

# Technology Modernization Board

## Meeting Minutes

Monday, June 11th, 2018

### Attendance

#### PRESENT

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

#### ABSENT

1. Mark Kneidinger
2. Matt Cutts

#### OTHER ATTENDEES

- |                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| 1. Elizabeth Cain    | GSA PMO   |
| 2. Emma Perron       | GSA PMO   |
| 3. Jenn Hanna        | GSA PMO   |
| 4. James Johnson     | GSA PMO   |
| 5. Allison Brigati   | General Services Administration                             |
| 6. Andrew Abrams     | Office of Management and Budget                             |
| 7. Ben Skidmore      | Office of Management and Budget                             |
| 8. Matthew Cornelius | Office of the Federal Chief Information Officer             |
| 9. Somer Smith       | Office of the Federal Chief Information Officer             |
| 10. Max Tassano      | Office of the Federal Chief Information Officer, Contractor |
| 11. Claudine Roxas   | Office of the Federal Chief Information Officer, Contractor |

### Meeting Minutes

1. The Board approved meeting minutes from May 24 and May 30.
2. The Board discussed and voted on two project proposals from two agencies.
3. The Board approved specific questions for agencies in the Final Project Proposal process.
4. The Board acknowledged the 6/12 reporting deadline, and received a website update.
5. The Board adjourned.

### Action Items

1. Board members will review the website content via a staging link provided by Matthew Cornelius.
2. The GSA PMO will draft letters for the two teams receiving reject letters based on the Board vote.
3. The GSA PMO will notify DOL, USDA, DHS, and State regarding the Visa project proposals.

### Voting Decisions

#### PROJECT DETERMINATIONS

Order	Project Title	Agency	Project Stage	Determination
1	Specialty Crop Program Modernization Initiative	USDA	Initial Project Proposal	Reject
2	Enterprise Application Inventory and Rationalization	DOE	Initial Project Proposal [RESUBMISSION]	Reject

### Voting Record

1. Specialty Crop Program Modernization Initiative (USDA)

Erwin Gianchandani	Reject
Maria Roat	Reject
Margie Graves	Reject
Rajive Mathur	Reject
Alan Thomas	Reject
Charles Worthington	Reject
Suzette Kent	Reject

2. Enterprise Application Inventory and Rationalization (DOE)

Erwin Gianchandani	Reject
Maria Roat	Reject
Margie Graves	Reject
Rajive Mathur	Reject
Alan Thomas	Reject
Charles Worthington	Reject
Suzette Kent	Reject

### Meeting Deliberations

1. **Welcome and Opening Remarks** – Suzette Kent, Chair (5 minutes)
  - Great press coming out of the event

- Suzette will be on the Hill on Wednesday making more in person thank you's
- Award event went really well
- Last minute change [CONFIDENTIAL]
  - Government reform would have preceded TMF award events, there is an open discussion around SFHD lending program consolidation
  - HOLDING pending discussion based on who will be in charge of running the project
  - Will likely be in late June – holding for later action
- LC – making sure we stay in alignment with message
- Comments were provided for communications people → will try to use when getting messages out about TMF
- There is a CIO event at the White House this afternoon about the CIO executive order; Will be making some quick comments on the TMF, will be highlighting the first receivers of \$

## 2. IPP Review – Board (30 minutes)

- USDA Specialty Crop Program Modernization Initiative
  - Initial Thumbs Vote: 7-0 (Reject)
  - Comments:
    - CW: There was not a lot of detail on how they would solve the problem, no description of what this component would do or what the solution they were proposing was
      - \$12 million was a lot for very little detail
    - MR: Why are they creating something from scratch? Didn't see where this was a special need. Audit / inspection wasn't very clear either
    - AT: Does this group have a revolving fund? The proposal has a reference to some sort of user fee program, why don't they just fund it for themselves?
    - MG: Seems like something they could do off the shelf
    - SK: Read it the same way as Maria and Charles, no indication of plan or progress – read it as they were going to build it, maybe it was poorly written
      - Are we reading this right? Are they proposing a custom build? This is commercially available AND available at other places across the Federal government
    - AT: Pentaho Schema Work Bench → What is this? SK: Is this one of the systems it would interface with?
    - SK: What she heard was lack of clarity on project plan, Board was unclear on custom build vs. commercially built software, proposal lacked sufficient details, is there a revolving fund / working capital situation, can they leverage other capabilities already built at other agencies – have they touched base with agencies who do audits (HUD, DOT, CIMA among others)
      - RM: How is this related to the larger portal effort?
        - DA: This one is new, would be helpful to know.
      - RM: There was no previous effort to build a system – that doesn't inspire confidence either (Question 5, final paragraph)
        - SK: They have not tried to tackle this before
        - It does reference a completely new project
    - LC: Did this deliver on the mission? Does that alignment (specialty crops industry facing improvements,) not make it worth going back to a revert state?

