

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
THE PRESIDENT'S MANAGEMENT ADVISORY BOARD

+ + + + +

PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

FRIDAY
JUNE 17, 2011

+ + + + +

The Board met in Room 428 in the
Eisenhower Executive Office Building, 1650
Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.,
at 9:00 a.m., Jeff Zients, Chairman,
presiding.

PRESENT

JEFF ZIENTS, Chairman
GREG BROWN, President and CEO, Motorola
Solutions
SAM GILLILAND, Chairman and CEO, Sabre

Holdings

JEFF KINDLER, Former Chairman and CEO,
Pfizer
DEBRA LEE, Chairman and CEO, BET Networks
GAIL McGOVERN, President and CEO, American
Red Cross
SHANTANU NARAYEN, President and CEO, Adobe

Systems

ENRIQUE SALEM, President and CEO, Symantec
LIZ SMITH, CEO, OSI Restaurant Partners,
LLC
TIM SOLSO, Chairman and CEO, Cummins Inc.

ALSO PRESENT

STEVE BROCKELMAN

BECKY BLANK, Deputy Secretary (acting)
of the Department of Commerce

SCOTT GOULD, Deputy Secretary of the
Department of Veterans Affairs

DANNY HARRIS, Chief Information Officer
of the Department of Education

SETH HARRIS, Deputy Secretary of the
Department of Labor

DAVID HAYES, Deputy Secretary of the
Department of the Interior

CHRISTINE KLUH, Deputy Assistant Secretary
of the Department of Veterans Affairs

VIVEK KUNDRA, U.S. Chief Information
Officer

DANIEL LEBRYK, Commissioner of the
Financial Management Service

MICHAEL LOCATIS, III, Chief Information
Officer of the Department of Energy

BERNARD MAZER, Chief Information Officer
of the Department of the Interior

TONY MILLER, Deputy Secretary of the
Department of Education

CATHERINE MURPHY, Regional Solicitor at the
Department Labor

DAN PONEMAN, Deputy Secretary of the

Department of Energy

STEPHEN SHIH, Deputy Associate Director for
Executive Resources and Employee
Development at the Office of Personnel
Management

SIMON SZYKMAN, Chief Information Officer
of the Department of Commerce

DENISE WELLS, Deputy Assistant Secretary
for Human Resources and Chief Human
Capital Officer at the Department of
Health and Human Services

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(9:02 a.m.)

1
2
3 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: I believe we have
4 a good agenda today. Before the camera starts
5 rolling, let me just take you through the
6 whole of the day. So, as the camera is
7 rolling, everybody should have a notebook in
8 front of them. I am on Tab 1, and we're going
9 into our Open Session from 9:00 to 11:15. And
10 we're going to spend time on the two
11 Subcommittee terrains, IT and the SES. And I
12 think in both terrains across the Subcommittee
13 meetings we've made good progress in defining
14 the topic areas where we feel like we can have
15 the greatest impact. And that's the
16 intersection of where there are corporate best
17 practices that we believe can have an impact,
18 or are applicable to government operations.
19 I think we've made good progress in that
20 funneling down to those hot topic terrains.

21 In the SES terrain, many of you
22 expressed an interest last meeting and across

1 the Subcommittees in getting to know the SES
2 better given how central they are to all of
3 government operations. So, we're going to
4 spend time bringing in some folks who have
5 been SES members for many years, a couple who
6 are very senior managers in the SES, and a few
7 others who actually have staff positions where
8 they help to manage the SES across their
9 agency, so we'll get both a line and staff
10 perspective on the SES.

11 We will, at 11:15 or so, break.
12 We're scheduled to meet with the President
13 before he heads off to Walter Reed, and also
14 with Secretary Geithner later in the
15 afternoon. And we'll have people out of here
16 as promised by 1:00. I have to make up for my
17 under-performance last night.

18 (Laughter.)

19 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: And to the five-
20 minute point, we'll also build in some breaks,
21 so everybody can do BlackBerries and catchup.
22 So, with that --

1 MR. BROWN: And Motorola.

2 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: I'm sorry?

3 MR. BROWN: And Motorola.

4 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: And Motorola,
5 absolutely.

6 (Laughter.)

7 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: We now are
8 behind Tab 2, and let's start our Open Session
9 I guess on page 3. And I'll hand it over to
10 Steven just to remind everybody of our overall
11 process and how we're going to make sure that
12 by our next meeting we have concrete
13 recommendations in both terrains that we can
14 begin to apply across government.

15 MR. BROCKELMAN: Okay. Let's go
16 to Slide 3. This is bird's-eye view of where
17 we are in the process. We spent the last
18 couple of months narrowing down our few areas
19 of focus to three specific topics where we
20 feel like we have the best opportunity to
21 bring private sector best practices to bear on
22 public sector challenges.

1 So, today's meeting is for the two
2 Subcommittees to share with the full Board the
3 issues that they have zeroed in on. But, more
4 importantly, I think it's an opportunity to
5 get a deeper understanding of how challenges
6 in these issue areas actually manifest in the
7 government. So, we're going to spend, as Jeff
8 said, a lot of our time today getting that
9 perspective from agency officials. We really
10 want to put our fingers on that intersection
11 of private sector and public sector.

12 So, that's today. And then
13 looking ahead we move into the Solution
14 Development phase over the summer. We'll be
15 identifying best practices, testing our
16 proposals with stakeholders and government.
17 And then the Subcommittees will have their
18 recommendations in the September-October time
19 frame, present those to the full Board at our
20 next meeting way off in November, and then
21 develop implementation plans from there.

22 Any questions on the process?

1 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: So, we
2 anticipate a lot of work across the summer
3 months, early fall with you, with your folks
4 that are working on the Subcommittees. We're
5 going to have to really dig in. We want in the
6 November meeting to have those concrete
7 recommendations that we can start to implement
8 across the late fall/winter months.

9 MR. BROCKELMAN: Right. And
10 you've all been terrific about giving us
11 access to your senior executives, so thank
12 you.

13 Okay. So, let's move to Slide 4.
14 We'll get into our first session of the day.
15 This is the work of the IT Subcommittee. We
16 have three goals here. First, we're going to
17 take a look at the topic areas that the
18 Subcommittee has chosen to focus on. Second,
19 several members of the IT Subcommittee, so
20 Shantanu, Liz, and Enrique are going to share
21 a high-level view of how their companies are
22 addressing some of the challenges in these

1 issue areas.

2 And then as part of this, we're
3 going to get at our third goal, which is to
4 have a dialogue about where these private
5 sector approaches might be applicable to the
6 public sector. So, that's why we have all of
7 our guests here.

8 So, this might be a good time,
9 actually, to do some introductions. Maybe,
10 first of all, we're going to have Vivek
11 Kundra, I think all of you know our Federal
12 CIO.

13 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Pause for a
14 second. When I arrived, my team was very
15 incomplete but for one person who had been
16 here since the beginning of that, and I, as I
17 assume all of you do, spend a ton of time
18 thinking through the team, and how you get the
19 right people in the right spot. Boy, did I
20 luck out. He is a total star. He has a
21 combination of the ability to think
22 strategically and figure out the things that

1 matter, and then get stuff done. Oftentimes
2 those two things don't correlate. In Vivek,
3 they're 100 percent correlated.

4 He has done unbelievable service
5 across 2-1/2 years, I can see all the Dep Secs
6 and CIOs nodding their heads. And it is with
7 sadness, but at the same time with a lot of
8 admiration that I say that he is leaving in
9 two months. Very rarely do people give two
10 months notice in government, Vivek has. And
11 across the next two months we're going to make
12 sure we have seamless transition in an attempt
13 to fill those very big shoes. So, thank you,
14 Vivek for all your service, and I know you'll
15 end as strong as the last 2-1/2 years have
16 been. So, thank you.

17 MR. KUNDRA: Thank you, Jeff.

18 MR. BROCKELMAN: And we're
19 honoring you by forgetting to give you a name
20 tag.

21 (Laughter.)

22 MR. BROCKELMAN: So, maybe I could

1 ask the rest of the agency officials if they'd
2 quickly introduce themselves.

3 DEP. SEC. PONEMAN: Dan Poneman,
4 Deputy Secretary of Energy.

5 MR. HARRIS: Dan Harris, CIO of
6 Education.

7 DEP. SEC. MILLER: Tony Miller at
8 Education.

9 ACTING DEP. SEC. BLANK: Rebecca
10 Blank, I'm Acting Deputy Secretary of
11 Commerce.

12 DEP. SEC. HAYES: David Hayes,
13 Deputy, Interior.

14 MR. MAZER: Bernie Mazer, CIO,
15 Interior.

16 MR. LOCATIS: Mike Locatis, CIO,
17 Energy.

18 MR. BROCKELMAN: I'm going to do
19 one more slide before I turn it over to all
20 the IT experts here. It's on page 5. I just
21 want to set things up by covering how the IT
22 Subcommittee selected its focus areas within

1 this large terrain area of IT Management.

2 You can see a box of criteria for
3 selection at the top of the page. So, we're
4 looking to focus on issues that are, first of
5 all, hard problems to solve in the government.

6 Second of all, where there is a track record
7 of effective best practices in the private
8 sector. Third, where there is potential for
9 meaningful impact. And then last, probably
10 most importantly, we want to select issues
11 where there is a reasonable degree of
12 transferability between private sector and the
13 public sector.

14 So, for example, if the private
15 sector solution to a problem is let's give our
16 IT program managers huge bonuses, well, that's
17 probably a non-starter in government.

18 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Danny, not
19 possible?

20 (Laughter.)

21 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: You don't like
22 that one.

1 MR. BROCKELMAN: If, on the other
2 hand, the private sector solution has to do
3 with a new project manager's methodology, then
4 maybe we can work with that. So, that's what
5 we've tried to zero in on, these types of
6 criteria.

7 So, a little bit of background on
8 how we gather our information. We wanted to
9 get a government perspective, so we worked
10 closely with Vivek and his team. We've met
11 with a number of the agency CIOs around this
12 table and others. And then we also wanted to
13 get a sense of how the private sector
14 addresses these issues, so we interviewed each
15 of the member companies on the IT
16 Subcommittee, talked to their CIOs.

17 I think one thing that we really
18 tried to do was instead of -- it's tempting to
19 try to cover the whole landscape, but if you
20 go a mile wide and an inch deep you're
21 probably not going to make much of an impact.
22 So, we've really driven to a couple of fairly

1 specific topic areas here, and you can see
2 them at the bottom of the page.

3 First is, how do you make sure
4 that IT and their business partners are
5 aligned around business' needs? And then
6 second, how do you manage the performance of
7 your IT vendors effectively?

8 So, we're going to dive into both
9 of these. I'm going to turn it over to Vivek.
10 Actually, maybe just pull up here since we're
11 kind of sharing this with the full Board
12 first. Are there any kind of questions? Do
13 those sound right? We're going to get into
14 them deeper, but --

15 (No response.)

16 MR. BROCKELMAN: Okay. Vivek.

17 MR. LOCATIS: All right, great.

18 So, on Slide 6 what was really enlightening
19 for us was the value that the private sector
20 brought to thinking about some of these
21 persistent problems that the federal
22 government has struggled with.

1 So, the government has to struggle
2 a lot with coordinating IT projects from the
3 planning phase all the way down to the
4 execution phase. Three big things as we see
5 challenges that the government faces, is
6 number one, is around limited control of CIOs
7 when it comes to the budget. And also, in
8 terms of making sure that the business is
9 actively engaged.

10 Two is that there have been
11 unclear project benefits from the very
12 beginning, which makes prioritizing first
13 order, second order, third order, what do you
14 go after very, very difficult across the
15 federal government.

16 Three, there are regulatory legal
17 frameworks that constantly keep changing, so
18 the uncertainty there. And, of course, with
19 leadership, too, is one of the big challenges
20 within the federal government.

21 What's interesting here is that
22 the private sector actually does this very

1 differently. So, first, with integrating
2 strategic planning right up front with the IT
3 planning, so it's not an afterthought, but
4 it's hardwired from the very beginning.

5 Second is that there's a very
6 rigorous methodology on how you compare
7 projects so you can differentiate the value,
8 so you can make a decision around where you
9 spend majority of your energy.

10 And third, the senior-level IT
11 Advisory Boards were actually real advisory
12 boards that would make decisions with very
13 active engagement on the business side, rather
14 than just the technology side.

15 So, there's a lot to learn here.
16 What I'd like to do is turn it over to
17 Shantanu to talk about how they actually do it
18 at Adobe, and Liz in terms of how they
19 actually do it at OSI.

20 MR. NARAYEN: Great. Thanks,
21 Vivek. First, maybe before I even start, just
22 to set a belt, which is from a big picture

1 perspective there's no question at Adobe that
2 we view our IT as a big enabler to
3 accomplishing our business goals. And it
4 might sound obvious, but I think unless you
5 state that in terms of how we get closer to
6 our customers, how we drive revenue, how we
7 drive better customer service, I think you
8 have to get to that understanding that IT is
9 a big part of strategically where you want to
10 go.

11 And the second big picture I would
12 say is that we recognize that this is not a
13 sprint, but it's really a long-term marathon
14 in terms of how you're trying to drive the
15 company forward.

16 So, with that sort of in mind, the
17 first thing we do strategically is we sort of
18 say how do we even divide up the money that we
19 have between new projects, existing projects,
20 and maintenance, and depreciation, so to
21 speak? Because unless you are clear about
22 trying to drive change, and trying to drive

1 new, I like to call it you have infinite
2 projects. Every existing project can take up
3 all your available resources, so you have to
4 actually, I think, proactively drive towards
5 what kind of mix you want to see between
6 keeping your current systems running, keeping
7 the lights on versus how you want to invest in
8 new businesses, or new IT projects that are
9 going to drive new business benefits for you.

10 And also strategically, in addition
11 to having that mix of how we want to spend
12 money, we think about architectural
13 consistency, because I think there's a little
14 bit of potential easy win about building
15 things that may not serve you well long-term
16 architecturally. So, just to set those things
17 in context, which is you have to think about
18 long-term architectural consistency.

19 Otherwise, you'll have a mishmash of projects
20 that actually don't work together.

21 So, our goals as you can sort of
22 see a little bit on the slide is for all

1 projects, we clearly want to deliver projects
2 that support the business strategies and
3 realize measurable value. But equally
4 important, we want to hold not just IT but the
5 business leaders accountable for both the
6 adoption, as well as the realization of the
7 value once this technology is delivered.

8 It's very simple to say from a
9 sales point of view, for example, I need this
10 new sales force automation, or I need this new
11 system, and I'm going to drive revenue, but
12 unless they quantify it and it becomes part of
13 their next year goals, you're really not
14 holding them accountable. So, I think we've
15 tried to really formalize how we hold these
16 business leaders accountable for the option.
17 And there are three parts to that.

18 The first part is the partnership
19 between IT and the business leaders, which is
20 how are you making sure that you become a
21 trusted partner, both between IT and business.
22 And all the project investments that we make

1 annually, they have to cascade back to our
2 strategic goals, and our annual objectives.
3 So, whether you're in IT, or whether you're on
4 the business side, you know exactly how the
5 projects that you are allocating against buy
6 back to the annual strategic objectives, as
7 well as the KPIs that you have for yourself as
8 an organization.

9 And I think Vivek mentioned this,
10 I know Liz has this, as well, we definitely
11 have a cross-functional governance council
12 which helps in those decisions because there's
13 always tradeoffs that are involved.

14 So, step one I would say to the
15 execution is the partnership. The second one
16 is the shared responsibility. And we've come
17 up with a value model. And what the value
18 model really, it's all about having skin in
19 the game. So, the value model basically says
20 for every project are you trying to grow
21 revenue, are you trying to reduce costs, or
22 are you trying to increase productivity and

1 efficiency? And that has to show up then in
2 the plan for next year.

3 If you are saving costs, well, next
4 year when you start the budgeting process
5 there's that negative amount associated with
6 the budget. So, unless you have this long-
7 term accountability we found that people
8 invest in IT projects, but there's no
9 accountability that we have.

10 And the third thing I would say is
11 that transparency was a big part to really
12 making this a shared responsibility, so we
13 have a realtime dashboard for all of our IT
14 projects. We're constantly monitoring that.
15 We have an out of bounds very formal process
16 in case something else happens which moves
17 that project out of bounds. And they're,
18 again, all tied back, so it's called the Blue
19 Doc in our particular case, but it ties back
20 to strategic objectives.

21 So, I would say those are the three
22 parts of how we run. And on the next page,

1 just very quickly, is a sample example of
2 that. This one we haven't put the numbers in
3 there, but it really deals with
4 virtualization. I think every one of us in IT
5 probably has tens of thousands of servers
6 lying around with all these old archaic
7 systems, and we really clearly wanted to make
8 sure that over many years we virtualized all
9 of that, which I think is a common theme that
10 all of you probably face.

11 There's an investment that you have
12 to make up front to get the benefits long-
13 term. So, as you can see, we model out what
14 those benefits looks like. But there's one of
15 these value models that actually exists for
16 every major project that we have.

17 So, that's sort of a quick summary
18 of how we do it.

19 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Liz.

20 MS. SMITH: Great. Well, I can
21 certainly echo much of what Shantanu does, so
22 I'm only going to focus on what's different

1 about it, because I think that he articulated
2 most of what is around the table would say are
3 absolutely the hallmark of healthy IT
4 governance programs.

5 At OSI, prior to 2009 this should
6 resonate from having spoken to many of you, we
7 were really very independent, five restaurants
8 with what I would describe optimistically as
9 a patchwork quilt of IT infrastructure. And
10 the first thing to Shantanu's point that we
11 really had to develop was the notion of fewer,
12 bigger, better. And it's become somewhat of
13 a mantra in our organization.

14 We cut the IT projects immediately
15 by 50 percent, while increasing IT spending
16 over 3X, and there was just a ton of, as
17 Shantanu said, loose ends, legacy projects,
18 things that had been green lighted that nobody
19 kind of knew why they were still going along,
20 but they had this momentum of their own.

21 So, the first thing was to kind of
22 get control of the resources and bring it into

1 a manageable situation. Very similar to the
2 approach that Shantanu outlined, we have a
3 governance structure that starts with the
4 business long-range plans, and five key
5 company objectives. Kind of a big believer
6 that you can maybe do three and five is a
7 stretch, and then the IT goals have to align,
8 so the screen is this is what we have to do.
9 How does this project that's being proposed
10 support that, or not support that, very
11 similar.

12 The entire company is aligned on
13 this business plan and IT plan. And as
14 Shantanu said, it's not just an IT plan, it's
15 a joint ownership plan to deliver the business
16 objectives. And there's joint ownership.

17 We have a Governance Committee,
18 very similar, called the ITAC, and it is
19 chaired by the CIO. But for purposes of our
20 organization, the entire Executive Leadership
21 Team is around the table, and I participate
22 actively. And these are robust. I love the

1 thing of it's a marathon and not a sprint,
2 because it is. This is an imminent process
3 that you have to go through to establish
4 annual priorities, look at multi-year
5 projects. We meet quarterly and we prioritize
6 projects and project resources, we monitor via
7 dashboards. And I think this one is really
8 important, because we all have an optimism and
9 a desire to use technology.

10 We've had to implement a really
11 strict one-in/one-out policy, because what
12 high-performing groups tend to do is they tend
13 to keep adding projects, but nothing ever
14 comes off the table. And what I found in IT is
15 that we will green light a project, and it's
16 the iceberg analogy. You've only identified
17 the top, but what it takes to get done, then
18 90 percent of the resources on the business
19 side and the IT side that are needed to come
20 together, nobody has thought through when they
21 put that plane in the air. So, we pretty much
22 focus pretty strongly on that.

1 We also don't allow a project to
2 get in the air until there is a full list of
3 the organizational resources on the business
4 side and the IT side that are going to work on
5 this, and what percentage of its time.

6 Because what you find as you go back is that
7 you have the same person allocated 800 percent
8 of their time, and so businesses -- projects
9 never get done. You know, Bob has got 700
10 percent of his time allocated across seven
11 projects, so we really measure that down. And
12 we won't let a project go into the air until
13 there's a full business slate that clearly
14 says that this person is going to be able to
15 spend that time on that.

16 And then we have only the top
17 executive team and the top advisory council
18 can prioritize, cancel, delay, or re-scope the
19 IT project. It can't happen while we're down
20 in the organization areas. My experience says
21 you have tons of scope creep all over the
22 place.

1 And then, finally, both business
2 and IT leaders and team members have their
3 project and key milestones on their annual
4 performance objectives. So, it's not about
5 money, and bonus dollars, but it's literally
6 about did you partner to make this happen
7 according to the milestones?

8 And my experience is, and I think
9 probably it's shared, when IT projects are
10 languished, they almost always are, it tends
11 to be that the business resources were not
12 available, not the IT resources. So, it's
13 really important that the business contact
14 that's going to make it happen, that you've
15 identified all of them. In my experience,
16 that is always why it's late.

17 The next page just reinforces what
18 Shantanu said, and we don't need to crawl
19 through it because by definition it is an
20 iterative process, but it's kind of the point
21 of there's no shortcuts. Once we have a
22 project team and a project that's been put in

1 the air, plane in the air, then it's an
2 iterative project where the ITAC of that
3 project meets, incorporates business needs,
4 goes to the next, has an output so that you
5 kind of have three or four iterative sessions
6 before you finally finish, so that means that
7 by the end in the finished product,
8 expectations have been fully aligned. And
9 that you don't have the kind of situation
10 where the business gets delivered something
11 that they didn't realize that this is what it
12 was going to do. It speeds up project
13 execution by focusing on development, and
14 minimizing documentation.

15 We try to keep, as I said here,
16 just enough ceremony to produce frequent and
17 high-quality solutions, but we tend to make
18 these working sessions. And it just results
19 in much less free work.

20 MR. KUNDRA: So, Danny, what I
21 thought was really interesting here -- Danny,
22 the CIO at the Department of Education, is

1 what Shantanu and Liz, what you talked about
2 in terms of being able to put in place systems
3 that allow you to see whether it's out of
4 bound projects, and how to build the right
5 structures there, or to figure out up front
6 that there's no difference between sort of
7 business plan and the IT plan.

8 Can you talk a little bit about the
9 Department of Education, and sort of how you
10 look at the universe in a federated
11 environment?

12 MR. HARRIS: Sure. What we do is
13 we use a segment approach. We've probably
14 been at it for the last three years, was
15 probably the most significant impact that we
16 had on IT spending in the Department's
17 history. So, a segment is a line of business,
18 is a broad line of business. Until we
19 actually looked at spending from a segment
20 perspective, we had duplicate projects,
21 duplicate spending, so now if you are -- let's
22 say you want to spend IT dollars on grants

1 management, or the grants management line of
2 business, you have to actually go to the
3 grants management segment owner, and you have
4 to sell that concept. And that segment owner
5 has to answer a number of questions. One, do
6 we already have an investment that either
7 solves that business problem, or with a slight
8 modification can support that business
9 problem. And what is the value, what is the
10 value of that specific solution? And does it
11 map to our enterprise architecture?

12 So, there's a list, there's about
13 a dozen questions that that business owner
14 would have to sell and convince the segment
15 owner of before that actually becomes an
16 investment.

17 Over a very short period of time,
18 we significantly reduced the amount of
19 spending, and at the high-level spend, the
20 major investment, there is no duplication.
21 Obviously, at the minor spend, you know, less
22 than \$1 million, less than \$500,000, you're

1 still going to see some duplication. But the
2 major spend level, no duplication, because it
3 just simply doesn't get through the process.

4 MR. KUNDRA: It would be
5 interesting, Bernie, from your perspective as
6 a CIO at the Department of Interior, this is
7 how we can replicate some of these best
8 practices. For the challenges, for example, in
9 Bernie's organization, when the Secretary is
10 sent an email, as Deputy Secretary Hayes
11 mentioned last time, because the
12 infrastructure was just so fragmented, we'd
13 love to get your thoughts on how Interior, as
14 it's going through a transformation right now,
15 and fundamentally rethinking its governance,
16 do you want to talk a little bit about what
17 you've done so far, Bernie, and then where
18 there are some issues that we could get some
19 thinking around.

20 MR. MAZER: Right. I'm so grateful
21 to be at this presence here.

22 Listening to both of you, one of

1 the things you brought up, Liz, about the
2 taxing of individuals on these multiple
3 projects, we have an expression internally, I
4 call it STP, but it's the same 12 people,
5 which is the one that we always go to to come
6 to try to have the execution.

7 What we're doing within the
8 Department of Interior is, we are -- we have
9 a multi-fold process. One is a consolidation
10 of what we consider common commodity type of
11 utilities. That's our infrastructure. We
12 have aging infrastructure, not really good
13 total cost of operations models to recycle the
14 refreshing of those technologies. And we're
15 also focused on what we call the governance,
16 and where Danny was talking about with lines
17 of business or segments.

18 The Department of Interior, we
19 have, I think, one of the most -- and we talk
20 in architecture, the most diverse business
21 lines. We have 37 separate business lines.
22 And what we are doing in the Department of

1 Interior is creating what I call domain areas,
2 things like law enforcement, things like
3 energy, and we are appointing -- we're not
4 only federated, we're a distributed
5 organization, and is appointing people from
6 within the Department and from the Office of
7 the Secretary, as well as owners from these
8 different domain areas. So, we're going
9 through a governance process of streamlining
10 all that.

11 Whereas, in the past we had
12 literally dozens and dozens of individual
13 investment review boards, and everyone was a
14 passing student and all of that. What we're
15 doing now is applying a rigorous approach to
16 saying these are common applications, this is
17 a common area, everyone shares those. We're
18 bringing experts, the CIO is supporting the
19 experts who are saying does this merit
20 consideration and continued funding, or not?

21 MR. KUNDRA: This the question that
22 is facing the Department is sort of the scale.

1 So, when I think of Department of Commerce,
2 for example, Simon, the CIO is here, and he's
3 got NIST and NOAA and all these different
4 agencies. What's your advice as we think
5 about this, where you have CIOs at a
6 departmental level that may not, necessarily,
7 manage the entire budget. But at the same
8 time, you've got sort of these toothless
9 review boards across the federal government
10 that aren't really able to drive change as
11 aggressively. How should we begin to even
12 tackle that problem?

13 MS. SMITH: I would -- I think the
14 whole Committee, Enrique, and Ron isn't here,
15 but he would certainly -- the first thing is
16 that it has to have the involvement of the
17 senior level of the house.

18 I know you have a council that
19 meets, but is that -- you can't leave it
20 because those ITACs that exist down further in
21 the organization, they are toothless, and they
22 will not be able to. So, you have to agree on

1 a set of principles at the top, and no one can
2 change those without bringing them back.

3 Right?

4 So, that's kind of what we do. The
5 one question I had, though, for you, Danny, in
6 talking through this is, you tend to get into
7 A, B, and C priorities with IT. And what we
8 found was that the C priorities, what you just
9 let happen and people have decision rights
10 over, they suck a huge amount of resources on
11 the business side and on the IT side, so the
12 first thing we had to do was rein all that in
13 and, in effect, put a freeze on those and just
14 say we're out of business on these things.

15 I know that for your project it
16 seems absolutely critical to build that
17 interface, but we're freezing all of that work
18 because we literally need to take the business
19 resources and we need to take the IT resources
20 and bring them up to the A projects, one, to
21 better the planes, and two, to better control
22 them.

1 So, I guess I would first say it's
2 a tough step to take in an organization, but
3 I've never been able to make progress without
4 first putting a freeze on the 2,000 C
5 priorities that are critical to one person and
6 one team, so that it frees up and it returns
7 control at the top so that you can get the key
8 programs done.

9 MR. NARAYEN: So, I agree. I mean,
10 I have two things. First is, you've got to
11 cancel some projects, as well. If you don't
12 cancel any projects then I don't think the
13 ITAC or the government's council, or whatever
14 your group is really has any real authority.
15 So, you have to figure out which ones have
16 outlived their value.

