

CBDAIF Meeting Minutes
23 September 2015
Pine Bluff Arsenal, Little Rock, AR

0830-0845 **Welcome**
Mr. Karl Semancik, CBDAIF Chairman
Mr. Doug Bryce, Deputy Joint Program Executive Officer for Chemical Biological Defense (JPEO-CBD)

Mr. Karl Semancik, Chairman of the Chemical Biological Defense Acquisition Initiatives Forum (CBDAIF), convened the quarterly CBDAIF on 23 September 2015 at 0830 hours.

- **Mr. Semancik made administrative notes and reviewed the agenda.**
 - He explained that the CBDAIF is an industrial working group of NDIA whose purpose is to foster dialogue between government and industry in order to make improvements. It is not a business development opportunity, but rather an opportunity to discuss needs, processes, and suggestions in a non-attribution environment.
- **Mr. Bryce provided some opening remarks.**
 - He emphasized that it was good to have the meeting at Pine Bluff Arsenal (PBA) in order to show the government the advantages of doing business with industry and show industry what we're trying to do with PBA, and find common ground between the two sides.

0845-0945 **Review of Previous Actions and Sector Lead Transitions**
Mr. Karl Semancik, CBDAIF Chairman
NDIA Announcements
Mr. Armando "Mandy" Lopez, Jr., Protection Sector Lead

See PowerPoint briefing posted to the NDIA website.

Mr. Semancik discussed sector lead transitions.

- This Meeting:
 - No transitions
- Next meeting:
 - CBDAIF Chair – Karl Semancik
 - Medical Sector – John Wade
 - Consequence Management Sector – Tim Henry
 - Demilitarization and Non-Stockpile Sector – Chris Lesniak
 - Services Sector – Bruce Philips
 - Surety Sector – Michael MacNaughton

National Defense Industrial Association (NDIA) Updates

Mr. Armando "Mandy" Lopez presented NDIA updates.

- NDIA hosts quarterly morning breakfasts at the Army-Navy Club, which are a good opportunity to engage with government in a smaller setting of around 60 people. There will be one more

breakfast this year in November, where BG William King will speak. It is timely because of the ATD and JCACS industry day.

- NDIA also re-started the CBRN Defense Conference, which hadn't been done for 2-3 years. There was a very successful Conference this year at Edgewood, and we're already planning for next year. The date and location are not yet decided. It will either be at Edgewood during the week of the Green Dragon Ball (August 5th), or at Fort Leonard Wood in the July timeframe.

Review of Previous Actions

Mr. Semancik reviewed the status of previous actions. Details were provided in participant packets.

Discussion of Directed Action 1: JPEO training with industry

- Industry (Ms. Hoeber): There hasn't been much progress since the last meeting. One company has volunteered, so need to get with the JPEO to work out the details.
- Government (Mr. Bryce): I met with Lt. Gen. Williamson, Principal Military Deputy to the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics and Technology (ASA(ALT)), who mentioned wanting to do more training with industry (TWI). In the past, there was TWI for military personnel, so why not offer the same opportunity for civilians?
 - Army ASA(ALT) will have an opportunity coming out soon for Army-wide civilians trying to get into the industry world. This would be longer-term, 6 months to 1 year. If companies are interested, they can participate in this in addition to the effort Ms. Hoeber is doing.
 - Industry: We should solicit all CBDAIF members to find companies interested in participating, not just the small business sector.
- Industry: When people come out of government and join industry, they often express surprise and wish they had known earlier what it was like.
 - Government: Agree. TWI offers a chance for government personnel to see how hard it is to respond to a solicitation (put a team together, bid, make sure it complies, etc.) – it's difficult because industry doesn't always know what government wanted. Mr. Spencer and Mr. Bryce have been on both sides, which makes a huge difference.
 - Industry: One lesson learned is that the government should allow participants to have full immersion. One company wanted to send a government participant to a conference but wasn't allowed.

