

# NUWCDIVNPT SeaPort-e Council Meeting

May 10, 2017



#### Q1: UPDATES ON SEAPORT-E?

- What is the plan for Navy procurements in 2019 when Seaport-e expires and when will the replacement be rolled out? Will there be a period of time where both systems (assuming a new system is put in place) will operate through the transition?
- What does the expiration of Seaport-e mean as far as awarding contracts for solicitations already underway?
- Can you please provide information regarding the Seaport-e IDIQ followon? Will there be an advance notice released regarding potential solicitation dates?
- Is it the intention of the Government, if a Seaport-e IDIQ follow-on is not anticipated, to utilize OASIS to obtain professional support services?



A1: NAVSEA currently has an analysis of alternatives underway. There is a working group actively working to identify the best alternative for the future of requirements currently met under the Seaport-e MACs (All options including GSA OASIS are being considered). Part of this effort is establishing a detailed POA&M and a process for meeting NAVSEA's contractual needs without a negative impact on the Navy mission. Until issuance of the resulting analysis and planning, NUWCDIVNPT has no knowledge of the future of SeaPort-e or the process for transition.

Regarding the follow-on MAC solicitation the question would need to be posed to the Dahlgren PCO, as Division Newport doesn't have cognizance over the follow-on.

Ms. Stacy McQuage (SeaPort-e PCO) will be attending the NCMA Ocean State Workshop on 14 June 2017.

Distribution Statement A: Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.



#### Q2: UPDATES ON TEAM SUB TASK ORDERS?

- Given that NUWCDIVNPT is now responsible for the Team Submarine procurements (Currently the Enterprise Wide Contractor Support Services (EWCSS) follow-on procurements), and the fact the current task order has been extended 24 months (expiring in 2019); does NUWCDIVNPT expect the re-compete of this procurement to occur through the Seaport-e, it's replacement or a different vehicle (e.g. GSA)?
- Will there be any further information regarding the Team Sub EWCSS follow-on contracts (i.e., Industry Day, Draft Solicitations, refined acquisition time-lines, etc.)?
- Does the government have any clarification to forecasted dates for the five Team SUB solicitations? Suspect that all will not be released in August. Is there any indication on priority of which solicitation will be released first?



A2: Division Newport is currently in the pre-solicitation phase for the Team Sub follow-on actions. At this time there is no approved strategy, so it is premature to discuss the number of contract actions, contract type, etc. Code 02 is planning to utilize SeaPorte for the competitions with RFPs slated for Q2 of 2018 with awards occurring in early Q2 of 2019. The Long Range Acquisition Forecast will be updated accordingly.

Once a strategy is approved Division Newport will release those specifics to Industry.



### **Q3: CPIF CONTRACTS AT DIVISION NEWPORT?**

- Does NUWCDIVNPT anticipate a trend toward issuing CPIF as opposed to CPFF contracts for future procurements?
- NUWCDIVNPT has indicated a desire to apply the incentive fee calculation at the priced SLIN level. However, proposals are submitted at a CLIN level without any realistic way for contractors to calculate the target rates at a SLIN level based on funding received. Does NUWCDIVNPT desire to apply the incentive fee calculation at the priced SLIN level, and if so, how would the target rates be determined?



A3: Division Newport has a pre-solicitation planning and strategy process that evaluates the requirement to determine the appropriate strategy. This strategy includes contract type consideration. NUWCDIVNPT will use CPIF when it is appropriate based on the requirement. If CPIF is selected as the appropriate contract type, Division Newport will also strategize on the appropriate way to handle incentive fee for that specific requirement.

If there are questions about a specific existing contract or task order, the company should reach out to the PCO identified in Section G.



Q4: Has the FAR been updated to allow more than one small business to make up the 51% requirement in SBSA solicitations?

A4: A review of Open FAR Cases as of 4/28/2017 shows that FAR Case 2016-011, which implements the SBA's final rule, is still open. The status indicates that on 04/26/2017 a draft interim FAR rule was sent from a FAR analyst to Legal, who is currently reviewing and that there is a "DoD Authority to Proceed" in process.



