MINUTES FOR 09 DECEMER 2014 CIC MEETING

I. Follow-up and New Discussion Items (issues / concerns remaining from October 2014 Agenda and not covered in SBIOI Contracts Panel Q&A)

   A. Follow-up: The Small Business Administration (SBA) has issued new rules on efforts being performed under a multiple award contract (MAC), including an IDIQ, a GSA Schedule Contract, a GWAC, or a multiple award task or delivery order contracts.

      1. As this item has been discussed at SPAWAR HQ Small Business Office (SBO) weekly conference calls is there any new information on the release of implementing guidance for these rules from SPAWAR HQs?
      2. **RESPONSE:** FAR has not been updated to reflect this change and SPAWAR HQ has not issued further guidance. SSC LANT Office of Small Business to address with SPAWAR HQ SBO.

   B. Issues / concerns presented by Industry

      1. Use of MAC IDIQ CPAR / Past Performance Citations on RFP responses.

         a. Current guidance on MAC CPARSs states, "There will be a CPARS/CDADS report on each Task Order, however compliance with DFAR for submission of CPARS formal reports will be accomplished only on orders of greater than $1M. An analysis has been performed to see whether rolling up task order evaluations under $1M would be beneficial. Continued analysis and policy adjustments may be considered in the future. Ultimately, those companies whose past performance information is not formally located on the automated systems, may still contact their references and request that each COR or contact individual complete a Past Performance Questionnaire".

         b. Most, if not all, IDIQ Task Order RFPs being released require submission of a statement or confirmation on forms 1A/1B that the Contract being cited has performance information available in the CPARs/PPIR systems, or in lieu of CPARs/PPIR information than offerors must submit a Past Performance questionnaire to the customer POC. The requirement for citing CPARs/PPIR information is also relevant for NEW Contract RFP responses. Going forward, it appears much less contract work will be covered by CPARs leading to an inundation of customer POCs with past performance questionnaires.

         c. Has any thought been given on how a contractor is to handle those task orders that may not have CPARs graded within the CPAR system by contracts when it comes to responding to RFP responses? The offeror usually references an IDIQ level contract for 1A and 1B. However, if there is no CPARs at the IDIQ level what is graded / cited?

         d. **RESPONSE:** Submit a questionnaire. Steve Harnig will discuss with the Pre-Award Contracts group to ensure proper language is being used going forward on *future* contract RFPs.

            i. For example: If a Contractor has been awarded multiple Task Orders on an IDIQ MAC contract:

1. Would that contractor have to supply CPARS/PPQs for each task order in its response in order to reference the IDIQ itself which has total award value rolled-up to meet Corporate Experience threshold? This could also result in a random mix of CPARS/PPQs based on which Task Orders meet the threshold for a CPARS and which do not.

   RESPONSE: This will need to be looked at on a Case-by-case basis. Contracts would have look at this and see how it is stated in the RFP.

   a. How would the Government score a bidder's past performance if the random mix contained many references that were outstanding but a few that were unsatisfactory? -- Are they averaged? -- Are all TO CPARs pulled? -- Would we need to site our Past Performance at a TO level? -- Would we need CPARs/PPQs for every TO we cite?

   b. **RESPONSE:** CPARs grades would be aggregated with an overall score provided. Aggregated scoring would be Acceptable / Non-Acceptable.

2. Task Order Process –

   a. How does SSC Atlantic determine Ceiling Reservations – Do Market Survey's go against all 4 pillars until a contract determination is made or is the ceiling reservation applied after a specific pillar contract has been identified?
      i. **RESPONSE:** Ceiling reservation is applied to a specific pillar contract after Market Survey determination has been made. SSC LANT was directed to remove remaining ceiling balances on Active Contracts Report due to security concerns in publishing. Wiki Leaks source of concerns.

   b. What efforts have been undertaken to train the CORs and the Contracts staff on Government Property (to include IUID) requirements? Since all modification requests have to be submitted to the COR, issues such as Government Property (GP) are often not given any priority, and Contracting Officers will not act on a request without a PR#. **Question:** In such cases, what recourse is there for a contractor to take in order to achieve compliance?
      i. **RESPONSE:** Contact / Inform the PCO / KO.

   c. Can the ceiling of a MAC Task Order be increased to support additional LOE with NO CHANGE IN SCOPE (additional hours for Labor Categories awarded in initial Task Order – NO NEW LABCATS).
      i. **RESPONSE:** Determination is made on a Case-by-case basis. If there is a change in scope must have a solid justifiable business case submitted via an Fair Opportunity Exception (FOE) request.

