

Minutes – 22 January 2016 CIC 9:30 to 10:30

In attendance: Steve Harnig, Kelly Cannady, Kristy Penninger, Robin Rourk, Joshua Hatter, Manny Lovgren, Gary Jaffe, Audrey Orvin, Sheela Casper, Lisa Rosenbaum, Pete Van, John O'Connor, Sheela Casper, Timmy Wiand

Opening Remarks (Steve Harnig):

Steve mentions Air Force's new acquisition system – changes that have to be made, going faster, making a difference. Future of acquisitions is fast, competitive, and affordable. Initiatives include identifying potential savings and partnering with Defense Industry. This is a great example of what we strive to do in this forum – think about what we can do as we move forward.

Here is the link to the article (***Meet the Air Force's New Acquisition System, By Deborah Lee James, Secretary of the USAF***)

<http://www.defenseone.com/ideas/2016/01/meet-air-forces-new-acquisition-system/125102/>

Topic 1: Questions from Q&A Session at December SBIOI

1. SeaPort-O portal use restricts teaming; not everyone able to see RFPs, and this may restrict competition and hurt teaming/partnering

This has been addressed a few times. We do not want to restrict teaming; if this is truly happening we do need to figure out a solution. Kelly states that some of the notices can go to all, but once a solicitation is issued, then can only go to certain distribution. This is appropriate given that we are ordering from a MAC. The Council agrees that this is not a change, and that the portal is being used correctly. MAC prime contractors can disseminate opportunities. It was recommended that the CIC craft something to go out in the minutes for the SBIOI explaining the limitations.

2. Command release of Org Charts showing IPTs?

Pete states the problem is figuring out what needs to be included. Robin stated we should provide what is publicly available to all and maintained by the Public Affairs Office, which is posted on our SSC LANT external website. We can have PAO update as there have been a couple of recent moves. There is a version that goes to SPL level, but Industry would prefer to IPT level.

3. Would Gov't consider use of need dates as opposed to estimated award dates for future task order pipelines?

Currently in process of changing to negotiated award dates, and this is what we really want to track and to publicize. These dates are basically a combined need date and proposed award date. Next update is to be posted by 17 March, prior to SBIOI. PPSM data is being used to determine estimated award date. Plan is to get this out by 1 March and then present a highlight list at SBIOI. Josh states he did not hear any negative feedback from panel presentation at December SBIOI.

Topic 2: CDAD deliverable (pp 9-10 of QASP); Industry training on use in order to provide contractor input and Gov't feedback on performance, directly feeds company CPARS rating

Gary states there is no feedback loop on the CDAD. Also, some of the requirements/ratings may need to be a little more realistic. Also states our QASP/CDAD is structured well but not necessarily always as fruitful a process for both parties as it could be. Some of the goals may be unachievable, and there is inconsistency overall. All CORs go through a 2 day training course where they get hands-on experience. They are trained on this to ensure that they understand the concepts. They are required to respond within 10 business days. John O'Connor states that he communicates this to them – he will continue and also asks Industry to follow the guidelines that are built into the form. CORs are trained that a rating of 3 is satisfactory, and if company earns a 4 or 5, then this must be justified. There are 450 to 500 active CORs; 150 experienced CORs left in last year, so there is and will always be a learning curve.

Topic 3: GSA Follow-up Conversation WRT task order backlog and potential for Industry to assist; latest status on conversations initiated during CDCA C5ISR Summit

Steve did talk with them; there was excitement about this possibility. There has been no follow-up and Steve would like them to follow up with him if possible. Could potentially provide extra help if we are able to use more GSA in future. Manny has the action to follow up with GSA and have them reach back out to Steve.

Topic 4: COG Data Forecasting: Would Gov't consider releasing PR Data Status Report to give Industry better visibility into forecasting timelines and better prioritize and resource bid opportunities?

Steve hears this often from incumbents – understands need for more frequent status updates. He has discussed more of an update with Kelly on a WIP-type product. Pete states some of this exists in the PPSM data – not the follow-on, but some status. Will see what we can do to provide more communication. Need more accurate information in CIMS.

Topic 5: Lack of sufficient responses from Industry on Mobile C4I opportunity; Gov't still interested in feedback. Need more feedback from Gov't re company responses to RFIs and Market Surveys so companies more likely to respond in future

We are looking for specific responses on each one. Have everyone read closely what we are looking for – do not assume anything. Discussion regarding solution vs services – Industry does not seem to understand that feedback is desired from multiple types of business, i.e. not just small business. Josh states this may need to be more explicitly stated. They would like feedback from large businesses on complexity as well. They have a process in 2.0 that tells them what they have to do and it is just not being done consistently.

We are still looking to do more Industry days, etc.

Follow-on strategy/solution might be a good SBIOI topic for Pete?

Need to get Market Survey responses/feedback out quicker. Gary states that Industry spends a lot of time on these and then hears nothing back; beginning to lose faith in the process. Steve states that what Sheela is working on is longer-term (contract-level) and there will not be immediate feedback. Josh states ANY type of feedback would be beneficial, even if not completely specific. Robin states there has been talk of “schooling” on source selection, etc., which could be helpful. Gary also states he is beginning to see more consistency in requirements in recent months. Steve also mentions that we must be clear when referring to task orders vs contracts – this is an example of possible training which could be provided during a future SBIOI.

Topic 6: After-Pillar Strategy: Will Gov’t retain 5-year window of relevancy for new IDIQs?

Steve states this has not been discussed specifically. There have not been any IDIQs issued with a 3-year window, and Sheela asks that Josh send more detailed information to her.

Other Discussions:

Lisa Rosenbaum says IRT responses to TO/RFPs and cost data, to make sure you provide information that is specifically asked for in provision 52.215-20 (cost/price data). Also, more of a heads-up on upcoming changes in language FAR16.306(d)(2), i.e., less deviation from LOE or it may cause you to get kicked out. Josh has noted more explicit language in some, but not all. Lisa says this is being worked.

Audrey states that there have been recent inquiries regarding procurement actions that are misdirected. Some information has been requested about a new contract that has not been posted – if any information is released to one company, has to be provided to all. In regard to supplies, this could involve having to initiate proposal modifications in some cases.

Sheela states again to be sure to look carefully at what is being requested. Trying to see how best to restructure their contracts. Also requests any applicable feedback if you feel it could be helpful. Pete states that what we do here is unique – both SPAWAR and Industry need to be able to think outside the box and be flexible. Rules currently do not allow the flexibility that we need.

Kristy mentions recent changes to section L&M.

Steve mentions that there was a lot of discussion at SBIOI in December about Contracts realignment to Portfolios. Announcement is made that Kelly Cannady has moved into the 2.2 role; she is also filling old role while being replaced. Changes are happening and we should see some real benefit. We are much better aligned with HQ, better relationship with Nancy Gunderson at HQ. PAC will be getting a new 2.0 (Ms. Sharon Pritchard). Steve will be reaching out and establishing relationship with new PAC 2.0.

Actions:

Contracts:

1. Action Closed/ Link Provided: Release of Command Org Charts –

<http://www.public.navy.mil/spawar/Atlantic/Pages/AboutUs.aspx>

2. Action Closed/To be addressed at upcoming SBIOI: Steve Harnig and Kelly Cannady to develop a plan to communicate workload/forecasting to Industry.

Industry: Josh to send more detailed info to Sheela re inquiry on 5-year window of relevancy for new IDIQs.