

NDIA IPMD SPRING MEETING SESSION – MAY 2 - 3, 2018

Sponsor - Artemis

Please refer to the speaker's presentations for more details (<http://www.ndia.org/divisions/ipmd/2018-05---may-2018-meeting>)

DAY #1 – MAY 2

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER – Mr. Dan Lynch, Department Manager Core Program Support, Raytheon Missile Systems, NDIA IPMD Chair

Mr. Dan Lynch called the meeting to order at 8:09 am. Mr. Lynch thanked Artemis, our event sponsor, for the event and Prime PM for the Community Connection event last night. The meeting's agenda was displayed. We then went around the room with introductions.

ARTEMIS PRESENTATION – Mr. Chris Miller, Artemis International Solutions Corporation

Mr. Chris Miller's main talking point was on Scaled Agility. Scaled Agility is running an entire enterprise with smaller teams. Key lessons were on having responsibility at the lowest level, getting results not milestones, having interconnection is most critical, and agility is the key.

KEYNOTE SPEAKER – Mr. Alan Chvotkin, Executive VP and Council, Professional Services Council

Mr. Neil Albert introduced the keynote speaker to discuss "*What should the Defense Industry Expect for 2018 and 2019*". The Professional Services Council is a national trade agency that keeps track of the total contract spending government-wide. The DoD total contract spending has grown in the last two years and the FY18 and FY19 spending caps have increased in both defense and non-defense. Mr. Chvotkin displayed the policy and compliance issues the DoD is currently facing. A question was raised about the 809 panel. To date, the 809 panel mostly tackled the low hanging fruit. The 809 panel has been in existence for about 12 -14 months. Expect more 809 panel reports in June 2018 and in January 2019. There was another question about audits/verifiability – There has been more government attention on the Cost Estimating and Accounting business systems. There has not been much attention on EVM. DCAA has focused more of their time on auditing proposals so that is why they are looking at a 3rd party audit team to reduce some of their backlog. The third question was on the percent of contracts going to small businesses. Currently 23% of contracts go to small business. However, there are a

smaller number of smaller businesses, so those small businesses are receiving more of the share. The DoD is currently meeting that goal.

NDIA IPMD UPDATE – Mr. Dan Lynch, Department Manager Core Program Support, Raytheon Missile Systems, NDIA IPMD Chair

There were about 15 first timers. We all took a moment of silence to remember why we are here. Mr. Lynch displayed the Board Members and welcomed back Ms. Tracie Thompson as a Past Chair. Also, Ms. Mary Ann Hale will be retiring from General Dynamics on May 31, 2018. Mr. Lynch thanked her for her contribution to the Board. Mr. Lynch also introduced the two new board members who were voted in at our last IPDM Meeting: Ms. CJ Jones and Mr. Glen Fujimoto. Mr. Lynch displayed the IPMD's Purpose statement which is to "Lead the advancement of IPM through industry government partnership." Our strategic plan has not changed from last year. Mr. Lynch gave the status of our 2017 Objectives and presented our 2018 Objectives. Mr. Lynch showed the locations of our remaining 2018 and 2019 meetings. Mr. Lynch gave us a summary on the topics discussed at yesterday's board meeting with the government:

- EVMSIG
- Agile Guide
- WBS 881D
- IPMR (8161A) rev B / JSON
 - o Establish a IPMR WG
 - o Delivery dates
 - o Variance analysis

Mr. Lynch mentioned EVM World on May 30 – Jun 1, 2018. Mr. Lynch mentioned we have two open board members and two candidates running: Mr. Scott LaFrance and Ms. Lisa Hoffman. The vice chair election will be postponed until the August 2018 meeting. The Application and Agile Guides will be voted upon for approval. Also we will affirm Mr. Dale Gillam as the Chair. Mr. Lynch introduced the NDIA IPMD Working Groups. Mr. Lynch discussed the NDIA IPMD awards and presented the award to Ms. Joan Ugljesa for all her hard behind the scenes work she performed for the Board. Congratulations Joan!

