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Learning Objectives

- Understand the new DCMA automated & data driven EVMS surveillance process
- Understand the new OSD PARCA electronic data requirement
- Understand EVAS and the challenges your organization will need to overcome to ensure your EVMS is compliant
Agenda

- Introduction to DCMA Automated & Data Driven EVMS Surveillance
  - What is EVMS Surveillance?
  - Current vs. New Surveillance Processes
  - OSD PARCA and DCMA Joint Electronic Data Strategy
  - EVAS Metrics
- Contractor Challenges
  - Data Configuration
  - Toolset Implementation & Processes
  - Internal Surveillance & Training
  - Benefits of EVAS Implementation
Introduction to DCMA Automated & Data Driven EVMS Surveillance
What is EVMS Surveillance?

NDIA - Integrated Program Management Division (IPMD) Surveillance Guide defines the following goals of an Earned Value Management System (EVMS) surveillance process:

1. Ensure that the organization’s EVMS has been effectively implemented in accordance with the organization’s EVMS documentation
2. Ensure the EVMS provides timely, accurate, and reliable integrated project management information for internal and customer use
3. Assess the project’s commitment and ability to maintain and use its EVMS as an integral part of its project management process

*It’s not a validation review or integrated baseline review - but uses the EIA-748 32 Guidelines and EVMSIG as a roadmap to conduct surveillance*
EIA-748 EVM Guidelines Overview

1) Define Work Scope (WBS)
2) Define Organization (OBS)
3) Integrate Subsystems
4) Identify Overhead Control
5) Integrate WBS & OBS
6) Schedule Work
7) Set Measurement Indicators
8) Set Time-Phased Budget
9) Budget by Cost Elements
10) Discrete Work Packages
11) Summary Work/Planning Pkg
12) Identify LOE Activities
13) Establish Overhead Budgets
14) Identify MR and UB
15) Reconcile to Target Cost
16) Record Direct Costs
17) Summarize into WBS
18) Summarize into OBS
19) Record Indirect Costs
20) Identify Unit & Lot Costs
21) Track & Report Material Costs
22) Calculate SV & CV
23) Identify Significant Variances
24) Analyze Indirect CV
25) Summarize Data & Variances
26) Implement Corrective Actions
27) Revise Estimate at Completion
28) Incorporate Change
29) Reconcile Budgets
30) Control Retroactive Changes
31) Prevent Unauthorized Change
32) Document PMB Changes

EIA-748 Compliant EVMS
- Organizing
- Planning & Scheduling
- Accounting
- Analyzing
- Revising
- DoD High Risk Guideline
Top DCMA Guidelines reporting the highest deficiencies or non compliance

- **Guideline 6:** Schedule the authorized work in a manner which describes the sequence of work and identifies significant task interdependencies required to meet the requirements of the program.

- **Guideline 10:** To the extent it is practical to identify the authorized work in discrete work packages, establish budgets for this work in terms of dollars, hours, or other measurable units. Where the entire control account is not subdivided into work packages, identify the far term effort in larger planning packages for budget and scheduling purposes.

- **Guideline 16:** Record direct costs in a manner consistent with the budgets in a formal system controlled by the general books of account.

- **Guideline 27:** Develop revised estimates of cost at completion based on performance to date, commitment values for material, and estimates of future conditions. Compare this information with the performance measurement baseline to identify variances at completion important to company management and any applicable customer reporting requirements including statements of funding requirements.

*Source, Shane Olsen, DCMA Presentation NDIA Meeting April 2016*
Current Surveillance Process

What projects are subject to DCMA Surveillance?

• Projects with EVM reporting requirement > $100M
• Projects identified for surveillance by the government program office
• Projects deemed to be high risk by the DCMA or stakeholders

Internal vs. External Surveillance:

• **Internal:** Contractor should have a process to ensure its EVMS continues to meet the guidelines and is used correctly on all applicable contracts

• **External:** DCMA is responsible for external surveillance which includes regularly scheduled (i.e. once per quarter) on-site surveillance with pre-defined EIA-748 EVMS guidelines targeted for review. The primary focus is on high risk guidelines
Current Surveillance Process (cont.)

Process flow represents BDO’s interpretation of the major interactions between DCMA and the contractor in the surveillance process.

