

Technology Modernization Board

Meeting Minutes

November 26, 2018

Attendance

PRESENT

- | | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| 1. Suzette Kent | Chair |
| 2. Alan Thomas | Permanent Board Member |
| 3. Matt Hartman | Permanent Board Member |
| 4. Maria Roat | Term Board Member |
| 5. Charles Worthington | Term Board Member |
| 6. Rajive Mathur | Term Board Member |
| 7. Matt Cutts | Term Board Member |
| 8. Grant Schneider | Alternate Board Member |
| 9. Margie Graves | Alternate Board Member |
| 10. Darren Ash | Alternate Board Member |

OTHER ATTENDEES

- | | |
|-----------------------|---|
| 1. Elizabeth Cain | General Services Administration |
| 2. Kim Tuyen Tran | General Services Administration |
| 3. James Johnson | General Services Administration |
| 4. Jackie Borman | General Services Administration |
| 5. Matthew Cornelius | Office of Management and Budget |
| 6. Ben Skidmore | Office of Management and Budget |
| 7. Kathleen Cheeseman | Department of Housing and Urban Development |
| 8. Mark Hayes | Department of Housing and Urban Development |
| 9. Robert Arrington | Department of Housing and Urban Development |
| 10. Kevin Cooke | Department of Housing and Urban Development |

Meeting Minutes

1. The Board heard opening remarks from the Chair.
2. The HUD project team presented their quarterly update to the Board.
3. The Board discussed and voted on proposals from multiple agencies.
4. The Board approved meeting minutes from November 19, 2018.
5. The Board adjourned.

Action Items

1. The TMF PMO will send Suzette the notification letters for the approved project proposals.
2. The TMF PMO will draft a document with the Board's questions for NewPay and CBP and share with the Board for review.

Voting Decisions

PROJECT DETERMINATIONS

Order	Project Title	Agency	Project Stage	Determination
1	NewPay Implementation	GSA	Initial Project Proposal	Approve
2	CBP Automated Commercial Environment (ACE) Collections	DHS	Initial Project Proposal	Approve

Voting Record

1. NewPay

Rajive	approve
Maria Roat	approve
Matt Cutts	approve
Charles	approve
Grant	reject
Margie	approve
Matt Hartman	approve

2. CBP ACE

Alan	approve
Rajive	revert
Maria	approve
Charles	approve
Margie	approve
Matt Cutts	approve
Suzette	approve

Meeting Deliberations

1. Welcome and Opening Remarks – Suzette Kent, Chair (5 minutes)

- SK: Welcome everyone. We will start with a discussion about NewPay. Voting will happen at the end of the meeting.

2. IPP Review: NewPay—Board (25 minutes)

- Ben: For GSA, there was no budget request in the 2019 or 2020 proposed budgets to standup NewPay, this is the only route to do it, there is migration money. Lapsed balance approach is a gamble-unsure if Congress will support reprogramming
- Rajive: would they be able to do 10 of 20?, Alan: the total number is 32 actually
- Allison: GSA has not been officially designated as QSMO, SK: all agencies have money for migration, not officially yet, GSA also has to migrate itself, there is migration money, but need standup money as well
- Charles: do we want to hear about the proposal in detail from the team?- I'm intrigued by a shared service model that involves repayment, still wondering why GSA?
- SK: GSA will eventually do HR-payroll is part of that, likely time frame of 5 years for this, want faster timeline in part since agencies want to move faster and payroll providers now not taking new customers so need place for new agency customers to go, USDA wants to move fast-older system, NewPay is also cost avoidance for other agencies, Allison: GSA's cost is high due to smaller numbers and legacy system, want economy of scale and SAS
- Matt H: is this Board the most appropriate place for QSMO-related activities? If the answer is yes, other agencies will come to this board with their shared services proposals, SK: long-term shared services should go through appropriations, in this case, the OPM merger accelerated the timeline
- Grant: they could have done this another way than TMF, have strategy, changed the timeline
- Darren: even with passback, they wouldn't see the money for some time
- Rajive: has GSA done another like this before?, Suzette: no, many agencies that are providers want to get out-few price increases and little funding, funding model change is another part
- Charles: this proposal would be stronger if it focused on modernization of the USDA system and here is this opportunity to move it to GSA and create this great system for all of government, much of this hinges on getting NFC excited on migrating to GSA
- SK: team should highlight what's important about it being the first starter
- Alan: more details about the rates (internal/external differences)
- Rajive: they would need customer service organization to deal with services issues and such, want to hear about their service delivery model

