# EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

+ + + + +

## PRESIDENT'S MANAGEMENT ADVISORY BOARD

+ + + + +

MEETING

+ + + + +

FRIDAY
JUNE 7, 2013

+ + + + +

The Board met in Room 238 of the Eisenhower Executive Office Building, 1650 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C., at 9:00 a.m., Steven VanRoekel, Chair, presiding.

# PRESENT

STEVE VanROEKEL, Chair
SAM GILLILAND
JEFF KINDLER
DEBRA LEE
GAIL McGOVERN
SHANTANU NARAYEN
ENRIQUE SALEM
LIZ SMITH
RON WILLIAMS

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

## ALSO PRESENT

GSA

SCOTT WINSLOW, Designated Federal Officer
SYLVIA MATHEWS BURWELL, Director, OMB
NORMAN DONG, Interim Controller, OMB
GAY GILBERT, Administrator, DOL
DAVID J. HAYES, Deputy Secretary, DOI
MAURICE JONES, Deputy Secretary, HUD
JOSEPH G. JORDAN, Administrator, OMB
JONATHAN D. McBRIDE, Deputy Director,
Presidential Personnel

JENNIFER PAHLKA, Deputy Chief Technology
Officer, Office of Science and
Technology
JOHN D. PORCARI, Deputy Secretary, DOT
DANIEL M. TANGHERLINI, Administrator,

# A G E N D A

AGENDA AND GOALS 11
UPDATE ON 2012 INITIATIVES 12
REAL ESTATE OPTIMIZATION 57
BREAK
HARDWIRING INNOVATION
PMAB ADMINISTRATIVE SESSION
AD TOUDNMENT 150

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	(9:11 a.m.)
3	MR. WINSLOW: We are going to go ahead
4	and get started. So, I just wanted to let
5	everyone know a couple of things before we start.
6	First, welcome. Thank you, everyone, for coming.
7	I am Scott Winslow, the Designated
8	Federal Officer for the President's Management
9	Advisory Board.
10	We are going to be on camera, so
11	everything that you're saying is actually going
12	to be webcast, so please be aware of that fact.
13	The public is invited to listen in to our
14	conversation as we are talking today.
15	Secondly, apologies for slightly
16	tight quarters, but everyone here, very good
17	friends.
18	(Laughter.)
19	CHAIR VANROEKEL: The most
20	comfortable chairs in the building.
21	MR. WINSLOW: We definitely got the
22	good chairs.

Secondly, you should all have a binder in front of you. This has all the materials that we'll be going through through the course of the day.

And with all that, let me then turn over the microphone to Sylvia Burwell, who's the new head of the Office of Management and Budget, and Steven VanRoekel, who is also the Acting Deputy Director for Management and, therefore, the Chair of the President's Management Advisory Board.

DIRECTOR BURWELL: Thank you so much, Scott. And, first, I want to add my voice of welcome and thanks.

One of the things that I know, my experience actually about an advisory group like this in previous positions I've had is terrific in terms of the value that it can add to one's thinking and one's direction. And I think that has already been seen in some of the work that you all are doing.

I hope over the last weeks that you

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

have seen some of the follow-up to the types of management work that everyone has been talking about, whether that's some of the permitting things that have been going forward that the President spoke to quite recently. Those are the types of things that these conversations lead to, which is a deep focus on specific places where we can actually make a quick difference. And I think I used permitting as the type of example, I think the visa issues that we -- all those kinds of issues are the kinds of things where a group like this in a conversation like this, I think can help us focus quickly on places that we can make progress on the management side of the agenda for the entire government, and one of the main responsibility of OMB.

I think you all probably know it's week five for me, so I am just here and just entering into the fray, but really wanted to come by and make sure that I stop by, because I think this is an important part of what will be happening, hopefully, over the next three and a

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

half years in terms of the time that people like me will be here. But I actually think it's about the next 10 years, and that that's a very important perspective for us all to have, is to change the way we do, and the way we think about how we can most effectively and efficiently deliver for the American people.

And in my hearings, you can go to the record, and as I was asked about priorities, one of the big priorities that we spent time in my hearings discussing was what is called the M side of OMB, which is the management piece of this. So, it is something that I and the team will be spending time on.

I think right now you know Steve has graciously agreed, so right now at OMB, the Acting Deputy Director for Management was the Chair, Danny Werfel, and also Controller of the U.S. Government, is now the Acting Director at the IRS. So, Steve has graciously agreed during this interim period where we're close, hopefully, and over time will have our decision

2.1

and go through the nomination process with a Deputy Director for Management appointee. But Steve has agreed to do two roles for us during this time, so we're privileged, and pleased, and happy to have that.

I know this organization -- I also want to say thank you and lock you into, hopefully, another two years of service in terms of thanking you and recognizing the importance of continuing this work. And I think, also, conversations about how we, I think, may need to add a person or two over time to this work, which is something that I think Steve and others will address.

So, with that, the one thing I just think is we really do want to focus on specific things that have impact to have change, and that those things are implementable, they are measurable, they are understandable, and they are supportable. One of the things, we are the Executive Branch, and that's where much of implementation of government occurs, but we must

2.1

and need to work closely with our colleagues on the Hill. And I actually think this is a terrific place where we have a lot of opportunity for agreement. So, I think this is actually an area of opportunity where we can come up with great ideas that we can work on and have the support of the Congress in implementing.

So, with that I want to say a very large thank you. I'm going to look forward to -- I know this is our first meeting of 2013, and I will look forward to as we evolve the opportunity to be able to spend some more time over time with you all.

So, thank you, and I'm going to turn it over to Steve for the agenda, and to kick us off and get started. And I also want to thank our government colleagues who are here today who are also the people who are implementing many of these things, and are committed to these kinds of issues. So, thank you all, too, around the table. Some of you I've had a chance to spend some time with, and others I'm in the processing of

2.1

doing that. So, thank you, and I will look forward to seeing you all again. And with that, I'll turn it over to you, Steve.

CHAIR VANROEKEL: Thank you very much.

(Chorus of congratulations.)

DIRECTOR BURWELL: I hope that the Chair with some others that, actually, what you just said, a number of Senators during the confirmation process did actually start with condolences, but fortunately I was at OMB once before, and in government, and I think things are harder in certain ways, but I am excited and have come because I believe we can have an impact. I really do believe that this is a place where progress can be made. And even in my first weeks here, in the first five weeks, actually on the M side I've seen a couple of things, whether it's the open data, the permitting, some of the regulatory issues making some headway. It's a place, actually, where I think we can get traction and move even more quickly. We'll need

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

to make that progress on the B side and working hard on that every day, but this is a place where I think there is just a lot of opportunity, especially with your support.

We have -- we're going to start the day kind of recapping a couple of 2012 initiatives. This is really a report out session on Strategic Sourcing and our important work that you've been doing on improper payments. And then we're going to have a couple of deep dives. One is on Real Estate Optimization. Dan Tangherlini came here from GSA to talk about what we're doing. And really, I think, have a nice discussion at the Executive level around how you all think about real estate, and then hopefully connect with your professionals inside your organizations to have a fruitful conversation there.

And then last section we're going to do is something we've been working on a lot which is Hardwiring Innovation, having a fruitful discussion on how we inspire innovation really

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

at all levels of the organization, not just an innovation team or a cohort, but bringing innovation to process, people, and our use of technology both facing inside government and out. So, I think we'll have a great set of questions for you, and a great discussion during that time.

With that, I'm going to hand it off to Joe Jordan to get us started.

MR. JORDAN: Thank you, Steve. We're going to go to Slide 10, so Strategic Sourcing is one of the items that many of you helped us with during the last PMAB period.

If you look at Slide 11, just a level set, where we were when we first kicked off this initiative. Dan and I talked to you about the fragmentation of buying across government, that we've had enough data to show that this fragmented buying approach was causing significant price cost variance, and are looking for the data in itself showed a real need around getting more of that information.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

1	So, there's certainly a large
2	opportunity here if we can come together, be
3	smarter and more thoughtful in our acquisitions,
4	take administrative costs of the system, and
5	really leverage the government's buying power.
6	We spent some time with all of you
7	and your experts visiting some of your
8	companies, and getting ideas.
9	At the last meeting, we adopted a set
10	of recommendations from the PMAB, or we received
11	a set of recommendations that PMAB adopted on how
12	we could actually implement this, how can we go
13	out and capture some of this opportunity.
14	So, moving to Slide 12, while we are
15	now still in a crawl, walk, run iterative
16	process, with strategic sourcing we'll be smart
17	and thoughtful while still moving as
18	aggressively as possible or we'll miss the
19	opportunity that we can capture, we've got some
20	significant results even since the last meeting.
21	So, we have implemented the
22	recommendations that the PMAB delivered. Every

agency now has a senior accountable official for
strategic sourcing. We created that Strategic
Sourcing Leadership Council, I briefed those of
you who were on the last call about where the big
issue, one of the things we heard from you and
your experts is focus on where the dollars are,
kind of put a Pareto principle around this, so
we took the seven agencies that control about 92
percent of the spend, and they now sit on a
Strategic Sourcing Leadership Council along
with the SBA, because we need to have our small
and disadvantaged businesses literally and
figuratively at the table for all of these
conversations. And we've started to roll out
certain commodity teams, build certain
commodity teams, and roll out certain vehicles.
So, already during just this fiscal year in
direct savings we've captured about \$50 million
in savings.

There's also tens of millions of dollars more in indirect savings, the administrative savings where instead of, you

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

know, standing up 15 different contracts for the exact same service, we're consolidating those down. We are standardizing terms and conditions so then the vendor doesn't have to have a whole set of different bid and proposals. We heard that from some of your folks, as well, and from the other side saying hey, when we deal with different agencies, even though theoretically you guys have the same rules, we have to create a whole new set of proposal documents because the agencies just ask for things a little bit differently, so we've really streamlined a lot of that.

Now, one particular success story that's happened since our last meeting and shows the collaboration among the agencies, as well as the collaboration between GSA as really the implementation lead for a number of strategic sourcing efforts and OMB helping shape the policy and chair the SLC is in the wireless category. Literally, the example we used that you saw on Slide 11, this Slide 11 was the one

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

1	we showed you about a year ago. That was one that
2	we attacked, and Dan is going to talk us through
3	a little bit of what the team was able to do.
4	CHAIR VANROEKEL: It would be great
5	to cover that, just talk about what we have in
6	Atlanta.
7	MR. JORDAN: Yes, sure.
8	CHAIR VANROEKEL: Because I think it
9	keys up what you're doing.
10	MR. TANGHERLINI: So, Joe said 15
11	different contracts, if only.
12	CHAIR VANROEKEL: Yes, right.
13	MR. TANGHERLINI: Our inventory
14	showed us we had over 4,000 different contracts
15	and 800 different plans. The joke was my own
16	family bought wireless better than the federal
17	government did, so we collapsed those 4,000
18	contracts and 800 plans into one contract and one
19	plan with four different vendors.
20	And the idea is then to bring that
21	scale together, bring the resources together,
22	and that will allow us then for subsequent

1	negotiations to begin to leverage the scale to
2	drive down the price, so that's part of the
3	challenge that's the outcome.
4	Now, finding our way through it was
5	not easy in the sense that the vendors knew that
6	there was some margin that was on the table
7	there, so it took us a long time because of
8	protests, rate protests, changes, but by
9	sticking through it and keeping the agencies
10	together, and I really compliment Joe and his
11	leadership making sure that people focused on
12	the outcome and the result.
13	MEMBER McGOVERN: Out of curiosity,
14	how much money was saved?
15	MR. TANGHERLINI: We have some
16	estimates, but part of the problem is we don't
17	really have data on what we're actually
18	spending, so what we need to do is pool the
19	different participants. We think it could be \$30
20	million in five years, we think that that's very,

**NEAL R. GROSS** 

Things like sharing minutes, not

21

22

very conservative.

having the ability to turn of roaming, particularly for those people working along the border where they would flip over to we'll call them non-domestic carriers, have had very high roaming charges. Those are all costs that were being borne by our -- the fact that we hadn't negotiated as an enterprise to get the best bargains.

We're going to look, now that we do actually have people participating, and try to match what the expenditures will be under this program versus prior programs and use that as an opportunity to then refine those contracts and get better outcomes.

MEMBER SALEM: So, one of the things that we've always dealt with is when you try to make a big change, there's always some pocket of resistance to that change. If you had one thing that you got resistance that would have a big impact on savings, what would that be? Meaning something that people are saying no, that can't be changed. Is there anything that comes to mind

2.1

1	that if you could say we will make that change.
2	I understand it's not easy, but
3	MR. TANGHERLINI: I have some ideas,
4	but I
5	MEMBER SALEM: All right. I just
6	think those are the things that
7	MR. TANGHERLINI: Yes.
8	MR. JORDAN: I think there are two
9	sides, one was, as Dan said, what were the
10	negotiating points with the vendor, and some of
11	those were how do you create, as Steve terms
12	it, the family plan for government. But then from
13	the user perspective, it's reallythe one
14	thing I heard a lot about was the device, you
15	know, people have a somewhat emotional
16	attachment to their device at times, and if
17	you're trying to standardize, you know, what we
18	showed before was a fully loaded data plan in
19	exact same metropolitan environments, really
20	trying to compare apples to apples, we saw wild
21	variance.

To streamline that, you do need some

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

device rationalization, and while that might work for 90 percent, those few are really aggressive. And then the other that you'll see in any strategic sourcing, I know Tim Solso is not here, but his folks at Cummings really drove it home when they did it there and it was the folks in the engine factory saying I got this can of Loctite for one dollar cheaper than you guys have, so I get better pricing than -- you know, strategic source vehicle. That's totally missing the point.

What are you getting in total, and are we losing on all those types of things, sometimes takes more than a 30-second elevator pitch with the person who we're now taking a little bit of control away in delivering huge savings to their agency.

