Voting Attendees

Tim Anderson, Kellie Benefiel, Dave Brown, Carol Dekkers, Steve Glogoza, Rich Hartley, Bob Hunt, Brent Johnstone, Jennifer Kirchhoffer, Mike Lionais, Arlene Minkiewicz, Cari Pullen, Sanath Rajagopal, Wendy Robello (via Shevlin Proxy), Jennifer Scheel, Christian Smart (via Alstead Proxy), Christina Snyder, Madeleine Teller

Non-voting Attendees:

Jen Alstead, Kevin Cincotta, Chris Massey, Cassidy Shevlin, Sharon Burger, Megan Jones

Welcome, quorum count, introductions: Christina Snyder

Christina expects lively discussion on the many topics on today's agenda and reminds everyone not to use the chat function on Zoom to make comments that are relevant to the meeting or should otherwise be included in the minutes. The quorum is established, and the meeting begins at 11:06 am.

Secretary Report: Arlene Minkiewicz

No comments or edits were suggested for the January 2024 minutes either in advance of the meeting or during.

Vote: Motion is raised to approve the January 2024 minutes. No further discussion is requested. Seconded and passed.

Treasurer Report:

Madeleine Teller

Financial data for the first quarter of 2024 has not been made available since the last meeting, so the financial report for March 2024 is limited. Financial statements will be presented at the May meeting.

Vote: Motion is raised to approve the March 2024 treasurers report. No further discussion is requested. Seconded and passed.

2024 Workshop U	pdate	Jennifer Scheel

Jennifer presents slides, thanks the 2024 Workshop Committee for all of their hard work. Sponsorships are selling well, and our new offering to bundle additional registrations with sponsorships seems popular. Based on registration data from previous years and the number of registrations to date, attendance is projected to be at around 440. This estimate is conservative considering we exceeded it last year, but a safe estimate that is justifiable with data.

Revenue projections were calculated by totaling average expenses for the past few years (leaning to the expensive side to allow for inflation), determining the average weighted registration cost in 2023, and anticipated sponsorship. With attendance of 440, the Workshop is expected to net approximately \$150K in revenue for 2024.

Jennifer K. asks what the "break even" registration total is. Megan says she could calculate it accurately, but hasn't done so, since if ICEAA were to simply break even on the Workshop, the association would not survive. Breaking even on the Workshop is not an option. However, it would be useful to know what the revenue total would need to be for the Workshop for ICEAA as a whole to break even for 2024. Jennifer reiterates that we are being very conservative with our estimates this year.

The Cost Challenge will be returning for 2024. Team signup was announced, and all six spots have been claimed (had to close the registration of teams), but the challenge details will still be held until April 15 to limit the available time teams can work on the challenge. This year's challenge will be more data-analysis focused than the 2023 challenge but will still contain an open-ended question that will allow for creative responses. The winning team will be announced Thursday morning this year, and that team will have the option to give their presentation as a breakout session later in the day –this is not an absolute but a possibility if the team is open to it.

The 2024 OEM Forum & Networking Event will be held on Monday, May 13 from 3-5pm. Planning for the OEM Forum is well underway, and 22 attendees have RSVP'd as of March 4.

The ICEAA room block is available until April 10 or until it sells out, **whichever comes first**. If you have not yet booked your hotel room, do so immediately, as hotel room rates are very high and once our block sells out, additional rooms will not be made available. Also keep in mind the rooms in our government per-diem block are reserved for actual government employees.

ICEAA has negotiated a discounted ticket rate at Target Field for the Wednesday, May 15 baseball game between the New York Yankees and the Minnesota Twins. Tickets are available for purchase through a link on the ICEAA website.

And finally, the early bird rates will be ending on April 1, be sure to register for the Workshop before rates go up by \$200 on April 2.

Professional Development Ut	odate	Jennifer Kirchhoffer

Jennifer presents slides. While CCEA certifications are down, PCEAs are up, so overall certification rates are stable.

Christina asks since we're doing CEBoK training at the Workshop, will we be holding an inperson proctored exam? Last year we offered a proctored exam, but only one person took advantage of it. Given the ease of taking the exam online, we expect most to choose to take it online, but will monitor requests if a need to hold a live exam arises. Jennifer says we will have room to hold study sessions should individuals have specific questions.

Looking at certification history, there are some peak years where we had high numbers of certifications. Jennifer and Sharon will investigate what may have caused these peak years to see if we can repeat. She also plans to start tracking both certification renewals and lapses going forward.