3. HUD Update—Board (30 minutes)

- Introductions, changed roles and responsibilities-need FAC PPM level 3 so brought in Kathleen,
- Kathleen: achieved multiple milestones, funds were delayed with end of fiscal year about did get funds awarded, have added and adjusted milestones as needed
- Alan: what's the acquisition strategy?- Jay put new strategy on salesforce out to the regions if HUD provides a waiver for it
- For 4.7 contract, its actually around 4.5, lessons learned by Rob from other cloud contracts in HUD to get this one faster
- Rajive: question about code reuse-Kathleen: cannot have code freeze due to regulations, Mark: cannot affect business lines, code conversion this first time is the hardest, then automated, Kevin: working with business lines but not doing wholesale transformation of their processes
- SK: go forward with same vendor or not?-Kathleen: not sure, have not done analysis yet, sole sourcing is the least risky way, Mark: vendor has lots of experience/historical knowledge, Jay: helping with sole source justification
- Charles: when will the first java code go?-Kathleen: systems will all go over together most likely near the end, Matt: earliest indication of if things look good or not? SK: want feel of what it looks like or if it needs rework, Margie: as early as possible, what agile is all about, Mark: vendor will do first testing and then not sure when other testing is, LC: HUD team will address this in February, Charles: in VA, we have systems running but no users to truly test them, big fan of getting it in front of the business line, Mark: doing lots of checks
- Rajive: what change management/training will be done by the business lines? Mark: no training required, same user interface-kept cold fusion frontend
- SK: interested in learning which tactics worked and which ones didn't, transition deliverables for other agencies to learn from such as breaking up milestones to move more quickly
- Mark: started with biggest one, Kevin: very engaged customer base, Suzette: highlight dialogue with business owners, Kevin: will do, Alan: might be good to have business line rep come to quarterly update, any oracle systems?-no
- Rajive: any idea of the shift to the right? Mark: based on when we receive the funding versus when we originally planned
- SK: For next update, make a page for things you did that are reusable for other agencies going through same thing
- Kathleen: scope boundary is important
- Matt C: make sure that the tech is proved out as quickly as possible
- Suzette: keep an eye out for HUD as a case study down the road
- Charles: suggestion for new feature of TMF website-storytelling about managing projects and such

4. IPP Review: CBP—Board (15 minutes)

- LC: Another mainframe migration project, Suzette: amount requested scared me, unsure of funding for next year, don't want to give more than a quarter of funding to one project, is there anything they could do for less?
- LC: issue is the payback, without decommissioning mainframe, can't generate enough cost savings
- Maria: interesting that they got through 5 of 6, LC: I think the cupboard is bare
- Margie: No budget cuts for CBP, SK: does that say something about agency's priorities?

- Margie: I like the concept but the context is missing, they have been successful in migration efforts
- Charles: why TMF for this?
- Grant: size of this, need some of next year's unknown money as well
- Suzette: also taking fulltime to pay back
- Margie: cost share with them?-we pay half and they pay half, see how interested they truly are
- Charles: question on part 4 answer opening sentence-the commissioner previously decided....-backstory there?
- Alan: what is a team in this context?, their numbers seem high
- Matt C: gave it thumbs up based on capability of execution, team is qualified, questions about context for sure, think odds are good it will work
- Charles: good to have a backlog of projects to tell Congress about
- Rajive: doesn't seem like a priority, maybe a next year thing that is ready to go
- SK: should ask if is there something we could help you with from a timing perspective that that might be a smaller amount but get you to a better place funding wise? Contract extension?
- Margie: mention uncertainty of funds
- LC: new team, FPP takes time, probably not until January (know funding situation by then)
- Why has this not been a priority before?
- LC: CBP leadership invested in this project, SK: they have a lot of projects

5. Vote—Board (15 minutes)

6. November 19 Meeting Minutes review and approval – Suzette Kent, Chair (2 minutes)

- Meeting minutes approved as presented.

7. Next Steps and Confirmation of Action Items – Board (3 minutes)

- PMO will draft notifications to the teams and send to SK for review.
- PMO will draft a document with the Board's questions for NewPay and CBP and share with the Board.

8. Adjourn