

NDIA PMSC– February 2011 Government / Industry Meeting Minutes

Host: Lockheed Martin

Location: Norris Center – Fort Worth, TX

Date: February 2, 2011

▪ **Introduction and Commendations**

Due to the weather conditions in Fort Worth on Tuesday, February 1st, Lockheed Martin was unable to host at their facility but were able to obtain space at the Renaissance Hotel to facilitate the NDIA PMSC Working Group meetings. This was done for the safety and welfare of the committee members as the weather conditions continued to deteriorate. Due to the efforts of Lockheed Martin personnel, a secondary location and a revised agenda was established for the Joint Government / Industry Day. NDIA PMSC and its members wish to thank Lockheed Martin, particularly Carol Boser, Lee Wimp, and Jane Spriggs for their efforts to ensure the successful execution of this meeting and the safety of its membership.

▪ **Call to Order, Welcome, Introductions, and Meeting Agenda Review**

Joe Kusick, NDIA PMSC Chairman (Raytheon) opened the meeting by asking the attendees to introduce themselves and provided housekeeping instructions regarding restroom facilities and emergency exit locations. Mr. Kusick also thanked Lockheed Martin personnel for their efforts in obtaining the alternate meeting locations and assisting in revising the agenda for the meeting due to the weather conditions. He introduced Mike Joyce, Lockheed's Senior Vice President of Operations and Program Management.

▪ **Keynote Address: Mr. Mike Joyce – Lockheed Martin**

Mike Joyce, Senior Vice President Operations and Program Management started the keynote address by giving a brief overview of Lockheed Martin's Industry position. He noted that Lockheed Martin was well positioned with the U.S. Government as the #1 provider for DoD and the #1 provider of IT solutions for the Defense department as well. Mr. Joyce noted that Lockheed had been heavily involved with the U.S. census and are beginning to support the census efforts in the United Kingdom as well.

Mr. Joyce stated that Industry and Government must understand the EVMS value proposition to the business. He stated that the performance measurement baseline in our very complex business is the plan to assist management in controlling the future through predictive metrics. The importance of measuring to the baseline to determine variance to plan should be able to inform you of normal vs. abnormal conditions.

He emphasized that the importance of rolling wave planning cannot be understated. We simply are not "good enough" to detail plan out efforts on a development contract for multiple years. One of the aspects of rolling wave planning is to ensure you only plan to your event horizon of information and how much can you predict with accuracy. One of Lockheed Martin lessons learned was that the tools and methods must be readily available to the Control Account Managers. EVMS should provide management insight and actionable information that can help the PM's do their job.

Mr. Joyce gave an example of a "Value of Planning" experiment that was conducted at Lockheed Martin where the experiment consisted of involving three groups. The first group was given all the planning information to complete the assembly of a model aircraft. The second group was only given half the necessary information to complete the aircraft and the third group was not given any information at all. The first group completed the assembly demonstrating flawless execution; the second group did not complete the task and there was a considerable amount of degradation and churn during the process; and the third group was in complete chaos and failed.

NDIA PMSC– February 2011 Government / Industry Meeting Minutes

Mr. Joyce emphasized that the schedule is not the total plan - you need both the Integrated Master Plan (IMP) and the Integrated Master Schedule (IMS) to bring order from chaos.

A survey of 1909 of 3317 Program Managers was conducted at Lockheed Martin; 39% said they used the IMP to guide their team and 55% said they only used it in response to a government requirement. 40 % said that programs can be successful without a formal IMP. Finally 49% said that their ability to use IMPs would improve with a better understanding of the benefits. It was noted that a lot of opportunities existed for improvement.

The value proposition for EVMS can be summed up in a quote from President Eisenhower: “Plans are Nothing...Planning is Everything.” Mr. Joyce stressed that plans are worthless in themselves unless they have the versatility to respond to the ever changing environment and also stated that we have allowed our planning skill-set atrophy over time. We need to get to the “Front Lines” to understand the issues and involve ourselves into the community to help the PMs.

