NDIA IPMD MEETING MINUTES
September 12, 2017

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.

Day #1

Welcome and Industry remarks (Industry and Government) – Mr. Dan Lynch

Dan Lynch welcomed the group and especially to Renee Desport and Dave Chesebrough from NDIA. We had a moment of silence for those who we serve and why we are here. Dan reviewed the agenda and thanked Artemis who sponsored our event. Introductions were given by everyone. Discussed that Marty Doucette will be videotaping some snippets (video only; no audio) during these meetings to show what we've accomplished and the collaboration between government and industry as part of the EVM 50th anniversary for CPM.

Artemis Overview 2017 presentation – Mr. Chris Miller (CEO - Artemis)

Chris Miller provided an overview on Artemis. They own about 120 companies. Chris discussed their philosophy where they focused on Customer Success first instead of Growth. They have over 9,000 customers, about 600,000 users in 46 counties. They were founded in 1974. For Defense, their views are visibility and program efficiency. Presented a sample customer of about 15,000 employees on how they integrated their software into that company.

EVM in the United Kingdom – Mr. Pete Wynne

While in the UK, Pete was located at the Atomic Weapons Establishment (AWE) - southern England. He had a team of about 20 LM employees. Pete had a 2 year engagement and returned in June 2017. MOD (Ministry of Defense) was concerned that the AWE's EACs were changing drastically and wanted support. This program had over 100 control accounts and thousands of work packages. Some of Pete's first tasks were to create a system description and a new program organization. He introduced a RAM and re-aligned the program to a product structure WBS. He also provided CAM/EV training. Next Pete's group created a business rhythm where they were updating their schedules, publishing their actuals and completing their analysis. Next, they completely rebuilt their schedules. When you get the plan right, EVM is a by-product. They are now down to about 15 - 32 control accounts. With the new plan in place, they created a critical path for the program. The forth thing they introduced was Change Control, which had to be very specific. They had to change the culture as they needed budget

and schedule change control. Too many baseline changes were occurring. Next, they modernized the contract. Pete worked with contracts and MOD to crystalize the scope and payment plans. They updated the EVM clause in the contract to report only to WBS level 3 (control account level). MOD wanted all the details, but they said no. So they invited MOD to the monthly CAM meetings where the CAMs discussed their issues at the WP level. This took about a year to correct their course, which included about 2 or 3 restarts on the program. Today, they are still holding to the business rhythm and holding them accountable at the executive level. They have streamlined the process and now have zero oversight from MOD due to the improvements they instituted. These improvements provided a different work ethic to the team.

NDIA IPM Division Update – Mr. Dan Lynch

Dan Lynch introduced Bob Lopez (DAU-west). There is a new course at the Defense Acquisition University (DAU) in Program Management. The course starts on January 22, 2018 and it is ten weeks long. There are four seats for government and industry. There is no cost but you will have to pay for your overhead costs, case based course, and field trips. Bob encouraged small business to participate and the prerequisite is for anyone going to an ACAT I Program. Email Bob Lopez at robert.lopez@dau.mil for questions.

Dan asked about how many newcomers are present today and about 20% percent of the audience raised their hands. Dan Lynch then presented our division update including our Purpose Statement, strategic themes, and 2017 objectives. We have sponsors for our 2018 IPMD meetings, but are still looking to confirm the dates. Dan discussed the pull back on the charter and the highlights from our strategy sessions. Dale will be the Chair at the April 2018 IPMD meeting. Dan thanked Dale on all his help as vice-chair. The Board still needs a vice-chair to replace Dale. The Board will be seeking a new board member (voting today) and two new board members in January 2018. Dan stressed for Working Groups (WG) that the Board needs to know where the WGs are going. WGs need a clear sense of direction. Dan stated the board reviewed the April 2017 surveys results and have incorporated some of the suggestions. Dan displayed the list of the WGs. Dan finished that the board is working on documenting the new vetting process for new board members.

Network Break (Government was dismissed)

NDIA IPM Division Meeting – Mr. Dave Chesebrough (VP of Development of NDIA)

Dave Chesebrough gave us an overview of NDIA. They have about 50 people who manage about 25 Divisions; such as our NDIA IPMD. Dave congratulated us on our role/support to NDIA. Dave briefly reviewed the history of NDIA that started in 1919. NDIA's goal is to align with today's challenges and always puts the Warfighter first. Focus areas include small business

challenges, acquisition improvement, innovation in tech and processes, and to promote the welfare of the defense industries. NDIA has recently been asked to support the Section 809 Panel. Dave left us with three words: Relevance, Balance, and Leadership.

