

SGTP eTravel Reference Guide

Table of Contents

GSA's eTravel Process: Status Report as of 6/28/2004

Travel Services Solution (TSS) Contract Update

SGTP/GSA eTravel Background (6/3/04 letter)

ETravel/TSS Cost Evaluation Model

eTravel Migration Process

1. eTravel Migration Plan—Table of Contents
2. Agency Migration Team (Contact Information)
3. Migration Checklist
4. Supplier Checklist to be Resolved
5. eTS Vendor Selection Criteria (SGTP Recommendation)



Update on Federal Government's eTravel Initiative

Society of Government Travel Professionals
National Travel Forum, June 28, 2004

+ What is eTS?

- eTravel Service for Civilian agencies (not Defense Travel System - DTS)
- eTravel Program Management Office (PMO) Vision: To deliver a unified, simplified service that delivers a cost-effective travel experience, supports excellent management, and results in superior customer satisfaction.
- Provided by 3 vendors: Northrop Grumman Mission Systems (NGMS), Electronic Data Systems (EDS), and Carlson Wagonlit Government Travel (CWGT)

+ What exactly is "end to end" eTravel?

- Request for Proposal at: <http://www.eps.gov/spg/GSA/FSS/FBG/FBGT-CD-030001-N/listing.html>
- Current scope: pre-trip authorization (order writer), book hotel / rental car/ transportation (on-line booking engine), post-trip voucher (expense reporting system)
- Possible future aspects of Program: business data warehouse, City Pair Program, Federal Premier Lodging Program (FPLP), FSS lodging multiple award schedule (MAS) for non-FPLP cities, car rental contract, travel card contract, DTS, relocation

+ Who are the players?

- GSA is the managing agency, and eTravel PMO is funded by the Federal Supply Service (FSS)
- PMO reports to FSS, Office of Management and Budget (eGov), and GSA eGov PMO (Lew Sanford)
- eTS Program Manager is Timothy Burke, 703-872-8600
- eTS Deputy Program Manager is Frank Robinson
- eTS Contracting Officer is Lisa Maguire, 703-872-8600, lisa.maguire@gsa.gov
- EDS Program Manager: Steve Vetter, 703-736-8532, steve.vetter@eds.com
- NGMS Program Manager: Leo Hergenroeder, 703-968-2382, leo.hergenroeder@ngc.com
- CWGT Program Manager: Dan Lee. POC is Kay Anderson-Hager, 210-805-3739, kanderson2@carlson.com.

+ Program update

- Contracts awarded November, 2003
- Federal Travel Regulations mandates that agencies place task order by end of 2004 with full migration by end of FY06
- Initial Operating Capability (pilot) testing at FAA in Oklahoma *completed*
- Independent Validation & Verification (functionality) testing *completed*
- Certification and Accreditation (security) *completed*
- Full Operating Capability (FOC) *completed*
- Now that FOC has been achieved, agencies can place Task Orders
- First agency to place task order was Treasury

+ Integration with other government-wide travel programs via on-line booking engines

- City Pair Program fares are indicated and travelers must select or provide rationale
- FPLP properties are displayed first
- Surface Deployment and Distribution Command (SDDC) government-wide rental car rates listed

+ Impact on business environment still unfolding. Some predictions if eTS succeeds...

- Lodging: FPLP properties will gain substantial edge. MAS properties may reap similar benefits.
- Airlines: City Pair fares usage increased.
- Car rental: Low cost vendors may gain market share.
- Travel agencies: TSS contract holders that align with eTS vendors should retain market share.
- Federal agencies: on-line booking will increase significantly with goal of 70% government-wide.