DIRECTED ACTION 1: Small Business sector lead will send out a white paper on the small business training with industry effort, with intent to expand to large businesses.

DIRECTED ACTION 2: Government will send out a white paper on the ASA(ALT) training with industry effort.

Discussion of Directed Action 4: CBDAIF Chair to solicit input on ways to increase dialogue between government and industry during RFI and RFP process.

- Industry: when an RFI comes out, industry wants to know what the government really needs so we can be specific. Many RFIs just say "send us information," so industry sends boilerplate. There should be a specific purpose for each RFI.

- Before we invest effort/money, industry needs to know: what's the realistic opportunity? Is it in the near term? Much better if the government can point to a program that's budgeted.
- Industry: There is inadequate feedback to RFIs. What does the government do in response to RFIs?
 - It is not clear at the beginning of the RFI process if a company is cut out of future acquisitions if it doesn't respond to the RFI. Small businesses feel this is what happens
 - When discuss white papers, don't get a clear understanding of what the government wants to discuss or not. Legal vs. substantive discussions – government doesn't know what they can/can't say.
- Industry: Companies typically build up an 8-12 person team to work on an opportunity based on anticipated contract award date. Hard to keep the team together if date slips.
 - For information systems, IT has a shelf life, so need an idea of where the government is going and a realistic timeline
- Industry: RFIs often look like draft RFPs. It is simple to respond to an RFI if it is answering basic questions about the company's capabilities. If an RFI asks how a company would respond to a specific problem, it's a much bigger effort.
 - If the government simply wants boilerplate information, it's easy deliver. If it's crafting a response and teaming, it costs the same as a proposal. That money then isn't available to respond to RFP
- Industry: why does the government send out an RFI?
 - Government: We're required to do market research.
 - Industry: then it should be very focused on what specific capabilities are out there. That's easier to respond to.
 - Industry: Does the government need an RFI, or could they find the information through web-based market research? Often an RFI asks for information that the government already knows or could easily find from the internet. It would be better if the government first did that basic research, and then use RFIs to ask more refined questions that state specifically what the government is looking for.
 - Government: We also use RFIs to gauge interest from industry.
 - Industry: That can be hard for small businesses to respond to.
- Government (Mr. Bryce): We understand your concerns and will start to put together what we can do differently in each of those processes. The government has to do market research, and maybe we should do more combing the web, but sometimes it's not enough or we don't know if the information is accurate so we use RFIs to confirm.
- Government (Mr. Bryce): RFIs and RFPs ask what the government is looking for, but where's the point where industry can intervene to provide input and alternative solutions?
 - For example, if a government requirement is 95% reliability, but the industry standard is 85%, we want to know that and how much it costs for that extra 10%.
 - Industry: Add a section to RFI response: if this isn't quite reasonable from industry POV, what would you suggest?
 - Government: That's our point, but don't want you to spend a lot of time and money providing an alternative that's not acceptable to government. Have to find a balance in how much we ask for.

