2019 NDIA IPM DIVISON FALL MEETING

Dates: September 11-12, 2019

Location: Hyatt Regency Denver Tech Center – Denver, CO

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

DAY #1 – Wednesday, September 11th

CALL TO ORDER – Mr. Dan Lynch, Chair NDIA IPMD, Raytheon Missile Systems

Mr. Dan Lynch called the meeting to order and thanked everyone for being here. He noted that there were some last minute changes to the agenda. As such the following minutes will follow the actual flow of sessions rather than the printed agenda. Mr. Lynch closed the call to order by asking everyone to please stand for a moment of silence in honor of the 18th anniversary of 9/11.

WELCOMING REMARKS AND STATE OF THE NDIA – MG James Boozer, USA (Ret), Executive Vice President, National Defense Industrial Association (NDIA)

MG James Boozer thanked everyone in the room for their role in the Defense industry. He noted that the IPM Division leads the advancement of integrated program management with industry and government and how incredible the collaboration and relationship is between the two. Key points about the state of NDIA:

- NDIA has developed 5 domain videos (land, air, sea, space, and cyber). MG Boozer shared each of the videos [(link).](#)
    - Additional comments on Cyber: NDIA is playing a key role in OSD efforts. CMMC Charter should be rolled out in January. NDIA also conducted a survey on cyber security. The full study will be available in late October. There were over 200 responses to the survey. Key takeaways: (1) 26% had been victims to cyber-attack or event, (2) 75% of the Primes believe their sub-Primes are not in compliance with DFARS 70-12 and (3) 25% feel the implementing DFARS 70-12 would result in no improvement to their overall security
- NDIA has brought in two software, analytical tools:
    - NDIA Connect: will be NDIA's go-to collaboration platform.
    - Analytics Acumen: Tool to manage, assess, monitor membership and finances, create Commanders Dashboard for staff and volunteer leadership
- NDIA has embraced academic partners (now have over 30 colleges across the nation that are members of NDIA). Just held the first event co-hosted academic event in August at Purdue University.
- In May 2019 the NDIA CEO sent out a governance letter and the intent of it was the ensure that they are routinely rotating leadership of divisions and chapters and providing opportunities for others to lead. Routine general elections were noted to be required. The need for good

stewardship of our volunteering manpower was also mentioned. MG Boozer noted that the IPM Division sets the gold standard for these points.

- The NDIA has had some organizational changes to become more effective and efficient.
- Two major efforts underway:
  - NDIA believes there is a need to report out annually to the nation the health, readiness, and resilience of the industrial base of the workforce.
    - First report will debut in January 2020. Initial report is pilot to gauge the usefulness of the report and get feedback on what is missing. Report will be called "Vital Signs".
  - Workforce Development Summit sometime in mid-2020. Theme is: "Are We Ready for 2040?".

INTRODUCTIONS – Mr. Dan Lynch, Chair NDIA IPMD, Raytheon Missile Systems

Mr. Dan Lynch requested that everyone in the room introduce themselves. Mr. Lynch closed introductions by recognizing Linda Nobel for all of her contributions to EVM and to NDIA IPMD.

NETWORKING BREAK - Sponsored by New Results PM Group - Government Departs to Separate Meeting

IPMD STRATEGIC UPDATE – Mr. Dan Lynch, Chair NDIA IPMD, Raytheon Missile Systems

Mr. Dan Lynch thanked ClearPlan, New Results PM Group, Prime PM and BDO for sponsoring the week's events. Mr. Lynch then provided an IPMD strategic update. Key points:

- IPMD Board:
  - Updated Organization Chart - split Vice Chair role into two: (1) Neil Albert: VC of Strategy and (2) Vaughn Schlegel: VC of Operations
  - New Organization Roles and Responsibilities (see PowerPoint for list)
  - Working Group Liaisons – assigned BoD Liaisons to each Working Group to be accountable to the BoD to provide information. See PowerPoint for detailed list.
    - Prime/Sub WG will be suspended due to no WG Lead interest.
    - Production is a brand new WG and needs a WG Lead.
  - Registration Fees - study performed on last 11 events points to a need for an increase in registration fees. Lack of sponsors has primarily driven this need, especially host sponsors. If there is no sponsor at future events, the fees will go up to $450. Ultimately, registration fees going forward will be based on level on sponsorships. See PowerPoint slide for Sponsorship opportunities.
  - IPMD Guides – Mr. Lynch displayed the status of each of the IPMD guides. The IBR, Acceptance, and PASEG guides are up of a vote of approval.
- IPMD Objectives
  - New alignment to NDIA Leadership. Key points:
    - NDIA initiative: Expand leadership opportunities to all members