Mr. Joyce summarized that requirements drive the plan and that we have to expect more discipline from our program execution teams and work with the customer to execute better. We should not accept that we can't get the requirements defined. In closing he stated that we need Program Managers that are “comfortable in their own skin” and that the role of leadership is to remove all of the excuses.

▪ **PARCA Presentation**

Mr. Gary Bliss, PARCA Director stated that the Continuing Resolution (CR) has a big effect on his organization's ability to perform its duties under the statute and it will likely last through the fiscal year. He continued that as part of the DoD Efficiency Initiatives, Defense Secretary Gates is preoccupied with reducing the infrastructure within the department. Currently there are ~1300 SES positions in the department and the goal is to eliminate 185 positions.

Contracting support to the department is shrinking across the board. A reorganization within AT&L is imminent and will be announced before the spring hearings on the hill. Mr. Bliss also stated that within 18 months, “Should Cost” will be a major part of our big programs. The effort will be divided into three (3) parts:

- 1) Indirect Cost
- 2) Supply Base
- 3) Direct Cost

Mr. Bliss gave a status of the PARCA EVM Initiatives, as well as the state of his department:

- The “Continuing Resolution” has adverse effect on staffing for the PARCA organization by limiting the ability of PARCA to staff.
- An “EVM Czar” will not be appointed in the short term.
- The Central Repository will transition to PARCA in the late spring timeframe.
- An EVM Reporting Compliance Dashboard will be implemented, mainly focused on data errors and omissions. The plan forward is to extend checks to cross-report checks (are values consistent with previous reports?)
- PARCA will review trend line deviations in execution of the programs to their performance measurement baselines and correlate the use of reserves and their impact - CPR program execution metrics (CPI and TCPI).

Gary Bliss stated that we need a process to deal with data issues going forward. This is a priority item with Mr. Frank Kendall, Principal Deputy (OSD AT&L). In the future there will be an

NDIA PMSC– February 2011 Government / Industry Meeting Minutes

automated master template that can be applied to collect statistics across any collection of reports or contracts and sorted at any level of the contract.

The current practices are not compliant with FAR 9.505-4(B). Mr. Bliss is working with department counsel to solicit a FAR change that would accommodate using a “third party beneficiary process”. PARCA has identified a third party beneficiary process in conjunction with the Industry as a potential solution to data protection. There is concern within OSD concerning subcontractor reporting requirement of the process and how this will be handled. This subcontractor data issue is being worked and will have to be part of the data management plan in each contract.

Mr. Bliss commented that H.R. 5013 (Performance Management of the Defense Acquisition System) which was passed in the House of Representatives (but not the Senate), was a clear indication that Congress believes that it has failed in its oversight of the DoD acquisition process. Additionally, he commented that the current administration is highly focused on performance measurement at all levels of the Government.

In closing, Mr. Bliss stated that PARCA is currently working with OSD offices on an implementation plan that will deal with the protection of company performance data that will entail a DFAR rules change.

- **NDIA ICPM - Program Planning & Scheduling Subcommittee (PPSS)**

Ms. Carol Boser, VP Program Performance Lockheed Martin gave a status of the Planning & Scheduling Excellence Guide (PASEG) which was developed under the auspices of the NDIA Industrial Committee for Program Management by a joint team of Government and Industry participants. The Initial focus of the PPSS was to develop the PASEG in order to gain consistency, predictability and usefulness of program schedules. The PPSS total deliverables were expanded to include the development of joint training curriculum for all levels of Industry & DoD management, develop approach to favorably influence recruiting, training and retention of planning talent, sponsor an Industry Day for DoD consultants and software tool vendors, and develop a joint cultural change management plan to be implemented across Industry & DoD.

The PASEG is based on what the Team labeled as “Generally Accepted Scheduling Principles” (GASP). The principles are defined as Complete, Traceable, Transparent, Stated, Predictive, Usable, Resourced and Controlled. It was developed to be consistent with the IMS-DID-81650 and the DCMA EVMS Implementation Guide (EVMIG).

