

Meeting Invitees	Attended
Bill Boroski	X
Peter Garbincius	X
Nancy Grossman	X
Dave Harding	X
Steve Holmes	X
Tom Lackowski	X
Mike Lindgren	
Pat Lukens	X
Ann Nestander	X
Ed Temple	X
Connee Trimby	X
Dean Hoffer	X
Elaine McCluskey	X
Additional Attendees	

ACTION ITEMS AS A RESULT OF THIS MEETING:

New Action Item	Assigned to
Determine if EVMS audit can be delayed	Connee
Send email to Steve regarding free physicist labor and EVMS	Elaine
Consult with Pepin about MR/Contingency and BNL CAP	Elaine

Agenda and Presentation slides for this meeting can be found at
http://www.fnal.gov/directorate/OPMO/Projectsns/EVMS/OversightMtg/2008/07_10/OCM.htm

Handouts: none

Dean provided **status update of system description document and procedure writing**. Two 3-hour focus meetings last week with core team members helped cross-review procedures and get them finalized. Expect to complete early next week. Connee is reviewing accounting section of system description document.

Next steps for these documents: have Fran Clark and technical writer review them for 2 weeks simultaneously; pick up those comments; Oversight Committee review for 2 weeks; pick up those comments.

Resulting milestones are (with 7 day slip from last meeting):
Documents ready for readiness review - 17 October 2008
One-day review - 16 December 2008
OECM review - March 2009

Brief discussion of **current FRA audit of EVMS**. Question is, “Why now?” Dean said this requested by FRA. Pier has determined that DECam should be project to be reviewed for implementation of accounting procedures. Connee is concerned that this is “too soon” given procedure development. She will see if this can be delayed.

Dean presented several items that Core Team has discussed and made the following determinations:

Variance Thresholds: Dean showed threshold levels that would be used for current and cumulative reporting at the cost account level. These are the same as used by DOE for cumulative for project summary level. Discussion ensued:

- Peter pointed out that continuing resolutions have a big impact on CPI, SPI, and would affect these thresholds shown.
- It was questioned which trumps to trigger a variance analysis report, the current or cumulative?
- How is reporting actually done? By combination of CAM statusing the schedule and actuals from Cobra.
- **Recommendation:** Peter suggested and others agreed that using a rolling 3 month average instead of current period would even out the difficulties with a monthly current period report. Keep same threshold levels for this, and for cumulative. Elaine will follow up to see if Cobra can produce a report for this.

BNL EMVS Certification CARs: Elaine reviewed the CAP dated May 2008 from the BNL certification review, and how they may impact the Fermilab EVMS effort. Possible ones to be concerned about include: WBS dictionary (NOVA has been struggling with this), escalation (need to have a lab policy), management reserve/contingency (policy established last OSC meeting doesn't quite meet what BNL direction seems to be). More discussion ensued on MR versus contingency. Elaine is talking with Pepin to see if our policy should change.

Surveillance and Maintenance process: Elaine described what is being proposed as the surveillance and maintenance process for ensuring continued compliance with ANSI standard. This is not one of the 32 criteria, but is necessary to retain certification. This will be part of CD-2 project reviews, but also an annual review by OPMO looking at all projects currently using EVMS. This will involve some nominal time from each project.

Free physicist labor: Dean described how the policy of free physicist labor on projects came to be a written policy and the impact on EVMS.

- It doesn't allow tracking by actual costs of this labor (estimated to be 15% of all NOVA labor). Could track hours instead of costs, but aren't set up for this, and would require "2 sets of books."
- Dean is concerned about how the review committee will view this policy, especially since we believe we are the only lab to have this and documentation is not ideal.
- Steve also expressed concern on how collaborators would view this policy on upcoming Project X, since collaborators are expected to provide "free physicists" as part of their scope.
- EVMS documents are currently written to comply with the policy, and reference DOE/OHEP undated and unsigned memo.
- **Conclusion:** need Directorate guidance on how to proceed – Elaine to send email to Steve to prompt this.

Next meeting will be August 14th.