



SOCIAL SECURITY
Office of Systems

March 31, 2011

The Honorable Sam Johnson
Chairman, Subcommittee on
Social Security
Committee on Ways and Means
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mr. Johnson:

Commissioner Astrue has asked me to respond to your March 10, 2011 letter requesting additional information to complete the record for the hearing held on February 11, 2011, *Managing Costs and Mitigating Delays in the Building of Social Security's New National Computer Center*. Enclosed is our response to your questions.

I hope this information is helpful. If we may be of further assistance to you or your staff, please do not hesitate to contact Scott Frey, Deputy Commissioner for Legislation and Congressional Affairs, at (202) 358-6030.

I am sending a similar letter to Representative Jeff Denham.

Sincerely,

G. Kelly Croft
Deputy Commissioner

Enclosure

MAJORITY QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD

- 1. What specific controls has the SSA built into the process to prevent further delays and stay within budget for the National Support Center?**

We regularly confer with the General Services Administration (GSA) on each step of the building process. Our principal control to ensure timely performance within budget is to thoroughly research and consider the requirements for the new facility, and complete those tasks on time. However, please note that GSA is responsible for timely project completion. We defer to GSA for further description of the controls it has established or plans to establish for the project.

- 2. How much of the *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009* funding has been spent to date? What additional funds will be spent before the end of the fiscal year and for what purpose?**

As of March 18, 2011, we have obligated \$385,881,201 and outlaid \$2,954,741. GSA will report separately those outlays it will spend during the rest of the fiscal year (FY) and its purpose. We also intend to spend additional funds on Information Technology (IT) activities in FY 2011. We hope to have precise information on the IT expenditures in the next 60 days.

- 3. The Commissioner has an advisory group of information technology experts known as the Future Systems Technology Advisory Panel. What recommendation has the panel made regarding the building of the new data support center and what actions has the SSA taken in response?**

At the Commissioner's request, the Future Systems Technology Advisory Panel (FSTAP) conducted a high-level review of our plans to replace the National Computer Center. FSTAP examined the physical and technological considerations related to the project, as well as the planning assumptions for workload capacity and risk management. In January 2010, FSTAP issued a report of its findings, entitled *Data Center Migration*. (See attachment 1)

Some of FSTAP's major recommendations for minimizing operational risks until the National Support Center (NSC) is complete included developing robust contingency plans in the event of future construction delays, utilizing virtualization at the National Computer Center, and installing new applications and equipment at the Second Support Center.

FSTAP also made recommendations for the NSC itself, such as utilizing "green" data center technologies only where there are tangible energy savings or substantial cost avoidance opportunities.

We generally concurred with FSTAP's comments, observations, and recommendations. On May 4, 2010, we provided our feedback to the FSTAP report at a meeting open to the public in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. For more information, please find attached the full FSTAP report and minutes from the May 4, 2010 meeting. These documents are also publicly accessible on the Internet at www.ssa.gov/fstap. (See attachment 2)

4. In his written statement, Mr. Foley from the General Services Administration referenced future expansions of the SSA’s Woodlawn campus. What expansion is he referring to? Please provide all planning documents that detail these plans.

Over the years, GSA has worked with us to develop and periodically update a master housing plan for the Woodlawn campus. The current plan is outdated. In consultation with us, GSA is currently in the process of developing a new master housing plan. We would be glad to provide the Subcommittees the new master housing plan when it is complete.

5. In his testimony before the Subcommittee on Social Security in 2009, Mr. Gallagher included a chart outlining disaster recovery capability and timeline. Please provide a similar updated chart with as much detail as possible.

NCC Disaster Recovery Capability Timeline
(Updated March 2011)

Timeframe	Location	Data Restore	Data Loss	All Critical Systems	Ability to Recover All Non-Critical Systems	Capacity for Daily Transactions
Pre - 2010	SunGard	7 days	1-3 days	No	No	25-30%
1/2010	SSC	7 days	1-3 days	Yes	No	100%
Current	SSC	4 days ¹	1-3 days	Yes	Yes ³	100%
10/2012	SSC	24 hours ²	1 hour or less	Yes	Yes ³	100%

¹ The 4-day recovery time applies to critical systems only.