MEMBER McGOVERN: You know, a lot of -- I'm sorry. A lot of companies -- and we're actually embarking on this at the Red Cross, have a bring your own device, but we are not maintaining it rule.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

1 MR. JORDAN: Yes. 2 MEMBER McGOVERN: And they don't pay for the device, so everybody has a personal 3 4 device and a work device, and the -- we are paying for the minutes, but we're not paying for 5 6 the device. And there were SO many ΙT 7 professionals that were maintaining devices, and they could all go away. And the 8 expense of maintaining it goes away. I mean, it's 9 10 something to think about. MR. JORDAN: Absolutely. 11 MEMBER McGOVERN: And then plus 12 13 everyone gets a device, people that don't need the device could get a device. 14 CHAIR VANROEKEL: So, we did two 15 motions in the last 12 months on that front. One 16 is we issued last summer bring your own device 17 guidance government-wide. 18 19 MEMBER McGOVERN: Yes. 20 CHAIR VANROEKEL: So, that's now up there. May 23<sup>rd</sup> was the one-year anniversary of 2.1 our digital strategy. I did see the Red Cross 22

shift their tornado app, which is very cool. I'm using some open government data that kind of on the heels of that strategy.

One of the things that came out in that May 23<sup>rd</sup> deliverable was a set of security guidelines for the vendor community to tell the device manufacturers here's what we'd like to see when you serve government, technologies handling, kind of laying the cards on the table and we want to see the technology go.

Those two things marrying up is starting to create а phenomenon government, and even in the White House we have a bring your own device policy now. I carry only my personal device with an app that works within our security guidelines so it's starting to have an effect, and I think it's going to continue with this new technology specification. It will actually allow the device to -- the work experience to take over the device, -- because the thing we have to worry a lot about is -- and we've very diligent on is records

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

retention and things very similar to the finance community, and corporate environment, and things like that, so we have to watch out for that, and think about how that works in the context of bring your own device.

MR. JORDAN: And one of the things for Steve, you know, Steve's work building on this is the PortfolioStat initiative that you've heard about. That's helping us identify within agencies where there may be zero use devices to your point, Dale, or some of the data that we need to capture to be able to tell you hey, exactly how much are we saving, and what are we doing? So, it's another kind of cross-management, cross-agency effort that is mutually reinforcing. Sorry.

MEMBER NARAYEN: That's okay. What incentives do you have for departments who save money, if it's I lose my project and I don't get any of the savings back then, you know, what's sort of the incentive for people to participate? So as you think about this, this is great. Are

2.1

there ways in which you are going to sort of funnel some of that back into other initiatives in the department?

CHAIR VANROEKEL: So, our IT budget guidance for the last year that formulated the President's 2014 budget was a cut and invest strategy, so it was asking agencies to cut 10 percent of their IT spend, and we gave them specific areas that were focused areas riding on the heels of strategic sourcing and PortfolioStat.

We automatically then gave them back 5 percent of that, but gave them areas where we wanted to see that invested. It was employee productivity, customer service, or cyber security were the three major categories. And then we asked them, each agency, to give us 5 percent priority add-backs, which would be if you could net to zero what are the additional 5 percent you would spend on in that context? And what was amazing is the agencies who did the hard work, you look at our federal IT spend, we were

2.1

actually up 78 basis points from the last year, so it's starting to work. We're starting to create the sort of depreciation mindset which is very foreign to government because the ROI is never realized in the place that you save it, so we want to create that virtuous cycle, so that mentality is going to continue forward on kind of how do we cut and invest, how do you take from the bottom of the list, add to the top, take from OpEx, give it to CapEx in that way that we drive this forward. And the incentive structure we've created is the agencies who work the hardest got the most support from us in really doing the innovative ideas.

MR. JORDAN: And I think, Shantanu, never waste a crisis. This is the perfect time for strategic sourcing because due to the fact there's even beyond OMB control, there is downward fiscal pressure. And, therefore -- I mean, Dave, and Maurice, and John can say more about how effective strategic source is in handing them some of these tools, but saying

2.1

look, you can plow these savings back in the mission, especially in the short-term. Over the long run we'd figure out how to give as much of it as possible back to the taxpayer, but in the short-term it's get the exact same commodity that you were buying before at the same quality, just for a lower price.

I mean, John and I spoke to the Department of Transportation Acquisition Work Force on Tuesday, and this was one of our shared messages. Look, we're joined together in saying this is the smart way to do the buying, and then plow that back into the mission where you've had these gaps created by the downward pressure.

So, just finishing up, you know, we've talked about wireless. There are other initiatives we've launched. I know office supplies we talked about a lot, and we've seen significant savings there. We spoke to you about — and I think there was a clear sense from the PMAB, drive up the value chain, start with those commodities where you can build successes, show

2.1

the clear wins, and then move up. So, now we're doing that and we've got a pipeline of things like laboratory supplies, some of the IT hardware that Steve has identified through PortfolioStat. And then moving into things that are more the services but not the, you know, really complex services that I think will take some time, but more building maintenance and operations, and things of that nature.

So, one more thing that really was driven home during our work together to, Gail, your point about well, how much, exactly the same or more of the same, the data. We don't have great places to get data. Dan just said that. It was something that was a shock to me when I walked in this job about 18 months ago. There's no place I can look and say even though I know every agency buys these binders, how much do we pay per binder? I know how much we paid to the vendor per buy, you know, it's all -- the end spending is all transparent, but the price per unit is nowhere found, to be Ι mean, without

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

significant amount of roll up your sleeves elbow grease, which I know Dan's team has done a lot of.

So, we're building a prices paid portal. GSA is running point. We've got DOD involved since they have so much of the spend, and OMB is using whatever resources we can apply from a policy perspective to try to launch first the pilot, prove it out. We're going to pick some IT categories and some other commodities where strategically we've already got vehicles, get that data, show the variance, show the best low-cost and low-price options with the strategically vehicles, drive the demand there, and then create that virtuous cycle that we all talked about.

CHAIR VANROEKEL: Great things happening on that front. As you can see, I had to shake things up every way, the changing the order in the slides --

(Off microphone comment.)

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

1 CHAIR VANROEKEL: On the management 2 team we are ready for anything. 3 (Simultaneous speech.) 4 CHAIR VANROEKEL: Let's go back to Slide 5, and Norm Dong is our Deputy Federal 5 6 Controller, who will take us through the work 7 he's been doing on improper payments. MR. DONG: Good morning, everyone. 8 Before we actually get into the slides, I want 9 10 to step back and provide folks with a quick snapshot of the progress that we're making on 11 12 improper payments. 13 We're continuing to see a positive trend in terms of the error rate. And when we 14 15 calculated the error rate for fiscal year `12 we saw that it had dropped to about 4.35 percent, 16 and I contrast that to the high-water mark of 5.4 17 percent that we saw in fiscal year `09. So, we're 18 19 making movements in the right direction. 20 And if you look at the programs that have traditionally had chronically high error 2.1

like Medicare fee for service,

Medicaid, and the Earned Income Tax Credit program, as well as UI, which we'll talk about in a few minutes, even with those programs we saw that the rate was notching down slightly, as well. So, again, I think we're kind of moving in the right direction.

But even when you take that 4.35 percent error rate and you apply it to the base of all federal spending, that's still a big number, and we calculate that to be about \$108 billion. So, I think that underscores the fact that we still have big challenges ahead of us.

So, I want to just recap some of the earlier conversations that we've had with this group in terms of improper payments. In prior discussions we focused on two overarching questions; one is looking at corporate best practices among the organizations sitting around this table for addressing error and fraud prevention and detection. And then, more specifically, talking about actions that the federal government should take based on the

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

experience around this table in terms of managing improper payments and errors.

And I want to recap some of the key findings that have come out of this group. What we heard was the following. One is we can't try to do it all at once. We can't try to boil the ocean, but we really need to be focusing on a subset of improper payments.

Based on that discussion our efforts have focused largely on trying to move the needle in terms of unemployment insurance and trying to bring that rate down, but then also looking at what Treasury is doing government-wide through it's Do Not Pay portal. And we're going to talk about each of those in a few minutes.

We also had conversation in terms of looking at game changing approaches and focusing really on the issues of incentive and governance. And I think you'll see a lot of that when we talk about the state-led model for unemployment insurance through the Integrity Center.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

Discussion around standardizing data to lay a foundation for more effective matching and analytics. And if you look at the work that's going on at Treasury right now, they're looking to standardize payment data so that as agencies send information to Treasury to make disbursements, they're taking the same in of embedding approach terms these transactions with the key information to help with fraud and improper payments detection and prevention.

And then, finally, on the issue of data analysis. There's a lot of conversation around that in the past, and what we see right now is more of that across the federal government but looking particularly at the Treasury and Do Not Pay. They are building that capacity as they stand up to the Do Not Pay program.

A couple of examples of some of the analysis that we're doing. Treasury has worked with one agency to examine the distribution of age, of beneficiaries by age to see does that

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

pattern -- does the data indicate the pattern that you would expect? So again, being able to do some initial analysis to say hey, that may not look right, and be a red flag that requires further review.

And another example is where the Do Not Pay program is providing analytical support to the Treasury OIG to help with that diverted payment program. That's where you take somebody's bank account number and you're routing it away from the original source to fraudulent actors.

So, if we go to the next slide on page 6, I want to spend a little bit more time talking about the progress we've been making with the UI Integrity Center of Excellence. As many of you may know from earlier discussions, the UI Center of Excellence is a partnership that we have with the New York State Department of Labor to develop and implement innovative strategies to prevent fraud and improper payments.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

And really New York is serving as the lead among all the states, and the work that we're seeing in New York will benefit all 50 states to build capacity among the states, again with an emphasis on data analytics and predictive modeling.

As the Center goes forward we're focusing on a few key priorities. One is, as I said before, data analytics and predictive modeling methodologies and tools. developing a secure alert system to update states quickly to new fraud schemes. And I want to underscore the fact that it is secure, as we were talking about this with the Department of Labor yesterday. It needs to be secure because (a) we don't want to tip off the fraudsters as we make this information available; and (b), we want to be able to share that information with and not have other potential the states fraudsters take a look at what's going on, so we need to keep that information very tightly held.

Big focus on best practices and

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

being able to identify what we're seeing across the landscape and make sure that all states are benefitting from the innovations that we're seeing.

And then, finally, major focus on training. And what we're going to be doing is looking at analytic capability and program integrity capability across the state landscape and seeing where there are big gaps, and seeing where there are trends, and be able to develop a program, again with New York State taking the lead, to be able to address those gaps as we go forward.

In our initial few months we had awarded the grant, when was it, Gay, in September of last year, to New York State, so we've been focusing with them in terms of standing up the initial program infrastructure. Some steering committees have been established focusing on data analytics, the portals and information technology element, as well as training.

Slide 7 provides the outlook ahead

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

in terms of what we see as some of the key deliverables on the horizon. They bring us back to the issue of training. This month the Training Subcommittee is going to be beginning to assess state integrity capability and training needs so that launches this month.

Back to the secure fraud portal, we're currently going through the procurement process, but we expect to be able to stand that up by around October of 2013. That's our target for launching that.

And then as we look into fiscal year `14, that's when we're going to see more activity in terms of the data analytics and the predictive modeling capability, not just in terms of developing the system, but also in terms of hiring and building the staff capacity, as well.

MEMBER NARAYEN: You know, when we first started talking about IT, we talked about how government sometimes creates sort of, you know, bespoke systems and systems for themselves. And this is probably an area of

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

research and innovation right now, the value that's second to none. Right? I mean, big data and what are you doing to find ways in which people can analyze data for whether it's credit card fraud, or what's happening on the web, et cetera. So, I really encourage you as you look at this rather than create, you know, again, a sort of standalone separate system, there is more dollars that are going to big data and analytics than I think anytime in software's history. So, I think there's a lot. A trip to the West Coast and just seeing what companies are up to in this space I think would be a very effective use of your time.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: Yes, I would second that. I think if you look at companies that are in the credit card space, they have very detailed analytic models to predict fraud and to be able to triangulate specific transactions with specific individuals, and send up red flags. I know at American Express there's an enormous amount of analytical capability.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

CHAIR VANROEKEL: I think on our Recovery Accountability Transparency Board that was stood up by an act of Congress after the Recovery Act was issued, they engaged a lot of data -- big data and forensics companies to do work there, and it's seen as a really great example. I think you're spot on thinking about that in this space, as well.

MR. DONG: I know that last year we had some initial visits with a few companies, but I think we're not done yet in terms of the research and information gathering, so I think it's time well spent to continue that effort to see how the corporate side is approaching this issue. I think we have to learn from those lessons --

MR. WINSLOW: And as we've been working through this, we've gotten focused down on specific issues that you've already pointed to, Shantanu, that is the data analytics and the capacity to extract from that data the patterns of behavior which you want to flag as you do go

2.1

1	through all these things.
2	MR. DONG: Right.
3	MR. WINSLOW: And I know Gay Gilbert,
4	who is the Program Manager for the Department of
5	Labor just sitting in the back there, we've
6	talked with some of the folks in some of the tech
7	forums have we not?
8	MS. GILBERT: We did have some
9	presentations from eBay that were very helpful,
10	and that is all part of our learning space.
11	MR. WINSLOW: Exactly.
12	MS. GILBERT: We also spent a lot of
13	time with the Medicaid, their fraud lab and
14	they've been engaged in the data over a couple
15	years to help with their learning and how they
16	approach their assets. So, we but Norm is
17	correct, we're still in a learning mode so I
18	think we're difficult.
19	MR. WINSLOW: Yes.
20	CHAIR VANROEKEL: And during the
21	Administrative portion at the end of this
22	session we're going to talk about so this is

a huge area of opportunity with the government. And as we think about the PMAB membership, there may be some additional professionals who could suggest -- to come in and bring real insights into this phase both on the big and small side.

MR. DONG: Okay. I'm going to shift the conversation to focus more on Do Not Pay, which starts on Slide 8. And I'm very excited about the progress that we've made over the past year with the Do Not Pay program.

