Where Our National Security Begins...
Agenda

- Welcome & Introductions
- “Snapshots”
- “S2P Corner” & “C2S Corner”
- Action Team discussions
- Government Perspective
- Open Dialog
- No-Host Social
“Snapshots”

Events
- Intel Summit: 4-5 September, Classified Day 12 September
- GEOINTEGRation Summit: 27-28 September (Attracting Talent team)
- GED Agile Industry Day: 27 September

USGIF Working Group Summit outputs
- Suggestion to hold a quarterly NRO/NGA WG joint session
- Recommendation to broaden engagement beyond GED (Small Sats)
- Small Business engagement

NRO IAWG meeting day will remain last Tuesday of month

USAF RFI: Contracting Agile Development
USAF RFI: Contracting for Agile Dev 1

• **RFP & Contract Information/Artifacts**
  - What information should be made available in the market research phase to better inform your recommended approach(es) to the government? What artifacts would provide value in terms of proposal development? (i.e. notional backlog, end-user commitment, technical debt, software assessment, current SDLC and labor structure).
  - What common CDRLs, DIDs, and clauses do you consider as being Agile anti-patterns?
  - What RFP/FOPR artifacts are required in proposals that are of questionable value to the evaluation process and/or subsequent Agile performance?

• **Contracts Language/Specifications**
  - Identify contract type(s) you feel would have the greatest potential of encouraging truly Agile behavior? Please provide rationale.
  - Recommendations on changing contractual language from specifying how work is to be completed to focus more on the expected productivity and quality of work?
  - Thoughts on adjusting pay for based on productivity and/or quality of work?
USAF RFI: Contracting for Agile Dev 2

Using the Product Owner-Scrum Master-Dev team triad as the starting point, provide your thoughts on:

- Contracting Officer Representative as Scrum Masters
- Government Program Managers as Scrum Master
- Government Program Managers as Product Owner
- Contractor Program Manager as Scrum Master
- Incorporating 3rd party contracted personnel to round out a Development Team
- 3rd party contractor as Scrum Master or Agile coach

Implementation

- If sufficiently informed by market research, should the appropriate Agile methodology (i.e., Scrum, XP, etc) be dictated by the government in the RFP/FOPR or left to the vendor’s discretion?
- Please the pros and cons of 1) govt/BES-provided CI/CD pipeline and development environment, 2) a contractor-provided CI/CD pipeline and development environment, and 3) a hybrid approach
- What is the impact of having more than one vendor supporting an Agile program?
- What should a generic “definition of done” for sprints, increments, and releases contain that would deliver value to the government while providing sufficient protection to the development team?
“C2S Corner”

Latest & Greatest...

Topics & Issues Discussion
https://reinvent.awsevents.com

$100 Discount Code Available – contact craigaa@amazon.com

65,000+ Expected Attendees

2500+ Sessions & Workshops

250+ Exhibiting Partners
“S2P Corner”

Latest & Greatest…

Topics & Issues Discussion

Explore on CWAN/JWICS @ https://jportal.S2P.proj.nro.ic.gov
NRO IAWG

Action Teams & Topics

- GED Systems Engineering Plan Review
- GED Agile Day inputs
- IAWG Data Call results
- Speed to Capability: 9/30 QUINT “RFP Bloat”
- Agile/DevSecOps: “GOTS/GOSS Management Operating Model”
GED Systems Engineering Plan: Call for Reviewers

- Agile ToR incorporated into GED SEP
- QUINT SPO discussion on 7/30: “Has IAWG reviewed the SEP?”
- SEP approved by D/GED August 2019, posted on S2P Confluence
- IAWG review team
  - Goal: 6-8 reviewers with Agile and/or DevSecOps experience
  - Reviewers do not have to be an active IAWG member, but must have CWAN/GWAN access
  - Timeline: provide draft comment matrix to GED Agile team by 9/13
  - Need: lead reviewer to consolidate comments into typical comment matrix (excel format)
GED Agile Day: IAWG Inputs Needed