Ms. Boser commented that the Team reached an acceptable consensus concerning “schedule reserve”. *(The PASEG “working draft” will be released for comment via NDIA ICPM website and is currently ~ 1 month from its first release.)*

- **CPR CDRL Recommendations to PARCA**

Ms. Sung Soon Stultz gave an overview of the CPR Working Group which was initiated as one of the three major action items under the auspices of the PARCA EVMS Stakeholders’ Meetings. The focus of the group is to define the following: Subcontracting level of incorporation; Frequency; Level of hierarchy required for Format 1; Requirements for Format 5; and Governance process for all. The Working Group is not addressing program management processes or the XML for data transfer.

Ms. Stultz informed the audience that the Team has reached a consensus after much spirited debate over several meetings. The recommendations are value added to all stakeholders in the process, eliminate waste and meet management needs and are only applicable to those programs which have the EVMS DFARS / DID reporting requirements.

NDIA PMSC– February 2011 Government / Industry Meeting Minutes

The Team decided on a two (2) phase approach. The Near-Term Recommendations eliminate non value added effort and can be implemented with minimal changes to the current process.

Summary of Near-Term Recommendations:

- The Current CPR Formats 1 – 4 will remain unchanged.
- Control account level data is optional and will require a separate submittal and will be identified in the CPR CDRL. Subcontractor data integration remains as described in the prime contractor’s system description. The delivery mechanism for Formats 1 – 4 remains unchanged. The Team recommends that the Format 5 - Variance Analysis / Management Analysis contain the following categories:
 - o \$ and %
 - o Current Cost & Schedule
 - o Cumulative Cost & Schedule
 - o At Completion
- If thresholds are not defined, then the supplier will use the threshold defined in their internal processes.
- There will be no more than 15 variances across all categories.
- There will be a 2-3 day collaboration period after data submittal where the customer will specify which variances to submit. If no response is received from the Government, then the Contractor defaults to the top three (3) In Each Category.
- Contractor analysis responses are due 15-20 working days after month-end.
- The Team recommends a standardized format structure for the program analysis section.
- Finally, the delivery process for the Format 5 remains unchanged.

The assumption is that any costs associated with submission of control account data (when required) is offset by the streamlining of Format 5 submittal changes. The near-term efforts should require minimal administrative effort to implement.

The Long-Term Recommendations are as follows:

- Leverage the current CPR DID and either develop a new DID or extensively revise the current DID.
- Eliminate the currently defined CPR Formats 1-5.
- The management analysis requirements will be the same as the Near-Term Recommendations.
- The required data would be delivered using an existing defined method (XML / MS Word etc).
- The level of data delivery will be defined in the contract CPR CDRL.
- The Team suggested that a pilot be established to understand and document the process to resolve any potential issues.

- **Civilian Agency / Industry Working Group (CAIWG) – How to get off the GAO High Risk List**
Dr. Robert Rovinsky, Director FAA IT Enterprise Services gave an overview of the CAIWG Working Group and lessons learned on how FAA removed itself from the GAO High Risk List.

Dr. Rovinsky began the presentation by stating the CAIWG was being revived because all Federal Agencies are under intense pressure to produce within budget and cost and must show that they are good stewards of the taxpayer dollars. The impetus for the Industry is a win-win or lose-lose; Good Government is Good Business. He stressed that it affects all of us as our country’s fiscal crisis is real.

The purpose of the Working Group is to promote best practices (no whining allowed), sharing and common efforts that demonstrate real (measurable) value to the Civilian Agencies and Industry with the goals of selecting the best ideas that save money (low cost / high yield), implement them and need to promote among all Federal Agencies and Industry. Dr. Rovinsky is looking for volunteers and stated that the Working Group needed “Movers and Shakers” on the Team. They should be

NDIA PMSC– February 2011 Government / Industry Meeting Minutes

proponents of what Earned Value Management (EVM) does and the problems it uncovers. The near-term Working Group goals are: provide feedback on ideas currently proposed or any new ideas by February 28; provide an updated list to the members, and draft an agenda for the next meeting by April 15.