17 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Pause for a
18 second to throw some data on the table. OMB,
19 Vivek working with agency leadership did 50 of
20 these TechStat sessions which will go deep on
21 50 large projects, and a bunch of
22 cancellations came out of that.

1 MR. NARAYEN: That's great.

2 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Then we
3 transferred the technology, as should be done,
4 to the agencies, which is fabulous, and those
5 TechStat sessions are now happening. However,
6 cancellations aren't happening any more. So,
7 I mean, there's good things happening,
8 projects are being streamlined, unnecessary
9 bells and whistles are going away, but it's
10 interesting when the heavy, Vivek here, no
11 longer was there, the agencies tended to make
12 good progress, again, it's a good thing, but
13 the terminations have stopped.

14 MR. NARAYEN: I imagine, as you
15 would say, requires constant vigilance because
16 it's like weeds, they grow up, they keep
17 coming back if you don't constantly --

18 MS. SMITH: There's no substitution
19 for senior leadership involvement. There
20 isn't. I mean, I've tried to validate this
21 thing 50 times, and this is what happens. So,
22 I've just -- I spend 25 percent of my time on

1 these matters, and I bet most of us would
2 because you're exactly right. There's good
3 intention, but it doesn't happen unless you're
4 at the table saying one-in/one-out. Nope,
5 we're going to kill that, we're green lighting
6 that.

7 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: That's a very --
8 in government it's called PayGo, meaning --
9 PayGo, meaning that if you're going to do
10 something new you've got to figure out a way
11 to pay for it in our budget. That's what
12 you've -- I mean, that's the tab, is we're not
13 starting anything new without something being
14 done, or killing it.

15 MS. SMITH: That's one in --

16 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Right.

17 MS. SMITH: Because everybody is
18 fully resourced.

19 MR. KUNDRA: I mean, just to add to
20 what Jeff said in terms of data points.
21 Right? So, when we did it sort of from the
22 White House perspective with the agencies, we

1 were able to save about \$3 billion. As we
2 tried to federate and solve the scaling
3 problem, as Jeff outlined, because we realized
4 that if every CIO in the Department could
5 replicate the same model, what we would be
6 able to do is go after far more projects at
7 terminations, but the challenge was after 75
8 projects versus 50, there are only \$11 million
9 in savings. So, that's the big challenge that
10 we're trying to figure out both government-
11 wide, but also at the departmental level.
12 Right?

13 To Simon, for example, when you
14 review a project that NIST or NOAA -- what are
15 some of the challenges? Can you give us a
16 flavor of that, and maybe we can try to
17 problem solve.

18 MR. SZYKMAN: I'd be happy to talk
19 about that, but I do want to mention that it
20 almost sounds like we are talking about two
21 different things. The TechStat process was
22 focused on poorly performing or high-risk

1 types of projects, and what I thought I heard
2 from Liz was also just look at those C
3 priorities, and reprioritizing, sort of
4 getting rid of the old to make way for the
5 new. That inherently won't happen through the
6 TechStat process if the TechStat is focused on
7 high-risk and poor performance. So, it sounds
8 like we might need some complementary process
9 here where even if things are performing
10 perfectly well, maybe they've outlived their
11 utility, or maybe they're still useful but
12 just not as important as some of the new
13 things that we want to be able to do. And it
14 sounds like there's just an inherently
15 different type of process that might also be
16 needed.

17 MS. SMITH: Yes, I would be
18 interested in -- the governance process is
19 every project. It's not just the poor
20 performing ones, because it's literally you
21 have a pool of dollars and a pool of
22 resources, and everything has to be evaluated,

1 because business needs change. So, nothing is
2 secure until you exit the quarterly meeting
3 and it's been reupped.

4 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: We should --

5 MS. SMITH: Okay. What is your's
6 though?

7 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Sorry, go ahead.

8 MR. SZYKMAN: One last thing from
9 that, it does bring it back to the question
10 that Vivek posed outward regarding this this
11 issue of distributive or federated
12 organizations without that much control,
13 because I can look across the Department and
14 perhaps identify some programs or projects
15 that are in my view for priority, but I don't
16 control the vast majority of them. So, it's
17 not -- I don't have the business span of
18 control to say well, that project in this
19 organization is not as important as this new
20 thing they want to do in this other
21 organization, and so we should free up the
22 resources to reinvest elsewhere.

1 It's very much -- there's a lot of
2 local autonomy and local control over what
3 money gets spent where.

4 MR. SALEM: Let me just give you a
5 comment. One of the things that I worry about
6 in our organization is we seem to have a lot
7 of churning projects, meaning in fields I can
8 start lots of things and things get
9 reprioritized. I think at some point on the
10 governance process that we're hearing from
11 Shantanu and Liz is, you've got to be rigorous
12 on what you pick, but once you pick, you've
13 got to make a commitment, and they have got to
14 be funded to completion. And if the projects
15 are not going well, then that comes back to
16 the project management.

17 But I worry about IT project churn,
18 because if you don't have the resources
19 allocated, and I like your STP, but that
20 creates so much churn in efficiency, you've
21 got to make commitments, and you've got to go
22 for it, and you've got to get it done.

1 Now, you asked a question that I
2 was wrestling with a little Vivek, which was
3 why do we have committees that have no power?
4 And the question you want to ask yourself is,
5 if that committee went away, what would not
6 happen? So, if you go to each of these
7 different committee groups that we've got,
8 what is going to happen if they go away? And
9 answer that question, and you'll make some
10 progress. But I do worry about project churn.

11 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: I want to make
12 something clear as we do a Subcommittee, other
13 Board members should feel free who aren't on
14 that Subcommittee to ask questions and --

15 MR. BROWN: I'm not at that point.

16 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Please.

17 MR. BROWN: I'm not involved in the
18 IT thing, but to bridge on Enrique's point,
19 it's easier said than done. It's a massive
20 thing. So, maybe you start -- you just
21 discontinue a lot of what appear to be
22 formalized legacy processes. And I wrote down

1 four things, sound the siren, use the power of
2 the office, get the right people, control the
3 calendar.

4 Sound the siren, use the power of
5 the office, get the right people, control the
6 calendar; the thought being, forget about the
7 fragmentation, lack of control, inefficiency,
8 the realities of all the imperfections of why
9 it's so hard.

10 First things first. Sound the
11 siren formally that says there's going to be
12 a cradle to grave review of IT systems
13 implementation of processes using the power of
14 the office. Vivek, the Office of the
15 President, whatever it is, so there's this
16 clarion call regardless of whatever department
17 you're in, hey, I heard this, there's top to
18 bottom review. Sound the siren, use the power
19 of the office. Forget the formal or
20 structured committees, and have a
21 prioritization ad hoc, informal, up-to-date,
22 new, and have people regardless of what level

1 in the organization on a call.

2 And sometimes we kind of look to
3 over-intensively process things or
4 systematize, or let's buy software to look at
5 a dashboard with green and red. Jump on a
6 call weekly or biweekly, it could be 10, it
7 could 15, it could be 30 people, have it very
8 efficient driven by one person, and you go
9 around and say Finance what's your top five,
10 Science, what's your top five?

11 Even if it's sloppy, even if it's
12 you're not prepared, the fact that there's a
13 clarion call, and there's an operational
14 control the calendar review process. So, I
15 may know what I'm doing, or I may not, Liz may
16 or may not, but she knows and I know there's
17 a call on Monday, so there's a level of
18 preparation. And that will -- even if it's
19 informal, force the alignment within the
20 agency. So even if a CIO doesn't have control
21 of the whole agency or group and it's
22 fragmented, he or she is forced to get

1 alignment with their business or agency
2 leaders, and the reason there's awareness of
3 that is because you sounded the siren.

4 So, it's a little bit of a -- it
5 isn't business as usual. We're not going to
6 incrementally cut \$11 million. We're not
7 going to boot one out, but there's a more
8 urgency, there's a significant level of
9 urgency to drive efficiency and get government
10 more upgraded from a technology standpoint.
11 It's an informal thing, and it sounds good,
12 I'm sure it's very hard to do, but that's what
13 I was thinking about.

14 MR. KUNDRA: That sounds like
15 common sense. How do we implement it?

16 MR. LOCATIS: You know, it's really
17 interesting. I came in recently to the federal
18 government from state government and private
19 sector, and immediately when I came in Deputy
20 Secretary Poneman who is sitting right here,
21 sounded the siren and said, "You will do a
22 deep review of all of the IT systems within

1 the Department of Energy, and not in 90 days,
2 but within 45 days." And then he formed a --
3 very much like your ITAC, Liz, we formed the
4 Information Management Governance Council with
5 Under Secretary representation so that we
6 could get our arms around this from the
7 highest level. And, actually, we've been
8 solving some problems.

9 We had a cyber incident recently.
10 We used the IMGC to bring together all the
11 resources, and actually consolidate our
12 fragmented incident -- Coordination Incident
13 Command capabilities and got that consensus
14 across all lines of business and moved it
15 very, very quickly. So, these private sector
16 capabilities, which I believe this was
17 patterned after, really can work if you're
18 empowered from the top of the department, and
19 from the top of the U.S. Government.

20 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: A lot of this is
21 counsel to Dan, Tony, and David. So, I want
22 to agree to -- probably in the next four or

1 five minutes switch to the other topic, but
2 I'd love to have the three of you give a sense
3 of how what you're hearing today could help
4 you, which will help inform our work.

5 DEP. SEC. PONEMAN: For me, and as
6 Mike just said, the key thing, the resonance
7 here is we insist that our Under Secretaries,
8 which are our division leaders, we have
9 Energy, Science, National Security, they have
10 to own this through this Governance Council.

11 It's the ephemeral nature of what
12 we do. You know, we're Presidential
13 Appointees, we're not in that long. We have
14 budget cycles mandated by Congress, so we get
15 herky-jerky funding, and I think I got a
16 window, is how to take these processes and get
17 them sort of woven in the fabric of the career
18 people so that delivery back to them will be
19 sufficient and attractive so they will stick
20 with it after I am gone. And I think that's
21 going to be the challenge.

22 And the last thing I'll say is that

1 we have done a lot of work, mainly because of
2 the Recovery Act, a much deeper transparency.
3 We used to have contractors reporting and
4 everybody to the next level and to the next
5 level each time producing two forms of
6 distortion, intentional and unintentional. We
7 have gone to a much flatter transparent
8 structure so you can look down from the 7th
9 floor down to the deck plate and see right
10 through. That's very empowering to the career
11 people, and I think that's how we're going to
12 try to get our arms around this problem of
13 having a marathon with a bunch of sprinters
14 handing the baton off.

15 DEP. SEC. MILLER: For us, I think
16 part of the challenge is top down goal setting
17 and linking it to your business, because I
18 think the environment -- I think one of the
19 challenges that we have, anyway, we're taught
20 -- we're starting with a level of IT
21 enablement that is, I would say on average,
22 well below what you see in the private sector.

1 So, we're doing time sheets by hand. Right?
2 I mean, you're talking about wow, there's a
3 whole lot of things that just say well, that's
4 crazy, why are we doing that? So, there's
5 kind of this feeling that you could have a lot
6 more productivity and process improvement if
7 we had more IT tools deployed. But still the
8 vast majority of your IT spend it spent on
9 kind of your larger sister, maintenance.
10 Right?

11 So, the big thing is how do we keep
12 even this not 21st century, necessarily,
13 business process and IT infrastructure going,
14 and at the same time in a more strategic way
15 really try to bring a whole new level of
16 productivity in IT.

17 And that's, I think, one of the
18 challenges, is how do we actually set goals
19 for how much of this spend should be allocated
20 and in what buckets. How do you then get your
21 political leadership, and your career
22 leadership to really embrace that because, as

1 you said, the real issue with the business
2 leadership and the change of management
3 required, not the IT. And that's what I think
4 has been some of our bottleneck.

5 So, in the interim you're kind of
6 managing projects against the segments lines
7 of business, but probably our biggest
8 management challenge is really bring a vision
9 for what are we really trying to accomplish,
10 what are the top three priorities, and how are
11 going to start shifting spend, and then we can
12 drive our IT agenda to that.

13 And I think we struggle with that
14 still right now. We're getting much, much
15 better on the IT execution, once that's
16 defined. But we struggle, which is really
17 setting kind of what we think is going to be
18 an optimal agenda.

19 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: David.

20 DEP. SEC. HAYES: Just a couple of
21 quick points. This is a terrific discussion,
22 and very helpful to all of us. I want to thank

1 you for that.

2 I want to say Greg's comment really
3 resonated with me. It is easy, and I imagine
4 for even you guys, but certainly for us who
5 are sitting on top of large federated
6 distributed organizations to feel like we
7 really don't have as much power as we do. If
8 you call a meeting, Bruce Babbitt taught me
9 this in the '90s when I was at the Department
10 before, if you're interested in an issue, just
11 call a meeting and start having regular
12 meetings. And we are doing that, and people
13 do realize okay, you're involved.

14 In our case, Secretary Salazar is
15 very interested in this issue, wants to hear
16 about it routinely, calls meetings. So,
17 that's very helpful to get reinforced also
18 that we don't have to be totally prepared and
19 have long issue papers in anticipation of the
20 meeting.

21 I would say the other -- two other
22 things I'm taking out of this. One is, we

1 have a huge challenge in aligning IT with our
2 business needs. And, Liz, your comments were
3 very helpful in that regard. And there's been
4 a sense that the IT world is its own little
5 world. And we've had lots of fiefdoms and the
6 IT folks, they're all their own technology
7 experts. And Bernie has done a great job in
8 terms of leadership of changing that.

9 Our IT folks now down through the
10 organizations are really strategic enablers.
11 They are not the decision makers on what
12 hardware to use, what software to use. We've
13 changed all the descriptions all the way down.
14 We're trying to make it a much more central
15 thing, but it's not just the centralization.
16 It's really a shift in thinking about what the
17 IT function is. It is not all the way through
18 the place where these big decisions are made.
19 It is an enabling part of the business
20 operation. That's a huge transformation that
21 we're trying to implement.

22 The final thing I'll say is, and

1 this goes to something that Jeff and Vivek
2 talked about. And the question, why is it
3 that now that these reviews are back in the
4 Department we're not finding these huge high-
5 risk projects?

6 I think that maybe it's not
7 unhealthy. I think we are still -- and, Liz,
8 your point about a lot of what we -- yes, we
9 can get the big hit and kill those big, ugly
10 projects. And, frankly, Vivek has done that
11 very effectively. He's always welcome in our
12 Department, but just as important is --
13 particularly in a time of shrinking budgets,
14 is that second function of prioritizing among
15 what you know you have to support.

16 And, actually, I think our budget
17 constraints are helping us in that regard.
18 Everyone gets it in the federal government.
19 There's not going to be enough money. It's an
20 opportunity for us really to make some of
21 those decisions that in the past just got
22 kicked down the road.

1 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Yes, the C
2 project.

3 DEP. SEC. HAYES: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: The PayGo, the C
5 projects.

6 MS. SMITH: Can I just make one
7 observation on that? To your point, Tony, is
8 that we struggled to get -- and I would say
9 that the two organizations that I was involved
10 in this on did not have the cutting edge
11 technology systems. And we really struggled
12 to get the head space from a resource and
13 dollar standpoint to work on the future,
14 because all of our resources were spent on
15 legacy system patchwork, keeping the lights
16 on.

17 So, we kind of made the bold step
18 up, you know what, we're freezing all changes
19 to legacy systems, and I bet the world will go
20 on. And it did. You know, there were
21 impassioned pleas about why you couldn't do
22 that, you're going to bring the whole thing to

1 its knees. We froze it, and we took all of
2 the resources and put them towards the future.
3 And guess what, life went on.

4 So, I mean, that was an important
5 step for us. I heard all the arguments about
6 why we can't --

7 (Simultaneous speaking.)

8 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: I'm going to play
9 timekeeper for a second. I want to -- oh,
10 sorry. Please.

11 MS. McGOVERN: I couldn't resist
12 jumping in for one second.

13 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Please. Please.

14 MS. McGOVERN: The chart on page 8
15 that Shantanu showed is really powerful. I
16 went through this once before in my former
17 life. My current life is just like your's,
18 manual time sheets, legacy systems that Clara
19 Barton coded on. I mean, it's kind of
20 amazing.

21 (Laughter.)

22 MS. McGOVERN: But once upon a time

1 I did live in a world where we did this, and
2 it gives perfect clarity, because it forces
3 your business leaders to work with IT, because
4 there are two parts of this equation, the
5 revenue and expense, or the savings and
6 expense. And then you create a spreadsheet
7 and just prioritize it by net present value,
8 and draw a line when your budget is over. And
9 everything below that line you can just put a
10 big X through. So, this is a really powerful
11 tool to get prioritization and clarity.

12 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Okay. Let me do
13 this. Let's get the second topic out, and then
14 let's get quick reaction to the second topic.
15 I think this first topic is clearly rich, and
16 we're going to keep driving on it to really
17 get the lessons. And I think one of the
18 things we'll need to do, there's a clear
19 message that Deputy Secretaries and many --
20 everyone at this table already is, and many
21 across government are spending more time here
22 than we ever have before. We also have to

1 figure out, as Tony, you captured it, or Dan,
2 or both of you, which is how do we make sure
3 that it lives beyond just your tenure. So,
4 that's a dual challenge. So, I think it's
5 clear that this topic is worthy of a lot more
6 exploration across the summer.

7 Let's get the second topic on the
8 table for quick reaction.

9 MR. KUNDRA: Great. Sure, really
10 quickly. This is a critical topic --

11 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: We're on page 11.

12 MR. KUNDRA: -- for the federal
13 government, on page 11, which is how we
14 actually look at IT vendor performance
15 management. The United States Government is
16 the largest buyer of information technology.
17 We spend \$80 billion every year, and we spent
18 \$600 billion over the last decade. And the
19 majority of the money is actually spent on
20 vendors. It's not money that's spent on
21 government employees, but it's outsourced
22 systems, or higher consultants to come in and

1 build solutions for the federal government.

2 The challenge within the government
3 is that they way we track performance, it's
4 actually done by project managers, which
5 creates disincentives because they want to see
6 the project move forward. And billing and
7 compliance is actually managed by another
8 group within the federal government, which is
9 the Contracting Officers.

10 And as we look into separation of
11 payment and performance, it creates a huge
12 divide on how these contracts are managed
13 effectively. We also, unfortunately, from an
14 IT service perspective have a very complex
15 environment in terms of how we monitor and
16 require very specific expertise that are
17 lacking within the federal government in terms
18 of the workforce itself.

19 The private sector, obviously, does
20 it very differently. It starts with the fact
21 that up front there's very heavy engagement
22 with business partners, where in government

1 it's the opposite, where the government
2 doesn't really engage with the potential
3 vendors up front.

4 Secondly, there's a very rigorous
5 process, and a lot of time is actually devoted
6 up front to statements of work that are
7 developed, and the performance goals are
8 actually set up front rather than afterwards.

9 And, lastly, in terms of reviewing
10 vendor performance, it's very healthy because
11 it's in the private sector that we've seen.
12 Enrique is going to walk us through some of
13 the great work that's been happening within
14 his company.

15 MR. SALEM: Thanks, Vivek. So, you
16 heard Shantanu say about having accountability
17 from the business. This is really about how
18 do you have accountability on the vendor side.
19 That's the real question. You spend \$80
20 billion, how do you have accountability on the
21 vendor side also?

22 So, what we looked at what was

1 through this process, this doesn't replace the
2 project management that Vivek talked about,
3 which is really about project execution, and
4 it doesn't replace the role of procurement
5 around negotiating the actual contract. This
6 is actually the glue between those two groups
7 that says how do we drive the accountability?

8 What we found was that throughout
9 the process, there was always a lot of
10 leakage, starting with spend management. You
11 heard Danny talk about going back to the
12 segment leaders and figuring out what is
13 specifically already being done, and how do we
14 get some leverage? Well, the idea is, you have
15 to formalize the opportunity to do that.

16 The second thing is, when you look
17 at different categories, project managers are
18 not experts in those categories. They're
19 trying to solve a specific problem. As you try
20 to go do that, you end up with a lot of vendor
21 fragmentation, so what you need is somebody
22 saying if we do networking, if we do storage,

1 if we do applications, who are the vendors of
2 choice? And you're really trying to get down
3 to a smaller set of people that you work with.

4 Next point is, as you inform the
5 contracting and negotiation, you want some
6 level of consistency. You don't want each new
7 contract to start over with are going to be
8 the expectations for performance. And then
9 you go through the procurement cycle, and then
10 you consolidate the whole payment process.

11 If you look at our company, we
12 spend about \$724 million a year, 700 different
13 vendors, but we have 25 that we would consider
14 strategic, that really fit into the heavy
15 management of what we call the vendor
16 management office.

17 So, let's take a look at the
18 solution. If you go to Slide 13, the
19 challenge has been clearly articulated by
20 Vivek in the notion that you have inconsistent
21 vendor performance. So, the question is, how
22 do you improve vendor performance across the

1 board and get efficiency out of that \$80
2 billion?

3 What we did is we decided to have
4 a small central group, we're talking six
5 people that are really looking after the 25
6 strategic vendors and driving a centralized
7 review process that is not impeding or
8 inhibiting the work done by the project
9 managers, but it's making sure that the value
10 is being realized, and the vendors are
11 delivering.

12 Second point is, what we want to
13 make sure is that there is a linkage between
14 the business goal and what the vendor
15 ultimately delivers. So, you need somebody
16 who is paying attention to that throughout the
17 process that has some level of objectivity,
18 that isn't in the sprint, because inside of
19 the marathon there are these little bursts
20 that you have to go through. And when they
21 get that heads down, they lose the visibility
22 into is the vendor really performing.

1 The other thing that you want to
2 do, though, when you build this group, is you
3 want to make sure they have some subject
4 matter expertise. Look at our company, we
5 work with AT&T and with Verizon. The person,
6 the VMO who looks after telecom, they came
7 from that industry. They understand the
8 industry, they understand the inner workings
9 of telecom, so then they can go back and say
10 you know what I know how the system works.
11 You're not delivering what you said, so it's
12 important to have the folks in this area
13 really be true experts with the folks that
14 they're going to interact with.

15 What we see clear about this,
16 consistent tracking of financial performance
17 to the objectives that were originally set
18 out. Two, you get the local IT project
19 managers that are freed up to run the project,
20 and are not as focused on the vendor side.
21 Their goal is to meet the business control,
22 the project manager's goal is to meet the

1 business control, and allow the VMO to make
2 sure that the vendor is performing.

3 The other thing that we see is that
4 it clearly allows us to bring the organization
5 together. That's not procurement, and that's
6 not the project management team.

7 And then, lastly, for us, which was
8 very important, as a security company, we had
9 a lot of people who buy and procure services,
10 and they weren't thinking about the risk
11 management aspect. We'd buy -- an example
12 listed here is they'd go out and they'd buy a
13 hosting service, but that hosting service
14 hadn't been appropriately vetted. And now
15 they created a potential security liability
16 for the company.

17 So, what we've done is by working
18 with the VMO who's going to go procure a
19 service, we also have some risk management
20 that's being done there to make sure that
21 they're meeting some of the things that we
22 feel are very important; in this case, for

1 example, that our systems are not going to be
2 compromised.

3 A small group of people that are
4 really focused on holding the vendors
5 accountable for what they said they were going
6 to do in the initial contracting process,
7 separate from the actual day-to-day execution
8 of the project.

9 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Let's get some
10 reaction, I guess this would be primarily from
11 your CIOs as to how different this is from
12 what we do, and most importantly, how
13 applicable are these kinds of best practices.

14 MR. SALEM: Bernie, do you want to
15 talk about the Department of Interior's
16 reaction?

17 MR. MAZER: Overwhelmingly positive
18 in terms of representing it. What we look at
19 it is, we look at IT, the way we are is we
20 don't really have a classic value chain or the
21 porter model where all of the supporting
22 business processes are tightly integrated with

1 one another to produce whatever our social ROI
2 is. So, it's an extensive communications of,
3 you know, my procurement folks do this, while
4 my HR folks do this, while my labor relations
5 folks do this, or our solicitor's folks do
6 that. So, we create the relationships there.

7 It sounds like what you're talking
8 about is a hybridization of skills that are
9 necessary to oversee almost, you didn't use
10 the architecture, which is in some quarters
11 very refreshing, but it's a hybridization of
12 skills that are looked at as to what it means
13 in terms of the business needs.

14 So, you bring up the thing of like
15 someone from the telecom sector, is that a
16 business analyst, or is that a box kicker that
17 you brought in to look at that?

18 We have some issues where we have
19 people that we're enamored with in the
20 technology, and they haven't looked at the
21 business purposes of what that technology is
22 for. And we work constantly on no solutions,

1 no, look at what the needs are for.

2 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: I messed up,
3 Becky. I didn't see you. Please enter the
4 conversation as the Deputy of Commerce.

5 ACTING DEP. SEC. BLANK: Well, I
6 will say something on this topic, in
7 particular, which I think is really --

8 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Please.

9 ACTING DEP. SEC. BLANK: --
10 relevant to -- in many ways, I find a little
11 bit more -- the first conversation was
12 fascinating, but I feel like a very
13 distributed department, I have much more
14 limited ability to move resources and drive
15 priorities across the entire department. And
16 I can't move resources away from weather
17 satellites into the Census Department. I just
18 don't have that spending flexibility.

19 Whereas, I can enforce constant
20 business practices across all of those
21 bureaus. And this is an area where,
22 particularly, the current budget situation

1 we're in I think has been incredibly useful to
2 us, to give us in some sense a clarion call,
3 something we could go out and say given the
4 budget environment we're in, we have to change
5 our business practices around vending, of
6 which IT is a very, very important piece. It's
7 such a large piece of our spend.

8 So, the question of how we deal
9 effectively, more effectively, and more
10 consistently with IT choices across the -- so
11 that it saves you money, it lets you provide
12 better expertise from your central acquisition
13 department in terms of how it interacts with
14 all the other groups.

15 I mean, this issue, in particular,
16 is something I know our department is in the
17 midst of, and one that I think we can make
18 real progress on. And I just -- I find these
19 comments terribly helpful in that sense.

20 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Reactions from
21 other Board Members?

22 MR. NARAYEN: I think one point

1 that Enrique made was really important, which
2 is who is managing the vendor? If it's the
3 relationship manager managing the vendor over
4 time it's very hard for them to be not biased,
5 or feel like their own performance is going to
6 be measured relative to the vendor's
7 performance. So, I think that's a really
8 important point to think about.

9 DEP. SEC. MILLER: The question for
10 us, I mean, what struck me, is there an
11 opportunity for us to set up a government-wide
12 VMO through GSA, because boy, if you said boy,
13 I'm going to have real expertise in managing
14 overall telecom spend across all the agencies,
15 if you looked at that budget, that kind of
16 power and expertise, and understanding the
17 variance of practices, the contracting
18 mechanisms, and performance, it would be
19 hugely valuable.

20 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: So, do it by
21 various spends.

22 DEP. SEC. MILLER: Yes, back to the

1 same, where you really get domain expertise.
2 You concentrate it, and then as an agency we'd
3 welcome that. Right?

4 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Think about your
5 ROI in buying those services for GSA. I mean,
6 I assume it would need extraordinary terms.

7 DEP. SEC. MILLER: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: I mean, GSA could
9 set up that kind of expertise.

10 MR. NARAYEN: Just maybe one more.
11 Do you realize how big a hammer an \$80 billion
12 IT spend --

13 (Simultaneous speaking.)

14 MR. NARAYEN: \$80 billion.

15 MS. LEE: And it would imply that
16 you have a first-rate IT system. That was my
17 first thought, after spending that much, why
18 is --

19 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Yes, we're going
20 through it, too. We spend a lot of money.

21 MR. SALEM: I think what really
22 happens is you get leakage throughout the

1 whole process, so by having a little higher
2 level of control and accountability for the
3 vendors, you actually will limit some of that
4 leakage. I mean, you can spend a lot of money
5 that would be used throughout the process. I
6 agree, you can grab so much efficiency.