Industry Only Clearinghouse (Industry Only) – Mr. Joe Kusick, Mr. Gary Humphreys, and Eric Schaum

This is industry's opportunity to ask questions. There was a panel discussion; including Gary Humphreys and Yancy Qualls from Humphreys & Associates, Joe Kusick from Raytheon, and Eric Schaum from Northup Grumman. Topics included the expected IPMR DID revisions (not related to IPMR2 change), Stop Work Orders, and Subcontractor MR. Joe started the discussed on the Stop Work Order (SWO) issues. Main issue is when you have a stop work order many contract officers are using ETC and not the BCWR to determine the correct amount of budget left on a contract. The scope that is removed should be the rate that it was baselined. Most contract officers do not know the difference between funding and budget. Mr. Gary Bliss will try to find a resolution at the DPAP level and above to resolve this. Next issue was on Subcontractor MR. This needs clarification on reporting subcontractor MR in prime's MR. Survey will be conducted by the Prime/Sub working group.

Eric Schaum gave a presentation on the Gate Month Issue – Some companies do not update their EACs until the comprehensive EAC or they hold their ETC as long as the thresholds are not breached. Do control account EACs on the IPMR have to reflect the latest actuals (actuals through the current reporting period)? EACs would change on a monthly basis. By holding the gate month, the EACs remain more constant but they may not be as accurate to adhere to the formula: EAC = ACWP + ETC. The differences are explained on their format 5s.

Agile vs EVMS – WG may have resolved this issue.

ETC at the WP level – This will be a discussion point with DCMA. DCMA will not change their position per their EVMSIG. Joe Kusick asked for feedback to show how much of a cost difference between calculating ETCs at the control account level vs the ETCs at the WP level so that we have data to take forward to DCMA.

Is the QBD (Quantifiable Backup Data) part of the baseline? While DCMA states that QBDs are 100% firm and should never change from the baseline when configuration is mature, DCMA understands that in some design and test effort documentation needs to be created to map from the initial QBDs. Examples will be presented at the next IPMD meeting.

If LOE is excluded from an IMS critical path, but is linked for consistency and planning purposes is this non-compliant? Not really, you can have discrete work drive your LOE, but LOE should

not drive a discrete task. This is being addressed by the Planning and Scheduling WG in their continuous update to guidance.

The Clearinghouse WG will discuss these issues in more detail during the working group session in the afternoon.

Board Candidate Presentations – Mr. Dan Lynch

The three candidates presented their background, qualifications and goals to be on the IPMD Board.

Scott LaFrance - BAE Systems
Vaughn Schlegel - Lockheed Martin – Ms. CJ Jones presented on Vaughn's behalf
Tej Sujlana - General Dynamics

Predictive Measures Guide Update – Ms. Joan Ugljesa

Joan Ugljesa presented in place of Gerry Becker the update to the Predictive Measures Guide. This guide is also up for a membership vote for approval.

Dan Lynch displayed a list of all of the IPMD Guides and when they will be updated. Dan Lynch asked for help from the group to assist those who will be updating the guides.

Wayne Abba presented a short brief on CPM. Wayne discussed the IPPM certification and discussed the IPMW 2017 (Oct 30 – Nov 1) in Bethesda, MD.

Voting

Lunch (Government was invited back)

Before the panel discussion, Dan Lynch announced the newest board member is Tej Sujlana. Congratulations to Tej! Also, the Predictive Measures Guide was approved.