Jennifer adjusted the pass rate graph to track success rates by exam but also by individual, counting only the passing exam in cases where individuals took it more than once.

Last board meeting we discussed exam fee policies for those who pay for but either never take the exam or wait a very long time to take their exam. Before the exams went online and more labor was involved, a policy was published on the website providing a timeline for rescheduling exams that has worked well and already allows for the grace period that the board was concerned about. A question was also raised at the last meeting whether fraud

could happen should ICEAA refund someone other than the original payor; all refunds are sent directly to the original payor, so this is not an issue. Individuals also have the option to transfer their exam fees to another member (though it has never been used). Jennifer and Sharon believe that the existing policy on the website covers all the concerns discussed in January and suggest we continue to implement it.

Jennifer asks Dave Brown for a quick report on the updates to CEBoK Module 6. Dave says progress has been slow since the last meeting, but updates continue, and he intends to share the results of the update at the Minneapolis Workshop for feedback. What Dave has been spending time on is an analysis of ICEAA's membership data and Workshop attendance data.

Jennifer would like to solicit members at the Workshop in May to volunteer to begin updating CEBoK Module 5, Inflation/Escalation.

For CEBoK-S, Sanath reports that the content update working group missed their last meeting, but progress continues.

Jennifer raises the question of experience-based certifications but would like Sharon to take part in that discussion (absent today) during the board meeting in May.

Discussions are ongoing about the feasibility of translating CEBoK into French.

ICEAA is working to host a joint workshop with SCAF in London for fall 2024, and SCAF has requested we host CEBoK training there. We will be planning this over the summer.

	Software SIG Performance Metrics	Christina Snyd	ler
--	----------------------------------	----------------	-----

Christina presents slides. Having recently reviewed the Software SIG charter approved by the board last year, she noted there is a clause that states ICEAA will provide the SIG with minimum standard performance criteria on an annual basis, and realized ICEAA has failed to provide the SIG with the guidance promised in the charter. As president, Christina believes the purpose of the Software SIG is to assist in maintaining CEBoK-S and promote training and the SCEC certification. She provides a rough outline of what those performance criteria should cover, including market research, identifying target audiences, budgeting, coordination with CEBOK-S principle on training, content, modifications and marketing. Christina asks the board for thoughts.

Jennifer K. says this is a great start and providing guidance to the SIG is an excellent idea. Madeleine adds as treasurer that clearly stating requirements will allow for useful reporting and effective budgetary planning. Sanath agrees the criteria are a good start, and can of course be adjusted as necessary, but setting goals for the SIG will be helpful. Tim also agrees.

Bob has also provided some draft criteria for board discussion. Bob has gone into deeper detail, but also encourages board contribution. The criteria reference the Software SIG draft marketing plan, which was included in the pre-read and is on the day's agenda. Bob reads through the draft criteria and reminds the board these are merely recommendations and are not final. Christina thanks Bob for the suggestions.

Bob provided an estimated target CEBoK-S sales goal in the draft SIG criteria of 50 copies per year: 20 sales from individuals in the US, 10 from Europe, and 20 from Asia. Christina asks the board if they think this is an attainable goal. Jennifer K. thinks 50 is an impressively ambitious goal and would be delighted if it could be achieved. Bob says the estimate was a complete guess and is open to discussion. He also does not expect the board to make a determination on the criteria today, but advises that the board should create the criteria in such a way as to encourage the Software SIG to excel. Madeleine says even if the goal of 50 copies isn't met, it becomes a benchmark against which future goals can be set, we can investigate why or why not the goals weren't met and adjust as necessary.

Dave raises a strategic long-term question: competition for continuing education and professional development is fierce, having intensified with the shift to virtual learning post-pandemic. Multi-week online courses that provide an immediate certificate upon completion are common. These systems are also secured to prevent pirating, as well as to collect data on the users. He understands it would take a significant investment to get our training in a model like this, but he believes our current training model is behind the curve and it will only get more difficult for us to catch up.

Christina agrees that the generational approach to training has shifted towards online selfpaced courses, but that in-person attendance at the Workshop has been the primary revenue source that has kept ICEAA in business for years, and our efforts need to be focused on encouraging more attendance at the Workshop to get more revenue to invest in our products.

Bob has seen the shift to online learning happen in corporate training, and suggests ICEAA form a working group to discuss how ICEAA can better train our members on both CEBoK and CEBoK-S.