7 I mean, we have targets that the
8 VMO drives, quite frankly, across the vendor
9 community, because they're responsible for
10 that vendor relationship, as Shantanu said.

11 MS. LEE: Is that possible, let me
12 ask?

13 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Yes, it is, I
14 believe, because I mean think about -- I mean,
15 GSA is there with a set of services, agencies
16 can purchase those services. If they have a
17 kind of return, which I would imagine they
18 could have pretty easily, especially given the
19 state of affairs today.

20 Do you like that being at GSA, or
21 do you like -- is that trying to create
22 something that's too big, or too -- or would

1 you rather build those capabilities at the
2 individual agencies?

3 MR. KINDLER: Last time we were
4 here, I understood that there had been a
5 decision made in the last several years to
6 decentralize procurement. We had that
7 conversation --

8 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Well, there was
9 decentralization of a lot of procurement at
10 GSA, but it's a -- and Scott and others, feel
11 free to jump in, it's a voluntary basis. It's
12 a market basis, so it's not a command and
13 control.

14 MR. KINDLER: Well, that seems to
15 be a policy decision that should be made
16 involuntarily.

17 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Yes.

18 DEP. SEC. HAYES: Can I throw a --
19 I mean, my instinct is it's not a good idea to
20 do it at GSA, frankly. I mean, our
21 organizations are all very, very large, and if
22 -- and we are trying to control them. If we

1 have to go outside to yet another organization
2 to get expertise that we can apply, it just
3 feels like --

4 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: That's --

5 DEP. SEC. HAYES: Yes. Plus, I --
6 the thing that really strikes me here,
7 Enrique, is the risk management piece. I mean,
8 this is what we're finding, where it's bad
9 enough when you're spending a lot of money and
10 you're not getting a good result, but when
11 you're actually increasing your risk, and
12 you're finding you're in the middle of a
13 software deal where you can't even use the
14 data because you don't have the rights to it,
15 and that kind of thing. I mean, that's the
16 kind of thing that the close day-to-day
17 manager may not be -- and I query whether you
18 can out source that to GSA.

19 MR. SALEM: Can I make a comment,
20 a quick reaction on the telecom.

21 MR. SALEM: One thing you may want
22 to think about, though, is what services are

1 more, for lack of a better term, commodity.

2 (Simultaneous speaking.)

3 MR. KINDLER: You made exactly that
4 point. This is something we struggle with, I
5 think, all the time. There are strategic
6 services that need to be kept within the, what
7 we would call a business unit. And this very
8 much goes to the discussion you and I were
9 having yesterday, David, the same thing with
10 hiring practices that really should not be
11 centralized.

12 But I have to believe that within
13 that \$80 billion spend, there are services
14 that are really, whether we call them
15 commodities or not, really don't require
16 strategic decision making.

17 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: We think that's
18 about \$25 billion of it.

19 MR. KINDLER: And that really do
20 not need the decision making at the
21 decentralized level, and that great savings
22 could be made.

1 MR. KUNDRA: Yes, you're absolutely
2 right. I mean, I think that the area that we
3 have, for example, is our networks. Right?
4 So, the various distributing networks we put
5 out a multi-billion dollar contract, and the
6 agency is already using GSA to migrate their
7 network infrastructure on one mega contract.
8 And we just put out a \$2.5 billion procurement
9 to move agencies into the Cloud.

10 So, you're absolutely right in
11 terms of the commodity side. The challenge
12 we've seen is, a lot of agencies drag their
13 feet.

14 MR. KINDLER: But here's where,
15 going back to Tony's point is, and actually
16 picking up on Liz' point earlier, if you that
17 on a market voluntary basis, then you are
18 dependent on who decides to participate or
19 not. If, on the other hand, you identify what
20 those vendors are, and those services are that
21 you just lay down the law and say those are
22 going to be done centrally, period, and these

1 are not. You have some chance of achieving
2 something in that group that Tony's
3 postulating. But if you leave it to the
4 market, I don't think you've got a chance of
5 success, to Liz' point earlier.

6 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: I think the VMO
7 concept is a no-brainer, and we have to figure
8 out -- we have to work across the summer to
9 figure out how we institutionalize it, and
10 make it work, and what's centralized, what's
11 commodity, what's at the agency, but how do we
12 stand this up?

13 MR. SALEM: One thing that also has
14 to happen, Jeff, is who gets the benefit of
15 using the shared service? So, if the
16 department goes to the shared service and
17 let's say that it was going to cost them X
18 amount, and now by going through the
19 centralized process it's less, the department
20 has to realize that savings. I mean, they --

21 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: They will.

22 MR. SALEM: As long as they do,

1 then there's an incentive to do it. Because,
2 otherwise --

3 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Yes, that's how
4 it works. Perfect timing. We've got to make
5 sure it happens that way.

6 MR. LOCATIS: Even though it's much
7 smaller scale, we've already pretty much moved
8 to a shared services model along those lines.

9 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: I think we've --
10 Sam, did you want to say something?

11 MR. GILLILAND: Well, just one
12 other observation on a VMO. It just seems to
13 me important, and this links back to kind of
14 Shantanu's comments about architectural
15 consistency.

16 It would seem to me that most
17 vendors that you work with want to build their
18 own new platform. They have no interest in
19 building on somebody else's, or building
20 consistent with what somebody else has done.
21 And it seems important to me that there's some
22 form of governance, probably at the CIO level,

1 that works in conjunction with a VMO to make
2 sure that as you buy, as you procure, that
3 it's done consistently, and consistent with
4 whatever your vision is, the CIO's vision for
5 architecture within the agency. And if you
6 don't do that, everybody is going to build it,
7 but there is no motivation for a vendor, and
8 even little motivation for those that are
9 working closely with the vendor to build
10 consistent with an architectural vision that
11 you set forth.

12 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: I think this a
13 very good conversation. I think it's
14 confirmation that this group is on to two
15 topics, and there's plenty of work to drive it
16 home across the summer so that we have
17 actionable items for November.

18 It's 10 after. We're close to
19 being on schedule. Let's take a 10-minute
20 break, a real 10-minute break, so at 10:20
21 we're going to switch to the SES topic.
22 There are restrooms outside. Thank you,

1 everybody. Thank you.

2 (Whereupon, the proceedings went
3 off the record at 10:10 a.m., and went back on
4 the record at 10:23 a.m.)

5 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: I think, clearly,
6 one of the most maybe shocking revelations of
7 the first meeting was that all of us political
8 folks aren't here for very long. And the end
9 of the day, the people who really drive the
10 efficiency, effectiveness, the customer
11 service of government operations is not these
12 folks who come and go every couple of years,
13 but it's the 7,000 or so strong members of the
14 SES. And we're, at best, maybe net neutral in
15 the equation.

16 So, we thought it would be helpful
17 to bring some of these folks, some of these
18 leaders forward so you could get a better feel
19 for who they are, what they do day-to-day, and
20 ask them questions directly on what's working,
21 what's not working, and how this group might
22 be able to help accelerate some of their

1 efforts to improve in a couple of areas.

2 So, with that, let me hand it over
3 to Steven, who I think is going to be on page
4 14. Is that right?

5 MR. BROCKELMAN: We can probably
6 jump right in to page 15. So, just a quick
7 refresher on the Senior Executive Service.
8 This is a group of more than 7,000 senior
9 executives that, basically, run the
10 government's day-to-day operations. The vast
11 majority of them are career executives. Those
12 are the ones we're going to be focusing on, as
13 opposed to the roughly 700 politically
14 appointed SESs. These are folks with deep
15 government experience, typical SES member,
16 been in government about 25 years, even before
17 they get to the SES, and then another 10 years
18 of tenure in the Senior Executive Service.

19 Despite the original vision for the
20 SES as kind of a mobile workforce, they don't
21 actually move around a whole lot, at least not
22 outside of their agency, only about 2 percent

1 in any given year switch jobs to another
2 agency. And then there's real concerns that
3 we're looking at the potential for an exodus
4 of SES members in the near future. Many of
5 them are eligible for retirement, or they're
6 just looking elsewhere because it's not a
7 particularly supportive time for federal
8 employees in terms of public environment. So,
9 it's a time of change, but maybe also an
10 opportunity to make some meaningful
11 improvements, so we're going to talk about
12 that.

13 The bottom half of the page are the
14 two areas of focus that the SES Subcommittee
15 is proposing. As with the IT topic, we talked
16 to a lot of individuals on the government side
17 to understand the challenges. And we've also
18 talked to all of the Subcommittee members, and
19 their Chief Human Capital Officers to
20 understand how the private sector approaches
21 things.

22 So, you see in the boxes, the first

1 is the performance management of the SES. We
2 listed some of the current challenges.
3 There's actually more than 80 performance
4 management systems, performance appraisal
5 systems for the SES across the different
6 agencies, so very little consistency to it.

7 They're not -- they don't tend to
8 be grounded in any set of standardized
9 leadership competencies, and there doesn't
10 tend to be a realistic distribution of the
11 performance ratings. Far too many are rated at
12 the top end of the scale, and very, very few
13 at the low end of the scale, but it's
14 different in the private sector.

15 And then a second area of this is
16 Executive Development Programs. Now, here it
17 can vary quite a bit from agency to agency,
18 but what you generally see is either a lack of
19 resources for developing SES members, or even
20 when the resources are there, you see that
21 some SES members will defer that training,
22 that funding to employees in the lower grades

1 because they don't have the time or the
2 flexibility to do the training themselves.

3 And then, finally, there's not
4 really a comprehensive approach to
5 development. You might get bits and pieces as
6 an SES member, but it doesn't tend to be that
7 coordinated or customized to the individual,
8 so the benefits are probably sporadic as
9 opposed to cumulative.

10 So, any thoughts on the topic
11 selection? Any reactions, do those feel
12 right?

13 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Let's dig in. I
14 know you're going to do introductions of a
15 bunch of folks, but everyone knows Seth Harris
16 is our Deputy at Labor, and Scott Gould, our
17 Deputy at VA. And then from my team at OMB,
18 Katie, who has been working for the last year
19 or so on this set of issues, so this is a
20 great opportunity for us to accelerate some
21 good work that's already going on. And she
22 partners with Steve, who's at OPM on John

1 Berry's team, so the two of them are working
2 on a PMC which, again, is the group of all the
3 Deputies that get together frequently. That's
4 one of our top initiatives, so we have some
5 early traction here, but we look forward to
6 this group really helping to move our stuff
7 forward. Back to you, Steve.

8 MR. BROCKELMAN: So, we've gotten
9 consistent feedback from all of you that it
10 would be valuable to actually hear firsthand
11 from some SES members, so that's what we've
12 done today, is we've put together a panel
13 consisting of SES members, as well as HR
14 leaders in the agencies to talk about these
15 two issues.

16 So, I'm actually going to turn it
17 over to Katie to facilitate the discussion.

18 MS. MALAGUE: Thank you, Steve.
19 It's a delight to be with all of you today.
20 Thank you for engaging on this issue.

21 I will facilitate a discussion to
22 learn a little bit more about those two

1 terrain areas. And we're fortunate to have
2 four federal executives with us who can share
3 more about their perspectives, and their
4 insights. Two of them have an agency or
5 department-wide perspective, they can share
6 that view from an HR standpoint. Two offer
7 more of a front line view. So, why don't we
8 begin with introductions of our panelists,
9 just name, agency, and your role. We'll start
10 with Denise and go down the line.

11 DEP. ASST. SEC. WELLS: Good
12 morning. I'm Denise Wells, and I'm the Chief
13 Human Capital Officer for the Department of
14 Health and Human Services. We have about
15 90,000 employees providing health care and
16 scientific program management, and health care
17 support across America. We have approximately
18 500 executives, and I'm looking forward to the
19 discussion today.

20 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: And how long have
21 you been in your position?

22 DEP. ASST. SEC. WELLS: Eighteen

1 months.

2 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: And before that?

3 DEP. ASST. SEC. WELLS: Before that

4 I was the Executive Officer for the Office of
5 the Secretary. I worked for Department of
6 Defense, Department of Commerce, and Health
7 and Human Services to assist them in moving
8 the Medicare Appeals function from the Social
9 Security Administration into the agency. So,
10 after I finished that, they asked me to take
11 a look at HR, so I'm working with them to
12 transform HR and our Senior Executive
13 Services.

14 DEP. ASST. SEC. KLUH: Good
15 morning. I'm Chris Klueh. I'm the Deputy
16 Assistant Secretary for Corporate Senior
17 Executive Management in Veterans Affairs.
18 Veterans Affairs is one of the few agencies
19 that has actually centralized SES management,
20 so my office provides full life cycle
21 management for SES. And we believe firmly that
22 that's the way to do it.

1 At my office, we report to the
2 senior leadership, and we have 400 executives,
3 400 SES, and 100 SES equivalents, Title 38
4 working in health care.

5 Prior to -- well, the office stood
6 up about a year and a half ago. The new
7 Secretary, when our new Secretary arrived he
8 wanted to have visibility of all of his
9 senior executives, so he stood up a corporate
10 SES office.

11 Prior to working in VA, I worked in
12 Army as the Director of Corporate SES Office.
13 And in Defense, they started to look at a
14 corporate approach, so I worked there for
15 three years, and we did a lot of the things
16 that needed to be done with regard to a
17 corporate focus. And then that started
18 getting legs in all of DOD, and there's now a
19 Program Executive Office in DOD that drives
20 corporate management.

21 It's tough, it's real tough to take
22 away from the previous owners what they

1 perceive to be their ownership of executive
2 management. Very tough challenge, but thanks
3 to the leadership in VA we're making a lot of
4 progress.

5 MS. MURPHY: I'm Cathy Murphy. I'm
6 the Regional Solicitor in Region 3, which is
7 located in Philadelphia for the Department of
8 Labor. My office is one of eight regional
9 litigation and legal services offices that
10 serve all the DOL agency staff in the field.

11 In my region, our primary client
12 agency, if you will, at this time is the Mine
13 Safety and Health Administration, but our
14 attorneys handle all DOL-related statutes at
15 the trial level. So, this could be Fair Labor
16 Standards Act, OSHA, ERISA, these are all
17 statutes that everybody here is familiar with.

18 I am a 30+-year employee. I worked
19 my way up through the ranks, as they say. I
20 went to law school specifically because I
21 wanted to be in public service. And I was
22 fortunate to have a series of mentors and

1 supervisors along the way who recognized that
2 I had ambition to do more than be in the
3 courtroom, which I loved, and never there now.
4 So, I have a branch office in Arlington,
5 Virginia, so I have some remote office
6 management challenges, as well. But I'm very
7 excited about being here today to talk to you
8 about senior executive development.

9 COMMISSIONER LEBRYK: I'm Dave
10 Lebryk, Commissioner of the Financial
11 Management Service at Department of Treasury.
12 We're a bureau of around 2,000 employees with
13 a budget over \$1.2 billion. We're responsible
14 for making over 1 billion payments a year to
15 American taxpayers and beneficiaries, about 80
16 million a month.

17 We're responsible for collecting
18 the revenues of the government. We collected
19 last year close to \$3 trillion from revenues.
20 And we're responsible for reporting the
21 government-wide activity for the government.
22 And, finally, we do centralized debt

1 collection services for the government. Last
2 year we collected about \$5.5 billion in
3 delinquent debt, over half of which, nearly
4 half of which was delinquent child support.

5 So, while we may sound like a
6 little bit of a sleepy organization, what we
7 think we do is very important. Three of the
8 functions are part of the National Critical
9 Infrastructure, and we have offices in five
10 cities in the country.

11 Prior to working at FMS, I worked
12 another Bureau of Treasury, the Mint, where I
13 was a senior career official, and I spent
14 probably 10 or so years at Mint and Treasury
15 in policy positions.

16 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: How long have you
17 each been SES? Cathy?

18 MS. MURPHY: Since June of 2000.

19 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Okay.

20 COMMISSIONER LEBRYK: Fifteen
21 years.

22 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Okay. How many

1 SES people are in Treasury?

2 COMMISSIONER LEBRYK: Probably
3 about 250, most at the IRS.

4 MR. KINDLER: The IRS is about 90
5 percent of the employees.

6 COMMISSIONER LEBRYK: Yes.
7 Correct.

8 DEP. ASST. SEC. KLUH: Fourteen
9 months.

10 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Congratulations.

11 DEP. ASST. SEC. KLUH: Thank you.

12 DEP. ASST. SEC. WELLS: Nine years.

13 MR. KINDLER: Could I inquire, you
14 mentioned SES equivalent. Could you explain
15 what that means?

16 DEP. ASST. SEC. KLUH: In VA, in
17 Veterans Affairs we have a special hiring
18 authority. It's called -- it's Title 38, and
19 we can non-competitively hire individuals who
20 provide health care support. That's because
21 of the difficulty of hiring in the health care
22 field.

1 MR. KINDLER: What do you mean by
2 non-competitive hire?

3 DEP. ASST. SEC. KLUH: Normally,
4 when we hire a senior executive into
5 government, it's a pretty cumbersome process.
6 It's all based on merit principles and
7 rightfully so, but it can be very time
8 consuming. With Title 38 non-competitive
9 authority, we can actually reach out and bring
10 somebody on board without having to go through
11 the merit principle procedures.

12 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Do you have
13 compensation flexibility in that?

14 DEP. ASST. SEC. KLUH: We do. It's
15 generally -- unless it's a physician or
16 dentist, it's generally connected to the
17 Senior Executive Service pay, and we do have
18 flexibility.

19 MR. KINDLER: Is that unique to
20 your department? The reason I'm asking, I had
21 a conversation with David and others last
22 night that reflects on the cumbersomeness of

1 the normal process, so I'm wondering how
2 common this ability is to hire outside the
3 process.

4 DEP. ASST. SEC. KLUH: HHS has it,
5 Defense has it. And in addition to health
6 care direct hiring authority, there are other
7 kinds of direct hiring authority. FAA,
8 Federal Aviation Administration can hire
9 executive equivalent, and they can pay I think
10 actually even more than what we can pay for
11 Senior Executive Service. So, if there's a
12 critical need and we have difficulty hiring,
13 Congress will give special authority.

14 MR. KINDLER: Thank you.

15 DEP. ASSOC. DIR. SHIH: That's a
16 good question, and there are alternative pay
17 systems under which there are individuals
18 serving at executive levels, but they're not
19 in the actual SES that was created by the
20 Civil Service Reform Act of 1978. ODNI is one
21 example.

22 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: So, Kate, with a

1 goal of opening up quickly to the group, do
2 you want to get us --

3 MS. MALAGUE: Yes. I had a number
4 of questions. We'd also welcome your
5 questions as we go. I'll begin with
6 Performance Management, and about midway
7 through we'll pivot to Executive Development
8 so we can cover both.

9 Why don't we start with Denise,
10 with your view as an HR leader at HHS, or give
11 an agency-wide perspective. Could you tell us
12 a bit about the challenges you see in
13 Performance Management?

14 DEP. ASST. SEC. WELLS: Similar to
15 the comments you made at the beginning, when
16 I came into the position we found that most of
17 the SESs were always ranked at the higher end
18 of the tiers, for the higher end of the
19 bonuses.

20 At the time, we had a four-tier
21 Performance Management structure. This past
22 year we did convert over to a five-tier

1 structure to try and get more distinctions
2 there. We increased training across all of
3 our senior leaders on performance management,
4 and engaging in the feedback discussions early
5 on.

6 For those of you that are familiar
7 with government, traditionally there is --
8 you're put on the plan at the beginning of the
9 fiscal year. You have a midyear performance
10 meeting, feedback meeting, and then you have
11 the appraisal at the end of the year.

12 We want to start with we're having
13 the conversations on a regular basis so that
14 we can get the distinguished distinctions in
15 the ratings at the end. So, that was one of
16 the significant challenges, the rating and
17 consequence of the ratings.

18 MR. SOLSO: Do the employees know
19 how they're rated?

20 DEP. ASST. SEC. WELLS: Yes.

21 MR. KINDLER: When you say "how,"
22 meaning?

1 MR. SOLSO: Well, year one meaning
2 high, are you told that, if you're rated low
3 are you told that --

4 MR. KINDLER: Yes.

5 MR. SOLSO: -- so people know how
6 they stand.

7 DEP. ASST. SEC. WELLS: Yes. At
8 the beginning of the performance period the
9 executive and the supervisor both sign off on
10 the elements within the plan. They also sign
11 off on the midyear discussions and any
12 narratives that are provided at that time.
13 And then at the end they have to sign off on
14 the final rating before it goes to --

15 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: We do have
16 agencies, I don't know how yours stack up, but
17 where 80 to 90 percent of the folks are in the
18 highest category. And then the remainder is -
19 -

20 (Off mic comment.)

21 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: No. And, in
22 fact, where the remainder are probably in the

1 second highest category. Now, there are other
2 agencies where it's much more of a
3 distribution.

4 MS. MALAGUE: And what do we think
5 causes that?

6 DEP. ASST. SEC. KLUH: Our
7 leadership, I believe, leadership, doing the
8 work it should be doing. In VA last year, 37
9 percent of our executives were rated top
10 block. That was a significant reduction from
11 previous years, from 2008. It's all about
12 leadership driving that.

13 MR. KINDLER: What are the -- I
14 learned a little bit more about this
15 yesterday, too. The consequences of being
16 rated different, your levers are limited.
17 Correct? In other words, you have some
18 discretion over the bonus, but what is the
19 difference between rated high and low? What
20 are the consequences of that?

21 DEP. ASST. SEC. KLUH: I think the
22 answer to that is it depends. It depends on

1 whether you have a performance management
2 system that's part of your life cycle
3 management for executives, or whether it's a
4 standalone, and perhaps a meaningless tool
5 other than the payout. And the payout is
6 significant, but I think it really depends on
7 what you do with the --

8 MR. KINDLER: But the payout is
9 significant? There's a meaningful difference
10 financially between being rated high and being
11 rated low?

12 DEP. ASST. SEC. KLUH: Not this
13 year there won't be, I don't think.

14 MR. KINDLER: But, normally, there
15 is?

16 DEP. ASST. SEC. KLUH: Yes.

17 MR. KINDLER: I thought that
18 variable pay was quite limited, that the bonus
19 opportunity is quite limited.

20 DEP. ASST. SEC. KLUH: Well, I
21 guess that depends on how we define
22 meaningful. It could range from zero dollars

1 to up to about -- I'd say on average maybe
2 about \$23,000 in a performance --

3 MR. KINDLER: So, it's a percentage
4 of pay, so --

5 (Simultaneous speaking.)

6 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: We have to be
7 careful because VA across the last 18 months
8 is making huge progress. If you go to the
9 average agency, 70 percent of people get the
10 bonus, are rated at the highest, and their
11 bonuses range between \$10-12,000. So, at a
12 typical agency there's not -- almost everybody
13 gets it. Almost everybody gets the exact same
14 amount of money.

15 (Simultaneous speaking.)

16 MS. McGOVERN: You mean SES or --

17 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: SES.

18 MR. KINDLER: That's a consequence
19 of being rated high, or whether that's --

20 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: It is.

21 MR. KINDLER: Because there's two
22 issues here. There's over-grading.

1 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Yes.

2 MR. KINDLER: And then there's what
3 happens to people that aren't -- the
4 consequence of being rated --

5 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Very few people
6 are rated truly poorly.

7 MR. KINDLER: Right.

8 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: But you would
9 have no bonus. So, at OMB where we have about
10 60 SES, there's been a history, it's not just
11 under our watch, a really differentiating
12 talent, so only about 40 percent get the high
13 rating. And those 40 percent get bonuses, and
14 no one else gets a bonus at all.

15 MR. KINDLER: So, is it zero sum?

16 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: It's zero sum.
17 But that's unusual. And, again, VA has made
18 huge progress, a typical agency. And Seth, I
19 think you inherited -- what were your numbers?

20 DEP. SEC. HARRIS: In 2010, we were
21 over 90 percent getting in the top two
22 ratings, and through education, cajoling, and

1 ferocious pressure we were able to bring that
2 back to 87 percent.

3 (Laughter.)

4 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: And, Seth, even
5 within that 87 percent there's very little
6 differentiation on bonuses.

7 DEP. SEC. HARRIS: On bonuses,
8 well, there has been -- the highest bonuses,
9 we think we're going to go up to 20%. It's the
10 exceptional case that it went that high. But
11 you could have a 5, 6, 7,000 dollar bonus
12 range between the highly effective and the
13 outstanding, those are our top two ratings.

14 But let me just say, I don't think
15 the money is the principal -- Cathy, you can
16 tell me what you think. The money is not a
17 principal concern. Overwhelmingly, our staff
18 -- our SES guys told us that they would
19 happily give up the money, what they care
20 about is the rating. There is a pride factor,
21 a shame factor, and a pride factor among our
22 employees that I think is the most powerful

1 tool, at least at my organization it's by far
2 the most powerful tool we have. And we've
3 gone actually in a different direction from
4 HHS. We've gone from five down to four, so
5 that we're able to encourage folks into a
6 lower but still satisfactory rating category.
7 And we're now pushing folks towards effective
8 being a good quality rating, even if it
9 doesn't come accompanied by a bonus. So,
10 there's a need for a lot of culture change
11 around that shame/pride mix.

12 MS. MURPHY: Seth has really
13 identified a really important issue for my
14 organization. I don't rate SES people. I rate
15 mid-level managers. But I will tell you that
16 lawyers who decide to take themselves out of
17 the market purposefully and to depress their
18 wages over their lifetime do that because they
19 have a motivation that comes from a place
20 where they want to make societal change. They
21 want to accomplish things on behalf of the
22 entire country, and there's no price on that.

1 But if you don't have financial
2 rewards, then what you're staff tends to do
3 is, as you say, pin their hopes on what their
4 rating is going to be. It has a value to
5 them. And if we don't get people into
6 government who are thinking like that, we're
7 going to have a serious problem over the next
8 two years.

9 You're already going to have a
10 brain drain, and you want people in government
11 who are motivated by the intangible of my boss
12 thinks I have done an excellent job this year.

13 MS. SMITH: The challenge of that,
14 though, is not only just -- this is all -- if
15 90 percent of the people that got rated is
16 really a meaningless rating.

17 MS. LEE: And if it means so much
18 to the folks that are getting rated --

19 MS. SMITH: High performers.

20 MS. LEE: -- why doesn't it mean
21 that much to the person that's rating them?
22 Because they're not making any distinction.

1 MS. MURPHY: I will say that the
2 number looks really high. I'm having a little
3 -- at least in my organization now, I'm
4 talking about people who are all attorneys, so
5 I have sort of a narrow look at this. But I
6 understand the idea that there needs to be
7 distinctions made. And I think where the
8 morale issue comes in, is where one SES person
9 knows that the other SES person who's gotten
10 the outstanding is not performing. And that
11 their boss is not doing the heavy lifting. It
12 is not about the numbers. I really have a
13 hard time with the idea of a direct connection
14 between that number, so you have to depress
15 the number.

16 It's not a college class. It's not
17 an issue of getting people on a curve. The
18 real issue is actually giving specific
19 performance feedback to people who need it all
20 year long, and making those people take
21 ownership of their careers, and not expecting
22 -- and knowing by the time you get to that

1 rating you should pretty much know what you're
2 going to be rated. You should have had
3 conversations with your boss all year long,
4 and it should not be a surprise to you.

5 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Yes, just to
6 throw this into the mix, because we're very
7 focused on ratings. I mean, I was shocked when
8 I came in that many of the SES at OMB, which
9 again has had an emphasis on this, write their
10 own performance reviews, and then their
11 managers sign off. So, I mean, there is not
12 a culture of feedback, honest messages, at
13 least not at OMB, and I think there's some of
14 that across government.

15 DEP. ASST. SEC. KLUH: And I think
16 that's critical. So, in VA we're looking at
17 re-engineering our entire system, and rather
18 than have a fully successful which has a very
19 horrible connotation in VA, we're thinking
20 about calling it commendable. But it's also,
21 if an executive for five, six years has been
22 rated top block, and all of a sudden they drop

1 down, it's also the culture that's driving
2 this.