+ For more information

- eTravel PMO: http://egov.gsa.gov/QuickPlace/e-gov/PageLibrary85256D72003ED2F8.nsf/h_Toc/FEA5867D5B93438485256D72003EED2F/?OpenDocument
- eTravel PMO Communications lead: Robyn Soldner, 703-872-8595, etravel@gsa.gov
- mLINQS, LLC: greg_mcintyre@mLINQS.com

###

About mLINQS, LLC

mLINQS, a Veteran-owned small business, was founded in 2003 to support the federal eTravel Service (eTS) reinvention initiative. The company is dedicated to providing federal agencies with professional implementation and consulting services as they transition to eTS. mLINQS also develops software applications designed to streamline certain additional travel management needs that are unique to the federal government, and is available on GSA Schedule.

UPDATE on GSA's TRAVEL SERVICES SOLUTION (TSS) CONTRACT

What is Travel Services Solution (TSS)?

- A comprehensive contracting vehicle that encompasses a variety of distinct commercial travel services in support of the Government travel needs.
- Goal is to provide agencies with flexible, streamlined acquisition tools to meet travel needs, obtain quality services at the best value, reduce acquisition time, meet regulatory requirements, and achieve socio-economic goals.
- TSS is intended to complement eTravel Service.
- Includes full range of travel agency services (but not an end-to-end system), travel consulting services.

How does TSS work?

- Two Special Item Number (SIN)-599-1 is Travel Consultant Services; SIN 599-2 is Travel Agency Services/Travel Management Center Services; SIN 599-1000 is Other Value Added Services.
- SIN 599-2 Travel Agent Services/Travel Management Services have core pricing that includes certain core requirements-fees based upon "transaction" which is defined as an itinerary, not ticket; services outside the core are value added services.
- Fees on TSS include an IFF (Industrial Funding Fee) paid to GSA of \$1.50 per transaction-value added services include an IFF of 0.75% of the contractor's price.
- Any contractor may submit a proposal to be included on the schedule at any time-process takes 3-4 months.
- Any federal agency, including DoD, state and local governments may choose to use TSS.
- Interested agency requests task order from approved TSS contractors.
- Potential 20 year contract.

Who are the players?

- GSA's Federal Supply Service is the managing agency for TSS.
- Becky Koses, FSS, is the contracting officer. Rebecca.koses@gsa.gov; T: 703.605.5606; GSA/Special Program Branch (FBGS); 1941 Jeff Davis Highway #812; Arlington, VA 22202. With Becky, Dan Frank is eT vendor management; Lisa Maguire is their eTravel Contracting Officer.
- 20 travel agencies and 3 travel consultants are currently on the schedule. 9 travel agents are pending (4 large/5 small). See GSA.gov website, go to GSA eSchedules library.



Society Of Government Travel Professionals

6935 Wisconsin Avenue, #200 ★ Bethesda, MD 20815
301/654-8595 ★ FAX 301/654-6663 ★ E-Mail: govtvlmkt@aol.com

The National Forum Of The \$20 Billion Government Travel Market®

June 3, 2004

The Honorable Stephen A. Perry
Administrator
U.S. General Services Administration
18th & F St., NW #6137
Washington, DC 20405

The Honorable Hector V. Barreto
Administrator
U.S. Small Business Administration
409 Third St., SW
Washington, DC 20416

RE: Opportunities for small business travel agencies under the E-Travel Services and Travel Services Solution Contracts

Dear Mr. Perry and Mr. Barreto:

The U.S. General Services Administration currently is promoting two different procurement initiatives that involve travel services. The first is the eTravel Services (eTS) contract which was awarded to three large prime contractors (EDS, Northrop Grumman Mission Services, Carlson Wagonlit Government Travel, Inc.) to provide an end-to-end travel management system to federal agencies subject to the federal travel regulations. The second is the Travel Services Solution (TSS) schedule contract, which is a typical federal supply schedule contract for which eligible and qualified contractors are approved. From either of these two contracts, federal agencies may select a contractor to provide travel services.

However, from the perspective of travel agencies who currently qualify as small businesses under existing criteria of the Small Business Administration (SBA), both initiatives may have a significant negative impact upon these small businesses. We will outline these impacts below.

