



Information Resources Management Working Team (IRMWT)

Meeting Minutes
San Diego, CA
January 6-8, 2004



Attendees

Members:

- Andrea Olson, USFWS Member
- Cam Johnson, USFS Research Member
- David Potter, BIA Member
- Gladys Grabtree, NPS Member
- Jim Stires, NWCG Liaison
- Mike Funston, USFS Member
- Philip Murphy, Western States Rep
- Shari Shetler, BLM Member and Chair
- Steve Westin, Eastern States Rep

PMO:

- Al Borup, Application Architect
- Allen Deitz, Repository Manager
- Barry Mathias, PMO Lead
- Judy Crosby, Data Architect

Project Managers:

- George Conley, IQCS
- Andy Gray, ICBS
- Dan Keller, FPA

- John Noneman, FPA
- Jon Skeels, ROSS

Business Leads:

- Gardner Ferry, FPA
- Mary A Szymoniak, I-Suite Stabilization
- Neal Hitchcock, ROSS, ICBS
- Rick Jensen, IQCS
- Tory Majors, Fire Code

Advisors:

- Dan Stoltz, USDA OCIO
- Dan Rivers, BLM SCO
- Doug Stephen, NPS
- Elyse Turkeltaub, DOI OWFC
- Dave Goldemberg, CDF
- Joe Frost, GTG
- John Gebhard, BLM
- Gary Bowers, BLM
- Mike Barrowcliff, USFS
- Susan Goodman, GTG Chair

State Representation for NWFEASG – National Wildfire Enterprise Architecture Steering Group

- Impossible to find one person to represent all of the states
- If both departments come to consensus, it should not be changed by state participation
- The states must sit at the table and participate, especially where the federal architecture touches the states
- IRMWT needs to make a recommendation to NWCG
- Recommendation that CDF be a technical advisor to the NWFEASG to represent the states
 - A conference call once a month
 - Meeting in March

Decision: IRMWT recommends NASF representation on the NWFEASG. The IRMWT recommends that CDF take on that role.

GTG Update

- Distributed copy of notes from D
- gis.nwcg.gov – posted on the web
- landsat – dysfunctional
- landsat 5 has enough energy left for about 2 years
- We rely on landsat data for BAER – data is used
- USGS owns the satellite and does not plan to replace it
- Landsat 8 is on the drawing board, but funding is questionable
- Satellite is actually launched by NASA
- This is a totally political issue

ACTION(s): GTG has the lead to develop an issue paper.
IRMWT will take this forward to NWCG.

- Susan feels that LANDFIRE should go forward based on what she heard and saw at the fire congress.

ACTION(s): Send recommendation that the GIS Training Advisory Group be affiliated with the Training Working Team. In the interim, that GTAG will be a workgroup under the GTG.

- The GTG is really doing some great active work.
- These are truly issues that need to be addressed.
- They should not be discouraged from continuing to make progress.
- If there is an “end”, then a project charter is appropriate. If not, then an organizational charter is appropriate.

ACTION(s): GTG will work with the PMO to identify the type of charter required and get it to the IRMWT for approval at the March meeting.

ACTION(s): Judy sent a response to the GTG data standard issue paper to Susan. She will get a response from the GTG

Post Deployment Review

Recommend that the Post Deployment Review form developed by the SCO be adopted as a NWCG standard for post deployment reviews.

- Mike F. supports this as a standard. Sent this to the other Portfolio Managers and others within the USFS as an example.
- Process needed here.
- Scalability needed.
- Invite the PMO's participation when we initiate this process with one of the projects.
- Mike thinks that USDA should take this and adopt it as their own.
- The follow up that is needed for the USFS is a non-negative response from the agency CIO.
- Dan Rivers indicated that this document has gone to OMB and GAO for review. Getting good feedback from them.
- Need to go into this with clear objectives
- Concerns that there may be negative impacts
- Advisable to be conducted by an independent group

ACTION(s): Comments due to Barry by Friday, February 13, 2004 to be presented at the March IRMWT meeting

ACTION(s): Shari, send out the SCO's Post Deployment Review Document to the IRMWT

Project Issues

- IQCS may be at risk related to not having the resources available for implementation and beyond.
- Directors want a presentation related to a System Management Organization
- May be more efficient to have a DBA available for multiple projects as well as system administrator.
- There needs a more business oriented focus on some of these activities
- Enterprise System Management after the traditional System Administration – the box and database administrator – Oracle.
- May need additional definition of the different roles and responsibilities.

