

NAWCAD INDUSTRY DAY 27 October 2021 – CHAT DOWNLOAD

- from The Patuxent Partnership to everyone: Good morning, thank you for joining us! Please post any questions you have here!
- from Susan P (privately): Will slides and/or recording be available after today's session in the event we have to miss part of the presentation? ANSWER: to Susan P (privately): Susan - we will post slides.
- from The Patuxent Partnership to everyone: We will be polling the audience after intros - please visit www.menti.com and enter code 4852 0157
- from Matt Scassero he, him, his to everyone: the poll only allows one selection. LinkedIn and TPP are the two we use.
- from Katy Gates to everyone: only able to select one option on the menti link, unfortunately.
- from Marc Briere to everyone: BLS does not consider clearances.
- from Marc Briere to everyone: BLS is based on Census data which is 10 years old.
- from Jeffrey Penfield to everyone: Couldn't get on menti.com; can we go back and answer poll questions later? Would like too especially on LOE question.
- from Dave Borski to everyone: Or allow it with conditions where offeror must explain approach.
- from Marc Briere to everyone: I called DOL and they were surprised BLS was being used for active contract bidding purposes as it was NOT the reason for the data
- from Marc Briere to everyone: BLS does NOT consider clearances in the rates given!!!
- from Ed Rule to everyone: otherwise have race to bottom on pricing.
- from The Patuxent Partnership to everyone: Menti.com is very easy to access via cell phone
- from John P to everyone: thank you...much easier on mobile phone...takes you right to the code entry window.....
- from Matt Scassero he, him, his to everyone: "stop consuming TOA" sounds like they don't value what the warfare centers are producing...disappointing..."maximizing ROI" would be more forward thinking, I believe...
- from Ed Rule to everyone: Competition is how you control prices and that comes from users/buyers having choices regarding where they go for products and services.

- from Marc Briere to everyone: There is a challenge with reducing the average salary for professionals as that concept conflicts with FAR for Compensation of Professional Employees and it is restrictive for the SCA employees.
- from Ed Rule to everyone: Warfare Centers in this regard face challenges similar to industry service providers to "knowledge-based" contracts. The customer is the most qualified to assess value vs. cost. The enterprise just needs to foster competition by opening up options to customers.
- from DALE MOORE to everyone: A Smart and Capable NAWCAD is a great lever to promote continuous competition via NASC OTA as the Lead Systems Integrator, process improvement, innovation etc. Compare in-house costs to the \$45B NAVAIR total budget - focusing on reducing the \$45B can save substantial TOA. We may be focusing on the wrong place to reduce costs.
- from Ed Rule to everyone: Market supply and demand largely determine what salaries you need to offer to get the talent you need
- from Ed Rule to everyone: Again, the competitive environment is the key to cost control
- from Marc Briere to everyone: Reduction in average salaries is difficult when there are more positions with increased "specificity" in terms of degrees and experience combined with clearances. The government wants contractors to hire smart and highly competent people. These smart people know what they are worth and have no problem marketing themselves.
- from DALE MOORE to everyone: Hard to attract and retain the best talent for the best naval force in the world during a real 'War for Talent' when reducing salaries and opportunities for growth and development. All the DAiTA topics are cutting edge and super competitive for talent acquisition and retention. What will be our "competitive advantage" to bring the best talent on-board and hold on to them?
- John Slaughter to everyone: There is no faster or more effective way to drain the talent pool in SoMD than to award contracts to lowball bidders. In a fight for talent, as we are in now, the employee holds the cards. Good example is software developers. They can get work anywhere they want and if offered low here to keep their jobs following a contract turnover, they will leave. If NAVAIR is not going to use very demanding and numerous key personnel requirements to get the people needed, then the market will result in low bidding to win. That does not mean the talent can be hired for the rates bid. Putting a floor under the direct rates forces quality of the offer to hold more weight by leveling the salary playing field instead of leveling the technical, as happens today.
- from Daniel Vogel to everyone: I would add to the above that the lack of imagination and determination from NAWCAD when given options to expand their pool besides the standard "who is in St. Mary's county that we can just give this to?"
- from DALE MOORE to everyone: In a highly competitive environment you get what you pay for - talent and ingenuity with deep knowledge and expertise are the keys to attracting the best and brightest to design, develop and deliver superior systems.