NETWORK BREAK

INDUSTRY ONLY CLEARINGHOUSE – Mr. Joe Kusick, Director, EVMS Resource Center, Raytheon Company and Mr. Gary Humphreys, CEO, Humphreys & Associates, Inc.

Past Topics:

- **Material Price & Usage Variance** definitions fixed – this has been fixed in the Guides but needs updating in the DoD EVMSIG Glossary.
- **Negative BCWP**
 - o LOE – proactively manage
 - o Discrete
- **Harvesting Underruns** – This is not good program management practice, but contracts usually includes this exercise. Still continues to be a big issue.
- **Work Authorization Documents**
- **Element of Cost (EOC)** - Planning in one EOC yet consuming actuals in a different EOC (labor and purchase labor)
- **Stop Work Order** value to reduce contract target cost
- **QBDs** – Mr. Nate Oligmueller and Mr. Joe O’Mara from Northrup Grumman had a presentation on QBDs. If the QBDs are not baselined, are they under baseline control? Does the Agile environment make a difference? If the weightings are changed due to the addition/subtraction of steps would this be under baseline control?
- **IPMR Best Case /Worse /Most Likely EAC** – Mr. Humphreys went through an example for a Fixed Price Incentive contract – How should EACs be handled given significant overruns or underruns? Present your true estimates and discuss your ceiling cost in the format 5 CPR/IPMR and in box 15 of the CFSR. Mr. Randy Steeno pointed out that the most likely EAC had to be consistent with the Cost Estimating reports. The consensus is to show your real numbers in the CPR/IPMR. There should be no surprises with your customer; keep communications open. Remember the CPR/IPMR is a management report not a financial report. Another point is to really understand what the three boxes really mean. They have different definitions to different people. This may need clarification on the new IPMR DID Rev B. This will be a continued topic for the Clearinghouse group.

BOARD CANDIDATE PRESENTATIONS – Mr. Gary Humphreys, CEO, Humphreys & Associates, Inc.

Mr. Humphreys introduced the two new potential board members: Mr. Scott LaFrance and Ms. Lisa Hoffman who gave a summary on their qualifications for the board.

SURVEILLANCE GUIDE UPDATE – Mr. Dan Bellovary, Rolls-Royce Corporation

Mr. Bellovary discussed the purpose of the surveillance guide along with a schedule to complete the guide.

VOTING

Voting members voted on the NDIA IPMD Agile and EVM Guide, Application Guide, two new Board members, and the affirmation of the Chair to Mr. Dale Gillam.

The group proceeded to lunch after voting.

LUNCH

Mr. Dan Lynch congratulated our two newest board members Mr. Scott LaFrance and Ms. Lisa Hoffman and affirmed Mr. Dale Gillam as our new Chair. Also, the NDIA IPMD Agile and EVM Guide and the Application Guide were approved.

OVERVIEW OF PROGRAM MANAGEMENT – Mr. Dale Gillam, Corporate Director of EVM and Scheduling, SAIC, NDIA IPMD Vice Chair

Mr. Gillam started with his vision on how do we keep to our true core while trying to reach out and expand to support Program Management. He wants to focus on empowering our group and to keep everyone accountable.

EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT – FROM THE PROJECT MANAGER TO THE CEO – Mr. Jim Scanlon, Senior VP and General Manager, Defense Systems Customer Group, SAIC