Our comments on these GSA programs are offered on behalf of the small business travel agencies who are members of our Association – the Society of Government Travel Professionals (SGTP). SGTP is the national, non-profit forum for all components of the \$28 billion government travel market, founded in 1983. Our members represent government and all travel industry supplier categories. Our members are very active in the Federal procurement arena. More than 25 of our travel agency members would be considered as small businesses under SBA's current size standards. During our May 2004 Board meeting, a resolution was passed requesting that we call GSA, SBA, and other interested parties' attention to the concerns of our small business travel agency members. That is the purpose of this letter.

Under current contracts for travel services in the Federal Government arena, small businesses have significant opportunities to directly compete for prime contracts that are restricted to small businesses. Under GSA's Master Contract for Travel Services, administered by Region 9, which does not expire until mid-2005, GSA has set aside specific task order opportunities for small businesses only. This system has worked well for all parties. In addition, small businesses may compete for any unrestricted task orders on the same terms and conditions as mid-sized to large businesses. Within the Department of Defense, the Defense Travel System Program Office has established

unique small business set asides. Likewise under the Defense Travel System contracts, small businesses may compete with mid-sized to large competitors essentially on the same terms and conditions. Unfortunately, this is not the case under GSA's two new travel services initiatives—eTS and TSS.

Under eTS, the prime contractor is only one of the three large businesses awarded the prime contract by GSA. Under eTS, there are no opportunities set aside for small businesses—a problem heightened by the fact that GSA has mandated through amendment of the Federal Travel Regulations that all federal agencies must migrate to this system, and to one of the three large prime contractors, by 2006. If this mandate is enforced, small businesses will have little or no opportunity to be prime contractors in their own name. Furthermore, even though GSA has requested subcontracting plans from the three large prime contractors, there is no requirement that any of the subcontracting opportunities be reserved for the travel services portion of the contract. At least with respect to one of the prime contractors under eTS, there is no opportunity for a travel agency to be a first tier subcontractor as that prime contractor requires its travel services be procured through its first tier subcontractor.

Under TSS, unlike the current GSA Master Contract which is similar to a schedule contract, there are no specific opportunities set aside for small businesses. Small businesses must compete along with mid-sized to large businesses for any travel opportunities. However, any opportunities under TSS will be limited only to those federal agencies that are not required to participate in eTS—which is the GSA-mandated solution. This further limits any small business opportunities. While GSA Program officials have stated that a federal agency may select its travel service provider from the TSS schedule and its "system" under the eTS schedule, and therefore opportunities "may" be available, there are several obstacles that exist in doing so which affect all travel agencies—but likely more so with regard to small businesses.

The first obstacle is the higher cost to the federal agency of selecting a travel agency off the TSS schedule to work with one of the systems under eTS. There are two cost disadvantages under GSA's two travel initiatives:

1. The first cost differential is entirely within GSA's control. It is the Industrial Funding Fee of \$1.50 imposed on each ticketed transaction serviced by a TSS contractor. GSA requires an IFF of \$1.50 for each ticketed transaction under TSS. GSA will already collect an IFF of \$3.50 on each invoice processed under the eTS system. Collecting another IFF for travel services under TSS only serves to place the travel agencies on the TSS schedule, the only means by which small businesses may directly compete as a prime contractor for federal agency business, at a significant cost disadvantage. Why would a federal agency consider paying a higher cost for identical services?
2. The second cost differential is the higher fees that each of the three prime contractors impose upon the federal agency to select a contractor from the TSS schedule. Each of the prime contractors was permitted by GSA to charge higher fees to "plug and play" with other travel agencies not under contract with the prime contractor. For example, if a federal agency chooses Northrop Grumman Missions Systems (NGMS) under eTS to provide both the online system and fulfillment of that online reservation, the federal agency would pay only \$5.25. However, if the federal agency chose NGMS under eTS for the online system, but also chose a small business travel agency to provide its travel services, the federal agency would pay a fee of \$4.75 to NGMS for use of its online system, a fee ranging from \$9.75 to \$13.50 (the online fulfillment fees from small business travel agencies currently available for viewing on GSA's website for TSS) and an IFF of \$1.50 to GSA. Nor is this cost disparity limited to NGMS, as the other two eTS large businesses have similar fees in place. The cost disparity places small business travel agencies at a significant cost disadvantage even though GSA had once promoted the eTS contract as a simple plug and play that would not impact small businesses.