3. Issue: Lack of Knowledge of, and Coordination on, SCI Billet and DD-254 Requirements.

   a. Discussion: During the execution of Pillar Task Orders there is an obvious lack of knowledge and coordination between SSC Atlantic's Contract Department and Special Security Office (SSO) for Special Compartmented Information (SCI) tasking. The SSO is not being informed in advance of Task Order Awards with SCI requirements and the Contract Resource Managers (CRMs) are not aware of the SSO's processes and

procedures for assignment of SCI Billets and DD-254 requirements for SCI access for both Prime and Subcontractors. This has been an ongoing issue for over two years.

b. **<u>Recommendation:</u>** Believe there would be significant benefit to SSC Atlantic, as a command, to hold an internal meeting between the SSO and Contracts to review processes and procedures for SCI billets and access, DD-254 processing, and coordination of SCI RFPs with SSO office for planning purposes. This meeting would also determine the best method to ensure CRMs and Contracting Officer Representatives (COR) are aware and kept informed of the required steps for getting SCI billets and DD-254's processed in a timely and efficient manner.

    i. **RESPONSE:** SSC LANT 2.0 and 6.0 are looking into this with command FSO. If delay is impacting your performance, notify PCO and if necessary, contact Jim Crawley at james.crawley@navy.mil or (843) 218-5713.

4. Issue: A large number of Task Order RFPs are being released with errors / discrepancies. Government errors impact potential offerors due to the requirement that in many cases industry needs to wait until the Government answers industry's questions before a final bid/no-bid or team composition decision can be made. Some of the errors / discrepancies affect how industry prices a proposal.

    i. **RESPONSE:** SSC LANT is working process improvement practices in order to reduce discrepancies.

a. Most of the errors are discrepancies between the Pricing Model (labor categories, hours, ODCs, Travel, etc.) and the rest of the RFP (PWS and Sections L and M).
    i. **RESPONSE:** Forward examples / description of discrepancies to Steve Harnig at steven.harnig@navy.mil so discrepancies can be corrected.

b. On other occasions, the PWS doesn't match the title of the RFP or the travel destinations in the PWS don't agree with the places of performance.

c. Task Orders requiring Cyber Security Work Force (CSWF) positions are not identifying IA Baseline and OS/CE certification requirements as required by DOD 8570.1-M Paragraph C1.4.4.5. which states, " Identify all IA function requirements to be performed by contractors in their statement of work/contract…" nor are they identifying what labor categories require CSWF certifications. This adversely effects the way industry bids since they are unable to price proposals correctly based on the IA certifications required.
    i. **RESPONSE:** If CSWF position requirements are not provide in the PWS contact the PCO / KO. SSC LANT (Jim Crawley) to reexamine IT Certifications

5. Do the Standard Labor Categories posted on the SSC Atlantic Public Page match those included in all current (Legacy/Pillar) Base Contracts? If not, can industry expect to see a contract mod incorporating the latest Standard Labor Categories as posted?

II. SBIOI Related Standing Action Items:

A. CIC Industry Representatives have standing action to provide prospective SBIOI Agenda Items for discussion at CIC meetings per William Paggi's request at the April 2014 CIC Meeting.

B. It was reiterated at the April 2014 CIC Meeting that there would be no indiscriminant 'walking the halls' and the main NON-Task Order related communications with the government will be at SBIOIs. William Paggi took as a standing action to get a representative from each Portfolio / Competency to attend SBIOIs.

C. *Meet the seniors event at the CDCA C5ISR Summit was very well received and SSC LANT contracts is looking at doing this again with Portfolio and IPT Leads at future SBIOIs.*

D. *Correction from October 2014 CIC Meeting minutes regarding Portfolio Management. All Business Portfolio Managers and Sub-Portfolio Managers are under Dave Monahan who is in Code 1.0 vice Code 8.0 as previously noted.*