- - IPMD efforts to align with NDIA initiative: WG leadership, panel participation and community connection
    - NDIA initiative: Define required content and standard charter/division format. The NDIA is using the IPMD's charter as the standard.
    - NDIA initiative: Mandate regular elections and creation of equitable leadership opportunities
      - IPMD efforts to align with NDIA initiative: Chair/Vice Chair term limits. 6 new BoDs in last 2 years.
    - NDIA Connect – online collaborative community. IPMD will become part of roles and responsibilities for Communications/Outreach role.
- New IPMDR DID Primer: has new name (Integrated Program Management Data Report), will have a new DID number (TBD), elimination of formats (narratives remain human readable) and new delivery options (incremental delivery and basic standard of NLT 16 working days). Incremental delivery means delivering required files below as soon as they are ready to achieve the ultimate goal of getting data out quickly.
  - Required files:
    - Schedule Performance Data Set (IMS in JSON file) along with native file.
    - Cost Performance Data set (to be accompanied with executive summary narrative).
    - Performance Variance Narrative (replaces Format 5).
  - New IPMDR DID promotes pre-award discussions to get it "right"
- Division's upcoming events:
  - EVM Practitioners Group: October 9-10, DC
  - Program Management Track at NDIA-Systems & Mission Engineering Conference: October 21-24, 2020, Tampa, FL
  - IPMD Strategy Session: Nov 4-5, Dallas
  - Final IPMDR Adjudication Meeting: Nov 19-21, DC
  - IPMW (CPM): Dec 10-12, Baltimore, MD
  - IPMD: January 29-30, 2020, L3 Harris in Melbourne, FL
  - IPMD: Spring 2020, DC?
  - EVM World: Spring 2020, Fort Lauderdale, FL
  - IPMD: Fall 2020, TBD
  - Past IPMDR Adjudication Meetings: Sep 2018, May 2019, June 2019, Aug 2019

*Event survey will include a question about co-locating a meeting with the Systems Engineering Division next fall. Survey will also include a question about frequency of the NDIA IPMD meetings.

- Distinguished Service Award: reminder of the award program. Everyone is eligible and it's based on service to this organization. Mr. Lynch acknowledged the previous winners.

CLEARINGHOUSE AND OTHER INDUSTRY ONLY TOPICS – Mr. Gary Humphreys, CEO, Humphreys and Associates, Inc., Mr. Russ Rodewald, Director, Raytheon Earned Value, Raytheon Company

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

- Visit the Clearinghouse WG webpage on the NDIA website to submit input forms and see past briefings. https://www.ndia.org/divisions/ipmd/working-groups/clearinghouse
- DCMA CRC: revised document has significant changes across guidelines. The WG submitted 52 comments to DCMA for review. Feedback is expected in Q4. Comments will be uploaded to Clearinghouse WG.
- Schedule margin interpretations on use and maintenance: Clearinghouse WG is developing a white paper for review and submittal to OSD AAP. Awaiting update and release of IPMDR.
- Apportioned Earned Value Technique (EVT): WG requested feedback from the group on opinions of application of apportioned EVT. Discussion ensued and will be discussed further in Clearinghouse WG session.
- Prime/Subcontractor relationship: how much detail is needed? Raytheon has seen inconsistent feedback from DCMA. Prime contractor was told integrated subcontract schedule was non-compliant, but subcontractor was told schedule was compliant. Discussion ensued from other companies that have also had experience with Prime/Sub inconsistencies from different hubs within DCMA.
- DCMA Metric Testing (DECM): new metrics released Aug 31, 2019. Current tests available on public site. Discussion ensued about when the new metrics are considered "effective" after release. Consensus was 30 days after release, but DCMA has noted to work with your direct DCMA hubs to determine when its effective. 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.
- Open topics:
    - EVMSIG Guideline 6 – discussion about needing controls in place (system description) in how to plan work as long as the detail does not inhibit the work/analysis with program management. Control examples: consistency and incorporating at integration points.
        - Further discussion about inconsistency of DECM scheduling metrics as well as inconsistencies when compared to the 14 point assessment.
    - Discussion about whether there has been a change in the DCMA approach to surveillance since the leadership change. Some noted changes to DCMA's approach. They are potentially reverting back to practice of sending 10-15 people out to sites for 1-2 week visits. Additional comments about some companies feeling like they are under constant surveillance with reorganization and additional hiring at DCMA. Some noted that if they have the same hub lead, they haven't seen changes.
        - Mr. Randy Steeno recommended the DCMA-INST 205: Major Program Support document to help understand the roles and responsibilities of DCMA.