*An onsite surveillance review typically includes interviews with Control Account Managers (CAMs), data traces on EVM artifacts, and review of related documentation.
Data Request

Data Request may include:

- Contractual documentation
- EVMS Documentation and supporting work instructions
- Project Management Plan and EVM Plan
- Subcontractor Management Plan and SOWs
- Risk and Opportunity Management Plans
- WBS and WBS Dictionary
- Org Chart and OBS
- IMP and/or IMS
- BOM and ODC Logs
- Basis of Estimates
- Responsibility Assignment Matrix
- Control Account Plans
- Work Authorization Documents
- Schedule Status Sheets
- Estimate to Complete Documentation
- Quantifiable Backup Data
- Schedule Risk and Health Analyses and Reports
- CAS Disclosure Statement
- Indirect cost policies and procedures
- Charge Number Matrix
- Actual Cost Reports
- Timekeeping Reports
- Subcontractor Invoices
- Documented Reporting Thresholds
- CPRs / IPMRs
- Direct and Indirect Rate Variance Analysis Documents
- Comprehensive EAC Documentation
- Contract Funds Status Report
- Corrective Action Log
- Baseline Change Requests
- Program Baseline Log
- Other related system audit reports and findings
New Surveillance Process

What projects are subject to Surveillance?

- Projects with EVM reporting requirement > $100M
- Projects identified for surveillance by the government program office
- Projects deemed to be high risk by the DCMA or stakeholders

DCMA is looking to modernize contractor oversight methods and practices to maximize effectiveness and create a standard benchmark, while simultaneously reducing costs

- Designed to streamline compliance oversight by generating a set of data tests and thresholds by which to adjudicate acceptable risk
- Facilitates the identification of high-risk contracts through an objective, automated process that allows for joint resolution of issues as they occur
- Contracts identified as high-risk are subject to a DCMA surveillance review
New Surveillance Process (cont.)

• The data-centric approach utilizes 131 metrics that:
  • Align directly to specific attributes or intent of the EIA 748 Guidelines
  • Include automated measures that run monthly as well as manual tests metrics set at variable frequencies

• DCMA will focus on:
  • Red metrics - data that trips the thresholds
  • Trending - Metrics that are tripped month over month
  • Communication - Information learned through exchanges with the contractor can be saved from one period to the next so issues are not repeated

Good News - if you can get the data right and automate the process, it should alleviate the need for costly data requests and onsite surveillance
Timeline and Next Steps

- This new approach to surveillance is expected to be implemented in CY 2018:
  - Piloted at five contractor locations to establish, test, and validate metrics/thresholds
  - Go-live metrics were published in March 2017
- May - August 2017 will focus on the EVMS guideline/process testing protocols
  - Establish metric testing guidance
  - Establish metric follow-up procedures
- Regardless of DCMA’s EVAS tool availability, DCMA will migrate to the new test metrics in January 2018

Source, DCMA Presentation EVM World 2017

Pilot sites have reported they have been requested to begin providing EVAS data
New Surveillance Process Flow

Process flow represents BDO’s interpretation of the major interactions between DCMA and the contractor in the surveillance process.

*Government can request onsite visits for programs identified as high risk through this process*
DCMA and PARCA Joint Electronic Data Strategy

• DCMA has currently configured their EVAS software to accept the UN/CEFACT XML files submitted to the PARCA EVM Central Repository (EVM-CR) requirements
• However, there is an ongoing effort to develop a file format (JSON) that allows for single source data analysis to meet DCMA surveillance and PARCA EVM-CR requirements
• Currently referred to as the IPMR2, PARCA’s newly proposed electronic data will be presented in the JSON format, a machine-readable representation of the data described in the current IPMR Formats
• The EVM-CR allows for the following:
  • Data quality validation status reports
  • Review of compliance reports real time
  • Access to view and download all files delivered by corporate Data Managers
### JSON IPMR Contract Performance Dataset

#### Overview

**Data Tables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worksheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPMR Format 7 Template</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version 1.0-alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worksheets:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Configuration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Metadata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Costs (Dollars)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Entities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Breakdown Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. Breakdown Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Accounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Packages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCWS (To Date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCWP (To Date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACWP (To Date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCWS (To Complete)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EST (To Complete)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reprogramming Adjustments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exchange Standard**

**File Format**

The file format for an IPMR Format 7 is a ZIP file containing multiple text files. One text file conveys type and version information. All the other text files convey data represented in JSON. Each JSON file corresponds to a single data table.