Another obstacle for small businesses is the timing involved in eTS and TSS for selection of contractors. Again, this obstacle is within the control of GSA. Most importantly, GSA is urging federal agencies to select an eTS prime

contractor as soon as possible even before GSA has processed all TSS proposals from small businesses that have been pending for months. This backlog virtually eliminates these small business travel agencies from even being considered by any of the federal agencies. GSA is publicizing the fact that eight federal agencies that collectively represent twenty-five percent of the government travel business are in line to select one of the eTS contractors by the end of June and be up and running by September 2004. (See Federal Times, May 24, 2004, page 7). Some of these federal agencies are serviced in part by small business travel agencies. However, since many travel agencies still have their TSS proposals pending before GSA, they will not be eligible to be selected by any federal agency interested in doing so. One small business travel agency originally submitted its TSS proposal in September 2003 and is still being processed eight months later.

It is our understanding that one federal agency, the Department of Transportation, is actively seeking to contract directly with small business travel agencies to service part of its travel budget under eTS. However, many qualified agencies are still awaiting GSA's processing of their TSS submissions. Our members applaud DOT's efforts in this regard, but such efforts need GSA's active encouragement and support.

Small business travel agencies would have a better opportunity if GSA would reexamine its own policies and requirements under eTS and TSS. We urge GSA to take the following actions:

1. GSA should delay any vendor selection under the eTS schedule until such time as all pending applications from small business travel agencies for the TSS schedule have been processed. We are not asking that they be approved as we understand that certain offerors may not be approved and that is normal in the course of such schedules.
2. Prior to any selection of an eTS vendor, GSA should promote to federal agencies that they may indeed select travel agencies, including small business travel agencies to provide travel services, as an alternative to using the eTS named vendors. While GSA's Office of Governmentwide Policy has promoted eTS and its Office of Federal Supply Service has promoted the TSS schedule, these two offices have not coordinated their efforts to maximize opportunities for small businesses.
3. GSA should review its contracting processes under both eTS and TSS to determine if any opportunities could be set aside for small business travel agencies as GSA itself has done in the past, and which DOD is doing under its Defense Travel System initiative.
4. GSA should reexamine its need for an IFF of \$1.50 on each ticketed transaction if a federal agency is using separate vendors under both eTS (under which there is an IFF of \$3.50 per voucher) and TSS. Does GSA really require a collection of \$5.00 on each transaction (under eTS there will be a voucher involved in every transaction and on most travel requests, a ticket as well) as part of its industrial funding fee? We understand that the IFF is required to offset GSA's costs of providing its services, but we believe based in part upon recent GAO audit reports that the amounts GSA is collecting may be significantly higher than its actual costs (See i.e., GAO Report 02-734, Contract Management – Interagency Contract Fees Need More Oversight, July 2002). We ask that GSA re-examine whether the IFF amounts here are in fact consistent with its costs.
5. We ask that GSA re-examine whether the cost differentials imposed by the three eTS prime contractors for using a travel agency selected from the TSS schedule are an appropriate reflection of actual additional costs in working with other vendors.

We have included The Honorable Hector V. Barreto, Administrator, U.S. Small Business Administration, on this letter so that any recommendations his agency may have as to how GSA can maximize the opportunities for small business travel agencies can be shared with GSA. We likewise are providing a copy of this letter to the various

The Honorable Stephen A. Perry, US GSA
The Honorable Hector V. Barreto, US SBA
June 3, 2004
Page 4

Congressional committees for any additional oversight or inquiries that may be appropriate: House Appropriations, Government Reform and Small Business; and, Senate Budget, Governmental Affairs, and Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

We are available to meet with you or other appropriate agency officials for any additional information or discussion. I can be reached at my office number 703-276-2038.