- o Discussion about use of AUW for additional work (harvesting underruns) and handling and reporting of AUW in System Description, including impact to profit margin. Additional discussion about un-definitized actions regarding CRC.
- o Ongoing LOE Baseline Plan Adjustments discussion about replanning LOE accounts.

NETWORKING LUNCH

PASEG/IBR/ACCEPTANCE GUIDES

PASEG – Mr. Scott LaFrance, Consultant, ClearPlan, LLC

Mr. Scott LaFrance presented an overview of the update to the Planning and Scheduling Excellence Guide (PASEG) version 4.0. Major changes: (1) addition of 13.3 – Scheduling in Agile, (2) addition of 13.4 – Scheduling in Construction, (3) removal of all references to DCMA 14-point assessment, (4) refreshed graphics, and (5) document has been hyperlinked. Mr. LaFrance then went through items that will be considered for future action. See PowerPoint presentation for this list. A voice vote was taken and the PASEG V4.0 was approved unanimously.

IBR – Ms. Cherilyn Jones, Director, Program Planning & Scheduling, Lockheed Martin Corporation

Ms. Cherilyn Jones presented an overview of the updated IBR guide. One of the main goals was to try and eliminate things that sounded compliance related and look more at risks of execution. Therefore they made various tweaks to words or removed any verbiage that was more EV compliance sounding. Also added a section on UCAs. Ms. Jones noted that there were some additional comments that still need to be discussed and she will be touching base with those people before the end of the month to determine if those comments can wait until the next 3 year revision or if an out of cycle revision is needed. A voice vote was taken and the IBR Guide revision was approved unanimously.

ACCEPTANCE – Mr. Shane Olsen, Northrup Grumman Corporation

Mr. Shane Olsen presented an overview of the Acceptance guide. Changes were minor for things such as removing PARCA and adding AAP. A voice vote was taken and the Acceptance Guide was approved unanimously.

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

NETWORKING BREAK - Sponsored by New Results PM Group

GOVERNMENT AND INDUSTRY CONCURRENT WORKING GROUP BREAKOUT SESSIONS #2 - The group divided up into their working group sessions: Clearinghouse Pt 2, Production, Agile & EVM.

NETWORKING BREAK - Sponsored by New Results PM Group

GOVERNMENT AND INDUSTRY CONCURRENT WORKING GROUP BREAKOUT SESSIONS #3 - The group divided up into their working group sessions: Planning & Scheduling, CSDR, and Prime/Subcontractor.

NETWORKING RECEPTION – Sponsored by BDO

DAY #2 – Thursday, September 12th

CALL TO ORDER – Mr. Dan Lynch, Chair NDIA IPMD, Raytheon Missile Systems

Mr. Lynch called the meeting to order and went over the day's agenda.

