greater than $50M
    - High Risk programs

    A CCDR data library and database are currently being developed. A SAR Cost Growth Database is also being developed utilizing DACIMS 2.X Tools,

CIRTS (Cost Info Resource Tracking System). This is a relational database to track requirements to their due dates – the architecture is complete. The goal is a 100% validity check on all submissions, automating the links and the process. Four basic software data metrics are utilized: Size, Labor resources, Schedule, and Quality; Basic Activities include: Analysis, Automation, Support, Policy and Training
- Future "to be" process
    - Semi-automated tracking process
    - Streamline plan/report formats and transmission paths
    - Expand automated validation beyond mathematical calculations
    - (EXCEL is the interim until XML format is established)

Major Issue: Coordinate with WSD/AT&L to transfer WBS policy responsibility (needed, per Ron Lile)
- The SBS is a function of Systems Engineering and precedes CCDR by years
- CCDR requires cost estimates in standard structures to utilize the data
- This issue was dealt with by the CAIG in past years
- MIL STD 881 is required on Government Program Management side
- If this is then mandated to the contractor it could drive the establishment of IPTs and Control Accounts
- Industry does not wish to go back to a directed WBS
- Bob Leach commented that this is an issue the community has to deal with yet and will be working through this issue
- The CCDR Manual will be posted on the web site by about June 1, 2003
- Implementation of new D.D. form 1921 –1 on 10/1/03 with a phrase in on new contracts
        - CCDR DiD language has also been modified
- 2003 Training Schedule 8-10 visits to major contractors scheduled throughout the year

- **CSC Federal Sector EVMS Validation, Buddy Everage,**
    The CSC Federal Sector initiative is to get an EVMS System certification/validated The CSC-AEGIS program (subcontract to Lockheed Martin) will be the process test program). The goal is to satisfy for all Federal System, all programs, instill disciplined standard set of procedures to ensure contract technical, schedule and cost objectives are met. This is planned in four (4) phases, as follows:
    - Phase I:
        1. Establish EVM System to be used on all programs
        2. Document current EVMS processes
        3. Write Federal Sector EVM System Description
        4. Write Federal Sector EVMS Policy
    - Phase II
        1. Progress Assistance Visits – help AEGIS implement processes
    - Phase III

1. Readiness Assessment – Prepare program staff for Self Evaluation Certification Review
- Phase IV: AEGIS & IRS PRIME
    1. Self Evaluation Certification Review
    2. CSC Team, NDIA and Customer comprise self evaluation team; and will invite DCMA DoD Executive Agent for EV and other customers

There is no contractual requirement for the EVM System currently on the program, but it's anticipated in the near future. The objective would be to present the validation approach to NDIA CEO to get final approval. The overall goal is to get NDIA (as an advocate) to send a letter giving approval of system. An Advance Agreement will be developed and approved after the self-evaluation

Rich Zell indicated DCMA does not have the ability to utilize Government resources to review the system and process for certification maybe NDIA should do this. With no validated system, however, a lengthy EV Plan must be submitted with every proposal requiring EVM. However, DoD will recognize and accept validation of other countries. Perhaps we should think about a certification process through NDIA to help ourselves out, similar to the ISO 9000 certification process (NDIA had, at one time in the past, rejected this idea). DCM expects good data. It's contractually required and how you get there is a business process.

This is the first organization to step forward from industry, get their operational processes established and complete the review/certification process. We're in a transformational state now.

- **OMB & International Update, Wayne Abba**
    OMB – Performance Management Laws
    - Currently working with David Muzio for information and updates and other related legislation
    - Working with the Department of Defense, developed principles included in A-11 Part 3, then transitioned to A-11, part 7 in June 2002
    - Program Budgets require a strong business case tied to project planning using EVM per ANSI/EIA 748-98
    - Agency scores have 10 categories including: EVMS, Program Management, Risk (scoring the performance based management system)
    - Requirements S, P, A and cost curve, time phased versus the EAC
    - Standard chart and reporting content and > 10% variance requires explanation
    - Name the software program you'll use to meet the ANSI/EIA 748 Standard
    - Baseline Plan reviews are taking place and affecting program funding, DoD programs are included
    - OMB work shop anticipated at PMA Management Conference

- Six (6) countries visited, including:
    1. Australia – David Read Consultant & Shane Huby, Program Manager EV Management – Australian Standard published
    2. Brazil – Ricardo Vargas, Consultant and Author – no government regulatory requirement for EV Program Management
    3. Japan – Ken Nishi, Consultant – Summit on Project Management in Tokyo 7/02, developing 1st EVM Guideline based on US Documents, and seek support from PMI-CPM in Fall 2003
    4. Canada – has adopted the ANSI Standard
    5. UK – Issued APM Guide to EV Analysis
    6. Sweden – No response – EV limited to Defense programs – No standards activity

- **DoD 5000 Guidance & OSD Activities Update, Bob Leach**
    - Acquisition Policy Revision (DoD 5000 is now under Defense Procurement Acquisition; we're not the author)
    - Two (2) of Secretary Rumsfeld's five (5) key points
        1. Incremental – phased approach to acquire a final capability – its easier to estimate
        2. Spiral development – pushing state of the art and you don't know the ultimate capabilities of the system in the future
        3. Grow that capability over time
        4. Objective introduce new weapons systems for new circumstances - Reduce cycle times of our Weapons
        5. Insert new Commercial Technology
    - Key focus:
        - Improved performance and quality - delivered faster
    - 10/30/02 – 5000 cancelled; re-issue 1/15/03 believe all issues have been addressed, and when time permits it will be signed/approved
    - *Status Documents currently with Deputy Secretary of Defense for Signature
        - 5000.1 – Principles retained; flexibility emphasized
        - 5000.2 – Instruction acquisition management model unchanged - focused on requirement and statutory requirements
        - 5000.2 – Regulation – cancelled as mandatory becomes "Guide" characterized as "non-mandatory"- content is:
            1. Expectations
            2. Best Practices
            3. Lessons Learned
    - Why Change?
        - Too prescriptive
    - Revised Policy Objectives