Dave believes adding more online training will not detract from Workshop attendance but encourage new members and reach new audiences. He thinks the up-front expense would be made up by increased attendance, and we could coordinate with universities to help distribute our training.

Sanath suggests considering the SIG criteria as a KPI: a goal to work toward that will either prove to be attainable or show us reasons why it was not. Regarding market penetration, there are many software-related trainings available, but ours is the only one focused on software cost estimation, so we need to create the demand for our product. He believes the key to reaching the European market is to explain to companies that the reason their budgets have overrun is because they did not have the proper software estimation training that we can provide, and investing in it will prevent the issue going forward. He has been using this approach with companies in the UK and the UK Ministry of Defence already.

Jennifer K. points out the difference between most training programs and ICEAA's is that we have created a body of knowledge from which someone can extract a training session, where other programs sell the training material through specified vendors. Companies accustomed to the other training approach us and want to sell the use of our IP using their pricing model. Since many ICEAA companies provide training as part of their solutions, ICEAA's training program essentially competes with its own members. How does ICEAA best protect our IP and products while encouraging others to support and grow the community?

Sanath is concerned that the Asian market may not be prepared for CEBoK-S, as he believes the Asian market wouldn't be advanced enough to benefit from CEBoK, let alone the more in-depth CEBoK-S. He suggests working with groups in Asia to find out whether interest exists.

Carol echoes earlier comments that it is a "chicken and egg" situation, where we have a product that we want to sell but don't know who to sell it to. She suggests working with groups like PMI and IFPUG to encourage participation, or with groups like the Federal Cost Estimating Leadership Alliance that's on the agenda later. If we can influence the government to make ICEAA certifications part of their requirements, the demand will appear

in the US and then other markets will follow. Mike agrees with Carol, having had a similar experience in Canada.

Carol suggests extracting a small portion of CEBoK or CEBoK-S and submitting it to the IEEE for publishing as an industry standard.

Christina thanks the board for a lively discussion and reiterates she does not expect a final decision today, especially given the short notice from the pre-read. She would like to schedule another board meeting before our meeting in May to determine the Software SIG Performance Criteria so that we may vote on the criteria in May.

Kellie has some concerns about specifics in the Software SIG Marketing Plan/performance criteria draft, particularly the request for \$2,000 for a 2-minute video and suggests savings can be seen if we combine that video recording with another. Overall, she warns that we need to consider the cost/benefit of the actions of the SIG.

Space SIG Funds

Bob Hunt

Bob presents slides. After the merger of ISPA and SCEA into ICEAA, a new group focused on space systems estimating, SSCAG, was formed. The group ran successfully for many years and accumulated funds. When SSCAG was looking to disband, they approached ICEAA to form the ICEAA Space SIG, but SSCAG did not transfer their funds to ICEAA but kept them in a member's personal bank account. The money changed hands a few times and ended up in Bob's bank account and is now \$14,728. Having gotten approval from the former SSCAG members, he would like to donate those funds to ICEAA with specific intentions for its use (rather than being deposited into the general fund), ideally for the Software SIG.

Tim adds that there was a Space SIG meeting at the Workshop in San Antonio, attended by about 6 individuals, where they discussed ideas of what projects the Space SIG could work on. Tim believes the money is insufficient for revitalizing the Space SIG, but enough that it shouldn't go to waste.

Bob asks the board for their guidance on what to do with the \$14,728. Megan has confirmed with ICEAA's accountants that we can accept the money as a donation (but the donor cannot claim a tax deduction for it).

Christina thanks Bob for his integrity and willingness to contribute. She agrees that the funds would make the most impact if the Board gives specific direction for their use. She likes the idea of approaching the members of the Space SIG to see if they have an idea for how the funds could best benefit them. Kellie agrees, suggesting we come up with a few options for the funds and allowing the board or even the membership to vote on it.

Christina asks Tim and Bob for names of ICEAA members who were involved in the Space SIG or those who might be interested that she can contact for their feedback on the fund use. Bob says he tried to reach out to all the Space SIG members and got no response. Dave says he would be interested in being involved with the Space SIG but was not a part of SSCAG. Dave suggests using the funds to create a space system estimating module for CEBoK. Bob thinks updating the Space System Cost Guide would be a good start.

Christina notes the recent growth of the U.S. Space Force, so increasing our offerings for space-focused estimators would be a good idea. Dave says Space Force utilizes AFIT training, which features a space system estimating course. Carol asks if the Space Force has been invited to the Federal Cost Estimating Leadership Alliance, which Christina uses as a segway to the next agenda item.