ACTION(s): Barry suggests that we hear what the project's organizations are going to look like from the project managers.

ACTION(s): Get project managers together to help define the system management organization that they need.

- Interim ROSS/IQCS interface is on track.
- The long term solution needs to be addressed.
- Dan Rivers suggests that a long term repeatable process to determine where the need is and who should fund it.
- We have the process for system interconnectivity. It just needs to be used.
- Need to establish communication between the different projects
- Would like to see a more formalized process

ACTION(s): PMO will lead, Gary Bowers and Mike Funston will participate in a system and project manager meeting to make recommendations to the IRMWT.

DisasterHelp.gov

- Does not appear that it would be suitable to replace the existing NWCG website
- Does have some capabilities that we could take advantage of
 - Working Team
 - Posting Minutes, etc.
- Lose public visibility that you need
- You don't have the ability to create a page and then post it, you have to already have the site
- It is appropriate as a portal
- Cannot replace the existing infrastructure
- You would not have to have the storage
- FTP capability would be available via DisasterHelp.gov, but does not provide anonymous FTP
- The anonymous FTP capability may not be available from a wildland fire community page
- This would not be an alternate host site, but you can point to a site from a community page
- FRAMES – explore what those capabilities could provide
- It may be that DisasterHelp.gov may be able to provide something to FRAMES
- Is there a potential that DisasterHelp.gov may go away some day? It will probably be there as long as DHS exists.
- We need some kind of guarantees. Perhaps in the capacity of membership on a steering committee.
- We would have to be recognized as a major stakeholder.
- Is there any intranet capability? Only indication so far is that it is only internet.
- Looking for a recommendation from the IRMWT to go to NWCG to appropriately use DisasterHelp.gov
- Allen with Greg Gollberg and Tom Wordell will meet with DisasterHelp.gov
- Allen recommends that we can establish an IRMWT test for using DisasterHelp.gov

ACTION(s): Allen will have a decision strategy for determining the appropriate use of DisasterHelp.gov by the March meeting if he has not already met with the DHS folks.

- Need to look at the message that is being communicated by going to the DisasterHelp.gov
- “Disaster” has a real negative connotation. Does not fit very well with some of the efforts going on such as education.
- The focus is moving away from response. The focus is preparedness, training, education, community assistance, etc.
- Incident Operations stuff may be more appropriate.
- You can mask the URL
- There may be other requirements that the fire community has that we are not looking at right now to utilize DisasterHelp.gov or other providers.

- A lot of working teams may have other requirements that they would want satisfied.

ACTION(s): Get any additional questions to Allen that you would like to have answered.

Systems Management

- Could not get a handle around the scope
 - NWCG Only
 - All interagency
 - Agency specific also
 - Help Desk
- Suggest that we start with help desk support
- Need to have an articulated vision
- At NIFC, some collocated personnel who are responsible for help desk functions for level I and level II for some applications
- Documented with service level agreements
 - Will describe who is responsible for what
 - Who is going to pay for what

ACTION(s): Table existing task group. Mike Barrowcliff and John Gebhard will look at help desk strategy between BLM and USFS. Discuss the consolidation of resources to provide help desk support at NIFC. This will be input into the bigger NWCG system management issue.

IBA

Charter change: Data Stewardship

- change accepted by IRMWT.

Budget Increase due to C&A Costs:

ACTION(s): IRMWT acknowledges that the cost has increased due to additional C&A requirements. Additional estimated cost of \$290,000 will be covered by the FS. The request for additional funding is not an IRMWT decision; it requires a decision by the managing agency: USFS.