- from Daniel Vogel to everyone: Are we able to get these slides after the industry day is over? **ANSWER:** from The Patuxent Partnership to everyone: Slides will be posted on TPP's website tomorrow that are permitted for distribution.
- from Ed Rule to everyone: Like the way the pandemic has forced us all to rethink geographical separation in the quest to meet cutting-edge developmental demands. Should recognize future high performance workforce is less geographically constrained - although existence of certain facilities do to a degree demand co-location and in-person teams still bring value, especially in developing young talent.
ANSWER: Jeff Guarnero answered verbally – several discussions here at Pax related to expanding the ability to propose and utilize Remote TW CSS employees on our services contracts. I think you will see more of this approach endorsed on future NAWCAD service support RFPs.
- from Paul Croisetiere to everyone: In FY19 the Naval Air Systems Command (NAVAIR) Digital Office (NDO) released a BAA which expressed NAVAIR's interest in receiving white papers for Science and Technology (S&T) Projects which offer potential for advancements and improvements applicable to the digitization of NAVAIR / U.S. Naval operations. Does the NDO intend on releasing a similar BAA in the future?
ANSWER: The NAVAIR Digital Department has posted a Digital BAA annually since the initial FY19 release. The current Digital BAA is posted on SAM.gov under N68335-21-S-0001 and is open through COB November 18, 2021. A new FY22 BAA for the digitization of NAVAIR will be released on November 19, 2021 on SAM.gov.
- from DALE MOORE to everyone: Excellent summary of DAITA!!!
- from Brian Reardon - QuantiTech (privately): Looking forward to follow on conversations from the Autonomy RFI.
- from Marc Briere to everyone: Does the Cyber include offensive-cyber development?
- from Brian Reardon - QuantiTech (privately): Best POC for the Advanced Technology R&D to review our RFI inputs and share similar work done with other customers?
- from dan.nega to everyone: is it possible to keep an up-to-date NAWCAD org chart, down to div mgr level, posted, maybe with TPP? **ANSWER:** Steve Cricchi responded that he would take an action to determine if a NAWCAD Org chart could be distributed – An updated Top-level NAWCAD Org Chart will be distributed via Pax Partnership along with this Chat Q&A.
- from Peter Verburgt to everyone: Great presentations from Amy & Chris. Where does the funding come from for these areas, like the Advanced Technology Development? **ANSWER:** Amy Markowich answered verbally - The funding comes from a variety of sources including but not limited to: Naval Innovative Science & Engineering (NISE) funding, DoD Strategic Capabilities Office, NRL, ONR, DARPA, and direct program offices.
- from Katy Gates to everyone: As we move into our new operating environment, I'm interested to see how we, the Government, can/should utilize the BLS codes/rates to support remote telework for skillsets that might be heavily focused in alternate geographic locations (i.e. software developers in Huntsville vs. SoMD)... it is going to become challenging to effectively evaluate/compare cost if/when Industry utilizes

alternate geographic locations for various LCATs. Interested to see what guidance comes down to support applies to apples proposals as well as evaluations. **ANSWER:** From Jeff Guarnero – Good question. Currently we typically perform cost realism analysis on proposed labor rates at one or a select few locations where the predominance of the CSS employees will be located. In the future, applicable acquisitions teams may need to consider looking at more geographic locations on applicable source selections.