**ZIP File Entries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FileType.txt</td>
<td>[N/A]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ReportConfiguration.json</td>
<td>ReportConfiguration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ReportMetadata.json</td>
<td>ReportMetadata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SummaryCosts.json</td>
<td>SummaryCosts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PerformingEntities.json</td>
<td>PerformingEntities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBS.json</td>
<td>WBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBS.json</td>
<td>OBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ControlAccounts.json</td>
<td>ControlAccounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WorkPackages.json</td>
<td>WorkPackages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ReportingCalendar.json</td>
<td>ReportingCalendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCWS_ToDate.json</td>
<td>BCWS_ToDate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCWP_ToDate.json</td>
<td>BCWP_ToDate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACWP_ToDate.json</td>
<td>ACWP_ToDate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCWS_ToComplete.json</td>
<td>BCWS_ToComplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EST_ToComplete.json</td>
<td>EST_ToComplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ReprogrammingAdjustments.json</td>
<td>ReprogrammingAdjustments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conventions**

**Text File Encoding**

Unless otherwise noted, all text files must be encoded in UTF-8.

**Text Normalization**

Unless otherwise noted, interpretation of text fields must include the following implicit normalization: whitespace must be removed from the beginning and end of the text, each whitespace character must be replaced by a space character (U+0020), and each sequence of space characters must be replaced by a single character.
# JSON IPMR Contract Performance Dataset - Work Package Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>WorkPackages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entity</strong></td>
<td>WorkPackage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fields</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Data Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IsPlanningPackage</td>
<td>Boolean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>String</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>String</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BaselineStartDate</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BaselineEndDate</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ForecastStartDate</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ForecastEndDate</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ActualStartDate</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ActualEndDate</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EarnedValueTechniqueID</td>
<td>String</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OtherEarnedValueTechnique</td>
<td>String</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ControlAccountID</td>
<td>String</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Primary Key**
- ID

**Foreign Keys**
- EarnedValueTechniqueID: EarnedValueTechniqueEnum(ID)
- ControlAccountID: ControlAccount(ID)

**Use Constraints**
- If omitted, the IsPlanningPackage field has a default value of False.
- OtherEarnedValueTechnique must be null unless EarnedValueTechniqueID has a value of OTHER.
### Sample Automated Metrics

Refers to the EIA-748 guidelines that the metric is testing.

#### Guideline 10
- To the extent it is practicable to identify the authorized work in discrete work packages, establish budgets for this work in terms of dollars, hours, or other measurable units.
- Where the entire control account is not subdivided into work packages, identify the far term effort in larger planning packages for budget and scheduling purposes.

#### Guideline 11
- Provide that the sum of all work package budgets plus planning package budgets within a control account equals the control account budget.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Count</th>
<th>Test Metric Count</th>
<th>Unique Test Metric IC</th>
<th>Reviwed?</th>
<th>Attribute ID</th>
<th>Current Template Revision</th>
<th>Test Metric Rev Date</th>
<th>Test Steps</th>
<th>Test Metric Numerator (X)</th>
<th>Test Metric Denominator (Y)</th>
<th>Metric Threshold</th>
<th>Min Freq</th>
<th>Artifacts</th>
<th>Test Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10A3024</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>10A3</td>
<td>v3.0</td>
<td>23-Mar-17</td>
<td>Have PPs incurred actual costs?</td>
<td>$X = \text{Count of PPs with } \text{ACWP}_{\text{SUM}}$</td>
<td>$Y = \text{Total count of PPs}$</td>
<td>$X/Y \leq 2%$</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10A3025</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>10A3</td>
<td>v3.0</td>
<td>23-Mar-17</td>
<td>Have PPs earned performance?</td>
<td>$X = \text{Count of PPs with } \text{BCWP}_{\text{SUM}}$</td>
<td>$Y = \text{Total count of PPs}$</td>
<td>$X/Y \leq 2%$</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10A3085</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>10A5</td>
<td>v3.0</td>
<td>28-Mar-17</td>
<td>Do all PPs have duration?</td>
<td>$X = \text{Count of PPs with baseline duration}$</td>
<td>$Y = \text{Total count of PPs}$</td>
<td>$X/Y \leq 10%$</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>11A1018</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>11A12</td>
<td>v3.0</td>
<td>28-Mar-17</td>
<td>For all IAs, does the BAC value for the CA equal to the sum of the WP and PP budgets within the CA?</td>
<td>$X = \text{Sum of the absolute values of } (\text{CA BAC} - \text{the sum of its WP and PP budgets})$</td>
<td>$Y = \text{Total program BAC}$</td>
<td>$X/Y \leq 1%$</td>
<td>P-IBR</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Test Metric Specification

## EVMS Test Metric Specification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10A302a</td>
<td>Automated</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Attribute:**
   10A3: Planning packages have the following characteristics:
   - Are the logical aggregations of work within a control account, normally the far-term effort that can be identified, budgeted, and time-phased in baseline planning, but cannot yet be detail-planned into work packages.