3 And sometimes, my experience has
4 been, sometimes it's not the tool that you
5 use, but how you administer it. So, just
6 rolling out a new performance management
7 system gives you a clean slate, and to start
8 fresh, and to start doing the kind of
9 communication and heavy lifting that's
10 required.

11 MS. McGOVERN: I was just going to
12 say that there's kind of this feeling around
13 the table that 87 percent, or 90 percent is a
14 bad thing. And I'm just going to be a little
15 provocative and throw something else out.
16 That could either be indicative of the fact
17 that people have a difficult time having
18 challenging conversations, they don't want to
19 go through it, they're writing their own
20 appraisals. It's just a pro forma exercise.
21 But it could also be indicative of the fact
22 that to make SES, you have gone through a lot

1 of hoops. And just the law of large numbers,
2 you have to be pretty exceptional to have been
3 an SES. And it is possible, I would argue,
4 that 87 percent of the people are exceptional.

5 Now, if it's because we're lazy, or
6 we're not differentiating, or there's an
7 equity problem, which is the worst of all
8 this, you know, somebody is an easy grader,
9 somebody is a hard grader, then there is a
10 problem that needs to be solved. But it could
11 just be that with all those crazy hoops you
12 put people through to be able to get promoted,
13 that it's weeding out --

14 MR. SALEM: In any given year, I
15 guess, we do this all the time. Any given
16 year, people perform at different levels. And
17 it could be the project they had, so I think
18 it's hard for me to see that 87 percent all
19 performed great, because that would be an
20 exceptional year. And I can see it maybe
21 happening in a year, maybe the group just did
22 so darned well, but I can't see it year in and

1 year out, because inside of every year there
2 will be really good performers, some people
3 who didn't do quite as well, and some people
4 who, quite frankly --

5 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: At 87 percent,
6 does that mean you are the higher end. There
7 are other agencies that are 30 or 40 percent,
8 so if nothing else, we have differentiation
9 across --

10 MS. McGOVERN: But it could be that
11 we're not setting the bar --

12 MS. MALAGUE: It could be as simple
13 as that.

14 MR. KINDLER: The question
15 underlying these comments is, is there a liner
16 around what the basis of appraisal is? So,
17 you can be appraising many different things.
18 Are you appraising the general quality of the
19 person's performance this year? Are you
20 agreeing on what the objectives for the year
21 are?

22 So, for example, in a business

1 setting you will have objective setting at the
2 beginning of the year, to Enrique's point, you
3 did or did not achieve those objectives. And
4 sometimes you do, and sometimes you don't. It
5 doesn't mean that, going back to Gail's point,
6 you may well have achieved that position
7 because of your hard work and your success in
8 the past, but at the beginning of this year
9 certain objectives were set. You did or
10 didn't achieve them.

11 So, the question is -- and I'd like
12 to just connect this to the earlier
13 discussion. My attraction to this subject
14 matter in the first place was it has struck me
15 from the beginning that the SES is the key
16 leverage point for everything you want to do
17 in government. And it's not just a question
18 of improving performance objectives, and
19 development, and everything else. It's that
20 these are the people that run the government
21 year in and year out. They're highly
22 qualified, hardworking, terrific people.

1 I was very struck by Catherine's
2 comments, because she seems to embody that
3 spirit. And I'm taken by the point of not
4 being motivated by money. But there are also
5 the people through whom anything you want to
6 get done, the IT discussion we had earlier,
7 are the people we want to get done. So,
8 connect this to the earlier conversation.

9 If we want to achieve those IT
10 objectives, then at the beginning of the year
11 one of the things that is said, and I'm
12 thinking about Enrique's point, is this year
13 one of the things I want from this particular
14 group of SES is to roll out whatever it is we
15 want to do on IT. And at the end of the year,
16 you either did it, or you didn't do it, and it
17 affects your rating.

18 So, to me, going back to Gail's
19 point, the key question is have we set the
20 objectives by which we're judging the
21 performance appraisal? And it's not a
22 function of are you a good, talent,

1 hardworking person, do we like you? That may
2 enter into it, but you can be outstanding this
3 year and not outstanding next year. So, the
4 question is, are we utilizing the performance
5 appraisal system to achieve the objectives of
6 the organization, or are we using the
7 performance appraisal system simply to assess
8 whether these are good people?

9 MS. MURPHY: I wonder if Dave was
10 really on to something with this, because one
11 of the things that I tell my mid-level
12 managers is, obviously, I value them all, and
13 think they're all terrific, and they are. But
14 when I'm looking at their ratings and they
15 know this, when I'm looking at how they're
16 doing throughout the year, I'm -- my
17 outstanding, my exemplariness are the ones
18 whose reach spreads beyond my region. Are you
19 making the department better? Are you making
20 the government better? And it's like the
21 pebble in the pond. How far are the
22 concentric rings spreading out because of your

1 actions?

2 And I -- that's how I think SES
3 people ought to understand. We get
4 communications all the time, I know exactly
5 what my standards are, I know exactly what OPM
6 requires of me. It's on their website. My
7 mid-level managers know what to aspire to,
8 because that -- but then that's not enough to
9 be exemplary. And that's how I think SES
10 people ought to look at it. How far is my
11 reach going?

12 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Steve, could you
13 give a -- because we have to be careful
14 because we picked leading edge folks at this
15 table. I want to take Jeff's observation
16 around setting objectives and then measuring
17 throughout the year, ultimately with the final
18 rating against those objectives. How often
19 does that happen across the --

20 DEP. ASSOC. DIR. SHIH: Yes, my
21 office is responsible for all SES policy,
22 product services, and oversight, among other

1 things. What we do is we got consistency and
2 standardization through a certification
3 process, first an approval of the initial
4 system design, and then a recurring one to
5 two-year certification cycle.

6 So, I think the answer is exactly
7 what we've said, it varies among agencies.
8 Some agencies are doing a very good job with
9 the implementation, setting objectives,
10 setting program commitments, really
11 emphasizing what's going to be required to
12 achieve certain distinct levels of
13 performance, having regular communication and
14 then communicating the ratings at the end of
15 the year, which are then tied in a pay-for-
16 performance standard, theoretically, to pay
17 not in a two-year salary freeze cycle, but
18 theoretically to pay, and then also to
19 bonuses, which are awards.

20 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: And roughly, is
21 that half, a quarter, three-quarters?

22 DEP. ASSOC. DIR. SHIH: I can't

1 quantify it off the top of my head. But I
2 think the other point that I would raise to
3 your point, Jeff, and I appreciate you
4 bringing me into this, and to your point,
5 Jeff, is that your earlier conversation -- and
6 what struck me about it also was the viewpoint
7 in terms of standardization and centralization
8 versus decentralization and control
9 flexibility. And I think that's one of the
10 questions that I'm hearing raised here, as
11 well, whether it makes more sense to drive
12 consistency across the government in terms of
13 how the systems look, and how they're
14 implemented, ultimately. And I think that's
15 a key question, and I really appreciate --

16 MR. SOLSO: I mean, to me, and this
17 goes back to the other conversation, is that
18 you've got the senior management moving in and
19 out every two years. Okay? And then you've
20 got this other people where stuff gets done.
21 And most of the projects were performed at the
22 management system, in this case are long-term.

1 So, if you've got all the turnover at the top,
2 and each time somebody new comes in and they
3 change their priorities, or they have a
4 different goal in terms of performance
5 management, you don't get any consistency.
6 So, that --

7 DEP. ASSOC. DIR. SHIH: On that
8 point, not only is there a lack of continuity
9 with respect to the strategic priorities, but
10 oftentimes there's a lack of community in
11 terms of the strategic priority of the
12 performance management --

13 MR. SOLSO: But see that, to me,
14 argues for more centralization, and more
15 standardization. Okay? Because that's where
16 you get the power of not having to change it
17 every two years.

18 The other thing on this performance
19 management, if your problem is overrating,
20 then some kind of forced distribution gets --
21 it's not popular, managers don't like it. My
22 view is the reason people get rated, everybody

1 gets rated highest because it's conflict
2 management. It's very difficult. It's very
3 difficult to tell somebody they're doing a
4 lousy job.

5 DEP. ASST. SEC. KLUH: If I may
6 make one point. I think the ratings are very
7 important, but I also think there's an awful
8 lot of time spent on the performance
9 management process. And I'm not sure it's
10 getting us what -- where it's supposed to get
11 us, which is, I think, competent organizations
12 led by competent leaders who understand what
13 they're supposed to be doing, they're held
14 accountable, and they're rated accordingly.
15 So, I think there's a bigger issue here, too,
16 in addition to the distribution of the
17 ratings.

18 MR. NARAYEN: I'll make one
19 comment, and then I'm wondering whether we're
20 framing this question slightly wrong. The
21 comment that I'd make is, all of us like to
22 see ourselves rated as one of the better

1 places to work in the private sector. And
2 virtually every year, one of the criteria for
3 when we get rated not as high as we want is if
4 people perceive, especially the strong
5 performers, that there isn't effective
6 performance management. And that they're
7 carrying the weight for others, so I'll share
8 that.

9 The question really is performance
10 management is a means to an end. Right? And
11 I know we're spending a lot of time on
12 performance management. It's all about are you
13 growing these folks' careers? How do you
14 differentiate it? And I'm not hearing -- I
15 mean, it's what percentage, I would ask, of
16 SES folks eventually get to be the
17 Secretaries, the Deputy Secretaries?

18 If there's not a way for them to
19 outgrow what -- and these are all excellent
20 people. The question is, where's the carrot
21 also? And I'm not sure we're spending enough
22 time on where the carrot is in the career

1 development for this.

2 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: You can progress
3 in the SES. You don't have to, necessarily,
4 jump to the dark political side.

5 (Laughter.)

6 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Right? You can
7 take on more responsibility within your SES
8 career, so I don't -- we don't want to take a
9 Secretary, Deputy Secretary, or the political
10 side is the ultimate career path.

11 MR. NARAYEN: But we rate and rank
12 a lot so that we can provide opportunities --

13 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Yes.

14 MR. NARAYEN: -- for the people who
15 are doing exceedingly well. And we sort of --

16 MR. SALEM: I think the other thing
17 we introduced that has made a huge difference,
18 especially if there is a career path, to your
19 point, is we went to a performance potential
20 matrix, so you actually -- which I think is
21 also a huge value.

22 MR. GILLILAND: Nine box.

1 MR. SALEM: Yes, the nine box
2 models. You've probably seen it.

3 MR. KINDLER: One of the things I'm
4 hearing here, though, that we have to be very
5 careful about is that we're -- we need to be
6 careful not to assume that motivations are the
7 same. And this is the thing that Catherine I
8 think is being very articulate about, that
9 motivations for SES people are the same as in
10 the private sector, and that we attribute the
11 same kind of ambitions and motivations.

12 So, I come back to the notion that
13 performance appraisal and development have to
14 work together without a doubt, and that's why
15 we have both topics here. But, to me, the
16 opportunity, especially going to Tim's point
17 about the duration of the SES as opposed to
18 the political appointees, is for the political
19 appointees, if they have a two, or three, or
20 four-year window to try to achieve something,
21 for example, in the IT world, is to set -- I
22 was talking to David yesterday, and saying

1 Secretary Salazar had five things he wanted to
2 do in the four years he was here included in
3 the objectives of the SES in his department,
4 and measure their performance, at least in
5 part. Competency and skills are obviously
6 part of it, as well, but that's a point of
7 leverage that allows you to assess, and
8 reward, and make it part of the development
9 whether or not those goals are being achieved
10 in the time you have allowed in office. And
11 that, I think, is a great means for achieving
12 the things that need to be achieved.

13 And that's part of what a
14 performance appraisal tool is designed to do.
15 And it means that one year you can get an
16 outstanding, next year you don't.

17 MR. BROWN: So, just to take a step
18 back. My observation is five steps, four
19 steps, the tool. Tools and processes are not
20 a substitute for leadership and management, so
21 forget the tools for a minute.

22 The second is the notion of forced

1 distribution or the legality of it. Forget
2 that. There are three things that I think you
3 should incorporate in your performance
4 management. One is results, deliverables, the
5 other is leadership behaviors, and the third
6 is relative contribution.

7 So, if you're doing those three
8 things, results, I have objectives, or maybe
9 I didn't cover them up front, but later on in
10 the year you delivered X, Y, and Z regardless
11 of your function.

12 The second and the more important
13 one is the values and the behaviors. So, we
14 all have people who can move the needle, hit
15 the gas pedal but they break glass, or they're
16 abusive, or they're not a team player. You've
17 got to introduce that component in performance
18 management, not just results.

19 And then the third element is
20 relativity. So, you're all wonderful, you're
21 great. I have eight attorneys, you really
22 are, but on a relative contribution, and it

1 doesn't even have to be legally forced, but
2 the conversation needs to occur, and the
3 notion of relative contribution -- now, you
4 don't want to be divisive.

5 I think those are the three key
6 elements. At the end of the day to implement
7 that regardless of the tool, you need a boss
8 who knows their people so they don't have an
9 errant ranking. You need candid
10 communications, and I think it should be
11 frequent and informal. Don't be susceptible
12 to the planning cycle of in December I have to
13 do 14 reviews. Interactively, spontaneously,
14 situationally say that's awesome, that's
15 something you should work on. It's this, we
16 look at the process, and I'll speak -- is this
17 in the public domain? Okay, never mind.

18 (Laughter.)

19 MR. BROWN: So, there are certain
20 companies I've worked at where we look
21 diligently at the tool, said no it should be --
22 -- let's go to five, let's go to -- let's do --

1 it's not the tool. It's the leader. And it's
2 all about leadership and communication, and
3 you've got to have three things, results,
4 leadership behaviors, and relative
5 contribution.

6 You've got to get the what nailed.
7 You can standardize, I do agree with you, you
8 can standardize on that tool. That's what's
9 missing. And it's not that hard.

10 DEP. ASST. SEC. WELLS: We have
11 within our program, though, a result section.
12 For example, in my performance plan there are
13 five elements with deliverables and results.
14 And then we also have an element that's just
15 on executive leadership, and just on
16 management, so we're hitting there.

17 MR. BROWN: Nice work.

18 DEP. ASST. SEC. WELLS: Where we're
19 on but we're not having enough of the
20 spontaneous communication, they're relying too
21 much on the formal time line that it's May,
22 it's time for mid-year, but you didn't tell

1 the person you completely blew that meeting
2 last week, or the program is way off, so
3 that's --

4 MR. BROWN: Performance ratings
5 should never be a surprise.

6 DEP. ASST. SEC. WELLS: That's what
7 we're counting. Too, we're also struggling
8 with, we have certain SESers who run large
9 operational centers where it's easy to count
10 the widgets, the quality there, the lead time
11 there, customer satisfaction. But put those
12 large policy programs with a broad scope but
13 they say, Denise, I don't manage a widget. You
14 want me to roll out a program that reduced
15 teen pregnancy, and I rolled it out across all
16 the states, but the percentages didn't go
17 down. You know, how -- so, I'm open to
18 feedback on that because we're still
19 struggling there.

20 Also, on the litigation side, our
21 attorneys, I don't count widgets, Denise. How
22 can we revamp my plan so it's more meaningful?

1 MS. McGOVERN: I would argue that
2 even in those fuzzier situations, that the
3 leaders know innately if the person had a good
4 performance or not. And just to echo Greg's
5 words, I think this is about training the
6 organization to have difficult conversations.
7 And that, I think, can be mandated. I know
8 this sounds crazy, but you just tell your
9 managers that every appraisal has to include
10 three strengths, three weaknesses, and that no
11 one gets away with not having three
12 weaknesses.

13 And the other mandate is at the end
14 of the appraisal, you ask the employee are you
15 shocked and surprised, or did you expect this?
16 And if they say shocked and surprised, that's
17 a bit of a signal that they haven't been
18 sharing the strengths and the weaknesses. But
19 I think that there are probably more jobs that
20 are not quantifiable from a results
21 perspective than there are that are
22 quantifiable, but the leaders know.

1 MS. MALAGUE: It's all about the
2 communication. I also want to jump back to a
3 point, Tim, that you made on -- with the
4 political rotating. Out of our 500 SESs,
5 probably only about 150 report to politicals
6 who are in and out. The majority of our
7 SESers report to other career SESers, so some
8 of these longstanding problems go back to
9 where they've had the same supervisor who
10 hasn't been providing the -- they haven't been
11 having the hard conversation for two or three
12 years. And that's why --

13 MR. SALEM: I have one really quick
14 point.

15 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Please.

16 MR. SALEM: There's one thing that
17 I've kind of taken just a step back, do the
18 people at the top believe performance
19 management is critical? Because when Shantanu
20 started the IT topic, he said where we come
21 from, IT guys' productivity is critical. And
22 I'm not just saying this group, I'm saying is

1 there a visceral notion that we're only
2 successful if we have great performance
3 management?

4 I've been in many large Fortune 500
5 companies who the people at the top, that's
6 not, necessarily, their priority going in.

7 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Let me ask Scott
8 to come into the conversation, because you did
9 -- you've also served in government at periods
10 of time. Give us sort of lay of the land on
11 that question.

12 DEP. SEC. GOULD: My initial
13 reaction would be it depends, and it is the
14 critical element. Unless you have senior
15 leadership committed to this notion, it
16 doesn't -- the rest of it is all -- it
17 devolves into tools, and process, and quotas,
18 and it doesn't work.

19 MR. SALEM: So, you've got to
20 change that. See, I think --

21 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: But, Scott, if
22 you had to say historically across government,

1 is it spotty, is it --

2 DEP. SEC. GOULD: Oh, I'd say
3 generally we have not gotten --

4 COMMISSIONER LEBRYK: So, if I
5 could jump in on one question on what's
6 happened in performance management in the
7 government over the last 20 years. There have
8 been some very good developments, many of the
9 points that you're raising. For example, now
10 the 360 evaluation is required for all our
11 executives, and we've gone through that
12 process in Treasury. It's been a very
13 positive process.

14 Coaching has becoming more
15 prevalent. We use coaching in our
16 organization, and require new SESers to have
17 a coach for at least a year.

18 Managerial training is becoming a
19 key thing, which has now been legislated.
20 We've been doing that for a number of years at
21 FMS, but the reason I mention this is that you
22 have very good leaders in the organization who

1 don't understand what it means to be a
2 manager.

3 Now, there's issues about what it
4 means to be a leader, but there's also issues
5 about what it means to be a manager. And the
6 government where we're very rule-bound, I'm
7 sure most of your corporations you have rules,
8 as well, you need to understand those rules.
9 You need to understand what EEO is, you need
10 to understand what performance management is,
11 how to conduct a performance evaluation, how
12 to rate someone, how to do performance
13 measures. So, I think over the years those
14 things have gotten better within government
15 and have moved along.

16 I would say within our
17 organization, I would agree with most everyone
18 with respect to inflation. We have had those
19 tough conversations where we told people in
20 advance they're not doing well, and they've
21 left the organization. In the last year we've
22 had four people retire or do that, so that the

1 evaluation didn't end up in a negative area.
2 We gave a cuing on that, which I think is very
3 important.

4 So, there's things you can do to
5 make this work better. And a lot of this is
6 really about the feedback that you're giving.
7 And I know you're saying that the tough
8 conversations are -- particularly, we had a
9 person who received a Presidential Rank Award
10 two years ago, and was doing a fabulous job,
11 but his organization changed and he didn't.
12 And, as a result, he was an extremely good
13 performer at that life cycle in his
14 organization. He was not a good performer
15 when it came to the new life cycle in his
16 organization, he struggled.

17 So, when we're looking at sort of
18 proficiencies within government, I'd say
19 change of leadership is a huge proficiency
20 that's right now. We talk a lot about
21 different things, about business acumen, and
22 collaboration, and employee satisfaction, but

1 we know in our organization where we failed is
2 when we haven't had good change leadership.

3 Decisions have been good, it's not
4 a matter of resources, it's not a matter of
5 this isn't a bad decisions, it's been about do
6 our leaders understand what it means to lead
7 that change and be successful.

8 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Debra, and then
9 let's --

10 MS. LEE: That's what I was going
11 to try to do, because I think part of the
12 issue, and one of the things I had to learn as
13 a manager over time was that it's not just
14 about telling someone at the end of the year
15 whether you're good or bad. It's about
16 development, and it's about taking the long-
17 term marathon view that in most cases you want
18 people to do well, and you want them to
19 develop. It's not about gee, I've got to fire
20 this person this year.

21 And if you look at it as it's
22 either they're great, or they're bad, you're

1 never going to be a good manager. You have to
2 let people know what their issues are, and
3 give them time to develop. And I think that's
4 why the development part is so important as we
5 talk about coaching, or 360 reviews, what kind
6 of feedback are people getting? Because if
7 you don't give people that, then you just have
8 someone who implodes, and then the question is
9 how do you get them out of the organization.
10 And I understand in government that's very
11 difficult.

12 MS. MALAGUE: That's a perfect --

13 MS. LEE: Okay. Great.

14 MS. MALAGUE: Why don't we start
15 with Cathy. Can you compare some of the
16 experiences you had in terms of development
17 opportunities leading up to your executive
18 role, and then how that compares to the kinds
19 of opportunities you've had --

20 MS. MURPHY: Well, leading up to my
21 executive role, I mean, as a mid-level
22 manager, I had basic departmental training as

1 I was assuming positions of greater
2 responsibility. And we all have standard
3 courses on how to supervise people, and coach
4 people, how to understand the federal system.
5 And I had a little bit of an advantage,
6 because as the lawyers within the department,
7 we represented the department in defensive
8 actions in EEO, and before the Merit Systems
9 Protection Board. I knew the personnel
10 system, that side of it inside and out, and I
11 knew -- I saw firsthand what the consequences
12 were for managers who did not give situation-
13 specific feedback all year long. Those cases
14 were the worst.

15 So, I got a lot of on-the-job sort
16 of that kind of training. I had good mentors,
17 informal and formal. I had people -- there
18 were people in the SES who both in my region
19 and in Washington who early in my career sort
20 of recognized that maybe I could be someone,
21 and they supported -- who would be a good SES
22 fit. They supported me informally. I got into

1 the SES Candidacy Program at a point in my
2 career when I was about to make a move,
3 actually. I was thinking about, I had taken
4 the exam for an Administrative Law
5 Judge position. I was just thinking well, it
6 may be time for me to go do something.

7 After going through the SES
8 Candidacy Program, and also because I had a
9 manager who had worked in the private sector
10 for a while, she knew about leadership
11 development opportunities that I had never
12 heard of before, and she managed to get some
13 end of the year money one year and sent me
14 down to the Center for Creative Leadership,
15 and it was absolutely a life-altering event.

16 I mean, I remember calling my
17 husband from there the middle of the week and
18 saying I can't believe what's going on here.
19 That was the first time I had a 360. They used
20 a lot of other intensive instruments, and they
21 put me through my paces like every day in all
22 these exercises. And then you sat down with a

1 coach, and they said well, this is what it
2 looks like to me.

3 And at a time when I was really
4 thinking about leaving, all these indicators
5 just said I had to be in government. I kept --
6 all the public service, and they kept looking
7 at these, and I was in a mixed group, and
8 they're like who do you work for? They
9 thought I was in the private sector, because
10 it was not a federal government group. And
11 I'm like -- and they said you need to stay
12 where you are. Stay right where you are,
13 don't move.

14 That was a really important part of
15 my development. And it could not have happened
16 if I had not had a boss who had some knowledge
17 beyond the federal sector.

18 I also recognized at that point
19 that the issues that we have as leaders are so
20 common. It was just -- all of a sudden, like
21 a lightbulb went off, and I ended up -- I
22 think I bought every management book that

1 Borders has to sell. And I just sort of
2 entered into a time of self-study. And then
3 I did, after the SES Program, I did -- I was
4 selected for this position.

5 And then since that time, now the
6 challenge for is more of a legacy issue. All
7 right? I have all these people that I need to
8 get hooked on management, the ones that I
9 think really are sort of hardwired for it.

10 I mean, I think we can talk
11 candidly. There are people who just have this
12 natural instinct, they want to drive the big
13 bus every day. They want to come in and
14 change something for the better. They have
15 restless curiosity beyond the work that's on
16 their desk. And when you see somebody like
17 that, I mean, you have to cultivate it. And
18 I'm feeling that pressure a lot now because I
19 realize what kind of a brain drain we're going
20 to have.

21 My mentors have all pretty much
22 left, which has been sort of a weird situation

1 for me, quite frankly.

2 MS. MALAGUE: Cathy, you perfectly
3 captured some of what we hear from other SES
4 members, where we spend some energy developing
5 them to get to the SES, and then once you're
6 an executive, it dries up, and in part because
7 time and resources become an issue. Given the
8 choice on spending money on yourself or your
9 staff, you turn to your staff.

10 MS. MURPHY: Absolutely.

11 MS. MALAGUE: So, I wonder if
12 Chris, and then Denise could also offer some
13 comments around what we can do for executives,
14 particularly new executives as they're
15 starting, and need to ramp up and learn about
16 being an executive. But then also in terms of
17 retention, where we need to develop skills for
18 the challenges we face on the horizon.

19 DEP. ASST. SEC. KLUH: So, thank
20 you for that. Not to paint -- I don't want to
21 paint too rosy a picture. I think what
22 generally happens is a person is selected for

1 SES, and then they're just thrown into boiling
2 water. And they're expected to get out of it.
3 Right?

4 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: That doesn't
5 sound rosy to me.

6 (Laughter.)

7 DEP. ASST. SEC. KLUH: Honest to
8 goodness. So, whether they're coming from
9 inside the organization and moving up to the
10 SES, or whether they're coming from outside,
11 the expectation is you're an executive, figure
12 it out, you know what how to do it. And I
13 think that's not the right way to go. And,
14 fortunately, VA's leadership agrees with that.
15 We put a lot of resources against insuring
16 that our senior executives are positioned for
17 success.

18 Now, we're starting a program,
19 we're not exactly where we need to be yet, but
20 we're at least moving in the right direction,
21 and that includes a very aggressive onboarding
22 program. We've been working with OPM, and

1 we've got an 18-month onboarding program that
2 we're standing up.

3 What's the challenge? The
4 challenge is a new executive comes into his or
5 her position, they've got all these challenges
6 to face, and then we say well, sorry, don't do
7 that yet. We're going to pull you out, and
8 we're going to send you away to training.
9 You're going to take time to work with a
10 coach, or we do 360s. And it's about driving
11 the culture.

12 Believe it or not, we've got
13 complaints from leadership that we're actually
14 sending executives away to training and they
15 shouldn't be going away. But in VA, what we do
16 is we do the 360, we assign an executive
17 coach, and we do get push-back to that.
18 Sometimes I think it's almost an ego or an
19 embarrassment thing, the mind set being if you
20 have a coach, you're in trouble. So, we're
21 trying to change the culture there.

22 We do have a new Executive Forum

1 for our executives. We put it on once a year,
2 and we've just started that. We just did our
3 second series. When our new leadership came
4 to VA, we brought all of our executives
5 together. We have roughly four to five hundred
6 executives. We had four sessions, 100
7 executives in each session, spent a week. The
8 leadership team at VA spent a week with our
9 executives. Many of the executives, some of
10 whom have been there for years and years, said
11 it was the first time they've ever come
12 together like that where the Secretary, the
13 Deputy, the Chief, all the Assistant
14 Secretaries actually spent considerable time
15 with VA's leadership team.

16 What did that do? And this gets
17 back to the life cycle management. So,
18 performance management. They heard what the
19 expectations were, they heard what the
20 challenges were. And then development, this
21 was part of our development effort to make
22 sure our executives knew what was expected of

1 them, they knew what was happening across VA,
2 and they had a corporate focus, not just I'm
3 running this hospital in Sioux Falls, but no,
4 I'm part of the leadership team. And I think
5 it was very inspirational.

