ICEAA Board of Director's Meeting

09:00 – 1500 | Monday, May 13, 2024

Zoom Virtual Meeting

OFFICAL MINUTES approved August 2, 2024

Voting Attendees

Tim Anderson, Kellie Benefiel, Dave Brown, Carol Dekkers, Rich Hartley, Brent Johnstone, Jennifer Kirchhoffer, Mike Lionais, Arlene Minkiewicz, Cari Pullen, Sanath Rajagopal, Wendy Robello, Christian Smart (remote), Christina Snyder, Madeleine Teller, Carol dekkers, Madeleine Teller, Anh Pham, Sanath Rajagopal

Non-voting Attendees:

Kevin Cincotta, Sharon Burger, Courtney Gray, Karen Mourikas

Welcome, quorum count, introductions: Christina Snyder

Christina welcomes everyone and thanks them for traveling to this in person meeting. She emphasizes the importance of maintaining perspective as we discuss important issues facing the ICEAA organization. Megan's recent situation has helped to highlight some cracks in the ICEAA Foundation, and it is time for us as a Board to address these issues. Although we have lots of good ideas, we must accept that we have limited resources. We have become increasingly dependent on the Business Office for execution of various items to the point of overtaxing the staff in some circumstances. Discussion proposing further investment of funds to meet objectives is tempered with Madeleine's admonition that while we expect to do well with the conference this year, there are still bills we have to pay. Jennifer K suggested we should try to encourage junior members to take on tasks with marketing, social media, etc. Cari reminds that the President can appoint committees if we have specific tasks we need – appointing a point person (not on the Board) to address very clear, directed requirements. Madeleine adds that continuous learning credits are an incentive.

Christina returns to the most immediate issue, stating that we are archaic with communication. Megan is our single point of failure with Zoom; we require her to start (and attend) all of our Zoom meetings – we have nothing like Teams to enable communication among the Board or for use among the Chapters. Christina asks if anyone might have an issue with Teams as an external source. Anh is the only one who had a concern but feels her personal computer is a reasonable option.

We should consider a new communication option but need to keep in mind that we need to address things such as: who is in control, how do we control access (limit to members only), how do we create a better structure for making materials easy for the board to access, etc. Some discussion as to whether it would make sense to drop the Zoom license and look into an MS Office license so we could make Teams accessible to the Board. Dave B reminds us that we need to keep in mind the webinars which may draw lots of people as we consider other options.

Action : Madeleine to look into cost for up to 50-100 users for Office

Additional opening thoughts from the board:

Tim reminds us that to increase revenue we need to increase membership, to do this we need to sell ICEAA as cool. Rich points out that people need a really good reason to become members – they need their boss and their boss's boss to tell them that certification is important. If we had a marketing team, their focus should primarily be to understand what motivates people to become members. Dave points out that on the government side, where people have to pay out of pocket for membership, they are not motivated to join unless there are career advantages that make it a good investment. The only government members we have are those that come to this conference because membership is included.

Anh reports it took years of evangelizing Cost Engineering (with government contractors) to sell the value of certification. Often there is confusion between cost engineering and accounting which needs to be acknowledge. The Board needs to evangelize/advocate. Rich reminds the Board that the hard part of engaging the government (and others) is convincing them of the value of certifications in general and the value that an ICEAA certification offers. We should leverage local chapters to be an important part of this evangelization. Jennifer suggests a presentation for Senior People to highlight the value of Certification by focusing on what we really teach. Kellie suggest that we aren't making the case that our certification is an umbrella certification – we need to market this better and we need to focus on getting more Chapters engaged (currently only two are fully active).