Mr. Scanlon gave the group an overview on what's important to know from the PM to the CEO. Some key elements are given below. One should have a risk management plan, which should include the financial risk on a program. Other key points are the program execution on strategy and growth. Can I execute the contract, the scope, schedule, and the costs? Program Performance is the key. Other responsibilities are protecting the company's reputation, including all the legal aspects, staying compliant, and finance reporting (revenue, gross margins and cash management). There should be no surprises from these groups. Also, there needs to be good communication from the CAM to the PM to Finance (all singing to the same music). Another important aspect is to have clear handoffs to help improve the quality. The workforce is important. Do we have the right program manager to do the correct work as well as those who perform the work? What do the CEO and/or COO really want to know? What keeps you up at night? Do you have a plan/baseline? Does the rest of the team know what it is? Are we fundamentally sound? The Program must have the right leadership team. Asking for help is hard but one can grow by asking questions. The art of negotiation is important. What defines success? Know how to use the right person/people for the task. Take risk but know the outcomes. Another key aspect is having a discipline environment. Program Management is a team effort. Final point is to communicate as no one likes surprises, especially the CEO.

PANEL: PROGRAM MANAGERS BEST PRACTICES – Ms. Andrea Nibert, Earned Value Analyst, Leidos

Panelist:

- Mr. Dan Hoffman – Director, Program Management, Lockheed Martin Corp
- Mr. Dave Patridge – Director, F-35 Programs, Northrup Grumman Corp
- Mr. Josh Richardson – Senior Procurement Manager, General Dynamics Mission Systems
- Mr. Mike Sapp – Senior Program Manager, Leidos

Mr. Patridge - Building trust is important as well as providing all the information and being transparent. He doesn't wait until the next program review; he lets his stakeholders know right away.

Mr. Hoffman – His biggest success was to recover a poorly performing program. He provided a good checks and balance for the team. One needs to understand where your product goes two levels up.

Mr. Richardson – Program failures. One learns a lot from your failures.

Mr. Sapp – What is the best go-to process / tool – One needs data to start to learn the program's issues. He uses his EVMS. Every program is a bit different in understanding the data. Find scheduling tools that work. Visualization is beyond the Gantt chart.

How does one use the Schedule? – Start with a sound baseline schedule and it must be properly resource loaded. The schedule handoffs are important. Any program large or small needs to have a schedule. The schedule shows the scope of the work. Also one needs a risk register in the schedule. One must align the product schedule to the WBS. Finally, add margin in the schedule.

Yes, we need the PM to be successful, but it's the CAM who needs to be educated in all the tools so the PMs are getting the right data. The PMs do look at the IEACs to check their EACs. EVM data is too slow, the PM and higher levels of management need the data earlier. The EV data confirms how the data was performing each week.

What is the first sign that a program may be in trouble? One can't rely only on EVM data as by the time it is available, it's probably too late to react. The PM needs to have a pulse on the program, and the team is the best way to get that information. One must have the right culture so the team can communicate any issues at any time to the PM. Leadership is where you provide the right help at the right time. Critical path items need reviewing. Look at the top ten critical items and see what is moving within the critical path.

Risk Management – Again, constantly looking at the critical path, what's happening next, what's causing the change? You must have a risk plan in your proposal and in your baseline. One needs to know what can go wrong.

The PM needs to tell their team why some data is generated so they feel their data is used for management.

Core competency – wanted a team to be successful. If there's no Deputy PM, then it's the financial or EV analyst. The system engineer and/or chief engineer can either help or kill your career. Keep in constant contact with that discipline. You should use the schedule besides using EVM. In a matrix organization, relationships (team, bosses, and customers) are important.

Closing thoughts – You are ultimately bound by the contract, so how do we achieve it? Try to fully understand the scope. Avoid UCA contracts!

Question - Would you still do an IBR if the 748 requirements were not recommended? Yes, have the contractor get their house in order first then have the IBR. With Agile one looks every 10 weeks to look at the remaining work (baseline).

Before the Network Break, Mr. Dale Gillam presented and thanked Mr. Dan Lynch on his work as the Chair. Great job, Mr. Lynch and thank you for all your hard work and leadership as Chair!

NETWORK BREAK

IPMD WORKING GROUP SESSIONS

The group divided up into their working sessions.