² The 24-hour recovery time applies to critical systems only.

³ Presently, we have the data center infrastructure (computing space, electrical power, and HVAC) to recover all non-critical systems and process 100% of their daily transactions but we do not have the necessary IT equipment. Procurement and installation of the necessary IT equipment to support non-critical systems will begin after critical systems are up and running.

Attachments (2)

Attachment 1 - FSTAP report, entitled *Data Center Migration*

Attachment 2 - FSTAP report and minutes from the May 4, 2010 meeting

FUTURE SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY PANEL (FSTAP)
“DATA CENTER MIGRATION”
Report
January 2010

Introduction

The Commissioner of Social Security asked the panel to conduct a high level review of the agency’s plans to replace the current National Computer Center located on the main campus in Baltimore, Maryland. He asked that the panel examine the physical, and technological, considerations, as well as the planning assumptions for workload capacity and risk management. This report is a result of briefings made to the FSTAP members by SSA, GSA, and contractor personnel involved in the planning stage of the project; a review of reports and discussions on anticipated workload trends; and deliberations of the FSTAP subcommittee on the Data Center Migration, and the review and approval by the members of the full FSTAP panel.

The panel makes the following recommendations based on their knowledge, expertise and experience in the areas of information technology, large scale project management planning and oversight and data center construction.

Commissioner’s Concerns with Existing NCC Architecture

The existing NCC is nearing 30 years in age. Although state of the art at the time, today this facility is severely limited as to the amount of power that can be distributed to each floor.

SSA received Congressional funding (\$500 million) to construct a new National Computer Center (NCC) and in partnership with GSA, SSA is planning to construct it and have it operational by 2014. However, with current workload growth rates SSA projects it will run out of electrical distribution capacity in approximately 2012. Unless SSA takes some remedial action, SSA will be unable to add more computer processing capacity to handle their increasing workloads.

Commissioner’s Scope of Recommendations to be addressed by the FSTAP

1. Other than building renovations to upgrade the existing NCC, what other recommendations and viable options can the panel offer as to how the agency can remain operational and efficiently support the increased IT demands during the period from 2012 until 2014? How can SSA bridge the gap and minimize the risks until the new building is operational?
2. What recommendations can the panel offer so that SSA avoids mistakes other organizations have made in planning for a data center replacement? What are the best strategies and options to make a computer center flexible to accommodate future technologies, new business processes, and workload growth?

3. If the panel has additional recommendations they would like to make that are not included in items 1 and 2, the Commissioner asked that the panel provide them as well.

FSTAP's Observations and Suggestions Regarding the NCC

1. How can SSA bridge the gap and minimize the risks until the new building is operational - Recommendations to maintain operability and efficiency from 2012 - 2014.

- The development of robust contingency plans is essential. This contingency planning should encompass the potential for delays in the construction of the new facility and ensure that no existing programs or planned programs are impaired during the gap from 2012-2014, or while the agency is migrating from the current NCC to the new NCC. The agency should assess the possible pitfalls, delays and identify “worst-case scenarios” with the appropriate mitigation actions to be taken for each. The agency should have these recovery plans in place should any one of the possibilities occur and be ready to execute them.
- The adoption of increased virtual computing environments to save space and power are strongly encouraged.
- New applications and/or equipment should be installed in the Durham Center where possible.
- The agency should examine their applications portfolio with the goal of determining potential candidates for retirement or outsourcing.
- Create a master project plan for the data center initiative. This plan should reflect critical path milestones needed to meet dependencies of all the other major IT initiatives underway concurrent with the data center project.

2. What recommendations can the panel offer so that SSA avoids mistakes other organizations have made in planning for data center replacement?