Mike addresses specific Canadian needs to 'fix the holes' in cost engineering – case studies of how certification addresses this need are key to evangelizing. Sanath suggests that a quick revenue could be realized if we did a Vendor's day to give vendors an opportunity to sell their solutions. (SCAF does this every four years – separate from their conference – and they

_

charge the vendors.) Karen discusses the need to get government agencies to first respect, and then require, certification from their contractors. We also need to recognize the dichotomy of our need to be International at the same time we hope to increase our appeal to the government – highlighting the need to tread lightly as we attempt to improve in both of these areas. Kellie reports that when the Wiki was created – lots of government stuff was pulled out but there wasn't enough budget to rewrite all of these modules, but a list was furnished to ICEAA as to the priorities for this to be done. (Kellie still has this list if we can find volunteers to take this on). Christina calls for development of an actionable plan today for a strategic plan that we can reference next year to assess how well we have done.

Secretary Report: Arlene Minkiewicz

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

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

Treasurer Report: Madeleine Teller

Madeleine presents slides. She pointed out that while the balance for 2024 looks quite good at present – it is important to remember that we have lots of revenue from the Workshop but haven't yet paid all of the bills.

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

Professional Development Report   Jennifer Kirchhoffer

Jennifer presents slides. She reports that we are down on certifications but hope to see a jump after the Workshop. Presented pass rates since we have moved to Mettl – pointing out that she has taken out the retakes with an adjustment factor – currently her analysis includes the first time and the time when they passed. PCEA pass rates are down a little this year. Kellie asked if the question bank has been stabilized. Kevin reports that the questionable

questions have been addressed and says his analysis indicates the questions have become more stable over time. The overall strategy for improving the test bank is to continue to add new questions into the mix. Jennifer points out that the SCEC should be a priority for adding new questions.

Module 6 – Data Analysis Update (Dave Brown)

Jennifer reports that Dave is doing an awesome job with his work on the update of Module 6. Dave reports good feedback on new and legacy content – the team is consolidating and working through the comments. They are cleaning up an updated draft for review outside the team. Kellie adds that she is ready to start putting this in the Wiki when it is ready.

Jennifer asks how the team plans to regroup update Module 6 with new questions. Kevin reported that the way we randomly generate tests we don't want to add too many questions (at present) to create unbalanced focus on new material – but we should explore the option of more focused filtering to generate 'random' test so too many questions would be a benefit not a concern. Kevin is to follow up on this with Sharon.

CEBoK-S Content Working Group (Sanath Rajagopal)

At the last Board meeting, we discussed making any corrections and responses to feedback by January 2025. The point of this review is to create digestible modules for training and the creation of training videos. Discussion focused on whether we were removing content. Sanath dispelled this – corrections are being made, content is being moved around, and large modules are being broken down into multiple modules for better manageability.

CeBok Module 5 Inflation/Escalation Updates

Jennifer reported that this task is complicated by the fact that the US government is driving lots of changes in this area and we need to determine the best way to walk the line of incorporating their changes but keeping the module country neutral. Acknowledging that a deeper understanding is always good, we need to make sure we are testing the concepts not the specific application of these concepts (such as the way of US DoD, for example). Suggestion that we consider moving DoD specific information to advanced topics. Rich suggests we might want to consider a certification with a specialty (maybe ICEAA + DoD (or MoD, or other) certification). Kevin cautions against dumbing down the certification – we need to make sure to focus on the important economic concepts – most governments

work from at least a subset of these concepts. Kellie adds that the suggestion is not to remove content but rather to make the terminology and examples more generic.

Christina asks about our status with DAU. Kevin finally got a response from POC (apparently our inquiries were going to SPAM – we are now white listed). She has committed to re-engagement now that we are connected.

Design to Cost Module – Karen reports this module was presented to the Southern California Chapter as part of training this year. She asks what are the next steps to get into the CeBok? Jennifer responds that it needs to be in a Wiki format, Kellie offers to help with this. Karen reports that it was developed as a new module but could be merged into Module 16. Kevin asks Karen for a recommendation on how best to do this. Kellie feels it should be merged with 16.