Budget Cut:

Information only; no action required from IRMWT.

ACTION(s): IRMWT will acknowledge receipt of letter. Non-decisional item.

Scope Clarification:

Phase 1 – Isuite Stabilization and Support

- The project team should develop NWCG standards, should not be expected to buy licenses, provide training, etc.

ACTION(s):

- Provide comments to Shari by 1/20/2004. Otherwise, IRMWT will respond that the IBA team's interpretation is correct.
- Send IBA charter documents to Susan Goodman.

Business Case Requirements Change Request:

- Change deliverable to remove "OMB Exhibit 300"
- Initially, FS agreed to the charter but no longer agrees with verbiage
- 5 requirements (interagency, \$, financial, ...) for major application
- Interagency automatically makes it a major application – this is a DOI standard, not USFS
- Exhibit 300 is required by BLM, USDA does not.
- NWCG projects should meet the most stringent requirements.
- If it is a funding issue, it should go to NWCG for decision
- It is not a funding issue, it is a principle, best practices – it is a conflict between IRM/CPIC requirements
- If not paid for by BLM, does it require 300? OMB requires 300 for "Interagency" projects
- ICBS does not intend to develop a 300
- BLM will not be able to utilize the system if a 300 is not completed
- Need to establish a repeatable process for applying OMB requirements to NWCG projects.
 - The charter covers this and is the proper place to cover it.

Vote: Accept Changes?
No.

ACTION(s):

- Response to IBA team: Delivery of an OMB 300 is in the charter. IRMWT is not relieving you of that requirement. Project team can respond with funding issues. (Shari)
- DOI and USDA CIOs need to get together to resolve differences in CPIC requirements for interagency systems. (Elyse – agenda item at next meeting)
- Memo to ICBS Reengineering team - OMB 300 is required in order for BLM to use it; therefore, it must be completed. (Shari)

LANDFIRE

ACTION(s): Elevate the issue of sponsorship, technical oversight to NWCG

- GTG has been identified as an advisory group to the LANDFIRE project
- Prototype is going well
- 1.5 years into a 3 year prototype.
- Looks like a 5 - 6 year project, however the term appointments are only up to 4 years.

- They are going through WFLC and developed a 300B
- Don't have an official start date
- Don't have an official project manager and business lead
-

ACTION(s): Cam requests involvement from the IRMWT in preparing the Project Charter

ACTION(s): The PMO will help develop the Charter

Project Management Methodologies and CPIC

- View is that we do not have a clear definition of what this group does
 - ABC/M – Activity Based Cost Management
 - PART – Program Assessment Rating Tool
 - PMS – Performance Management System
 - ITIM – IT investment Management
 - IPC – Interiors Performance Challenge
 - CPIC – Capital Planning/Investment Control
 - Project Sponsor
 - Stakeholder
 - FEAPMO – Federal Enterprise Architecture PMO
 - BRM – Business Reference Model
 - SRM – Service Reference Model
 - TRM – Technical Reference Model
 - DRM – Data Reference Model
 - PRM – Performance Reference Model
 - Balanced Scorecard
 - Exhibit 300/53 Roll-Up
 - OMB/GAO Guidelines
 - Start with Business Needs
 - Then measure if there is an IT solution
 - Come out with requirements
 - Identify performance measures to show that the IT solution met the business need
 - Project is initiated
 - Fire CIO reviews it (prescreen)
 - If it meets the business needs (strategic objectives of the agency), it is goes on, otherwise, it is rejected.
 - Goes to Review Board (ITIB)
 - If it meets the business needs, it goes on, otherwise, it is rejected.
 - Goes to OWFC Review Board
 - If it meets the business needs, it goes on, otherwise, it is rejected.
 - Goes to the Department
-