Just to recall, that the Do Not Pay program is a centralized data matching service launched last year run by the Treasury Department, and the service allows us agencies to check multiple databases to determine a recipient's award or payment eligibility.

And, you know, we build this program we're focusing with a core of two datasets, the Death Master File, as well as the Excluded Parties List System. And that is, I would consider the standard that we use for all the payments, but then based on what agencies have

2.1

in terms of existing authorities or additional authorities, we're accessing other data sets, as well, which you see listed here on Slide 8 in terms of the Debt Check database, the Work Number, as well as the Central Contractor Registration.

And since we launched the program last year, we've been working to address and balance several key challenges. One is balancing the need to share information with the need to respect and follow privacy rules. But then, also, the challenge of how do we integrate this new Do Not Pay process into agency business processes?

So, the milestone that we just hit last weekend was by June 1<sup>st</sup> we had set out to run all federal payments, as appropriate, through the Do Not Pay program. And as we were thinking about this, we first focused on agencies doing it one by one for the pre-disbursement process. And we decided that that's probably a better way of doing it where

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

if agencies are already sending payment information to Treasury, why not do it on a centralized basis where Treasury takes that information and screens it against these data sets, and then figures out the hits. So, that's the approach we're taking, and we think it is a much more effective way of achieving scale across the federal government. And that's what we launched as of June 1st.

And in terms of how we act upon those hits, we recognize that not all hits translate into stops. There may be a valid reason why a dead person is being paid. So, for example, the beneficiary may --

MEMBER McGOVERN: Sorry. Can't wait to hear this.

# (Laughter.)

MR. DONG: That beneficiary may be paid or survivor may be paid the beneficiary's benefit, so it's not an absolute rule where, you know, you see a dead person, you've got to not make the payment. You've got to understand

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

what's going on, what's the back story on that transaction? So, we want to be able to be more thoughtful in terms of understanding what's going on agency by agency to make the right decision, as opposed to simply stopping all payments and then when they, in fact, may be valid payments.

So, the process for doing that is as Treasury takes the payment information coming from the agencies, they screen it against the data sets that I just described, and they'll take the list of hits. They push the list of hits back out to the agencies for adjudication and disposition.

So, let's just say Treasury finds 100 hits for the Department of Housing and Urban Development. We send that information back to Maurice's team, and they run those hits to ground, and they may decide okay, 10 are actually valid payments, but 90 are payments that should be stopped. And that allows us to make more thoughtful, thorough review of all the payments,

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

1	and make sure that people who should be paid are
2	getting paid, and those who are not will not get
3	paid.
4	And then we want to see the feedback.
5	We actually want to see how those dispositions,
6	how those hits are being disposed of one way or
7	the other. So, as Treasury pushes out this
8	information at the beginning of the month,
9	agencies are required to send disposition
10	reports back to Treasury and to OMB at the end
11	of the month, so that gives us that cycle where
12	we can see how the hits translate either into
13	stops or valid payments.
14	MEMBER McGOVERN: So, your overall
15	rate is 4 point something percent.
16	MR. DONG: 4.35.
17	MEMBER McGOVERN: But is there a
18	point where you say okay, I'm now spending more
19	to chase this than I am the upside? And do you
20	know where that is?
21	MR. DONG: We've set an initial goal
22	of 97 percent accuracy, or 3 percent error, which

1	I think is stretching us beyond where we have
2	been historically. And I think it reflects kind
3	of the fact that you'll never get 100 percent
4	accuracy. And then, also, as we look at some of
5	these payments, not all of the payments are
6	overpayments. Some of the payments are actually
7	documentation errors where so, let's just say
8	I've got a contract where the vendor did the
9	work, but the period of performance it had
10	gone beyond the period of performance. You could
11	argue that, you know, that vendor was entitled
12	to that payment because they did the work, but
13	you didn't do the paperwork to adjust the period
14	of performance.
15	CHAIR VANROEKEL: She's saying do we
16	have a target for a line
17	MEMBER SMITH: 3 percent is what I
18	heard.
19	CHAIR VANROEKEL: Yes, but that's the
20	goal. I don't know if that's the cost benefit
21	analysis line
22	MEMBER McGOVERN: Yes, I'm just

trying to figure out --

2.1

CHAIR VANROEKEL: -- because operationally it costs more.

MEMBER McGOVERN: The process that you've described to me sounds a little labor intensive. You're sending it one place, somebody has to investigate everything, they send it back. And I'm sure we're nowhere near this point, but taken to its illogical conclusion, you're going to be spending more money chasing after this than you're getting upside. And I just wondered if you had a feeling for that because, you know, you're -- you can't always police the unpoliceable. I mean, no matter how great your data analytics get, these fraudsters find -- they're like water, they just sort of find a path of least resistance.

MR. DONG: Yes. We want to be able to monitor the initial results closely as they come back from the agencies, so if we see that this is a huge grind for the agencies and is so labor intensive, and it's just kind of grinding

1 everything to a halt, then we may need to adjust 2 how we approach this. And to that end, we also want to use 3 technology and automation so that it's less of 4 a manual process. 5 6 MEMBER McGOVERN: Yes. 7 MR. DONG: And that as we learn on how agencies adjudicate this, why not just build 8 that into the business rules up front so that 9 10 you're slowly --MEMBER McGOVERN: Right. 11 Hopefully, more 12 MR. DONG: slowly, quickly moved out of the process of 13 moving -- having a manual very labor intensive 14 15 approach to a more automated approach. MEMBER SMITH: Well, along those 16 lines as you were talking about, so the example 17 you gave of if someone's data turns out it's a 18 legacy payment to their estate, shouldn't that 19 20 be -- or can't you handle that in data entry? I mean, I'm just thinking about why you wouldn't 21

-- to Gail's point, I'm struck by running all

1	that down, you know, so when you go back to your
2	data warehouse is there an opportunity for more
3	of what I call sophisticated mapping so that you
4	don't have all these exceptions hitting the
5	screen. So, if someone dies they put them to a
6	PS1 number, and then, you know, I'm just thinking
7	about you maybe want to go a little step forward
8	in the data entry process.
9	MR. DONG: Absolutely. And when we
10	talk about data standardization in terms of the
11	
12	MEMBER SMITH: Right.
12 13	MEMBER SMITH: Right.  MR. DONG: information that
13	MR. DONG: information that
13	MR. DONG: information that we're putting in our payment file going to
13 14 15	MR. DONG: information that we're putting in our payment file going to Treasury, that is something that we can do more
13 14 15 16	MR. DONG: information that we're putting in our payment file going to Treasury, that is something that we can do more standardly across the board. So, if I'm putting
13 14 15 16	MR. DONG: information that we're putting in our payment file going to Treasury, that is something that we can do more standardly across the board. So, if I'm putting in data that shows that it's actually to a
13 14 15 16 17	MR. DONG: information that we're putting in our payment file going to Treasury, that is something that we can do more standardly across the board. So, if I'm putting in data that shows that it's actually to a survivor, then it's not going to be
13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. DONG: information that we're putting in our payment file going to Treasury, that is something that we can do more standardly across the board. So, if I'm putting in data that shows that it's actually to a survivor, then it's not going to be (Simultaneous speech.)

doing kind of the front screen data cleansing and --

(Simultaneous speech.)

MR. DONG: Figure out okay, what is the core set of information that I need to see on every payment?

MEMBER SALEM: And one thing you may want to consider, there's three companies in the United States that probably pay 75 percent of every private sector employee between ADP, Paychex, and Ceridian, and you may actually want to just go talk to them about if we were going to try and solve this problem, is there a creative way, because they literally are cutting checks every week, every other week, and there may be some knowledge they have, or there may be some data feeds they can give you that would be a Social Security lookup or something and say to the UI, the State UI agencies, look, this person is receiving a check from an employer, there's no reason to pay him. So, I would say those --I'm pretty sure they pay at least 70, if not more,

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

of the private sector at this point.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

CHAIR VANROEKEL: I think the other do out I'm hearing from this us going back and making sure that we're tracking, super diligently tracking the cost structures of the process, goaling ourselves and around optimizing both productivity and cycle time that drives us to technology or other things, and then we can metric against that.

I think your assumption is right, that 3 percent is still a win, but not all the way there on a cost-benefit analysis.

MR. WINSLOW: So, one of the other things I just want to highlight, just following up with Liz' question. The reason for what Treasury is in the process of doing by capturing the adjudication results is to figure out what are those things that should be built into the front of the system. So, trying to build a bit of a closed loop, and we're still at the sort of beginning stages of figuring out what are those components of data that do need to be baked into

the front of the system.

2.1

MEMBER SMITH: So, that will make the whole cost of compliance analysis a little bit slippery because, presumably, you're going to be getting better, and better, and better and automate a lot of this, so --

CHAIR VANROEKEL: Norm, can you hit the -- it says at the top "As appropriate." make sure we don't skim over that -

MR. DONG: Sure. We interpret as appropriate two ways. One is we don't want to duplicate work that's already being done, so if you look at the pre-award process there's a system called SAM where agencies are already looking -- doing a lookup against these same databases. So, we didn't want to make them repeat that process and do that twice.

Secondly, while Treasury disburses most of the federal payments, it's not all of the federal payments, so there are other disbursing organizations in the federal government where there are some systems limitations right now

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

that prevent us from moving 100 percent of their payments through Do Not Pay, but those are issues that we're working on.

CHAIR VANROEKEL: We think that's a pretty small number.

MR. DONG: Yes. Slide 9 real quick just to summarize, the road ahead our focus is on (a) developing an implementation guide that helps make this process —— to help institutionalize the process across the federal agencies, as well as to reach out to states and let them access the Do Not Pay program for state-administered payments.

Also, we talked before about how we're just using two databases in terms of the Death Master File and the Excluded Parties List. We want to be able to add other data sets into the Do Not Pay program. We look at CBRS at the Department of Housing and Urban Development that helps us determine creditworthiness, and it helps us with the eligibility question. But then also we look at the Work Number for unemployment

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

1 insurance. Again, that provides detailed 2 earnings data that helps us, again, have a better sense of program eligibility. 3 MEMBER WILLIAMS: How comfortable 4 are you with the metrics that you're using to 5 6 measure the activity and the yield on each 7 activity? MR. DONG: In terms of how we are 8 9 disposing of the hits? I'm not sure I understand. 10 MEMBER WILLIAMS: Well, in the whole program you have a set of activities you're 11 12 engaging in. And some activities will have a greater yield to Do 13 Not Pay than other 14 activities, so how do you -- how comfortable are you that in tracking that you have good metrics 15 by agency, by activity, that gives you a sense 16 as to where the yield actually is? Not all 17 activities will have an equivalent yield, I 18 19 would assume. 20 MR. DONG: Yes, as we look forward to the results that we're going to be sharing with 2.1

the agencies, I think that will give us a better

sense. So, in some of our initial work, for
example, we saw that there are a lot of false
positives. So, again, it kind of comes back to
the labor intensity of this effort, and are we
getting a lot of false positives, and are we
getting a lot of noise here? And, again, what do
we do to kind of change some of the business
rules, and do more of the up front work so that
you're not creating a lot of work at the back end?
But we will know better as we begin to see the
results coming off of all payments running for
June for Do Not Pay, which started June $1^{\rm st}$ .
CHAIR VANROEKEL: Great. Skipping
around once again GSA Acting Administrator.
The President has nominated him -
MEMBER LEE: Sorry, Steve. I was just
I couldn't hear. I couldn't hear what you were
saying.
CHAIR VANROEKEL: Sorry. I was
bouncing over there. Slide 13, bouncing over to
Dan Tangherlini who is the Acting Administrator
of our General Services Administration, and very

recently the President nominated him to be the permanent administrator.

MR. WINSLOW: Well, maybe not permanent --

# (Laughter.)

MR. TANGHERLINI: Thank you very much, Steve. And I think that this is much like the Strategic Sourcing Initiative. An example where if you focus on what you take to be fixed costs, you can try to make them variable so that you can then drive them down.

We have a working assumption. It's -- I think it's a pretty safe one, and that is that the federal government has more real estate under lease than it needed to carry out its missions and activities. And we've identified, we've gone through a process over the last several years, the Administration has been very focused on this issue. We have identified properties that we can either repurpose and consolidate agencies into what we can put back into the marketplace. In fact, you've probably

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

just heard that this week we finalized the terms with the Trump organization for them to do a 60-year out lease of the Old Post Office Building and turn that into a hotel.

We also released an RFP where we're looking to work with the private sector partners in Silicon Valley to help us operate the Moffett Federal Airfield and use that operation to get investment in a historic structure. So, we are pushing very hard on finding ways that we can leverage these assets.

We believe that by eliminating these under-utilized or excess properties, or getting improved utilization of the properties we have we can drive down the cost of operations, and we think there are second-order effects in terms of reducing the tail, the administrative tail that goes with those programs, as well as, I'll talk a little bit about this, really pushing up productivity as we find ways to either collaborate and cooperate, and just even bump into each other in the hallways.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

We've made significant progress. The President and OMB have issued a variety of guidance around telling agencies that they really need to look in at this particular line item, challenging them to be more aggressive about approaching the way they physically organize themselves, and encouraging people to work together to collaborate, and particularly work with TSA on trying to find ways that we can better manage these assets.

We've already generated more than \$8 billion in savings over the last two years, and we've adopted a pretty aggressive policy, a hard-ceiling policy of zero growth in the federal real estate portfolio.

Now, at GSA, we want to do better than zero, and that's our goal -- to push down. We think the opportunity, as I said, is by shrinking and maximizing, well, not maximizing but shrinking the federal government's sprawling real estate portfolio, maximizing the utilization. How did I not get that? Will allow

2.1

each agencies to realize its efficiencies and save directed toward their mission-critical activities, push it back into the mission or return it to the taxpayer. Don't put it in the space that you're not using. But we have some challenges.

Like strategic sourcing, we have very limited visibility. We look through a porthole, frankly. We don't get a picture window into what agencies' real estate holdings are, how agencies use that real estate, even how many people come in and out of the buildings in a given day.