- Encourage Innovation and Flexibility – focus on outcome not process
  - Changes to Requirements Generation System
  - DoD 5000.1
    - Four (4) definitions, system characterized by:
      1. Flexibility
      2. Responsiveness
      3. Disciplines
      4. Innovation and streamlined effective management
  - One enclosure to summarize key policies
  - DoD 5000.2 – focuses on outcomes, provides summary and interpretation of statutory requirements, reinforces 5000.1
  - The Guide will be worked and published
  - Update EVM policy and guidance
  - Continue partnership with NDIA

- **DCMA Headquarters – Activities Update, Richard Zell**
  - EV Center – Steve Krivokopich, Center Director moving to Northern Virginia
  - Looking for speakers for the CPM Conference 5/7 to 5/9 Conference at the Marriott in New Orleans
  - EVMS is a matter of perception
  - System Validation – The EV Center does a risk based analyses
    - There are a lot of aspects and questions to be discussed here
    - DCM is looking at outcomes
    - The ultimate good program management and good program results
  - There are common EVM Issues arising
    - EACs
    - Baseline Control and Maintenance
    - Inappropriate EV Techniques
    - MR Control
  - Problem Resolution
  - Initial System Capability Assessment
  - General lack of predictive analysis – skills in Government may lead to increased oversight and or surprises
  - IBR is key to the entire process –
  - EACs – Understand the differences
  - Challenge Assumptions
  - A validated EVM System does not assure program success
  - Joint Surveillance get all parties involved for improved understanding of all and build trust
  - Formal Reporting form the previous guide (e.g. CPR, etc.)
    - Bob Leach – I don't see CPRs going away
    - CPR is in the DFARs clause

- USAF pushed for merging CPR and C/SSR – not yet accomplished
- Enclosure 3 to 5000.2
    1. EV Management Systems
    2. A-11 Part 7 Reference D – When required implementation
    3. ANSI Standard 748 and conduct IBRs
    4. Applied to contracts:
        a. > $73M
        b. > $315M
        c. FY 2000 Constant $

- **Bob Leach – OSD Updates**
    - EVM – OSD Perspective
        - EVM is a fundamental component of programs decision making and oversight
    - OSD reviews contractor cost performance info for Major Defense Acquisition Program (MDAPS)
    - EVM data serves as early warning signs of program challenges
    - ≈ 75 programs reviewed
    - EV info is essential for the DA ES process
    - Program related Site Visits – SBIRs High and USMC Bell Helicopter
    - NDIA Involvement and visited major government contractors: Boeing, Lockheed Martin, planning Northrop Grumman ES visit
    - Re-engaged DoD EVM IPT
    - Updating DoD EVM Web Site: **Bob.Leach@osd.mil**
    - Priorities
        - Ensure that EVM contributes to improved contractor program management
        - Awareness of when OTB is necessary for proper program management
    - Ensure contractors have management systems capable of producing reliable EVM data
    - Address EVM specialist personnel requirements

- **USAF Lt. Col. Harold "Buck" Ennulat – AF Update – AF EV Focal Point:**
    - USAF IPT meets bi-annually
        - Focal point at all major Acquisition Centers
        - Conduct monthly analysis
        - Expanding analysis to less than major programs (ACAT 2 & 3's)
    - We're anticipating increase in EV Requirements based upon (ACAT 2 & 3's)
    - *NDIA as a body may need to look at this EVM requirement on FFP programs – this may be a good topic for a letter to OSD from NDIA
    - No categorical exclusion of EVM on Fixed Prices Contracts (if OMB wants to see it (EVM) if it's within threshold requirements)
    - Ties EVMS requirement to OMB Circular A-11, Part 7

- SMART is an Oracle (Sequel) generated database standard criteria for health assessment
- New A F Analysis Tool – SMART (System Metrics and Reporting Tool)
- Senior Execs portal to program info – real time access program manager – acquisition command and control tool
- Conduct on-line PMRs, track deliverables
  - Assess portfolio health
- Currently being deployed as areas are trained
- Predictive tool for increased visibility and plan to review programs on a monthly basis (future)
- Strong Relationship with OSD EV Focal Point

- **NASA Update, Wes Brown:**

  NASA's goal over the past ten years has been "faster better cheaper." This is not necessarily the answer for better programs, and we don't want to lose control of those program management tools. SAP is going slowly and we haven't addressed the PS model (12-18 months for integrated management system at NASA). Emphasis on EVM is growing; overall many changes are currently being evaluated as we're pulling together a new launch vehicle.

  NASA has an EV Focal Point Meeting, an IBR execution Handbook (complementary to Program management Handbook). NASA policy directives (NPG) were signed Revitalizing NASA web site.
  - Rewording DRDs (DIDs) to avoid confusion
  - Schedule – currently dev a schedule "Book of Knowledge" evaluation tool
  - EV Implementation Assessment being developed
  - Life Cycle Cost – We need to be able to project that price out at the end
  - IBRs – we performed six (6) last year and plan more in 2003
  - A-11 we're looking for additional guidance
  - MOU – we're not prepared with knowledge base to do these reviews
  - Geographic – Huntsville provides a location to support on EV Meeting periodically

Next Meeting – NDIA

The next PMI meeting is in May. Jim will check with Ruth on the schedule for this. Buddy Eldridge, CSC at Falls Church, is looking at hosting the August meeting (typically end of August). Those interested in hosting the August meeting are asked to please contact a board member.