

2019 NDIA IPM DIVISION SPRING MEETING

Dates: April 30 – May 1, 2019

Sponsor: Encore Analytics, LLC

Location: Hyatt Regency Dulles - Herndon, VA

Please refer to the speaker's presentations for more details ([link](#)).

DAY #1 – Tuesday, April 30

CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS – Mr. Dale Gillam, Chair NDIA IPMD, Corporate EVMS and Scheduling Implementation Manager, Leidos

Mr. Dale Gillam called the meeting to order. Mr. Gillam introduced himself and discussed the agenda, encouraged attendees to participate in working groups, and asked attendees to please complete the event survey.

NDIA 100 YEAR REMARKS – MG James Boozer, USA (Ret), Executive Vice President, National Defense Industrial Association (NDIA)

MG James Boozer provided a strategic update on the NDIA. Key points:

- Showed NDIA 's 100 year anniversary video ([link](#)) and shared that the NDIA's plan for the next 100 years is to find ways to collaborate across divisions. They plan to do so with the following 6 strategic priorities: (1) advanced budget stability, (2) expanded international security, (3) gain acquisition agility and regulatory efficiency, (4) promote innovation and technology and its process, (5) foster small business successes, (6) strengthen defense industrial base and its workforce.
- NDIA's first joint academic conference will be held at Purdue University.

IPMD STRATEGIC UPDATE – Mr. Dale Gillam, Chair NDIA IPMD, Corporate EVMS and Scheduling Implementation Manager, Leidos

Mr. Dale Gillam provided an IPMD strategic update. Key points:

- IPM Division's purpose is leading the advancement of integrated program management through industry and government partnership. The Division's current strategic objectives are thought leadership in IPM and collaboration:

- Thought leadership includes creating and maintaining guides, conducting forums and meetings to advance IPM practices, providing and publishing industry perspective documents, and developing a pipeline of future leaders.
- The collaboration includes developing communication plans, engaging executive leadership in government and industry as well as academia, and participating in other industry groups.
- Division's upcoming events:
 1. EVM World: 5/22-24, Fort Lauderdale, FL
 2. IPMD: 9/11-12, Denver, CO (Need a sponsor)
 3. Program Management Track at NDIA-System Engineering Division Conference: 10/21-24, Tampa, FL
 4. IPMD: Winter 2020, Location TBD
 5. IPMD: Spring 2020, Location TBD
 6. IPMD - combined event with NDIA SE Division: Fall 2020, Location TBD

REALISTIC COST ESTIMATES (RCEs): NRO'S INNOVATIVE PILOT PROGRAM FOR CONTRACT COST EVALUATION – Ms. Jennifer Rose, Director, National Reconnaissance Office (NRO), Cost and Acquisition Assessment Group

Ms. Rose explained how the NRO is attempting to solve the issue of government contracts growing in value. Key points:

- NRO has developed a Realistic Cost Estimate (RCE) process to promote proposals to be more cost realism driven, rather than proposed cost. This approach has driven industry to justify cost proposals using historical performance as their basis. Also created a new Section L and M criteria, which have been effective.
- NRO has piloted this process on three programs and seen great success as well as had some lessons learned. The piloted programs were awarded ahead of schedule and without protest. The methodology addressed the Government's cost growth risk and increased the speed of cost evaluation significantly.
- A few of the key lessons learned from this pilot are that pre-RFP discussions are key, quality RCEs and datasheets require oversight, well-trained cost analysts are very important and getting cost estimators involved early by tapping into well-maintained historical cost data to support realism evaluation is also important.

SCALABILITY GUIDE UPDATE – Mr. John Duval, Integrated Program Planning and Controls, SM&A IPMD Board of Directors Member

Mr. John Duval provided an update on the EVMS Scalability Guide refresh and encouraged those who are interested in participating in the document refresh to please contact John at john.duval@smawins.com.

NETWORKING BREAK - Government Departs to Separate Meeting

IPMD MEETING UPDATE

Mr. Dale Gillam encouraged attendees to take advantage of the NDIA IPMD website and its resources and requested that attendees complete the event survey to help the Board continue to improve these meetings. He also encouraged attendees to review the provided material about NDIA, read about the Division's initiative to collaborate with Systems Engineering, and become familiar with the other 29 Divisions of NDIA. There is also a regular publication of the NDIA magazine, which highlights some relevant topics. The IPM division has the opportunity to publish in this magazine and Mr. Gillam requested participation from attendees to represent the IPMD in the magazine.