- Logistics: 9/27 at JD Hill, 0800 Check in, program 0900-1300
- Purpose: inform industry of GED’s Agile Evolution
- Agenda: final to be disseminated week prior
- NRO IAWG: Respond to Government invitation for Inputs
  - STC Topics: Pre-award comms, Dev & Tech transfer, Outcome based contracts?
  - Architecture “Runway” to pace technology ahead of developers?
  - Methods to communicate platform capability to the ecosystem?
  - Agile Governance procedures?
  - Connecting Enterprise Portfolio Priorities to Program release priorities?
  - Measuring Agile team performance/velocity?
- Other ideas? Questions? Reccos?
NRO IAWG Data Call

- Unintended Consequences of AF/IF
- Getting Industry Feedback on FGA architecture
Fundamental misunderstandings of Agile with an award fee based program will drive Agile anti-patterns onto the program. For example:
- Customers changed. New Customers didn’t understand agile development & changed approach
- Team was castigated for not focusing on requirements instead of grooming backlog, velocity, etc.
- Fee negatively impacted, Senior levels of customer didn’t accept reclama.
- Unintended consequence: disenfranchised development team, resulting in retention issues.

Standardization: Differing perceptions on what constitutes a “Good” Award Fee
- Government COR “does not believe in 100%” and “80% a good score.”
- Some programs start at 100% and work down, others start at 80% and go up from there.
- Unintended consequence: government may be happy with prime but PM is still fired.

Don’t presume *business implications* of the incentive structure are understood.
- Industry doesn’t communicate implications that well either –
- BD folks that attend the meetings are NOT the line-of-business PMs that have to deliver
- Govt should require that any industry interaction include at least one mid/senior LOB person
Data Call #2: Capturing Industry Feedback on FGA while maintaining level playing field

- Quarterly dialogues (like the December industry day)
  - discuss current status, feedback received, and their reaction to that feedback.
  - Follow up each session with one-on-ones.
  - Requires customer commitment and time, but could create a stronger industry partnership

- Host Open Industry Roundtable discussions in addition to forums like Industry Days
  - Organize participation into relevant groups, e.g. NRO IAWG
  - Direct discussion, trade show attendance, peer networking groups, etc.

- Go beyond RFIs with small group discussions.
  - Near unanimous feedback that paper RFIs are of low value and ROI given the time required.
  - Trust relationships are needed so those sharing feel that their IP (best practices) is protected.
  - Idea: GED send delegations to trade shows and set up separate meetings with various vendors. Gather best practices from as many different vendors as possible. Prepare specific asks beforehand. Empower government staff that it is permissible to meet with commercial vendors and follow up after.

- Resurrect the $50K-$100K Study Task approach used in SIGINT post-HASA/LISA timeframe
IDEA for Data Call #2: Capturing Industry Feedback on FGA while maintaining level playing field

Concept: Annual “Market Surveillance & Research” Cycle

- Step 1: “FGA 2025 Communication Day”
  - Govt explain the program and allow for initial Q&A during the session (ala 2016 GED Industry Day).
  - Govt ID’s specific questions they would like addressed by industry during the day.

- Step 2: 60 minute “Market Surveillance” dialogs with industry over a 2 month period
  - Industry provide perspectives for FGA2025 and address govt questions from Day 1.
  - Includes both technical and business areas.
  - Format: Two-way conversation. Not an uber-structured, constrained meeting where govt are not allowed to speak. Govt PMs/engineers/operators sharing what they really are trying to achieve, what bugs them, what architectural characteristics are of significant value to them, and what key EXTERNAL interfaces are challenging them.
  - The content of these sessions would NOT be available beyond the govt and specific company.

- Step 3: “FGA 2025 Communication Day 2”
  - Reflect govt architectural adjustments in light of the industry engagement.

- Step 4: 30 minute, focused “Market research” meetings on specific topics
Action Team: Speed to Capability (STC)

QUINT SPO briefing topic: Addressing RFP Bloat, Right-Sizing CDRLs
24 September 2019

Ben Chicoski (Lead)
Joe Chioda       Scott Lawler       Pete Epstein
Mike Moran       Ron Alford       Eric Viglione
Right-Sized RFPs

Observations
• “Solicitation Bloat” deprives govt of qualified, innovative performers (mostly SBs), creates extra work – on both sides – without necessarily providing benefit
• Increasing complexity of acquisitions in areas like IT has caused a skills gap in the acquisition workforce

Contributing Factors
• “Include Everything” has historically been the path of least resistance and lowest risk re compliance
• High variance and low predictability of acquisition timing