Over Target Baseline / Over Target Schedule (OTB/OTS) Panel – Mr. Tony Finefield (Finefield Consultants)

Tony Finefield introduced the OTB/OTS Panel. Today, there's a guide on OTB/OTS which is under review. PARCA has not approved it yet. In the past there was no real OTB/OTS document so Tony started a WG to publish a doc and this was first published in May 2003. The OSD adopted it and published it in 2012. NDIA provided comments in Dec 2016 for an update to this guide. Tony presented one of his older presentations on OTB/OTS where he went through the steps leading to an OTB from one of his programs. Members of the panel included: Julie Miller (Leidos), Denise Kerby (MDA), and Melissa Elliott (Raytheon). Melissa discussed her

experience with an OTB. She followed the 12 step procedure from Tony's presentation. Scope became one of the main issues that caused the OTB. Going through the OTB process was the correct path for program improvement. Denise Kerby expressed the benefits of going through the OTB/OBS process. Steps need to be taken early to avoid going through the OTB/OTS process. In general, it takes 2 – 3 months to discuss the OTB/OTS and then six months to work through the OTB/OTS process. In the past 12 months, Julie Miller has gone through three OTB/OTS procedures. Poor planning and understanding the scope were major factors in having an OTB/OTS. Julie noted that the government is not as critical in seeing an OTB/OTS now. The OTB/OTS guide has been very helpful and instrumental in going through the process. Julie noted that one must have a very good formal process during the request of the OTB/OTS.

 Questions were then asked from the audience. Were there lessons learned from the OTB/OTS that can be used on new contracts? Denise mentioned that DAU has a process that you can use them to help industry/government start a program. A WBS Dictionary really needs to be descriptive enough to describe the scope of the contract. Tony discussed the terms 'scope growth' and 'cost growth' has to be separated and understood by both parties. Discussion that's important is for both parties to discuss and agree the remaining scope and schedule before formally approving an OTB/OTS. There was a discussion on reporting relief; how long? Reporting relief does not mean you stop performing EVM. Sometimes only provide format 1 actuals. Understand what your customer wants reported data while going through the OTB/OTS process. What were the results of conducting an SRA as part of the OTB/OTS? Shouldn't regular SRAs have predicted an OTS? OTB/OTS could be for just on one or a few CLINs or only a certain WBS element. It doesn't have to be on the whole program. For an OTB/OTS, are the variances (CV/SV) eliminated? It depends. Sometimes the OTB/OTS is only for future work. What are we missing so an OTB/OTS is not necessary? That is our challenge to have an achievable baseline and schedule along with a good understanding of the scope of work. This was a very good panel discussion with lots of audience participation.

Break

IPMD Working Groups

Members went to their respective working groups.

The Networking Reception followed.

NDIA IPMD MEETING MINUTES
September 13, 2017

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.

Day #2

Call to Order/Agenda Review – Mr. Dan Lynch

Dan Lynch welcomed the group and held a moment of silence to remember what we do and who we do it for. Dan reviewed the agenda.

Owning the Technical Baseline – Lt. Gen. Trey Obering (ret.)

Neil Albert introduced Lt. Gen. Trey Obering (VP of Booz Allen Hamilton). Trey enforced the necessity that we need to change the way we run our business now based on the wide spectrum of threats around the world. Early in the 90's USAF was the premier technical acquisition enterprise. In the mid-1990 the USAF started to lose this acquisition excellence. This presentation discussed an AF Studies Board tasking to reclaim the acquisition excellence in the USAF. Owning the Tech Baseline means the "ability to make informed timely and independent decisions to manage cost, schedule, and performance risk." It is not about data rights. The major points of the presentation were the current state and the recommendations of acquisition in the USAF: Leadership and Culture, Workforce Management, Contracting Support, and Funding. A key point was the lack of contracting support to the program community. You can download this study at https://www.nap.edu/catalog/23631/owning-the-technical-baseline-for-acquistion-programs-in-the-us-air-force.

Training for the PMs must come from Leadership. Buy-in has to come from the top and flowed down to the PMs.

OSD CAPE: CADE Vision and Major Initiatives Update – Mr. Daron Fullwood (Deputy PM for CADE)

