NRO-NGA
Industry Advisory Working Group
Joint Working Session
June 2, 2020
Joint Session Objectives

- Create awareness of ongoing efforts across the Groups
- Communicate Working Group results to the Community
- Share best practices and ideas
- Create an open venue for industry-government dialog
- Identify additional Action Team / Subcommittee topics
Introductions & USGIF Welcome
NRO S2P Data Call update
Topic 1: Impact of OCI Policy on Acquisition
Topic 2: Improving Software Acquisition
Topic 3: Accelerating System Level Integration & TTO
Government Perspective (TBD)
Open Dialog
USGIF Welcome & Introductions

Ronda Schrenk
USGIF Upcoming Events

GEOConnect Series

- Mainstage (Wednesdays at 1300 EDT)
  - 10 June NGA Technology Strategy
  - 17 June GEOINT From My Basement
  - 24 June NGA Tech Focus Area: Data Management

- Training
  - Conflating New Vector Data Into Legacy Data Layers – Friday, June 12 at 1300 EDT

Upcoming Events

- GEOIntegration
- Geospatial Gateway Forum/GeoResolution 13-15 Oct
NRO IAWG Data Call: S2P Future Investment Recommendations

- Purpose: capture needs, ideas and recommendations regarding future S2P investments.

  1. What investments and improvements should the government consider in order to ensure S2P is able to evolve through upgrades to enhance developer user experience and overall results? Specifically:
     - a. needed functionality
     - b. automation to achieve speed to mission goals
     - c. platform stability and security
     - d. documentation, on boarding, and user training

  2. COVID19 impacts and perennial challenges in hiring cleared talent increase the importance of unclassified "low-to-high" development. What recommendations do you have for approaches and improvements to accomplish this? Specifically:
     - a. tooling
     - b. CONOPS
     - c. Security
     - d. Cross-domain code migration

Response Window Extended to 6/12 So All Have Opportunity to Participate
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Impact of OCI Policy on Acquisition

Team Lead: Bob Whiteman
Agenda

• Scope
• Why OCI?
• Approach
• Sample Questions
Scope

- NGA OCI policy effects on acquisition: NAWG membership is interested in exploring the impacts of NGA’s OCI policies on acquisition outcomes

- Members support the intent of OCI policy and would like to explore whether and how it might effecting:
  - Competition
    - Cost of products and services
    - Quality of products and services
  - The realization of industry benefits to NGA’s mission. For example, do current OCI policies unnecessarily “stove-pipe” incumbent providers into only one domain, i.e., engineering OR operations
Why OCI?

- FAR Subpart 9.5 – Organizational and Consultant Conflicts of Interest
  - Objective: prevent an unfair advantage to any party
  - Each Individual contracting situation should be examined on basis of particular facts and nature of the proposed contract.
  - Must exercise common sense, good judgment, and sound discretion in deciding whether a potential conflict exists and developing appropriate means for resolving it.”

- Balance between “twin risks” of insufficient competitive field and unfair advantage

- Types of OCI and related questions:
  - Unequal access to information – companies or personnel have access to information that results in an unfair advantage and dampens competitive environment
  - Biased Ground Rules - Unequal treatment due to differing roles or position
  - Impaired Objectivity – personnel have business interests in program decisions
Why does Industry get worked up over OCI?

- New acquisition constructs are evolving with many programs & opportunities.
- Business models / provider roles are changing due to technology & mission evolution
- Unpredictability of future business creates an existential threat to the IC industry base

What industry partners are impacted by OCI direction?

- Affects large, medium, and small business alike
- Business is at risk – less expensive to win as incumbent than breaking into a new area
- Industry bases organizes around it, self-selecting in/out based on risk

Observations & Perceptions

- Companies novated contracts or sold/divested portions of business solely due to NRO OCI approach: loss of opportunity to industry AND cost to government (loss of provider)
- Inconsistent or unpredictable OCI approaches impact bid/no-bid decisions: it’s not about “liberal or restrictive” policy, it’s about consistency and predictability
- Perceptions that OCI policies aren’t built on solid foundation drives “shaping” behaviors

Significant perception differences exist between Program SETA & Industry Base regarding predictability and consistent application of OCI
Approach

- Determine if there is:
  - a NGA policy or guideline related to OCI
  - related training
- Prepare questions to interview NGA Contracts and PMO regarding OCI
- Conduct interviews
- Share data and identify common response threads
- Determine framework or precedence to share findings
- Prepare and submit whitepaper (as read-ahead)
- Conduct NGA-Industry follow up session to discuss findings
Sample Questions

- Assuming FAR clauses, are there any other NGA OCI concerns?
  - What really needs to be avoided? Dollars, Timeline, and/or Requirements?
  - Can mitigation be the rule?
  - Do you trust firewalls? By Task Order, Individual, and/or Company?
  - Are you comfortable letting industry police themselves?
  - Are penalties sufficient for someone advantaging OCI mitigation?