IPMR2 UPDATE – Mr. Dan Lynch, Raytheon Missile Systems, Past Chair, NDIA Integrated Program Management Divisions

Mr. Dan Lynch provided an overview of the IPMR2 update initiative. Key points:

- Explained the process used to review the 200+ comments submitted and displayed a highlight of comments received. See the presentation for more detail.
- The next step for Round 2 of the adjudication process will occur on May 15-16. AAP expects this process to be completed and released by August 2019.

EIA-748 REVISION E – Mr. Randy Steeno, Boeing BDS EVMS Policy, The Boeing Company

Mr. Randy Steeno gave an update on the EIA-748 E revision. Key points:

- The working group's mission is to revise and consolidate the current 32 guidelines to reflect current program management business needs. The working group leadership is Randy Steeno and Shane Olsen. Participation in the working group was by invite only in order to limit comments. See the presentation for a list of participants.
- The key tasks and due dates include Draft A by December 2019, submission to SAE in the 4th quarter of 2021, and Revision E expected to be published in 2022.

CLEARINGHOUSE AND OTHER INDUSTRY ONLY TOPICS – Mr. Gary Humphreys, CEO, Humphreys and Associates, Inc., Mr. Russ Rodewald, Director, Raytheon Earned Value, Raytheon Company, Rachel Pink, Sierra Nevada Corp, and Tracie Thompson, Honeywell

Mr. Gary Humphreys and Mr. Russ Rodewald provided an update on some of the February meeting topics as well as discussed a few current topics. Key points:

- Visit the Clearinghouse WG webpage on the NDIA website for specific topics discussed at the February meeting as well as past presentations and issue input forms.
- Encouraged members to provide feedback/metric suggestions or issues to DCMA at dcme.lee.hq.mbx.dcma-pix-evms-center@mail.mil (or a shortcut is available on the DCMA Metrics page). You can also submit input on the Clearinghouse WG webpage.
- Discussed Baseline Changes on Open WPs and went through the instances where changes may need to be made to material and production work packages.
- Reporting AUW in a contractor's letter that includes fee/profit: AUW typically does not include the fee, the fee should not be held in UB, and fee/profit should typically be established upon definitization.
- Further defined a CAM as not being an employee of the contractor and noted that Admin CAMs are not technical leaders of an effort.

AGILE GUIDE – V1.3 UPDATES – Mr. Ron Terbush, Program Management Compliance, Lockheed Martin Corporate and Matt Strain, Operational Excellence, CACI

Mr. Ron Terbush and Mr. Matt Strain provided an update on the Agile Guide. Key points:

- Working group's primary focus is currently publishing Version 1.3 of the Agile Guide. The WG has reviewed and adjudicated the Board and NDIA member comments. The guide was released for the final 30-day review on April 18, 2019. Electronic voting will take place after a 30-day review period (May 2019). Mr. Terbush provided a list of Version 1.3 update highlights. See the presentation for more details. The Guidebook is moving to a standard 3-year update with Version 1.4 planned for 2022.
- The other focus of the WG is to conduct Agile Framework Training at EVM World and subsequent conferences.

NETWORKING LUNCH

CONCURRENT WORKING GROUP BREAKOUT SESSIONS #1 - The group divided up into their working group sessions: Clearinghouse Pt 1, Program Management, Contracts.

NETWORKING BREAK

CONCURRENT WORKING GROUP BREAKOUT SESSIONS #2 - The group divided up into their working group sessions: Clearinghouse Pt 2, Production, Planning & Scheduling

NETWORKING BREAK

CONCURRENT WORKING GROUP BREAKOUT SESSIONS #3 - The group divided up into their working group sessions: Agile & EVM, CSDR, and Prime/Subcontractor

NETWORKING RECEPTION – Sponsored by DecisionEdge

DAY #2 – Wednesday, May 1

CALL TO ORDER & AGENDA REVIEW – Mr. Dale Gillam, NDIA Chair, Corporate EVMS and Scheduling Implementation Manager, Leidos

Mr. Gillam called the meeting to order. He gave an overview of yesterday's events, thanked Ms. Stacey Cummings for making time to come speak to the IPM Division, and gave a bio for Ms. Cummings. Mr. Gillam also acknowledged Mr. John McGregor and his team and noted the IPM Division is committed to working in a collaborate manner across all government agencies.