Recommendations based on Best Practices – Panel Experience

- “Cloud computing” is useful for certain business applications, however, at this state we do not believe the agency should deploy any mission-critical applications to a public “cloud computing” platform.
- We encourage the agency to examine a Software-as-a-Service offering for its email needs.
- Data Center Design and Construction
 - a. Plan for hot/cold aisles and “in-row” water cooling.
 - b. Eliminate disk storage in servers; storage area networks are more robust and space efficient.

- “Green” Data Center Technologies
 - a. These should be considered only where there are tangible energy savings or substantial cost avoidance opportunities.
 - i. Consider the use of cheaper power sources that may be available in some geographic locations.
 - ii. Utilize Plate heat exchangers to exploit more efficient use of ambient air temperature.
- New Data Center Operating Concepts
 - a. Consider having an extremely limited staff in the center. We recommend the provision of adequate space for emergency IT staff that may need to locate there in the event a disaster situation occurs.
 - b. The location of the command center for the new NCC can be housed at a different geographic location. This can provide security and labor cost benefits. Remote access technologies are sufficiently mature for this to be undertaken.

3. Additional Recommendations for the New Data Center Initiative and IT

- Strengthen overall plans
 - a. Establish one organizational owner responsible for the execution of all the IT activities associated with this project.
 - b. Align the overall strategic plan for the agency with the different IT activities that are in process or contemplated.
 - c. The agency’s business plan should ensure that each of the IT programs supports and delivers the capabilities the agency plans to provide to the public and other stakeholders
 - d. Identify a single technology executive in the agency who is accountable for alignment and execution of all of the IT functions.
 - e. Factor in plans to expand and increase capacity for growth, to process larger workloads, and advances in technology.
 - f. Ensure continuity-of-funding remains once the project begins. Determine how the agency will handle and plan for cost overruns.
 - g. Align all government organizations involved in the new NCC construction project activities with the agency’s overall business goals. Determine and agree on who is responsible for each aspect of the project, schedule, and outcome.
 - h. Plan for potential loss of key personnel and staff retirement by creating succession plans for a smooth transition without any gaps in knowledge.
 - i. Constantly oversee contract expirations and key vendor renegotiations which may impede the schedule, change resources or increase costs

- Assessing costs and estimates
 - a. Examine benchmark data to determine how the planned data center costs compare to similar Tier 3, Level 4/5 security data centers elsewhere in government. Also consider comparisons to comparable private sector projects.
 - b. Reconcile project cost differences between the Lockheed-Martin and GSA studies. These should be normalized for:
 - i. Additional security measures
 - ii. “Buy American”
 - iii. Use of union labor sources
 - iv. LEEDS certification
 - c. Strive to accelerate land acquisition to capitalize on current “buyers market”.
 - d. The new location should take into account factors such as:
 - i. sources for power and telecommunications infrastructure
 - ii. Avoidance of I-95 and DC metro area traffic congestion
 - iii. Distance limitations associated with certain technology components (e.g., synchronous disk mirroring, etc.)
 - iv. Power needs of the future may exceed the 13,200v feeder capacity currently under consideration

3. *Long-Range Issues for Data Center Planning*

- Selecting a viable number of enterprise Data Centers
 - a. Reduce the need for space by exporting some “compartmentalize-able” applications. Buy a managed service application where possible, instead of adding equipment capacity at the NCC. Data privacy is a crucial factor to the applicability of this approach.
 - b. Develop the Data Center with a clear link between the agency’s business plan and growth drivers.
 - c. A “hot-site” may still apply in multi-data center environments.
- Life span of Data Center
 - a. The lifecycle of the new NCC should encompass a horizon of 20+ years.
 - b. The upgrade or expansion of computer equipment should have as one of its goals the reduction of floor space, and the use of this space capacity for other purposes.
- The decision making consideration for future technology should consider 5 years as the normal limit of usable forecasts.
 - a. The agency should work with key vendors to obtain non-disclosure briefings on their product and service roadmaps.

