# NDIA IPMD Meeting Minutes
## Industry Meeting – January 31, 2017

1.  Mr. Dan Lynch, IPMD Chair, called the meeting to order.  Dan started the meeting by welcoming everyone and highlighting the newcomers reception last night.  Dan started the meeting by asking the attendees to participate in a moment of silence for Kim Hunter who was a member of our community for many years and recently passed.  Dan reviewed the agenda for the next two days.   As is the committee's normal practice, all attendees introduced themselves.  Dan thanked Deltek for sponsoring the meeting.

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.  Dan introduced Mr. Gary Bliss, Director of PARCA, who provided the keynote address to the attendees.

    Gary mentioned a memory of Kim Hunter and her love and ability with animals.  He began his remarks discussing cost and status reporting and his future retirement plans to become a microeconomics professor.  Gary noted the uncertainty about CAPE's plans, the "flex file", the 2017 NDAA, and cost reporting.  CAPE would determine cost reporting on DoD contracts – does that extend to EV reporting?  There is debate within the government and their legal community.

    Gary's concern is that the cooperation and progress between PARCA, other govt agencies and industry could be impacted.  Gary asserted that EV reporting is and should be separate from cost reporting (the reporting of actuals).  Gary noted that the key tenet on EV is the reporting on "progress" (BCWP) and not resource consumption (actuals).  Gary highlighted that tracking cost is not a problem but properly measuring BCWP is where the real effort is.

    Gary has concern that CAPE's desire for data and cost information will be costly and disruptive.  He mentioned the "argument" that when reporting is eliminated the cost saving is minimal.   Further, industry did not complain much when the language was being proposed.  Gary's rebuttal is that examining the marginal cost change is not appropriate but rather the full impact of changes and requirements.  For example, what is the cost of a CAM to manage all the detailed elements (every unit being produced) including developing a baseline, scheduling, managing, etc. All the people that would be involved in maintaining a level of detail beyond what the company would normally do to manage.  He encouraged industry to price the real cost of a CDRL if these requirements are levied – this will send the signal to the government of the "true price".

4.    A break was taken.

5.    Dan next presented the NDIA IPMD update.   Dan's presentation will cover the IPMD mission and objectives, recent activities by the division, the working group efforts, various communication initiatives and upcoming meeting schedule.   Dan noted the IPMD is focused to maintain strong industry and government working relationships and showed the current mission and various objectives statements.   Dan discussed that the board will meet in March for a strategy session where these statements will be re-visited and re-evaluated.

Dan discussed how the division is attempting to broaden its program management focus but also not lose the emphasis on historical areas of expertise in EVM.   He noted that this is a challenge.   Dan showed the current board members and highlighted to the attendees that the board represents them.

He highlighted the 2016 major activities and events – the IPMD meetings, board strategy sessions, EVM World and the IPM workshop, and joint government discussions (for example on IPMR).   Dan discussed the working groups, the working group leads, and showed their charters.   He mentioned the initiative led by Mr. Dale Gilliam (vice chair) to drive more communication and accountability between the board and the WGs.   The WGs are PM, Agile, Planning and Scheduling, Contracts, Prime/Sub Contract Management, Benchmarking, CAIWG, CSDR, IPMR DID Data Exchange, Clearinghouse, IPMD Guides, and Newcomers.

Dan identified the various communication efforts including letters and published articles. For 2017, the future IPMD meetings are planned as follows:

-    IPMD meeting April 26-27 at Northrop Grumman in Fairfax, VA
-    IPMD fall meeting will be in September (dates TBD), sponsored by Artemis

Lastly, Dan reminded the attendees about the IPMD award program and the nomination process.

6.    A break was conducted.

7.    A panel discussion on PM development was presented facilitated by Mr. Marc Gaudioso from Northrop Grumman.   The panel consisted of Gerry Becker, Harris; Reginald Grant, Lockheed Martin; and Amanda McNanley, Rolls Royce Corporation.

Marc highlighted the need to develop new PMs and continue to train existing ones.   The panel discussed PM core competencies and how employees are measured against them. In Rolls' case they identified 12 competencies and the employees self rate (1-4) against them.   When gaps are identified, then specific training opportunities are identified.   The Lockheed panelist noted that the corporation has developed and delivers various training modules for PMs.   The training provides the foundational knowledge and skills that PMs need.   In conjunction with training, Reggie noted the process to identify potential PMs

based on observation by senior leaders.  Gerry noted his company follows a similar process to the Lockheed Martin model.  Gerry also discussed how if certain levels/scores are not attained then "refresher" training has to be taken.