NETWORKING RECEPTION – Sponsored by BDO

End of Day #1

DAY #2 – MAY 3

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER – Mr. Dan Lynch, Department Manager Core Program Support, Raytheon Missile Systems, NDIA IPMD Chair

Mr. Lynch called the meeting to order at 8:07 am and reviewed the updated agenda.

Mr. Lynch introduced Retired Army Major General James Boozer (NDIA Chief of Staff). Mr. Boozer will be our liaison with NDIA and he hopes to spend time with all the divisions in NDIA. He thanked our group for all of our volunteer work as he expressed that we help ensure what the warfighter gets and when they need it. He expressed that our division is a good model for NDIA. Our division is looking to increase more cooperation and collaboration between divisions and chapters within NDIA. He also thanked how we collaborated with PARCA and now the Department of Energy. Mr. Boozer provided six strategic priorities within NDIA. 1) Advance budget stability for government and industry; 2) Promote innovation and processes; 3) Expand foreign co-operation; 4) Foster small business successes; 5) Strengthening the industrial base; and 6) Gain agility in our acquisition process. These priorities are also on the NDIA website.

KEYNOTE SPEAKER – Mr. Sam Abbate, VP and Chief Information Officer, Northrup Grumman Corp.

Mr. Glen Fujimoto introduced Mr. Sam Abbate from Northrup Grumman. Mr. Abbate presented “*A Program Manager Story*”. Program Management is a lot of on-the-job training. One of his accomplishments was to learn how to interrupt EVM data and the tools. One needs a good perspective on being a PM (people, data, and customer). The soft skills on being a successful PM are just as important. One of his first assignments was to help programs that were struggling and to share lessons learned. Key discussion points: 1) Know what can go wrong—it’s more than just the metrics; 2) Programs can be bad at the start when they are first bid; 3) Cannot recover from a bad contract; 4) Unrealistic assumptions; 5) Know the difference between thresholds vs objective requirements; 6) Know the political climate; 7) Don’t be afraid to say “No”; and 8) Program stability vs reality. Another point to remember is leadership values and characteristics. Always be candid. Some issues that Mr. Abbate has seen in the past, having a lack of accountability and trust. Do not throw people under the bus. Have the conversation with the customer before they see the CPR/IPMR. We need to change the behavior on Cost Plus contracts about having no need to worry about overrunning. Every program should focus on hitting the thresholds; not the objectives. Words you never want to see on a contract: 1) To be determined; 2) To be negotiated; 3) Other tasks; 4) Reasonably inferred; and 5) All requirements to be verified via test. One cannot manage out of a bad contract. Final thoughts are to be honorable and transparent and you do whatever it takes (lots of unexpected tasks) to run a program. Understand the behaviors before you react.

Here are some attributes on a successful program that Mr. Abbate presented: 1) Emphasis on System Engineering – it plan must be executable; 2) Plan, schedule & resource comprehensively – dependencies throw you; 3) Have an open and transparent partnership – invest in the relationship; 4) Risk and

opportunity management – have a plan B. Mr. Abbate ended his presentation with asking “How can I help you?”

DOE – EVMS UPDATE – Mr. Mel Frank, Director Project Controls Division, Office of Project Management, U.S. Department of Energy.

Mr. Dan Lynch introduced Mr. Mel Frank. His presentation is on “Achieving consistency isn’t for the weak of heart”. Mr. Melvin Frank displayed the PM-30 org chart. Mr. Frank displayed a chart on *Invoking Change – Lessons Learned*. They are: 1) Consistency doesn’t come easy; 2) Consistency requires commitment and fear of commitment impedes the process; 3) Approach and communication is everything; 4) Nothing is possible without authority and management; and 5) The goal is cost effective and an efficient use of the EVMS. The vast majority of quality problems are rooted in processes – ignored, flawed or misunderstood by the worker. One needs clear process definition, documentation and accompanying roles and responsibilities to assure that the EVMS works as intended and to stay compliant with the EIA-748 standard. The DoE is using the NDIA IPMD Intent Guide Compliance Map Template to map it to their Cross Reference Checklist. The number of compliant tests by the DoE is decreasing. Mr. Frank displayed an update to their CNS Certification Pilot. By June 2018, the DoE should be able to complete their certification process for CNS. It will be a data driven automated analysis approach and they are now entering in to a self-governance model. Their certification framework on self-governance has seen improvements in the data driven metrics from 66% (May 17) to 92% in Feb 18) – continuous improvements. Some of the DoE tasks going forward include: be involved in the EIA-748 E standard, participate in the NDIA Intent Guide update, gain certification at their facilities with projects over \$100M, and participate in the update to the PASEG.