DOE UPDATE – Mel Frank, Director, Project Controls Division, Office of Project Management, DOE and Dr. Ed Gibson, Professor and Sunstate Chair of Construction Management and Engineering, School of Sustainable Engineering and the Built Environment, Arizona State University

Mr. Mel Frank and Dr. Ed Gibson presented on the Earned Value Management System reliability and development of an EVMS Rating Index. Key points:

- Goal of research and development activity was to create a method to assess both <u>maturity</u> of the 10 program/project management processes which comprise the EVMS and the <u>environment</u> in which the EVMS operates.
    - o Maturity – management analysis process example: look at analyzing significant variances and compare against index.
    - o Environment – culture/leadership example: assess leadership against levels described in the index.
    - o Once you look at environment and maturity you can plot it. Maturity on the Y axis and environment on the X axis. Goal is to have things in the top right quadrant as those are the ones with high maturity and a good environment.
- See PowerPoint slide for leadership team, research team, and research schedule.
- Preliminary results of survey: over 123 responses as of September 5, 2019. Goal is to have 250 responses out of the 500 sent in August. Concentration of demographics of the responses thus far:
    - o ~43% were government and ~41% were government contractors
    - o Largest concentration of roles were project management and project controls
    - o ~51% had >25 years of experience. Survey was targeting people with >10 years of experience.
    - o ~82% of respondents agreed with survey's definition of EVM.
    - o ~82% agreed with definition of EVMS.
    - o Most challenging aspects of managing projects/programs using EVMS: (1) Leadership/manager attitudes towards EVMS, (2) providing timely data and information for decision making, (3) flexibility or scalability to different types of organizations and projects

- o Top three EVMS processes based on impact on EVMS effectiveness: (1) planning and scheduling process, (2) change control process, (3) risk management process
  - o Top factors that can impact accuracy of EVMS: (1) organizational culture, (2) organization implements and follows a standard EVMS development process, (3) leadership's team previous experience in using EVMS
- Contact Mr. Frank or Dr. Gibson if you did not receive the survey and would like to complete it. Survey is intended to be completed from a personal perspective, not a company perspective.

IPMD/SE FALL INTEGRATED MEETING – Mr. Dale Gillam, Manager, Corporate EVMS & Scheduling Implementation, Leidos

Mr. Dale Gilliam presented on the opportunity to collaborate with the Systems Engineering Division and participate in co-locating our Fall IPM Division meeting with the annual SE Division meeting. This would open the doors to increase value to the Warfighter and generate better results.

- Allow IPMD to break away from the typical meeting (concentrated career areas of EVM and scheduling, same core speakers, dedicated time to working groups).
- Typical SE Division conference: attendees cover many career areas (acquisition, program management, engineering, technical), variety of topics that compliment IPMD (PM, Agile, Risk Management, Scheduling, IBRs), event occurs once a year for three days.
- This is an untapped market and audience to promote integrated PM.
- IPMD would still have the plenary, working groups and sessions wanted. IPMD would share the event and exhibit space to showcase vendors and consultants to a larger audience.
- Co-locating would not eliminate IPMD or typical IPMD events. It would not make IPM topics secondary to SE Division or community. Trying it for one year would not lock the Division in for future events.
- Event survey will include a question on opinion to co-locate for the Fall 2021 event

NETWORKING BREAK

IPMDR PANEL DISCUSSION – Facilitated by Mr. Tej Sujlana, Director, Program Performance Management (PPM), General Dynamics

The panelist included:

Mr. Scott LaFrance (Consultant, ClearPlan LLC), Mr. Dan Lynch (Raytheon Missile Systems), Mr. Vaughn Schlegel (Director, Program Management, Lockheed Martin Corporation), Mr. Randy Steeno (Boeing BDS EVMS Policy, The Boeing Company) and John "Scrappy" Scaparro (NAVAIR)

Mr. Sujlana presented a slide showing the IPMDR adjudication team. See PowerPoint for this list. There have been 4 meetings thus far with the next one planned for November 2019. The DID is expected to be released in January 2020.

Question – What was the purpose and goal of having the IPMDR/changing the current IPMR?

Response – Mr. Lynch explained the "why" as two faceted: (1) getting data into analysts' hands more rapidly after reporting period ends and (2) force the hand of the buying command engagement. Additionally the incremental delivery forces the government to tell industry what they want. Mr. Lynch is hopeful and cautiously optimistic that they will improve the RFP process and communications. Mr. Steeno added that the DID is now 14 pages long and there is a table at the end of the DID that is important. This is where the buying command and industry can have a pre-award discussions.

Question – Can you explain the subcontractor direct reporting option?

Response – Mr. Steeno explained this is similar to the CSDR 1921 series. This new option requires the subcontract to send the detailed information to the central repository and then a more limited report (ex: dollars only) to the Prime.

