



CBD AIF

Systems Integration

Sector Briefing

22 May 2008

Dave Tilles

Northrop Grumman Electronic Systems



Comments re: ITAR

- Documentation is generally well defined from what the USG needs to process an industry request.
- Lead times in deciding what is type of export / import authorization is/may be needed for what products or services. Not everything is black or white (e.g. dual use, technology in development)
- Risk of getting it wrong or missing something drives thorough / comprehensive review and approval processes on both sides.
- Detailed and clear documentation within submissions (scope of work, citing USG POCs knowledgeable of the effort, etc) remains key for obtaining desired level of approval.
- USG processing time is somewhat predictable...however process takes several months to complete
- Turn-around time is improving...attributable to new management personnel within DDTC and their focus on improving turn around times. Emphasis within the Directorate is also being directed towards reducing/minimizing State licensing officers use of RWA'ing license submissions.



Comments on DCMA

- View of DCMA's role: a partner with industry focused on ensuring the delivery of quality products to the customer
- A Benefit, A Detriment or Just There?
 - Have experienced all 3 – highly dependent on the individuals involved
 - DCMA is generally viewed favorably... Local DCMA knows our company as well as any USG entity and can help drive items to closer resolution vs. “training” a new customer or end user.
- How Can DCMA Provide More Value?
 - More Training to DCMA representatives
 - Early involvement and communication with the ultimate customer / end user regarding what our company is providing and what is needed of DCMA from the end user will bring added value.
 - Industry needs to ensure that documentation necessary for the DCMA representatives is timely and accurate.
 - Showcase programs where a positive and constructive Industry/JPMs/DCMA partnership led to success. Hold Lessons learned sessions for industry



Comments on Contracts

■ **Contracts of Right Size and Type?**

- Depends on opportunity
- Proposals are very expensive to prepare
- Many of the contracts are on the small side considering the competition and investment that is usually involved.
- The proposals are too expensive for the potential payback that could be had.

■ **Are Contract Awards Fair?**

- Usually, some concerns with technical expertise of evaluators

■ **Do Contracts Protect Both Industry and Gov't?**

- Yes, trending toward more risk on industry

■ **What Might Improve Contracting Process?**

- Plan for FRP competitions up front
- More open communication between gov't procurement agencies and contractors
- More use of draft RFPs and Industry Days
- Ensure quality/consistency of Sections L & M with each other and SOW
- Pick us more often 😊



Comments on SOWs

■ **Clear and Specific?**

- Could be more specific – tend to be templates
- Especially in Logistics sections

■ **Suggestions for Improvement?**

- Build the SOW using a database tool (Access or other) and provide it along with the Word or PDF SOW.
- More rigorous industry review as a draft prior to final release.
- Clear definition of Government desired schedule (must be realistic).
- Clear indication of funding that is available to support the program.



Comments on IR&D

■ **CBD Market Sufficient for Robust Industry IR&D?**

- More complex question than just size of market. Business case is defined by:
 - Growth Rate, Stability, Competition, Profitability
 - Development Cycle Timelines
 - Comparison to Other Industries
- Market size is sufficient, but predictability of opportunities (or lack thereof) hinders investment.
- Industry frequently doesn't feel a sense of urgency within the government to get technology deployed. JRO-JSTO-JPEO frequently not on same page. Programs get bogged down. This impacts industry's willingness to invest.



Comments on IR&D

- The CBD Program S&T investment and the related DHS investments are a small fraction of their industry R&D equivalents (clinical and environmental analysis industries). However, this is not unexpected, since the CBD Program and related DHS expenditures are a small fraction of the clinical testing and environmental analysis markets.
- The current level of CBD Program investment could be much more effective with several changes:
 - Explain to industry how the DARPA-DTRA-JPEO CBD process will work in the future, and provide credible evidence these three groups will actually follow the process. There appears to be little coordination or communication at the present time. This coordination process must be synchronized with an industry's commercialization plan to create and justify specific private S&T investment plans, and this is currently very difficult to do with a high level of confidence.
 - Provide a longer-term roadmap and plan. Currently the business opportunities that are announced at the APBIs or POMs do not give sufficient time to coordinate long-term investments in potential dual-use products. Without some type of formal plan, the risk to industry is too high for many investments.
 - Provide incentives that will encourage interactions between classical defense contractors and medical or environmental companies, so the current clinical, environmental, and other industrial S&T investments can be leveraged for CBD applications earlier and in more cases.