

NDIA IPMD Meeting Minutes

Industry Meeting – April 29, 2014

1. Ms. Carol Boser, IPMD Chair, called the meeting to order and welcomed all the attendees. Carol thanked SAP for sponsoring the meeting, especially filling in on short notice. Carol noted that this was the first meeting of the Integrated Program Management Division (IPMD) as the transition from the PMSC occurred officially after the last committee meeting. As is the committee's normal practice, all attendees introduced themselves. Carol then reviewed the agenda for both days.
2. Note: These minutes are intended to supplement the charts shown during the presentations (as applicable). Charts (with some exceptions) will be uploaded to the IPMD website shortly after the meeting.
3. SAP welcome – Mr. Jim Davis. Jim welcomed the attendees back to SAP. Jim highlighted the mission noted in the IPMD charter to be consistent with SAP's goals of managing programs and the business. It is summarized in their company tagline - "Run Better". He discussed the challenges in company systems and how to integrate and execute them. He also discussed the issues faced by industry of a retiring workforce and the challenge to retaining younger workers who are heavily influenced by technology. Jim discussed the importance of integrated solutions to optimize business results and SAP's product offering that can provide that.
4. A short break was conducted due to some technical difficulties. A small change in agenda order was then made with the NDIA Intent Guide update being moved forward one spot.
5. Mr. Mike Cuticchia provided discussed the status of the Intent Guide "refresh" which corresponds to the latest version of the ANSI standard (version C). Mike noted the NDIA IPMD policy to update/refresh each guide every 3 years. He discussed the interim Intent Guide update in Aug 2012. In addition to adjustments due to changes in the ANSI, the guide was made more readable, more graphs were added and formatting changes were made. The changes were reviewed by a joint government/industry working group as well as the IPMD committee. Publication of the guide was delayed due to additional comments being adjudicated. The guide will be voted on in this meeting and published if approved.
6. Carol provided the IPMD update. She first thanked Tracie Thompson – the prior chair – and noted her accomplishments (and presented her a Hawaiian shirt – in absentia). Carol noted the IPMD board members and the nominees for the open board position (vote will be conducted today). Carol then highlighted the IPMD objectives. She introduced the various IPMD working groups and each WG lead discussed what their teams are working on. Carol also discussed some USG documentation changes (for example, DCMA's updated

Compliance Review Instruction (CRI)). Lastly she discussed upcoming meetings – EVM World to be held on May 21-23 in San Antonio, the next IPMD meeting Sep 16-17 in Washington DC and the IPM (fall conference) on Nov 3-5 in Bethesda.

7. Mr. Gary Humphreys introduced the 3 IPMD board member candidates – Mr. Dale Gillam (SAIC), Mr. Robert Jennings (Raytheon), and Ms. Linda Noble (Raytheon). Each nominee was given 3 minutes to discuss their qualifications and goals for the board. A vote will be conducted before lunch.
8. A break was conducted.
9. Carol then presented a discussion on the “DoD EVMS Operational Environment”. This is a new set of information that will be maintained on the IPMD website. Carol discussed the DoD leadership, policy and processes, and known changes within EVMS that are underway at DoD. Carol showed the DoD organization layers highlighting the departments involved in EVMS, whether directly involved in policy and process or “influencers” on it.

Carol reviewed the flow down of policy and processes from the FAR to DFARS to DoD EVMS policy and what gets put on industry’s contracts. She also noted the instructions provided to DCMA on how to conduct compliance reviews and surveillance. Website references on where to find the policies and instructions were provided. Carol also discussed the Business Systems process for systems that get disapproved.

Lastly, Carol addressed changes that we know are underway, including an update to the DFAR clause pertaining to EVM. PARCA is initiating an effort to have work scope recognized in the application of EVM. The PARCA Integrated Program Management EVMS Implementation Instruction or Guide document was also discussed (this has been mistakenly referred to as the “DoD Intent Guide”). PARCA’s goal is to achieve specific DoD intent on each of the 32 Guidelines. This document will identify the attributes DoD will review in EVMS reviews. The goal is for fewer attributes tested than in the NDIA IPMD Intent Guide. Carol also noted the various DCMA guides and instructions that are in work or being updated.

