

Technology Modernization Board

Meeting Minutes

December 17, 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. Matt Cutts | Term Board Member |
| 7. Grant Schneider | Alternate Board Member |
| 8. Margie Graves | Alternate Board Member |
| 9. Darren Ash | Alternate Board Member |
| 10. Erwin Gianchandani | Alternate Board Member |

OTHER ATTENDEES

- | | |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. Elizabeth Cain | General Services Administration |
| 2. Allison Brigati | General Services Administration |
| 3. David Shive | General Services Administration |
| 4. Liz DelNegro | General Services Administration |
| 5. Kim Tuyen Tran | General Services Administration |
| 6. James Johnson | General Services Administration |
| 7. Jackie Borman | General Services Administration |
| 8. Ben Skidmore | Office of Management and Budget |
| 9. Andrew Abrams | Office of Management and Budget |
| 10. Karen Pica | Office of Management and Budget |
| 11. David Vargas | General Services Administration |
| 12. Marcel Jemio | General Services Administration |
| 13. Lelia Jackson | General Services Administration |
| 14. Freddie Morris | General Services Administration |
| 15. Huy Le | General Services Administration |

Meeting Minutes

1. The Board heard opening remarks from the Chair.
2. The NewPay team presented their pitch to the Board with a Q/A session after the presentation.
3. The Board discussed and voted on it.
4. The Board discussed and voted on the Commerce ACE IPP.
5. The Board approved meeting minutes from November 26, 2018.

6. The Board adjourned.

Voting Decisions

PROJECT DETERMINATIONS

Order	Project Title	Agency	Project Stage	Determination
1	NewPay Implementation	GSA	Pitch	Approve
	Commerce ACE	DOC	IPP	Revert

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: let everyone ask questions who hasn't after NewPay goes-as a matter of protocol

2. NewPay Presentation—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, and there is migration money. Lapsed balance approach is a gamble-unsure if Congress will support reprogramming

3. NewPay Q/A—Board (30 minutes)

- David Vargas: Already having discussions with OMB, Charles W: first seven milestones along USDA migration?- dv: understanding what we are working with from interfaces to staffing, change management is biggest thing to deal with in this migration, have to work
- Darren Ash: Anything special about march 2020 date?, David Vargas: let me take you through the schedule, we will start with GSA, then move to other components like GSA then next components like USDA to do that, have to have tool running by 2020 to make this work, Allison: agencies get money for migration in 2020
- Darren Ash: if it is march 2020 achievable?, David Vargas: working in agile know quickly what is doable and not, very early testing configuration of the tool-title 5,
- SK: GSA team realized something need to be operational before we started moving other agencies in, going back to board's question-agencies only asked to plan in 2019, funding comes in 20202, David Shive: GSA payroll cycle ending right now so have to go to new system, gsa takes risk on first
- Matt Hartman: if partnership with usda begins to wane, what will you do?, have you begun discussion with doi and doe?-check that second agency
- David Vargas: very hard to do only part of these payroll entities, will be working at highest levels of leadership to combat any issues, will work with tmf pmo, these agencies must report to congress as well-might be another issue
- David Vargas: usda has different business model from doi, usda is cafeteria style, doi is different style than, will work with agencies
- Erwin: implications of funding not going through on this particular proposal? David Vargas: different funding sources, lapsed funding is a gsa request-gsa money, if any changes happen, will let you know
- Matt Cutts: different providers, two different vendors, how will you be evaluating vendors? David Vargas: two different teams, which one can best meet our needs and get us to success by deadline, working toward what task order will look like
- Marcel: want commence to standards, goal is uniform and common, DS: legacy to cloud-based, big problem is diversified business processes in each, these cloud providers are built on generally accepted payroll practices
- Alan: how many custom interfaces have to be built in the timeline? David Vargas: three interface categories looking at: out of the box-1.not federal specific, 2.federal specific like tsp, 3. Ones that are very specific to agencies like gsa with hr links, David Shive: 10 to 1 reduction in interfaces and in complexity of interfaces, standardized api that customers must conform to, Liz DelNegro: currently 50 of 80 interfaces are recording so about 10 to 12