ACQUISITION ENABLERS ORGANIZATION UPDATE: Ms. Stacy Cummings, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, Acquisition Enablers

Ms. Stacy Cummings spoke on her role in the Acquisition Enablers group which focuses on acquisition reform. Key points:

- Group receives input from various panels (industry, expert, etc.) and from the "Hill" then reviews those comments to ensure that enabling occurs and to assist in DoD's goal of enhancing acquisition decision making and improve acquisition outcomes.
- Restructure of A&S, which was the biggest DoD organizational restructure in 30 years. Split USD (AT&L) into USD (R&E) and USD (A&S). Within the USD (A&S) they restructured the ASD(A) to be more portfolio oriented and less program oversight driven. The result of this was the creation of the DASD Acquisition Enablers.
- Ms. Cummings wants to get people more involved (for example, get people in the ditch digging not just standing on the sideline watching others dig) and reduce the bureaucracy.
- Showed an Adaptive Acquisition Framework slide, but noted that it was likely to change in the future.
- Group has the authority to do some agile software development and have done a handful of agile pilots. Some of them are also mid-tier acquisition projects. The purpose of these pilots was to determine how to best deliver software to the DoD. Her group wants to create a pathway for software so that people can use different approaches, different funding, etc.
- The Department has a unique opportunity to change the way program acquisitions are managed and improve acquisition outcomes (cost, schedule, and performance) by utilizing a tailored approached that makes the most sense for the program and by establishing greater accountability to accelerate decision making.

PLATINUM SPONSOR KEYNOTE – Mr. Gary Troop, President, Encore Analytics

Mr. Gary Troop presented on Encore Analytics' flagship product Empower, which is a software tool to help improve program management and includes the DoD and DOE data-driven metrics. Empower is a

complete program analytics and reporting solution to help accelerate business rhythm, has a lower total cost of ownership, and integrates current EVM and IMS software tool investments

- Empower is used by NASA, MDA, DOE HQ, and other various government and industry entities including by DAU as a teaching tool.
- Empower supports the DECM Version 3.1 metrics now and will release V3.2 before EVM World.
- The key to achieving successful integration with Empower is configuring the tool to focus on the different users and tailor options based on those roles. Mr. Troop provided a few videos on how the tool operates for a Portfolio Manager, CAM, Director of Program Control, and Compliance Manager. Mr. Troop also provided an overview of how a Cost/Schedule Analyst or a Customer could use the tool.
- Empower Users' Group Workshop will be in Sandestin, FL on August 28-29.

KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT – Dr. Ed Hoffman, CFO Knowledge Strategies, LLC

Dr. Hoffman discussed the concept of knowledge and why it's important. Key points:

- Knowledge is finding the right people, it's challenging, and it is constantly changing, but getting knowledge from a personal point of view requires an interactive process. Knowledge is an intermediate function, it's only useful if people see the connection and at the core, the key the increasing leadership knowledge is knowing what relevant knowledge is needed for strategic business missions. Focus on things that are critical to the success of the project.
- A good knowledge system would be able to identify: How well did we do? (Measurement) How will we execute? (Implementing change) What do we need to do differently? (Learning) What do we actually do well? (Competitive knowledge) What we could do well? (Knowledge possibilities) Where may we be vulnerable? (Knowledge losses)
- Package knowledge for consumption (case studies help bring context and concept mapping helps visualize and share the integrated nature of knowledge) and measure knowledge use in meaningful ways.