Question – From a program management perspective, what impact do you see to the users?

Response – Mr. Schlegel explained a couple of changes: (1) no more formats just to deliver to someone else. You are providing your data as you manage it, (2) tools have to be able to produce JSON file, (3) detail and analysis is more focused on true analysis of the data and what it means (providing more of a voice rather than checking a box) and allows you to have the conversations with your customer.

Question – From planning and scheduling perspective, the first data to be looked at is schedule data, do you see any challenges with the timing of the schedule data set?

Response – Mr. LaFrance pointed out that this will highlight if you are using your IMS to manage your program or just submitting it to management. If you are using the IMS to manage, you are looking at this information frequently so submitting it early should not be an issue because it should be ready to go.

Question – Will there be updated deliveries when you receive subcontractor delivery?

Response – Mr. LaFrance explained this should be part of the conversation pre-award. You can submit an early initial native file and then a final one on the 16th day.

Question – (Audience) On the variance analysis, will the government be specifically saying what they want?

Response – Mr. Lynch explained that in the incremental delivery option that is how it will work. They could still revert back to thresholds if they chose to.

Question – (Audience) When will contractors be submitting data to the new IPMDR?

Response – It will not be retroactive, just on new contracts. Contract modifications will be considered on a case by case basis and depends on value and time left on contract.

Question – (Audience) Can you expand on the Format 3?

Response – The future is you won't have to submit what your baseline was last month because they already have it. The tool will work such that you give CUM impact of the Format 3 control account changes and it will self-calculate. It will be a cultural shift to get away from looking at the traditional hard copy formats and just submitting data.

Question – (Audience) Will Format 3 be more of mathematical function and BCRs will transition to more of a Format 5?

Response – In the JSON file, BCR numbers won't be identified. Just the control accounts, but since a BCR can affect multiple control accounts then yes you will need to call out those significant changes in more of a Format 5 function for visibility.

Question – (Audience) By day 16, is the expectation that the subcontractor and prime data is on the same month end date? Or will that be specified in the CDRL?

Response – Mr. Lynch explained that is the hope, but the reality is that not everyone operates on the same month end. This ultimately goes back to the emphasis of the pre-award discussion. For example, there is the opportunity for the subcontractors to directly submit their schedule and let the customer integrate it themselves.

748E Updates – Mr. Shane Olsen, Northrup Grumman Corporation

Mr. Olsen presented an update on 748E. Key points:

- General timeline: currently working on Draft A. On schedule to get through that by next May before IPMD conference. Then plan to provide that to industry for comments. Expect a year to get through those comments. Expected to be complete by 2022.
- Small group is meeting monthly and have gone through 15 guidelines so far. Deleted three guidelines (4, 11, and 15) and added one.
- Next sections: Accounting (October), AMR (November), RDM (December), Section 3 (January)

NETWORKING LUNCH

PANEL: DCMA DECM CHANGES – Mr. Erik Berg and Mr. Dean Nifakos

Mr. Berg and Mr. Nifakos provided an update to the DECM changes and DCMA's organizational structure. Key points:

- Company changes: Collins Aero and Pratt & Whitney moved to the Raytheon Group. Dynetics and Leidos were moved to GD Group. L3 Harris was moved to the Boeing group.
- Created three teams: Training, Policy and Tools and assigned SMEs to each.
  - Policy team leads (Dean Nifakos and Danielle Bemis) will now own all the Business Practices. BPs are posted to the EVMS public site at: https://www.dcma.mil/HQ/EVMS/
- BP4 Changes: will be moving away from calendar year to fiscal year (Jan-Sept), will evaluate supplier's system by surveilling 32 guidelines over 3 year period (minimum of 1 surveillance

event per year). Will focus on guidelines instead of piecemeal metrics (i.e. if looking at guideline 6, will look at all metrics on guideline 6).

- Going to a semi-annual Configuration Control Board (CCB) - Next CCB will be in January 2020
- 5 CCB meetings have taken place in FY19. Last CCB took place in July: 1 new metric, deleted 3 metrics, and 49 metrics updated based on individual change requests (CR). Total of 105 metrics updated due to CRs and additional EVMSIG admin changes.
    - o Deleted metric 19A301a but replaced it with new metrics 19A401a due to EVMSIG update (admin change)
    - o Deleted metric 06A203a: SF relationships are now checked as part of 06A212a (OOS check)
    - o Deleted metric 06A206a: leads are now checked as part of 06A212a (OOS check)

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.