- from Brian Reardon - QuantiTech (privately): Concur with the location discussion. Getting creative with other geographic locations can have a large benefit for NAWCAD.
- from Mark Lucas to everyone: When you mention Enterprise IT under DNA, did that change include subsuming the former 7.2 organization and legacy capabilities? **ANSWER:** from Amy Markowich to everyone: Yes, "old 7.2 Corporate IT support" is now part of DNA Department in DAITA.
- from DALE MOORE to everyone: Kill Chain status is our ultimate measure to consider effectiveness - how are we doing?
- from Brian Reardon - QuantiTech to everyone: Concur with the location discussion. Getting creative with other geographic locations can have a large benefit for NAWCAD.
- from Matt Scassero he, him, his to everyone: that idea of not focusing on consumptive metrics but rather outcomes is exactly the message we need, all of us. Good points, Steve.
- from Curt Dodges L3Harris to everyone: Re Acquisition... Is there any thought toward opportunities to expand the NAWCAD PLP contract? It was awarded during changing NAWCAD/AIRWorks strategy and has a limited group of primes. The FRP contract was better promoted and understood by industry, and has a more industry representative MAC pool. But all the work is funneling thru PLP first and those FRP guys are at a disadvantage vs PLP incumbents even if there's a follow-on. **ANSWER:** Chris Beard answered this verbally - The current PLP MAC is approaching the completion of the base ordering period and the decision point to exercise the first of the three one year optional ordering period. In order to expand the pool of the PLP, the admissions process would essentially replicate the same process required to compete and award a PLP MAC follow on. Therefore, the Government is currently assessing the strategy related to a follow on PLP MAC like requirement and the timing of starting that competition versus opening the competitive admissions process on the current contract while exercising the ordering period options.
- from Marc Briere to everyone: It would really benefit the government to overcome some of the challenges with Cyber staffing if there could be consideration for pooled staffing solutions especially in design/development where high-priced-talent can be matrixed in as needed but not as FTEs. Would the government consider capabilities-based-staffing solutions rather than making all staffing FTE-based? **ANSWER:** Jeff Guarnero verbally answered this question – I have been discussing this approach of performance based, outcome based services with local industry and NAWCAD requirements owners for several years. The challenge is that due to many factors such as the uncertainty of actual project workload in the out years of a given contract, among other factors, Government contract/requirements owners have been reluctant to depart from a non-performance based Level of Effort (LOE) FTE staffing approach.
- from Scott Trail to everyone: Classified infrastructure was mentioned as a priority. Does that include expanding/improving network connectivity above the Secret level? **ANSWER** from Amy Markowich to

everyone: Yes, Scott Trail, we MUST expand network connectivity above SECRET - actually have capability but need more and improvements.

- from Brian Reardon - QuantiTech to everyone: The ability to tap into strong expertise in other geographic locations could be key.
- from Randy Mahr to everyone: This is one of the best exchanges of info and ideas that I have seen at these virtual I-days.
- from Peter Verburgt to everyone: Agree that additional classified space is essential to the new lines of advanced development. Classified resources are becoming more difficult for small businesses to support. Use of government facilities would be important in this area
- from Mark 'Stick' Converse, Cypress International (privately): can you speak a bit more about where you are applying the Section 219 NICE funds? **ANSWER:** This would be covered in the NAWCAD NISE strategy which is encompassing of many technology areas. NAWCAD will look at presenting information on the NICE Strategy at the next Industry Day.
- from John Slaughter to everyone: How does the R&M Support contract differ from the AIR-4.1 Speciality Engineering contract that contains the same specialty areas? Both include R&M and Systems Safety in their SOWs. **ANSWER** from Rhonda Garcia to everyone: R&M Support and Specialty Engineering do have some similar scope wording but the main difference is R&M focus on Product Integrity versus a contract that focuses on specialty engineering disciplines such as flutter analysis etc..
- from Brian Reardon - QuantiTech to everyone: Good to see Draft RFPs. Helpful
- from Tom Sanders to everyone: I believe the SS for this one is due today. Can you confirm no set aside decision has been made (for AVSES)
- from Scott Trail to everyone: FFRDCs were mentioned earlier. Have University Affiliated Research Center (UARC) sole source contracts been considered to leverage academia's research and technical expertise? **ANSWER:** Rick Tarr answered this verbally – We have used a few UARCs in the past and we do consider UARCs as an option.
- from Daniel Chambers to everyone: Chris Beard is the POC for the DAiTA Group, his email is Christopher.M.Beard6.civ@us.navy.mil
- from Christian Utara to everyone: Rhiana Haney is the POC for NAWCAD WOLF, her e-mail is rhiana.m.haney.civ@us.navy.mil.
- From Matt Scassero he, him, his to everyone: Similar to Scott Trail's question (which is great!), what is Contract's view on Cooperative Agreements these days? what kind of leadership guidance are they getting on those? It has been "problematic"... **ANSWER:** Our latest NAWCAD-wide BAA was published in June (N0042121S0001) and we've got a handful of cooperative agreements in the works. But on the whole, it's fairly rare for this NAWCAD to issue cooperative agreements because they're considered "fundamental research" and therefore have to benefit the public at large, rather than directly benefit the Government. And per DFARS 235.016, we are limited to the types of funding we can use for cooperative