Q5: Will the revised SP-e RFP and TO numbering changes, i.e., use of UIC N66604 and disuse of N4XX, have any practical effects on contractors besides the obvious need to adapt to the new numbering scheme? Incidentally, does NUWC prefer contractors use dashes in solicitation and task order numbers or omit them, as now appears to be the format used in electronic references such as the online SeaPort Enhanced Task Order Award Report?

A5: As an example the impact is moving from a task order format as follows:

Was

N00178-04-D-XXXX-N4XX

N00024-17-R-XXXX

**Going Forward** 

N6660417FXXXX

N6660417RXXXX

There are no practical impacts beyond this of which Division Newport is aware. Each system will be different, so contractors will need to adapt to the specific requirements of each electronic system.



Q6: NUWC Newport announcements in the SP-e Auction Portal continue to be among the most informative posted by any of the NAVSEA warfare centers. While the use of UIC N66604 should make Newport announcements even easier for contractors to pick out once an RFP number is assigned to a requirement, may we anticipate that until that point Newport announcements will continue to be as detailed as in the past?

A6: Yes, they will continue to be the same. The Advance Notice content is a best practice and is one piece that has helped with significant competition improvements at Division Newport.



Q7: Is NUWC looking to further clarify and define how they view Best Value awards such as some other Naval Agencies have done? (See below example)

3.0 STEP THREE – Trade-off Process/Source Selection Decision Note: Offerors that receive a Marginal or lower rating in the Technical Understanding factor or Organizational Experience factor will not be considered in this step.

In order to select the winning offeror under this competition, the Government will rank the offerors under consideration for award from best to worst by making a series of paired comparisons among them, trading off the differences in the non-cost factors (Technical Understanding and Organizational Experience only) against the difference in most probable cost and proposed fee between the members of each pair, as follows:



### Q7 (Con't):

If one offeror is better in terms of the non-cost factors and has the lower cost and fee, then we will consider that offeror to be the better value.

If one offeror is better in terms of the non-cost factors but has the higher cost and fee, then we will decide whether the differences in the non-cost factors are worth the difference in cost and fee. If we consider the differences in the non-cost factors to be worth the difference in cost and fee, then we will consider the offeror with the higher cost and fee to be the better value. If not, then we will consider the offeror with the lower cost and fee to be the better value.

We will continue to make paired comparisons in this way until we have decided which offeror is the best value.



A7: Division Newport will continue to evaluate in accordance with the criteria stated in the RFP. Division Newport performs a tradeoff analysis of all awardable (marginal or better) offers received in response to the solicitation. The tradeoff analysis considers the non-cost merits of the proposals and the total evaluated cost/price in accordance with the stated relative importance to determine the best value to the Government.

Division Newport does not rank offerors in a tradeoff analysis.



Q8: If NUWC uses "priced" SLINs vice CLINs, what is the process of realigning cost and fee at the priced SLIN level?

A8: Communication between the COR and STR prior to the action coming to Code 02 is critical to reducing the need for realignments post-award.

If for some reason a realignment is necessary, the COR submits a TI revision requesting the realignment. In accordance with NUWC's process the ROM hours and total CPFF are used to recalculate (in the case of a realignment) the cost, fee and hour split. This process must take place prior to incurring cost, fee, or hours above the SLIN ceiling. If a contractor requests a realignment after one of these ceilings has been met the government may seek consideration in the form of reduced fee depending on the circumstances.

Distribution Statement A: Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.



Q9: Can you elaborate on the process for realigning the estimated cost, fixed-fee, and hours in task orders? Prime Contractors do this with their subcontractors as things change (i.e., staffing changes, Tl's with specific requirements, etc.), so we are wondering what NUWC's process is?

A9: We cannot provide a valid general answer to this question. Since realignments at the task order level are dependent on many variables (pricing structure, time of award, etc.) in order to provide a valid specific response, contractor's should contact the PCO listed in Section G of their task order.



Q10: With regard to CPARS, can you explain why it is nearly impossible to receive an excellent rating when the contractor's work is recognized by the government as being above satisfactory?