6 We had a lot of push-back that when
7 we first brought executives together, when we
8 had our Executive Forum in March this year,
9 there were 70 executives there, and it was
10 just the passion in the room and the
11 excitement in the room was amazing. So, that
12 was one thing we did, and we think that's the
13 right way to do that.

14 We also have a specific transition
15 plan for each new executive when he and she
16 comes on board, talks about what the
17 challenges of the job will be, what kind of
18 specific things they need to do. So, you're
19 going to run a hospital, and you have to
20 downsize X number of people. You need Labor
21 Relations training, you need this kind of
22 leadership event. And that's very tailored.

1 But the challenges are, fortunately
2 in VA we don't have this challenge right now
3 because we're making a priority, but I'm
4 concerned about funding in the future for
5 this, and the time that it takes to -- short-
6 term paying for long-term gain. My point of
7 it is, if it hurts to send somebody away to
8 train them, you're sending the right person.
9 And we want to change the mind set about we
10 can send John, because we don't need John
11 around right now. And, quite frankly, that's
12 what happens sometimes.

13 MR. GILLILAND: Chris, do all those
14 programs apply to political appointees, as
15 well?

16 DEP. ASST. SEC. KLUH: No, they
17 don't go to these programs. The Executive
18 Forum, our political appointees attend the
19 political -- the Executive Forum, but not the
20 coaching and those kind of thing. And we'd be
21 open to whether we should --

22 MR. GILLILAND: It seems like a

1 missed opportunity.

2 DEP. ASSOC. DIR. SHIH: The White
3 House Personnel Office does run an orientation
4 program for --

5 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Pretty minimal.

6 DEP. ASST. SEC. KLUH: And I do
7 want to throw one other thing out there. We
8 recently stood up a week-long event, a
9 strategic leadership event. It's not talking
10 about anything specific, necessarily, in VA,
11 other than the fact that the group works a VA
12 challenge in the evening. But it's focused
13 just on strategic leadership.

14 We send 30 executives away. We
15 chose UNC, University of North Carolina, as
16 the group for this. We're getting ready to
17 send our second cohort in June. We've gotten
18 very, very positive responses to it. The
19 training is amazing, and also gives an
20 opportunity for VA executives to come
21 together.

22 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Let's open it up

1 for group questions and feedback on the
2 development tier.

3 DEP. ASSOC. DIR. SHIH: How often
4 do the private sector companies actually get
5 together to evaluate executive competencies
6 and developmental needs, and to look at
7 rotational opportunities within your
8 companies?

9 MR. SALEM: We have formal rotation
10 programs that are built into our company. So,
11 the goal is actually to get people -- we have
12 inter-function and cross-function, and the
13 people who get put in those programs are the
14 highest potential people in our organization.
15 And they really do see it as a tremendous
16 career development opportunity.

17 MR. GILLILAND: Yes, I think this
18 is where you're going to link the performance
19 appraisals to the development, so the
20 opportunity to get all the senior leaders
21 together and look at all of the SES folks in
22 this case, and look at the ratings they

1 receive, and therefore what kind of
2 development they should get, what should their
3 opportunities be going forward? And it also
4 gets back to this equity of performance
5 appraisals, because you've got peers looking
6 at the ratings of other people and, of course,
7 they're linked to permits we're getting.
8 They're saying well, wait a minute now, that
9 doesn't seem right. This person, I gave this
10 person the highest rating, and they're much
11 better than this other person that got the
12 same rating, and then develop -- then, again,
13 I think it's probably a very similar type of
14 program, then deciding on what the development
15 opportunities need to be.

16 MR. SOLSO: I'll give you an
17 example. This is what we do, is once a month
18 a business unit will come into an executive
19 group that I chair, and part of that meeting
20 is that they'll go two or three levels of
21 management and do it in a succession
22 management, so you can argue among that group

1 whether you agree on how the person is being
2 evaluated, whether they really are a candidate
3 for the next job, if they are, what kind of
4 experiences they need to have, so we're going
5 to put this person overseas for two years, and
6 bring him back.

7 So, it's a very, very formal
8 process. And, again, it's just ongoing. And
9 if you have a difference of opinion among the
10 group about a particular employee or
11 something, then you can really do a deep dive
12 on that and say what aren't we getting here?

13 That's in addition, and we'll have
14 the same kind of across the board programs,
15 and the Executive Development Program for the
16 top 20 people, or that type of thing. So,
17 there's ongoing things like that, but there's
18 a lot of individual measurement.

19 DEP. ASST. SEC. KLUH: That's where
20 we're heading in the VA. Frankly, what we
21 lack right now is the visibility of the
22 leadership cadre, so we're looking at a tool

1 that will give leadership that kind of
2 visibility, so you can really do the deep
3 dive. Because until you have that, you can't
4 have this kind of --

5 MR. KINDLER: Chris, why do you
6 need -- I mean, this will be consistent with
7 Greg's statements all morning. Why do you
8 need a tool? Why not just have them sit down
9 and talk to you about the people?

10 DEP. ASST. SEC. KLUH: Well, for
11 400 executives, 500 executives, in order to
12 have visibility over that -- all of those
13 executives, how long have they been in their
14 positions, what are their --

15 MR. KINDLER: No, but I guess --

16 DEP. ASST. SEC. KLUH: I'm talking
17 about the data.

18 MR. KINDLER: No, I guess I'm
19 suggesting that if you break it down, and
20 maybe this is at different levels, so I grant
21 that Scott can't see all those people. But
22 maybe at the assistant level, a smaller group

1 can certainly see -- how many SESs are there
2 in the department, 400?

3 DEP. ASST. SEC. KLUH: We have 500
4 when you --

5 MR. KINDLER: Five hundred, you can
6 certainly get them down in groups of 40 or 50
7 and the people responsible for those units
8 should -- I think that's a reasonable number,
9 whatever the number is, should know enough
10 about them that they can come in with a
11 notebook with a page on each of them, and you
12 can talk about them.

13 COMMISSIONER LEBRYK: We do that.
14 We're a bureau of only 20 senior executives,
15 so when we do our evaluation process, we ask
16 the principal senior executive from that
17 business area to come and talk about their
18 SESers with the group, and what rating they're
19 proposing to give to that SESer.

20 That serves two purposes. One, it
21 helps the norm of the organization to say are
22 we all being relatively fair across the

1 organization? The second is to emphasize the
2 point, and we tell this to our new executive,
3 to say you're going to be evaluated by your
4 peers. And one of the things that we value in
5 the organization is collaboration. And if
6 you're not collaborating with your peer,
7 that's going to come up during the evaluation
8 period and you're going to be marked down for
9 that.

10 We also -- getting to this question
11 about the tool, itself. The Deputy
12 Commissioner and I meet with every new
13 employee, whether they're GS-2, the lowest
14 level, or all the way to the highest level.
15 When we bring on a new SES, we spend a lot of
16 time with them and talk with them about the
17 mission, vision, and values of the
18 organization about what we expect, and what's
19 important to us, and kinds of the cultural
20 issues that we think.

21 Specifically with the executives,
22 we talk about three things. It's about do you

1 have leadership skills? Are you thinking
2 strategically for your business area? Are you
3 good at operations, are you executing on your
4 operations? And the third thing we say to
5 everyone is you need to be good with people.
6 Those are the three things that we value as an
7 organization, and so we rate our people on
8 those bases and say we -- if you're a
9 principal, you're going to be more thinking
10 about strategic. If you're a Deputy, you're
11 going to be thinking more about operations,
12 but everyone needs to be thinking about the
13 people in the organization at all times, and
14 they'll be evaluated on that.

15 MR. SALEM: Give you one thought,
16 kind of goes back to the first topic. We've
17 gone through a Whole Job rating system, so --
18 and it's actually been a big change, because
19 it used to be very focused, and this touches
20 on what Greg said. It wasn't just the result,
21 it's how they got the result. So, it's really
22 important to combine those two things

1 together. And we call it the Whole Job. And
2 it actually gives you a lot of flexibility to
3 make sure that people are breaking glass to
4 get their job done. It's not the behaviors
5 that you want. They're not following the
6 values of the organization. So, by going to
7 that Whole Job model, it has really changed
8 the conversation, where before it was just get
9 your job done.

10 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: We've got to
11 break at this point. MR. BROWN: So, week
12 after next we're changing the ranking
13 methodology within Motorola. And I said we're
14 going to have a session, no PowerPoint, no
15 laptops, no paper, no presentations. Everybody
16 comes with nothing.

17 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: What are you
18 going to do?

19 (Laughter.)

20 MR. BROWN: So, I have eight direct
21 reports, and there's 100 officers in the firm
22 out of 23,000 people. I've asked each of the

1 eight to come in and rank their people. They
2 do it, not me, no one else, they do it. So,
3 the eight are across the top, and I see how
4 they rank their people, their view.

5 We each have stickies, green, blue,
6 red, and black. That's all we have. Green,
7 I look -- I see the whole composite of 100
8 people. I put a green for the people that I
9 think, GB, thought high potential. And I --
10 when I get my turn on that person, talking
11 about Debra, I talk about why I think they're
12 high potential. Blue means they're solid, red
13 means we have to watch more closely, black
14 says I don't know them.

15 And if there are -- out of 100
16 people, if there's 14 blacks, what are we
17 going -- who owns this? Because we all
18 should, not the top 100 people, really
19 informal, kind of light, but what it forces is
20 candor, because you see the rankings, input
21 from the whole team, because they see the
22 rankings and they have a different view, and

1 it fosters discussion. And on the green we
2 say what do we need to do? Are we paying this
3 person? Do we need to develop him or her,
4 move them, challenge them? The red is maybe
5 this person -- it doesn't necessarily be a
6 performance problem, maybe it's a fit problem.
7 It's discussion and content rich and process
8 light. We'll see how it goes.

9 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Take a break. I
10 think we have to do this handover by -- which
11 is we have lots of great SESers, we cherry-
12 pick some of the best of the best. So, I
13 think this is representative of the best of
14 the best. We have, I think, a lot of work
15 that we can do to take their best practices
16 and our best practices, and bring everybody
17 else's levels. So, thank you for --

18 (Chorus of thank you.)

19 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Chris, do you
20 think we're on calendar? So, we should --
21 we've missed the 20 minutes where we as a team
22 were going to pull up, close the session and

1 figure out some direction for the summer
2 months for this SES Subcommittee. We might be
3 able to pick up on that at lunch, or if we
4 can't, what we'll do is we'll do a call,
5 Scott, with this team, because I want to bring
6 Scott into this conversation. Scott's got a
7 big vision that I want him to share with the
8 group, so we'll either bootstrap it at lunch,
9 and then get you via phone next week, Scott,
10 or we'll do the whole thing via phone next
11 week.

12 DEP. SEC. GOULD: I've got good
13 news for you.

14 CHAIRMAN ZIENTS: Okay, good.
15 Thank you. So, we have to break now and moving
16 across the street, so we'll get to you. Okay.
17 Thank you.

18 (Whereupon, the proceedings went
19 off the record at 11:28 a.m.)
20
21
22

A				
ability 8:21 67:14 93:2	adding 24:13	agreeing 108:20	appointed 80:14	Army 87:12
able 25:14 28:2 33:10,22 35:3 38:1,6 39:13 79:22 101:1 102:5 107:12 154:3	addition 17:10 93:5 116:16 146:13	agrees 138:14	appointees 47:13 119:18,19 142:14 142:18	arrived 8:14 87:7
absolutely 5:5 22:3 34:16 75:1,10 134:15 137:10	addresses 12:14	ahead 6:13 40:7	appointing 32:3,5	articulate 119:8
abusive 121:16	addressing 7:22	air 24:21 25:2,12 27:1,1	appraisal 82:4 95:11 108:16 110:21 111:5,7 119:13 120:14 125:9,14	articulated 22:1 61:19
accelerate 79:22 83:20	administer 106:5	align 23:7	appraisals 106:20 144:19 145:5	asked 42:1 86:10 151:22
access 7:11	Administration 86:9 88:13 93:8	aligned 13:5 23:12 27:8	appraising 108:17 108:18	asking 92:20
accompanied 102:9	Administrative 134:4	aligning 52:1	appreciate 114:3 114:15	aspect 64:11
accomplish 50:9 102:21	admiration 9:8	alignment 44:19 45:1	approach 23:2 28:13 32:15 83:4 87:14	aspire 112:7
accomplishing 16:3	Adobe 1:19 15:18 16:1	allocated 25:7,10 41:19 49:19	approaches 8:5 81:20	assess 111:7 120:7
accountability 20:7 20:9 59:16,18,20 60:7 71:2	adoption 18:6	allocating 19:5	appropriate 64:14	assign 139:16
accountable 18:5 18:14,16 65:5 116:14	advance 129:20	allow 25:1 28:3 64:1	approval 113:3	assist 86:7
achieve 109:3,10 110:9 111:5 113:12 119:20	advantage 133:5	allowed 120:10	approximately 85:17	assistant 2:8,20 86:16 140:13 147:22
achieved 109:6 120:9,12	advice 33:4	allows 64:4 120:7	architectural 17:12 17:18 77:14 78:10	ASSOC 93:15 112:20 113:22 115:7 143:2 144:3
achieving 76:1 120:11	advisory 1:2 15:11 15:11 25:17	alternative 93:16	architecturally 17:16	Associate 2:17
acquisition 68:12	affairs 2:4,8 71:19 86:17,18 91:17	amazing 55:20 141:11 143:19	architecture 29:11 31:20 66:10 78:5	associated 20:5
Act 48:2 88:16 93:20	afternoon 4:15	America 1:1 85:17	architecturally 17:16	ASST 85:11,22 86:3,14 91:8,11 91:12,16 92:3,14 93:4 94:14 95:20 96:7 97:6,21 98:12,16,20 105:15 116:5 123:10,18 124:6 137:19 138:7 142:16 143:6 146:19 147:10,16 148:3
acting 2:2 10:9,10 67:5,9	afterthought 15:3	American 1:18 89:15	areas 3:14 5:18 6:6 7:17 8:1 10:22 13:1 25:20 32:1,8 80:1 81:14 85:1	assume 8:17 70:6 119:6
actionable 78:17	agencies 33:4 36:4 36:11 37:22 69:14 71:15 72:2 75:9 75:12 82:6 84:14 86:18 96:16 97:2 108:7 113:7,8	amount 20:5 29:18 34:10 76:18 99:14	architecturally 17:16	assuming 133:1
actions 112:1 133:8	agency 4:9 6:9 10:1 12:11 35:19 44:20 44:21 45:1 70:2 75:6 76:11 78:5 80:22 81:2 82:17 82:17 85:4,9 86:9 88:10,12 99:9,12 100:18	analogy 24:16	area 11:1 32:17 63:12 67:21 75:2 82:15 130:1 148:17 150:2	attempt 9:12
active 15:13	agency-wide 94:11	analyst 66:16	areas 3:14 5:18 6:6 7:17 8:1 10:22 13:1 25:20 32:1,8 80:1 81:14 85:1	attend 142:18
actively 14:9 23:22	agenda 3:4 50:12 50:18	annual 19:2,6 24:4 26:3	argue 107:3 125:1 145:22	attention 62:16
activity 89:21	aggressive 138:21	annually 19:1	arguments 55:5	attorneys 88:14 104:4 121:21 124:21
actual 60:5 65:7 93:19	aggressively 33:11	answer 29:5 42:9 97:22 113:6	Arlington 89:4	attraction 109:13
acumen 130:21	aging 31:12	anticipate 7:2	arms 46:6 48:12	attractive 47:19
ad 43:21	ago 87:6 130:10	anticipation 51:19		attribute 119:10
add 37:19	agree 33:22 35:9 46:22 71:6 123:7 129:17 146:1	anyway 48:19		AT&T 63:5
		Appeals 86:8		authority 35:14
		appear 42:21		
		applicable 3:18 8:5 65:13		
		applications 32:16 61:1		
		apply 5:14 73:2 142:14		
		applying 32:15		

91:18 92:9 93:6,7 93:13 automation 18:10 autonomy 41:2 available 17:3 26:12 Avenue 1:10 average 48:21 99:1 99:9 Aviation 93:8 Award 130:9 awards 113:19 awareness 45:2 awesome 122:14 awful 116:7 a.m 1:11 3:2 79:3,4 154:19	bear 5:21 Becky 2:2 67:3 becoming 128:14 128:18 beginning 8:16 14:12 15:4 94:15 95:8 96:8 109:2,8 109:15 110:10 behalf 102:21 behaviors 121:5,13 123:4 151:4 believe 3:3,17 46:16 71:14 74:12 86:21 97:7 126:18 134:18 139:12 believer 23:5 bells 36:9 belt 15:22 beneficiaries 89:15 benefit 76:14 benefits 14:11 17:9 21:12,14 83:8 BERNARD 2:12 Bernie 10:14 30:5 30:17 52:7 65:14 Bernie's 30:9 Berry's 84:1 best 3:16 5:20,21 6:15 11:7 30:7 65:13 79:14 153:12,12,13,14 153:15,16 bet 1:18 37:1 54:19 better 4:2 16:7 22:12 34:21,21 50:15 68:12 74:1 79:18 111:19,20 116:22 129:14 130:5 136:14 145:11 beyond 57:3 111:18 135:17 136:15 biased 69:4 big 9:13 14:4,19 15:22 16:2,9,11 20:11 23:5 38:9	49:11 52:18 53:9 53:9 56:10 70:11 71:22 136:12 150:18 154:7 bigger 22:12 116:15 biggest 50:7 billing 58:6 billion 38:1 57:17 57:18 59:20 62:2 70:11,14 74:13,18 75:8 89:13,14 90:2 bird's-eye 5:16 bit 12:7 17:14,22 28:8 30:16 45:4 67:11 82:17 84:22 90:6 94:12 97:14 125:17 133:5 bits 83:5 biweekly 44:6 black 152:6,13 BlackBerries 4:21 blacks 152:16 Blank 2:2 10:9,10 67:5,9 blew 124:1 block 97:10 105:22 blue 20:18 152:5,12 board 1:2,9 6:2,19 13:11 42:13 62:1 68:21 92:10 133:9 141:16 146:14 boards 15:11,12 32:13 33:9 Bob 25:9 boiling 138:1 bold 54:17 bonus 26:5 97:18 98:18 99:10 100:9 100:14 101:11 102:9 bonuses 11:16 94:19 99:11 100:13 101:6,7,8 113:19 book 135:22	boot 45:7 bootstrap 154:8 Borders 136:1 boss 103:11 104:11 105:3 122:7 135:16 bottleneck 50:4 bottom 13:2 43:18 81:13 bought 135:22 bound 28:4 bounds 20:15,17 box 11:2 66:16 118:22 119:1 boxes 81:22 boy 8:19 69:12,12 brain 103:10 136:19 branch 89:4 break 4:11 78:20 78:20 121:15 147:19 151:11 153:9 154:15 breaking 151:3 breaks 4:20 bridge 42:18 bring 5:21 22:22 34:20 40:9 46:10 49:15 50:8 54:22 64:4 66:14 79:17 92:9 101:1 146:6 149:15 153:16 154:5 bringing 4:4 32:18 34:2 114:4 broad 28:18 124:12 BROCKELMAN 2:1 5:15 7:9 9:18 9:22 10:18 12:1 13:16 80:5 84:8 brought 13:20 31:1 66:17 140:4 141:7 BROWN 1:14 5:1 5:3 42:15,17 120:17 122:19 123:17 124:4 151:11,20	Bruce 51:8 buckets 49:20 budget 14:7 20:6 33:7 37:11 47:14 53:16 56:8 67:22 68:4 69:15 89:13 budgeting 20:4 budgets 53:13 build 4:20 28:4 34:16 58:1 63:2 72:1 77:17 78:6,9 building 1:10 17:14 77:19,19 built 144:10 bunch 35:21 48:13 83:15 bureau 89:12 90:12 148:14 bureaus 67:21 bursts 62:19 bus 136:13 business 13:4,5 14:8 15:13 16:3 17:9 18:2,5,16,19 18:21 19:4 23:4 23:13,15 24:18 25:3,13 26:1,11 26:13 27:3,10 28:7,17,18 29:2,7 29:8,13 31:17,20 31:21 34:11,14,18 40:1,17 45:1,5 46:14 48:17 49:13 50:1,7 52:2,19 56:3 58:22 59:17 62:14 63:21 64:1 65:22 66:13,16,21 67:20 68:5 74:7 108:22 130:21 145:18 148:17 150:2 businesses 17:8 25:8 buy 19:5 44:4 64:9 64:11,12 78:2 buyer 57:16 buying 70:5
B				
B 34:7 Babbitt 51:8 back 19:1,6 20:18 20:19 25:6 34:2 36:17 40:9 41:15 47:18 53:3 60:11 63:9 69:22 75:15 77:13 79:3 84:7 101:2 109:5 110:18 114:17 119:12 120:18 126:2,8,17 140:17 145:4 146:6 150:16 background 12:7 bad 73:8 106:14 131:5,15,22 bar 108:11 Barton 55:19 based 92:6 bases 150:8 basic 132:22 basically 19:19 80:9 basis 72:11,12 75:17 95:13 108:16 baton 48:14				

C				
C 34:7,8 35:4 39:2 54:1,4	carrot 117:20,22	1:15,17,18,22 3:3 4:19 5:2,4,7 7:1 8:13 11:18,21 21:19 35:17 36:2 37:7,16 40:4,7 42:11,16 46:20 50:19 54:1,4 55:8 55:13 56:12 57:11 65:9 67:2,8 68:20 69:20 70:4,8,19 71:13 72:8,17 73:4 74:17 76:6 76:21 77:3,9 78:12 79:5 83:13 85:20 86:2 90:16 90:19,22 91:10 92:12 93:22 96:15 96:21 99:6,17,20 100:1,5,8,16 101:4 105:5 108:5 112:12 113:20 118:2,6,13 126:15 127:7,21 131:8 138:4 143:5,22 151:10,17 153:9 153:19 154:14	127:20 130:19 131:2,7 136:14 139:21 142:9 150:18	64:4 79:5
cadre 146:22	carrying 117:7	47:21 48:16 50:8 52:1 57:4 58:2 61:19 75:11 88:2 103:13 136:6 139:3,4 142:2 143:12 153:4	changed 52:13 130:11 151:7	client 88:11
cajoling 100:22	cascade 19:1	challenges 5:22 6:5 7:22 14:5,19 30:8 38:15 48:19 49:18 81:17 82:2 89:6 94:12 95:16 137:18 139:5 140:20 141:17 142:1	changes 54:18	close 73:16 78:18 89:19 153:22
calendar 43:3,6 44:14 153:20	case 20:16,19 51:14 64:22 101:10 114:22 144:22	challenge 38:7,9	changing 14:17 52:8 151:12	closely 12:10 78:9 152:13
call 17:1 31:4,15 32:1 43:16 44:1,6 44:13,17 51:8,11 61:15 68:2 74:7 74:14 151:1 154:4	cases 131:17 133:13	challenging 106:18	change 16:21 42:12 56:18 57:5 63:15	closer 16:5
calling 105:20 134:16	catchup 4:21	chance 76:1,4	clear 16:21 42:12 56:18 57:5 63:15	Cloud 75:9
calls 51:16	categories 60:17,18	change 16:22 33:10 34:2 40:1 50:2 68:4 81:9 102:10 102:20 115:3,16	clearly 18:1 21:7 25:13 56:15 61:19	coach 128:17 133:3 135:1 139:10,17 139:20
camera 3:4,6	category 96:18 97:1 102:6	Chairman 1:11,14		coaching 128:14,15 132:5 142:20
cancel 25:18 35:11 35:12	Catherine 2:14 119:7			coded 55:19
cancellations 35:22 36:6	Catherine's 110:1			cohort 143:17
candid 122:9	Cathy 88:5 90:17 101:15 132:15 137:2			collaborating 149:6
Candidacy 134:1,8	causes 97:5			collaboration 130:22 149:5
candidate 146:2	Census 67:17			collected 89:18 90:2
candidly 136:11	Center 134:14			collecting 89:17
candor 152:20	centers 124:9			collection 90:1
capabilities 46:13 46:16 72:1	central 4:2 52:14 62:4 68:12			college 104:16
Capital 2:21 81:19 85:13	centralization 52:15 114:7 115:14			combination 8:21
captured 57:1 137:3	centralized 62:6 74:11 76:10,19 86:19 89:22			combine 150:22
care 85:15,16 87:4 91:20,21 93:6 101:19	centrally 75:22			come 19:16 24:19 31:5 57:22 79:12 102:9 119:12 126:20 127:8 136:13 140:11 143:20 145:18 148:10,17 149:7 152:1
career 47:17 48:10 49:21 80:11 90:13 117:22 118:8,10 118:18 126:7 133:19 134:2 144:16	century 49:12			comes 14:7 24:14 41:15 102:19 104:8 115:2 139:4 141:16 151:16
careers 104:21 117:13	CEO 1:14,15,17,18 1:18,19,21,21,22			coming 36:17 138:8,10
careful 99:7 112:13 119:5,6	ceremony 27:16			command 46:13 72:12
Carolina 143:15	certain 109:9 113:12 122:19 124:8			commendable 105:20
	certainly 21:21 33:15 51:4 148:1 148:6			comment 41:5 51:2 73:19 96:20 116:19,21
	certification 113:2 113:5			
	chain 65:20			
	chair 145:19			
	chaired 23:19			
	Chairman 1:11,14			

comments 52:2 68:19 77:14 94:15 108:15 110:2 137:13	competencies 82:9 144:5	32:20	conversations 95:13 105:3 106:18 125:6 129:19 130:8	Creative 134:14
Commerce 2:2,19 10:11 33:1 67:4 86:6	Competency 120:5	consistency 17:13 17:18 61:6 77:15 82:6 113:1 114:12 115:5	convert 94:22	creep 25:21
Commissioner 2:10 89:9,10 90:20 91:2,6 128:4 148:13 149:12	competent 116:11 116:12	consistent 63:16 77:20 78:3,10 84:9 147:6	convince 29:14	criteria 11:2 12:6 117:2
commitment 41:13	complaints 139:13	consistently 68:10 78:3	coordinated 83:7	critical 34:16 35:5 57:10 90:8 93:12 105:16 126:19,21 127:14
commitments 41:21 113:10	complementary 39:8	consisting 84:13	coordinating 14:2	Cross 1:19
committed 127:15	completely 124:1	consolidate 46:11 61:10	Coordination 46:12	cross-function 144:12
committee 23:17 33:14 42:5,7	completion 41:14	consolidation 31:9	corporate 3:16 86:16 87:9,12,14 87:17,20 141:2	cross-functional 19:11
committees 42:3 43:20	complex 58:14	constant 36:15 67:19	corporations 129:7	cuing 130:2
commodities 74:15	compliance 58:7	constraints 53:17	Correct 91:7 97:17	cultivate 136:17
commodity 31:10 74:1 75:11 76:11	component 121:17	consultants 57:22	correlate 9:2	cultural 149:19
common 21:9 31:10 32:16,17 45:15 93:2 135:20	composite 152:7	consuming 92:8	Correlated 9:3	culture 102:10 105:12 106:1 139:11,21
communicating 113:14	comprehensive 83:4	contact 26:13	costs 19:21 20:3	cumbersome 92:5
communication 106:9 113:13 123:2,20 126:2	compromised 65:2	content 153:7	council 19:11 25:17 33:18 35:13 46:4 47:10	cumbersomeness 92:22
communications 66:2 112:4 122:10	concentrate 70:2	context 17:17	counsel 46:21	Cummins 1:22
community 71:9 115:10	concentric 111:22	continued 32:20	count 124:9,21	cumulative 83:9
companies 7:21 12:15 122:20 127:5 144:4,8	concept 29:4 76:7	continuity 115:8	counting 124:7	curiosity 136:15
company 16:15 23:5,12 59:14 61:11 63:4 64:8 64:16 144:10	concern 101:17	contract 60:5 61:7 75:5,7	country 90:10 102:22	current 17:6 55:17 67:22 82:2
compare 15:6 132:15	concerned 142:4	contracting 58:9 61:5 65:6 69:17	couple 4:5 5:18 12:22 50:20 79:12 80:1	curve 104:17
compares 132:18	concerns 81:2	contractors 48:3	course 14:18 145:6	customer 16:7 79:10 124:11
compensation 92:13	concrete 5:12 7:6	contracts 58:12	courses 133:3	customers 16:6
	conduct 129:11	contribution 121:6 121:22 122:3 123:5	courtroom 89:3	customized 83:7
	confirmation 78:14	control 14:6 22:22 34:21 35:7 40:12 40:16,18 41:2 43:2,5,7 44:14,20 63:21 64:1 71:2 72:13,22 114:8	cover 12:19 94:8 121:9	cut 22:14 45:6
	conflict 116:1	conversation 67:4 67:11 72:7 78:13 92:21 110:8 114:5 114:17 122:2 126:11 127:8 151:8 154:6	covering 10:21	cutting 54:10
	Congratulations 91:10		cradle 43:12	cyber 46:9
	Congress 47:14 93:13		crawl 26:18	cycle 61:9 86:20 98:2 113:5,17 122:12 130:13,15 140:17
	conjunction 78:1		crazy 49:4 107:11 125:8	cycles 47:14
	connect 109:12 110:8		create 56:6 66:6 71:21	
	connected 92:16		created 64:15 93:19	<hr/> D <hr/>
	connection 104:13		creates 41:20 58:5 58:11	Dan 2:15 10:3,5 46:21 57:1
	connotation 105:19		creating 32:1	DANIEL 2:10
	consensus 46:13			Danny 2:4 11:18 27:20,21 31:16
	consequence 95:17 99:18 100:4			
	consequences 97:15,20 133:11			
	consider 31:10 61:13			
	considerable 140:14			
	consideration			