agreements – essentially pure OH or RDT&E budget activities 6.1 & 6.2 – so we just don't do a lot of cooperative agreements.

- from Ed Rule to everyone: Matt, I believe cooperative agreements are key to going fast and retaining key intellectual capital within U.S.
- from Ed Rule to everyone: need to be more creative on vehicles - besides OTA and classic contracts
- from Tom Sanders to everyone: The comment on IMM that it was 'previously' a SBSA, is that an indication the future opportunity will be F&O? **ANSWER** from Kristen Ferro to everyone: Tom Sanders - No, however, the final determination will be made based on the responses to the sources sought and any additional market research conducted.
- from Wendy Lee to everyone: For the follow on to the 3 SE contracts do you anticipate Seaport NEXGEN as the contract vehicle or stand alone IDIQ? **ANSWER:** from Daniel Chambers to everyone: Wendy, no the current plan is to utilize SA IDIQ approach for the follow-ons, however the acquisition strategy is still in development.
- from Chris Bimson to everyone: In addition to Seaport NEXGEN, any potential DTIC IAC or Best In Class vehicles? **ANSWER:** From Jeff Guarnero – NAWCAD uses many different contract vehicles, SEAPORT is one of several tools in the toolbox. NAVAIR and NAWCAD use the IACs and other best in class strategic source vehicles such as NASA SEWP, GSA OASIS, GSA Alliant, and others in addition to SEAPORT.
- from Joe Joseph to everyone: I was under impression that NAVAIR/NAWC opted out of SEAPORT NXG and would not be using this vehicle.
- from The Patuxent Partnership to everyone: Slides will be posted on TPP website later today.
- from Tom Sanders to everyone: Christina, There is lots on guidance on the requirement to give preference to SBIR technology for Government programs. However, it is not at all clear, particularly with OTAs how that is implemented. Can you point me to the right source to better understand how OTA's give SBIR technology preference in the acquisition process? **ANSWER:** from Christina Allee - The right source for the SBIR and OTA leadership is with Mr. Ron Crescini as the NAWCAD CTSO. Mr. Rick Tarr is also the TTO office and the Tech Bridge director who can help with understanding opportunities and reaching back into the CTSO office to understand the possible opportunities. RPED is experimenting with SBIRs in ANTX as well as working to take technology that has been demonstrated during our IMPAX events and work to interject that technology into the SBIR process.
- from Maura Boselowitz to everyone: Do you exclusively use the Naval Aviation Systems Consortium (NASC) OTA? If not, which other OTA Consortiums do you frequently use? **ANSWER:** NAWCAD has used the MARCORPSYSCOM C5/CEED a few times done some work using DOTC. DIUx has done some stuff for NAWCAD as well but majority of OTAs are from NASC.
- from rod (privately): OTA - SBIR/STTRs/CSA/CRADA -- Would DFARS 252.223-7999, Ensuring Adequate COVID-19 Safety Protocols for Federal Contractors (Deviation 2021-O0009) be applied to these vehicles/agreements? **ANSWER:** Yes, if they are for OTA for RDTE and/or services. There is a separate clause used for OTAs with similar wording to the DFARS clause.
- from Chris Bimson to everyone: Is Christa willing to share her POC?