We are concerned about developing a shared government-wide goal, we're very concerned about developing a one-size-fits-none policy that then creates a lot of agency push back, so we have to figure out ways that we can come up with some metrics, or some strategies that agencies can accept, and they can adopt.

Real estate has a long lead time, and the savings is needed now. Part of the problem

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

is as we see lease expirations coming up, we've been working on that with agencies for 36, 24, 12 months. Some of the exigencies, some of the focus, some of the energy that we're feeling now may not have been felt several years back, so how do we make sure that we're not pouring concrete, if you will, around the government we have rather than the government we want, and the costs.

Even fast payback projects, projects that pay back in 13 months when you have a 12-month budget cycle, a hard budget cycle, and you have issues as we've had with getting appropriations, even fast payback projects are hard to actually buy.

So, current tactics, some of the things we're doing. We're trying to create not just bigger but better tails on real estate data to get aligned government-wide data collection to decision making, getting agencies to contribute more, focusing on what we're asking agencies about, trying to develop deeper understanding of agencies' portfolio.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

Freezing the footprint, we're going to tell agencies and work with agencies to say look, there's a no expansion policy. If you need to expand, expand within your current resources or work very closely with OMB to plan it and justify. We've got to trust, but we also have to verify, so we're asking agencies to develop their plans, provide those plans to OMB. We'll work closely with OMB to try to understand what the needs of the agencies are going forward.

We need to encourage the adoption of flexible workplace management practices. At our headquarters, GSA, we just opened two weeks ago in the space where 80 percent of the offices are telling, only 20 percent are assigned. I sit in a 6,000 square foot area with about 50 people. We went from the distance between the two other chief leaders in my organization in two separate buildings being about 4 miles to being less than 40 feet. And I tell you, it's a powerful message when people walk up and they see I'm sitting at a desk not much bigger than this end of the table.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

It's kind of hard for them to start complaining about the actual turf that we're fighting for now with agencies and organizations. Every square foot that goes into space is one -- every dollar that goes into space is one dollar less that could go into programs.

We also need to get ahead of the curve by developing a better, more robust, and more thoughtful long-term real estate plan process. Real estate is a long-term lead item. It really does define to some extent a big chunk of cost structures, and we really need to start describing where we want to go if we have any hope of trying to get there.

We also need to find ways that we can cut to the chase, and when we are done with the property, when it's being accessed, when it's time to put it to a different use, we need to find ways to get through the legislative and legal process to get it out into the market.

The Administration has a proposal, there is also a proposal in the House, there's

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

a proposal in the Senate for reforming the ways we deal with civilian non-military real estate, so as they say, those are the three ingredients you need in Washington to bake anything legislatively, the Administration, the House, and the Senate. We think we can probably work out a deal to try to move something forward in this Congress.

So, that leads to how you can help us. We have a couple of questions for discussion. I hope we'll generate some response, maybe you can even respond if these aren't the right questions. But how have you, or how do you identify under-performing assets in your real estate portfolio? How do you do that? How do you figure it out? How do you overcome the incentives within your own organization for people to hold on to those assets? I imagine what we see in the federal government is probably replicated in your organizations, as well.

Is real estate playing a corporate-wide exercise, is it something you do

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

at the corporate level, or do you do it at a sub-corporate level? Do you let something below the corporate level make those decisions? So, for us, it could be is it at the Administration level, or is it at the agency level, or is at the local and regional level?

And then how do you think about the balance between pushing improvements in units that are less advanced versus across the board mandates? So, how do we strike that balance of trying to do smart cuts with just forced cuts, you know? How do you handle that within your organizations?

And then how do you think about structuring the goal-setting process to insure that you do, in fact, get buy-in? So, even if you are getting to the hard cut, the mandates, how do you make sure that people aren't squirming around you and figuring out every which way to not deliver the outcome?

Those are some of the questions perhaps we could talk about.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

CHAIR VANROEKEL: Right before -(Simultaneous speech.)

MEMBER SALEM: I would say, though mean, these questions, are good corporate-led kind of top down management of your employee base and your real estate kind of go hand in hand; meaning, where do you want your workforce to be, what do you want the real estate footprint to look like? These are mandates. These aren't things that if you leave it up to the little individual units they're going to get anywhere. So, I'm sure if you go talk to the real estate managers they will say that they have big support from the executives in the company on which direction they're going to go, and it is pretty top-down.

I would tell you there's really easy techniques on under-performing assets now, everything from how many people badge in to a location. I mean, some of the work that was done where I used to work, we ran reports and we had small offices in places where there was minimal

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

utilization just from the badging report to when you shut those down, and it was pretty striking.

So, again, the real estate managers will tell you all the techniques because they all get together and talk about it. The thing I would encourage, that you talked about, Dan, which was great, is the flexible workforce. I think that most companies have really seen the biggest gains there in reducing their footprint. You're already on that so I don't know what more -- what best practices you're missing but, again, you could ask real estate managers because they're usually involved in that, too. MR. TANGHERLINI: It's interesting it has this nexus with the technology work that Steve's been really leading over the last several years. We found that by pushing to the cloud it's easier to make people more flexible and mobile. The other thing is it makes our whole operation more resilient. After super-storm Sandy, we had folks who were able to get right back in the system to help get the government stood up and working

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

again.

2.1

One of our heroes up in New Jersey, she found her way to the one coffee shop in the neighborhood that had Wi-Fi still working, and she was able to log in and help us move forward.

MEMBER SMITH: You know, I was just going to say, you know, being in the restaurant business company, we deal a lot with real estate and these issues, you know, and distribute it, and people holding on. And I would just reiterate we moved towards a centralized real estate organization and pulled the decision making from the individual concepts because there's -- that just doesn't work.

Real estate is a core functional expertise and there's no argument that says that I'm in this agency, have a different lens I need to go on real estate. Real estate is about ROI, what are you getting out of it? So, that is absolutely functionalized and centered everywhere. I can't imagine there's any argument left out there that would fly, and I'm sure they

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

could make it, but the facts just don't support that in the private sector. You're never going to find anyone heavily real estate dependent who allows that to exist in the business units any more. So, I just think that ship has sailed, and so the government needs to go like no one does it this way any more, perhaps they're right.

MR. TANGHERLINI: Is that an evolution up that we point to --

MEMBER SMITH: There's no one that does that any more.

(Simultaneous speech.)

MEMBER SMITH: Twenty years, you pulled it 15 years ago, yes. And that's why industry was slow to react, right, because particularly in our industry where casual buers here -- you didn't have a lot of infrastructure. Right? So, for Carrabba's, they got to control their own because no one wanted to ruffle the founder, and Outback controlled its own, ruffled the founder. So, we were probably a great -- a little bit analogous to the federal government

2.1

in that nobody wanted to disturb the different founders. That has had to change just because there's no expertise out there. Analytics exist and it's simply the argument for, you know, having particular expertise that's only suited to how you're -- it's just very hard to staff that up. So, yes, I would say that over the last X amount of years that certainly anyone who wants to compete in a slow-growth environment has kind of acknowledged that there can be productivity and efficiency that come out of that.

The one thing I would just say, and how do you get people to -- you know, you were saying -- I wrote down how do you get people to buy into that and everything? One of the challenges that you guys always have is that there's no penalization for inefficiency, so the way you get it in business is that capital and real estate isn't free. There's an expense portion of capital and depreciation that flows through your PNL that you are measured on, so the impetus to get rid of under-performing assets

2.1

and to clear your balance sheet of those and have 1 2 a reserve is there because you are measured on 3 them. 4 You need to set up -- I know there's -- after two and half years on this, 5 6 there's limitations, but unless you have some 7 benefit towards clearing under-appreciation or tax back to you in the form of depreciation 8 9 expense that you're measured on, why are you 10 going to get a ground swell of impetus? So, I think you need to figure out how to incorporate 11 that accountability on capital allocation 12 efficiency into the performance metrics of these 13 different agencies. 14 15 (Simultaneous speech.) MR. DONG: -- essentially managed 16 as business units, frankly, but program units 17 are not feeling the cost of their --18 19 MEMBER SMITH: Right. And that's why 20 even though it's centrally managed on real estate at our company, the costs flow --2.1

MR. DONG: You're pushing the cost

1	down.
2	MEMBER SMITH: through the
3	individual concepts
4	MEMBER KINDLER: Yes, I was going to
5	make the exact same point. We had a period of time
6	where capital was free, people were only looking
7	at income statement, not the balance sheet.
8	MEMBER SMITH: Right.
9	MEMBER KINDLER: They weren't
10	charged for the depreciation, so build a
11	building, doesn't cost you anything, across
12	corporate. So, I don't know the extent to which
13	it's feasible for you to apply depreciation
14	charge, have capital ROI metrics, but that's
15	when it starts to that's when they pay
16	attention to it.
17	MEMBER SALEM: We actually do annual
18	financial statements for each of the agencies.
19	It does include depreciation, but depreciation
20	isn't used in the decision making in any

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

MEMBER KINDLER: Yes, but if you want

21

22

meaningful way.

them to take ownership --

2.1

MEMBER SMITH: You have to do it. And that did happen in businesses a while ago, which was, you know, actually capital isn't free. Here's your expense, and the expense portion of the capital, here's your bottom line target. If you don't hit that --

(Simultaneous speech.)

MEMBER NARAYEN: Those are -- I mean,
I completely agree with the point, but here it
may be mocking the market because all of the real
estate here is probably among the best real
estate in the world, but it's not that expensive
because it's been on the books for, you know,
ages. So, you know, it actually might be the
reverse here, which is you have to --

MEMBER SALEM: That's interesting, and that is the one thing, within the GSA portfolio we do actually rent the property at a 3-year -- we do it on an annual and a 3-year rolling appraisal and adjustment, so we charge market rents. Now, what's interesting is because

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

of the way it's structured, we don't get to make market reinvestments in the properties --

MEMBER WILLIAMS: Just a couple of quick points, if I may. I think probably your situation is probably more analogous to merger integration than operating an existing business. If you put two large businesses together, control you have а and rationalization process of duplicate sites. You have different leases, different terms, et cetera, and you have often inadequate control in the sense that one side knows a lot more than the other side knows in that process.

So, I would think about it more as an analog to two large organizations coming together or several small ones and how do you get control over that process with the inventory and some critical decision making? I think it does have to be top-down, and I think the way you control it is given the lead time for real estate you control it with a multi-year strategic plan integration, so that your real estate is not a

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

separate activity from your business planning. It is an integral part, and just as people would have goals for productivity, for customer service performance, there are multi-year goals for real estate rationalization and facility which would get you there.

That also permits you to integrate the technical infrastructure to move more into not just hoteling, but telework where people actually work at home. And the infrastructure and metrics have to be in place to make that work, but at Aetna we got up to about 50 percent of 40,000 people working at home. Needless to say, it did wonders for our real estate footprint. Our productivity went through the roof, customer satisfaction was extremely high because it was a privilege to work at home. It was highly valued, and it was something that people couldn't get and really wanted to be able to maintain.

MEMBER GILLILAND: Dan, a question for you, because I think there's probably

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

violent agreement amongst this group about
top-down, but we also have the benefit of I
think most of us would say we have a single
mission, that we hope to have a single mission
at our companies. And you've got agencies with
many missions, so if you think about the agencies
in the intelligence realm versus others, what do
you think your addressable opportunity is? And
realistically speaking, there's only so much
top-down you can do, it would seem. I mean, you
can provide templates, perhaps, to some of those
intelligence agencies who I think would be
pretty resistant to your meddling.
MR. TANGHERLINI: Yes, we control
about 10 percent of the federal real estate at
GSA.
MEMBER GILLILAND: Okay.
MR. TANGHERLINI: Control somewhere
around a 40 or 50 percent of the office space.
MEMBER GILLILAND: Okay.
MR. TANGHERLINI: But the part that
we don't control is really DOD and intelligence

1	MEMBER KINDLER: Is what?
2	MEMBER GILLILAND: DOD and
3	intelligence.
4	MR. TANGHERLINI: DOD and
5	intelligence. So, in a way you move into the
6	addressable opportunity, it's not a small one.
7	We have a third of
8	MEMBER GILLILAND: Okay.
9	(Simultaneous speech.)
10	MEMBER GILLILAND: Yes.
11	MR. TANGHERLINI: Even at that, you
12	know, half of that office space level, so the
13	question is can you work with you know, can
14	we work with agencies that even if their
15	missions are very different, we're talking about
16	pretty much a common asset, and finding ways to
17	actually gets agencies to think collaboratively
18	and across agency hierarchies, so even within
19	agencies, you know, they're pretty stovepiped.
20	John's is a good example of that.
21	MR. PORCARI: One of the real
22	incentives I think for all of us is we know we're

never going to get capital money for, for example, our R&D facilities. And Dan has changed his culture at GSA to the point where we're actually comfortable working with GSA on a public-private partnership.

We have 14 acres in Cambridge, Massachusetts abutting MIT at our Transportation Research Center, for thought leaders, for a lot of transportation work. We are never going to be able to renovate that 1960s era space and R&D facilities, but we have one-story buildings and surface parking lots in some of the most valuable real estate in the country. We're doing a public-private partnership to unlock some of that FAR and some of the value and get renovated facilities as part of it.

And that's a relatively easy sell because we can get directly to the core mission for our employees, and they see the benefit in that one.