- Government: The problem is by the time they get to RFP evaluation, they don't look at alternatives that are provided. We had one example where an industry alternative was exactly what was needed, but it was thrown out because it didn't meet the official RFP.
- Government: Have to do it in the RFI process that we're looking for alternatives.
- Industry: But companies won't share their technical solutions at the RFI stage only to see it put out as an RFP for another company to compete for.
- Government: If the government puts an alternative in the RFP after the industry provided it in an RFI, it would show that the alternative is valued.
- Industry: Government could broaden the RFP to say what's really needed, so that it encompasses those good alternatives.
- Industry: Dialogue is key. Industry can sit down with the JPEO and say which requirements are driving up cost.
 - Government: Every time we bring industry together in a forum, they don't share that input in front of other companies. We would have to do meetings company by company, which is time consuming. How can we share across broader industry audience?
 - Industry: It's true that industry won't share secrets with other industry. Companies who respond to RFIs represent a subset of the people who are interested and could be approached for more focused dialogue.
 - Government: But focusing on a subset could disqualify them from the RFP.
- Industry: Inconsistency among government staff (not just in the JPEO) is very frustrating. Some clients are very willing to talk right up to RFP. Some organizations say if they talk to one company they have to talk to all, which is not true. Some cut off discussion at the RFI, which is also incorrect.
 - Government (Mr. Bryce): JPEO created its own Army contracting command to do chem-bio, consolidated under APG. We're making sure that all staff understand that they can talk all the way up to the official RFP. Once the government talks to one company, it has to be WILLING to talk to all – don't have to talk to all, but have to share the same information if asked.
 - Industry: Agree. If a company has an alternative idea to an RFI, the government can't call up the company and ask for it. But the company can reach out to the government to push their idea further.
- Government: DoD is constantly behind the technology curve because of the long competition process. There are some ways to improve, but it's still not fast enough. This is nobody's fault, it's just the way the system works.
 - Government: We also need more dialogue with S&T partners so that they better understand the insertion point for new technology.
 - Industry: In the past there were Phase I/Phase II procurements (e.g. of 20 companies, choose 5 to work on Phase I, then put out a Phase II RFP.) This approach is used less frequently, but could be used more for certain opportunities.
 - Government: part of the problem is reduced funding due to sequestration. We're trying to improve process through ATDs.

Discussion of Directed Action 8: Industry incentives beyond cost and schedule.

- Government (Mr. Bryce): One of the comments from industry was that we give lots of information on the types of possible incentives, but not on what JPEO is actually using. But it really is dependent

on what we're asking for. Our goal is to not box JPMs into one specific type, although we are trying to get away from cost plus and FFP.

- We realize that we can incentivize industry with schedule and cost. But all too often, we've been content to live on cost plus and firm fixed price contracts.
- If the government provides a contract for 5 years, Industry will take 5 years to complete the work. How do we incentivize getting over technical hurdles and bringing in technologies that industry thinks would solve the problem?
- Industry: It sounds like the government wants both shorter schedule and better performance at the same time. If shorter schedule is the goal, industry will provide a more developed solution. If better performance is the goal, industry will need to focus more effort on R&D.
- Government: JPEO is reviewing incentives used in the past and trying to improve communications with industry by prioritizing requirements.
- Government: We also incentivize sustainment, so cost is looked at twice. We'd rather spend more money up front in order to spend less money later. CBRN items stay on shelf, but need a warm production base (break glass if needed). Plan is to buy less but over longer period of time.
- Industry: Value engineering and reasonable award fees are sometimes appropriate but not used often enough.
 - Government: CPAF contracts do have their place. They require a higher burden because they have to be reported on quarterly, but they do offer evaluation flexibility. An Award Fee Evaluation Board and Award Fee Official decide how much award fee will be given. The AFO has the final decision, and the amount can't be disputed, although industry could protest that the process is not followed.
 - Industry: It takes upfront work on the government side to come up with a good award structure.

0945-1045 30 Year Plan Industry Feedback

Mr. Karl Semancik, Sector Leads

See PowerPoint briefing posted to the NDIA website for detailed comments from each sector.

- Industry: The Information Systems Sector didn't see how the 30-Year Plan addressed some of the issues raised in the white paper discussed at the last CBDAIF meeting.
 - Government: The 30-Year Plan wasn't supposed to get to each point, it's to show the longer term view. We still need to define what CBRN-IS is, but we're looking at it from the warfighter mentality – who's using it for what purpose, from the tactical to strategic level.
 - Industry: A better sense of milestones would be helpful.
 - Government: It's still to come what apps will be needed in each 5 year increment.
- Industry: The Medical Sector has some unique challenges. Animal studies take three years, and there are often subsequent R&D advances after milestone decisions are made. The 30-Year Plan focuses a lot on focused programs of record, but not how they interact with each other and what enhancing capabilities are product agnostic.