Future Systems Technology Advisory Panel

May 4, 2010
Hotel Palomar
117 South 17th St, Philadelphia, PA 19103

Minutes

1. The Future Systems Technology Advisory Panel held its seventh meeting on May 4, 2010 from 9:00 A.M. to 4:00 P.M. in the Burnham Ballroom of the Hotel Palomar in Philadelphia, PA . The meeting was open to the public from 9:00 A.M. to 4:00 P.M..
2. Attendees included:
 - a. Future Systems Technology Advisory Panel members
 - **Alan Balutis**, Panel Chair and Director of the North American Public Sector, Cisco Systems' Business Solutions Group
 - **Phil Becker**, Associate Commissioner for the Office of Telecommunications and Systems Operations, Social Security Administration
 - **Andy Buckler**, Special Advisor to the Deputy Commissioner Services & Enforcement, Internal Revenue Service
 - **Gregory E. Buoncontri**, Executive Vice President and CIO, Pitney Bowes, Inc.
 - **John D. Halamka**, MD, MS, Harvard University, CIO, Harvard Medical School, CIO, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center. Dr. Halamka was available by telephone only.
 - **Blaise Heltai**, Founder, Genus2 Technology
 - **Henry C. Lucas, Jr.**, Department Chair and Smith Professor of Information Systems, University of Maryland
 - **David McClure**, Associate Administrator, Citizen Services and Communications, U.S. General Services Administration
 - **CJ Moses**, Senior Manager, Amazon Web Services..
 - **Frank Reeder**, Founder, The Reeder Group.
 - **Steve Sullivan**, Vice President of Global Technology Services, T. Rowe Price Group, Inc.
 - b. Social Security Administration Officials
 - **Michael J. Astrue**, Commissioner of Social Security
 - **Frank Baitman**, Chief Information Officer
 - **Betsy Bake**, Associate Commissioner, Office of Facilities Management
 - **Jim Borland**, Associate Commissioner, Office of Electronic Service and Strategic Information, Office of Disability Adjudication and Review
 - **Kelly Croft**, Deputy Commissioner, Office of Systems.
 - **Ephraim Feig**, Associate Chief Information Officer for Vision and Strategy

- **David Foster**, Assistant Deputy Commissioner for Quality Performance
 - **Michael Gallagher**, Deputy Commissioner for Budget, Finance, and Management.
 - **Eric Kressman**, Regional Chief Counsel, Philadelphia
 - **William Martinez**, Deputy to the Special Advisor for Health Information Technology
 - **Greg Pace**, Deputy Chief Information Officer
 - **Ron Raborg**, Deputy Commissioner for Quality Performance
 - **Debbi Russell**, Associate Commissioner, Office of Automation Support
- c. Social Security Administration Staff
- **Ginny Skiest** for Dianne Rose, Designated Federal Officer (DFO)
 - **Devin Fensterheim**, Hardy-Apfel IT Fellow
- d. Members of the Public who presented oral or written statements
- None
- e. Other members of the public
- Several members of the public attended the meeting

3. Description of matters:

Tuesday, May 4, 2010

- a. Meeting Kick-Off: Alan Balutis, panel Chairman, made welcoming remarks. Panel members and SSA officials introduced themselves.

Ginny Skiest introduced herself and members of the panel support staff. She discussed the meeting agenda, completed action items, and documents provided to the Panel.

The panel unanimously approved the meeting minutes of the sixth panel meeting.

- b. Data Center Migration Report and Data Center Trends and Best Practices Discussion – Agency Feedback was presented by Frank Baitman, Kelly Croft, Michael Gallagher, and Betsy Bake.

The panel heard the agency response to the Panel's report on data migration. The agency generally concurred with the panel's comments, observations, and recommendations.

The panel heard, as background information, that SSA's existing data center will soon need replacement, and that there is a need to continue operations at the existing data center through the anticipated production date of the new center in 2015. The agency is retrofitting the existing center to bridge this gap, for instance, by purchasing spare parts for the uninterrupted power supply system. . There is also a need for additional data consumption; an additional servers are added each month, resulting in power delivery becoming an issue.