- Does strict OCI enable to the Government to get what it needs?
  - Mission first (cost savings, speedier transformation, and culture change)?
  - Optimized use of industry’s innovations and capabilities?

- Thoughts?
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*Improving Software Acquisition*

Team Lead: Colin Thomas
The Challenge

1. Software at the speed of operations

2. The Acquisition Process to Support “Modern Software Engineering”
Questions

1. Determine perceived challenges to acquiring Software

2. Determine perceived impact to mission
Approach

Interview Key Stake holders
  – Executive Staff
  – PM’s
  – SAM Office
  – OCS

Develop Whitepaper
  – Show findings
  – Show potential Resolutions

Have Cross Table discussion
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Joint Action Team:
Accelerating System-Level Integration &
Transition to Operations (TTO)

Team Lead: Eric Viglione
Challenge:
System Level Integration, Test, and TTO Timelines

Current Agile implementation has improved the development cycle
but not the integration, test, and TTO cycles.
Why we Formed this Action Team

• NRO is in the process of changing the way they procure ground systems
  • Moving away from “Black Box” segment developments with well defined and well controlled interfaces
  • Moving towards smaller application developments, and micro services running on a common framework
  • The transition to date has focused on moving from waterfall development to agile development
• End-to-end integration and transition to operations should be reviewed and adjusted to account for development changes

• Two Optics on the topic:
  • Developers
    • SECDEVOPS security reviews impede transition to operations
    • Accepting risk increases speed, fail fast mentality
    • Large developers still limit and impede small developers innovation
  • SETA/SI
    • The new development approach creates an explosion in interfaces that are poorly documented
    • Issues don’t get discovered until late in the process resulting in significant DRs and stability issues
Topics to assess

• Integration – No single organization tasked with Ground integration
  • Pros and Cons to Top-Down Integration Approach
  • Pros and Cons to Diversified Integration Approach
  • What is the level of integration responsibility between Govt and Industry
• How does the Government Incentivize to deliver fast
  • Industry incentives to deliver
  • Government incentives and processes to accept CI/CD
• How to Sync CI/CD between NRO and NGA
  • What is the baseline “as is” at NRO vs NGA; the “ideal”?
  • ID philosophical differences to CI/CD approaches to TTO (risk tolerance differences)
• Thoughts on how MOD can participate in CI/CD
  • How to deliver assured mission. How much risk is too much?
  • What about risk of delay?
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Chris Arroyo, Matt Madigan, Matt Manning,
Renard Paulin, Steve Sharp, Steve Thomas

TTO Subgroup 3
May 28th, 2020
Point #1
How to conduct parallel development

- We need to clarify what is meant by “development” (e.g. Digital Makers Services)

- Recco: consider release and deployment capabilities focus as that is critical to transitioning to operations.
  - Q: How does the government define release and deployment capabilities?
  - Q: Does the government truly differentiate between development, releases and deployment?
  - Q: Is there coordination today once code is ready to be released between NGA and NRO?
Point #2

How can testing across agencies be performed seamlessly?

• Ties into Point #1

• Recommendation: development should be viewed as mutually distinct from release and deployment.

• Additional discussion and vetting ongoing
Point #3 - DevSecOps ROI

- What is the defined “ROI” on implemented DevSecOps across NGA/NRO?

- What is happening in the factories and how is ROI measured?

- What is our goal? Common OR Synchronous development environment?
Point #4 - Examples Across Industry

- What can we learn from similar initiatives across government and industry?
  - Kessel Run?
  - NDOR?
  - DI2E? (joint Air Force / NRO)
  - Platform One?
Open Dialog and Look Ahead

Next Steps

- Actions/Follow ups
  - Next NRO IAWG working session: June 30, 2020
  - Next NGA AWG working session: July 7, 2020
Contact Information

NRO IAWG
• Nick Buck: nick@buckgroup.net (703) 801-3405
• Ann Waynik: Ann.Waynik@tenica-gs.com (571) 376-5641 or (703) 975-4456

NGA IAWG
• Renard Paulin: renardp@me.com (585) 615-7322
• Fred Turman: fturman@peraton.com (314) 307-7859

USGIF coordination:
• Shannon McAvoy: shannon.mcavoy@usgif.org (703) 793-0109 ext 118