

MINUTES FOR CIC 10 December 2013 MEETING

FOLLOW-UP DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Contracts Industry Council (SSC-LANT CIC) Charter – Request follow-on status and discussion regarding the process to adjust the charter, as well as the potential to collaborate with a SPAWAR HQ/Pacific entity similar to the SSC-LANT CIC, called the Procurement Efficiency Working Group (PEWG).
 - a. Background: The Government was assessing the existing make-up of the members on the Council, analyzing whether adding additional professional organizations would potentially benefit the efficiency and further the reach of the group. Additionally, SPAWAR HQ, in conjunction with and through a San Diego based entity called the Procurement Efficiency Working Group (PEWG), contacted the Industry Members of the CIC to explore potential collaborative initiatives across the SPAWAR Enterprise along our same interests. The PEWG consists mainly of NDIA representatives, but is performing primarily the same as our east coast entity.
 - b. Discussion Items:
 - i. The Industry took for action to meet and develop a number of potential alternatives for further discussion (see attached).
 - ii. The Government took for action to contact SPAWAR HQ personnel to better understand the PEWG initiative and its potential goals with the SSC LANT CIC.
 - c. RESPONSE: William Paggi and Donna Murphy were both called away to another meeting. As a result, there was very little to discuss as we were anticipating William to accept/modify/decline the recommended charter revision and brief us on his discussion(s) with SPAWAR HQ. Robin Rourke reviewed the recommended revision and expressed her concern there was no Women-in-Defense (WID) representative with a "seat at the table". Our recommendation was to include WID as one of several recommended "associate members". While our (CIC) research did not find that WID was specifically asking for a seat at the table, apparently Ms. Rourke believes that's what they want.
2. Industry Program Management (Individual PMs Off-Site) Badging and Authorization remains a concern.
 - a. Background: The CIC is in receipt of the Individual On-Site CAC and Access badging brief, completing the action item from the September 2013 CIC meeting (Thanks to Jim Crawley for his follow-through). Can SSC LANT assist with the concerns of (badging) authorization guidelines for industry PMs seeking to gain access to contract individuals under their employ?
 - b. Discussion Item: Status or updates on Government action to review.

- c. **RESPONSE:** We (CIC) provided clarification to the government members present what we are specifically asking for. That is, for those program/project managers (PMs) that work off-base to be able to obtain a regular SPAWAR badge to frequent, regular and direct support to company personnel that work on-base. Doing this minimizes the impact to work being performed by company personnel. The thought is one person coming on-base to many has less impact than having many personnel having to come back to their office to meet with the one PM. The ensuing discussion brought a concern that a company PM with a full-time SPAWAR badge presents an unfair advantage to those companies that have no personnel on-base and unable to gain regular and frequent access to potential customers. We suggested this badging only be allowed for active delivery/task orders and no fee be incurred by the customer.
- 3. Advanced Planning document for upcoming task orders under each pillar contract on Seaport-O.
 - a. **Background:** Seaport-O (potential) functionality is expected to be implemented in the 2nd Quarter FY14 timeframe. Work is progressing with efforts including Command Forecasting within the Contract Strategy Working Group to better assist with advanced planning. Such status should be tracked under Seaport-O.
 - b. **Discussion Item:** Status or updates requested for its published implementation.
 - c. **RESPONSE:** The government advised that their efforts to provide advanced planning and forecasting was behind schedule. They noted the Lean Six Sigma (LSS) effort related to this matter was starting that very day (12/10/2013). The bottom line is the overall effort is further delayed from previous expectations that were set (for the Jan./Feb. 2014 timeframe).

NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS / CONCERNS

- 4. Is there a plan to provide industry with MAC Task Order Award information as is done with contract awards?

RESPONSE: This matter is under consideration. Audrey Orvin took for action on this to include way to provide post T.O. Award Debriefs and results of RFIs to industry.

- 5. During the SBIOI held on 15 Nov 2013 Dave Monahan took an action to provide an update on the SSC LANT plan for transitioning from Legacy SAC / MAC contracts to Pillar MAC contracts.

- a. **Discussion Item:** What is the timeline for providing this information to industry?

RESPONSE: For now, options on legacy contracts will be exercised where appropriate. Underutilized contracts may not have their option years exercised. The government suggested that incumbents ask the Contracting Officer (of that contract), about 60 – 90 days before the current POP expires, if they plan to exercise the option or not.

6. 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 (see attached).
 - a. Discussion Item: What affect if any will these new rules have on execution of the Pillar MACs and other MACs issued by SSC LANT?
 - b. RESPONSE: The new rules are effective 31 Dec 2013. SPAWAR HQ is engaged and SSC-LANT is awaiting guidance. At this time, there is no known impact to the pillars. A question was asked if all SB requirements should be sent to the SBA. The response was that if they did, there should not be much impact due to the very quick turnaround currently provided by the SBA.

7. There was an ad-hoc question about what happens if a pillar team member leaves the team?
 - a. RESPONSE: Pricing could be an issue if a (proposed) new team member's (sub) pricing is higher than the original sub. Audrey Orvin stated that her staff is developing responses to industry questions, to include various scenarios regarding loss of a sub / adding a new sub, from GCGCA's November symposium.