34:5 60:11	93:5	2:15,16,19,21	developing 82:19 137:4	143:2 144:3
dark 118:4	defensive 133:7	27:22 28:9 30:6	development 2:18	direct 93:6,7
darned 107:22	defer 82:21	31:8,18,22 32:6	6:14 27:13 82:16	104:13 151:20
dashboard 20:13 44:5	define 98:21	32:22 33:1 38:4	83:5 89:8 94:7	direction 102:3
dashboards 24:7	defined 50:16	40:13 43:16 46:1	109:19 118:1	138:20 154:1
data 35:18 37:20 73:14 147:17	defining 3:13	46:18 51:9 53:4	119:13 120:8	directly 79:20
Dave 89:9 111:9	definitely 19:10	53:12 65:15 67:13	131:16 132:4,16	Director 2:17 87:12
David 2:6 10:12 46:21 50:19 74:9 92:21 119:22	definition 26:19	67:15,17 68:13,16	134:11 135:15	discontinue 42:21
day 3:6 7:14 79:9 122:6 134:21 136:13	degree 11:11	76:16,19 85:13	140:20,21 144:2	discretion 97:18
days 46:1,2	delay 25:18	86:5,6 88:7 89:11	144:16,19 145:2	discussion 50:21 74:8 84:17,21
day-to-day 65:7 73:16 79:19 80:10	delight 84:19	92:20 111:19	145:14 146:15	85:19 109:13
deal 68:8 73:13	delinquent 90:3,4	120:3 133:6,7 148:2	developmental 144:6	110:6 153:1,7
deals 21:3	deliver 18:1 23:15	departmental 33:6 38:11 132:22	developments 128:8	discussions 95:4 96:11
Debra 1:18 131:8 152:11	deliverables 121:4 123:13	Department's 28:16	devolves 127:17	disincentives 58:5
debt 89:22 90:3	delivered 18:7 27:10 121:10	department-wide 85:5	devoted 59:5	distinct 113:12
decade 57:18	delivering 62:11 63:11	dependent 75:18	dialogue 8:4	distinction 103:22
December 122:12	delivers 62:15	depends 97:22,22 98:6,21 127:13	difference 28:6 97:19 98:9 118:17 146:9	distinctions 95:1 95:14 104:7
decentralization 72:9 114:8	delivery 47:18	deployed 49:7	different 21:22 32:8 33:3 38:21	distinguished 95:14
decentralize 72:6	Denise 2:20 85:10 85:12 94:9 124:13 124:21 137:12	depreciation 16:20	39:15 42:7 60:17	distortion 48:6
decentralized 74:21	dentist 92:16	depress 102:17 104:14	61:12 65:11 82:5	distributed 32:4 51:6 67:13
decide 102:16	Dep 9:5 10:3,7,9,12 47:5 48:15 50:20	Deputies 84:3	82:14 97:16 102:3	distributing 75:4
decided 62:3	54:3 67:5,9 69:9	Deputy 2:2,3,5,6,8 2:13,15,17,20	107:16 108:17	distribution 82:10 97:3 115:20
decides 75:18	69:22 70:7 72:18	10:4,10,13 30:10	115:4 130:21	116:16 121:1
deciding 145:14	73:5 85:11,22	45:19 56:19 67:4	147:20 152:22	distributive 40:11
decision 15:8 34:9 52:11 72:5,15 74:16,20	86:3,14 91:8,11	83:16,17 86:15	differentiate 15:7 117:14	dive 13:8 146:11 147:3
decisions 15:12 19:12 52:18 53:21 131:3,5	91:12,16 92:3,14	117:17 118:9	differentiating 100:11 107:6	diverse 31:20
deck 48:9	93:4,15 94:14	140:13 149:11 150:10	differentiation 101:6 108:8	divide 16:18 58:12
deep 12:20 35:20 45:22 80:14 146:11 147:2	95:20 96:7 97:6 97:21 98:12,16,20 100:20 101:7 105:15 112:20 113:22 115:7 116:5 123:10,18 124:6 127:12 128:2 137:19 138:7 142:16 143:2,6 144:3 146:19 147:10,16 148:3 154:12	describe 22:8	differently 15:1 58:20	division 47:8
deeper 6:5 13:14 48:2	department 2:2,4,5 2:6,7,8,12,13,14	design 113:4	difficult 14:14 106:17 116:2,3 125:6 132:11	divisive 122:4
Defense 86:6 87:13		designed 120:14	difficultly 14:14 106:17 116:2,3 125:6 132:11	Doc 20:19
		desire 24:9	difficulty 91:21 93:12	documentation 27:14
		desk 136:16	dig 7:5 83:13	DOD 87:18,19
		Despite 80:19	diligently 122:21	doing 31:7,22 32:15 44:15 49:1 49:4 51:12 97:7,8 104:11 106:8 111:16 113:8 116:3,13 118:15
		develop 6:21 22:11 131:19 132:3 137:17 145:12 153:3	DIR 93:15 112:20 113:22 115:7	
		developed 59:7		

121:7 128:20 129:20 130:10 DOL 88:10 dollar 54:13 75:5 101:11 dollars 26:5 28:22 39:21 98:22 DOL-related 88:14 domain 32:1,8 70:1 122:17 doubt 119:14 downsize 141:20 dozen 29:13 dozens 32:12,12 drag 75:12 drain 103:10 136:19 draw 56:8 dries 137:6 drive 16:6,7,14,22 16:22 17:4,9 18:11 33:10 45:9 50:12 60:7 67:14 78:15 79:9 114:11 136:12 driven 12:22 44:8 drives 71:8 87:19 driving 56:16 62:6 97:12 106:1 139:10 drop 105:22 dual 57:4 duplicate 28:20,21 duplication 29:20 30:1,2 duration 119:17 D.C 1:10	107:8 124:9 echo 21:21 125:4 edge 54:10 112:14 education 2:5,14 10:6,8 27:22 28:9 100:22 EEO 129:9 133:8 effect 34:13 effective 11:7 101:12 102:7 117:5 effectively 13:7 53:11 58:13 68:9 68:9 effectiveness 79:10 efficiency 20:1 41:20 45:9 62:1 71:6 79:10 efficient 44:8 effort 140:21 efforts 80:1 ego 139:18 eight 88:8 121:21 151:20 152:1,3 Eighteen 85:22 Eisenhower 1:10 either 29:6 82:18 106:16 110:16 131:22 154:8 element 121:19 123:14 127:14 elements 96:10 122:6 123:13 eligible 81:5 else's 77:19 153:17 email 30:10 embarrassment 139:19 embody 110:2 embrace 49:22 emphasis 105:9 emphasize 149:1 emphasizing 113:11 employee 2:17 88:18 125:14 130:22 146:10	149:13 employees 57:21 81:8 82:22 85:15 89:12 91:5 95:18 101:22 empowered 46:18 empowering 48:10 enablement 48:21 enabler 16:2 enablers 52:10 enabling 52:19 enamored 66:19 encourage 102:5 ended 135:21 ends 22:17 energy 2:12,16 10:4,17 15:9 32:3 46:1 47:9 137:4 enforce 67:19 enforcement 32:2 engage 59:2 engaged 14:9 engagement 15:13 58:21 engaging 84:20 95:4 enlightening 13:18 Enrique 1:21 7:20 33:14 59:12 69:1 73:7 Enrique's 42:18 109:2 110:12 enter 67:3 111:2 entered 136:2 enterprise 29:11 entire 23:12,20 33:7 67:15 102:22 105:17 environment 28:11 48:18 58:15 68:4 81:8 ephemeral 47:11 equally 18:3 equation 56:4 79:15 equity 107:7 145:4 equivalent 91:14	93:9 equivalents 87:3 ERISA 88:16 errant 122:9 especially 71:18 117:4 118:18 119:16 establish 24:3 evaluate 144:5 evaluated 39:22 146:2 149:3 150:14 evaluation 128:10 129:11 130:1 148:15 149:7 evening 143:12 event 134:15 141:22 143:8,9 eventually 117:16 everybody 3:7 4:21 5:10 37:17 48:4 78:6 79:1 88:17 99:12,13 115:22 151:15 153:16 exact 99:13 exactly 19:4 37:2 74:3 112:4,5 113:6 138:19 exam 134:4 example 11:14 18:9 21:1 30:8 33:2 38:13 64:11 65:1 75:3 93:21 108:22 119:21 123:12 128:9 145:17 exceedingly 118:15 excellent 103:12 117:19 exceptional 101:10 107:2,4,20 excited 89:7 excitement 141:11 executing 150:3 execution 14:4 19:15 27:13 31:6 50:15 60:3 65:7 executive 1:10 2:17	23:20 25:17 80:7 80:18 82:16 86:4 86:12,17 87:19 88:1 89:8 92:4,17 93:9,11,18 94:7 96:9 105:21 123:15 132:17,21 137:6,16 138:11 139:4,16,22 141:8 141:15 142:17,19 144:5 145:18 146:15 148:16 149:2 executives 7:11 80:9,11 85:2,18 87:2,9 97:9 98:3 128:11 137:13,14 138:16 139:14 140:1,4,6,7,9,22 141:7,9 143:14,20 147:11,11,13 148:14 149:21 exemplariness 111:17 exemplary 112:9 exercise 106:20 exercises 134:22 exist 33:20 existing 16:19 17:2 exists 21:15 exit 40:2 exodus 81:3 expect 125:15 149:18 expectation 138:11 expectations 27:8 61:8 140:19 expected 138:2 140:22 expecting 104:21 expense 56:5,6 experience 25:20 26:8,15 80:15 106:3 experiences 132:16 146:4 expertise 58:16
E				
earlier 75:16 76:5 109:12 110:6,8 114:5 early 7:3 84:5 95:4 133:19 easier 42:19 easily 71:18 easy 17:14 51:3				

63:4 68:12 69:13 69:16 70:1,9 73:2 experts 10:20 32:18,19 52:7 60:18 63:13 explain 91:14 exploration 57:6 expressed 3:22 expression 31:3 extensive 66:2 extraordinary 70:6 extremely 130:12	feedback 84:9 95:4 95:10 104:19 105:12 124:18 130:6 132:6 133:13 144:1 feel 3:14 5:20 42:13 51:6 64:22 67:12 69:5 72:10 79:18 83:11 feeling 49:5 106:12 136:18 feels 73:3 feet 75:13 ferocious 101:1 fewer 22:11 fiefdoms 52:5 field 88:10 91:22 fields 41:7 Fifteen 90:20 figure 8:22 28:5 35:15 37:10 38:10 57:1 76:7,9 138:11 154:1 figuring 60:12 fill 9:13 final 52:22 96:14 112:17 finally 26:1 27:6 83:3 89:22 Finance 44:9 financial 2:10 63:16 89:10 103:1 financially 98:10 find 25:6 67:10 68:18 finding 53:4 73:8 73:12 fingers 6:10 finish 27:6 finished 27:7 86:10 fire 131:19 firm 151:21 firmly 86:21 first 7:14,16 8:10 11:4 13:3,12 14:12 15:1,21 16:17 18:18 22:10	22:21 33:15 34:12 35:1,4,10 43:10 43:10 56:15 67:11 70:17 79:7 81:22 109:14 113:3 134:19 140:11 141:7 150:16 firsthand 84:10 133:11 first-rate 70:16 fiscal 95:9 fit 61:14 133:22 153:6 five 4:19 22:7 23:4 23:6 44:9,10 47:1 90:9 102:4 105:21 120:1,18 122:22 123:13 140:5 148:5 five-tier 94:22 flatter 48:7 flavor 38:16 flexibility 67:18 83:2 92:13,18 114:9 151:2 floor 48:9 FMS 90:11 128:21 focus 5:19 7:18 10:22 11:4 21:22 24:22 81:14 87:17 141:2 focused 31:15 38:22 39:6 63:20 65:4 105:7 143:12 150:19 focusing 27:13 80:12 folks 4:4 7:3 52:6,9 63:12,13 66:3,4,5 66:5 79:8,12,17 80:14 83:15 96:17 102:5,7 103:18 112:14 117:13,16 144:21 following 151:5 force 18:10 44:19 forced 44:22	115:20 120:22 122:1 forces 56:2 152:19 forget 43:6,19 120:21 121:1 forgetting 9:19 form 77:22 forma 106:20 formal 20:15 43:19 123:21 133:17 144:9 146:7 formalize 18:15 60:15 formalized 42:22 formally 43:11 formed 46:2,3 former 1:17 55:16 forms 48:5 forth 78:11 fortunate 85:1 88:22 fortunately 138:14 142:1 Fortune 127:4 Forum 139:22 141:8 142:18,19 forward 16:15 58:6 79:18 84:5,7 85:18 145:3 fosters 153:1 found 20:7 24:14 34:8 60:8 94:16 four 27:5 43:1 46:22 85:2 102:4 120:2,18 129:22 140:5,6 Fourteen 91:8 four-tier 94:20 four-year 119:20 fragmentation 43:7 60:21 fragmented 30:12 44:22 46:12 frame 6:19 frameworks 14:17 framing 116:20 frankly 53:10 71:8	72:20 108:4 137:1 142:11 146:20 free 27:19 40:21 42:13 72:11 freed 63:19 frees 35:6 freeze 34:13 35:4 113:17 freezing 34:17 54:18 frequent 27:16 122:11 frequently 84:3 fresh 106:8 FRIDAY 1:6 front 3:8 15:2 21:12 28:5 58:21 59:3,6,8 85:7 121:9 froze 55:1 full 6:2,19 13:11 25:2,13 86:20 fully 27:8 37:18 105:18 function 52:17 53:14 86:8 110:22 121:11 functions 90:8 fundamentally 30:15 funded 41:14 funding 32:20 47:15 82:22 142:4 funneling 3:20 further 33:20 future 54:13 55:2 81:4 142:4 fuzzier 125:2
F				
FAA 93:7 fabric 47:17 fabulous 36:4 130:10 face 21:10 137:18 139:6 faces 14:5 facilitate 84:17,21 facing 32:22 fact 44:12 58:20 96:22 106:16,21 143:11 factor 101:20,21,21 failed 131:1 fair 88:15 148:22 fairly 12:22 fall 7:3 Falls 141:3 fall/winter 7:8 familiar 88:17 95:6 far 30:17 38:6 82:11 102:1 111:21 112:10 fascinating 67:12 federal 8:11 13:21 14:15,20 33:9 45:17 53:18 57:12 58:1,8,17 81:7 85:2 93:8 133:4 135:10,17 federate 38:2 federated 28:10 32:4 40:11 51:5				
G				
				GAIL 1:18 Gail's 109:5 110:18 gain 142:6 game 19:19 gas 121:15 gather 12:8 GB 152:9

gee 131:19	145:20	37:2 45:11 72:19	grant 147:20	half 81:13 87:6
Geithner 4:14	goal 8:3 48:16	73:10 78:13 83:21	grants 28:22 29:1,3	90:3,4 113:21
general 108:18	62:14 63:21,22	85:11 86:14 93:16	grateful 30:20	hallmark 22:3
generally 82:18	94:1 115:4 144:11	102:8 108:2	grave 43:12	hammer 70:11
92:15,16 128:3	goals 7:16 16:3	110:22 111:8	great 13:17 15:20	hand 5:9 12:2 49:1
137:22	17:21 18:13 19:2	113:8 125:3 128:8	21:20 36:1 52:7	75:19 80:2
getting 4:1 6:8 39:4	23:7 49:18 59:7	128:22 130:12,14	57:9 59:13 74:21	handing 48:14
50:14 73:10 87:18	120:9	131:2,3,15 132:1	83:20 107:19	handle 88:14
100:21 103:18	goes 27:4 53:1 74:8	133:16,21 150:3,5	120:11 121:21	handover 153:10
104:17 116:10	76:16 96:14	154:12,14	127:2 131:22	happen 25:19 26:6
132:6 143:16	114:17 150:16	goodness 138:8	132:13 153:11	26:14 34:9 37:3
145:7 146:12	153:8	gotten 84:8 104:9	greater 133:1	39:5 42:6,8 76:14
149:10	going 3:8,10 4:3	128:3 129:14	greatest 3:15	112:19
GILLILAND 1:15	5:11 6:7 7:5,16,20	143:17	green 22:18 24:15	happened 128:6
77:11 118:22	8:3,10 9:11 10:18	Gould 2:3 83:16	37:5 44:5 152:5,6	135:15
142:13,22 144:17	12:21 13:8,9,13	127:12 128:2	152:8 153:1	happening 36:5,6,7
give 9:9,19 11:15	17:9 18:11 21:22	154:12	Greg 1:14 150:20	59:13 107:21
38:15 41:4 47:2	22:19 25:4,14	governance 19:11	Greg's 51:2 125:4	141:1
68:2 93:13 94:10	26:14 27:12 30:1	22:4 23:3,17	147:7	happens 20:16
101:19 112:13	30:14 32:8 36:9	30:15 31:15 32:9	grounded 82:8	36:21 70:22 77:5
127:10 132:3,7	37:5,9 41:15 42:8	39:18 41:10 46:4	group 35:14 44:21	100:3 137:22
133:12 145:16	43:11 45:5,7	47:10 77:22	58:8 62:4 63:2	142:12
147:1 148:19	47:21 48:11 49:13	government 3:18	65:3 76:2 78:14	happily 101:19
150:15	50:11,17 53:19	4:3 5:14 6:7,16	79:21 80:8 84:2,6	happy 38:18
given 4:2 68:3	54:22 55:8 56:16	9:10 11:5,17 12:9	94:1 107:21	hard 11:5 43:9
71:18 81:1 107:14	59:12 60:11 61:7	13:22 14:1,5,15	110:14 126:22	45:12 69:4 104:13
107:15 137:7	63:14 64:18 65:1	14:20 33:9 37:8	135:7,10 143:11	107:9,18 109:7
gives 56:2 106:7	65:5 69:5,13	38:10 45:9,18,18	143:16 144:1	123:9 126:11
143:19 151:2	70:19 75:15,22	46:19 53:18 56:21	145:19,22 146:10	hardware 52:12
giving 7:10 104:18	76:17,18 78:6,21	57:13,15,21 58:1	147:22 148:18	hardwired 15:4
130:6	80:3,12 81:11	58:2,8,17,22 59:1	154:8	136:9
glass 121:15 151:3	83:14,21 84:16	79:11 80:15,16	groups 24:12 42:7	hardworking
glue 60:6	101:9 103:4,7,9	81:16 89:18,21	60:6 68:14 148:6	109:22 111:1
go 5:15 12:20 14:14	105:2 106:11,14	90:1 92:5 95:7	grow 19:20 36:16	Harris 2:4,5 10:5,5
16:10 24:3 25:6	109:5 110:18	103:6,10 105:14	growing 117:13	28:12 83:15
25:12 29:2 31:5	112:11 113:11	109:17,20 111:20	GSA 69:12 70:5,8	100:20 101:7
35:20 38:6 40:7	119:16 127:6	114:12 127:9,22	71:15,20 72:10,20	Hayes 2:6 10:12,12
41:21 42:6,8 44:8	131:10 132:1	128:7 129:6,14	73:18 75:6	30:10 50:20 54:3
54:19 60:20 61:9	134:7,18 136:19	130:18 132:10	GS-2 149:13	72:18 73:5
61:18 62:20 63:9	139:7,8,9,15	135:5,10	guess 5:9 35:1 55:3	head 54:12 114:1
64:12,18 68:3	141:19 144:18	government's	65:10 98:21	heading 146:20
73:1 79:12 85:10	145:3 146:4 149:3	35:13 80:10	107:15 147:15,18	heads 4:13 9:6
92:10 94:5 99:8	149:7,8 150:9,11	government-wide	guests 8:7	62:21
101:9 106:19	151:6,14,18	69:11 89:21	guys 51:4 101:18	health 2:22 85:14
122:22,22 124:16	152:17 153:22	grab 71:6	126:21	85:15,16 86:6
126:8 134:6	good 3:4,13,19 8:8	grader 107:8,9		87:4 88:13 91:20
138:13 142:17	31:12 36:7,12,12	grades 82:22		91:21 93:5

H

healthy 22:3 59:10	historically 127:22	75:19	inconsistent 61:20	inspirational 141:5
hear 51:15 84:10	history 28:17	identifying 6:15	incorporate 121:3	instinct 72:19
137:3	100:10	III 2:11	incorporates 27:3	136:12
heard 39:1 43:17	hit 53:9 121:14	imagine 36:14 51:3	increase 19:22	institutionalize
55:5 59:16 60:11	hitting 123:16	71:17	increased 95:2	76:9
134:12 140:18,19	hoc 43:21	IMGC 46:10	increasing 22:15	instruments 134:20
hearing 41:10 47:3	hold 18:4,15	immediately 22:14	73:11	insuring 138:15
114:10 117:14	holding 18:14 65:4	45:19	incredibly 68:1	intangible 103:11
119:4	Holdings 1:16	imminent 24:2	incrementally 45:6	integrated 65:22
heavy 36:10 58:21	home 78:16	impact 3:15,17	independent 22:7	integrating 15:1
61:14 104:11	honest 105:12	11:9 12:21 28:15	indicative 106:16	intensive 134:20
106:9	138:7	impassioned 54:21	106:21	intention 37:3
held 116:13	honoring 9:19	impeding 62:7	indicators 135:4	intentional 48:6
help 4:8 47:3,4	hooked 136:8	imperfections 43:8	individual 32:12	interact 63:14
79:22	hoops 107:1,11	implement 7:7	72:2 83:7 146:18	Interactively
helpful 50:22 51:17	hopes 103:3	24:10 45:15 52:21	individuals 31:2	122:13
52:3 68:19 79:16	horizon 137:18	122:6	81:16 91:19 93:17	interacts 68:13
helping 53:17 84:6	horrible 105:19	implementation	industry 63:7,8	interest 3:22 77:18
helps 19:12 148:21	hospital 141:3,19	6:21 43:13 113:9	inefficiency 43:7	interested 39:18
herky-jerky 47:15	hosting 64:13,13	implemented	infinite 17:1	51:10,15
hey 43:17	hot 3:20	114:14	inflation 129:18	interesting 14:21
HHS 93:4 94:10	house 33:17 37:22	implodes 132:8	inform 47:4 61:4	27:21 30:5 36:10
102:4	143:3	imply 70:15	informal 43:21	45:17
high 53:4 96:2	HR 66:4 84:13 85:6	important 18:4	44:19 45:11	interface 34:17
97:19 98:10 99:19	86:11,12 94:10	24:8 26:13 39:12	122:11 133:17	interim 50:5
100:12 101:10	huge 11:16 34:10	40:19 53:12 55:4	152:19	Interior 2:7,13
103:19 104:2	52:1,20 53:4	63:12 64:8,22	informally 133:22	10:13,15 30:6,13
117:3 152:9,12	58:11 99:8 100:18	68:6 69:1,8 77:13	information 2:4,9	31:8,18 32:1
higher 57:22 71:1	118:17,21 130:19	77:21 90:7 102:13	2:11,12,19 12:8	Interior's 65:15
94:17,18 108:6	hugely 69:19	116:7 121:12	46:4 57:16	internally 31:3
highest 46:7 96:18	Human 2:21,21,22	130:3 132:4	infrastructure 22:9	intersection 3:16
97:1 99:10 101:8	81:19 85:13,14	135:14 149:19	30:12 31:11,12	6:10
116:1 144:14	86:7	150:22	49:13 75:7 90:9	interviewed 12:14
145:10 149:14	hundred 140:5	importantly 6:4	inherently 39:5,14	inter-function
highly 101:12	148:5	11:10 65:12	inherited 100:19	144:12
109:21	hurts 142:7	improve 61:22 80:1	inhibiting 62:8	introduce 10:2
high-level 7:21	husband 134:17	improvement 49:6	initial 65:6 113:3	121:17
29:19	hybridization 66:8	improvements	127:12	introduced 118:17
high-performing	66:11	81:11	initiatives 84:4	introductions 8:9
24:12		improving 109:18	innately 125:3	83:14 85:8
high-quality 27:17	I	incentive 77:1	inner 63:8	invest 17:7 20:8
high-risk 38:22	iceberg 24:16	inch 12:20	input 152:20	investment 21:11
39:7	idea 60:14 72:19	incident 46:9,12,12	inquire 91:13	29:6,16,20 32:13
hire 91:19 92:2,4	104:6,13	include 125:9	inside 62:18 108:1	investments 18:22
93:2,8	identified 24:16	included 120:2	133:10 138:9	involuntarily 72:16
hiring 74:10 91:17	26:15 102:13	includes 138:21	insights 85:4	involved 19:13
91:21 93:6,7,12	identify 40:14	incomplete 8:15	insist 47:7	42:17 51:13 54:9

involvement 33:16
36:19
IRS 91:3,4
issue 6:6 8:1 40:11
50:1 51:10,15,19
68:15 84:20
102:13 104:8,17
104:18 116:15
131:12 136:6
137:7
issues 6:3 11:4,10
12:14 30:18 66:18
83:19 84:15 99:22
129:3,4 132:2
135:19 149:20
ITAC 23:18 27:2
35:13 46:3
ITACs 33:20
items 78:17
iterative 26:20 27:2
27:5

J

Jeff 1:11,14,17 6:7
9:17 37:20 38:3
53:1 76:14 114:3
114:5
Jeff's 112:15
job 52:7 103:12
113:8 116:4
130:10 141:17
146:3 150:17
151:1,4,7,9
jobs 81:1 125:19
John 83:22 142:10
142:10
joint 23:15,16
Judge 134:5
judging 110:20
jump 44:5 72:11
80:6 118:4 126:2
128:5
jumping 55:12
June 1:7 90:18
143:17

K

Kate 93:22

Katie 83:18 84:17
keep 14:17 24:13
27:15 36:16 49:11
56:16
keeping 17:6,6
54:15
kept 74:6 135:5,6
key 23:4 26:3 35:7
47:6 109:15
110:19 114:15
122:5 128:19
kicked 53:22
kicker 66:16
kill 37:5 53:9
killing 37:14
kind 13:11,12 17:5
22:19,21 23:5
26:20 27:5,9 34:4
44:2 49:5,9 50:5
50:17 54:17 55:19
69:15 70:9 71:17
73:15,16 77:13
80:20 106:8,12
115:20 119:11
126:17 132:5
133:16 136:19
141:17,21 142:20
145:1 146:3,14
147:1,4 150:16
152:19
KINDLER 1:17
72:3,14 74:3,19
75:14 91:4,13
92:1,19 93:14
95:21 96:4 97:13
98:8,14,17 99:3
99:18,21 100:2,7
100:15 108:14
119:3 147:5,15,18
148:5
kinds 65:13 93:7
132:18 149:19
Kluh 2:8 86:14,15
91:8,11,16 92:3
92:14 93:4 97:6
97:21 98:12,16,20
105:15 116:5