MEMBER McGOVERN: It strikes me, if you are already charging market rent, you know,

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

1	it's marked to market and it's market rent one
2	way to incent people is to reduce their rent if
3	they reduce the square footage. So, you can get
4	people to free up half of the property by
5	scootching in the way you're doing, and cut the
6	rent in half even though you haven't disposed of
7	the building. And then you use the other half of
8	the building
9	MR. TANGHERLINI: You only charge
10	them for the space they occupy.
11	MEMBER SMITH: The space they use.
12	So, why aren't they incented to do what you did?
13	I mean, it's free money for them.
14	MR. TANGHERLINI: Yes, I think it
15	does get into, you know, the actual turf war. I
16	mean
17	MEMBER SMITH: So, in other words,
18	they'd rather overspend their budget than
19	(Simultaneous speech.)
20	MR. HAYES: Can I speak to that,
21	because I think we're dealing with a historical
22	problem, because we didn't have Dan heading GSA

for years. And the view in the field is we have
70,000 employees, we have 150,000 structures,
many of them are not GSA, but the view is GSA
charges market rates. It's completely
insensitive to what's going on in our community.
We see that we're paying way more than other
people should be paying. We're stuck with it, and
the idea of incentives are not historically
there, I think. I mean, we're seeing it with
innovations right now, that Dan working with our
Denver Center where we have 10,000 employees
across, in our siloed Park Service Bureau of Land
Management, Bureau of Reclamation, et cetera. I
think we have to tackle those big kind of moving
pieces and show our workforce which is very
skeptical. Their view is we are getting killed
in terms of our budgets by what GSA top-down is
telling us we have to pay for real estate in our
community, and we know that we should be doing
better than that. That's kind of the cultural
challenge that we have, I think.

MEMBER McGOVERN: But just for point

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

of clarification, so if they're paying it and they don't like the rate, but they're stuck paying it, why don't they scootch into smaller quarters and reduce the rate? I mean, that --

(Simultaneous speech.)

MEMBER McGOVERN: -- square footage, just reduce the square footage.

MR. HAYES: You know, the whole -- I was in Moab, Utah two summers ago. We have Park Service over here, we've got BLM over here, we have USGS over here. They're not consolidated. The leases come up every five or ten years, you know. There's not a nice obvious entry point often I think for those negotiations. I think that's right. I think that's the key, is to use those entry points and have more of a menu of how -- and empowering the agencies to realize if they work with the newly creative people at GSA, you can save money, because we do feel it in our budget. There's no doubt about that. But we, historically, have not had kind of the lean in, I would say, from GSA, so we have a cultural kind

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

of thing to get over here.

2.1

MR. DONG: But you're providing that service now for different agencies through your portfolio analytics --

MEMBER SALEM: Yes, we're doing a portfolio analysis. The problem with the portfolio analysis, I have to say, is it takes a long time to do, and we're feeling this right now, and we have leases expiring right away, so we have to strike some balance between immediate and emerging response, as well as having this long-term strategic plan.

Now, I'll be perfectly honest, our engine was just kind of running happily along, we'd get the leases, we'd renew the leases, no one wanted less space. Right? There was always an interest in a little more, so we're trying to find an extra room, so we've gone through this massive shift in the way we need to relate to the agencies and, frankly, the agencies need to relate to us.

You add to that then decades of kind

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

of experience and legend, and clear, obvious mistakes, so it makes for an interesting job. I'm wondering if I actually want it any more after -- (Laughter.)

MEMBER KINDLER: Can I just clarify a point that David made, that one of you two can explain. Why would GSA be charging above-market rents?

MR. TANGHERLINI: I would argue that, you know, it's like any price. If I publish a price, you can go find a store that's selling it for cheaper. We aren't. We're doing it under a law that says how we will determine our rents. We're forced to charge market rates so that we aren't actually cheaper than commercial real estate, so that there is a make-by decision that agencies get to make.

There's a bigger question, and it's one maybe for a follow-on discussion, perhaps, with the CFOs, the real estate folks, and that is how do you actually finance then smart capital investments such as the consolidation of the

2.1

1	space in Moab? We've been in Moab for quite some
2	time. We are probably going to stay in Moab. Why
3	are we in a market that doesn't have a facility
4	that could fit all of DOI's needs? Why aren't we
5	building one?
6	So, the question comes then to how
7	we finance things in the federal government,
8	particularly on the real estate side. It gets
9	pretty complex, and gets into budget scoring
10	rules that are neat and interesting, but it's
11	worth the conversation to help us start thinking
12	about maybe ways we can change that.
13	MEMBER NARAYEN: I think the
14	Cambridge example is a good one. So, how do you
15	think about it now? How do you think about it when
16	you're saying it's this prime real estate in
17	Cambridge, and you can do different things with
18	it, so how do you go about making that strategic
19	decision? I'd be curious.
20	(Simultaneous speech.)
21	MEMBER NARAYEN: As to whether you
22	should even own it, or whether you should not own

it, and --

2.1

MR. TANGHERLINI: Our job is to find those opportunities by talking to agencies. I started a whole round of going from agency to agency, and they've all been very kind to let me in the door the first time, I don't know if they're going to do it the second, but -- and try to identify opportunities.

This particular location that John was talking about was something that he was thinking about, something he recognized as an opportunity, too, and we just sparked a conversation and said let's pursue requests in the market place. And part of it is also then challenging the market place to give us their ideas.

We have a lot of Requests for Information now, RFIs, which say we don't know what the right answer is. We don't know what the interest in the market place is. Here's the asset, give us your ideas. We did that with the FBI building, we've done it with a whole set of

six federal office buildings down in along the Federal Triangle South where the floor area ratio was developable FAR is a 3X multiple of what's there now, so we have all this potential real estate energy stored in those facilities that aren't fully utilizing their developable area. You need to go to the market place and ask them okay, how would you take down this?

MR. PORCARI: And Cambridge was an easy one for us in the sense that we knew we had to do something, and because it's an R&D facility, a big part of the value is its location. We can get people at government salaries because they're rubbing elbows with the private sector and the MIT people, and the other intellectual resources that make their jobs worth doing.

We just needed the facilities to do that, and the value capture part of it is easier here than it's going to be on almost any other transaction that we do. And it has the added bonus of being consistent with the master plan

2.1

that the City of Cambridge has for the area, so the community revitalization part works well.

MEMBER NARAYEN: I'd like to maybe echo one more thing that Enrique said. We do call it people and places, because I think that's really aligned, and I don't know whether you think about what should happen in D.C. versus what should happen in Utah, versus what should happen somewhere else, but we found significant savings, ways to grow people's career, attract the right people by having a people and places strategy.

MEMBER SALEM: So, call centers we don't put them in Silicon Valley. Right? We put them in Oregon and other places. I'm sure you do the same thing. But, I mean, that's a huge amount of savings.

CHAIR VANROEKEL: I think the other missing theme that's part of this that's a unique opportunity for us, and I think it goes back to your M&A mindset is the customer service aspect, you know, the siloed nature of the way we operate

2.1

government. You go to a strip mall in Middle America and you'll find five different government agencies occupying different spaces in the same strip mall, and we have a post office right down the street that we own, and things like that.

From a federal serving Americans aspect, you know, outside looking in versus our current inside looking out, you know, mindset here as we think through this. I think something Dan and I talked a lot about on consolidation opportunity across the agencies to drive a new model for customer --

MEMBER McGOVERN: I think that's where the good savings will be. I mean, I almost think you're better off going city by city where you know you have a lot of agencies, and you say how much real estate do I need collectively, how many of these buildings should I just sell off? Because by having everyone look at this siloed, you're playing with so many constraints. The human, I want more office space; the I'm paying

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

too much for this; what's my incentive to use less of this space when we're still paying for the whole building? I mean, it's like a puzzle piece, and it -- the strategic question is do I sell the property off, yes or no?

I'm of the opinion if you're -- if everybody is not hoteling now, anything you can get that looks like it's at market rate, I would just start selling the stuff off, unless it's in a city where it's the only building that you have. So, I mean, if MIT came to you and said I'll take the Cambridge property off your hands, I would just look at everything with an eye towards yes, because my guess is when you're done, you probably have 50 percent more real estate than you need.

MEMBER KINDLER: Just picking up on your point, and on Ron's, it is a little like an integration. If you took a city that had multiple agencies in it, and strip malls and whatever, and you said okay, we're going to treat this like a merger. We're going to have a synergy target,

and everybody is going to share in that, because that's how you end up rationalizing real estate more often than not in corporate situations where you have -- as Ron says, you put them together. You identify the cost synergies and you have a target, and then in this case you want to, as we talked about in other contexts, make sure the agencies have skin in the game, they're going to get some benefit from that. So, you start in a small place but one that has multiple agencies, and you say you guys get together, you rationalize your real estate. We're going to give you a synergy target, and then you're going to get the benefit of that somehow. It comes back to you in your budget. That's the way -- I think that's probably what you were thinking about when you were talking --

(Simultaneous speech.)

MEMBER KINDLER: That's what drives it. That's how we, you know, when we did massive real estate rationalizations it was mostly driven by mergers where we had to achieve a

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

1	certain cost synergy by virtue of the merger, and
2	we had a target, and everybody had a stake in it,
3	and that required us, it forced us, to come to
4	the head, to rationalize real estate.
5	MEMBER SMITH: Yes, I mean, the
6	mechanism for accountability is always where it
7	breaks down, where the private sector analogies
8	break down when we try to apply them to the public
9	sector. So, I guess my question is, you know,
10	what is the incentive whether you want to call
11	it, you know, the depreciation charge that maps
12	into the synergy target. What are your options
13	to create that accountability and that benefit
14	to having positive behavior at the business unit
15	levels, because, you know, whenever we ask that
16	question it's always like well, we can't
17	actually do that.
18	MEMBER KINDLER: Can't you
19	MEMBER SMITH: What can you do in that
20	area?
21	MR. DONG: I think you can do it,

though. I think we just haven't done it in the

1 past. Right now, when you look at a lot of 2 agencies those costs are being managed at a central level, and they're not being pushed to 3 4 the different program organizations. 5 MEMBER SMITH: Right. 6 MR. DONG: But it's the program 7 organizations that are making a lot of the --MEMBER SMITH: Right. Yes. 8 9 MR. DONG: And the theory would be 10 that as you push those costs down, it's going to inform the behavior. I don't think there's 11 anything that prevents us from doing that, we 12 13 just haven't done that. MEMBER SMITH: Because that's the 14 15 charge that goes on, that if they shrink they benefit, but if it grows, they --16 MEMBER KINDLER: But if you've got 17 everybody in that -- start with a relatively 18 19 small pilot of one city where they have multiple 20 things and you say we're going to have a synergy target, and if you want to choose this, you get 2.1

to share in that benefit. And they each get --

MEMBER SMITH: But then you can commercialize to other people, market --

MEMBER LEE: And one thing should be helpful is that this is happening in the private sector. I mean, as someone said earlier, in a slow-growth environment you've got to look for all the areas where you can save money, and where you can invest in other places. And I know there was a time when, you know, government executives compared themselves to corporate executives. And I remember years ago, I interviewed for a job at the FCC, and the person who was interviewing me apologized because the office that I would have had if I took the job didn't have a door. And she's like, you know, well, this is going to be a big thing for you. But, I mean, in these days and times most -- you know, as you said, people are hoteling, or sitting out in cubicles in the private sector, so why shouldn't the government do this? Why should you take a government job and expect a huge office, because you came from that in the

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

private sector? You know, things have just
changed so dramatically in the private sector
that that should be helpful.
MR. TANGHERLINI: And I think to get
to that point, I think some of our changes are
lagging, so in many ways we're reflecting the
last change, which is to try to push a bunch of
decision making out at the lowest level and ther
try to aggregate at a central level which is
budgets and costs. But now we have to start
driving down those budgets and costs, and maybe
we need to start pulling some of that decision
making back up further north, because at the end
of the day, it's going to be there's going to
be very little incentive in the field level that
get less realistic. My budget is going down, car
I at least keep my big office?
MEMBER LEE: Right.
MR. TANGHERLINI: And the answer is
actually, no, you better hand back the big office

MEMBER SMITH: But then what do you

because --

21

1	get out of that, right? Because people are human,
2	so what do I get, because in the private sector
3	you do have a synergy target, and if you exceed
4	it you're rewarded, and if you don't hit it, then
5	you're penalized.
6	MR. TANGHERLINI: But in an
7	environment now where what you're getting are
8	furloughs, and what you're getting are program
9	cuts, I think
10	MEMBER LEE: And you're losing
11	people.
12	MR. HAYES: You know, there's one
13	other potential incentive that really is greatly
14	federal-oriented, but very real. Right? We're
15	trying to get our siloed folks to get together
16	and have more shared services. Right? So, our
17	silos all have their own fleets. You know, they
18	all have their own IT. Well, we're centralizing
19	that, but there are a lot of services, you know,
20	HR, whatever, if they were in one location, you
21	could have shared services.
	11

Now, that just takes away from their

program money. And they get that, they like the idea, so in some locations, not so much cities but -- or big cities, but areas where you could -- look, we're all going to get together. You're going to save money on your fleets because you'll have smaller fleets, because we're going to save money.

There's something there, I think. That's one of the things we're using. We have a huge problem with the fact that our field structure is not -- is in all kinds of places, and not -- the regional structure isn't centralized in Atlanta for the Southeast or whatever, so we want to kind of over time pull people together, and we're looking -- and I think that's one incentive that we potentially can take advantage of.

MEMBER LEE: And even though you centralize the decision making at a higher level that doesn't mean you can't work with the business units to design the space in a way that might work better for them. You know, I mean, you

2.1

don't -- you can't push down everything, but you say this is how much space you have. Let's talk about, you know, are they cubicles, is it shared space? How do you make it -- design it in a way that works for the individual departments, or whatever? I know that's how we do it. It's like this is what you have, and you can tell us how you can work better in a particular design, but at least that keeps the business units still involved in the decision making process.

MR. TANGHERLINI: That's really interesting. I'm wondering, and I ask, did you have a problem where you had distributed corporate expertise in this area so that you had different people arguing over who was right about the way to manage that strategy?

MEMBER SMITH: We were completely decentralized, I mean, to the point where if you were going in the market, the JBP partner that controlled let's say eight restaurant span was in charge of going -- yes, I think that's the right property. You know, I talked to Sally, who

2.1

knew Bill, who said Ted said that this turns a lot -- I mean, that's where we were, so the decision would be made there. Right? And then the project work would then be paid for at corporate.