Daron Fullwood thanked the IPMD for allowing time on the agenda and to participate in the CSDR WG. What is CADE (Cost Assessment Data Enterprise): http://cade.osd.mil. Five categories of CADE: Cost, EV, Acquisition, Technical, and Library. CADE is the authoritative data source for estimating and analyzing major defense programs. Top priorities: Quality data, data tells the story, and informs decision making. Data will be migrated to the cloud in mid-2018. A study using data from the DAES Group C, (Aug 201) showed 75% of programs have CSDR WBS

and EVM WBS alignment. DIDs are going through final adjudication. Industry will have one final review before they go live. The FlexFile and the 1921-Q are about a year away to go live. The rest are about 18 months away. Starting in Nov 2017, CADE is looking for pilot programs on the 1921-T. CADE will make changes based on the pilot programs. Daron went in more detail on what's included in the FlexFile DID (Data Groups A – G). For the FlexFile process, industry may need a third party to convert their data into a readable data output to load into CADE. Other option is to create your own in-house tool. Future capabilities will have an on-line CADE tool to validate the FlexFile prior to upload. Once CADE has the data, they will validate it and create a one flat FlexFile. That FlexFile will go into the CADE database to be used by the government. Government can slice and dice the data as needed. cPet will convert to a Guided Workflow to make data uploads easier for industry. Daron does not want this data to be part of the bureaucratic machine.

Services are responsible for those smaller programs (ACAT II and ACAT III) to request this requirement.

Training will be conducted by CADE (20+ visits around the country), which includes certification.

Break

PARCA – Mr. Gary Bliss (PARCA Director)

Mr. Bliss had four topics of discussion: EV Policy; Transitions of repository; waiver process; and the AT&L reorganization. First, the EV value chain has been under PARCA for seven years and has worked very well with NDIA IPMD. Their goal is to streamline and remove the burden on the DCMA data collection. Gary stressed that any data collection has to be cost effective to the taxpayer. Again, Gary wants feedback from Industry on the administration costs in implementing the FlexFile and CoPlan reporting. Second, Gary had two reservations about CADE and the transition of the repository with the first being that there is a difference in the contractor's price and what's in the EV data and second the data may not go to the Cloud in the spring of 2018. Gary finished that each company will need an ECN token to submit their data to the repository. Third, just because you have an EV waiver this does not remove your company's exposure to withholds. Lastly, Gary had no new information on the AT&L reorganization. He stated that EV will remain but will PARCA still be in control of EV policy.

PARCA Policy Updates, IPMR2 DID, EVMSIG – Mr. John McGregor (Deputy Director of EVM – PARCA)

Mr. McGregor displayed the PARCA organization slide and the EVM division authorities. John discussed the need of the IPMR2, which is to develop streamlined data reporting process for Industry and to gain efficiencies within the Department. John discussed the working

relationship with industry over the last year and half to develop the data tables and the DCMA EVAS. For a look at the IPMR2 Implementation plan and a sample file and tool download, go to this link: https://portal.tecoloe.com/parca/ipmr2download.aspx. The IPMR2 DID should be ready by the end of September 2017 for internal government review and for Industry review in the November/December 2017 timeframe.

EVMSIG Update – Industry comments have been adjudicated. The government reviewed industry's comments with the IPMD board of directors on September 11. There are still about six items that need to be discussed between government and industry. The planned release is now December 2017.

MIL-STD-881C update – This is out for review with a due date to PARCA on September 22, 2017. The final release date is November 2017.

OTB/OTS Guide Update – PARCA updated the document and is going through review. Comments are due back to PARCA by October 2017.

EVM-CR Initiatives – EVM-CR moving from current JSP hosting to milCloud; no downtime. Industry will need ECA certificate again. Security is still a very important topic with industry data being on the cloud.

DoD Agile & EVM: PARCA is working on an update to the PM Desk Guide. PARCA is looking for government and industry collaboration to help identify best practice for IBRs and metrics in an EVM Agile environment. This effort is planned for Aug 2017 – Jan 2018.

DoD PM Guide to the IBR – Will begin Oct 2018

EVM IG Replacement – Planned Jan-Feb 2018.

EVM Application Process – version 3 accepted all the red lines; version 4 is being reviewed.

PARCA does not own the waiver authority. PARCA will support. The SAE owns it.

DoDI 5000.02 EVM Applicability – 2 step application process.

Open discussion starting by asking the group, If not EVM then What…? What would you do differently? John McGregor posed these topics for discussion:

- Planning/Budgeting
- Scheduling – IMS, status
- Collecting Performance – actuals, technical performance status
- Forecasting – EAC
- Risk Management

- Change Management
- Reporting – performance, variance

Can perform variances/reporting at a higher level (makes it easier).

This topic will be discussed later in the day since the "IPM in Today's Complicated Engineering Environments" presentation was cancelled.