10. Mr. Gerry Becker presented a Harris company process called “BOOTS” (Business Operations Optimized To Succeed). The process is how to get programs off on the “right foot”. How do you avoid the “train wreck”? Gerry highlighted the essential practices that are critical to program management and bringing these disciplines to programs early to get them started correctly. The essentials Gerry noted are project life cycles and models, leadership, planning, change management, business essentials, status and evaluation, subcontract management, risk management and business growth. The key is to keep things as common as possible but as different as necessary. The process goal is to implement the best practices and lessons learned while balancing customer needs, the company needs, the available funds and time.

11. A panel discussion on EVM scalability was conducted. Mr. Dan Lynch facilitated a panel composed of Mr. John Kanicsar, Ms. Pam Cleavenger, Mr. Gerry Becker and Mr. Muzzammil Ahmed. The panelists introduced themselves and discussed their roles at their companies. Dan encouraged the committee to ask questions about EVM scalability. The panel discussed applying EVMS to FFP contracts, commercial contracts, IR&D efforts, etc. It was discussed whether you scale back from the 32 guidelines or start with the program and determine what disciplined program management principles apply. The panelists focused on the key elements of performance management, EACs, schedule management, etc. Ideas were discussed on the importance of not over burdening small projects with “full up EVMS that satisfies” DoD versus the ability to get good program management in a streamlined manner.
12. Gary conducted the vote on the open board position and the updated Intent Guide. Results will be provided later in the day.
13. A one hour break for lunch was conducted.
14. Mr. Bill Altman provided a status on the guide being prepared on “Predictive Measures”. The goal for the guide is to provide various predictive measures drawn from government and industry for effectively managing programs. Bill noted that many of the items discussed in the guide are likely documented in various places at many companies but this guide will bring them all together in one document. There are approximately 35 measures in the guide but not all would be used at any one time and would likely change as a program progresses. Organizations should decide which measures suit them and their environment best. IPMD approval of the guide is anticipated in Sep 2014 and will be officially published thereafter.
15. Carol announced the results of the vote. Dale Gillam will be the new IPMD board member. The Intent Guide was approved with a 100% vote. Carol also provided the rooms where the working groups will meet.
16. Dan and Gary facilitated a panel on Issues/Concerns that have been brought forward to the IPMD.
 - a. A question was asked if a 2nd or 3rd tier supplier with an IPMR requirement needed to provide a digital signature. The answer given was no – this answer came from PARCA. The prime requirement when submitting to the Central Repository is to have a digital signature. It was noted that if the IPMR is flowed down as is then the requirement is for XML and a digital signature. The question is whether the IPMR is “tailorable” to remove the requirement of a digital signature. It was noted this would be asked tomorrow when PARCA is in attendance.

- b. A question was asked about root cause analysis. In this case the corrective action had been in place for 9 months and there is still questioning around the root cause analysis. Without more detail, it was difficult to determine whether there is a problem with root cause analysis or not.
- c. A question was asked if there are any lessons learned from the implementation of the new IPMR. A discussion on format 7 occurred and sometimes the differences in frequency of submittal. It was noted that you should review the specific requirements being put on contract as some agencies are not flowing the DID requirements as written. For example, changes to the Format 5 requirement – more than 15 items and the use of “or” instead of “and” in variance requirements.
- d. A question was asked about reciprocity within the civilian agency sector. It was noted that typically civil agencies will accept an EVMS that has been certified by DCMA. In general, different companies work with different agencies however, some companies span multiple agencies. The cost of not having reciprocity is the cost of going through another certification process – there is general consensus that this is waste. It was noted that PARCA participates in the CAIWG and that there is some movement on reciprocity but it is not there yet.
- e. A recommendation was made that there needed to be more focus around program management in lieu of a focus on EVMS, compliance, etc. It was noted that the IPMD has been and will continue to do more to try to focus on broader program management issues and concerns.
- f. The last question submitted was asking about best practices and alternatives for compliant ways of subcontract management and integration. It was discussed whether to have more focus on the agenda or possibly reformulating a working group on the topic.

17. The IPMD working groups convened and met for approximately 1 ½ hours.

18. A networking event hosted by SAP was held.