In the April – May time frame, members share ideas among the community and solicit feedback and support. At the May PMSC meeting the results will be reviewed and the group will work on a plan forward for implementation.

Dr. Rovinsky then provided an overview of what the FAA learned from getting on and then off the GAO High Risk List. He provided an historical perspective on how the agency got on the list in 1995 and a summary of actions taken from 1996 to 2008 to get off the list; the specific steps that FAA took; what GAO considers in their evaluation and how EVM helped. Dr. Rovinsky stated that the keys to FAA EVM success were; they obtained and have kept executive management support; obtained and have project management support; kept stakeholders and the industry fully engaged. They also focused on improving project performance rather than EVM. They focused on fixing the problems with projects, not placing blame, and continuous improvement with everyone involved. They never declared victory, but always demonstrated concrete progress and finally were not afraid to reveal the real issues and challenges.

EVM lessons learned were presented and broader view of lessons learned was given. Dr. Rovinsky stated that you need to pay attention to the reasons given (for variances) and actions recommended; make real changes, then justify them to yourself first; be prepared for denial, anger, bargaining and depression, as well as skepticism; you need three champions at three levels; it's not good to be green – variances are good; it's not about Program Management but the Program Management Transformation; establish a collaborative relationship with your critics; Government must understand that Industry is a partner and both stand to win; Socialization among Agencies, Industry and the Audit and Oversight Community is vital, as auditors must be concerned with having the Government succeed.

▪ **DCMA Update**

Mr. Gregg Griffith, DCMA EVM Center (EVMC) Policy Lead gave an overview of the current events in the DCMA Earned Value Center.

Mr. Griffith began with an overview of the organizational changes within EVMC. The responsibility for Annual Surveillance (Standard Surveillance Plans and End of Year Assessment execution) has been transferred to a group of individuals reporting to Mr. Bob Keysar in the Earned Value Management Operations Directorate (EVMOD). Mr. Keysar and his group report to Ms. Marie Greening, Operations Directorate DCMA and is a part of the overall recent reorganization within the agency.

OSD has implemented a Government IPT for EVM recently. Stakeholders include PARCA, ARA, USAF, USN, US Army, DCMA, NRO, MDA, NGA, NSA and DAU. A draft charter was issued November 10, 2010 and is being circulated for final concurrence. The purpose of this IPT is to provide the means to promote and serve as a clearinghouse for common issues of interest to its membership regarding DoD's EVM issues. DCMA and DCAA are currently coordinating a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) concerning each agencies' roles and responsibilities during EVMS surveillance and reviews.

The status of guidance updates is as follows: the EVMIG update is pending finalization of DFARS business rule; the System Surveillance Instruction (SSI) and the Compliance Review Instruction (CRI) will be released in the 3rd quarter, FY 2011 (April – June 2011). The DCMA Interpretive

NDIA PMSC– February 2011 Government / Industry Meeting Minutes

Guide (DIG) will be released 1st quarter, FY 2012 (October – December 2011). Mr. Griffith commented that the SSI is being completely rewritten to be more efficient and all changes suggested by Industry are being considered.

The EVMS End of Year (EOY) assessments are being worked collaboratively by the EVMOD and EVM Center. The EOY letters communicating the system rating to each contractor site will be delayed a couple of months to ensure accuracy. DCMA CARs issued late in the year are not being considered for the EOY ratings. During a discussion concerning the processing and approval of EVMS Corrective Action Requests (CAR), Mr. Griffith revealed that EVMS CAR's are reviewed and approved within DCMA IAW an internal process that is dependent upon the type and level of CAR.