As added information, I am forwarding this letter in my capacity as President of SGTP on behalf of our small business travel agencies. In my business capacity, I am with a large business with arrangements with one of the eTS teams.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "M/Stec".

Marc Stec,
President, SGTP

eTS/TSS Cost Evaluation Model: Vendor _____

	TSS Option	eTS Option	Variance by Vendor	Comments
FIXED COSTS				
Development Costs to Federal Agency				
Federal Data System				
Multi-Agency Data Systems				
Vendor Systems				
Sub Total				
Installation Costs to Federal				
Facilities Modifications				
Racks/Containers				
Sub Total				
Deployment Costs to Federal				
Training				
Client Software Licenses				
Management				
Sub Total				
Other Fixed Costs				
TOTAL FIXED COSTS				
ANTICIPATED ANNUAL COSTS				
Vendor Costs				
Contract Fees				
Awards				

Federal Costs				
Anticipated Domestic Tickets				
Average Cost Per Ticket				
International Ticket Costs				
Support Personnel				
License				
Other Annual Costs				
TOTAL ANNUAL COSTS				
EXPECTED RISKS				
Vendor Failure				
Cost to Mitigate				
Likelihood				
Technical Obsolescence				
Cost to Mitigate				
Likelihood				
New Federal Mandates				
Cost to Mitigate				
Likelihood				
Other Expected Risks				
TOTAL RISK COST EXPECTED				
TOTAL EXPECTED COSTS				

Source: SGTP 7/19/04

Date: _____ By: _____

SGTP's recommendation is for Federal agencies to do concurrent task orders under TSS and eTS, for a full cost comparison.

US Federal Agency eTravel Migration Plan

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

Purpose
Scope
Background
eTS Timetable

ETS MIGRATION STRUCTURE

Roles and Responsibilities

Executive Sponsor
Federal Migration Team
Migration Manager
Federal Contracting Officer
Federal Travel Manager*
Federal TMC*
Technical/Integration Lead
Business Process Reengineering
(BPR) Lead
Change Management Lead
Security Lead
Superusers Lead
Testing Liaison
Help Desk Lead
Superusers Group

ETS MIGRATION PROCESS

Planning Phase

Allocation of Federal Resources
Vendor Selection
Project Controls
Quality Management
Reporting Structure/Requirements
Federal Migration Schedule
Performance Measures
Financial Management
Information Management

Business Process Reengineering (BPR)

Change Management

Preparation Phase

Business Process Reengineering (BPR)

Finalize To-Be Processes

Revise Travel Policies

Needs Analysis

Technology

Security Requirements

Configuration

Infrastructure Assessment

Integration Approach

Testing

Migration Readiness Checklist

Migration Phase

Operational Readiness Review (ORR)

ETS Phase I

Full Training Rollout

Integration

Migration Checklist

Feedback Phase

Post Migration Review

Performance Measures

Lessons Learned

ETS Enhancements

SUPPLEMENTAL PLANS

Change Management

Planning Phase

Communications

Training

Preparation Phase

Training Development/Preparation

Risk Management

**These two positions currently are not included in a Migration Plan. SGTP strongly recommends they be included in all team activities.*

AGENCY MIGRATION CONTACT INFORMATION

(ROLE/NAME/PHONE/E-MAIL)

Executive Sponsor

Migration Manager

Contracting Officer

Agency Travel Manager*

Current TMC*

Technical and Integration Leads

Business Process Reengineering

Change Management Lead

Security Lead

Super Users Lead

Testing Liaisons

Help Desk Lead

Commission Liaison

****These two positions currently are not included in a Migration Plan. SGTP strongly recommends they be included in all team activities.***

MIGRATION CHECKLIST

On-Going Activities

The activities below have been identified as regular, on-going Project Management tasks that will need to be completed throughout the lifecycle of the migration to eTS.