We had to flip it, right? Which is all -- so implement all analytics, all -- you know, now they still -- there's still a role for the JBP to say you know what, here's some things -- to Debbie's point, just some things that you're not going be spit out by your ROI and data analytic model that you need to consider at the marketplace. But once that decision is made, then it's pushed out, you know, versus it used to be this is what we're opening, here's the bill, please build it. Then you get to flip it.

MEMBER SALEM: So, the answer is they thought they had expertise in these JBPs, but was not effective.

MEMBER SMITH: Well, it's -- you know, so much of this is about analytics versus intuition. Right? And that's the big change in private -- in our industry, in the hospitality

2.1

industry. Yes, you always -- the way we talk to people, it's a marriage of the science and the art. You can't go all science, and you can't go we're going to sit here and centralize everything and spit out the ROI, and here's your map. However, you've got to lead with the facts, so we did have to swap the decision rights.

MEMBER KINDLER: So, it occurs to me again that while all of us here would say that in our worlds complete centralization of the expertise and the decision making is optimal. That's probably a bridge too far for you guys to get from here to there, so an alternative would be to empower those local experts to work together to generate a cost-savings target in a particular community. Let them feel the ownership of it, bring their respective expertise, and kind of force them to collaborate because they have a shared goal.

MEMBER McGOVERN: And then hold that up as a best practice.

MEMBER KINDLER: Yes, once you get

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

that done in one community and that community proves that they've saved money and it worked well together, you can scale it across others.

MEMBER SMITH: I don't think, you know, I mean to your -- I don't think anyone would say complete centralization is right. I know in our business it would die. Right? And in any company the minute you say centralized, so I would strongly encourage you to never use the word "centralized." No, seriously, that's first and foremost, never use the word "centralized." Center of Expertise that they input in, that they own, that we all benefit from, because I do think it's -- I do think bad things happen when everything is sucked to the center and you don't have any local input. But I think it's that tension between having the color and expertise on the ground but the analytics and facts have to rule the day at the end of the day. But they have to feel like they have skin in the game, that their input is important, that you're not just telling them what to do.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

1	MEMBER KINDLER: I guess what I'm
2	saying is the model that we operate under is
3	probably not one that realistically in the short
4	term you can get to; and, therefore, the to
5	me, at least, the step in that direction is to
6	empower the local groups with very clear targets
7	that they're going to benefit from achieving.
8	And they get help from the center or whatever
9	word you want to use, that has a place. But in
10	terms of expertise and the rest, but they own it,
11	they feel accountable for it. And that way it's
12	not being foisted on them.
13	MR. WINSLOW: Maurice, from your
14	perspective at HUD, how does all of this
15	conversation relate to your real estate issues?
16	SECRETARY JONES: It leaves out one
17	big issue, Congress has a play in our real estate
18	
19	MEMBER KINDLER: What does that mean,
20	if you close a site and a Congressman doesn't
21	like that
22	SECRETARY JONES: I have 81 offices

right now, I'm trying to close 16 of them. These offices were originally structured and the way they're structured now in 1968. They do not make operational and business sense, but boy do they make political sense. So, you tell the Congressman from X community that we're about to close his office, he says come on up to my office, we'll talk.

#### (Laughter.)

SECRETARY JONES: So, I'll give you a story. So, I went to a Congresswoman's office and I said we are closing your office, but we're going to serve your constituents from an office that we are already serving them from in the same state, and she looked at me and she said, "Have you been confirmed?" And I said, "Yes, ma'am." And she said, "Do you have to be reconfirmed?" I mean, so it leaves out the fact that these are not just -- I used to run a newspaper so I shoveled a lot of stuff.

### (Laughter.)

SECRETARY JONES: This -- there are

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

2.1

1	just a lot of people who have their hands in your
2	stuff.
3	(Simultaneous speech.)
4	SECRETARY JONES: You've got to be
5	able to manage that part of it, too.
6	MEMBER LEE: And do they care about
7	it or why do they care about it, from their
8	job's perspective?
9	MEMBER KINDLER: The building is
10	probably named after them.
11	SECRETARY JONES: I think there are
12	two pieces to it. There's a symbolic piece of it
13	that is really significant, that here I am. I
14	can't keep a federal office open in my district.
15	What am I supposed to tell my constituents,
16	right? So, whether it makes good business sense
17	or not, does it make good political sense? How
18	do I stand up and tell my constituents I couldn't
19	keep and if you're, let's just say right now,
20	if you're a Democrat with a Democratic
21	President, how do I tell my constituents that I

couldn't with a Democratic President keep a HUD

1	office open and fill in the blank, so that's
2	part of it.
3	MEMBER McGOVERN: But here's a
4	question, does that still stop you from doing it?
5	I mean, if that's the case, we'll never close any
6	
7	SECRETARY JONES: No, no, it doesn't
8	stop you. All I'm saying is
9	MEMBER McGOVERN: You've got to put
10	it in the equation.
11	SECRETARY JONES: you've got to
12	put that in the equation. And it's a huge hurdle
13	
14	MEMBER McGOVERN: Just plow through
15	it.
16	SECRETARY JONES: It's not that
17	simple. I wish it were that simple, but you plow
18	through and then you get up at an Appropriations
19	hearing and they go oh, yes, I remember you, Mr.
20	Deputy.
21	(Simultaneous speech.)
22	SECRETARY JONES: Welcome to the

1	Committee meeting. So, you have to
2	MEMBER McGOVERN: That happens in the
3	private sector, too. I mean, you know, we close
4	down one little piece of Glen Biomedical Center
5	and I heard from the Congressman. I mean, I
6	we're kind of talking if we can't close
7	anything
8	SECRETARY JONES: So, I wasn't
9	suggesting that we can't. We are doing it. What
10	I'm suggesting is
11	(Simultaneous speech.)
12	SECRETARY JONES: At this moment we
13	haven't talked about that, and it's a
14	MEMBER McGOVERN: Yes.
15	MR. PORCARI: And just remember you
16	have to walk in with a strategy as to why
17	(Simultaneous speech.)
18	SECRETARY JONES: Yes, definitely
19	have to.
20	MEMBER McGOVERN: Because we're
21	going to go to the next slide if we can't close
22	anything down.

1	MEMBER WILLIAMS: Are there
2	strategies that get you past it?
3	SECRETARY JONES: Oh, yes. Yes, you
4	can but it is a real piece of the equation.
5	The other thing I would
6	MEMBER WILLIAMS: Do you think it
7	speaks to this notion of the coordinated agency
8	approach, too. If we're sending each agency in
9	to each Congressional office to wrestle over
10	each store front, maybe that's the approach to
11	your plan. Trying to let agencies work together,
12	partner out of the strategic plan and say they
13	go, as John said, with a plan for those offices.
14	Okay, here's how we're going to do it.
15	SECRETARY JONES: That would be much
16	stronger. The challenge is that's not the way
17	they operate as government right now, so we're
18	in space in a southern city right now. There's
19	a federal building in that same southern city
20	that has space. It makes sense for us to be in
21	that federal building. We could save money. Even

if we didn't save money, the fact is we work with

l		partners.
$O \cap D \cap \Gamma$	TECETAL	nariners
	$\perp \cup \cup \cup \perp \cup \perp$	PULT CITCED

2.1

MEMBER KINDLER: So, what prevents you from doing that?

SECRETARY JONES: One is not -- in bad relationships between us and GSA at a level. Right? So, I think at bottom a lot of this relationship-based, and our ability to improve our relationships. Another is, I think what Dan was alluding to, which is right now we lease in private space. We feel a little more control over that. Right?

A third one is there isn't an obvious economic incentive to do it for folks who are in Atlanta. I've got to come down and say you've got to get this done. And, frankly, of all the alligators I'm wrestling with, this one probably doesn't rise. I may get to it in the third year. Right? So, there are lots of factors that conspire, if you will, to keep us from being better at this. And Dan will be gone in so many years, and I'll be gone.

(Laughter.)

# NEAL R. GROSS

PARTICIPANT: You have a permanent appointment.

SECRETARY JONES: Right, I'll be gone in so many years, and whether the next person after me believes this is worth getting at or not, I mean, this is -- all these things are part of it.

Now, having said all of that, we can do it, but you've got to get up every day doing this stuff.

MR. TANGHERLINI: I will say, this is why I asked about the structure and the function and your evolution there. A lot of what we do is we have a real estate function that deals with agency real estate functions, and there is the sense that the agency real estate function has the expertise and knowledge that reflects the agency's actual needs and priorities. It does get to issues of control, and authority, and responsibility. A lot of those people are former GSA people who then bring their GSA horror stories to the agency that would get back to GSA.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

MEMBER SMITH: Well, that's why it has to be a benefit of both, like they can't -- decision rights both have to have inputs in it and decision rights.

MEMBER SALEM: But if I'm the secretary at one of these agencies and I just say, you know what, I do want to go --

(Coughing.)

MEMBER SALEM: -- take my estate person and repurpose that person to being programs person. Right? Couldn't secretaries or the -- you know, at HUD, example, couldn't Secretaries say I don't want to have this real estate person any more? I mean, that's what happens in business. Right? The business manager says I've got choices I can make. I can put more resources to doing things where I can get some Center of Excellence help, or I can have another program. So, does the Secretary not have the ability to -- or he just not trust that they have a great person in Dan who can actually do a good job for him?

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

1	SECRETARY JONES: I think there's a
2	combination of yes, you can make that call. You
3	know, I no longer need to be in the real estate
4	business. So, then you work with the units and
5	then you work with GSA if you trust GSA. Right?
6	And you really have to I don't want to
7	underestimate the trust issue here. It's a big
8	one. The trust issue is a huge one here, so you
9	can't quantify that, but I'm telling you that is
10	a big part of the picture here.
11	If we could get better trust amongst
12	agencies within the federal government, we would
13	find ways to get the yes, even with all these
14	challenges. But the fact of the matter is, we
15	have a trust issue. It's gigantic. I know Dan,
16	I'm willing to trust Dan. He's my teammate. We'll
17	find ways to work with
18	PARTICIPANT: But you guys at the top
19	
20	SECRETARY JONES: Yes. He and I are
21	sitting up here trying to figure out what's going

on. Meanwhile, folks on the day to day level,

1	whew.
2	MR. HAYES: And I think the fact that,
3	as Dan said, Congress requires us to pay market
4	rates period. There's not a sense there are
5	no deals to be made here. Right? So, our guys are
6	very you know, we've got we have to give
7	it to GSA to do this work. We've got to pay top
8	dollar. There's nothing you know, this is
9	not good, you know. But I think if we work what
10	we're trying to do with Dan now is find these
11	other ways to show that there will be savings and
12	efficiencies and all of that, but
13	MR. JORDAN: And we shouldn't lose
14	that thread of the city by city approach because
15	all of us, we could pick five or six cities right
16	now
17	(Simultaneous speech.)
18	MR. JORDAN: and all of us have
19	footprint there. You know
20	(Simultaneous speech.)
21	MR. HAYES: And we're working with
22	Dan in Denver, which is a huge center for us. We

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	need patriotism, we need a new narrative. We need
2	new stories, GSA is our partner, and we can save
3	money, and we can be better off. And there's a
4	
5	PARTICIPANT: How to make inroads on
6	history.
7	SECRETARY JONES: That's right, so
8	it's doable. I'm optimistic about it, but I also
9	want to make sure
10	PARTICIPANT: That we understand the
11	challenge.
12	SECRETARY JONES: It is a challenge.
13	MEMBER SMITH: Whenever you put
14	change through, so this pivot what you guys
15	can do and even further up is champion the people
16	that are courageous enough at the lower levels
17	to do something different, and make sure that
18	they because everyone has some make sure
19	that they are recognized, make sure that they are
20	championed, make sure that they become, you
21	know, the model of what you're looking for, and

that people know that. Right? So, that is how

1	you drive change from the top, too, is that
2	people that do take the risk at the bottom and
3	do collaborate, and do do things in a different
4	way, you make a very public acknowledgment that
5	this is the new way of doing things, and this is
6	the kind of folks that we want, and this is the
7	kind of behavior we're going to reward.
8	CHAIR VANROEKEL: I think that's a
9	fantastic segue into the innovation section,
10	that you should say the exact same thing. But
11	before that, we should jump into a break.
12	MR. WINSLOW: Great, so why don't we
13	take roughly a 10-minute break, be back around
14	11:00.
15	(Whereupon, the proceedings went
16	off the record at 10:51 a.m. and went back on the
17	record at 11:02 a.m.)
18	MR. WINSLOW: Let's get started. I am
19	mindful of the fact that to make sure we get you
20	out at the appointed time. Let me go ahead and
21	get the camera started and go back live, so

22

everybody knows.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

CHAIR VANROEKEL: All right. Welcome

back to everybody watching on line. The last

agenda item today is Hardwiring Innovation. I

think we keyed up the last PMAB for a discussion

topic.

We are very fortunate to have two of

the most amazing people, one very new, one who's

been around the building for a while coming to

join us. Jenn Pahlka, you may have heard that

name, one of my favorite, and I consider one of

the best TED Talks up on line was delivered by

Jenn. I encourage all of you to check that out.

Jenn comes to us from Code for

America, an organization in San Francisco where

she was the Executive Director. She ran Code for

America, which is a non-profit organization that

connected innovators with local government to

solve innovation challenges at the local level.

And there are incredible things I'm actually

going to have to get into this about that effort,

and how we were lucky enough to convince the Code

for America board to have her come and spend some

time with us as Deputy Chief Technology Officer of the United States, and give some time at the federal level in the same way, and scale those efforts.

Jonathan McBride is one of our most important partners here in the White House, in the Office of that he is the Deputy of Presidential Personnel, SO from talent а standpoint getting the deputies you see here in this room to the new secretaries of the offices, and all the Presidentially appointed positions, Jonathan is at the forefront of that, and is also probably more relevantly to our conversation today, is that he's a key member of Innovation cohort, one of the founders of that group that's really thinking about how do we bring innovative people across the government landscape together on a regular basis to kind of discuss and tackle some of this innovation stuff.