Before the network break, Mr. Lynch thanked our sponsors BDO for the Networking Reception last night, Artemis for hosting this event, and PM Prime for the Community Connection event on Tuesday evening.

NETWORKING BREAK

INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY (IC) UPDATE – Mr. Ivan Bembers, Chief CAAG/ECE, National Reconnaissance Office

Mr. Lynch introduced Mr. Ivan Bembers. Mr. Bembers shared some new initiatives within his agency. There is a waiver policy change to shift more to a risk based approach. A risk statement will be included in an EVM waiver. There is a new focus on pursuing these escapes. Mr. Bembers explained the future on their compliance framework. He’s going through the next generation on IPM tools. This has been a

two year effort. They are currently in the pilot phase. The schedule integration is witnessing good procedures with the new software too. The schedule execution metrics (health checks) are driving accountability and process improvements. If anyone needs these metrics, Mr. Bembers will send them to you. Mr. Bembers noted again that IBRs are technical reviews; not an EVMS guideline review. IBRs should be led by technical people and have a technical focus. His agency is having much more successful IBRs now. His team performs lessons learned session right after an IBR. They are currently working on an IBR Guide. The focus is to show there is no difference between an Agile IBR and a typical waterfall type IBR. Here is what his agency has learned from the Agile IBRs: Review the plan not the CAM. Is the plan really executable? Another approach is to pull the thread on the technical baseline. Programs that have an agile environment need to share their terminology with the government. An IBR is a technical review of the PMB and the scope definition. Scope definition is your appetite for risk. Agile seems to only look at one or two months of work and not knowing the rest of the work. Total scope definition should be part of the PMB. Planning packages need to include the scope of the work. Another observation is the EVM community does not always interact correctly with the engineering community. Mr. Bembers has been asked to speak again at our next IPMD meeting in August.

PARCA POLICY UPDATES, IPMR REV B DID, EVMSIG – Mr. John McGregor, OSD AT&L PARCA

Mr. McGregor thanked Mr. Dan Lynch for all his work as the Chair. Mr. McGregor displayed his organization chart (no changes from earlier versions). However it could change in June 2018. The functions of PARCA will not change though. He then discussed the following topics:

- **EVMSIG Revised** – Published in February 2018. There are still a few clerical issues to fix. These will get republished by mid –June 2018.
- **MIL-STD-881D** - Published in April 2018.
- **DoD Agile and EVM: PM Desk Guide** – Added two new chapters (IBRs and Agile Metrics). Also published April 2018. This will be a working document as new chapters will be added in the future (examples: Contracting, EAC?).
- **EVM – CR Website Reskin Complete** – The Industry Reviewer is available to all of industry. Not too many companies have one’s own company data. Request to be included via the PARCA website.
- **DFARS Update** – Currently sitting at the OMB Review. Once it goes on the public register, everyone will have 90 days for comment. Mr. McGregor will notify us when this will occur.
- **5000.02** – Change version 4 is in process. The change is in Table 8.
- **DoD PM Guide to the IBR** – modernizing the document with a focus on purpose and process.
- **EVMIG Replacement** – Single document that contains disparate EVM policy application. Trying to publish summer of 2018.
- **IPMR Rev B (IPRM2):**
 - o Received 954 comments. You can still send comments to PARCA!
 - o Major comment topics include: Delivery timing, variance analysis, level of reporting, and software change from UN/CEFACT to JSON

- One reason for the delivery timeframe was for the government to receive the data faster and to provide the data to DCMA for their data driven metrics.
- Variance Analysis – The VAR form is not as critical as having the variance analysis to include the root cause, impact, and corrective action plan.
- Restrictions on tailoring to remove requirements.
- Will have an adjudication meeting/team (government and industry) in the future
- Timeline – Currently testing the DEI and file specs. Need to work with industry on the format.