- **Committee Vote on Officers at Large , Surveillance Guide and Charter updates**

During the lunch break a committee vote was organized by Ms. Gay Infanti (Northrop Grumman), Mr. Gary Humphreys and Mr. Pete Deacon (H&A) and Mr. Wade Smith (Raytheon). It resulted in the election of Mr. Eric Christoph (L-3) and Ms. Tracie Thompson (ATK) to Officers at Large positions on the PMSC Board. Additionally, both the changes to the Surveillance Guide and the Charter were approved as well.

- **Military Standard 881C Update**

Mr. Neil Albert, PMSC Board Member and CEO/President of MCR LLC presented the status of Mil. Std. 881, titled "Work Breakdown Structures for Defense Material Items." The effort is in its third year and it has been a challenge gaining consensus between all stakeholder communities. The actual reporting requirements will be contained within the contract. Aerospace Industries Association (AIA) spent 3 years on the Space Systems alone. The total is 75 pages and the expansion was due to the increased need for greater visibility. The total document is 282 pages and comments will be processed through NDIA PMSC to the Government. The Government and Industry worked together to ensure common definitions and application, software and the ability to capture new technology incorporated into all appendices, reporting levels addressed by program/contract, a coordinated effort was established with OSD CAPE, AT&L/DDR&E, the document provides flexibility to address items outside WBS definitions.

The official coordination is being conducted per DoD Standardization Office and the anticipated schedule is as follows: Draft released for comment on 14 January 2011, comments due 28 February 2011, publish final version 15 April 2011.

- **Navy Update**

Mr. Beau Willis, Navy EVM Center of Excellence Director began his summary of Navy EVMS activities by giving the audience an overview of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Research, Development and Acquisitions) and the organizational placement of the NAVY COE. Mr. Willis continued with a review of the organizations missions and responsibilities, products, initiatives & special interest items and current activities.

In closing, Mr. Willis stated that as an Industry, we need to better manage with EVM data, need to focus more on corrective actions and mitigating overruns and schedule slips, continue to strive for a better dialogue between customer and supplier, seek to understand each others' position, constraints, and business processes and finally focus on managerial action rather than the metrics reported.

- **Applying Agile Software Development to Existing EVMS Programs**

Mr. Glen B. Alleman, Vice President of Program Controls at Lewis & Fowler started the presentation by reviewing the results of a study conducted in 2006 concerning software intensive defense programs.

- In 115 of the 155 projects (surveyed), Project Managers did not know what to do.

NDIA PMSC– February 2011 Government / Industry Meeting Minutes

- 120 overlooked the need to implement a project management principle.
- 125 allowed constraints to be imposed from higher levels that prevented them doing what they know they should have done.
- 130 did not believe that formal project management principle added any value.
- 135 believed that project management processes were flawed.
- 140 thought the Project Manager's goal was something other than the success of the project.
- 145 said policies and procedures prevented them from doing what they knew they should be doing.
- 150 said statutes prevented them from doing what they knew they should do.

Mr. Alleman then began the discussion on how Agile and EVMS are not really as dissimilar as first thought by reviewing the core principles and “connecting the dots” between the two processes.

The business management practices that must be met are consistent:

- Relate time phased budgets to specific contract tasks.
- Provide Managers with information at a practical level of summarization.
- Alert Project Managers to potential schedule and cost risk.
- Provide documented project performance trail.
- Provide quantitative data for decision making.
- Communicate project status.
- Track and monitor discrete project metrics.
- Enable statistical estimation of completion costs.

The path forward starts with the 32 Criteria of the ANSI and selecting the guidelines which are consistent with Agile. A total of 11 of the 32 Guidelines are included: (1) Define WBS, (2) Identify Organization, (5) Integrate WBS and OBS, (6) Schedule Work, (7) Identify Products & Milestones, (8) Set time phased budget, (16) Record direct costs, (23) Determine variances, (25) Sum data and variance, (26) Manage action plans and (28) Incorporate changes.

Mr. Alleman summarized by stating that the single most fundamental concept in Agile is the speed of feedback and that we must be able to answer the question, “How long are we willing to wait before we find out we are going to be late?”