If you turn to page 19 -- actually, why don't -- just Jenn, for level-setting, why

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

don't you give us a little bit of background on you, Code for America, some fun projects. I know I'm putting you on the spot.

MS. PAHLKA: Yes, you are.

(Off the record comments.)

MS. PAHLKA: The most stressful 12 minutes of my life.

Code for America came out actually of the work with Gov 2.0. What would it look like finding principles and values of the web in government, and think a way of thinking and approaching the problem, and I got to be exposed to. What we ended up doing was to start at the local level, the way that citizens feel, they have a closeness to the local government. And what we designed, initially, we call the Peace Corps for Geeks, so it's really, you know, mid-career folks, so average age of our fellows is 30. They're working in it's like Google, Microsoft, take a year off, and pairing them into small teams with those from local government, based on lean startup and this kind of design.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

So, when they leave they leave, they leave at least, but often many applications that cities can use.

Really what they're doing is they're leaving the folks in government with new approaches that they can use when they're gone to try to think of ourselves a virus for culture change. Did you want me to talk about -

CHAIR VANROEKEL: If you have any favorites.

MS. PAHLKA: Probably my favorite one last year was something called Blight Status in New Orleans. They, obviously, had a lot of problems with blight, but more importantly there's really an information problem. So the people who inspect the properties versus people who take the complaints, versus all different inspectors, the hearings, all of this is different. Not databases but even spreadsheets, ledgers, people's notebooks, and there was no way that anybody could -- except once a month at these Blight Status meetings ,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

	you couldn't tell the status of any brighted
2	property.
3	But the fellows went down and they
4	took a very lightweight approach to this where
5	they pulled the data out and put it in these APIs
6	using a different interface, and I'd say about
7	six weeks after their initial interviews they
8	had something up on the web: type in any address
9	and see the accurate status of any blighted
10	property. So, that evolved over the course of the
11	year and ended up being a beautiful,
12	consumer-looking type website, but the first
13	instance of it was six weeks, not three years.
14	CHAIR VANROEKEL: That's awesome.
15	MS. PAHLKA: It really worked with
16	the community.
17	MEMBER SALEM: I feel like clapping
18	now.
19	MS. PAHLKA: But the real win there
20	was they worked with the community, you know,
21	people actually use it, not it's not
22	something that you build and hope people show up.

1	There is such an active community of people:
2	residents, community groups that all use this.
3	CHAIR VANROEKEL: And, you know, the
4	Code for America team has an unending list of
5	these amazing projects they've been able to do.
6	The other thing that may sound
7	familiar here is this was the model we used, Todd
8	Park and I, the Chief Technology Officer of the
9	U.S. and I used to launch Presidential
10	Innovation Fellows. It was based entirely on
11	Code for America which was how do we rotate
12	private sector entrepreneurs, innovators in the
13	government, these fixed amount of times to
14	tackle some innovation challenges that we have.
15	But we all know, and we're going to talk
16	Jonathan is going to talk a little bit about
17	the reverse of that, potentially rotating people
18	out in some of the pilots and thinking we've been
19	doing about that virtuous cycle.
20	That part of it, and the sort of
21	injecting talent in and potentially training
22	talent we know is just a small part of the

innovation challenge we face in the federal government. Slide 19, I won't go through the slides here, but outside of the technical and scientific specializations where we in the government often lead the way, government innovation just isn't sort of embraced for so many reasons, from the range of experience to the -- just the cultural aspects encouraging this. Over, and over, and over again visiting agencies of government talking about good management, talking about innovation, talking about process change or doing things in a new way. You often hear well, that's the way we've always done it, and that is very much prescription for the future for a lot of people out there.

And there's an aspect of, you know, from what we've discussed earlier today on I don't get the return on investment, bringing the savings I drive, or innovation I do that you're just going to cut my budget if I say anything to just this massive risk intolerance because the approach in government often when faced with

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

challenge, like you said earlier, there's people out there already doing smart thinking on this stuff. The approach is often let's go build it ourselves, and that becomes this big multi-year monolithic effort that oftentimes fails and costs hundreds of million of dollars. We have way too many examples of those things, so the risk intolerance on these long-term big deliverables is huge, so people tend to not take risks broadly, so that's a difficult thing.

And then I'd say the other aspects of it are, you know, to Maurice's comments earlier in some part there's statutory and regulatory barriers to innovation. You know, certain laws, like we can't -- you can't go to a federal website and just pop up a form that asks for customer feedback. You have to run a process, get approval to do that if you're doing any quantitative feedback through this law, the Paperwork Reduction Act.

There are other things that really impede the ability for multiple agencies to get

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

together from a law standpoint now. That never means let's stop trying, let's stop driving, let's stop innovating, but it just brings a variable to bear on the way we look at this.

I've been seeing this a lot in delivering kind of policy and the innovation space is people feeling like they don't have permission, that there's the classic innovator sitting in the basement with a red stapler who's been pushed down the organization chart down to the basement saying, you know, that's not the way we do things. You've got these crazy ideas, stop doing that. Those people will come out shaking that policy running down the hall saying finally I have permission. It's just scaling that broadly is one of the challenges we face.

So, we had some conversations, Todd

Park and I had some conversations with many of

you to talk about what to do here, and we're going

to sort of -- we're very much behind thinking

about how to foster innovation a little broader,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

and the context that holds in the role of
management agenda, you know. And I think that the
overarching theme we heard from all of you is
really, you know, we have to think two things.
One is that innovation is in a certain group.
It's not a cohort, it's not a small team of people
you just deploy on innovation things. That model
is great and we can and some extent an
important part of our work is showing the art of
the possible, inspiring people that best
practices can exist in the realm of innovation,
but it's not just one team that moves around and
parachutes in. That it's a whole of organization
approach, and I think everyone I've talked to
said it's got to be people innovation, process
innovation, tech innovation across the board.

And then the second part of it was really that we have to think very deliberately around how to restructure, evaluate, and more importantly reward innovation. And we've done a little bit of that inside government and focusing some efforts at some of the departments

on creating innovation awards, and bringing that to the level of senior leadership and insuring we're doing that and thinking about some of the innovation incentives.

As one sidebar, one of the things I mentioned we're doing is really thinking about how do we create that virtuous cycle of not only bringing in external talent through transitive property and having them here training federal employees on how to do things in new ways, but also how do we then take those same federal employees and maybe bringing them outside government to experience that, and discuss that. And then we're going to go into some questions.

MR. McBRIDE: Thanks, Steven. So, we have a slide here. I'll kind of give you the summary of highlights, but if you go back two years we started convening groups that were a cross sector to ask a question of (a) are you thinking about cross sector leadership as you think about your leaders; and (b) are you doing anything about it; and 8 is there a role for the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

federal government to play? And the answer was yes, we're thinking about it; no, we're not actually doing anything about it; and, yes, would you please do something about it from the federal level, if nothing else to start to convene people who are people of goodwill and actually trying to accomplish and create some regular dialogue across sector, and the ability to build relationships across sector, and ideally start to trade talent across sector. So, we started getting people together to think about what that might look like over the last couple of years.

Most notably, on March 20<sup>th</sup> we had a kickoff event here in the White House for about 100 people who represented a bunch of different sectors, and there was actually a design construction built into the day to try and identify opportunities for two things. One is, what is the role of the federal government, and everybody that was attending the meeting, what are the roles that they can play in fostering

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

this movement, because there are a lot of people out there starting between Code for America, City Hall Fellows, pilot projects, and a lot of different versions that exist out there in the marketplace. What can we do to help to bring them together, to lift up their efforts, and kind of put more gas in their gas tank?

At the same time, the conversation also was -- and the design challenge was also to complete kind of one of the last circuits or last components of a circuit, or last miles of these exchange programs, because there are a lot of exchanges going in a bunch of different directions, particularly from private to X.

What there seems to be very little outside of the national security world are exchange programs going from public to private sector, in particular. And in conversations with a lot of private sector entities, there seemed actually to be a competence gap, or a perception gap about the value of the opportunity of bringing public sector talent into the private

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

sector, and what they potentially could add over some reasonable time.

So, we had all of these folks together for a day, we asked them to spend some time designing and thinking about what might different exchange programs, both heavy and light, look like. We got a smaller group back together on May 16<sup>th</sup> to dive a little further into that and come up with some specific ideas. And from that we got two versions, one light, one heavy, as ideas that potentially people would want to work on.

The pilot project is more of a shared learning model where you would have 20 to 24 top executives on a 12-month program that would be rotational where each month or every other month they would spend call it three days in a given sector, in a given geography together learning both about that sector, but also seeing how that sector does its highest level of professional development. An example might be they spent three days in New York City, they go to Black Rock

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

and go maybe one other financial institution. They learn about the financial markets at large, but they also get two and a half days of the best development to build the organizations who obviously have very sophisticated development programs, offer their people, side by side with their people. The next month they go to the Midwest and visit some manufacturing companies. They go to Silicon Valley, you can kind of see the idea.

It's modeled off two things. The Naval War College does a developmental program for emerging colonels who potentially could be Joint Chiefs one day down the road, and they actually do a rotational program. Some of your companies may have hosted them. They tend to go to Wall Street, and know America, and manufacturing facilities and so on, so they can see how the economy really comes to life.

There's also a similar program that GE and other companies did just with each other trying to rotate people around their development

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

facilities to see what best practices are, but also give them an opportunity to build relationships with one another.

One important component of this to Steven's point would be they thought it was important that as these people rotate we want to make sure that we pick people and structured a program where not only do they go and get these experiences for two to three days every month or every other month, but there would be an educational requirement when they come back to their agency, that there be a structure set up where they actually share and impart that knowledge to this agency.

As for the composition of this group, there's two versions. There's one where all 24 are potentially career SES in government. There's another version potentially where you actually have all of the groups, U.S. Government as well as the different organizations that are volunteering their time actually each contribute X number of participants to the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

1	group, and the group itself is cross sector, and
2	moves through all of these experiences together,
3	and starts to build those relationships.
4	MEMBER LEE: Now, do these folks have
5	other jobs while they're doing this, or is this
6	a full-time?
7	MR. McBRIDE: They have other jobs.
8	This would be just basically going off for a
9	couple of days every month or every month.
10	MEMBER LEE: Okay. Right.
11	MR. McBRIDE: The larger idea is
12	actually is to do an actual reverse for an
13	exchange program, where someone is basically
14	seconded or spends a year or two years on a
15	fellowship having left the U.S. Government going
16	into a program to be having a very structured and
17	specific program offered to them.
18	They'd go through that experience
19	and part of their responsibility, and part of the
20	design is to have them teach the people they're
21	working around what they know. And then, also,

as they come back a year or two years later,

there's a responsibility that they teach the people around them in the organization that they left.

And an example we often use is large consumer products company might be figuring out how to develop the West Coast of Africa. USAID understands the people, and the cultures, and the personalities in the West Coast of Africa. There's no conflict there of any kind. It's expertise that could be shared back and forth. It's certainly something that could be taught over a year or two, and at the same time have somebody learn about how companies think about such things, and then come back to the U.S. in a year and two, it would be helpful to them given the number of public-private partnerships they constantly try and create in order to do their work.

The second requires, obviously, a heavier lift from a legal perspective. The Office of Personnel Management, the Acting Director is actually looking at it intensely

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

right now to try and understand what the components of it may be.

The first one, much like the launch of the PIP program actually feels a lot lighter to us where a couple of -- a small group of companies who would be interested in participating and a handful of agency leaders who would be interested in participating could potentially get it off the ground.

Of note, when we came out of the May event, a series of corporate leaders actually raised their hand and said if you do this, we already in. We don't know exactly what it's going to look like, but we're interested, and we think it would be really interesting.

MEMBER SMITH: Can I make a suggestion, because I notice this on the Jobs Council. The service sector retail is the main employer in this country, but yet like on the Jobs Council there's no one from the service centers. There's just from manufacturing. I would strongly recommend since it's the largest

2.1

employer of individuals in this country that you include service sector at the table.

MEMBER SALEM: This is --

MEMBER SMITH: No, no, no, I'm not.

(Laughter.)

MEMBER SMITH: But I'm always amazed that the employment council has no one from the service sector. Well, you know, there's 6,000 people on Facebook, there's several hundred thousand people at McDonald's, and Walmart. So, just -- I think if you really want to understand how the economy works, then you need to spend time at a service sector and retail company in addition to some of the sexier companies, where maybe it's more revenue per employee, but the reality is the basic economic of this model of this country for most workers is a lower revenue per employee structure. So, I just always notice that's missing. I'm not volunteering us, but it would feel like a Walmart, it would feel like something like that would really be important for you to understand

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

how the economy works, rather than just a Google.

CHAIR VANROEKEL: Yes, the other question I had was small innovative companies. You know, they aren't set up to do exhaustive executive training or anything like that, but just embedding in the culture for even three days you could see a phenomenal difference.

MEMBER SMITH: Yes, it would be. But I just think, you know, it's an unsexy part of this economy, but it happens to employ most of our nation, the service sector.

MEMBER NARAYEN: The shared learning experience, how much authority do they have when they come back? I mean, if they've got all excited, they get all these ideas to make change. Otherwise, you could actually have just the opposite effect, which is they go, they see all the things that they want to do, and then it's like but I can't do anything, so are you working in conjunction with the shared learning experience to enable them to have some authority to make changes?

2.1

MR. McBRIDE: So, the thought on the shared learning experiences would actually start with cabinet secretaries who say I would like to be a part of this program. So, the answer is yes, by virtue of starting with them. Similar in the corporate world, if the representatives we had at the meeting went back to their CEOs, talked to them and came back to us and said our CEO wants to do this.

We thought one component of it could be that in the rotational program, and the government would be responsible for doing a three-day module, by the way. They would have to through their Federal Executive Institute develop and deliver on a three-day module for people to come to Washington, D.C. and learn about how government works.