137:19 138:7
142:16 143:6
146:19 147:10,16
148:3
knees 55:1
knew 22:19 133:9
133:11 134:10
140:22 141:1
know 4:1 8:11 9:14
19:4,10 25:9
29:21 33:18 34:15
44:15,16 45:16
47:12 53:15 54:18
54:20 63:10,10
66:3 68:16 83:14
95:18 96:5,16
105:1 107:8
111:15 112:4,5,7
117:11 124:17
125:3,7,22 130:7
131:1 132:2
138:12 148:9
152:14
knowing 104:22
knowledge 135:16
knows 44:16 83:15
104:9 122:8
KPIs 19:7
Kundra 2:9 8:11
9:17 27:20 30:4
32:21 37:19 45:14
57:9,12 75:1

L

labor 2:6,15 66:4
83:16 88:8,15
141:20
lack 43:7 74:1
82:18 115:8,10
146:21
lacking 58:17
land 127:10
landscape 12:19
languished 26:10
laptops 151:15
large 11:1 35:21
51:5 68:7 72:21

107:1 124:8,12
127:4
larger 49:9
largest 57:16
lastly 59:9 64:7
late 7:8 26:16
Laughter 4:18 5:6
9:21 11:20 55:21
101:3 118:5
122:18 138:6
151:19
law 32:2 75:21
88:20 107:1 134:4
lawyers 102:16
133:6
lay 75:21 127:10
lazy 107:5
lead 124:10 131:6
leader 94:10 123:1
129:4
leaders 18:5,16,19
26:2 45:2 47:8
56:3 60:12 79:18
84:14 95:3 116:12
125:3,22 128:22
131:6 135:19
144:20
leadership 14:19
23:20 35:19 36:19
49:21,22 50:2
52:8 82:9 87:2
88:3 97:7,7,12
120:20 121:5
123:2,4,15 127:15
130:19 131:2
134:10,14 138:14
139:13 140:3,8,15
141:4,22 143:9,13
146:22 147:1
150:1
leading 112:14
132:17,20
leakage 60:10
70:22 71:4
learn 15:15 84:22
131:12 137:15
learned 97:14

leave 33:19 76:3
leaving 9:8 135:4
Lebryk 2:10 89:9
89:10 90:20 91:2
91:6 128:4 148:13
led 116:12
LEE 1:18 70:15
71:11 103:17,20
131:10 132:13
left 129:21 136:22
legacy 22:17 42:22
54:15,19 55:18
136:6
legal 14:16 88:9
legality 121:1
legally 122:1
legislated 128:19
legs 87:18
lessons 56:17
let's 5:8,15 7:13
11:15 28:21 44:4
56:13,14 57:7
61:17 65:9 76:17
78:19 83:13
122:22,22,22
131:9 143:22
level 30:2 33:6,17
38:11 43:22 44:17
45:8 46:7 48:4,5
48:20 49:15 61:6
62:17 71:2 74:21
77:22 88:15
147:22 149:14,14
levels 93:18 107:16
113:12 145:20
147:20 153:17
leverage 60:14
109:16 120:7
levers 97:16
liability 64:15
life 55:3,17,17
86:20 98:2 130:13
130:15 140:17
lifetime 102:18
life-altering 134:15
lifting 104:11 106:9
light 24:15 152:19

153:8	47:13 51:19 76:22	149:15 151:2	86:17,19,21 87:20	Mazer 2:12 10:14
lightbulb 135:21	79:8 85:20 90:16	153:14	88:2 89:6,11 94:6	10:14 30:20 65:17
lighted 22:18	104:20 105:3	lots 41:8 52:5	94:13,21 95:3	McGOVERN 1:18
lighting 37:5	131:16 133:13	153:11	98:1,3 106:6	55:11,14,22 99:16
lights 17:7 54:15	147:13	lousy 116:4	114:18,22 115:5	106:11 108:10
limit 71:3	longer 36:11	love 23:22 30:13	115:12,19 116:2,9	125:1
limited 14:6 67:14	longstanding 126:8	47:2	117:6,10,12	mean 35:9 36:7,20
97:16 98:18,19	long-range 23:4	loved 89:3	120:20 121:4,18	37:12,19 49:2
line 4:9 28:17,18	long-term 16:13	low 82:13 96:2	123:16 126:19	55:4,19 68:15
29:1 56:8,9 85:7	17:15,18 114:22	97:19 98:11	127:3 128:6	69:10 70:5,8 71:4
85:10 123:21	142:6	lower 82:22 102:6	129:10 135:22	71:7,14,14 72:19
liner 108:15	look 7:17 24:4	lowest 149:13	136:8 140:17,18	72:20 73:7,15
lines 31:16,21,21	28:10 39:2 40:13	luck 8:20	145:21,22	75:2 76:20 92:1
46:14 50:6 77:8	44:2,4 48:8 57:14	lunch 154:3,8	manager 69:3	99:16 103:20
link 144:18	58:10 60:16 61:11	lying 21:6	73:17 129:2,5	105:7,11 108:6
linkage 62:13	61:17 63:4 65:18		131:13 132:1,22	109:5 114:16
linked 145:7	65:19 66:17 67:1	M	134:9	117:15 132:21
linking 48:17	84:5 86:11 87:13	maintenance 16:20	Managerial 128:18	134:16 136:10,17
links 77:13	104:5 112:10	49:9	managers 4:6	147:6
list 25:2 29:12	114:13 122:16,20	major 21:16 29:20	11:16 58:4 60:17	meaning 37:8,9
listed 64:12 82:2	131:21 144:6,21	30:2	62:9 63:19 102:15	41:7 95:22 96:1
Listening 30:22	144:22 152:7	majority 15:9	105:11 111:12	meaningful 11:9
literally 26:5 32:12	looked 28:19 59:22	40:16 49:8 57:19	112:7 115:21	81:10 98:9,22
34:18 39:20	66:12,20 69:15	80:11 126:6	125:9 133:12	124:22
litigation 88:9	looking 6:13 11:4	makers 52:11	manager's 12:3	meaningless 98:4
124:20	62:5 81:3,6 85:18	making 14:8 18:20	63:22	103:16
little 12:7 17:13,22	105:16 111:14,15	20:12 62:9 74:16	managing 50:6	means 27:6 66:12
28:8 30:16 42:2	130:17 135:6	74:20 88:3 89:14	69:2,3,13	91:15 103:17
45:4 52:4 62:19	145:5 146:22	99:8 103:22	mandate 125:13	117:10 120:11,15
67:10 71:1 78:8	looks 21:14 63:6	104:20 111:19,19	mandated 47:14	129:1,4,5 131:6
82:6 84:22 90:6	104:2 135:2	142:3	125:7	152:12,13
97:14 101:5 104:2	loose 22:17	MALAGUE 84:18	manifest 6:6	measurable 18:3
106:14 133:5	lose 62:21	94:3 97:4 108:12	mantra 22:13	measure 25:11
live 56:1	lot 6:8 7:2 9:7 14:2	126:1 132:12,14	manual 55:18	120:4
lives 57:3	15:15 41:1,6	137:2,11	map 29:11	measured 69:6
Liz 1:21 7:20 15:18	42:21 46:20 48:1	manage 4:8 13:6	marathon 16:13	measurement
19:10 21:19 28:1	49:3,5 53:8 57:5	33:7 124:13	24:1 48:13 62:19	146:18
31:1 39:2 41:11	59:5 60:9,20 64:9	manageable 23:1	131:17	measures 129:13
44:15 46:3 52:2	70:20 71:4 72:9	managed 58:7,12	March 141:8	measuring 112:16
53:7 75:16 76:5	73:9 75:12 80:21	134:12	marked 149:8	mechanisms 69:18
LLC 1:22	81:16 87:15 88:3	management 1:2	market 72:12	Medicare 86:8
local 41:2,2 63:18	102:10 106:22	2:10,18 11:1 29:1	75:17 76:4 102:17	meet 4:12 24:5
located 88:7	116:8 117:11	29:1,3 41:16 46:4	massive 42:19	63:21,22 149:12
Locatis 2:11 10:16	118:12 130:5,20	50:2,8 57:15 60:2	matrix 118:20	meeting 1:4 3:22
10:16 13:17 45:16	133:15 134:20	60:10 61:15,16	matter 9:1 63:4	5:12 6:1,20 7:6
77:6	136:18 138:15	64:6,11,19 73:7	109:14 131:4,4	40:2 51:8,11,20
long 20:6 21:12	141:6 146:18	82:1,4 85:16	matters 37:1	64:21 79:7 95:10

95:10 124:1 145:19 meetings 3:13 51:12,16 meets 27:3 33:19 mega 75:7 member 12:15 80:15 83:6 members 4:5 7:19 26:2 42:13 68:21 79:13 81:4,18 82:19,21 84:11,13 137:4 mention 38:19 128:21 mentioned 19:9 30:11 91:14 mentors 88:22 133:16 136:21 merit 32:19 92:6,11 133:8 message 56:19 messages 105:12 messed 67:2 met 1:9 12:10 methodology 12:3 15:6 151:13 mic 96:20 MICHAEL 2:11 middle 73:12 134:17 midst 68:17 midway 94:6 midyear 95:9 96:11 mid-level 102:15 111:11 112:7 132:21 mid-year 123:22 migrate 75:6 Mike 10:16 47:6 mile 12:20 milestones 26:3,7 Miller 2:13 10:7,7 48:15 69:9,22 70:7 million 29:22 38:8 45:6 61:12 89:16	mind 16:16 122:17 139:19 142:9 Mine 88:12 minimal 143:5 minimizing 27:14 minor 29:21 Mint 90:12,14 minute 4:20 120:21 145:8 minutes 47:1 153:21 mishmash 17:19 missed 143:1 153:21 missing 123:9 mission 149:17 mix 17:5,11 102:11 105:6 mixed 135:7 mobile 80:20 model 19:17,18,19 21:13 38:5 65:21 77:8 151:7 models 21:15 31:13 119:2 modification 29:8 momentum 22:20 Monday 44:17 money 16:18 17:12 26:5 41:3 53:19 57:19,20 68:11 70:20 71:4 73:9 99:14 101:15,16 101:19 110:4 134:13 137:8 monitor 24:6 58:15 monitoring 20:14 month 89:16 145:17 months 5:18 7:3,8 9:9,10,11 86:1 91:9 99:7 154:2 morale 104:8 morning 85:12 86:15 147:7 motivated 103:11 110:4	motivation 78:7,8 102:19 motivations 119:6 119:9,11 Motorola 1:14 5:1 5:3,4 151:13 move 6:13 7:13 58:6 67:14,16 75:9 80:21 84:6 121:14 134:2 135:13 153:4 moved 46:14 77:7 129:15 moves 20:16 moving 86:7 114:18 138:9,20 154:15 multiple 31:2 multi-billion 75:5 multi-fold 31:9 multi-year 24:4 Murphy 2:14 88:5 88:5 90:18 102:12 104:1 111:9 132:20 137:10	34:18,19 39:8 56:18 60:21 62:15 70:6 74:6,20 93:12 102:10 104:19 119:5 120:12 122:7,9 129:8,9,9 135:11 136:7 137:15,17 138:19 141:18,20 141:21 142:10 145:15 146:4 147:6,8 150:5 153:2,3 needed 24:19 39:16 87:16 needle 121:14 needs 13:5 27:3 40:1 52:2 66:13 67:1 104:6 107:10 122:2 144:6 150:12 negative 20:5 130:1 negotiating 60:5 negotiation 61:5 net 56:7 79:14 network 75:7 networking 60:22 networks 1:18 75:3 75:4 neutral 79:14 never 25:9 35:3 89:3 122:17 124:5 132:1 134:11 new 12:3 16:19 17:1,8,8,9 18:10 18:10 37:10,13 39:5,12 40:19 43:22 49:15 61:6 77:18 87:6,7 106:6 115:2 128:16 130:15 137:14 139:4,22 140:3 141:15 149:2,12,15 news 154:13 Nice 123:17 night 4:17 92:22	nine 91:12 118:22 119:1 NIST 33:3 38:14 NOAA 33:3 38:14 nodding 9:6 non-competitive 92:2,8 non-competitively 91:19 non-starter 11:17 Nope 37:4 norm 148:21 normal 93:1 normally 92:3 98:14 North 143:15 notebook 3:7 148:11 notice 9:10 notion 22:11 61:20 119:12 120:22 122:3 127:1,15 November 6:20 7:6 78:17 no-brainer 76:7 number 12:11 14:6 29:5 94:3 104:2 104:14,15 128:20 141:20 148:8,9 numbers 21:2 100:19 104:12 107:1 N.W 1:10
N				
nailed 123:6 name 9:19 85:9 NARAYEN 1:19 15:20 35:9 36:1 36:14 68:22 70:10 70:14 116:18 118:11,14 narratives 96:12 narrow 104:5 narrowing 5:18 National 47:9 90:8 natural 136:12 nature 47:11 near 81:4 nearly 90:3 necessarily 33:6 49:12 118:3 127:6 143:10 153:5 necessary 66:9 need 18:9,10 26:18				
O				
objective 109:1 objectives 19:2,6 20:20 23:5,16 26:4 63:17 108:20 109:3,9,18 110:10 110:20 111:5 112:16,18 113:9 120:3 121:8 objectivity 62:17 observation 54:7 77:12 112:15 120:18				

obvious 16:4	open 3:9 5:8 124:17 142:21 143:22	25:3	panel 84:12	peer 149:6
obviously 29:21 58:19 111:12 120:5	opening 94:1	organizations 40:12 51:6 52:10 54:9 72:21 116:11	panelists 85:8	peers 145:5 149:4
occur 122:2	operation 52:20	orientation 143:3	paper 151:15	Pennsylvania 1:10
ODNI 93:20	operational 44:13 124:9	original 80:19	papers 51:19	people 4:15 8:19 9:9 20:7 31:4 32:5 34:9 43:2,5 43:22 44:7 47:18 48:11 51:12 61:3 62:5 64:9 65:3 66:19 79:9 91:1 96:5 99:9 100:3,5 102:14 103:5,10 103:15 104:4,17 104:19,20 106:17 107:4,12,16 108:2 108:3 109:20,22 110:5,7 111:8 112:3,10 114:20 115:22 117:4,20 118:14 119:9 121:14 122:8 126:18 127:5 129:19,22 131:18 132:2,6,7 133:3,4 133:17,18 136:7 136:11 141:20 144:11,13,14 145:6 146:16 147:9,21 148:7 150:5,7,13 151:3 151:22 152:1,4,8 152:8,16,18
offer 85:6 137:12	operations 3:18 4:3 31:13 79:11 80:10 150:3,4,11	originally 63:17	part 8:2 16:9 18:12 18:18 20:11 48:16 52:19 90:8 98:2 120:5,6,8,13 131:11 132:4 135:14 137:6 140:21 141:4 145:19	
office 1:10 2:18 32:6 43:2,5,14,14 43:19 61:16 86:4 86:20 87:1,5,10 87:12,19 88:8 89:4,5 112:21 120:10 143:3	opinion 146:9	OSHA 88:16	participate 23:21 75:18	
Officer 2:4,9,12,12 2:19,21 85:13 86:4	OPM 83:22 112:5 138:22	OSI 1:21 15:19 22:5	particular 20:19 67:7 68:15 110:13 146:10	
officers 58:9 81:19 151:21	opportunities 118:12 132:17,19 134:11 144:7 145:3,15	ought 112:3,10	particularly 53:13 67:22 81:7 130:8 137:14	
offices 88:9 90:9	opportunity 5:20 6:4 53:20 60:15 69:11 81:10 83:20 98:19 119:16	outgrow 117:19	partner 18:21 26:6	
official 90:13	order 14:13,13,13 147:11	outlined 23:2 38:3	partners 1:21 13:4 58:22 83:22	
officials 6:9 10:1	opposed 80:13 83:9 119:17	outlived 35:16 39:10	partnership 18:18 19:15	
oftentimes 9:1 115:10	opposite 59:1	output 27:4	parts 18:17 20:22 56:4	
oh 55:9 128:2	optimal 50:18	outside 73:1 78:22 80:22 93:2 138:10	passing 32:14	
okay 5:15 7:13 13:16 40:5 51:13 56:12 90:19,22 114:19 115:15 122:17 132:13 154:14,16	optimism 24:8	outsourced 57:21	passion 141:10	
old 21:6 39:4	optimistically 22:8	outstanding 101:13 104:10 111:2,3,17 120:16	patchwork 22:9 54:15	
OMB 35:18 83:17 100:9 105:8,13	option 18:16	outward 40:10	path 118:10,18	
onboarding 138:21 139:1	order 14:13,13,13 147:11	overall 5:10 69:14	patterned 46:17	
once 18:7 26:21 41:12 50:15 55:16 55:22 137:5 140:1 145:17	organization 19:8 22:13 23:20 25:20 30:9 32:5 33:21 35:2 40:19,21 41:6 44:1 64:4 73:1 90:6 102:1 102:14 104:3 111:6 125:6 128:16,22 129:17 129:21 130:11,14 130:16 131:1 132:9 138:9 144:14 148:21 149:1,5,18 150:7 150:13 151:6	overrating 115:19	Pause 8:13 35:17	
ones 35:15 39:20 80:12 111:17 136:8	organizational	oversee 66:9	pay 37:11 92:17 93:9,10,16 98:18 99:4 113:16,18	
one-in/one-out 24:11 37:4		oversight 112:22	PayGo 37:8,9 54:4	
ongoing 146:8,17		Overwhelmingly 65:17 101:17	paying 62:16 142:6 153:2	
on-the-job 133:15		over-grading 99:22	payment 58:11 61:10	
		over-intensively 44:3	payments 89:14	
		owner 29:3,4,13,15	payout 98:5,5,8	
		owners 32:7 87:22 23:16 88:1 104:21	pay-for 113:15	
		ownership 23:15 23:16 88:1 104:21	pebble 111:21	
		owns 152:17	pedal 121:15	
		P		
		paces 134:21		
		page 5:9 10:20 11:3 13:2 20:22 26:17 55:14 57:11,13 80:3,6 81:13 148:11		
		paint 137:20,21		
				perfect 56:2 77:4 132:12
				perfectly 39:10

137:2	personnel 2:18 133:9 143:3	PMC 84:2	17:14 59:2 64:15 81:3 118:19 144:14 152:9,12	principle 92:11
perform 107:16	person's 108:19	point 4:20 18:9 22:10 26:20 41:9	43:13,18 51:7 69:16 115:16	principles 34:1 92:6
performance 13:6 26:4 39:7 57:14 58:3,11 59:7,10 61:8,21,22 63:16 69:5,7,18 82:1,3,4 82:11 94:6,13,21 95:3,9 96:8 98:1 99:2 104:19 105:10 106:6 108:19 109:18 110:21 111:4,7 113:13,16 115:4 115:12,18 116:8 117:6,9,12 118:19 119:13 120:4,14 121:3,17 123:12 124:4 125:4 126:18 127:2 128:6 129:10,11 129:12 140:18 144:18 145:4 153:6	perspective 4:10 6:9 12:9 16:1 28:20 30:5 37:22 58:14 85:5 94:11 125:21	109:2,5,16 110:3 110:12,19 114:2,3 114:4 115:8 116:6 118:19 119:16 120:6 126:3,14 134:1 135:18 142:6 149:2 151:11	power 42:3 43:1,4 43:13,18 51:7 69:16 115:16	prior 22:5 87:5,11 90:11
performed 107:19 114:21	perspectives 85:3	109:2,5,16 110:3 110:12,19 114:2,3 114:4 115:8 116:6 118:19 119:16 120:6 126:3,14 134:1 135:18 142:6 149:2 151:11	powerful 55:15 56:10 101:22 102:2	priorities 24:4 34:7 34:8 35:5 39:3 50:10 67:15 115:3 115:9
performer 130:13 130:14	Pfizer 1:17	points 37:20 50:21 128:9	PowerPoint 151:14	prioritization 43:21 56:11
performers 103:19 108:2 117:5	phase 6:14 14:3,4	policy 24:11 72:15 90:15 112:21 124:12	practices 3:17 5:21 6:15 11:7 30:8 65:13 67:20 68:5 69:17 74:10 153:15,16	prioritize 24:5 25:18 56:7
performing 38:22 39:9,20 62:22 64:2 104:10	Philadelphia 88:7	political 49:21 79:7 118:4,9 119:18,18 126:4 142:14,18 142:19	69:17 74:10 153:15,16	prioritizing 14:12 53:14
period 29:17 75:22 96:8 149:8	phone 154:9,10	politically 80:13	pregnancy 124:15	priority 40:15 115:11 127:6 142:3
periods 127:9	physician 92:15	politically 80:13	preparation 44:18	private 5:21 6:11 8:4 11:7,12,14 12:2,13 13:19 14:22 45:18 46:15 48:22 58:19 59:11 81:20 82:14 117:1 119:10 134:9 135:9 144:4
permits 145:7	pick 41:12,12 153:12 154:3	politically 80:13	prepared 44:12 51:18	pro 106:20
persistent 13:21	picked 112:14	politically 80:13	presence 30:21	proactively 17:4
person 8:15 25:7 25:14 35:5 44:8 63:5 103:21 104:8 104:9 111:1 124:1 125:3 130:9 131:20 137:22 142:8 145:9,10,11 146:1,5 152:10 153:3,5	pick 41:12,12 153:12 154:3	politically 80:13	present 1:13 2:1 6:19 56:7	probably 11:9,17 12:21 21:5,10 26:9 28:13,15 46:22 50:7 77:22 80:5 83:8 90:14 91:2 96:22 119:2 125:19 126:5 145:13
	pieces 83:5	politically 80:13	presentations 151:15	problem 11:15 29:7,9 33:12 38:3 38:17 48:12 60:19 103:7 107:7,10 115:19 153:6,6
	pin 103:3	politically 80:13	President 1:14,18 1:19,21 4:12 43:15	problems 11:5 13:21 46:8 126:8
	pivot 94:7	politically 80:13	Presidential 47:12 130:9	procedures 92:11
	place 25:22 28:2 52:18 102:19 109:14	politically 80:13	PRESIDENT'S 1:2	proceedings 79:2 154:18
	places 117:1	politically 80:13	presiding 1:12	process 5:11,17
	plan 20:2 23:13,13 23:14,15 28:7,7 95:8 96:10 123:12 124:22 141:15	politically 80:13	pressure 101:1 136:18	
	planes 34:21	politically 80:13	pretty 24:21,22 71:18 77:7 92:5 105:1 107:2 136:21 143:5	
	planning 14:3 15:2 15:3 122:12	politically 80:13	prevalent 128:15	
	plans 6:21 23:4	politically 80:13	previous 87:22 97:11	
	plate 48:9	politically 80:13	price 102:22	
	platform 77:18	politically 80:13	pride 101:20,21	
	play 55:8	politically 80:13	primarily 65:10	
	player 121:16	politically 80:13	primary 88:11	
	pleas 54:21	politically 80:13	principal 101:15 101:17 148:16 150:9	
	Please 42:16 55:10 55:13,13 67:3,8 126:15	politically 80:13		
	plenty 78:15	politically 80:13		
	Plus 73:5	politically 80:13		

6:22 20:4,15 24:2 26:20 30:3 31:9 32:9 38:21 39:6,8 39:15,18 41:10 44:3,14 49:6,13 59:5 60:1,9 61:10 62:7,17 65:6 71:1 71:5 76:19 92:5 93:1,3 113:3 116:9 122:16 127:17 128:12,13 146:8 148:15 153:7 processes 42:22 43:13 47:16 65:22 120:19 procure 64:9,18 78:2 procurement 60:4 61:9 64:5 66:3 72:6,9 75:8 produce 27:16 66:1 producing 48:5 product 27:7 112:22 productivity 19:22 49:6,16 126:21 proficiencies 130:18 proficiency 130:19 program 11:16 85:16 87:19 113:10 123:11 124:2,14 134:1,8 136:3 138:18,22 139:1 143:4 145:14 146:15 programs 22:4 35:8 40:14 82:16 124:12 142:14,17 144:10,13 146:14 progress 3:13,19 35:3 36:12 42:10 68:18 88:4 99:8 100:18 118:2 project 12:3 14:11 17:2 18:22 19:20	20:17 21:16 23:9 24:6,15 25:1,12 25:19 26:3,22,22 27:2,3,12 34:15 38:14 39:19 40:18 41:16,17 42:10 54:2 58:4,6 60:2,3 60:17 62:8 63:18 63:19,22 64:6 65:8 107:17 projects 14:2 15:7 16:19,19 17:2,8 17:19 18:1,1 19:5 20:8,14 22:14,17 24:5,6,13 25:8,11 26:9 28:4,20 31:3 34:20 35:11,12,21 36:8 38:6,8 39:1 40:14 41:7,14 50:6 53:5,10 54:5 114:21 promised 4:16 promoted 107:12 proposals 6:16 proposed 23:9 proposing 81:15 148:19 Protection 133:9 provide 68:11 91:20 118:12 provided 96:12 provides 86:20 providing 85:15 126:10 provocative 106:15 public 1:4 5:22 6:11 8:6 11:13 81:8 88:21 122:17 135:6 pull 13:10 139:7 153:22 purchase 71:16 purposefully 102:17 purposes 23:19 66:21 148:20 pushing 102:7	push-back 139:17 141:6 put 6:10 21:2 24:21 26:22 28:2 34:13 55:2 56:9 75:4,8 84:12 95:8 107:12 124:11 134:21 138:15 140:1 144:13 146:5 152:8 putting 35:4 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-... 3:1 <hr/> Q <hr/> qualified 109:22 quality 102:8 108:18 124:10 quantifiable 125:20,22 quantify 18:12 114:1 quarter 113:21 quarterly 24:5 40:2 quarters 66:10 query 73:17 question 16:1 32:21 34:5 40:9 42:1,4,9 53:2 59:19 61:21 68:8 69:9 93:16 108:14 109:11,17 110:19 111:4 114:15 116:20 117:9,20 127:11 128:5 132:8 149:10 questions 6:22 13:12 29:5,13 42:14 79:20 94:4 94:5 114:10 144:1 quick 21:17 50:21 56:14 57:8 73:20 80:6 126:13 quickly 10:2 21:1 46:15 57:10 94:1 quilt 22:9 quite 71:8 82:17	98:18,19 108:3,4 137:1 142:11 quotas 127:17 <hr/> R <hr/> raise 114:2 raised 114:10 raising 128:9 ramp 137:15 range 98:22 99:11 101:12 rank 118:11 130:9 152:1,4 ranked 94:17 ranking 122:9 151:12 rankings 152:20,22 ranks 88:19 rarely 9:9 rate 102:14,14 118:11 129:12 150:7 rated 82:11 95:19 96:2 97:9,16,19 98:10,11 99:10,19 100:4,6 103:15,18 105:2,22 115:22 116:1,14,22 117:3 rating 95:16 96:14 100:13 101:20 102:6,8 103:4,16 103:21 105:1 110:17 112:18 145:10,12 148:18 150:17 ratings 82:11 95:15 95:17 100:22 101:13 105:7 111:14 113:14 116:6,17 124:4 144:22 145:6 reach 92:9 111:18 112:11 reaction 56:14 57:8 65:10,16 73:20 127:13 reactions 68:20	83:11 ready 143:16 real 15:11 35:14 50:1 59:19 68:18 69:13 78:20 81:2 87:21 104:18 realistic 82:10 realities 43:8 realization 18:6 realize 18:3 27:11 51:13 70:11 76:20 136:19 realized 38:3 62:10 really 6:9 7:5 12:17 12:22 13:18 16:13 18:13,15 19:18 20:11 21:3,7 22:7 22:11 24:7,10 25:11 26:13 27:21 31:12 33:10 35:14 45:16 46:17 49:15 49:22 50:8,9,16 51:2,7 52:10,16 53:20 54:11 55:15 56:10,16 57:9 59:2,17 60:3 61:2 61:14 62:5,22 63:13 65:4,20 67:7 69:1,7 70:1 70:21 73:6 74:10 74:14,15,19 79:9 83:4 84:6 98:6 100:11 102:12,13 103:16 104:2,12 108:2 111:10 113:10 114:15 117:9 121:21 126:13 130:6 135:3,14 136:9 144:15 146:2,11 147:2 150:21 151:7 152:18 realtime 20:13 reason 45:2 92:20 115:22 128:21 reasonable 11:11 148:8
--	--	--	---	--