- EG: Value proposition in terms of value to the agency was weak in compared to other agencies, if EG was voting now it would be a flat out no
  - AT: Buried the mission value within question 3 – this is the only place you could really see some sort of impact on the citizen
  - SK: Can they draw a clear parallel between what this does and citizen facing improvements?
- CW: Do we need to go out of our way to bring it back?
  - Board concurs
- RM: How does this fit with other agency initiatives already underway?
- AT: The only way to stay engaged with this would be to ask the question about where else this lines up with other agency goals – we don't want them to duplicate this work when there is already a solution within USDA
  - GS: Encourage them to do this through the CIO council vs. through the Board
- DOE Enterprise Application Inventory and Rationalization
  - Initial Thumbs Vote: 7-0 (Reject)
    - We went back and asked for less in the “planning phase” but that is still what they delivered. Board objectives should be action and deliverable oriented
    - SK: Struggles with a proposal not showing cost savings, improved processes etc. whereas this is the insight before the project
    - RM: They are doing what they should be doing, but it doesn't align with the goals of the Board
    - SK: Tell them we are excited and supported for this across every agency, and after they have completed this step – we would welcome a new proposal
      - LC: Maybe see if we have something to do with system turn-offs that would help them save money to complete this project
      - SK: They basically came back with more analysis on the planning process
      - MR: Seems like a plan to plan

### **3. Board Specific Questions for Appendix A / Narrative Templates for recently reviewed Initial Project Proposals – Board (10 Minutes)**

- USDA:
  - SK: The first question – try to lead them to a better answer, where savings will come from and how they will repay (NOT from the 2020 budget)
  - EG: Do we have a FAQ? “Here's the language you need to use about how the repayment is happening.”
    - BS: This is in briefing documents and in website information
  - The rest of the questions are good to go as presented.
- DOL:
  - Include DHS in addition to State Department in Question II
  - Question III: Overall cost / funding means – if this is not the full cost, what is the full cost overall?

- **Make sure we capture that we want all four agencies to present as one for the Visa process.**
- We will get these letters out later this afternoon.

We will be getting a Board overview from Matt Cutts in late June or July on the Visa process. Suzette wants to get things moving on this project though because it is timely and has Cabinet focus on it.

#### **4. Update on GSA and USACE Phase II Projects – GSA PMO (10 Minutes)**

- We have kicked off both of these projects.
  - We will get GSA in front of the Board by July 18.
  - USACE is very excited and proud of their tool, but they still need executive level buy in and it seems that it may move a little bit slowly with appendices

#### **5. May 24, 2018; May 30, 2018; and June 4, 2018 Meeting Minutes Review and Approval – Suzette Kent (2 Minutes)**

- All minutes approved as presented.

#### **6. Next Steps and Confirmation of Action Items – Board (3 Minutes)**

- We need to get the Visa projects in front of the Board as soon as possible
  - We need to build in additional time for RMO review
- GSA PMO gets out notification letters today to Visa teams.
- Website will be out in time for reporting requirement
  - Hopefully we will be able to add some more information on payback component
  - MC: After this meeting, will send the staging link look for a final look through
    - Tomorrow, based on the statute is the first report
    - Most of the information is still TBD pending review process, but it is basically the info included in the press release
- SK: General Ask – please go through the website from several different perspectives, make sure the wording is clear and clean towards all audiences.

#### **7. Adjourn**