- Government: We agree with all of these comments, and are working on it. It is important to get more involved with S&T and for JSTO to come up with more than one candidate, so that the best products move forward.
- Industry: Overall industry was very satisfied with the 30-Year Plan, and the JPEO should be commended for their effort. What are the next steps?
 - Government (Mr. Bryce): JPEO plans to update the 30-year plan at least once a year, so hopefully there will be updates coming soon. We want to keep receiving industry comments throughout.

1045-1145 JE-RDAP Update
Mr. John Gorrell, JE-RDAP Lead, JPEO-CBD

See PowerPoint briefing posted to the NDIA website.

- Mr. Gorrell provided an overview of the updated JE-RDAP contract process, which has two stages:
 - IDIQ level: 5 year base with 5 year option, and on-ramps as specified and as needed for technology insertion. Full and open competition, and teaming is not required.
 - The IDIQ is designed to be easy to compete for and win. Companies simply need to provide past performance, 10 pages of technical/management approach, and price. The JPEO anticipates a lot of IDIQ awards.
 - RDAP Orders: These are competed among IDIQ holders. Each one is different and up to the discretion of the JPMs. Could be any type of contract or period of performance.
 - This is the stage where there is competition between companies, and companies are more likely to form teams to complete the work. The 45 day response period to RDAP orders allows more time for teaming.
 - There is a small business set-aside for service type RDAP orders of \$5M or less in certain NAICS codes. Also, if two small business IDIQ holders say they can do the work (and the government agrees), they required to do small business set-aside.
- Industry: Can a company only provide its three most recent past performance statements?
 - Government: No, companies can choose relevant contracts within a recent timeframe.
- Industry: How will this be affected by a year-long continuing resolution?
 - Government: This IDIQ is not considered a “new start.” It’s not a new program. The JPEO can put out IDIQs, it just can’t obligate the money.
- Industry: how will you handle small businesses in larger task orders?
 - Government: large businesses will have to have small business plans. There will be percentage requirements, managed at the IDIQ level.
 - Industry: How do you enforce that?
 - Government: It can be made part of CPARS.
- Industry: When do you use OPETS compared to using a service order under JE-RDAP?
 - Government: OPETS supports the PM offices. JE-RDAP services would be stand-alone with a specific deliverable, like a test to support the development of a product.
 - Industry: Actually it’s allowed to do that type of work under OPETS. JPEO is not using OPETS as it was written.

- Government: The government controls OPETS. These requirements would be coming from the programs, so wouldn't want to make companies go back to the government to get service.
- Industry: Companies will provide labor prices when competing for IDIQ award. Will companies be held to those prices?
 - Government: We are required by law to ask about cost/price.
 - Industry: Then how do you evaluate that?
 - Government: the actual cost/price evaluation will happen at the order level.
 - Industry: Will the hourly rates that companies submit in the IDIQ be locked?
 - Government: No, although for a certain amount of time the labor rates listed in the IDIQ will remain relevant. When an RDAP order comes in, the evaluator will look at the IDIQ rates for comparison so that industry has to justify any big changes.
 - Industry: There needs to be a mechanism to keep companies accountable, otherwise they'll game the system by putting in lower prices at the IDIQ level.
 - Government: You're not competing at the IDIQ level. Companies submit labor rates, but both can win.
 - Industry: Have to make that very clear in the RFP
 - Government: We'll only ask for rates for a few common labor categories at the IDIQ level, and keep companies to what they said for a certain amount of time.
 - Industry: I've seen it where all they ask is to cost for a program manager at the IDIQ level. I believe it's legal.
 - Government: If there is such a thing and it's legal, we'd like to do it.
 - Industry: It's best to minimize the cost part as much as possible at the IDIQ level.
 - Government: We're legally bound to ask for this info, so might as well make something meaningful out of it.
 - Industry: do you have to do labor categories at all?
 - Government: We have to have cost/price.
 - Industry: You don't have to do that through labor categories.
 - Government: but labor categories are the simplest. The IDIQ will only ask for a few labor categories. Other LCATs can be priced at the RDAP order level.
- Industry: 45-day RDAP turnaround is about half of current average. Are you expecting something to streamline process?
 - Government: If you've already given a relevant past performance, don't need to do it again. At RDAP level, let industry decide how to team
 - Industry: could a PM provide 60 days instead for an RDAP order?
 - Government: 45 days is notional. Our goal is to award contracts in 120 days.
- Industry: JPEO is putting out a forecast every quarter. Will that be reflected in RDAP orders?
 - Government: Just look at the PresBud.
- Industry: would a task order cover multiple milestones, or break at each?
 - Government: It's up to the PM.
- Industry: Would you allow a leader/follower of R&D and then production?
 - Government: Yes. That's why the IDIQ calls for either an R&D company or a producer (not both), so that it doesn't require teaming at IDIQ level. But we understand there may be teaming at RDAP order level.