NETWORKING LUNCH

DCMA UPDATE – Mr. Russ Rodewald, Acting Director EVMID, DCMA

Mr. Rodewald stated that Mr. Shane Olsen is on temporary assignment as he has been working for the DCMA Chief of Staff for about four months. Russ reviewed DCMA's Mission: Develop and execute EVM System Surveillance Plans (SSP) to ensure ongoing system compliance, Provide documentation output in System Surveillance Reports (SSR) - assess system compliance and seek corrective actions, Execute Validate Reviews (much less reviews today), Engage with Program Offices, Services and OSD by supporting IBRs and performing Review for Cause upon customer request for contracts >\$20M, and Communicate mission and requirements to contractors and industry groups.

Work products – seven business practices (BP1 – BP7); should all be finalized by the end of May 2018.

Accomplishments to date include the BBP 3.0 Initiative Completion: Consolidation of EVMS mission to EVMS Center – Completed; Completion of EVMS Data Pilot and incorporation into surveillance – Completed; and Metric Automation (EVAS) – Delayed.

In the 2016-2017 Compliance Reviews, 58 deficiencies were found in 8 reviews (FY2016 – Present). Deficiencies (compliant and non-compliant) were found on GLs 6, 10, 27 & 29 in over 50% of reviews.

Continued Focus: Consistency of oversight across Contractors, Early Engagement with PMO and Contractor (attending IBRs), Leveraging internal oversight to limit onsite engagement (keep one minimum visit a year), and Continue push towards automation of metric assessment.

If anyone has updates/changes to the data driven metrics, one can contact DCMA.

IPMD GUIDES UPDATES – Ms. Joan Ugljesa, Partner, New Vistas Group

Ms. Ugljesa presented all the IPMD Guides and their due dates. The newly approved NDIA IPMD Agile Guide and Application Guide will be on the website soon.

EIA-748 Version D – reaffirmation in process with SAE International

Intent Guide – Received 182 comments. The intent guide team is targeting a July 2018 completion date.

PASEG UPDATE – Mr. Yancy Qualls, Engagement Director, Humphreys & Associates, Inc.

The PASEG Working Group discussed if the new EVMSIG and IPMR Rev B will have any impacts on the PASEG. The Working Group received 611 comments from industry, DCMA, NASA, DoE, Contractors, PSWG, EFCOG, and Consulting Firms. Mr. Qualls went through the comments by chapter. Some of the comments suggested having new sections like ‘Scheduling in an Agile Environment’, ‘Scheduling in a Construction Environment’, and ‘Determining the Appropriate Level of Detail’ to be placed on a schedule.

WORKING GROUP OUT-BRIEFS

- **Clearinghouse Working Group:** (Below are the topics discussed. Please see the Clearinghouse Working Group minutes for the details <http://www.ndia.org/divisions/ipmd/working-groups/clearinghouse>.
 - Material Price & Usage Variance definitions will be fixed by PARCA in the EVMSIG by June 15 2018.
 - PARCA also clarified that in the EVMSIG the MPR/ERP is not to be repeated in the schedule and the graphic will be updated (figure 6 in Guideline 6)
 - Harvesting Underrun should be avoided as it is not an acceptable practice.
 - WAD
 - Planning in one Element of Cost
 - Stop Work Order
 - QBDs
 - EACs – IPMR Format 1 FPI – Need to update the DID language.