The panel heard that the agency strongly agrees with the panel's recommendation for hardware virtualization, and it heard that the agency has an active virtualization plan. The agency also agreed with the panel's recommendation that hardware refreshment be focused primarily at the second site while refreshment at the existing NCC is minimized.

The agency indicated that the panel's recommendation for application portfolio management could warrant future requests to the Panel. SSA maintains over 500 production legacy applications, and has an existing process to manage the portfolio and to evaluate business value and maintenance costs. The panel heard that the process of developing the portfolio and preventing migration of unneeded applications is expected to be an ongoing process and that it may be an area in which the agency may seek future support. The panel also heard about the revamped IT investment process which produced SITAR (Strategic IT Assessment and Review). SITAR was designed to develop more strategic IT investment, and it divides IT investment among eight Portfolios Executives across the enterprise. The panel heard that analysis indicates that over 40% of IT spending is used on maintenance activity. The agency said that this is an area of concern that the SITAR process will be used to address.

The panel heard the agency concurs with the recommendation to limit the number of staff in the new data center. Mr. Buoncontri indicated that the agency utilize remote access to the data center. Mr. Moses concurred, indicating that legacy systems may require a higher onsite workforce, that office space is much less expensive than data center space, and that data centers are generally unmanned except when access to hardware is needed. Mr. Buoncontri recommended that the agency choose a staffing target and adhere to that limit.

The panel heard the agency's response to observations from the panel regarding the silo nature of the business approach. This response indicated that the agency endeavors, through the SITAR process, to move from a silo to a matrix management approach in order to increase accountability. The panel heard that the SITAR process involves making investments that span the enterprise and represent the correct investments for the entire agency.

The agency updated the panel on the data center acquisition and reported that the agency is currently engaged with GSA to build a program of requirements for award of the contract. The agency indicated that the recommendation that one person be in charge has great appeal. The agency reported that SSA and GSA meet quarterly with Congressional staff, and that SSA takes questions and responds quickly to Congressional inquiries.

The agency reported initial plans to move certain workloads to the cloud to realize the resulting process efficiency. E-mail was suggested as a potential initial cloud-based application. The panel heard that the agency would consider placing additional applications in the cloud, but that doing so requires a baseline for risk assessment. Several panel members offered feedback, indicating that while responsibility is transferred, risk is not, and that due diligence in selecting a provider is necessary.

Mr. Gallagher indicated that power consumption is a concern, and asked the panel for additional recommendations. The panel discussed mechanisms for reducing power consumption, including running the data center at a higher temperature, placement of hardware in separate rooms in contrast to a large open space, and reducing unnecessary code. Mr. Buoncontri offered to coordinate further discussion on this topic.

- c. Data Center Construction – A First-hand Experience was presented by panel member Steve Sullivan.

Mr. Sullivan presented on T. Rowe Price's experiences in the construction of a data center for disaster recovery of about 350 applications. The data center is a 60,000 square-foot facility including two separate 10,000 square-foot data centers.

The panel heard that T. Rowe Price was experiencing several of the issues in the disaster recovery space as SSA is experiencing in its primary space, including power supply and data center space issues. The panel heard that outsourcing and co-location were considered as possibilities; the costs for co-location or keeping the data center inside were about equal, and the firm decided to maintain control.

The panel heard that the selected location met the distance and infrastructure requirements.

The panel heard that T. Rowe Price engaged in a nine-month site selection process. Verizon was contracted to evaluate the site and to evaluate risks. The site was ultimately selected due to available infrastructure, low risk of natural or human disasters, carrier coverage, and proximity to the production site.

The panel saw a series of photographs documenting the construction of the data center between July, 2009 and April, 2010.

- d. Re-Imagining SSA Subcommittee Report was presented by panel member Henry Lucas.