- from Christopher Beard to everyone: Other OTA's we frequently use are the C5 and PEOSTRI TREX OTAs.
- from A Mickley to everyone: When you mention the Seaport contract vehicle, is that Seaport or Seaport NextGen? **ANSWER:** SEAPORT Next Gen (NG).
- from Alison` to everyone: It is getting very expensive for Small Businesses to have to join multiple consortiums. All academic institutions are exempt from membership dues. Could the Navy consider also exempting small businesses from fees as well? **ANSWER:** Under NASC, the membership fee is \$500/year. The Consortium incurs administrative and operating expenses which is the reason for the dues.
- from Nagel Sullivan to everyone: Are JVs and Mentor/protege programs seen more/less/as favorably when responding to NAVAIR RFPs? **ANSWER:** From Jeff Guarnero – No discrimination in regard to a JV or mentor protégé status when responding to NAWCAD RFPs.
- from Danice Wilson to everyone: Christa's contact info is crista.rodewald-franz.civ@us.navy.mil.
- from John Kormash (privately): What's the best way for industry to engage with Airworks to learn about collaboration and contracting opportunities? **ANSWER:** Ms. Rodewald-Franz answered verbally to contact her directly.
- from Peter Verburgt to everyone: With more work requiring classified IT and facility resources, it is becoming more difficult for small businesses to cover the cost of government requirement in this area. In that case, the availability and use of on-base classified facilities becomes more important to maintain the support of small businesses. Are you seeing any concerns in this area. **ANSWER:** NAWCAD is focusing on adding more on-site classified facilities.
- from Bud Jewett to everyone: How do FNC (Future Naval Capabilities) and other ONR thrusts fit in with NAWC Experimentation & Rapid Prototyping efforts? **ANSWER:** The RPED office is working to be aligned as much as possible with the efforts of technology development associated with filling capability gaps. Working closely with OPNAV and program offices on addressing capability gaps and with the fleet.
- from george.franz to everyone: As CSS telework increases, what is your perspective on rates - Govt site; Contractor site; hybrid? Recent RFPs still follow the old model of majority Govt site work. **ANSWER:** Jeff Guarnero answered this verbally – Many of our latest RFPs allow for use of Telework and many now show a predominance of work site being other than Gov't site (i.e alternate or Contractor site). Any off-site versus on-site rates have not been a consideration here at Pax AD in relation to services contracting.
- from Katy Gates to everyone: I think some of the challenges with CRADAs/Co-ops/UARCs is finding a funding source to tie the R&D back to. Industry has lots of great ideas, but sponsors aren't always willing/able to come up with funding immediately to support them. Bridging that gap between capability offering and tech development to the point of warfighter insertion is a team sport for both the Gov't and Industry, IMO.
- from The Patuxent Partnership to everyone: For inquiries about engagement with AIRWorks, contact Christa Rodewald-Franz

- from Scott to everyone: Any updates on CMMC Level 3 requirements coming down in new NAWCAD solicitations? **ANSWER:** Jeff Guarnero & Chris Beard answered verbally – We are not seeing recent RFP issued including requirements for CMMC at any level.
- from Donald Murphy Snowflake to everyone: What’s the best way for industry to engage with Amy/DAiTA team? **ANSWER:** Chris Beard answered verbally – contact him.
- from John Slaughter to everyone: We continue occasionally to be told by government technical POCs that they can't talk to industry about upcoming solicitations, even when some of these are many months away and no draft RFPs have been put out. Can a concerted educational effort be undertaken to make sure TPOCs, CORs and others know industry input is valued and desired right up until RFP release? **ANSWER:** Jeff Guarnero answered verbally – Sometimes TPOCs and CORs don't support visits and discussions due to heavy workload. However, here at Pax, I have made it very clear that we must communicate with industry and that includes TPOCs and CORs. If Contractors get rejected by NAWCAD personnel for communications, you may contact me directly via phone or email and I will look into the situation.
- from The Patuxent Partnership to everyone: Christopher.M.Beard6.civ@us.navy.mil
- from Christina.Allee to everyone: For RPED you can contact me at christina.m.allee.civ@us.navy.mil or the full team at neo_ate.fct@navy.mil
- from The Patuxent Partnership to everyone: All POC info will be shared in a follow up email later today from TPP. Along with slides and link to video.
- from Matt Scassero he, him, his to everyone: Nice job, especially the leadership discussions with Amy and Steve. All good info throughout.