But one of the commitments would be if you are participating, that your CEO also has to present to the group. They actually have to have skin in the game, so they would show up and be a part of the actual event itself. That's a

2.1

1	key part of it.
2	We're placing a lot of emphasis on
3	the shared learning model of it and bringing that
4	back to the place. We have not thought through
5	all the components of what if they want to
6	implement something as a result of this.
7	MEMBER GILLILAND: Yes, and I do
8	think, just to follow-on on the larger program
9	idea, and it sounds like you're still studying
10	it, but this idea of where you land when you come
11	back is going to end up being a pretty important
12	part of how they consider the opportunity.
13	MR. WINSLOW: For the individual?
14	MEMBER GILLILAND: For the
15	individual. For the individual that's picked it
16	could be very exciting. On the other hand, it
17	could be very uncertain. I don't know. You may
18	be able to provide a lot of certainty around what
19	they come back to. That would be really helpful,
20	I think, for a program like that.
21	MR. HAYES: Otherwise, they may not
22	come back.

MEMBER GILLILAND: Yes, they may not come back, or yes, well, there may not be a place for them to come back to.

 $\label{eq:member_mcgovern:} \mbox{MEMBER McGOVERN: They may not want}$  to go.

 $\label{eq:member gilliand: Yes, they may not} % \begin{center} \$ 

MEMBER McGOVERN: You know, a comment little bit tactical which sounds а nevertheless, I feel compelled to make it. Learning the financial markets and how they work in three days is quite a stunning goal, and I think that in addition to just sending them out, getting dipped in a conference room for a few minutes and going back, there needs to be some online supplemental training that they have to do on their own time so that when they show up going the other direction -- and important. For somebody to show up here for three days and learn how government works, that could be a lifetime endeavor. So, I feel like there just needs to be the Basics 101 so that they come

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

1	out and they're not they don't feel like they
2	landed from Mars trying to figure out what
3	CHAIR VANROEKEL: That's the
4	three-day sessions, would be the 200, 300 level
5	and it
6	MEMBER McGOVERN: Exactly. Because
7	you don't want to waste anyone's time
8	spoon-feeding, this is what a stock is, this is
9	what a bond is, this is what a capital market.
10	Yes. There needs to be some sea legs before
11	you can get on the boat, I guess.
12	MEMBER GILLILAND: Jenn, how does the
13	model work for Code for America? How does it
14	work? Is it all volunteer that's coming out of
15	private sector, or is how is it funded?
16	MS. PAHLKA: We're funded primarily
17	by philanthropic dollars, but we also have the
18	cities pay us, but it doesn't cover the whole
19	cost of the program. So, we actually do get some
20	public every year there's one or two people
21	who come out of government that still could do
	II

it. They get a small stipend so it's somewhere  $% \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right)$ 

between	 they	make	\$35,000	for	the	year.
	MEMBI	ER GI	LLILAND:	Oka	У•	

2.1

MS. PAHLKA: One element I would just mention is that there really -- and I know we have a limited amount of time. They're really doing something with their partners, they co-creating, and so on both sides I think they're not just sort of learning from each other, they're actually learning by doing.

MR. McBRIDE: Yes, we talked a lot about that, and where we kind of ended up on the very, very light version was just that, try to be as light as possible, start down a path and learn as we go. But there was discussion about that, and how applied can we make it, can we give them a challenge over the year that the group works on, and as they're gathering the intelligence in each marketplace, they fold that into the challenge and they have to do some kind of presentation at the end.

The other thought was that you could use -- we could develop a shared sense of what

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	are the components, competencies to be across
2	sector leader in this economy, start there, ask
3	each organization that's going to be doing some
4	portion of the training to look at those say five
5	competencies, and speak to the two or three that
6	through their training and development programs
7	they already run, they think they can actually
8	explore pretty thoroughly during that period of
9	time, but over the course of the year you would
10	hit each competency multiple times, but you'd
11	see different people's view of it.
12	So, we thought about different ways
13	to (a) make it more applied; or (b), kind of tie
14	it to a competency or value-based model so it
15	sinks in a little bit more.
16	MEMBER NARAYEN: Dan, I'll jump on it
17	and say, you know, let them go solve the real
18	estate problem. Right?
19	(Laughter.)
20	MEMBER NARAYEN: How does the public
21	sector do it, and the private sector do it?
22	MR. TANGHERLINI: You know, to your

1	earlier point, did they have authority to make
2	changes, what's interesting is we shouldn't
3	overstate the sense that people don't have
4	authority to make changes within government. I
5	think they do. Oftentimes, they just don't have
6	the tools, the experience, the knowledge, or the
7	relationships.
8	I did a two-year Executive MBA
9	midway through my career, and I tortured my
10	people every week when I came back. A trick I
11	learned at school, and I just think that part of
12	it is each new trick, you know, like oh God, what

(Laughter.)

are you studying --

MR. TANGHERLINI: And I think that's the trick, how do we give people the opportunity to get exposure, get those relationships, connections, and then give them, frankly, the confidence to come back and apply them within their organizations.

MR. McBRIDE: One other thing I would add to that, and this -- again, the group was

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

very governed by this thinking. Please feel free to push back on it, but there was a keen sense that sitting here today that whether you offer the value proposition of taking public sector talent and loaning it to the private sector, that you will -- the response will be negative. There will not be an immediate understanding of what the value of an exchange might be there, so one of the reasons that they wanted to start light is they felt like we needed a program to start to chip away at that confidence gap about what public sector talent might offer the private sector.

And they were very invested in this in the conversation, so that might have had something to do with kind of why we went very light, because that was one of the goals of this light version.

MEMBER McGOVERN: You know,
Jonathan, I've been at the Red Cross for five
years, so I've lived through two different
Administrative turnovers, actually three if you

2.1

count the midpoint with President Obama, so we always get this flood of resumes for people that want to stay in D.C.

You look at these resumes and the people are so sharp, then you have to meet them. So, I think so much of it is myth. I think if you threw the right candidates in front of any CEO in the private sector with some of these resumes, they would be surprised. And a number of us have said on a number of occasions just how bright everybody is that we meet in this room. I mean, we've all given keynote speeches to the SESs because of the training program that initiated, and the questions you get, the -- I mean, this is a group of people that the private sector would embrace, I believe. It's just a little bit of urban myth that, you know, that we just need to crash through.

MEMBER GILLILAND: One more comment on a large program idea. And I think we -- our experience is probably parallel across private sector around the intern programs that we have.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

And you can hire somebody and they can meander
around the organization without a whole lot of
objectives, and can be not very helpful for the
company or for that individual, so setting very
specific objectives, back to Jenn's point about
this program where they come together and
working on something very specific, ends up
being an important thing, and the companies that
participate should be asked to provide very
specific commitments around what that person is
going to be doing over that, whatever that period
of time is, six months, a year, two years. So,
that person gets applied to, it's very
compelling, they're working hard to that whole
period of time and coming back and sharing a lot
of important experiences from it.

MR. McBRIDE: We agree, actually, and I think that's one of the big learnings of the PIP Program was that if you start with a very, very specific challenge, the program might be — or result, like product research, you want to create it, that you can design around it. So, for

the larger program that's definitely built in.

CHAIR VANROEKEL: Without signing any of you up to the large program, have we thought through the ingredients that it would take to get people like you to sign up, or what's missing in what you've learned so far at this very high level that -- are there aspects that -- would it have to really be about the person coming in to provide intrinsic value in some very specific way in the organization? I always think of the FDA employee, not that we do this from a conflict stand, but the FDA employee going to work at a medical technology company and they get allocation process learning and the person understands while we took down these four barricades, we could foster innovation in this country. Those are certainly the --

MEMBER GILLILAND: I mean, I think this idea of matching kind of skills and needs is -- would be really important, although it's pretty hard, so the example you used in was it South Africa, is that the -- West Africa. A great

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

example, I think there would be a lot of companies that are very compelled by that type of idea, so that there is some value that's coming back to the company from the process.

You know, for us when we hire interns we're evaluating them, and we want to know how well they're going to do if we put them in a job permanently, so you don't really have that benefit, but we also get a -- particularly, as you bring younger people into the organization, and they're on the leading edge of how they're using technology in their lives, for us it's fantastic. But, again, so you get a lot of value out of just somebody's different thinking about things. And I think we could probably justify it just based on that different thinking that's coming, but I think the matching, the West Africa things, that would idea, those be compelling for companies.

MR. HAYES: Can I throw in a thought here? And I think it goes along to this, and it suggests Gail's point isn't really tactical.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

It's serious. I mean, and to Liz' point, look, we're in the customer service business, too, in the government. And if you had a customer service oriented orientation that would be -- like our National Park Service could learn a lot from your company in terms of how you present yourself to the public and all of that.

The other thing, what Steve just talked about, you know, one of the real problems that people have with the federal government is our regulatory interface with people. And we're searching for ways for our regulators in an appropriate way to understand how industry looks, when we do deep water, you know, permitting and oil and gas permitting, and solar permitting, for our people to understand the perspective of the private sector. And, frankly, for the private sector to understand what we have to go through in order to do this in the right way. And, frankly, for the private sector to avoid litigation. I think it would be powerful, but it should be at a high level. This is not,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

you know, not in the weeds, but in a -- get high level people who can start talking in a different way about these activities. I think it would be -- you'd get a lot more embrace from top levels of the agencies.

If we're seeing like you're seeing that you're really going to get something that has immediate applicability, as opposed to, frankly, you know, going to JP Morgan and learning about bonds, you know.

MEMBER SMITH: I think that as you were talking I was thinking about exactly, I think the kind of regulatory empathy and the impact going both ways, so I'll give you a great example.

As we look to expand in China, just how difficult is it to do work, to do the -- to be competitive, to be globally, having that perspective, and just trying to -- you could substitute that for everything, having that perspective on both sides as to why some of these U.S. kind of, you know, regulations, policies

2.1

that we feel like well, gosh, that makes us not as competitive with say another country that doesn't have that. But then understanding, likewise, so to the extent that there could be more regulatory empathy on both sides, both private to public, and public to private, I think would be huge.

MEMBER McGOVERN: I think a great filter mechanism, you could turn to the SES that you want to target and say here are a list of companies that said they would participate. So, provide us with an application that explains what you could provide that company, so then they have to research the company, understand what their biggest challenges are, so what would you bring to the table, and what problem of their's can you help solve, and what do you want to learn from the experience?

And it's almost like a combination of personal statement and case for change, and you hand that to the company, and then let them figure out is there value here. And that way half

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

the legwork is done before they show up. And you filter out the best and brightest. And I think that that will also get rid of the, you know, if you get people to just suspend their disbelief when they see it, then they'll say you know what, I could actually use help in that area.

MEMBER NARAYEN: I think the reverse as well, Gail. I mean, I think your first point that there would be a lot of interest. Companies can also say hey, we would love to get expertise and learn about these areas. So, I think, you know, rather than put the onus only on the SES, I think put the onus on any company that wants to participate, which is one of the 15 ways in which you can benefit.

MR. McBRIDE: So, that came up in the room, this chicken and egg of do you start with the need of the companies and then match the talent, or do you look across government and say where are we deep in expertise around supply chain, and procurement, and so and so forth. You can pick areas where we go very, very deep

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

and say okay, let's pick the very best among those people, and then see what companies would show up and say well, we've got use for them to come and educate our people on how they do things over that one-year period.

MEMBER McGOVERN: I think you could do both. It's sort of like a match.com when you're done.

MEMBER LEE: I would just emphasize that it has to be a substantive role. I mean, you know, sometimes fellowships or fellows, or interns, or whatever you call them can just get lost in the shuffle if they don't have a real objective, or real -- you know, reporting to the CEO, usually done work, you know, CEO doesn't have time to manage an extra person, you know, get them in a real department where they can learn something, and where they can offer some help, because otherwise, I've just seen it happen too many times. You bring in MBAs, or you bring in folks from the outside, and they don't have a portfolio, and they just, as someone else

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

said, wander around for a year, and it doesn't
help anybody.

MEMBER GILLILAND: I think on the chicken-and-egg front, I do think it would be helpful if you could lay out, you could as a part of a process that a company is going through to commit or kind of apply that, participate, laying out the areas that you're deep, that you really like you're deep in, and also laying out areas, if you wanted help in real estate, as an example, you wanted to get some private sector expertise in real estate, so it's kind of need-based, and also this is where we're really deep and could be helpful. Lay it out and then let the companies apply, if you will, here's what we think we -- here's where we can get benefit, here's what we think we can get -- you know, we can deliver value to that person that would have that expertise.

CHAIR VANROEKEL: What are the next steps on this, Jon?

MR. McBRIDE: I think our hope is that

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

we do two things, that we go out and find a coalition of the willing in the private sector for the light shared learning experience model. In the meantime, we've actually already asked the cohort members to go talk to their cabinet secretaries and try and find a handful of cabinet members who want to be part of a trial program, and hoping that we get a core number on both sides, and try to then determine what the actual program would look like, and try something small over the next year to get momentum then to try something larger.

CHAIR VANROEKEL: This group is back together I think in September, so getting -- it would be great reconvene and talk about where we are on that.

MR. WINSLOW: And one of the things we'd also like to do is to reach to you all individually to tap into some of the folks inside your organizations just to help us as we continue to develop this idea, and to pressure test some specific questions as we do have them. Anything

2.1

1	else?
2	MR. McBRIDE: Thank you very much for
3	your time.
4	CHAIR VANROEKEL: That concludes our
5	agenda.
6	MR. WINSLOW: It definitely does, and
7	again, as the Designated Federal Officer, thank
8	you very much. We are going to close the meeting
9	now because we have a couple of Administrative
10	items that we'd like to talk about which are off
11	camera. So, thank you very much for all of those
12	who have been listening to the webcast, and this
13	concludes our meeting of the President's
14	Management Advisory Board.
15	(Whereupon, the proceedings went
16	off the record at 11:41 a.m.)