To: Justin Marsico  
From: Janelle Becker  
Date: 30 JUN 17  
RE: MTS Meeting Summary (26 JUN 17)

# Summary

On Monday (6/26) Renata, Justin, and Janelle met with Chris Kubeluis and other members of his team at the Office of Fiscal Projections. The goal was to twofold. First, to satisfy a request made by their team: after seeing a presentation, they asked for us to show them more about using Tableau. Second, to discuss opportunities for partnership in regards to the Monthly Treasury Statement (MTS)/Daily Treasury Statement (DTS) and better understand if connecting the Fiscal Projections team with the DATA Act Analytics team would be a fruitful endeavor.

While Renata tactfully navigated the meeting, the overall sense of this meeting was that Tableau would not be as useful as a tool for the individual team members’ day-to-day work, but perhaps useful for summarizing and reporting data for leadership to quickly ingest and understand large amounts of information typically displayed in table/spreadsheet format. While Chris was more optimistic about the software and exploring opportunities to work together, the team members seemed more skeptical, perhaps because they did not have the ultimate vision/goal for the meeting.

The larger meeting concluded, and Chris spoke more with Renata, Justin, and Janelle in his office to show a particular software service (Haver Analytics Database) that was mentioned for data aggregation, which included the MTS and DTS. Renata attempted a few more questions to explore whether or not a useful partnership might exist for the two teams, and Chris said he was happy to receive assistance in terms of projections and using Tableau.

Several names were mentioned throughout the various meetings for people that may be good to connect with, including someone at OMB, and Chris mentioned he’d send an email to Renata to follow up on this.

# Options

1. **Use MTS and DTS data for our own analyses, but without a formal partnership**
   1. Stakeholders – Internal DATA Act teams and future analytics website users
   2. Risks
      1. If we’ve been asked to partner with MTS folks/data and we don’t, we look uncooperative despite our mission to partner with agencies
      2. We could end up spending more time on analysis than if we had a SME helping us understand the data
      3. We could develop something that the MTS folks don't agree with causing internal conflicts
2. **Create new visualizations of the current MTS charts and graphs, without re-thinking what is displayed**
   1. Stakeholders – The producers (MTS team) and consumers of the MTS (OFP, data repurposers, etc.)
   2. Risks
      1. We do not currently have a clear champion/product owner for this and would need this to move forward
      2. The scope creeps and increases to include more of a revamp than we had imagined
      3. This could cause minor delays in the launch of the analytics website/platform (performance risk)
      4. We do not currently know the entire set of MTS consumers other than Fiscal Projections, fee-based data repurposers e.g., Haver, LexisNexis
3. **Re-design the MTS from the ground up, based on user-centered design principles**
   1. Stakeholders – The producers and consumer of the MTS; DATA Act/Treasury leadership
   2. Risks
      1. We do not currently have a clear champion/product owner for this
      2. This could cause major delays in the launch of the analytics website/platform (performance risk)
      3. This is likely outside the scope of the analytics team and it could look bad that we are stretching our team to provide services outside our mission (optics risk)
4. **Consult with the Office of Fiscal Projection on their core mission of predicting government cash flows. [Purpose would be to get some experience with cash with an eye towards schema changes]**
   1. Stakeholders – Office of Fiscal Projections (Chris Kubeluis et al.)
   2. Risks
      1. This could delay launch of the analytics website/platform
      2. This may fall outside the scope of the analytics team and it could look bad that we are stretching our team to provide services outside our mission (optics risk)
      3. They interpret our team as solely supporting their functions instead of a mutually beneficial partnership causing internal tension/time wasted
5. **Do nothing/drop MTS** 
   1. Stakeholders – Christina Ho
   2. Risks
      1. If Christina Ho asked for this for a reason, whether from her bosses or because she’s seeing beneficial connections, we don’t want her to think our team is ignoring her requests