

Minutes - 20 November 2015 CIC 9:30 to 10:30

In attendance: Steve Harnig, Kelly Cannady, Kristy Penninger, Tim Wiand, Robin Rourk, Joshua Hatter, Manny Lovgren, Jennifer Osment, Gary Jaffe, Jim Crawley, Audrey Orvin, Sheela Casper

Opening Remarks (Steve Harnig): Steve Harnig asks for updates from industry's perspective. May need to revisit the CAC issues when Pete Van is able to attend – he is out of the office today.

Topic 1: Pre-RFP Discussions with Portfolio Managers and IPT Leads

No problem with these discussions occurring. There have been ongoing discussions with the SPAWAR Industry Engagement Council (SIEC) relative to this. PMs and IPT leads are encouraged to have open communication up until that step in the process, but then there is some reluctance to engage due to legal issues in the later stages. ASN RD&A issued a memo in January 2015 that designated each Deputy Program Manager as the Small Business Advocate responsible for identifying opportunities within their program for Small Business participation and serving as a technical point of contact for small businesses. As a result of this memo, several PEOs have begun supporting industry events by briefing future opportunities to open up communication in a fair and equitable manner. PEO EIS is currently supporting several events, including the CDCA C5ISR summit in December. We will continue to engage industry to determine the best methods to engage in future opportunity discussions while ensuring equal and fair access.

Topic 2: Use of Themis to collect questions in between SBIOIs and present to appropriate initiative (SBIOI or CIC)

Robin Rourk suggested the CIC vet questions prior to the SBIOI and SSC LANT continue to update the FAQs on E-commerce to address any updates. Goal would be to answer some of them here, and then use to lead discussion during Q&A period at SBIOI. Steve mentions we do not have a good feel for what we want to do with SBIOI and planning committee; it has changed over the years. Technology is available to capture these questions.

Steve also proposes a 30-60 minute phone con on in-between months and having these meetings every other month vs monthly. Many topics could also be handled via email.

Topic 3: Contracts Top 2-3 Major Initiatives; How can Industry help to reach these goals?

CO had commented on his top 2-3 goals. Gary Jaffe states he wants this to be less of a Q&A session and more oriented towards being part of the solution. Want to help to resolve issues and communicate changes to industry partners.

Steve says we have several major initiatives. A lot of **pressure to meet need dates** – to go faster, to be more timely, etc. This requires managing the schedule and collaboration with the IPT leads. The acquisition team has a part in this as well. We have not previously managed that way as a command; did not have need dates from technical teams prior to FY15 Q4. We now have these need dates, and trying to get a holistic view of the acquisition and contracting processes. We have to figure out how to meet dates by managing better and doing job more efficiently. NAD = Negotiated Award Dates are beginning to be used. This is the biggest initiative on the table.

The Contracts department has also been subject to many audits, and has not fared as well as we would have liked. There are many initiatives focused on improving the quality of our work products. RFP and L&M outputs are seen by industry, but no visibility into some of the parts. We are back into an era of oversight – feels like we are in an “audit standard” on everything.

Steve has seven focus areas which also include personnel, staffing, training, work product, ownership and accountability, etc. We can look at sharing some of this information with industry and see if there are ways that they can help.

Josh Hatter mentions templates that could be shared among industry partners. Also asks about need dates – are they realistic? Kelly Cannady states that there are problems with the dates not being “real,” as they sometimes represent “want” dates. Data is often skewed; there are instances where contract may be ready to award, but funding not available.

8800 contracting actions done in FY15. Many are actually several actions but could/should have been one action with better planning. Audrey Orvin states there is daily communication with portfolios re need dates. Josh asks if there is a way to help with this, notify ahead of time re expirations, etc – some customers are better planners than others. PMs and IPTs are now told to give realistic dates plus 50%, not “best case” dates in order to manage expectations.

Manny Lovgren states that he sees this all over; the situation is not unique to SPAWAR. Steve states that this also needs to be understood by the command here. He needs help messaging back to the Command about things that are good or are common elsewhere. CAPT Heller wants SPAWAR LANT to be the example of how to do contracts.

Josh also states that benefits from these changes will take time to be evident. Gary Jaffe states quality on RFPs from SPAWAR are good, some other agencies are not as well-done.

New pricing model template is being developed but is not out yet. Pricing model will account for multiple funding CLINs and is being altered to aid in cost realism analysis. Gary asks if there is a way that industry can see a template? Steve thinks there can be a way to do this – cost models and other templates that may be developed. Could possibly use E-commerce to get feedback.

Topic 4: Trends across proposals that always cause questions

Are there any initiatives in the SPAWAR Enterprise, Navy, or DOD that the government is looking at to speed award processing times or make the evaluation process more efficient that we might be able to share with industry?

Kelly Cannady states there are issues with no-bids and rationale that goes along with them – would rather have that information, would like to know why. Some companies do a no-bid letter, can be put into portal (have heard that some are putting in 1 penny in order to enter into portal); otherwise email with rationale will suffice. When making changes to pricing model, need rationale/reasoning for changes. DCMA/DCAA information is requested but often not provided with proposals. Bigger issue is at subcontracting level – we do not get enough data on subs, particularly cost/price narratives and

explanation of cost. Disconnect between prime's and sub's submissions – prime to ensure that the agreement with sub is documented (including proposed hours, labor categories, etc.). Reference data – need to tie back experience to reference. Certified cost and pricing data submissions – when requested this should be submitted promptly; getting pushback and/or does not get submitted even when asked for. Jennifer states they give templates to their subs so that they capture all necessary info; some have no SPAWAR experience. Kelly also mentions caution about upcoming changes to language in Sections L and M of the RFP as source selection templates are undergoing significant changes.

Gary mentions difficulty with LOE/clauses, managing a moving target. Audrey states that there are some who think there should be a mod for any change, others feel that as long as within initial agreement, flexibility is okay. Audrey also mentions supply RFPs – if they know a part number is wrong, it would be good to know that early to eliminate necessity for mods. Sheela Casper mentions L&M changes and pricing model changes, give more rationale if specialized skills needed, etc. Looking for industry feedback on strategy – what happens after pillars expire, how to set up new contracts.

Josh asks about services vs solutions – how does government define? Sheela states we are looking for longevity – longer-term ordering period. Term does not equate to service or supply. Sheela wants feedback on this now; it is not too late. Jim mentions he would like to see examples of single-award that we do on a MAC – would be helpful to us to see if/how this is being done. Could also use examples of quick-turnaround solutions.

Steve adds issue of cloud computing – how to buy this. Looking at how NIH set this up. Would like input on how to price these as well.

Josh mentions us vs them mentality between industry/govt – would like to be more collaborative.

Topic 5: Discussion re CAC processing times

Good summary on this received. Josh states they did a straw poll in order to get answers within a couple of weeks – could gather more data from others with more time. Manny states there is a move towards PIV versus individual badging. Will tee this up again in January.

Industry Actions: None.

2.0 Actions: Provide cost model and other templates to industry.