Software SIG Performance Metrics   Christina Snyder

Christina introduces the topic, reports that Carol and Sanath are the two representatives present from the SW SIG. Christina expresses concern that with us already spread very thin, the SIG's request for marketing money, though we don't spend money for marketing ICEAA, is not realistic.

The SIG Charter specifies that ICEAA will provide the SIG with performance criteria. They have presented to us their recommendations for the criteria, some of which were acceptable, some which weren't. After today's discussion, Christina and Arlene will put together a final version of the criteria and share with the SIG Board.

Action: CS and AM to share finalized Performance Criteria to the SW SIG

In SIG Charter which we have already approved, it says that the ICEAA Board will provide marketing support for the Software SIG and CEBok-S. They are using up a lot more of Megan's time (supporting meetings and such) and this ask has become too much of a drain on the Business Office's resources. We need to reconsider going forward how much marketing support we can reasonably provide.

Performance Criteria

The CeBoK-S Sales bullet from Slide 2 will be reworded to say:

- The Software SIG will be responsible for the sale of 50 copies of CEBoK-S (removing the designations as to what geographical locations they are sold to)

The CEBok-S Training

- Christina is uncomfortable with the term monitor in bullet c (Slide 2) – we need to clarify that monitor means is that the training material should not deviate from the ICEAA Standard. Christina questions whether the SW SIG Board is able to focus on the ICEAA Standards – Sanath reports that they are working on this but not there yet
- Christina asks if it is fair to ask for 5 training sessions this year?
- Kellie suggests we should define what a training session is.
- Carol asks who is on the SW SIG Board – Eric, Harold, Bob, Brian, Steve, Sanath and Carol. Sanath reports that the people on the board at this point are the people who created most of the content – he feels that we should focus on removing bias from the board.
- Christina reports that Bob will be the president of the SIG Board in November.
- We originally agreed that the leadership of the board would rotate annually between ICEAA and NESMA. Christina raises the question as to why NESMA has a proscribed role on the SIG Board and whether this decision needs to be revisited. While NESMA has agreed to share membership with ICEAA for our membership purposes, NESMA does not track membership by individuals but rather by corporation, making it hard for us to target them in membership campaigns and such.
- Christina asks the board how they feel about asking the SIG to do one training plus the training at the workshop in 2025. We should also consider whether want to discourage attendance at the workshop by publishing recorded CEBoK-S training before the conference?
- Sanath questions if there was demand for CeBoK-S training this year. We need to add this to the survey – Madeleine will reach out to Sharon on this.
- Slide 2 – bullet A – remove all together (remembering that we can update this each year)
  - The Software SIG will directly support 5 training sessions each year.

Kevin discusses the original impetus for the CeBok-S reminding all that the MOU that was originally signed was based on the implication that there were demands in the 100's

internationally for such as certification, a demand that has yet to be realized in any substantive way. The issue of the unsanctioned ICEAA Software logo was raised and discussed.

Action AM – strongly worded memo under ICEAA letterhead from Christina and Arlene – insisting that they immediately desist with the use of this non-logo,

Action: AM – update the slides per above discussion and distribute with minutes

Madeleine voices worry about the 20% of CEBoK-S revenue that we agreed to fund them – 20% off the top where other chapters they make a request. Madeleine is comfortable with giving them a small amount every year and above that they have to justify just like any Chapter would.

Action: AM to research MOU and Charter to see specifics as to when and how the terms can be modified

Jennifer expresses concern that the SIG board is not including members but doing stuff autonomously. Christina reminds that every member of ICEAA should be allowed to be part of the SW SIG – not the board but the SIG itself. Another concern is that there are other organizations than NESMA, why haven't we tried to bring them into the fold as well?

Slide 4 of Perf Criteria

- Christina questions what we can do with this due to the fact that the Business Office resources are limited and already overtaxed. Carol to dispel this with her plan.