Tim suggests the board vote to accept the funds from Bob now so he can get rid of the money, then give the Board time to determine what to do with it. Bob agrees. Madeleine agrees but wants a time limit set that if the funds are not dedicated after a certain amount of time, they are freely usable by ICEAA. Tim agrees.

Vote: A motion is raised to accept the \$14,728 from Bob at his convenience, and that ICEAA will vote on a plan for what to do with the funds by the May 2025 Workshop or those funds will be moved to the ICEAA general fund. No further discussion is requested. Seconded and passed.

Federal Cost Estimating	g Leadership Alliance	Chris Massey

Christina thanks Washington Capital Area Chapter President Chris Massey for his initiative and efforts in spearheading this idea. She encourages all members to pass ideas along to the board that they believe will be beneficial to the membership and will always encourage more volunteer participation.

Christina shows slides outlining the Federal Cost Estimating Leadership Alliance (FCELA) and invites Chris to explain the draft charter. Chris thanks everyone for their time. The

Washington Capital Area Chapter (WCAC) had noticed that due to their proximity to various government headquarters, they were uniquely positioned to encourage more federal government employees to join and encourage more government participation. The chapter had found that despite their advantages, government employees only make up about 20% of the chapter's members and wanted to figure out ways to promote or get buy-in from those individuals' employers. The idea is a benefit to all of ICEAA and does not need to be limited to a chapter activity. Chris has begun reaching out to some of these organizations and the response has been positive. He believes that once a few join the club, others will be more enticed to follow.

Christina thanks Chris and WCAC Vice President Courtney Gray for their hard work. She mentions that the executive committee had some early conversations about a similar idea, and hopes that Bob and Kellie, who had initiated those conversations to support Chris in the effort. Christina would like the board to vote to approve starting the FCELA and recommends Chris Massey serve as its first chairperson. Kellie supports the idea, would like to be involved, and suggests it be a role for the Executive Vice President, a position that does not have defined responsibilities. Dave suggests also having an ICEAA board member who is also a government employee serve on the FCELA.

Christina asks Chris for more details on the individuals he has contacted already. Chris explains that he has been focusing on organizations rather than individuals, since individuals can change positions and we will want the connection to remain constant. He proposes setting guidelines for who should participate asking the organizations to appoint their representatives.

Cari volunteers to help Chris connect with AFCAA and/or the Air Force, Dave has suggestions from Space Force. Chris is concerned about the group getting too large and hopes to keep it limited to 20 members.

Christina would like the board to vote today to allow Chris to continue to pursue the initiative but wants to edit the charter before voting on it in May.

Vote: A motion is raised for the board to approve the formation of the Federal Cost Estimating Leadership Alliance, that Chris Massey will lead the initiative, and that the board will revise and vote on the FCELA charter at the May 2024 board meeting. No further discussion is requested. Seconded and passed.

New Business, Plan Next Meeting & Adjourn

Christina Snyder

Mike mentions a call he had with Christina, Megan, and Jennifer K. to discuss translating CEBoK into French, and the idea of applying for a grant (or contribution in Canadian terms) from either the Canadian government or Province of Ontario was raised. Mike and some members in Canada will investigate the option.

The Canada Chapter is also working to reestablish their board and is beginning to plan a halfday workshop in Ottawa in the fall to help revitalize the chapter. Christina thanks and applauds Mike for bringing these ideas to us and working to develop the chapter.

The board will hold a working meeting on **Friday**, **April 5 from 11am-1pm** to compile comments on and finalize: the Software SIG Performance Metrics, the Software SIG Marketing Plan, and edits to the charter for the FCELA.

Dave would like to talk with Mike about how Canada attracted so many government employees, and also at some point discuss with the board how to encourage membership from government employees whose companies do not pay their dues. Christina adds this topic to the agenda for April 5.

Sanath would also like to discuss the experience-based certification topic at the April 5 meeting, Christina adds it to the agenda.

Megan would like to finalize the schedule for our May meeting at the Workshop. Since many of our board members will be involved in the OEM Forum & Networking Event on Monday, May 13 from 3-5, she suggests we hold the meeting from 9-2 so that those board members can attend both. Sanath asks if the Software SIG Board will meet in May, she says they can meet after the ICEAA board meeting Monday or at another time.

The ICEAA board meeting in Minneapolis will be scheduled from **9am-2pm on Monday**, **May 13, 2024**. Room to be announced.

With no other new business, a motion to adjourn is raised, seconded, and approved. Meeting adjourns at 1:06.