NETWORKING BREAK

FUTURE OF DOD EVM REQUIREMENTS – Mr. John McGregor, Deputy Director EVM, Acquisition Analytics & Policy, OUSD (A&S)

Mr. McGregor provided an update on the future of DoD EVM requirements. Key points:

- Mr. McGregor wants the mentality to switch from being anti-EV to understanding that regardless of the acquisition approach, project management is the important part. EVM is simply the contractual requirement levied on suppliers. You have to ask the appropriate questions and have the appropriate conversations: (What are you buying? How are you buying? How will you manage it?) regardless of the acquisition approach. There are functional

equivalents of EVM in every approach as well as functional equivalent artifacts in every approach through the program management process.

PANEL: PROGRAM MANAGERS – IF NOT EVM, THEN WHAT? – Ms. Andrea Nibert, EVM Senior Analyst, Leidos

Ms. Nibert facilitated the panel discussion. This discussion used the Sli.do app. The panelist included:

Ms. Kirsten Curran (Project Management, Senior Manager, Lockheed Martin Rotary and Mission Systems), Mr. Robert Franceschini (Leidos Corporate Program Director, Vice President and Technical Fellow, CTO), Mr. Bardia Khoshnoodi (Program Manager, General Dynamics Mission Systems), Mr. Doug Tillman (Director, Product Line Lead Program Management Excellence, Raytheon Missile Systems)

Question – Which EV metrics help manage your programs best?

Answer – The EAC is critical because it will affect our profit, but while the bottom line is very important, but another area of focus is managing risks. Being open about these risks and challenge ourselves to identify risks as well as opportunities. There should be thresholds for managing the risks

Question – Which process investment at startup yields the most significant positive outcome? SE, Training, risk, agile, big CM? Which need defined prior to planning or building a schedule?

Answer – Training and understanding what agile really means. System engineering also plays a big part in the success of a program. Risk mitigation is also key, but don't process people to death, you will lose your team and affect their growth. Have the tools available and use them appropriately. Another point is to require everyone to read the contract and statement of work. People really need to understand the foundations of what you are contractually obligated to do.

Question – Which EVM processes are the most burdensome to project execution and could be eliminated from monthly statusing and still provide schedule and cost insight (Writing a VAR? Baseline changes? Compliance?)

Answer – This isn't a fair question as it assumes there is one answer. Every program is different and will be in different stages so eliminating one of these blanketly doesn't make sense. Ultimately, the decisions have to be made based on value. For example, on long duration programs where variances occur early on, having to do VARs monthly on the same automated topic doesn't add value. You must look across the overall portfolio of programs, consider the risk profile of each, look at what you're learning in in order to determine what is not needed.

Question – What is the first leading indicator that consistently jumps out that the program is taking a wrong turn?

Answer – EAC growth, crashes on the critical path, and BEI/CEI metrics. Another approach is looking at the human aspects. Human identifiers lead to what is driving the issues.

Question – What is your “elevator speech” to executive leadership is asked why EVM is a best practice and why they should use it?

Answer – “Imagine it’s your own money. Why wouldn’t you want to put some tools around it to make sure it’s successful (on time and on cost)? You want to make it personal for yourself and have some ownership of that.” Use that as an explanation for why they should use it. It’s a proven path to success and they should use the tools available to them.

Question - What is the first thing that jumps to your mind related to compliance?

Answer – From a negative standpoint, it's backward-looking information rather than forward thinking. It’s too much of a prescribed method/process to follow to be compliant and it constrains the PM and team. From a more positive standpoint, it shows that things are going the way the team said they were going to go. Compliance metrics would be better if you could tailor the compliance to the things that are important (i.e. the risks you identified). This would bring value and give indicators of the future.

Question - What is the first thing you look at when you arrive in the office every day?

Answer – Primarily emails from key program people. Additionally, daily stand-up meetings for the team to meet regularly and remove barriers is a great way to start the workday. Another suggestion was to look at overtime reports and compare those to the reports of issues and if there isn’t an issue reported this indicates that there is an issue that needs to be looked at.

Question - Would you use an IBR to validate the baseline if EIA 748 is not a requirement?

Answer – There are cases where an IBR is appropriate for riskier programs, but for others, a process similar to an IBR would still be appropriate you would just tailor it to the situation. Ultimately you want to try and get in front of an IBR with a pro-start mentality. If you wait until the IBR to find out you have a problem, then you’re too late. You are starting off badly.