1145-1215 Unplugged with the JPEO (working lunch)

Mr. Doug Bryce, Deputy Joint Program Executive Officer for Chemical Biological Defense (JPEO-CBD)

- Industry: Are there metrics that can be talked about in terms of how the JPEO is doing in its interaction with industry and contracting process?
 - Government: Most JPEO contracts take 9-24 months from RFP to award. The average is about 14 months. The issue is usually protest or that the government doesn't articulate its requirement in terms that industry can respond to. We could simplify things by stating the bigger picture and letting the industry fill in the details.
 - On the other hand, industry second guesses the government often, assumes there's other info that's not in the RFP.
 - JE-RDAP is supposed to shorten this time. 12 months is not unrealistic in contracting terms, but it's too long for JPEO
 - Industry: Is there something CBDAIF can do going forward to track progress and see how we're doing (government and industry collectively)?
 - Government: JPEO evaluated what we've done on contracts. Found that execution is poor – all money was executed in 3rd in 4th quarters. We're stopping this practice, and want 85% of FY15 money to be executed in FY15.
 - Industry: Recommend developing a set of metrics, easy to collect and understand over time, which characterize the acquisition environment of JPEO CBD. These metrics will provide context to CBDAIF discussion concerning how to improve the quality of government-industry interactions across the acquisition lifecycle (e.g., level of industry interest in JPEO programs and opportunities; responses to RFIs and RFPs; and products/services provided during contract execution).

DIRECTED ACTION 3: Services Sector Lead to develop metrics on JPEO acquisition environment to enhance CBDAIF discussions on improving government-industry interactions across the acquisition lifecycle.

- Industry: To what degree has the JE-RDAP team stress-tested itself? Shortening from 1 year to 120 days, and there's the potential for increased submission of proposals. What's the burden on their time going to look like?
 - Government: OPETS was a great test of using omnibus vs. non-omnibus. OPETS forced government to do what it should. JPEO has 50 contracting officers, so we want them to be focused on one of the three omnibus contracts, with JE-RDAP being the biggest. We think we've figured out how to do it.
- Industry: Any update or prediction on the budget process?
 - Government: There are some predictions of a continuing resolution (CR) for the entire year, while others predict a shorter CR followed by either a longer CR or a budget. History says nobody wants to make that risk in an election year, but it's all still very uncertain.
- Industry: What's the status of the OTA initiative?
 - Government: Two consortia were put together. The first industry day didn't answer all questions, so another industry day will come soon. We are hoping to have one consortium and are ready to move forward.

- Industry: There's a big void of understanding in what happens after the consortium is awarded the OTA.
- Government: We think the consortium should do the whole process from soup to nuts, from R&D all the way through production of prototype.

1215-1245 Doing Business with DTRA

Mr. Mark DeGroot, Technical Program Manager, Defense Threat Reduction Agency

See PowerPoint briefing posted to the NDIA website.