Slide 5 – want to make sure every year they report as to what they did with what we gave them

Slide 6 – need to change 2024 to 2025

- Do we want to make the Software SIG in charge of the running of CEBoK-S training for the Annual Workshop? Should we just keep it the way it is with Jen K assigning trainers like she normally does. Concern is that it won't get done – the workshop is too important. Kellie points out that we don't usually put Chapters in charge of stuff – why should we do that with the SIG.
- Kellie points out that ICEAA owns CEBoK and CEBoK-S while the SIG was formed to help grow demand – they weren't formed to control the content. We need to change the language -maybe move away from having a Board – we can have a Principal and Leaders

– Sanath reminds us that although we agreed to have a Board – we are learning and can revisit this

- Kellie suggests we need to revise the charter to make it more like a Chapter. OEM was more of a coalition.

Software SIG marketing Plan   Carol Dekkers

Carol presents slides with five long and short term goals. Sanath comments that as to Goal 1 – last year Megan gave a presentation to SCAF which was well received but we failed to close the loop. SW industry doesn't care about the cost. They care more about size Carol points out that if we are not solving a problem they know they have they are not going to be interested in our solution. Discussion ensued as to the difference in demand between government and commercial. Kevin revisits the idea that with commercial we are more likely to be successful focusing on pricing rather than estimating.

Mike explains that they seek authority in Canada as you don't want to go back to Parliament asking for more money. The market for CeBoK-S is in the government sectors. Kevin adds that the CEDA contractors are also targets. Sanath suggests there is a good opportunity in the UK Market, perfect opportunity for marketing and selling the idea that we can help them be successful with bids. Much discussion to this point culminating in the idea that people who might be interested in our certification are, in general, people who want ICEAA backing to help them get more work. They want a mechanism to convince buyers that their methods of arriving at a cost are justified and their results are competitive.

2024 Workshop Overview   Courtney Gray

Courtney presents slides and thanks the 2024 Workshop Committee for all of their hard work.

Federal Cost Estimating Leadership Alliance   Chris Massey

Christina speaks to slides as Chris is not in attendance. Christina mentions that from previous meetings it seemed clear that there was consensus that this alliance is a good idea for ICEAA. Her only qualm with the document from Chris is the role of the Washington Chapter as being the Chair of this group. The Chair should be an ICEAA member who is either appointed or elected. Carol questions whether membership is limited to federal agencies? Christina reports that Chris wants to start small to get things going but she sees no reason why we would exclude anyone as the Alliance takes hold and grows. This Alliance is intended to be 100% US Federal – not relevant for other governments. Kevin proposes that the GAO and DAU should also be included. Jennifer questions whether there is a certain level associated with being part of this group. Kellie reports that the membership should be decision makers representing the specific agencies. Rich points out that limiting membership to decision makers could result in us losing out on a good member willing to participate; he also mentions that policing such a restriction would be problematic. Jennifer believes the goal was to prevent the watering down of the Alliance. Kellie addresses the goal of fostering relationships with people higher in the government.

Christina recommends the wording of the Roles for the Chair of this group needs to be revisited. Tim takes the action to do this and send it to Christina and Arlene. Changes should exist with the understanding that Chris will be leading and Courtney will be the Deputy (as they are from different companies). Pending this stipulation we proceed to approval. Motion was made and seconded. The motion passes.

Experience-Based Certification   Sanath Rajagopal

Sanath speaks on this topic. Recommends we change the terminology to Experienced Based Recognition to remove confusion with the concept of Certification.   Christina poses the question as to whether we should do this at all. Sanath says yes. He believes this will give people a way forward and that people will want to do this. Jennifer questions the direction forward. Sanath reports that he hasn't gotten there yet – still working on what the process and procedures going forward are going to look like. He is engaging with ACostE people and has invited them to spend a day with him where they will go through their processes and procedures so he can assess the level of effort.

