

From: Hunter, Andrew [Andrew.Hunter@mail.house.gov]

Sent: Wednesday, April 21, 2010

Subject: RE: Marked-up to H.R. 5013

It will probably go up first on the Rules Committee website, either tomorrow or more likely on Friday.

The committee added the following phrase to the existing language in section 106 requiring a review of defense acquisition guidance on EVM to direct DOD to review "whether measures of quality and technical performance should be included in any earned value management system"

This will ensure that we discuss this issue with the Senate in conference.

Sent: Wednesday, April 21, 2010

To: Hunter, Andrew

Subject: Marked-up to H.R. 5013

Andrew,

When will today's bill be posted to the website?

Paul Solomon

From: Hunter, Andrew <mailto:Andrew.Hunter@mail.house.gov>

Sent: Friday, April 16, 2010 1:24 PM

To: Paul Solomon PBEV <mailto:paul.solomon@pb-ev.com>

Subject: RE: Proposed Mark-up to H.R. 5013

I did receive this thank you. I'm working on ways to incorporate this issue into the bill.

From: Paul Solomon

Sent: Friday, April 16, 2010

To: Hunter, Andrew

Subject: Proposed Mark-up to H.R. 5013

Andrew,

The current version of H.R. 5013 discusses metrics of "contractor performance" but does not address the deficiencies in DFARS and DoD Guidance regarding contractor "quality performance."

The attached letter to Chairman Skelton includes a recommended mark-up to remedy the deficiencies. Please forward it to Chairman Skelton and Rep. Andrews.

I would appreciate your acknowledgement that you received the letter and forwarded it to Committee. I just learned that the full Committee is meeting on April 21 to mark-up the Act.

Paul Solomon

To: Hunter, Andrew

Subject: Bill to overhaul acquisition system

Andrew,

I just learned that a bill to overhaul the acquisition system will be introduced tomorrow. As you know, for cost reimbursement contracts that use earned value management, the final report was not sufficient. **The existing contractual requirements permit contractors to continue reporting performance that is not based on quality/technical performance.**

Was this remedied in the bill? Is it too late to revise it?

Paul Solomon

From: Hunter, Andrew

Sent: Friday, March 19, 2010

Subject: RE: Additional information regarding recommended improvement to Acquisition Reform Panel Interim Report

Mr. Solomon,

Thank you for sending us your comments and your article. **The Panel has heard that EVM data submitted to DOD is often flawed and your article adds significant detail and perspective to the causes and consequences of this problem. We appreciate your help. We anticipate that the Panel's final report will be posted on our website next week.**

To: Howard, Megan; Hunter, Andrew

Subject: Additional information regarding recommended improvement to Acquisition Reform Panel Interim Report

Mr. Hunter and Ms. Howard,

I hope that you had a chance to read my recommendations for acq. reform regarding EVM and that you agree with my assertion that a **contractor's EVM performance reports are not necessarily accurate or valid.**

Attached is an article to be published by the PMI in May. It provides additional information regarding **how commercial IT companies manage their projects with EVM.** I realize that it may be too detailed and technical for your needs. However, I hope that it will help the Panel to decide whether or not to include my recommendations in the final report.