Ongoing Activities across Phases & Reference Materials

Review and complete Migration Checklist activities
Prepare monthly status reports
Submit the status reports to eTS PMO for review
Monitor project risks

Phase: Planning

It should be noted that during the migration, tasks may overlap within phases. Additionally, multiple tasks may go on simultaneously based on the structure of the Agency's Migration Team.

Planning Steps

Review eTS Planning Worksheets
Review costs and allocate Agency funding
Identify and mobilize members of the Agency Migration Team
 Migration Manager
 Agency Contracting Lead
 Agency Travel Manager*
 Agency's TMC*
 Technical/Integration Lead
 Business Process Reengineering Lead
 Testing Liaison
 Change Management Lead
 Security Lead
 Help Desk Lead
 Superusers Lead
Review vendor information
Prepare and submit RFQ (for eTS and TSS)**
View eTS Vendor demos (SGTP recommends your current TMC fully participate, to provide input).
Select vendor solution
Place task order
Discuss and select Agency-wide migration approach
Develop draft Migration Plan
Determine project controls
Draft project schedule
Document current travel business processes and associated job responsibilities

****These two positions currently are not included in a Migration Plan.. SGTP strongly recommends they be included in all team activities.***

***** SGTP recommends concurrent task orders to obtain competitive bidding***

Review travel business policies
Draft/finalize Communications Approach
Draft/finalize Training Approach
Submit Migration Plan
Migration Plan approved
Update Migration Checklist

Phase: Preparation

It should be noted that during the migration, tasks may overlap within phases. Additionally, multiple tasks may go on simultaneously based on the structure of the Agency's Migration Team

Preparation Steps

Finalize "to be" travel business processes and procedures
Conduct gap analysis between "as is" and "to be" processes
Review vendor training curriculum
Perform Training gap analysis
Develop/prepare for training
Develop and implement communications vehicles
Assess security requirement
Determine configuration elements
Assess infrastructure
Establish integration approach
Establish testing requirements/procedures
Conduct training for Migration Team and Superusers
Continue to update Migration Checklist

Phase: Migration

It should be noted that, during the migration, tasks may overlap within phases. Additionally, multiple tasks may go on simultaneously based on the structure of the Agency's Migration Team.

Migration Steps

Conduct Operational Readiness Review (ORR)
Complete Phase 1 migration
Conduct Training
Implement Integration Plan
Update Migration Plan (if necessary)
Continue to update Migration Checklist

Phase: Feedback

It should be noted that during the migration, tasks may overlap within phases. Additionally, multiple tasks may go on simultaneously based on the structure of the Agency's Migration Team.

Feedback Steps

Develop Lessons Learned deliverable
Discuss enhancements to eTS solution and process
Discuss maintenance of eTS solution
Conduct Post Migration Review
Transition Agency Migration Team
Complete Migration Checklist

BACKGROUND

The agency has X travel requirements expending \$X a year on actual travel related expenses and \$Z on its current eTravel system out of a \$ZZ million dollar annual budget.

eTS TIMELINE

The General Services Administration (GSA) amended the Federal Travel Regulation (FTR) by requiring, with specified exceptions, the use of the common Government-wide, end-to-end eTS. The Office of Governmentwide Policy (OGP) developed a rule to the FTR that provides for federal agencies to begin migrating to eTS in accordance with the schedule below.

1. Migration Plans submitted to the eTravel PMO no later than March 31, 2004
2. Migration to eTS to begin no later than December 31, 2004
3. Migration to eTS completed no later than September 30, 2006

The tasks and activities described in this document are consistent with the dates set forth in the rule.

ETS Migration Process

The four phases of migration are planning, preparation, migration, and feedback.

Federal will use the eTravel PMO "Migration Readiness Checklist" modified as appropriate for Federal unique environment.

Vendor Selection

For each alternative Federal will prepare a process flow diagram, a data flow diagram, and a cost model. Once the most cost-effective solution has been identified, Federal will provide further details to enhance its Migration Plan based upon the selected course of action.