Rebecca 10:9	relative 69:6 121:6 121:22 122:3 123:4	138:15	right 7:9 8:19,19 13:13,17 15:2 28:4 30:14,20 34:3 37:2,16,21 38:12 43:2,5 45:20 48:9 49:1 49:10 50:14 70:3 75:2,3,10 80:4,6 83:12 100:7 117:10 118:6 130:20 135:12 136:7 138:3,13,20 141:13 142:2,8,11 145:9 146:21	sadness 9:7 Safety 88:13 salary 113:17 Salazar 51:14 120:1 SALEM 1:21 41:4 59:15 65:14 70:21 73:19,21 76:13,22 107:14 118:16 119:1 126:13,16 127:19 144:9 150:15 sales 18:9,10 Sam 1:15 77:10 sample 21:1 sat 134:22 satellites 67:17 satisfaction 124:11 130:22 satisfactory 102:6 save 38:1 saves 68:11 saving 20:3 savings 38:9 56:5 74:21 76:20 saw 133:11 saying 32:16,19 37:4 60:22 119:22 126:22,22 130:7 134:18 145:8 says 19:19 25:14,20 43:11 60:7 152:14 scale 32:22 77:7 82:12,13 scaling 38:2 schedule 78:19 scheduled 4:12 school 88:20 Science 44:10 47:9 scientific 85:16 scope 25:21 124:12 Scott 2:3 72:10 83:16 127:7,21 147:21 154:5,6,9 Scott's 154:6 screen 23:8 seamless 9:12
receive 145:1	relatively 148:22	respect 115:9 129:18	rigorously 92:7 rights 34:9 73:14 rigorous 15:6 32:15 41:11 59:4 rings 111:22 risk 53:5 64:10,19 73:7,11 road 53:22 robust 23:22 ROI 66:1 70:5 role 60:4 85:9 132:18,21 roll 110:14 124:14 rolled 124:15 rolling 3:5,7 106:6 Ron 33:14 room 1:9 141:10,11 rosy 137:21 138:5 rotating 126:4 rotation 144:9 rotational 144:7 roughly 80:13 113:20 140:5 routinely 51:16 rules 129:7,8 rule-bound 129:6 run 20:22 63:19 80:9 109:20 124:8 141:19 143:3 running 17:6 141:3	
received 130:9	relativity 121:20	responses 143:18	Sabre 1:15	
recognize 16:12	relevant 67:10	responsibility 19:16 20:12 118:7 133:2		
recognized 89:1 133:20 135:18	relying 123:20	responsible 71:9 89:13,17,20 112:21 148:7		
recommendations 5:13 6:18 7:7	remainder 96:18 96:22	rest 10:1 127:16		
record 11:6 79:3,4 154:19	remember 134:16	Restaurant 1:21		
Recovery 48:2	remind 5:10	restaurants 22:7		
recurring 113:4	remote 89:5	restless 136:15		
recycle 31:13	replace 60:1,4	restrooms 78:22		
red 1:19 44:5 152:6 152:12 153:4	replicate 30:7 38:5	result 73:10 123:11 130:12 150:20,21		
reduce 19:21	report 87:1 126:5,7	results 27:18 121:4 121:8,18 123:3,13 125:20		
reduced 29:18 124:14	reporting 48:3 89:20	retention 137:17		
reduction 97:10	reports 151:21	rethinking 30:15		
Reed 4:13	representation 46:5	retire 129:22		
reflects 92:22	representative 153:13	retirement 81:5		
Reform 93:20	represented 133:7	return 71:17		
refresher 80:7	representing 65:18	returns 35:6		
refreshing 31:14 66:11	reprioritized 41:9	reupped 40:3		
regard 52:3 53:17 87:16	reprioritizing 39:3	revamp 124:22		
regarding 40:10	require 58:16 74:15 128:16	revelations 79:6		
regardless 43:16 43:22 121:10 122:7	required 50:3 106:10 113:11 128:10	revenue 16:6 18:11 19:21 56:5		
region 88:6,11 111:18 133:18	requires 36:15 112:6	revenues 89:18,19		
regional 2:14 88:6 88:8	resist 55:11	review 32:13 33:9 38:14 43:12,18 44:14 45:22 62:7		
regular 51:11 95:13 113:13	resonance 47:6	reviewing 59:9		
regulatory 14:16	resonate 22:6	reviews 53:3 105:10 122:13 132:5		
rein 34:12	resonated 51:3	reward 120:8		
reinforced 51:17	resource 54:12	rewards 103:2		
reinforces 26:17	resourced 37:18	re-engineering 105:17		
reinvest 40:22	resources 2:17,21 17:3 22:22 24:6 24:18 25:3 26:11 26:12 34:10,19,19 39:22 40:22 41:18 46:11 54:14 55:2 67:14,16 82:19,20 131:4 137:7	re-scope 25:18		
relations 66:4 141:21		rich 56:15 153:7		
relationship 69:3 71:10		rid 39:4		
relationships 66:6				

SEC 10:3,7,9,12 47:5 48:15 50:20 54:3 67:5,9 69:9 69:22 70:7 72:18 73:5 85:11,22 86:3,14 91:8,11 91:12,16 92:3,14 93:4 94:14 95:20 96:7 97:6,21 98:12,16,20 100:20 101:7 105:15 116:5 123:10,18 124:6 127:12 128:2 137:19 138:7 142:16 143:6 146:19 147:10,16 148:3 154:12	119:10 134:9 135:9,17 144:4 secure 40:2 security 47:9 64:8 64:15 86:9 see 9:5 11:2 13:1 14:4 17:5,22 21:13 28:3 30:1 48:9,22 58:5 63:15 64:3 67:3 81:22 82:18,20 94:12 107:18,20 107:22 115:13 116:22 127:20 136:16 144:15 147:21 148:1 152:3,7,20,21 153:8 seen 59:11 75:12 119:2 segment 28:13,17 28:19 29:3,4,14 60:12 segments 31:17 50:6 select 11:10 selected 10:22 136:4 137:22 selection 11:3 83:11 self-study 136:2 sell 29:4,14 136:1 send 139:8 142:7 142:10 143:14,17 sending 139:14 142:8 senior 4:6 7:11 33:17 36:19 80:7 80:8,18 86:12,16 87:2,9 89:8 90:13 92:4,17 93:11 95:3 114:18 127:14 138:16 144:20 148:14,16 senior-level 15:10 sense 12:13 45:15 47:2 52:4 68:2,19	114:11 sent 30:10 134:13 separate 31:21 65:7 separation 58:10 September-Octo... 6:18 series 88:22 140:3 serious 103:7 serve 17:15 88:10 served 127:9 servers 21:5 serves 148:20 service 2:10 9:4,14 16:7 58:14 64:13 64:13,19 76:15,16 79:11 80:7,18 88:21 89:11 92:17 93:11,20 135:6 services 2:22 64:9 70:5 71:15,16 73:22 74:6,13 75:20 77:8 85:14 86:7,13 88:9 90:1 112:22 serving 93:18 SES 3:11,21 4:1,5,6 4:8,10 78:21 79:14 80:15,17,20 81:4,14 82:1,5,19 82:21 83:6 84:11 84:13 86:19,21 87:3,3,10,12 90:17 91:1,14 93:19 99:16,17 100:10 101:18 102:14 104:8,9 105:8 106:22 107:3 109:15 110:14 112:2,9,21 117:16 118:3,7 119:9,17 120:3 133:18,21 134:1,7 136:3 137:3,5 138:1,10 144:21 149:15 154:2 SESer 148:19	SESers 124:8 126:7 126:7 128:16 148:18 153:11 SEs 80:14 94:17 126:4 148:1 session 3:9 5:8 7:14 140:7 151:14 153:22 sessions 27:5,18 35:20 36:5 140:6 set 10:21 15:22 17:16 34:1 49:18 59:8 61:3 63:17 69:11 70:9 71:15 78:11 82:8 83:19 109:9 110:19 119:21 139:19 142:9 Seth 2:5 83:15 100:18 101:4 102:12 setting 48:16 50:17 108:11 109:1,1 112:16 113:9,10 seven 25:10 shame 101:21 shame/pride 102:11 Shantanu 1:19 7:20 15:17 21:21 22:17 23:2,14 26:18 28:1 41:11 55:15 59:16 71:10 126:19 Shantanu's 22:10 77:14 share 6:2 7:20 85:2 85:5 117:7 154:7 shared 19:16 20:12 26:9 76:15,16 77:8 shares 32:17 sharing 13:11 125:18 sheets 49:1 55:18 shift 52:16 shifting 50:11	SHIH 2:17 93:15 112:20 113:22 115:7 143:2 144:3 shocked 105:7 125:15,16 shocking 79:6 shoes 9:13 short 29:17 142:5 shortcuts 26:21 show 20:1 showed 55:15 shrinking 53:13 side 15:13,14 19:4 24:19,19 25:4,4 34:11,11 59:18,21 63:20 75:11 81:16 118:4,10 124:20 133:10 sign 96:9,10,13 105:11 signal 125:17 significant 28:15 45:8 95:16 97:10 98:6,9 significantly 29:18 similar 23:1,11,18 94:14 145:13 Simon 2:19 33:2 38:13 simple 18:8 108:12 simply 30:3 111:7 Simultaneous 55:7 70:13 74:2 99:5 99:15 Sioux 141:3 siren 43:1,4,11,18 45:3,21 sister 49:9 sit 147:8 sitting 45:20 51:5 situation 23:1 27:9 67:22 133:12 136:22 situationally 122:14 situations 125:2 six 62:4 105:21
--	--	---	---	---

skills 66:8,12 120:5 137:17 150:1	32:22 33:8 37:21 39:3 47:17 104:5 118:15 127:10 130:17 133:15,19 136:1,9,22	spirit 110:3 spoken 22:6 spontaneous 123:20 spontaneously 122:13 sporadic 83:8 spot 8:19 spotty 128:1 spreading 111:22 spreads 111:18 spreadsheet 56:6 sprint 16:13 24:1 62:18 sprinters 48:13 stack 96:16 staff 4:7,9 88:10 101:17 103:2 137:9,9 stakeholders 6:16 stand 76:12 96:6 standalone 98:4 standard 113:16 133:2 standardization 113:2 114:7 115:15 standardize 123:7 123:8 standardized 82:8 standards 88:16 112:5 standing 139:2 standpoint 45:10 54:13 85:6 star 8:20 start 5:8 7:7 15:21 20:4 41:8 42:20 50:11 51:11 61:7 85:9 94:9 95:12 106:7,8 132:14 started 87:13,17 126:20 140:2 starting 37:13 48:20 60:10 137:15 138:18 starts 3:4 23:3	58:20 state 16:5 45:18 71:19 statements 59:6 147:7 states 1:1 57:15 124:16 statutes 88:14,17 stay 135:11,12 step 19:14 35:2 54:17 55:5 120:17 126:17 STEPHEN 2:17 steps 120:18,19 Steve 2:1 83:22 84:7,18 112:12 Steven 5:10 80:3 stick 47:19 stickies 152:5 stood 87:5,9 143:8 stopped 36:13 storage 60:22 STP 31:4 41:19 strategic 15:2 19:2 19:6 20:20 49:14 52:10 61:14 62:6 74:5,16 115:9,11 143:9,13 150:10 strategically 8:22 16:9,17 17:10 150:2 strategies 18:2 streamlined 36:8 streamlining 32:9 street 154:16 strengths 125:10 125:18 stretch 23:7 strict 24:11 strikes 73:6 strong 9:15 79:13 117:4 strongly 24:22 struck 69:10 109:14 110:1 114:6 structure 23:3 48:8	94:21 95:1 structured 43:20 structures 28:5 struggle 14:1 50:13 50:16 74:4 struggled 13:22 54:8,11 130:16 struggling 124:7,19 student 32:14 stuff 9:1 84:6 114:20 Subcommittee 3:11 3:12 7:15,18,19 10:22 12:16 42:12 42:14 81:14,18 154:2 Subcommittees 4:1 6:2,17 7:4 subject 63:3 109:13 substitute 120:20 substitution 36:18 success 76:5 109:7 138:17 successful 105:18 127:2 131:7 succession 145:21 suck 34:10 sudden 105:22 135:20 sufficient 47:19 suggesting 147:19 sum 100:15,16 summary 21:17 summer 6:14 7:2 57:6 76:8 78:16 154:1 supervise 133:3 supervisor 96:9 126:9 supervisors 89:1 support 18:2 23:10 23:10 29:8 53:15 85:17 90:4 91:20 supported 133:21 133:22 supporting 32:18 65:21
---	---	--	---	--

87:15 90:7 119:19 121:2,7 122:5 123:3 125:10,10 125:11 126:11 145:20 149:22 150:6 three-quarters 113:21 throw 35:18 72:18 105:6 106:15 143:7 thrown 138:1 tied 20:18 113:15 tier 144:2 tiers 94:18 ties 20:19 tightly 65:22 Tim 1:22 126:3 time 3:10 4:4 6:8 6:18 8:8,17 9:7 25:5,8,10,15 29:17 30:11 33:8 36:22 48:5 49:1 49:14 53:13 55:18 55:22 56:21 59:5 69:4 72:3 74:5 81:7,9 83:1 88:12 92:7 94:20 96:12 104:13,22 106:17 107:15 112:4 115:2 116:8 117:11,22 120:10 123:21,22 124:10 127:10 131:13 132:3 134:6,19 135:3 136:2,5 137:7 139:9 140:11,14 142:5 149:16 timekeeper 55:9 times 36:21 150:13 timing 77:4 Tim's 119:16 Title 87:3 91:18 92:8 today 3:4 6:8,12 47:3 71:19 84:12	84:19 85:19 89:7 today's 6:1 told 96:2,3 101:18 129:19 ton 8:17 22:16 tons 25:21 Tony 2:13 10:7 46:21 54:7 57:1 Tony's 75:15 76:2 tool 56:11 98:4 102:1,2 106:4 120:14,19 122:7 122:21 123:1,8 146:22 147:8 149:11 tools 49:7 120:19 120:21 127:17 toothless 33:21 top 11:3 24:17 25:16,17 34:1 35:7 43:17 44:9 44:10 46:18,19 48:16 50:10 51:5 82:12 84:4 97:9 100:21 101:13 105:22 114:1 115:1 126:18 127:5 146:16 152:3,18 topic 3:14,20 7:17 13:1 47:1 56:13 56:14,15 57:5,7 57:10 67:6 78:21 81:15 83:10 126:20 150:16 topics 5:19 78:15 119:15 total 8:20 31:13 totally 51:18 touches 150:19 tough 35:2 87:21 87:21 88:2 129:19 130:7 track 11:6 58:3 tracking 63:16 traction 84:5 tradeoffs 19:13	traditionally 95:7 train 142:8 training 82:21 83:2 95:2 125:5 128:18 132:22 133:16 139:8,14 141:21 143:19 transferability 11:12 transferred 36:3 transform 86:12 transformation 30:14 52:20 transition 9:12 141:14 transparency 20:11 48:2 transparent 48:7 Treasury 89:11 90:12,14 91:1 128:12 tremendous 144:15 trial 88:15 tried 12:5,18 18:15 36:20 38:2 trillion 89:19 trouble 139:20 true 63:13 truly 100:6 trusted 18:21 try 12:19 27:15 31:6 38:16 48:12 49:15 60:19 95:1 119:20 131:11 trying 16:14,22,22 19:20,21,22 38:10 50:9 52:14,21 60:19 61:2 71:21 72:22 139:21 turn 10:19 13:9 15:16 84:16 137:9 152:10 turnover 115:1 two 3:10 6:1 9:2,9,9 9:11 14:10 34:21 35:10 38:20 48:5 51:21 54:9 56:4	60:6 63:18 78:14 81:14 84:1,15,22 85:4,6 99:21 100:21 101:13 103:8 114:19 115:17 119:19 126:11 130:10 145:20 146:5 148:20 150:22 two-year 113:5,17 type 31:10 39:15 145:13 146:16 types 12:5 39:1 typical 80:15 99:12 100:18 <hr/> U <hr/> ugly 53:9 ultimate 118:10 ultimately 62:15 112:17 114:14 unbelievable 9:4 UNC 143:15 uncertainty 14:18 unclear 14:11 underlying 108:15 understand 63:7,8 81:17,20 104:6 112:3 116:12 129:1,8,9,10 131:6 132:10 133:4 understanding 6:5 16:8 69:16 understood 72:4 under-performa... 4:17 unfortunately 58:13 unhealthy 53:7 unintentional 48:6 unique 92:19 unit 74:7 145:18 United 1:1 57:15 units 148:7 universe 28:10 University 143:15	unnecessary 36:8 unusual 100:17 upgraded 45:10 up-to-date 43:21 urgency 45:8,9 use 24:9 28:13 43:1 43:4,18 52:12,12 66:9 73:13 106:5 128:15 useful 39:11 68:1 usual 45:5 utilities 31:11 utility 39:11 utilizing 111:4 U.S 2:9 46:19 <hr/> V <hr/> VA 83:17 87:11 88:3 91:16 97:8 99:7 100:17 105:16,19 139:15 140:4,8 141:1 142:2 143:10,11 143:20 146:20 validate 36:20 valuable 69:19 84:10 value 13:19 15:7 18:3,7 19:17,17 19:19 21:15 29:9 29:10 35:16 56:7 62:9 65:20 103:4 111:12 118:21 149:4 150:6 values 121:13 149:17 151:6 variable 98:18 variance 69:17 varies 113:7 various 69:21 75:4 vary 82:17 vast 40:16 49:8 80:10 VA's 138:14 140:15 vending 68:5 vendor 57:14 59:10
---	--	---	---	--

59:18,21 60:20 61:15,21,22 62:14 62:22 63:20 64:2 69:2,3 71:8,10 78:7,9 vendors 13:7 57:20 59:3 61:1,13 62:6 62:10 65:4 71:3 75:20 77:17 vendor's 69:6 Verizon 63:5 versus 17:7 38:8 114:8 Veterans 2:4,8 86:17,18 91:17 vetted 64:14 view 5:16 7:21 16:2 18:9 40:15 85:6,7 94:10 115:22 131:17 152:4,22 viewpoint 114:6 vigilance 36:15 Virginia 89:5 virtualization 21:4 virtualized 21:8 virtually 117:2 visceral 127:1 visibility 62:21 87:8 146:21 147:2 147:12 vision 50:8 78:4,4 78:10 80:19 149:17 154:7 Vivek 2:9 8:10 9:2 9:10,14 12:10 13:9,16 15:21 19:9 35:19 36:10 40:10 42:2 43:14 53:1,10 59:15 60:2 61:20 VMO 63:6 64:1,18 69:12 71:8 76:6 77:12 78:1 voluntary 72:11 75:17	wages 102:18 wait 145:8 walk 59:12 Walter 4:13 want 6:10 7:5 10:21 11:10 16:9 17:5,7,11 18:1,4 28:22 30:16 38:19 39:13 40:20 42:4 42:11 46:21 50:22 51:2 55:9 58:5 61:5,6 62:12 63:1 63:3 65:14 73:21 77:10,17 94:2 95:12 102:20,21 103:10 106:18 109:16 110:5,7,9 110:13,15 112:15 117:3 118:8 122:4 124:14 126:2 131:17,18 136:12 136:13 137:20 142:9 143:7 151:5 154:5,7 wanted 12:8,12 21:7 87:8 88:21 120:1 wants 51:15 Washington 1:10 133:19 wasn't 150:20 watch 100:11 152:13 water 138:2 way 6:20 14:3 37:10 39:4 49:14 52:13,17 58:3 65:19 77:5 86:22 88:19 89:1 117:18 124:2 138:13 141:13 149:14 ways 67:10 weaknesses 125:10 125:12,18 weather 67:16 website 112:6 weeding 107:13	weeds 36:16 week 124:2 134:17 140:7,8 151:11 154:9,11 weekly 44:6 week-long 143:8 weight 117:7 weird 136:22 welcome 53:11 70:3 94:4 Wells 2:20 85:11 85:12,22 86:3 91:12 94:14 95:20 96:7 123:10,18 124:6 went 42:5 55:3,16 79:2,3 88:20 101:10 118:19 135:21 154:18 weren't 64:10 we'll 4:9,15,20 6:14 7:14 56:18 85:9 94:7 146:13 153:8 154:4,4,8,10,16 we're 3:8,10 4:3,12 5:11 6:7 7:4,16 8:2,10 9:11,18 11:3 13:8,10,13 20:14 25:19 31:7 31:14 32:3,4,8,14 32:17 34:14,17 37:5,5,12 38:10 41:10 45:5,6 47:12,13 48:11,19 48:20 49:1 50:14 52:14,21 53:4 54:18 56:16 57:11 62:4 66:19 68:1,4 70:19 73:8 78:18 78:21 79:14 80:12 81:3,11 85:1 88:3 89:12,13,17,20 95:12 101:9 102:5 102:7 103:6 105:6 105:16,19 107:5,6 108:11 110:20 116:19 117:11,21	119:5 123:16,18 123:19 124:7,7,18 127:1 129:6 130:17 136:19 138:18,19,20 139:2,7,8,13,20 142:3 143:16 145:7 146:4,20,22 148:14 151:12,13 153:20 we've 3:13,19 12:5 12:10,22 18:14 19:16 24:10 28:13 42:7 46:7 52:5,12 59:11 64:17 75:12 77:4,7,9 81:17 84:8,11,12 102:2 102:4 113:7 128:11,20 129:21 138:22 139:1,12 140:2 143:17 150:16 151:10 153:21 whistles 36:9 White 37:22 143:2 wide 12:20 38:11 widget 124:13 widgets 124:10,21 win 17:14 window 47:16 119:20 wonder 111:9 137:11 wonderful 121:20 wondering 93:1 116:19 words 97:17 125:5 work 7:2,15 12:4 17:20 25:4 27:19 34:17 46:17 47:4 48:1 54:13 56:3 59:6,13 61:3 62:8 63:5 66:22 76:8 76:10 77:17 78:15 83:21 97:8 109:7 117:1 119:14 122:15 123:17	127:18 130:5 135:8 136:15 139:9 153:14 worked 12:9 86:5 87:11,14 88:18 90:11 122:20 134:9 workforce 58:18 80:20 working 7:4 27:18 35:19 64:17 78:9 79:20,21 83:18 84:1 86:11 87:4 87:11 90:11 138:22 workings 63:8 works 63:10 77:4 78:1 143:11 world 52:4,5 54:19 56:1 119:21 worry 41:5,17 42:10 worst 107:7 133:14 worthy 57:5 woven 47:17 wow 49:2 wrestling 42:2 write 105:9 writing 106:19 wrong 116:20 wrote 42:22
W			X	
			X 56:10 76:17 121:10 141:20	
			Y	
			Y 121:10 year 18:13 20:2,4 57:17 61:12 81:1 83:18 87:6 88:18 89:14,19 90:2 94:22 95:9,11 96:1 97:8 98:13 103:12 104:20 105:3 107:14,16 107:20,21,22 108:1,1,19,20	

109:2,8,21,21	101:4 105:5 108:5	18 99:7	148:3
110:10,12,15	112:12 113:20	18-month 139:1	
111:3,3,16 112:17	118:2,6,13 126:15	1978 93:20	<hr/> 6 <hr/>
113:15 117:2	127:7,21 131:8		6 13:18 101:11
120:15,16 121:10	138:4 143:5,22	<hr/> 2 <hr/>	60 100:10
128:17 129:21	151:10,17 153:9	2 5:8 80:22	
131:14,20 133:13	153:19 154:14	2,000 35:4 89:12	<hr/> 7 <hr/>
134:13,13 140:1		2-1/2 9:5,15	7th 48:8
141:8	<hr/> \$ <hr/>	20 128:7 146:16	7,000 79:13 80:8
years 4:5 9:5,15	\$1 29:22	148:14 153:21	101:11
21:8 28:14 72:5	\$1.2 89:13	20% 101:9	70 99:9 141:9
79:12 80:16,17	\$10-12,000 99:11	2000 90:18	700 25:9 61:12
87:15 90:14,21	\$11 38:8 45:6	2008 97:11	80:13
91:12 97:11 103:8	\$2.5 75:8	2009 22:5	75 38:7
105:21 114:19	\$23,000 99:2	2010 100:20	
115:17 120:2	\$25 74:18	2011 1:7	<hr/> 8 <hr/>
126:12 128:7,20	\$3 38:1 89:19	21st 49:12	8 55:14
129:13 130:10	\$5.5 90:2	23,000 151:22	80 82:3 89:15 96:17
140:10,10 146:5	\$500,000 29:22	25 36:22 61:13 62:5	800 25:7
yesterday 74:9	\$600 57:18	80:16	87 101:2,5 106:13
97:15 119:22	\$724 61:12	250 91:3	107:4,18 108:5
your's 40:5 55:17	\$80 57:17 59:19		<hr/> 9 <hr/>
	62:1 70:11,14	<hr/> 3 <hr/>	9:00 1:11 3:9
<hr/> Z <hr/>	74:13	3 5:9,16 88:6	9:02 3:2
Z 121:10		3X 22:16	90 24:18 46:1 91:4
zero 12:5 98:22	<hr/> 1 <hr/>	30 44:7 88:18 108:7	96:17 100:21
100:15,16	1 3:8 89:14	143:14	103:15 106:13
zeroed 6:3	1:00 4:16	360 128:10 132:5	90s 51:9
Zients 1:11,14 3:3	10 44:6 78:18 80:17	134:19 139:16	90,000 85:15
4:19 5:2,4,7 7:1	90:14	360s 139:10	
8:13 11:18,21	10-minute 78:19,20	37 31:21 97:8	
21:19 35:17 36:2	10:10 79:3	38 87:3 91:18 92:8	
37:7,16 40:4,7	10:20 78:20		
42:11,16 46:20	10:23 79:4	<hr/> 4 <hr/>	
50:19 54:1,4 55:8	100 9:3 87:3 140:6	4 7:13	
55:13 56:12 57:11	151:21 152:7,15	40 100:12,13 108:7	
65:9 67:2,8 68:20	152:18	148:6	
69:20 70:4,8,19	11 57:11,13	400 87:2,3 147:11	
71:13 72:8,17	11:15 3:9 4:11	148:2	
73:4 74:17 76:6	11:28 154:19	428 1:9	
76:21 77:3,9	12 31:4	45 46:2	
78:12 79:5 83:13	13 61:18		
85:20 86:2 90:16	14 80:4 122:13	<hr/> 5 <hr/>	
90:19,22 91:10	152:16	5 10:20 101:11	
92:12 93:22 96:15	15 44:7 80:6	50 22:15 35:19,21	
96:21 99:6,17,20	150 126:5	36:21 38:8 148:6	
100:1,5,8,16	1650 1:10	500 85:18 126:4	
	17 1:7	127:4 147:11	

C E R T I F I C A T E

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: The President's Management Advisory
Board

Before: Jeff Zients, Chairman

Date: 06-17-11

Place: Washington, DC

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under
my direction; further, that said transcript is a
true and accurate record of the proceedings.



Court Reporter

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701