Dr. Lucas presented the findings of the Re-Imagining SSA Subcommittee. The subcommittee used a scenario from SSA on agency processes, and attempted to imagine that process in a different environment. The subcommittee attempted to develop a sufficiently radical report and to push frontiers, to effect observable change.

The subcommittee recommended that online customer service model be the primary interaction channel for most of the US population. The panel heard that where there are many fewer points of face-to-face contact, such transition requires a major change in the organization itself. The subcommittee recommended moving away from paradigm where we serve people by meeting face-to-face, and presented the objective that 90% of all service transactions be completed electronically by 2015. Mr. Buckler indicated that IRS electronic filing, introduced in 1990, is currently about 70% and expressed concern that the 90% goal is too high. Commissioner Astrue indicated that there is something to be said for a difficult goal, and that currently 80% of people are using electronic wage reporting, and direct

deposit transactions may increase significantly with upcoming treasury initiatives. The Commissioner indicated that the agency is likely to make major transactions accessible on line and then set objectives that are aggressive but achievable. The agency is also engaged in cost effective advertising campaigns to advertise suites of services that encourage family members to help those needing access to SSA services.

Mr. Reeder expressed fundamental concern speaking of service delivery as though there is an expectation that people come to SSA as opposed to reaching out to the customer. Mr. Reeder indicated that it is counter-intuitive that people would come to SSA for a once-in-a-lifetime transaction, and argued that it would not be possible to exceed 20% without utilizing different channels including the nation's financial infrastructure.

Dr. Lucas reported that the use of HIT is very promising in reducing the length of time to process a disability claim. The panel learned earlier that MetLife uses a program to automatically determine disability, and reviews only the denials. Commissioner Astrue said that electronic records are problematic since they produce a significant number of false positives from 2.2 million filings; for instance, the text "We ruled out ALS" might be recorded erroneously as ALS.

Dr. Lucas recommended that all applications need to be accessible on cell phones. Mr. Astrue said that some third world nations are issuing payment through cell phones as an alternative for those who don't have traditional bank accounts.

Dr. Lucas proposed the implementation of a physical one-stop shop for government services, similar to the Australian CentreLink, which could use video kiosks and involve multiple state and federal agencies. Mr. Buckler indicated that the costs to maintain video kiosks are excessive, and instead organizations typically place workstations in walk-in office, encouraging customers to use web-based services. IRS has worked through volunteer organizations for tax preparation, and can consider such organizations as an extension of the workforce; and that while kiosks in public areas are appealing, physical security, maintenance, telecommunications, and information security issues tend to make this approach infeasible. Commissioner Astrue also noted that kiosks tend to not be used, and indicated as an example an unused kiosk observed in a Seattle field office waiting room that had not been used for several weeks. Dr. Lucas suggested that the waiting-room population might be self-selected, and that the agency may have skimmed out the kiosk-using population.

The panel heard discussion of disruptive future technologies. Dr. Lucas reported that a single breakthrough to eliminate the backlog was unlikely, and suggested the move to the Internet for as many transactions as possible and to utilize third parties.

Mr. Balutis suggested some minor changes and additional research on the use of mobile devices. Mr. Heltai and Mr. Balutis volunteered to provide assistance. Contingent on these final modifications, the panel unanimously accepted the report.

- e. Legacy Systems Subcommittee Report was presented by panel member Andy Buckler.

Mr. Buckler provided a summary of the subcommittee report. The subcommittee discussed the transfer from MADAM to DB2, and found mainframe based DB2 to be a reasonable technology solution.

The subcommittee suggested that the Agency bring in outside help to ensure the robustness of the data model. The subcommittee also made suggestions around the planning process in aligning the business strategy with application process, and found the SITAR process to be consistent with these recommendations.

The Panel approved the report without objection.

- f. Privacy, Authentication, and Fraud Detection Subcommittee Update was presented by panel member Frank Reeder.