Question - What advice do you have when presenting to leaders who don’t understand EVM?

Answer – Most will not bring up these issues or show EV slides to upper management. One should pick the appropriate level on how to present the status of the program. Your stakeholder plays a big part in how much data to show.

Question - How do you use your risk register to manage the cost leg of the triangle? Your customer’s priorities?

Answer – Start back at the proposal phase and incorporate risk and opportunities into the plan. You should then meet throughout the program lifecycle, which should include risk conversations weekly with customers and leadership. This helps foster trust with customers. Additionally, most effective

teams have a central management tool. It drives how they operate because they are able to control things by thinking about what's going to happen, what things could be issues, and how they will show up in the execution plan.

Question - What challenges do you face with your customer priorities?

Answer – The volume of change, therefore you need to prioritize with your customer which changes are most important in order to reduce bad flows of information and to keep everyone on the same schedule. You could also implement monthly meetings to discuss changes with your customer. During these meetings, the customer and team can engage and have direct interaction. It also makes everyone realize that changes can have consequences and there needs to be a balance with these changes.

Question - Recognizing that we are ultimately bound by the contract, what can be done to establish better contracts to ensure better execution?

Answer – Understand the tools that you have, bring in the customers and stakeholders early in the game, and understand the risks as a group so you can plan for those together. Bringing everyone together for ongoing discussions help everyone evolve.

Dale made note that as noted in the program, in lieu of speaker gifts the IPMD makes donations to the Fisher House.

ACQUISITION, ANALYTICS, AND POLICY UPDATE – Mr. John McGregor, Deputy Director EVM, Acquisition Analytics & Policy, OUSD (A&S)

Mr. John McGregor provided a DoD EVM policy update and discussed EVM policy initiatives. Key points:

- The new AAP website is now the front end portal as you no longer have to go through the CADE.
- The EVMIG was published in January 2019.
- The EVMSIG was republished in March 2019 to take care of some administrative changes. Mr. McGregor requested everyone to continue to submit comments for the comprehensive update next government fiscal year.
- Update on the IPMR2 - they received approximately 382 comments as of April 18th and they plan to go paragraph by paragraph during upcoming two-day adjudication. Their goal is to get it out by Summer 2019.
 - Comment from the audience: if it's a fundamental change, please change the DID number so that people doing proposals pick up on the change. Also suggested that the name should be IPMR Specification (or IPMR Spec for short).
- Agile guide update - it is on hold for now, but he would eventually like to remove EVM from the cover and call it Integrated Program Management and Agile Guide.

NETWORKING LUNCH

804 UPDATE IMPACTS ACROSS SERVICES – Mr. Jerry LaCamera, Jr., Professor, Executive Program Management & Course Manager SAMC ACQ 404, Defense Acquisition University (DAU)

Mr. Jerry LaCamera, Jr. discussed the challenge to accelerate the Rapid Acquisition process. Key points:

- The reason why rapid is so important is that technology is advancing at exponential rates and therefore, we must adapt the way that we acquire systems and components in order to stay relevant. Rapid can mean rapid acquisition, rapid prototyping, rapid fielding.
- Discussed the difference between following DODI 5000.02 Enclosure 13 and Sec 804 FY2016 NDAA Middle Tier of Acquisition. Since 2016, there have been a lot of releases related to guidance on Middle Tier Acquisition. The interim policy was published in October 2018 and focuses on CAEs formally identifying MTA programs and governance. An update was published in March 2019 to add sustainment planning and reviewing as a requirement.
- The goal is to balance requirements/capability, cost, schedule, and risk.

DCMA UPDATE – Mr. James Winbush, Director, DCMA EVMS Center

Mr. Winbush provided a DCMA update. Key points:

- Shared DCMA's FY19-22 Strategic Plan and noted that the EVMS center's mission is to ensure that decision makers have the right information they need to make the right decisions. Their vision is to serve as dedicated partners for effective DoD acquisition decision making.
- Emphasized that EVMS center engagement throughout the contract lifecycle facilitates cost-effective implementation and value-added program management control processes. Encouraged the audience to reach out to hub leads and be engaged with DCMA.
- DECM CCB meets quarterly. Use the input form on the DCMA website to submit input. The next CCB is July 2019.