▪ **Air Force Update**

Mr. Bob Loop, Air Force EV Focal Point gave a brief presentation concerning the departments EVMS initiatives. The AF EVM IPT completed comprehensive EVM Query utilizing live interviews in August to November 2010 timeframe. A total of 50 programs were included in the review. Included were all ACAT I and most ACAT II programs with current EVM reporting (SDD and LRIP). The review was conducted for the purpose of assessing expertise and use of Earned Value across the service and to guide future EVM improvements. The observations from the interviews were:

- Lack of clear functional ownership and alignment.
- Lack of defined career path for EVM and scheduling function.
- Lack of Government training in use of EVM and scheduling.
- Lack of a certification program to provide training and field proficiency.
- Inconsistent or lack of schedule analysis by PMO.
- Inadequate PMO scheduling and EVM SMEs (The service has lost a lot of talent).
- Failure by PMOs to reject non-compliant IMS and CPR CDRLs DID (There is no training available on how to evaluate Contract Performance Reports),
- Failure to perform required Schedule Risk Assessment (SRA) during Integrated Baseline Reviews,
- Lack of incentive to complete IBR within 180 days,

NDIA PMSC– February 2011 Government / Industry Meeting Minutes

- Use of SPI/CPI as a basis for incentive fee (40% of contracts using for incentive fee calculations),
- Lack of PMO participation in contractor EVM surveillance.
- Lack of PMO program level IMS.

The general recommendations from the query/review are as follows:

- Address organization of EVM & Scheduling resources.
- Address staffing for EVM & Scheduling resources.
- Address PM ownership of EVM and Scheduling.
- Ensure schedule risk analysis is performed.
- Centralized monitoring.
- Establish standard schedule analysis process and tools.
- Require all ACAT I PMOs institute a Program Level Integrated Master Schedule.

The AF EVM IPT recommendations were as follows:

- Develop IMS/CPR compliance checklist.
- Develop recommendations for contract incentives on based contractor EVM compliance.
- Develop supplemental EVM/scheduling training.
- Develop AF EVM and scheduling certification proposal.
- Develop EVM best practices sharing methodology.

Mr. Loop then reviewed the data pilot which was a request from PARCA. It was based on a comparison of 50 reporting elements to control account level reporting and selected a program that had both high and low WBS level reporting. The conclusions were that significant early warning is lost with summary reporting and early warning visibility in the first complex end item may help plan and manage the following end items. There is potential “Masking Effect” on complex structures in space and aircraft programs driven by interpretations from MIL-HDBK-881-B. The summary conclusion is that the government needs to have access to the lower level of data to properly evaluate programs when necessary.

Mr. Loop concluded by reviewing the common EVM challenges for Government and Industry”

- Specific concerns about EVM effectiveness.
- Programs that have EVM CPI trends close to 1.0 with EAC growth.
- A trend toward replan and reset rather than execution.
- Are we using EVM as a reporting tool or as a management tool?

Mr. Loop indicated that USAF is working on a policy for resets (single point adjustments which eliminate cost and schedule variance). There will be no resets without an OTB if there is a negative cost variance.

▪ **Program Management Outreach Working Group**

Ms. Jane Spriggs, Lockheed Martin Program Manager gave the presentation of this Working Group’s stated Mission is to “Broaden the focus and membership of the PMSC to influence acquisition policy and share best practices among program management professionals”. Ms. Spriggs reviewed the major accomplishments of the Working Group after one year, some of which include: Proposed changes to charter to add more emphasis on program management, developed and published PMSC brochure, development of an electronic registration for PMSC meetings, improved meeting agenda format, and suggested the formation of a new working group on Risk and Opportunity Management.

Some additional proposed recommendations of the Working Group are for PMSC to establish a relationship with PM PhD degree programs (e.g. Capella University), gain more PM participation by the Government, increase the value of participating in PMSC meetings (course credit, research

NDIA PMSC– February 2011 Government / Industry Meeting Minutes

opportunities, etc.), and examine our meeting structure to ensure we are meeting the needs of the membership.