Reggie noted LM does not hire entry level personnel into PM roles but identify high potential employees from other disciplines.  They focus on a pipeline of talent that then receive training and other on the job support.  They actually conduct interviews to determine the individuals aptitude and desire for PM roles.  Gerry again reinforced that his company identifies future PM talent by looking across the organization rather than trying to hire externally.  He noted the mentoring process of starting as a work package lead or CAM or IPT to grow in those roles before becoming a PM.

Amanda noted that their PM training is open to everyone who works on a program.  The panelists were in agreement on how talent is identified and developed as they gain experience in the business.  They also noted the various levels of training ranging from basic levels through advanced training.  The panelists also discussed the variety of training from instructor led as well as computer based.

Cost was discussed and the panelists acknowledged that typically training was an indirect charge although many individuals take computer based training on their own time.  Certification was discussed.  Gerry noted that they do send people to PMI for PM certification but do not have an internal certification at this time.  Amanda indicated that they have not required certification to perform a role but they are looking at it.  Reggie noted that LM does not emphasize external certification but rather assess PMs by their competencies and performance.  Gerry noted that OJT is the most valuable form of training and that senior personnel are encouraged to train their people.  The panel touched on the importance of soft skills, courses offered and how the culture can influence how programs are executed with the desired behaviors.  The panel concluded with some Q&A with the committee members.

8.  Col. Jimmie Schuman was scheduled to present on the topic "Bending the Cost Curve" however he was unable to attend.  The timeslot was made up for via a longer panel discussion and an inserted break.

9.  A break for lunch was conducted.

10.  Mr. Neil Albert provided an update on the Mil-Std 881C (WBS).  Neil noted the next update will be a more significant change than prior updates.  Many of the appendices (ie aircraft systems, electronic systems, missile systems, etc) will be changing.  Only 3 appendices (sea systems, unmanned maritime systems, and launch systems) are not expected to change.  Neil highlighted the expected changes by appendix.

11. Mr. Gordon Kranz from Enlightened Integrated Program Management, discussed program management and systems engineering integration. Gordon asked the question of how do you get SE and PM to buy into EVM principles. Gordon discussed the baseline principles of integrated program management and then correlated them to earned value management – that is if you are doing program management your are most of the way to EVM. Gordon highlighted the various stakeholders for programs and the need to be able to view their needs from their perspectives.

   To get PM & SE buy in you need to describe the benefits of EVM in terms they understand. The metrics that are developed and used need to tie into the end goal and benefits. By focusing on the essential work products the likelihood of buy in success can be increased. Work products examples would be system specifications, system architecture, prototypes, test plans, production units, etc. Showing those parties where their work product fits into the schedule, the budget, etc will enable greater buy in.

12. Mr. John McGregor, PARCA, presented on the IPMR DID Rev B Data Exchange. John first discussed the EVM-CR (Central Repository) which will be further discussed on Thursday's meeting agenda. Industry requested a "reviewer role" prior to data being published in the CR. This capability is being introduced.

   John's major topic was on the IPMR update initiative. The effort has been in work for 18 months. The prior IPMR is not "broken" but the goal was to improve and refine and work towards the goal of more automated compliance and surveillance with DCMA. The update is to create a new Format 7 that represents existing data in the IPMR but will allow for the elimination of other IMPR Formats. The schema was critical in development of the standard for the Format 7 data set. JSON was chosen as the schema. PARCA is targeting having the data standard and an updated IPMR policy (DID) by the end of 2017.

13. Ms. Joan Ugljesa highlighted the formation of the Data Exchange working group. Joan discussed how this working group is an extension of what was the XML working group. Many of the working group leaders and participants are the same. The WG's goal is to facilitate the PARCA and DCMA transition to a DoD owned data exchange format for the next revision of the IPMR DID/EVM-CR. The working group is expected to last a short time until the JSON development activity is complete.

14. A break was taken.

15. The IPMD working groups (Clearinghouse, Program Management, Planning and Scheduling, Agile and EVM, Prime/Subcontractor, Contracts, CSDR, Newcomers, Data Exchange and CAIWG) convened and met for approximately 1 ½ hours. The working groups will out-brief in tomorrow's session.

16. A networking event hosted by Deltek was held at the conclusion of the meeting.