6. **Test Step:**
   - Have PPs incurred actual costs?

7. **Test Metric:**
   \[ X = \text{Count of PPs with ACWP}_{\text{CPM}} \]
   \[ Y = \text{Total count of PPs} \]

8. **Metric Threshold:**
   \[ X/Y \leq 2\% \]

9. **UN/CEFACT Required DEI(s):**

10. **Data Elements Required:**
    - EV Cost Tool Data
    - ACWP<sub>CPM</sub>
    - AT Planning Package UIDs

11. **Assumptions:**
    - ACWP<sub>CPM</sub> is collected at the WP/PP level

12. **Instruction:**
    1. Identify and count the total number of PPs; this is the denominator (Y) of the test metric.
    2. Identify and count PPs that have incurred actual costs (ACWP<sub>CPM</sub> is not zero); this is the numerator (X) of the test metric.
    3. Calculate the test metric (Block 7): X divided by Y.
    4. If the result is within the threshold (Block 8), the metric passes.

13. **Numerator Code**

14. **Denominator Code**

---

Details of each test metric is published so that there is a common understanding of the test and associated thresholds.
### Sample Manual Metrics

Refers to the EIA-748 guidelines that the metric is testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric ID</th>
<th>Authorize Work Elements</th>
<th>Test Steps</th>
<th>Test Metric Rev Date</th>
<th>Test Metric</th>
<th>Test Metric Numerator (X)</th>
<th>Test Metric Denominator (Y)</th>
<th>Metric Threshold</th>
<th>Min Freq</th>
<th>Artifacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01A101a</td>
<td>Define the authorized work elements for the program. A Work Breakdown Structure (WBS), tailored for effective internal management control, is commonly used in this process.</td>
<td>23-Mar-17</td>
<td>X = Occurrence of a WBS that is not product-oriented</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X = 0</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>08, 20</td>
<td>38, 46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01A201a</td>
<td>Identify the program organizational structure, including the major subcontractors, responsible for accomplishing the authorized work, and define the organizational elements in which work will be planned and controlled.</td>
<td>23-Mar-17</td>
<td>X = Count of sampled SOW paragraphs identifying scope that are not in the WBS</td>
<td>Y = Total count of sampled SOW paragraphs identifying scope</td>
<td>X/Y ≤ 5%</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>09, 11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02A101a</td>
<td>Provide for the integration of the planning, scheduling, budgeting, work authorization and cost accumulation processes with each other, and as appropriate, the program work breakdown structure and the program organizational structure.</td>
<td>23-Mar-17</td>
<td>X = Count of mismatches between the program organizational breakdown</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>X = 0</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>07, 20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02A201a</td>
<td></td>
<td>23-Mar-17</td>
<td>X = Count of major subcontractors and intra-organizational elements with an EVMS DFARS clause flow down requirement identified in the OBS reporting requirements in Format 2</td>
<td>Y = Total count of major subcontractors and intra-organizational elements with an EVMS DFARS clause flow down requirement</td>
<td>X/Y ≤ 5%</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>09, 11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview of EVAS Tools

DCMA Solution:
• DCMA has awarded a contract for the development of an EVAS tool that will perform analysis against the test metrics
• Metrics are currently being coded into the tool but delayed due to IT freeze
• Demo of tool at EVM World 2017 demonstrated capabilities to identify breaches in thresholds, analyze metric trending information, and capture notes/resolutions from ongoing communication

Deltek Acumen EVAS Solution for Internal Surveillance
• Import cost engine, schedule, and work authorization (optional) data into Internal EVAS solution for analysis against the 131 metrics
• Review any metrics which have breached the prescribed thresholds
• Implement data corrections as required before sending data to DCMA
Contractor Challenges
Contractor Challenges

Data Configuration

- Integrating data from multiple sources for analysis
- Automating metrics when possible through coding of EVM data

Toolset Implementation & Processes

- Reviewing the metrics in an automated manner requires the implementation of a new toolset
- Processes must be reviewed and updated to account for new tools and execution of internal surveillance