A10: NUWC does not concede it is "nearly impossible to receive an excellent rating". The CORs are given guidance to operate using the ratings guidance associated with CPARS and the PCOs review to confirm the evaluation and ratings align with the CPARS guidance. If there is a particular instance where a contractor has an issue with their assigned ratings they should use the CPARS functionality to respond to the COR's assessment.



Q11: The release of Technical Instructions more often than not lags by several days the release of the funding modification. This makes it difficult to proceed with work without knowing what it is we are tasked to perform. Can NUWC institute a process to release Tl's with the funding mod?

A11: Under the current process the TI is executed by the PCO concurrent with modification release and provided to the COR for processing. Division Newport Contracts is taking an action to ensure the COR community understands the importance of timely TI processing. If a contractor does not receive a TI in a timely manner the COR should be notified. If the TIs are regularly late the contractor should contact the PCO.



Q12: It seems that NUWC is using more firm, fixed-price task orders for services work. Can you explain why? It is very difficult to price such FFP services effort without explicit exit criteria (knowing when we are done, done with a given task in the SOW).

A12: Per FAR 16.202-2 "A firm-fixed-price contract is suitable for acquiring commercial items (see Parts 2 and 12) or for acquiring other supplies or services on the basis of reasonably definite functional or detailed specifications (see Part 11) when the contracting officer can establish fair and reasonable prices at the outset"

Division Newport uses FFP contract type only when this condition is met. As for "explicit exit criteria" when FFP terms are used Division Newport ensures the requirement is sufficiently well defined, SOW, CDRL, Performance Requirements Summary Table (PRST) considered.



Q13: We have noticed several potential multiple award vehicles coming down the pike. Can you explain the method of awarding tasks on these after award of the contracts?

A13: These actions are still in the pre-solicitation stage and do not have approved acquisition strategies. If Division Newport does move forward with multiple award contracts, each contract will have an ordering clause and potentially a CONOPs that will detail the task/delivery order process.



Q14: As a company with significant Navy presence at SPAWAR and NAVAIR, we are always looking for opportunities to team with great partners. Looking into the future, we are interested in meeting with organizations that have a presence at NAVSEA and NUWC in particular – what is the best way to obtain a contact list of these organizations?

#### A14:

- 1: Contact the Director, Office of Small Business Programs (OSBP) at each location
  - Cannot provide contact info for other locations in this forum due to PII
  - Contact NUWCDIVNPT OSBP at: nwpt.nuwc\_npt\_osbp@navy.mil
- 2: Contact/engage/join local trade groups and organizations
  - In RI: NCMA, SENEDIA, AFCEA, PTAC



### A14 (Con't):

- 3: Attend Industry Days, Pre-Solicitation Conferences, etc.
  - Several upcoming local events on last slide, including today's Matchmaker
  - NSWC Corona has an Industry Day scheduled for June 6, 2017
- 4: Utilize the external SeaPort-e website to identify Prime contractors in each Zone
  - https://buy.seaport.navy.mil/SeaPort/rpt CR ViewSchedule dReports.asp?ReportName=SeaPortETOAward



### Conclusion

- Thank you NCMA for coordinating the questions for this SeaPort-e Council meeting
- Once approved by PAO, this Briefing will be posted to the DIVNPT Electronic Reading Room at: <a href="http://www.navsea.navy.mil/Home/WarfareCenters/NUWCNewport/Partnerships/BusinessPartnerships/ElectronicReadingRoom.aspx">http://www.navsea.navy.mil/Home/WarfareCenters/NUWCNewport/Partnerships/BusinessPartnerships/ElectronicReadingRoom.aspx</a>
- Upcoming Events
  - May 24, 2017: Code 85 AMSTC Pre-Solicitation Conference and Facility Tour
  - June 13, 2017: Small Business One-on-One with Ms. Emily Harman, SES, SECNAV, OSBP
  - June 14, 2017: 2<sup>nd</sup> Annual NCMA Ocean State Workshop
  - August 28 30: SENEDIA Defense Industry Day
  - October TBD, 2017: 5<sup>th</sup> Annual Small Business Product Vendor Industry Day
  - December TBD, 2017: SeaPort-e Government/Industry Council Meeting

Distribution Statement A: Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.