- **Clearinghouse WG:**
    - o Revising process to eliminate redundancy by debriefing government after morning sessions and requesting topics from group ahead of time
    - o DCMA CRC: 52 comments will be posted to clearinghouse website
    - o Schedule margin: white paper being developed for submittal to AAP
    - o Monthly apportioned: will be discussed at next meeting
- **Production WG:**
    - o Jeff King named a co-chair of working group
    - o WG is still forming and trying to determine the overview/mission. Objectives have stayed the same.
    - o Primary focus is on Program Management utility
    - o Need more US Gov involvement
- **Agile WG:**
    - o Removed EVM from working group title to embrace all aspects of performance management
    - o Current initiatives:
        - ▪ Guide content: critical path and HW/SW embedded or blended acquisitions
        - ▪ Training: updates/modification to Industry Practice Guide Comprehensive Training for Agile on EVM Programs training package (align with V1.3)
        - ▪ DIB/SWAP and S/W acquisition policy research: review OSD materials for gaps to current NDIA documents/materials
- **CSDR WG:**
    - o 2019 Task Plan and Status developed for Products/Initiatives, Tasks/Due Dates, Concerns and/or Collaborations, and Other Notable Points
    - o Recent CADE information: 236 people attended the CSDR Cost and Technical Focus Group meeting on 07/16/2019. Highlights from that meeting:

- FlexFile/1921-Q Quantity report status: 35 approved CSDR Plans with FlexFile/Q reporting
- 1921-3 Contractor Business System Data Report (starting in 2020, transitioning from legacy reporting to contractor format reporting)
- CAPE Policy Update (DODI 5000.73): CSDR Policy Manual (DODM 5000.04 being updated)
- 1921-T Technical Data Report status (7 Programs have implemented this report)
- 1921-M/R Maintenance and Repair report status (has been implemented with the FlexFile on a few contracts)
- SRDR Status
- **Planning & Scheduling WG:**
    o PASEG v.4 Refresh (accepted for formal release)
    o IPMDR DID discussion: definition of critical path, schedule margin, SRAs, SVTs
    o DECM V3.4: 6 changes to existing Guideline 6 checks, 2 Guideline 6 metrics deleted
    o CRC comments (from March): use of SVTs and Margin (suggest using company guidance vs. the SD)
- **Program Management WG:**
    o New Co-Lead is still needed
    o Predictive Measures Guide is up for refresh in 2020
    o Planning 1 hour webinars in between the meetings to provide content to community
- **Contracts WG:**
    o Plan to put together a Contracting with EVM Requirements Guide. WG has determined the guide sections and leads for each sections, but need more people to be involved.

NETWORKING BREAK

CLEARINGHOUSE/OPEN GOVERNMENT AND INDUSTRY PANEL – Mr. Gary Humphreys facilitated the panel. Panelists include Zac West (DOE), Jerald Kerby (NASA), Erik Berg (DCMA), and Dean Nifakos (DCMA)

Question – Would clear entrance and exit criteria stored in your scheduling tool (steps) qualify as acceptable QBD?

Response – It depends on how it is implemented, but Mr. Berg has seen this done in P6 and it has been acceptable.

Question – Can you place general guidance in your system description and detailed processes in supporting instructions?

Response – DCMA has seen it both ways. As long as you capture the requirements in 748 in aggregate between the SD and instructions then it's acceptable.

Question – Under what conditions would you allow making changes to open work packages?

   Response – From a DOE perspective, they do not prefer it, but want to know why. They want to maintain baseline stability and ensure that it's limited to time phasing the remaining budget that is being used. From DCMA perspective, there is a specific metric on this situation and identifies if you are making changes to open WPs then you need to have a reason why and communicate that. It's on a case by case basis and the SD needs to address it and spell it out. From NASA perspective, case by case basis, but mainly look at how it effects the metrics and the reliability of data.

Question – Is it acceptable to reduce/remove the freeze period to accommodate programs using agile?