Mr. Reeder provided a summary of the draft subcommittee report. The subcommittee reported that the ability to move from face-to-face to electronic access is important, and that the agency is constrained by two sets of concerns: the necessary authentication methods through the National Institute of Science and Technology, and a very low tolerance for risk from both a financial and reputational standpoint.

The panel heard that the Agency has developed an authentication strategy. The agency is in the process of implementing a solution for Level-3 authentication. The subcommittee found that the strategy, based on its observations, is sound.

Mr. Reeder reported that the subcommittee's main concern was from a reputational risk perspective, and recommended a more extensive consultation with affected groups from a privacy and usability perspective.

The panel heard that the agency had expressed an interest in having the views of the Panel on alternative means to provide Level-3 credentials. Mr. Reeder asked the panel for additional thoughts on balancing the need for authentication while simultaneously achieving the agency objectives for electronic services usage.

Mr. Moses expressed concern that the proposed use of credit card validation would subject the Agency to payment card industry security standard certification, and recommended against its use.

Mr. Balutis inquired about earlier efforts to implement a government-wide PKI solution. Mr. McClure reported that this effort is ongoing that there is some consensus around a federal PKI standard.

The panel discussed whether to appoint panel members with experience and background in this area. Mr. Baitman agreed to work with the panel to identify the exact nature of the request.

The subcommittee agreed to finalize the report and present a final copy to the panel at the next quarterly meeting.

- g. Marketing Online Services to a Spanish-Speaking Population – Follow-up was presented by Devin Fensterheim, Hardy-Apfel IT Fellow, SSA.

The panel heard an historical perspective of this issue and a discussion of guidelines and vision as well as an assessment of operational drivers and future challenges. The panel also heard discussion of the agency's Retirement Estimator, the use of social media, the flexibility of e-services infrastructure.

- h. Disability Backlog and HIT Subcommittee Update was presented by panel members Blaise Heltai and John Halamka.

Mr. Heltai and Dr. Halamka presented an update on the merged Disability Backlog and HIT subcommittee. The panel heard that the committee has moved toward broader process and governance issues. The panel heard that a paper will be delivered at the next quarterly meeting.

- i. Agency-Wide Strategic Planning Status Update was presented by Frank Baitman and Ephraim Feig.

Mr. Baitman discussed the agency's strategic planning process and the schedule for completion of the Agency Strategic Plan. The panel heard that the plan, whose targeted completion date is December 2010, will envision human resources, infrastructure and technology needs over a 5 to 10 year period and that it will include achievable, grand challenges as well as the use of metrics and short-term goals.

Mr. Feig discussed taking action in an evolutionary way to make substantial gains in service delivery while reducing the cost of operations. He recommended clearly identifiable goals and practical methods. He said that an outreach program will begin immediately, stakeholders will be engaged, and that regional meetings and online forums will be held.

Mr. Balutis recommended that the strategic planning process not be schedule driven and that it should be created in a very open, collaborative, communicative way that includes customers, constituents, citizens and other interested parties.

Mr. McClure recommended that strategic planning be done in a quick rapid cycle and that the results be inculcated in the business planning and governance processes. He added that the agency should be rapidly re-engaged.

The panel discussed development of a series of goals and Mr. Baitman asked for the panel's advice on metrics which can be used to drive the strategic vision.

- j. New Subcommittee Discussion

The panel created a subcommittee specifically designated to work with the Office of the Chief Information Officer in the area of strategic planning. The panel also created a joint subcommittee combining governance and policy with innovation and open government. Members were selected for both of these subcommittees.

4. Certification

I, Dianne Rose, Designated Federal Official for the Future Systems Technology Advisory Panel ("FSTAP Panel") hereby certify that the above minutes accurately describe the seventh meeting of the FSTAP panel, held on May 4, 2010 from 9: 00 A.M. to 4: 00 P.M. in the Burnham Ballroom of the Hotel Palomar, 117 South St., Philadelphia PA 19103.

Dianne Rose 

08/05/2010