Questions arise as to whether this is something considered necessary for revenue generation. Madeleine reports that we are staying steady, a little low but of course we could be doing better. Kellie adds that revenue should not be a motivator for offering something that may present as an

option to certification. Discussion ensues as to whether this is desirable and whether it might take away from or devalue ICEAA Certification. A wide variety of opinions were expressed – ranging from the test should be the definitive point of ICEAA with no other form of 'recognition' being offered to the plight of those who are well into their careers who could benefit from some professional recognition but aren't motivated to take the test. Karen presents the OEM perspective that while certification may be of no interest, they might find industry recognition valuable. Sanath emphasizes the fact that the recipient of recognition needs to prove they are worthy by presenting a Body of Evidence. We should strive for a level between certification and fellowship. Rich points out that many years of experience in related fields, such as pricer, does not make someone an estimator and this might make determination of qualifications for recognition problematic. Kevin reminds us of the differences between specialists and generalists – while specialists are worthy of recognition, they are probably not proficient in all the categories necessary for ICEAA certification. He recommends we might want to consider specializations rather than certifications. Karen mentions this as relevant to OEMS – they want to tailor things specific to the systems engineering practices necessary for their job. Dave suggests that we need to beware of people who show up with no connection to ICEAA to make sure that applicants have skin in the game.

Sanath points out that the next phase should be fact finding to make a decision as to what is valid criteria for recognition.

Christina reminds that we are so strapped resource wise that even if this is a great idea, who is going to do the work of reviewing packets of work and such.

Kellie asks if we have data to support that there actually is a demand for such recognition. Sanath replies that BAE has approached us because ACostE (who has done this for BAE for many years) has abandoned their Cost Estimating Certification.

Christina asks Kevin and Jen K what information they would think is necessary for the kind of fact finding that Sanath is talking about. Kevin thinks we need to focus on areas of specialization and tailor recognition in those areas. Jen compares professional based certification and experienced based certification noting that her research indicates that professional certifications don't always mean exam-based certifications. Rather than focus on whether we call this a certification or recognition – we need to listen to our own membership and try to find ways to deliver to them 'recognition' in forms that are valuable to them.

Kellie asks if there is something we can offer BAE, some workshops or services to help them get the standard certifications. Because they are specialists this help is likely to involve training in areas outside their specialty, not focused on passing the test but rather focused on helping them get proficient in these areas that haven't been important in previous certifications. Dave agrees there might be a business case there but if these people are not even members yet we are not really serving our membership with this discussion. We discuss approaching BAE with a proposal to see what we can do in this area within their concerns. Christina asks all to send questions and concerns to Sanath by the end of this week to support this proposal.

Christina suggests we focus on BAE for now and revisit this later in the more general sense. Kellie, Kevin and Dave will work with Sanath on this.

New Business and 2024-2025 activity prioritization   Christina Snyder

Canada CEBoK (French version)

Mike reports that a real barrier of adoption of ICEAA is the fact that there is not a French translation noting that 40% of Canada is French speaking. There was an prior exemption because the Prime Minister agreed that there was a requirement for cost estimation certification. This exemption is no longer available and ICEAA certification cannot be required for government contracts. There needs to be a French version for ICEAA to be successful in Canada. Estimates put the cost of this translation at $20,000. They are seeking a government grant (or Canadian equivalent of grant). Madeliene reports that we got a quote several years for translation that was $105K. Mike went by an estimate based on number of pages. Madeline asks whether the grant issue is likely to be resolved by Sept workshop. Mike replies probably not by then but hopefully within this fiscal year. When translation starts, we will need to keep an eye on planned revisions so that we don't translate something that is about to be revised. Kellie reminds that we also need to be aware of the fact that there are many graphics that will need to be updated as well.