- SK: Two sides of this

4. NewPay

- SK: formal process for this, lot of sensitivity involved in this
- Allison: plan for three payroll providers with gsa as civilian one
- Maria: I've felt his pain, this needs to happen, project team is key to making this happen.
Allison: he reports to Emily and I,
- Darren: agrees with Maria, what's the exit strategy if things go south? Also about implementation, worried about how aggressive it is?, SK: part of de-risking was to move things up into 2019, Darren: importance of great reporting to tmf pmo,
- Margie Graves: agreed, Allison: will makes sure our cio, cfo and dave are joined at the hip, Matt Cutts: pretty experienced team but not concrete answers to some of the questions, are there enough technical people-where it might struggle, SK: what are the deliverables that are tied to progress, LC: will have incremental milestones, Kim: in appendix b have deliverables tied to key milestones, they have done that assessment regarding api
- Grant: confidence in 2020 funding?, ben: lapsed funding strategy better than appropriated request, Andrew: bigger risk, why they use the tmf-lots of midcycle dependences, where will we be in February? Pressure on execution is even greater
- Alan: if I'm a member of congress, hard to see citizen impact
- Erwin: what happens if the 20 million for migrations (usda and doi) doesn't come through?
LC: have to revisit payroll plan, usda would have higher operating costs, gsa have to work even harder to get price reductions, have to get to 100,000 users regardless
- Matt Hartman: backup strategy for getting users if that doesn't work?- Kim: need nfc for this to work, usda will not come over until both payroll/time and attendance so running those in parallel- have users come over quickly
- Darren Ash: clarification on numbers-usda is committed what about other users? SK: every user will require work to bring over, spending migration money but would have spent money to keep up existing systems, every agency will have some sort of impact as they move, usda-the faster it goes, the faster that system gets shut down, save money
- Alan: like eis migration
- SK: differing levels of investment depending on role in process from customer to provider, this is the simplest one-most of the agencies are in agreement on the requirements
- Margie: already done one consolidation which is helpful
- Charles: feels more like this is a migration nfc to gsa thing, start focusing on nfc users and getting them through to use this new thing,

5. Commerce IPP Discussion—Board (15 minutes)

- SK: have they talked to treasury? LC: yes, but treasury's timeline is way off there's, Thumbs-mainly down
- SK: 34 million to get to one place to transfer to another one rather give extra money
- DOC RMO: everyone has bought into doc going forward on this including treasury, this project would not be commerce-specific standards would work with qsmo aka treasury, doc has been prepared to do this for a while,
- SK: why don't they have money for it if planning for this? RMO: M-308-check this, could not get pass this, not enough money in budget request so idea to establish WCF and use tmf, Somer: idea of setting up contract/common standards that could move over to Treasury, RMO: this project would benefit from additional oversight from tmf board, want oversight/monitors, RMO does not have that oversight capability

-SK: hard to talk to congress about this specific proposal: no shared services, benefit to all of government

-Charles W: feels like business as usual, don't see why tmf

-SK: new CIO coming in, maybe have a discussion with new person

-Margie: get governance where treasury is involved

-Alan: want situation where treasury is like I got my first customer and it is commerce

-Somer: letter provided is internal to commerce, cap goal team working on waiver process

-SK: the planning to move-they will have to spend that money anyway, want to make sure it's going to the right place, Somer: treasury can only handle midsize agencies, not doc

-Darren: worried about customization/customers

-SK: heard a lot is there a different approach to this?-not sure

-RMO: wished they had waited until they got m-308 guidance, could be value in final version of guidance

-SK: maybe come back with new CIO/wait until guidance comes out

-Grant: level of reformulation talked about sounds like new project almost

-LC: language of a revert could be better for this team than a reject

-SK: board has had lots of good ideas but with no backbone to them; need more on how they would do it? Heavy contractor dependence given for project so want CIO on aboard and confident about how they will get it done

6. November 26 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 regarding funding and such.
- Messaging business to discuss in next meeting

8. Adjourn