Additional information from Mike Funston re: OMB Exhibit 300

- Investment board made the decisions to exclude all projects where the life cycle cost is under \$250K
- Exclude all data projects
- USFS has both a 1/3 reduction in the overall IT budget as well as the ongoing competitive sourcing
- LANDFIRE is a data system – therefore there is no OMB 300
- It is in the USFS's best interest to not report what we do not have to report
- USFS has no intent to increase the number of major systems
- There is no requirement from either the USFS or the States to develop a 300
- USFS will only cover the cost of the 300's for FPA and ROSS
- Alternatives to consider:
 - Does DOI really require a 300 for LANDFIRE?
 - IBA – only 10% of the equipment is BLM. Can BLM use USFS equipment on incidents?
 - Does DOI want to provide resources to the projects to develop and support the 300 requirements?
 - If USFS cannot afford to provide 300's, what is NWCG's priority regarding which systems to keep or drop?
 - Would IQCS pay the extra \$ to meet USDA's OMB 300 standards?
 - Contractor in place – Karen Beck – SAIC
 - What is the cost?
 - If the USFS is the managing partner then all DOI is required to do is a 300-1

ACTION(s): Barry – Need to identify what is and what is not a project.
Mike and Elyse will get together and see what they can come up with
Shari – Need to inform NWCG of this issue
USFS project managers will come up with cost requirements to develop 300's up to BLM standards and report back to this group.

Thursday Session:

The following are notes from developing the presentation material for the NWCG meeting.

CPIC Discussion

- Need for a common CPIC approach for interagency applications
- Current department/agency interpretation and implementation are in conflict (examples)
 - 1 slide that compares/contrasts DOI and USDA CPIC Processes
 - DOI requires an OMB 300 for all projects.... USDA and FS do not (This is an absolute business requirement before DOI implementation)
 - DOI has adopted OMB guidelines as written.... USDA and FS have not
 - Impacts to interdepartmental/interagency projects include:
 - Dual reporting requirements with conflicting directions
 - Additional cost

- Additional time
 - Additional complexity
 - Implementation problems
- Impacts
 - \$\$
 - Duplication of effort
 - Project “on hold”
 - Ability to implement
 - Dissolution of the partnership
- Solution
 - Beyond IRMWT
 - Letter from NWCG to WFLC
 - Direction from WFLIC to Departments to align on CPIC process
- The IRMWT endorses the DOI CPIC process as a good model for a common process.
- We are unable to use this due to the current conflicting interpretations and implementations.

IRMWT Membership

See Mike’s notes

The PMO has agreed to take notes at the IRMWT meetings

ACTION(s): Send out draft NWCG agenda to the IRMWT membership

NWCG Meeting:

ACTION(S): Shari, ask that Budget discussion occur after the IRMWT presentations.

IRMWT Presentation

Order of presentations:

1. IRMWT Overview - Shari
Time: 30/10
2. Strategic Direction for NWCG project selection and sponsorship (add DOI scatter chart)
Time: 30/10
 - a. NWCG IRM Strategic Plan (draft)
 - i. Handout: (Mike’s selection criteria for NWCG Project)
 - ii. Handout: PMO Application Inventory
3. CPIC - Barry
Time: 10/5
4. Wildland Fire Enterprise Architecture
 - a. GAO Report (NWCG IRM Strategy) – Mike F.
Time: 15/5

b. EA Presentation

Time: 20/15

- i. Overview (EA 101) - Judy
- ii. Steering Group Charter - Judy
- iii. Handout: Charter & Plan - Judy
(BRM illustration that it will give them the information they need, not from application inventory)

5. Fire Statistics – Gladys (backup – Shari)

Time: 5/10

ACTION(s): Judy will send Shari the scatter diagram and criteria to be distributed to the IRMWT

ACTION(s): Finalize “prototype” for presentation to NWCG (distribute for review)

ACTION(s): Agenda item to develop “final” criteria at the next meeting

ACTION(s): Barry will develop a one pager summarizing the major differences between the DOI and USDA CPIC processes (with Mike/Elyse/Dan)