

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

ACTION ITEMS AS A RESULT OF THIS MEETING:

New Action Item	Assigned to
Include Oversight Committee on distribution for Core Team minutes	Elaine

Agenda and Presentation slides for this meeting can be found at http://www.fnal.gov/directorate/OPMO/Projectsns/EVMS/OversightMtg/2008/06_12/OCM.htm

Handouts: handouts for this meeting included the current EVMS schedule.

Dean provided **summary of Earned Value Management System (EVMS) history at Fermilab**, and then defined what EVM and EVMS is.

The **requirements for EVMS** usage come from the DOE O413.3, including the levels at which EVMS systems are required.

The requirements use the **ANSI/EIA-748-A/B** EVMS Standard and Intent Guide. The latter has 32 criteria against which reviewers judge systems to be compliant.

Dean confirmed that once Fermilab (or actually FRA) has a certified system this valid for all projects done at Fermilab, and if FRA would manage other laboratories, the system would be valid there, too.

Dean described the **two steps it takes to achieve a certified system:**

1. Develop and implement an FRA EVMS process, including a policy, system description, implementing procedures, and training
2. Go through the certification process with OECM, including one day review, full review, CAP, and followup review

Oversight Committee Meeting Minutes

Dean emphasized the length of the process, including 6 months from certification review and certification letter.

Question was asked about **how completing this process affects NOvA**. It has been agreed with DOE that there will be a certified system before NOvA receives CD-3b. The current schedule shows that certification would be achieved in early September 2009, which aligns with the NOvA schedule for CD-3b in late September 2009.

Dean presented **information about the Core Team**. Membership is from all across the lab, with folks who have project-related experience. Some impacts from staffing changes include TJ Sarlina leaving and Dale Knapp taking over his duties, reducing Dale's time on the team.

The Oversight Committee membership similarly represents a cross section of lab.

Dean noted that **other DOE labs have already been through reviews**, thus we are taking advantage of past documentation and experience as the Core Team develops documents.

Dean showed the MSP project **schedule key dates**, which were just updated the day before:
Documents ready for Readiness review – new date is 8 Oct 2008
Readiness Review – new date in 5 December 2008
Certification Review – new date 2 March 2009

Question of what if NOVA doesn't happen or is slowed down? Backup plan is to have DECam be the project demonstrating implementation of EVMS for the review.

Question of why not use a smaller project? There are no other smaller projects who are doing EVMS in this manner at Fermilab right now.

The **Oversight Committee role** is:

- represent lab and take info back to individual D/S
- guidance on process and documents being developed
- add'l level of review on documents

The **communication tools** being used are:

- Project webpage at <http://www.fnal.gov/directorate/OPMO/Projectsns/EVMS/home.htm>
- WelcomHome document database

It was agreed that OS committee on emails about core team meetings so that they could have information about progress.

The **Core Team, who has been working for about 2 months, has done the following:**

- Developed system description document, then are editing as procedures are being developed
- Using existing other lab documents and requirements documents to develop implementing procedures
- Procedure status was shown on slides

Oversight Committee Meeting Minutes

Discussion ensued about the review and who the reviewers are. It was noted that having 2 core team members (Bill and Dean) who have been reviewers at other lab's certification reviews gives us some insight into what's required. But it was also agreed that different reviewers will have different backgrounds and opinions and we can't prepare necessarily for that.

Dean outlined two pending issues that have come up in Core Team discussions and for which the team needs Oversight Committee decision on how to proceed. These were then discussed.

How to treat Collaborator effort:- as Fermilab labor or as Subcontractor M&S?

- Dean listed pros & cons of each approach
- Steve mentioned that the labor model gives more diagnosis tools, ability to see what's might be causing problems.
- Connee and Anne noted that accounting procedures at universities won't be able to report at even cost account levels, and that statusing issues are similar no matter what. Related to this, ideally would writing separate POs for each cost account if possible, but universities and other labs wouldn't like this since it creates more G&A costs, versus larger POs.
- Agreed that having the ability to produce effort graphs for DOE reviewers is important, and only by having it in the schedule can this be done.
- **Conclusion: use labor approach, not M&S approach**

Contingency versus Management Reserve: what terms should we be using?

- Dean described the conflicting definitions of these terms from DOE and ANSI
- Dean noted the meeting we had with some experienced project managers and core team members on this topic
- Management reserve essentially is what the project manager controls him/herself during the project without higher approvals. This is currently done on NOVA by having thresholds developed under which the Fermilab PM is able to draw on contingency without DOE approval, up to \$500k.
- Discussion ensued of how projects like Main Injector, NuMI, and CDF have worked in the past. DOE and Fermilab PM co-manage contingency, with thresholds as on NOVA. Connee noted that DOE doesn't actually hold back funds from the lab until contingency is requested, the funds are actually "given" to the lab and to the project each year. Therefore, DOE isn't actually managing contingency in that sense.
- **Conclusion: Agreed that using only "contingency" and thresholds as we have done in the past and are doing today is appropriate. Management reserve definition should be given in the documentation so that it's clear what we're intending in our system.**

Meetings & frequency:

- Monthly basis, estimate 6 to 8 in the future, Terry Erickson will set up
- May have ad hoc meetings in the future if issues are holding up progress on core team matters