Ideas
• Avoid complex RFPs with long planning phases which include deliverables and milestones and fixed budgets, and which can stifle ability to learn and adopt new ideas along the way.
• Right-size compliance documentation (especially docs listed as “reference,” which can be misleading, overly onerous, or unnecessary) to match the work being procured.
• Train program officers and contract managers to specialize in IT acquisition (e.g., mimic Digital IT Acquisition Professionals Program).
• Train people from a variety of functions (tech, finance, contracting, security) on Lean-Agile practices.
• Minimize CDRLs to the extent practical in order to avoid unnecessary effort and disrupting flow of execution
  o Start with minimum (e.g., financial CDRLs required by law) and add more only if deemed mission-essential
  o Make CDRLs “contractor format” to mitigate agile development issues tied to delivering classic CDRLs
  o Question for QUINT SPO: What should be a CDRL?
Proposed Approach: Right-Sizing CDRLs for Agile Dev Contracts

Similar process to Agile ToR...

- Obtain Government down-selected CDRL list
- Research other sources: 18F, USAF, etc
- Poll IAWG contracting and PM experts
- Cross-walk for alignment and outliers
- Conduct Government-Industry round table to converge
- Outbrief to IAWG, USGIF-wide, and QUINT SPO
Action Team: Agile & DevSecOps

Future QUINT SPO briefing topic: GOSS/GOTS Management Operating Model
GOSS/GOTS Management Operating Model: Key Questions

QUINT SPO Customer questions:
• Can we (why not) open source our code to the IC?
• Do we already have an open source or re-use operating model in place?

IAWG follow up observations
• “Manage it like open source” isn’t the same as “Open source it”
• GED code changes are done via contract (no “community contribution”)
• State the objective: promote re-use via libraries? Share source code?

Consideration/Discussion areas
• Contract/Operating model
• Code management functional R&Rs
• IP & Data Rights
GOSS/GOTS Management:
Some Benefits of a User Community

For GED: Other missions are already using core product; in-house champion may help Agency and IC-wide adoption process

For Agency: Product is widely known, hopefully loved, and supported by community to speed time to mission

For PMO: Feedback is fast and comprehensive, getting users close to GED App Development

For engineering: Feedback improves product, contributions speed up development; GED gets development contributions from a wide range of contributors, not just those on the program

For support: Self-supporting community lowers overall support costs, makes documentation more comprehensive (instill “document first” before code accepted
Goal: Drive adoption of free core product by growing a self-supporting open source community.

- Lead community to deploy and use core product
- Lead community to evangelize more new members
- Lead community to be self-supporting wrt core product
- Firm can steer its investment by user-conversion metric
- Many best practices of community building apply
User community provides fast and comprehensive feedback

Feedback on functional needs and issues (e.g. usability)

Faster and more immediate and more accessible than in traditional setting

Helps prioritization and triage of features and road maps

User community is source of user innovation

Source of new feature ideas and insights

Helps find new application ideas

Community gets product management closer to user.
User community provides fast and comprehensive feedback

Fast feedback on functional and non-functional issues (bugs, performance, …)

Also for most unusual circumstances

User community extends core solution into new applications

Users can help themselves and develop free open source add-ons

Effectively, free mission usability research and exploration

Pre-screening of potential future GOSS Application contributors
Government Perspective
Open Dialog

Additional Topics for Consideration
Actions & Next Steps
No-Host Social
NRO IAWG Contact Information

- Nick Buck: nick@buckgroup.net (703) 801-3405
- Ann Waynik: Ann.Waynik@tenica.biz (571)-376-5641
- Mike Moran: mmoran07@peraton.com (571) 524-1184

USGIF coordination:
- Shai Sobrino: shai.sobrino@usgif.org (571) 392-7205
STC: Engage GED Contracts regarding “Contracting Performance” aspects and how industry would propose assessing them. What metrics?

IAWG data call: examples of AF/IF criteria that created dis-incentives

FGA: Identify options for providing industry-wide feedback on FGA architecture in format more useful and open than RFIs
   - Get membership access to FGA 2025 architecture (government stated it was ‘released’)
   - Consider Action team and/or RID to engage

Talent: Provide GED leadership with “DevOps Starter Kit” info for clearance sponsorship and IR&D instances on C2S/S2P

New Action Team (Joint w/NGA WG): Waterfall TTO to DevOps “incremental”