

## **Minutes – 3 June 2016 CIC 9:30 to 10:30**

**In attendance:** Steve Harnig, Pete Van, Josh Hatter, Jennifer Osment, Amy Bare

**Opening Remarks (Steve Harnig):** Feedback is desired from Industry in regard to forecasting. The problem is that much of the data/forecasting can be up to a year in advance so accurate forecasting is difficult.

Josh Hatter states they need better understanding of what feedback is desired, more specific versus general information. Consensus is that feedback needs to be constructive and should be focused on the data that could most help SPAWAR and industry.

### **Topic 1: Recap of 29 April CIC session open to industry**

Josh reports this was done about 6 weeks ago, with no dial-in. Meeting was constructive, with some good questions posed, new ideas and a good mix of people. The intent is to do this possibly quarterly. Charter and minutes were reviewed. Pete Van mentions that there are many questions regarding the CDCA and organization in general. Josh suggested that an intro from Steve at an upcoming open session might be helpful.

### **Topic 2: Sections L and M released at TO level on MACs; boundaries and guidelines to determine when Sections C, L, and M will be provided?**

Josh says specific instance noted where PR number and date were provided – wanted to know if there are boundaries or guidelines for “why or why not” on providing full drafts. Steve states this is an issue of time, and would like to be able to provide this information. Try to do it on at least the larger actions, more complex actions, or those actions that are determined to need drafts to increase/improve competition. Josh states if nothing is released until RFP, then everyone is scrambling and teaming opportunities are affected. Steve says we try to assess that, but time is the overriding factor. This is based on the milestone plan for the order and how we are progressing toward negotiated award date. New work would be more likely to have a draft. The specific question came from a company that was not around when pillars were created, so they are less likely to be familiar. Steve says this will be matured as we continue to improve our processes.

### **Topic 3: Pillar contract/PoP extensions?**

What is likelihood? This is being looked at, but unsure if it will happen or not. All avenues are being explored, and will be briefed at SBIOI. Steve says we are looking at different variables to see what makes sense in new strategy – use external contracts where best suited, and could ask for ceiling increase as well. Desire is to get to new strategy as quickly as possible – would like to have more of the new contracts on the street, but still in requirements-gathering phase.

### **Topic 4: What is the desired response from RFI (i.e., information, prime can perform 51%, best value solution, or to determine acquisition strategy)? With Industry not receiving feedback from RFIs,**

**perception is that RFI response is merely execution of process requirement; is RFI/Market Survey a part of ongoing QA process initiative?**

The answer is “it depends” – but in general, RFI on task order side is to figure out 51% and set-aside decision; on the Contracts side, much more market research (who can perform what, best solution). Would encourage getting the word out to ask people to call Sheela Casper if there are questions. Panel format at SBIOI is a step in the right direction. Steve says they do not feel that there is a lot of ambiguity in what is being asked for. Constructive criticism is welcome – the goal is to improve RFIs and responses received. Josh states also continued comments about Industry not receiving feedback from RFIs. (future SBIOI topic for Kelly or Sheela)

**Topic 5: Expected improvements to PPAB report released to Industry as a result of Contracts QA initiatives or 6.0 process initiatives?**

Pete mentions that there is still work to be done on this. Josh states there are concerns. Steve states this is a 2.0 and 6.0 initiative and will be worked together. Small business group from San Diego basically “set the field” as to what will be provided. Pete says there is data, but much of this data is based on forecasting, and also based on a particular point in time. Basically the process is not “matured” to the point we need to be – still a work in progress. The PPAB data will eventually lead into much better forecasting for industry.

**Topic 6: Industry Day (USNO) – have seen similar events held by SSC PAC on large MAC TOs**

Josh to see if they can get actual data on this to share. Steve states feedback was pretty positive. Will try to do more of these in the future.

**Topic 7: Expected relief in near-term for \$10M contracting approval threshold with HQ?**

Steve says he really does not know. He feels we are doing a good job, seeing better quality. Recently won GAO protest, and have had some good feedback. There have been some little bits of relief, including boarding RFPs over \$10M and HQ currently not reviewing all of those but will randomly sit on a board – allows RFPs to go out quicker. BCMs go through HQ very quickly and are signed quickly. Amy Bare asks if there is a timeline on how long it takes to get an approval. Steve states this can vary – has to go through policy group, etc, prior to approval authority receiving.

**Other:**

Don Curtis’ term as CDCA Mid-Size Business Rep ends in June – 3 potential candidates thus far, closes June 10th; group will vote on new rep and then Steve will review/approve. May have new rep by June SBIOI.

Amy asks about change to solicitation number and cancellation on mobile C4I? This was all requirements-driven. Amy asks if planning to use ITES 2s, etc. LANT has identified a lot of existing external contracts that should work for us, but we have struggled with GSA Oasis – scope is different, more general, not traditional engineering. May not be as technical as what is needed. Steve’s goal is to

show how these vehicles will be used as this is determined. Will continue to try to be as transparent as possible.

Jennifer Osment states there were positive comments from NOLA event. Josh states many topics were generated from the CIC event that was open to industry, and he feels this is a good change.

Steve mentions that we have to get out of FAR Part 15 and into FAR Part 16 – source selection is complicated. There have been some good articles out in reference to part 16; now looking at that to see how to do it. Sections L and M in TO would define. There is a very good article on posted on VAO site; unsure if Industry would have access? Would help to reduce amount of info required in proposals, and reduce time required for review.

**Future SBIOI topics:**

Gov has noted FPDS should be used to look at spending on current MAC vehicles as opposed to publishing TO award report – possibility of a training session on FPDS?

The inquiries regarding use of GSA 8(a) STARS contract vehicle with SSC LANT; possibility of training session on how best to propose use of this or other SBSA GWACs and instances where they might be used?

Possibly going to schedule an SBIOI for September, but would likely be a half-day vs an entire day. This June's SBIOI agenda is going to be a big one. Nancy Gunderson will be speaking, as well as PEO/EIS reps and also Kevin Charlow. Steve may be able to speak on contract strategy. Also upcoming industry day for polar programs.

Could staffing be a topic at SBIOI?

Next CIC scheduled for 22 July 2016 – need to figure out if want to meet July and Sep, or move next mtg to early August

**Industry Actions:**

1. Josh to send Steve the info re CDCA rep

**2.0 Actions:**

1. Possibly schedule intro from Steve at next open session CDCA event