- **Agile Working Group:**
 - Working on comments (62 comments received) on the updated version (version 1.3). Teams are forming on Training, Contracting, Agile, the Critical Path and Use of Agile Metrics, and Computer Agile (graphics for the Guide).
 - Looking for help to be on these teams.

- **Prime/Sub Working Group:**
 - Finishing a white paper on Management Reserve, provide a checklist approach for key consideration when entering into a relationship
 - Focusing on the Framework for Prime/Sub collaboration and communication

- **Program Management Working Group:**
 - Partnering with the NDIA System Engineering Division
 - Conference Abstracts due Monday, June 18, 2018 and the Conference is Oct 22 – 25, 2018. We will have a track at the NDIA System Engineering conference

- **Contracts Working Group:**
 - Created questions for contracts
 - Working on a Contracts Guide
 - Need volunteers from industry and government!

- **Surveillance Guide Working Group:**
 - Members increased to 17.
 - Keeping the Purpose of the guide as is. May mention data driven metrics in the guide.

- **CSDR Working Group:**
 - Continue to flow information from CAPE to the working group
 - There is a “Straw Man” FlexFile DID posted to the CADE website
 - Have about 4 pilots; CADE wants 25-36 pilots
 - Pilots are using Excel or CVS files
 - Still in the “walking” phase. Look to get an 80% solution
 - Looking to have a new DID based on the pilot programs
 - CAPE has updated the CSDR Manual (DODM 5000.04-M-1)
 - MIL-STD-881D has been published
 - The CADE CSDR plan templates will be updated based on the latest MIL-STD-881D.
 - CAPE has been sending CSDR delivery status to the buying commands
 - Status includes Finalized submissions for current year, overdue submissions, upcoming submissions and history deliverables.

NETWORKING BREAK

GOVERNMENT PANEL – Panelist: Mr. Russ Rodewald (DCMA), Mr. John McGregor (PARCA), and Mr. Mike Pelkey (OUSD AT&L)

This is an open forum to ask any question to our government panelist. After each question is the answer along with other discussion points from industry.

Question: Was the focus or expectation of the IPMR Rev B (IPMR2) was to how to create the “format 7”; JSON?

- Initially the format 7 was going to also be used for the DCMA System Surveillance data driven metrics. So the IPMR2 was created to satisfy that requirement so DCMA will not have to ask for the same type of data for their data calls.

Question: Any special objectives for DCMA?

- Keep the data driven metrics going.

Question: The RFP on a billion dollar EMD competitive proposal was a Firm Fixed Price (FFP) contract and the LRIP contracts are Fixed Price Incentive (FPI) contracts. Is this correct?

- Doesn't quite make sense on why they requested it.

Question: Still receiving PBL contracts with EV requirements.

- 5002 issue. Start having the conversation if EV is really required. Need to start having the discussion on how performance will be taken. EVM Applicability.

Question: What do you not want to talk about next year?

- IPMR2, DFARS, discussing standard data to see if it's working, and to continue to hear the contracting officer is taking the blame for everything.

Question - IPMR2 – 17 days and no major subs. Why can't we have a gradual deliverable on amount of days to send the data into the government?

- What is the right number of days? Industry needs to have the conversation during post award. Industry needs to start having the conversation themselves and report back to PARCA. The timing may hurt the quality of data.
- Suggested to add in the SOW to have 30 days after contract award, have a meeting on EV requirements, CDRLs, requirements and expectations and then have another meeting 90 days afterwards for a follow-up review.
- Could be a resource issue with the decrease in turnaround data. More hours and/or more people may be needed to account for the earlier deadline.
- Could there be inefficiencies in the customer's review time?

SUMMARY AND ADJOURNMENT – Mr. Dan Lynch, Department Manager Core Program Support, Raytheon Missile Systems, NDIA IPMD Chair

The IPMD meeting finished at 4:38 pm. Thank you for attending and see you at the next NDIA IPMD meeting in Ft. Worth, Texas at the Hurst Convention Center on August 28 – 29, 2018!