Canada workshop

Mike reports that they are hoping to put on a workshop for a half day in Sept in Ottawa. Expecting to invite 20 speakers, possibly best papers from recent conferences. Don't expect it to be too costly, just a matter of getting a venue He sees this as an opportunity to reinvigorate the Canada ICEAA community and highlight ICEAA. Hopefully this will also help create a new

executive board. They hopeto be able to do something similar in the Spring. Most certifications are in Ottawa. Public service in Canada is 300K, so they hope to focus more going forward outside of the government. Looking to get into construction and other markets. People with certifications are letting them lapse because they see no value because the government is no longer allowed to require them.

UK Workshop

Sanath reports that the workshop will be held Sept 19th and 20th in London, across from Parliament. Expecting 160-170 people (Bristol had 160 despite complications). Tracks are not yet decided. The cost will be $399 and there is lots of interest in sponsorships. Key sticking point is what's the benefit for SCAF members? Sanath is working on this. Christina reminds us that when ICEAA was formed we agreed to partner with SCAF for a conference once every four years, so it is very good that we are able to do that this year (COVID was the reason we missed 2020). Call for papers is for July 10th (Note from AM – this deadline was extended to July 24th after this meeting)

Wrap up and Prioritization

1. We left the SW Sig discussion in an unresolved state
    a. Action for AM/CS – send notification on ICEAA letterhead asking them to cease and desist the use of the ICEAA Software 'logo'
    b. Action: AM to look at the Charter and MOU – figure out what it says and when we can make changes and modifications
    c. Action: we need to respond to their marketing plan to SW SIG by May 24th
    d. Question about the 20%? Christina says we should follow the agreement as written until we have the opportunity to rewrite.
2. We did approve the alliance – AM to change the language in there per our discussion today
3. Two workshops are happening – we have promised Megan to support the one in the UK – she will be attending that one in person. Note that she will not be able to support the Canada one – does not appear to be a problem.
4. This workshop is 9 months worth of hard work in the background – we need to work out the process – CS proposes that by the end of July that we have outlined the process of how the workshop is done. We have just let it be done so far – but what happens when Megan is not available.
5. Professional Development
    a. Jen reports that we are prioritizing for next year but need to think where we want to be 20 years from now – we need to make tactical decisions. – where do we

want to be with certification in the future. How to protect IP while serving the greater community.

    b. Christina ask if we have we ever really done the strategic planning of 20 year planning before. Kevin reports that we once in 2007-2009. Rich stated we started in 2004 (conversations – took a while). Kevin feels we need a vision. We need to decide if the goal is to be international or is it to get more members, do we want to strip of DoD and US Gov or do we want to get equivalency and strengthen our partnership with DAU. We need to acknowledge that not everything can be a first priority

6. Megan should have an assistant.

    a. Board should consider authorizing funding a new EO position. (possibly part time). Action for Madeleine to determine if and how much we can afford for such a position.

7. We are one deep with so many roles. – we need succession planning. We should have defined roles, responsibilities and workloads for each of the following (some of these are roles that may not now exist but date back to the days when we had lots of Committees – the roles still need to be defined even if they are currently being done as part of a Board members responsibilities)

    a. All Board Members
    b. Training Chair
    c. Certification Chair
    d. CEBoK Chair
    e. Principals for CEBoK and CEBoK-S
    f. Workshop Chair
    g. Awards Chair

There was also some discussion that we should really try to have Deputies for many of these roles, in order to ensure continuity and better succession success.

8. Kellie notes that now that we have people volunteering to help with CEBoK improvements – we need to keep this going to keep the CEBoK valuable and up to date. K has a list of proprieties for CEBoK that she can provide and report out each Board Meeting.
9. Single point of failure with communication. Action: Madeleine to research costs for Microsoft Office for 50 so we could replace Zoom with Teams.
10. Next meeting scheduled for July 12th 11AM-1PM Eastern time due to scheduling conflicts, Christina suggested reschedule the meeting to August 2nd
11. Meeting adjourned at 3:00PM (Central time)

ICEAA Board of Director's Meeting

09:00 – 1500 | Monday, May 13, 2024

Zoom Virtual Meeting

OFFICAL MINUTES approved August 2, 2024