Intelligence Community Update – Mr. Ivan Bembers (NRO)

Mr. Bembers discussed three topics: EVMS Health challenges, Schedule execution metrics, and refocused IBR processes. Before discussing these topics, Ivan has observed a decrease in the resources that perform the project control function. There is no longer a "home room" for these resources. These resources do not see project control as a viable career path and management is not emphasizing the value of skilled project control personnel.

EVMS Health challenges - Industry should try to achieve an effective management process. How much risk should industry take on a cost plus contract? Scope definition is the number one problem NRO is seeing today. Cost growth is tied to scope growth. The lack of scope definition is the root cause of EAC and work authorization issues. The NRO is looking for preventative measures not corrective actions.

Schedule Execution Metrics (SEM) – provides feedback to the planning process; identifies upcoming planning challenges, highlights issues that are not necessarily identified by technical metrics, and supplements typical schedule presentation. BEI is a lagging indicator; not a leading indicator. EVM vs SEM. NRO has created a corporate toolbox so schedule data and analysis is part of the EVM data set. Each program should be able to answer: Is the contractor executing to the baseline plan and is the forecast realistic? It's always a suite of metrics that can tell the real story or the health of a program.

IBR – IBR have become process/compliance reviews. The real outcome of an IBR should be to determine: 1) is the baseline achievable, 2) non-achievable, or 3) cannot be determined. The NRO has an IBR Team Handbook. Industry needs to review their questions on IBR training and remove the process questions. "Mock CAM Discussions" are not an interview. IBRs have nine industry-accepted project management constraints – Scope, Time, Budget, Resources, Quality, Risk, Procurement, Project Integration and Customer Relations. It's a PM (technical) review.

Lunch

MDA Update – Ms. Denise Kerby (Director of EV – MDA)

Ms. Kerby gave an overview on the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) which has about 21 major programs with approximately $20B in CBB. Her department also conducts IBRs at least on an annual basis. She performs Director's reviews, monthly program reviews and finance execution reviews. Senior Leadership has taken an emphasis on EVM. Is not required to use 5000.2 but still follows it. At the Director level, they approve Single Point Adjustments and OTB/OTS. MDA has created an IBR scorecard. EACs are reviewed to verify if there's funding for the EAC.

DCMA Update – Mr. Shane Olsen (Director, EVMID, DCMA) & Mr. Russ Rodewald (Deputy Director, EVMS, DCMA HQ)

DCMA is merging INST 208 and 210 into one EVMS Center Manual. Draft ECD is Oct 27. Their new process will focus on re-certifying EVMS Business System every 3 - 5 years (aligns with other Business Systems) instead of "once validated, always validated" approach. They are developing detailed procedures for EVMS Compliance related activities. System Surveillance will get pushed back on the Nov 2017 date due to additional work. System Surveillance Plans (SSPs) on hold pending promulgation of new processes. New SSPs will be developed and coordinated no later than the first quarter of 2018. Here are some important dates: EVAS – Validated software repository: Sep 1-15, 2017; Validate software / dashboard and metrics: Sep 15 – Oct 13, 2017. Deploy Software and Train EVMS Center personnel: Oct 15, 2017 – Jan 12, 2018. Full Deployment: Jan 15, 2018. What's causing the delay? Updates to the DoD EVMSIG, Compliance Assessment Results, Industry Input. EVAS metrics are only indicators. DCMA will still look at the processes. Metric configuration on their tool will be conducted two times a year. Expect at least one annual visit by DCMA in 2018.

Guideline of the Quarter: Guideline 27 – Reiterated the EVMSIG wording on what's expected to verify this guideline.

 Working Group Outbriefs – Working Group Leaders

- **Planning and Scheduling** – Yancy Qualls – Update to the PASEG – Jan 2018 Kickoff; Jan 2019 Completion (includes 3 months of total float-actual due date is Apr 2019); Topics of interest: Scheduling Agile, Integration of LOE, Top Level Schedules (Executive level), Integration of Subcontract effort and the Evolution of schedule metrics. Scott LaFrance will be part of the co-co-lead team; joining Carla Gilhuys.
- **CSDR** – Randy Steeno – WG active for two years; working closing with CAPE. CAPE/DCARC (Daron Fullwood) attended the WG meeting – Draft FlexFile DID released Oct 2017, planned phase 4 pilots; go live with final FlexFile DID **Sep 2018**. Looking for Co-Plan + FlexFile pilots. 1921-Q DID is next, then 1921-T and 1921-M/R will go live in 1.5 years. Discussed the differences in the April and June Draft FlexFile DID. Check the CADE website which includes the Draft DIDs and the new 5 page Co-Plan. Next CSDR

Focus Group meeting is late October 2017 at Ft. Belvoir. Additional CAPE Focus Group meetings: Nov 14-15 Kettering, OH and Feb 21-22 Huntsville, AL.