Performance Measures

Milestone/Time Frame

Develop Performance Measures

Cost-Benefit Analysis

Vendor Contacts Begin

Vendor Contacts End

Travel Team Makes Recommendation to Executive Sponsor

Executive Sponsor Issues Recommendation to Administrator

Administrator Review Ends
Task Order Signed
System Implementation

These measures will vary depending on whether the Administrator requests a waiver to continue with its existing end to end eTravel system, joins with the multi-agency effort, or selects an eTS vendor.

Financial Management

Financial controls should be determined by contract type and vehicle. The Migration Manager will establish a cost management mechanism that will ensure the eTS migration project stays within the budget specified by the Executive Sponsor.

Revise Travel Policies

The gap analysis will also allow Federal to verify which Federal specific policies and standard operating procedures (SOPs) to revise. The BPR Lead should make recommended changes to policies to Federal's policy office and follow protocol to get the identified policies amended.

Technology

Although eTS will not be a traditional system implementation for the Federal, there are some technical aspects to complete. Those portions of the eTS system which are accessed by Federal employees will for the most part consist of web pages, which will be viewed with existing PC workstations. Most sensitive data processing will be handled off-site, either by the eTS vendor or multi-agency financial systems. Federal will nonetheless examine their respective requirements, for security, configuration, and infrastructure. Federal Migration Team personnel will design the integration approach, and determine testing requirements.

Configuration

The Federal Migration Team will work with the eTS vendor to address its plan to configure any system tables needed for eTS. The information needed for configuration will include documentation of:

Employee data-Determine the timing for loading employees into the database and the mechanism (i.e., will the employees be batch-loaded and/or loaded individually as they go on travel).

Organization structure-Determine which organizations will be identified in the database and mapping employees to each organization.

Security levels-Determine which employees will be able to view other personnel data, create documents for other travelers, view/edit administrative tables, edit routing lists.

Workflow-Determine approach for routing lists:

- How many approvals are required for each document type
- Whether they will allow multiple approvers at each step in routing list
- Whether travelers will be able to dictate part of the entire routing list

Expense information-Determine budget object class codes, expense categories, and expense types-how these levels of expense would map to each other.

Accounting code information-Determine which accounting codes need to be loaded into the system and how they relate to the organizational structure.

Testing

Additional testing of eTS by Federal will include:

- An integration test
- An end-to-end functional test
- Random sampling of output for accuracy

Risk Management

It is possible that there will be some risk involved in the project. Clearly the biggest risk for an agency of this size is that the cost of project management and documentation will consume the entire budget for the project. The first step in the Federal risk management plan will therefore be to ensure that the project avoids the development of needless bureaucracy and that it produces only that documentation which will actively assist in successful project completion.

A risk is defined as the probability of an event, situation, or condition occurring that might adversely impact the historical accounting project relative to resources, schedule, and quality. A **risk** is different from an **issue** in that a risk has a high degree of uncertainty and lack of clarity, while an issue is a condition or circumstance that is clearly understood, but a needed decision has not been made so that required action can be taken. The Migration Team will identify, track, and resolve issues separately from risks.

Risk identification systematically finds the factors driving project risk including cost, schedule, and programmatic factors. Risks are identified through review of project documentation and discussions with the Executive Sponsor, Migration Manager, vendor, and subject matter experts.

Risk Assessment and Analysis consists of determining the likelihood the risk will occur, and the impact the risk occurrence will have on the success of the project.

Risk Response uses the information from analyzing risk to develop and implement strategies to minimize or eliminate the impact of identified risks on the successful outcome of the project. Four basic strategies are available to respond to project risks-avoidance, mitigation, acceptance, and transference.

- **Avoidance**-altering the scope of the project to eliminate conditions that “trigger” the risk event.
- **Mitigation**-developing and implementing plans to reduce the likelihood of occurrence or the impact.
- **Acceptance**-merely acknowledging the existence of a risk that will be monitored, but no response provided. This response is typically used when there are no other appropriate responses.
- **Transference**-shifting the risk impact and burden of action to another party.