▪ **PMSC Guides Update Working Group**

Ms. Gay Infanti, Cost Estimating & EVM Corporate Manager Northrop Grumman gave the overview to the Working Group's progress to date.

- IBR Guide: Revision 1 completed and published 1 September 2010.
- Surveillance Guide: Completed initial re-write and two rounds of review by PMSC membership and non-DoD agencies respectively. All comments reviewed/dispositioned by the Team; final version distributed for PMSC membership review on 12/14/10. The Surveillance Guide was approved by the committee for publication.
- Application Guide: Update in process under leadership of Neil Albert.
- Acceptance Guide : Update in process under leadership of Buddy Everage.
- Intent Guide (last updated June 2009). Anticipate need for an out-of-cycle update to the Intent Guide sometime next year - Todd Schulzetenberg slated to lead.

▪ **Production EVM Working Group**

Mr. Kim Herrington, Bell Helicopter VP Cost Management Integration gave the update of this Working Group which was formed to address the EVMS challenges in a production environment. Mr. Herrington gave a status of activities since the last PMSC meeting.

- 5 additional draft documents were completed and circulated (17 total to date) – 4 more ready to be distributed.
- Devoted one monthly meeting to reviewing, discussing and commenting on the PP&SS chapter on Production.
- Conducted a well attended workshop session at the November, 2010 IPM conference.
- Summary of Government review at two contractors completed and White Paper development is underway.

The next step for the Working Group is to complete Sub-group documentation efforts, complete the summary/main body of White Paper and circulate it to all WG participants and then to PMSC. The target date for the final product is in mid-2011 and will be made available to PMSC membership for final review and comment.

▪ **Contracts Working Group**

Mr. Michael Martin, NDIA PMSC Vice-Chair (Pratt & Whitney) gave an update of this working Group, which is focused on resolving contract related EVMS issues. The Team is currently reenergizing its efforts while awaiting some key Government participants (PARCA, EVM Center, Intel Community). The following issues remain open and require Government participation and input to achieve closure:

- Contract vs. EVM system order of precedence.
- Subcontractor validation.
- Subcontractor Surveillance compliance and surveillance.
- EVM Implementation Challenges.
- Use of a supplier's previously-validated process at a new supplier site.
- DCMA EVMS Standard Surveillance Instruction (SSI). Anticipated closure 2nd Quarter 2011.
- Ownership and Control of Management Reserve.
- Undefined Contractual Actions (UCAs) /Unpriced Change Orders (UCOs).
- Treatment of existing CAR's when Business Systems DFARS is implemented.

NDIA PMSC– February 2011 Government / Industry Meeting Minutes

One of the proposed paths to closure is to review these items with PARCA (Mr. Gary Bliss) for selected inclusion into the EVMS Stakeholder Initiatives. .Once new Government participants are established, a face to face kickoff will be scheduled to reenergize the Team.

- **Summary/ Discussions & Adjourn**

Mr. Joe Kusick, NDIA PMSC Chairman (Raytheon) thanked everyone for their time and participation in this meeting. He noted that the focus of the committee is Program Management, regulatory review, and oversight. Mr. Kusick stressed that there will be more collaboration with the other Federal agencies and there will be an effort to get GAO and OMB more involved with the NDIA Program Management Systems Committee.

Joe closed the meeting thanking Lockheed Martin for their phenomenal effort to keep this meeting on track and value added. He reminded everyone that the next NDIA PMSC Meeting will be hosted by Sikorsky and will be held at the United Technologies Research Center (UTRC) in East Hartford Connecticut, May 2nd through the 4th. On Monday, May 2nd there will be a NDIA PMSC Officers Meeting, Tuesday May 3rd an Industry Only Day, and on Wednesday May 4th the Government / Industry Session. (Note: The PARCA EVMS Stakeholders Meeting (by Government invitation only) will be held on Thursday May 5th from 8:00 AM to 2:00 PM in the UTRC Facility.)