- **Agile** – Conducting annual cycle updates; Release version 1.2 - October 2017; Training release - Feb 2018; Publish version 1.2 - April 2018. Continue collaboration with PARCA, GAO and other NDIA groups (Planning and Scheduling)

- **Clearinghouse** – Gary Humphreys, Joe Kusick, Eric Schaum, and Yancy Qualls – Stop Work Orders (SWO): De-scoping of work addressed in EVMSIG update; LOE in IMS: Planning and Scheduling WG generating guidance and best practice (Qualls). Subcontractor MR: Prime/Subcontractor WG. Gate Month – Best practice/process developed by Eric Schaum. De-earning/Negative BCWP: Discrete (test failures) examples will be put together for evaluation and for LOE replans. Changes to QBD milestones (part of the baseline?): trying to pull together examples. For industry issues, contact Gary Humphreys and/or Joe Kusick so they can present at the next IPMD meeting. Also for any DCMA or PARCA issues contract Russ Rodewald or John McGregor, or submit an issue resolution request at:
  http://www.acq.osd.mil/evm/issueRes.shtml

- **Prime/Subcontractor** – Bill Bridenbaugh – coined new approach: FAST (Flexible, Agile, Scalable, and Timely) to address major Prime/Sub issues. WG decided to take alternative approach on their activities including developing panel discussions on current Prime/Sub topics; conducting information gathering workshops; reaching out to DCMA/PARCA for key system users; exploring methods for electronic communication; and interacting with other IPMD WGs.

- **Program Management** – Lisa Manning – discussed the PM best practice guide in development. Board of Directors has tasked the WG to produce an agenda for a one day PM event. Has about 20 topics and will scale it down during future monthly telecoms.

Break

Navy Update – Mr. Dave Tervonen (Director DON Center for Earned Value M, CEVM)

Dave gave an overview of this organization. Implements EVM at the Navy. DON org chart was displayed. The DON has 96 ACAT I active contracts. DON created an EVM Implementation Guide, which had over 600 comments. Dave discussed those updates/changes. The DON also created the EVM Competency Framework and Career Path Guide (updated 2016-2017). Dave has also assisted with DCMA in the creating of the DCMA standardized data driven compliance metrics.

SAE EIA 748 EVMS Standard Update – Mr. Dan Butler (Raytheon)

This group updates the EIA standard every five years. The EIA 748-D is in progress. Team includes Dan Butler, Randy Steeno, and Joan Ugljesa. Long term goal is to re-evaluate the standard. Important dates: EIA 748-D Refresh: Jan 2017; Kickoff: Feb – Aug 2017; Comment collection and adjudication: Sep – Dec 2017; Document finalization and review process with SAE: Jan – Mar 2018.

Next generation EVM standard – Will ask for comments from industry, PARCA, DOE, OMB, and Civilian Agencies. Team will start with a survey. What additional effort from Industry and Government will occur with a substantial change to the standard?

Open Forum – Panel Discussion: Mr. John McGregor, Mr. Shane Olsen, Mr. Russ Rodewald, and Mr. Ivan Bembers

This is a continuation from the earlier PARCA session above.

Started the discussion on waiver consideration – if not EV then what? This is the question John asked to Industry. Example: Customer is asking to do things that may make the vendor to be non-compliant according to their system description. Why do the IPMR if no one uses the data? Conversations need to take place between customer and contractor. Data is actually being used by another lower level (CDRLs).

Since this was a very good discussion, we will continue this open forum at the next IPMD meeting.

Summary and Adjournment – Mr. Dan Lynch

Dan Lynch thanked all the presenters and WG leads, Board of Directors, PrimePM for hosting the Community Connection on Monday evening, Artemis for hosting our event, and everyone else for attending.