

During the SBIOI held on 23 June 2016, many questions were submitted during the Contracts brief that could not be answered due to time/schedule constraints. The questions have been logically grouped, and summary responses to frequently asked or broadly applicable questions are provided below.

- 1) External contracts: questions ranged from internal and external communications to processes and plans for use of specific contracts.

Response: In the SBIOI contract strategy briefing we outlined the plan for usage of external contracts over the next several years. It is SSC LANT's position going forward to maximize the use of external where possible. The future contract strategy is also being briefed internally to all stakeholders (competencies and portfolios). External contract vehicle options that may meet IPT requirements are also discussed during Project Procurement Approval Board (PPAB) (internal planning team) meetings. The planning meetings will ensure that IPTs know that the external contracts are available to them. Selection of any contract vehicle (internal or external) generally focuses on scope, period of performance, costs/fees, terms and conditions, ordering procedures, need dates, and competitive environment. The plan is for SSC LANT Contracts to issue RFPs, evaluate proposals, and issue/administer orders. We are exploring assistance available to us from the contract owners, but they would primarily be used to augment our operations. The list of potential external contracts will evolve, but the SBIOI briefing lists those external contracts we have used and/or are targeting for use right now. We will continue to mature our forecasting ability to give maximum visibility to our requirements and which contracts are being considered for use. As far as we know, Seaport-e will be a viable contract for us for several years, but we are closely monitoring its availability. It is our understanding that orders may be issued up until April 2019 and may have a period of performance for an additional 60 months from that date. Regarding Other Transaction Agreements (OTAs), we do have some IPTs exploring that option, but SSC LANT has no plans to issue any OTAs. IPTs may use existing OTAs, and those actions would be completed by the organization that owns the OTA. Additionally, SSC LANT has utilized external classified contracts in the past and will continue to do so when appropriate.

- 2) Strategy: questions ranged from clarifying intent to specific questions about niche contracts/requirements:

Response: Slide 5 of the SBIOI contract strategy briefing identified a goal of holding a contractor accountable for the entire requirement and deliverable. The primary intent of that statement was that supply contracts can be used to cover several phases of a project (e.g., design, development, etc.), and that this strategy gives us the ability to consider the appropriate phases for each action and receive delivery of the total "solution." We will still be awarding several niche contracts as part of this strategy. We will continue to forecast those as much as possible, and we will use SBIOI events to share those future niche contracts opportunities. We are still determining final strategies for some requirements, and there will not always be a one-for-one relationship between contracts used and specific customers. As an example, we have used the

NIH CIO-SP3 contract for some DHA requirements, but that will not be the exclusive contract for all DHA requirements. Additionally, cloud capabilities are available on several external contracts, so we will select the most beneficial vehicle for each requirement. We also are exploring internal cloud contracting solutions.

- 3) Communication: questions ranged from Seaport specific questions to ideas about communication methods:

Response: Communication is very important to us, and Contracts has a goal to be as transparent as possible. At the same time, we want to provide quality information, and we realize that we will never satisfy the entire industrial base. That said, we are working closely with the PPAB to build better forecasts so that industry sees planned actions as early as possible. The current plan for solicitations on internal MACs is to use the Seaport-o portal. Schedule permitting, Contracts staff does conduct meetings with individual contractors; as an example, generally, SSC LANT Head of Contracts, Steve Harnig, sets aside time on Fridays for meetings with companies. We do plan to conduct more industry days on new contracts and task orders (as time permits), and we are exploring other venues and opportunities to share information. We welcome recommendations for events where we can further our industry engagement. We have set up a functional mailbox to encourage and receive feedback from Industry specifically regarding the future contract strategy. The email address for the functional mailbox is [industryfeedback.fct@navy.mil](mailto:industryfeedback.fct@navy.mil).

- 4) Competition: questions related to incumbent contractors winning follow-on actions:

Response: Competition is a key driver for SSC LANT. We value competition and believe that it is in our best interest to foster competition as much as possible. As we have said many times, requirements drive the source selection methodology/criteria. We have tailored evaluation criteria on several actions so that we evaluate approach instead of just experience. We will continue to work with our IPTs to select the most appropriate source selection procedures for each action.

- 5) Small Business: questions related to carve-outs and future of 8(a) Incubator Contract:

Response: We are reviewing each action in our strategy for set-aside potential, and then we consider some form of carve-out or reserves in the strategy. If possible, we will identify specific scope that can be set-aside and establish contracts with that particular scope for award to small businesses. If we employ reserves, we will attempt to clarify the scope that is being reserved so that we can avoid confusion or overlap with large business scope. We will continue to conduct market research on the future IDIQ contracts identified in the SBIOI briefing, so we recommend companies monitor E-commerce for opportunities to respond/comment so that we can make informed decisions about small business efforts within the strategy. We are still in the early

planning stages on the best way forward with the 8(a) incubator program to ensure the continuation of bringing new, qualified contractors on board.

6) Contract specific: questions related to individual contracts:

Response: For the best possible information sharing, contractors should address specific questions about new contracts to Sheela Casper (sheela.casper@navy.mil). However, we wanted to address questions regarding the change in the former Mobile C4I Solutions opportunity (N65236-15-R-0015) to Cyber Missions Systems, Kits, and Supplies (N65236-16-R-0036). Currently, we are in the midst of finalizing the market research for this requirement. At this time, we do not plan to send a new RFI on this action. There was a discrepancy in the SBIOI charts regarding this action. Slide 11 and 13 indicated this action has been determined to be a SBSA. However, the final decision has not been determined. The correct information is annotated in slide 41 as TBD (To Be Determined). We will continue to look at key opportunities to engage with industry on the requirement to ensure we remain as transparent as possible in our future contracts strategy.