   Response – There is no set guidance on how long the freeze period has to be. You can make it short enough to accommodate agile, but the setback needs to make sense to the type of work that you are doing.

Question – Can you speak to baseline change control where the WP is tied to the MRP? Is there flexibility to make changes to open work?

   Response – The overall consensus is that there is always flexibility, but you need to be transparent.

Question – How supportive is NASA management of EVM? DOE? DCMA?

   Responses –

DOE: There are 8 programs at DOE that have different levels of management support, but overarching order is in support of EVM. There is continuing dialogue with senior leaders to help them understand the value of EVM.

NASA: Right now, support is the best Mr. Kerby has seen in years, but fluctuates based on the current political leadership. Budget was just doubled so that is an indication of support as well.

DCMA: Leadership support is tied to the experience that leaders have had with EV. If they had a good experience it tends to stick with them and if they had a bad experience they tend to be less supportive.

Question – Is there an effort to gain greater alignment between the DOD and DOE metrics?

   Response – Mr. West explained that the two are not very far apart when compared to the metrics. There are 197 DOE metrics vs. 141 DOD metrics and this is because the DOE looks at more baseline tests. No plans from DCMA to do any alignment.

Question – Are others experiencing increased "need" to be agile, but don't receive the appropriate training/resources/culture development (aka "check the box" mentality)?

   Response – The overall consensus is that there is a lack of knowledge across the industry and government about agile and its application.

Question – What is the philosophy of changing thresholds to zero in DECM? I thought the intent was perfection is too expensive and not needed.

    Response – Per DCMA, with the 14-point assessment, people were overly reactive to being in the red or green and it drove bad behavior so the message about the metrics is that it is just a starting point for discussion and does not indicate an automatic CAR. DOE agreed they are just a flag for discussion.

Question – During surveillance is it normal practice for DCMA to provide 3-4 rounds of new comments on the same CRC metrics over a few weeks? We see this with newer people.

    Response – DCMA is in the process of hiring people and it will always be part of the struggle of training people.

Question – Will you include a markup version when DECM templates are released?

    Response – DCMA Leadership says no.

Question – What are good methods for efficiently applying EVM on recurring services contract scope? Should EVM be applied?

    Response – The overall consensus is that EVM should not be applied.

Question – Will all DCMA BPs be revised and released by November?

    Response – Policy team will meet in October to try to get the BPs out by November.

Question – Is there a preference towards a method to plan support type tasks which span discrete effort? Both LOE and apportioned have their pros and cons.

    Response – Depends on the situation – case by case. Mr. Berg sees LOE more often, but that does not mean its preferred.

Question – What will be your approach to flowing down the IPMDR?

    Response – Mr. Kerby expects it to take at least a year or two for the initial release to be tested before it will be flowed down.

Question – Is DCMA's use of the CRC limited to assessing/validating compliance of a contractor's SD to EIA-748?

    Response – Mr. Nifakos explained that the CRC's primary purpose is to validate the SD.

Question – How much time would I have to submit proposed revisions to the CRC? How should I submit those?

Response – Submit additional comments to Russ Rodewald by 10/31/2019. The current NDIA-IPMD 52 comments will be submitted to DCMA now for review and the additional comments will be submitted to DCMA by 11/28/19.

Question – What is good data? What are the challenges related to data being reported to the government?

Response – Data that is accurate, actionable, and timely. Data that you can make decisions from.

DCMA open question to audience – what do you think of the metrics?

Audience responses: (1) good experience with metrics because we know what were being tested on, (2) there are too many metrics and the underlying issues are often repeated throughout various metrics, (3) consider giving a grace period (for example: 60-90 days) to allow for tool vendors and home grown tools to bring in updated metrics and test them before surveillance would begin using those metrics.

CLOSING REMARKS & ADJOURNMENT - Mr. Dan Lynch, Chair NDIA IPMD, Raytheon Missile Systems

Mr. Dan Lynch thanked everyone for their patience over the past few days especially in the challenges with the agenda, the BoD for their support, and Andrew Peters for all his hard work.

See you at the 2020 Winter NDIA IPMD meeting on January 29-30, 2020 at L3 Harris in Palm Bay, FL.