NETWORKING BREAK

DOE UPDATE - Mr. Mel Frank, Director, Project Controls Division, Office of Project Management, DOE and Mr. Matthew "Zac" West, Performance Team Lead – Project Controls Decision (PM-30) Office of Project Management (PM), DOE

Mr. Frank provided an overview of the DOE's research study on improving the reliability of EVMS implementation. Key points:

- This was a collaborative partnership between government and industry.
- The objective of this study is to investigate the EIA-748 EVMS related knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors across government and industry.
- The timeline of the study is 3 years. Next week is the first meeting of the core team. Mr. Frank provided a list of members of the core team. See the presentation.

Mr. West presented an update on DOE's Project Assessment and Reporting System (PARS), which is the DOE's project management information system. Key points:

- PARS is going through an update to add the commercial off the shelf analytics and reporting tool, Empower, which will go into production the first week of June 2019.
- Gave an overview of how the process of getting files into PARS will work and showed what the PARS site will look like. Mr. West showed how the PARS site has integrated Empower into their tool with custom dashboards and well as with EVMS Surveillance.
- Phase 1 will roll out in June 2019 and PARS training will occur between April – September 2019.

CLEARINGHOUSE PANEL – Mr. Dean Nifakos (Policy SME, DCMA Group Lead, DCMA), Ms. Donna Holden (Deputy Director, DCMA EVMS Center), Mr. Gary Humphreys (CEO, Humphreys & Associates, Inc.), Mr. Jerald Kerby (EVM Program Executive, NASA), Mr. John McGregor (Deputy Director EVM, Acquisition Analytics & Policy, OUSC (A&S)), Mr. Russ Rodewald (Director, Raytheon Earned Value, Raytheon Company)

These questions were derived by using the sli.do app or website www.slido.com

Gary Humphreys and Russ Rodewald facilitated the panel.

Question – Industry has asked to be part of the DCMA metric CCB's. How can that be addressed and potentially implemented?

Answer – Ms. Donna Holden explained that when they first reinstated the CCB they received a lot of comments and needed time to go through the comments in their own groups. Once they were able to get ahead of these, they decided to have CCBs quarterly. DCMA purposefully excluded industry because they needed to do their work, but want to include industry going forward. Therefore they encourage industry to discuss items with DCMA hub leads or use the input form on the DCMA website. Ms. Holden explained that the control process has improved and DCMA plans to change to semiannual CCBs and hope to have an annual group forum for industry to participate in.

Question – Do you have any additional thoughts on LOE baseline maintenance, especially once the WP starts?

Answer – If the baseline is not realistic anymore, you can replan future periods. There are right and wrong ways of doing this and the risk is ultimately that people will abuse this to mask variances. The DoD EVMSIG describes the various ways to replan, but it was emphasized not to replan

BCWS as an open WP without the appropriate reasons, which should be stated in the company's system description. Reasons for replanning open work packages must be considered on a case by case basis. One method to avoid this issue is to keep the WPs small in duration.

Question – **Has there been any recent progress in system acceptance reciprocity between agencies?**

Answer – OMB participated with CAIWG to develop a memo to encourage reciprocity. The current issue at this time, and still remains is that the DoD doesn't accept other validations. FAA and NASA have signed an agreement for reciprocity. DoD issued a memo that says they will consider reciprocity on a case by case basis. The DOE and NASA are working together to achieve this as well. Mr. McGregor noted that for DoD the limit is the DFARS. The DoD agreed to share compliance-related information and review information in order to help increase knowledge.

Question – **Many contracts are UCAs. PMB is planned to a near-term event with the remaining budget in UB. Customers want IBRs with a full PMB in place. What are your thoughts?**

Answer – DCMA says to plan according to what you're given (i.e. the best you can do with the information you have in regard to budget, scope, etc.). Definitization is not required to do an IBR. Therefore, you should go do it on what you know and figure out the delta later.

Question – **What do you do with QBD/associated budget that is unclaimed because it was not needed to meet the objective of the work package?**

Answer – This is seen often with software and flight training, but you should just close out the WP when complete and take the underrun.

