

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

ACTION ITEMS AS A RESULT OF THIS MEETING:

New Action Item	Assigned to
In-progress Action Item	
Handling of spares in EVMS (not needed for certification process)	Core Team

Agenda and Presentation slides for this meeting can be found at http://www.fnal.gov/directorate/OPMO/Projectsns/EVMS/OversightMtg/2009/06_11/OCM.htm

Handouts: none

Dean presented information about the **Corrective Action Plan** submitted to OECM on May 29, and then the **OSC discussed each CAR and CIO**. Summary of the discussion is:

CAR1 CAP – NOVA has work by uncosted scientists for which there is no MOU, therefore the provision in the CAP for just adding an addendum to the MOU doesn't really work; also, there are hours in the RLS that are not yet assigned for future work, so no association with a particular institution. In general, getting MOU agreements with institutions is a concern.

CAR2 CAP – This corrective action is already being written by Bob April of OPMO.

CAR3 CAP - Computing Division has committed to implement FTL by Sept 1 for exempt employees, which satisfies this.

CIO2 – To respond to this CIO, the question is, is more training enough? Dean feels that may not be. Then what actions should be taken? OSC thinks this needs more discussion in other venues.

Oversight Committee Meeting Minutes

CIO3 – The contingency/MR slash term doesn't meet the ANSI standard. Core Team believes what we have at Fermilab is really MR, since it's in our pocket, to be used for risks. Core Team says we should define MR as ANSI does, but the contingency definition (from DOE O413, ANSI doesn't define contingency since the customer usually holds that) may be difficult. We will still have nomenclature issues, but the Core Team feel this is the minimum problematic path.

CIO4 - Getting signatures for materials by CAMS will be impossible to implement, as the automated system in receiving already does a 3 way match (\$ amount, goods received, ?). But this should work for services.

CIO5 – For changes to variance threshold \$ amount – should these be different? Discussions have leaned toward raising the cumulative level. Connee agrees that they shouldn't be the same. Ann says better to raise cum, because these are what really matter.

CIO6 – Notification of project team when baseline changes are made is already being done on NOVA, needs to find its way into the FRA documentation.

Issues/concerns

- Availability of resources – Suzanne not very available. This creates a tight time frame for implementing the corrective actions, as her participation is required.
- Trouble getting collaborating institutions to agree to report hours.
- When hours are reported, will we get only scientist hours? That's all we want now. But in the future could want all.
- Who are uncoded scientists? HR title or by function?
- Submitting target dates for CAP? Do we have what we need for this? Question is can we come up with legitimate process to collect and track hours in time, and get institutions to do this.

Next meeting would be 9 July, but not sure of what OSC's future is.