Internal Surveillance & Training

- Contractors should perform internal surveillance and review data quality prior to monthly submissions
- Requires qualified resources readily available to address the new data requirements and assess any potential risks before you submit your data to the DCMA
Data Configuration

- Metrics look for inconsistencies across schedule, EV data, and work authorization data.
- Automate as many of the manual tests as possible but it requires that the data is integrated first.
  1. Schedule data
  2. EVM engine data
  3. Work Authorization Document Data
- Need a unifying identifier such as WBS/OBS or Unique ID.
Automating Metrics Example

### EVMS Test Metric Specification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Guideline No:</th>
<th>2. Unique Test Metric ID:</th>
<th>3. Test Type:</th>
<th>4. Frequency:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>06A101a</td>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5. Attribute:**

06A1: The planning, scheduling, budgeting, work authorization and cost accumulation systems are integrated with each other via a common coding structure and, as appropriate, with the Contract Work Breakdown Structure (CWBS) and the Organizational Breakdown Structure (OBS) at Control Account (at a minimum) through the total contract level.

**6. Test Step:**

Is control account data traceable between system artifacts including schedule, cost data, and work authorization documents?

- Do baseline dates align between the work authorization documentation (WAD) and IMS? (count)

**7. Test Metric:**

\[ \frac{X}{Y} \]  

- **X** = Count of sampled incomplete CAs with IMS baseline dates outside the WAD POP
- **Y** = Total count of sampled incomplete CAs in IMS

**8. Metric Threshold:**

\[ X \leq Y \leq 5\% \]

**9. UN/CEFACT Required DE(s):**

- 09 Work Authorization Documentation (WAD)
  - 09C Baseline Finish
  - 09D Baseline Start
- 11 Integrated Master Schedule (IMS)
  - 11G Baseline Finish
  - 11J Baseline Start

**10. Data Elements Required:**

- 09 Work Authorization Document (WAD)
  - 09C Baseline Finish
  - 09D Baseline Start
- 11 Integrated Master Schedule (IMS)
  - 11G Baseline Finish
  - 11J Baseline Start

**11. Assumptions:**

1. Test metric is based on a sample of incomplete CAs
2. If BAC and BCWP are within $100 (1 hour), then CA is complete

**12. Instructions:**

1. Identify a sample of incomplete CAs in the IMS; this is the denominator (Y) of the metric.
2. Identify the baseline start and baseline finish dates in the WADs for the sampled CAs.
3. Compare the baseline start and the baseline finish dates for each incomplete CA between the WAD and the IMS.
4. Count each instance where at least one of the baseline dates (baseline start, baseline finish, or both) is outside the WAD POP in the IMS; this is the numerator (X) of the metric.
5. Calculate the test metric (Block 7): \( \frac{X}{Y} \)
6. If the result is within the threshold (Block 8), the metric passes.

**13. Numerator Code**

**14. Denominator Code**

Currently Manual, done Quarterly, and on a sample of Control Accounts in the IMS. Can be automated, monthly, and across all elements if IMS and WAD data is integrated.
Additional Coding and Data Improvements

- Tag Control Accounts and Summary Level Planning Packages
- Tag Work Packages and Planning Packages
- Identify Elements of Cost
- Flag recurring costs
- Identify the Performing Entity
Toolset Implementation & Processes

- Metrics are all based on relatively simple math calculations that *could* be in excel. However, this introduces additional risk:
  - Hand calculation errors
  - Increased timeline to complete analysis
  - Smaller sample size - DCMA may select different WBS elements for their analysis
  - Lack of trending data which DCMA will use in their EVAS tool
  - Limited drill-down capabilities for root cause analysis
- Desk guides and training will be necessary to support new tools or even existing tools with new functionality
internal surveillance & training

- DCMA recommends that government contractors use the Earned Value Analysis System (EVAS) metrics for internal analysis before submission to the government - the metrics cover all 32 EIA-748 guidelines
- Internal surveillance processes may need to be revisited to allow for time to review EVAS test metrics
- Requires qualified resources readily available to address the new data requirements and perform internal surveillance on test metrics
Benefits of EVAS Implementation

• Improve EVMS processes and systems, enhancing project performance management

• Develop your organizations internal surveillance capability to analyze your project information versus the DCMA EVAS metrics before the information is submitted to the government

• Avoid additional document requests and DCMA surveillance by delivering compliant data