Question – **What is the proper way to handle closed work packages for work that has been determined to be not within specs? (i.e. rework the same scope of work)**

Answer – Follow your System Description. Plan your rework if you know it.

Question – **Would you all address successes and challenges of the DCMA agreements with NASA and other agencies?**

Answer – In the past, most of the work done has been post-award. DCMA got involved with the Coast Guard up front on an award and the process went really well so these types of agreements are working.

Question – **Would you all provide comments on scalability and agile application?**

Answer – All companies have some form of scalability when it comes to project management and you should be scaling your approaches based on the type of program you are working on.

Question – **What are your thoughts on replanning previously closed work packages when conducting a total program replan?**

Answer – You should never replan a closed work package.

WORKING GROUP OUTBRIEFS:

Each Lead/Co-Lead presented a short summary of what their working group has most recently been working on and/or what they have planned to work on going forward.

- **Prime/Sub Contract WG:**
 - Published the framework for prime/sub best practices.
 - Next focus is on the IPMR2 data requirements and FlexFile from the prime/sub perspectives, schedule integration of prime/sub, and UCA pain points.
- **Planning & Scheduling WG:**
 - PASEG v.4 refresh. The refresh changes are minor because the vast majority of comments were administrative. Also, added two new sections: (1) Scheduling in Agile and (2) Scheduling in Construction. The WG is in the last stages of making changes from comments then the document is going into Board review for comments before going out to the membership for review.
 - Reviewing and considering changes to DCMA GL 6 Test Metrics (the two added tests and two retired tests).
- **Clearinghouse WG:**
 - DCMA CRC (Please use the DCMA website to submit specific wording and guidelines for comments/changes.)
 - Slides will be up on WG page
- **Contracts WG:**
 - Reviewed the final WG charter and discussed the goals of the WG
 - Requested volunteers to assist in providing feedback in the guide they are developing
 - Next steps: vote on a final name for the guide, review draft timeline for the guide, identify sub-leads and subgroup members to draft the needed sections of the guide, review subgroup status updates.
 - Next meeting is June 3rd.
- **CSDR WG:**
 - Reviewed Dr. Burke's memo regarding FlexFile and 1921-Q implementation (all RFPs after May 15, 2019, must use these DIDs)
 - Reviewed the latest FlexFile CDRL
 - Asked software vendors to provide a status of their toolset regarding the FlexFile and 1921-Q deliverable
 - Recommended that people review the latest FlexFile training on the CADE website (as of March 2019)
 - DCARC will be adding the JSON Creation Tool into the cPET tool
 - Provided latest information regarding the implementation of the 1921-T DID
 - For next two months, CADE will be updating DODI 5000.73 CSDR Reporting and Planning Document

- Next Cost and Schedule Focus Group meeting will be at Boeing in Crystal City, CA July 16-17
- **Production WG:**
 - Lisa Cazalet identified as EFCOG liaison.
 - Set up bi-weekly meetings with the first one occurring 5/17/19.
 - Next steps: clarify vision and mission, purpose statement and establish EViP Group. Then the WG needs to develop a charter and get Board authorization. WG plans to send out a survey on “How We Work” and “What We Need” then present those points to the Board for review.
- **Program Management WG:**
 - Supporting the NDIA SE conference - contact Vaughn for any topics and/or speakers for the System & Mission Engineering Conference.
 - New Co-Lead is needed.
- **Agile and EVM WG:**
 - Virtual kick-off meeting in June to prioritize the list of ideas from the previous IPMD meeting.

CLOSING REMARKS & ADJOURNMENT - Mr. Dale Gillam, NDIA Chair, Corporate EVMS and Scheduling Implementation Manager, Leidos

Mr. Dale Gillam recognized Mr. Andrew Peters and the rest of the NDIA team for their efforts as well as the A/V team. He noted that the meeting surveys were sent out via email this afternoon and asked everyone to please complete one so we can improve our future events. In closing, he emphasized the importance of sponsors, requested sponsors for the future events and thanked this event’s sponsors. He closed the 2019 NDIA IPMD Spring Meeting.

See you at the 2019 Fall NDIA IPMD meeting on September 11-12, 2019 at the Hyatt Regency Denver Tech Center in Denver, CO.