Risk Monitoring and Control involves the monitoring of identified risks, identification of new risks, and assessment of risk control activities taken. It also includes developing contingency plans in case risk events occur despite previous strategies to minimize or eliminate.

Risk Communication requires communicating the results of risk management activities to the Migration Manager and other stakeholders.

The Migration Team weekly meeting agenda should include a discussion on potential and current risks identified to the eTS Migration. The Migration Manager should appoint a Migration Team member to the duty of tracking and documenting all risks.

RISK INFORMATION TEMPLATE

Detailed Risk Information

Risk Identification

Risk Number:

Risk Title:

Description of Risk-including the project objective that is affected:

Risk Analysis

Category:

Likelihood of Occurrence:

Impact of Occurrence:

Time Span:

Risk Response

Risk Response (e.g., acceptance, avoidance, mitigation, transference):

Action to be taken:

Objective:

Contingency Action:

Trigger Point:

Terminus:

Sample Process and Data Flows, and Cost Models

Sample Travel Ticketing System Process Flows

Sample Travel Ticketing System Data Flows, Before and After
(to be expanded to document, one each, all before and after scenarios)

GSA's eTRAVEL SOLUTION

Unresolved Supplier Concerns-NDTA Car Rental Committee

- **Pricing**-Inaccurate rates in the availability/display screen. "Penny ending rates" not allowed by SDDC; also, no rates above ceiling. Liability issues for vendor incorrect loading.
- **Formatting and display of rates**-Some vendors allow only 3 RACs on 1st screen (where 80% of bookings are made). Adopt GDS system of one line per RAC.
- **Listing of non-SDDS approved RACs in the rate/availability display**-This is wrong, and may expose travelers/government to substantial liability.
- **Payment from car rental companies to eTS providers**-There should be no preferred program.
- **eTravel awards notification**-eTravel PMO needs to provide timelines and schedules to suppliers. Post this on a user-friendly website within 5 days of award, (linked to SGTP's!). List the Implementation Schedule; users; and agency travel volume. Update at every task order award.
- **In conclusion**-GSA/eTravel must work with the travel industry as partners. GSA needs to address these key issues in a timely fashion.

As of 6/17/2004

eTS VENDOR SELECTION CRITERIA (SGTP Draft)

- **Agency background.**
 - Describe Government agency's scope and size of eTravel requirements: System access/security; password procedures; firewall issues; system administration procedures; workflow of entire process; business rules management; standardization required of federal agency processes; finance/accounting strings; reports required; implementation costs; training costs.

TRAVEL SERVICE REQUIREMENTS

- **Solution designed and built for federal traveler policies and practices.**
 - Already in production.
 - What percentage of your travel can the system process as self service.
 - No touch, light touch, full touch requirements of agency.
- **Solution should have a good past performance.**
- **Solution should be extremely flexible.**
 - Quickly tailors to meet unique agency needs.
 - Can use multiple on-line booking engines.
 - Uses wide variety of desktop infrastructure.
 - Completely web-based service.
- **Can eTS vendor accommodate any Travel Agency (Travel Management Centers or TMCs).**
 - Are there any costs of accommodation to support TMCs through the TSS contract? (The eTS solution should work with the TMC at no-cost to the agency and the TMC).
 - Does the TMC have to be trained in order to support the agency eTS system.
 - Can the solution work with multiple TMCs.
- **Agency should request concurrent pricing for travel services from TSS to obtain the benefits of competition and to encourage use of small business.**
- **Extensive financial administration capabilities, including:**
 - Adding financial reporting information to travel documents.
 - Centrally Billed card management and reconciliation.
 - Fraud management controls to limit losses.
 - Delinquency management controls resulting in significantly increased travel card rebates received from card vendors.
- **The solution provides extensive integration experience with any current agency financial and human resource systems.**
 - Interfaces into many agency financial systems: AMSFFS, ORACLE, Other.
- **What are your suggested criteria?** Weight them by importance. Then, score each vendor, for each of the criteria used. Add up the total points for each.