- The business process is a way of connecting innovative ideas from industry and applying them to government missions.
 - DTRA uses Broad Agency Announcements (BAA), Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR), Small Business Technology Transfer (STTR), Contracts, and the CWMD IDIQ Contract.
 - Companies looking to business with DTRA should review all competitive announcements, attend Industry Days, respond to inquiries and draft solicitations, and read the instructions when bidding.

1245-1345 Joint CBRNE Advanced Capability Sets (JCACS)

COL Jeff Woods, Joint Program Manager for NBC Contamination Avoidance

See PowerPoint briefing posted to the NDIA website.

- Government (COL Woods): We have an Acquisition Decision Memorandum from Mr. Spencer to proceed on JCACS. Intent is to utilize already-scheduled exercises to test TR level 6 technologies, which could then be inserted into programs of record.

JCACS Industry Day Feedback:

- Industry: Some companies didn't understand the intent of white papers. They wanted a sense of why the government wasn't interested in certain white papers.
 - Government (Mr. Bryce): We were trying to make it easy to get in the door by writing a white paper, then let industry determine if they want to play based on the industry day. Not trying to evaluate each of the white papers.
 - Industry: If a company had 2-3 white papers covering different sectors/capabilities and only one was discussed, what was the reason?
 - Government (COL Woods): One-on-ones should give industry a better technical understanding. Was anybody restricting you from talking with multiple PMs?
 - Industry: It wasn't clear.
 - Government (COL Woods): Our intent was to allow multiple conversations. We're looking into a feedback mechanism to tell industry if they weren't accepted.
 - Government: In one-on-ones, we told industry that we'd provide good and bad feedback, but we need to have an IPT on the government side first and clarify before providing that feedback.
- Industry: Some companies didn't understand that there would be other increments, thought that this was their last chance. There also wasn't a clear understanding of the funding profile. Want better situational awareness.

- Industry: The draft SOP says the government won't pay for RFI responses, but in fact they are indirectly paying for it, because industry is spending money on RFI responses instead of IRAD, which gets into overhead rates.
 - Government: We understand. The program doesn't pay for RFI responses directly, but the government collectively pays.
- Industry: Is ATD input only being provided through white papers?
 - Government: If there is a program that has funding, it will take advantage of ATD. Doesn't matter if you've submitted a white paper or not.
 - Government: The white papers are for marketing.
 - Government: We're talking to JSTO, also hoping that they will focus on the ATDs to see where technology insertion may help. ATD is trying to bring everything together, but there will be other opportunities.

1345-1415 Global Operational Support

Mr. Mark Zimmerman, Chief Operations Officer, Strategic Portfolio Integration, JPEO-CBD

- JPEO is more and more being defined as an operational element. We have a unique capability to react to events, as evidenced in the response to Ebola and Syria, although it is difficult to merge an acquisition culture with an operational culture.
 - COL Abramson has been named the Deputy JPEO for Operations
 - Have liaison officers (LNOs) around the world.
 - Have ability to work quicker with SOCOM and LNOs there, which are important as they draft the Unified Campaign Plan.
 - Also have activities around the world, primarily funded by DTRA

1415-1445 Public Private Partnership Government Perspective

*Ms. Kristi Keller, Public-Private Partnering Manager, Joint Munitions Command
Ms. Julie Jafar, Public-Private Partnership Manager, Pine Bluff Arsenal*

See PowerPoint briefing posted to the NDIA website.

- Government (Mr. Bryce): What are the basics of a PPP? Who pays who?
 - Government: The contractor would pay PBA.
 - Government: PBA is a Center of Industrial and Technical Excellence (CITE) for CB defense. So a company could put its equipment in PBA through a CITE?
 - Answer: Yes.
 - If a company used PBA's equipment in PBA?
 - A: Then it would be a work share agreement.
 - Government (JMC): If contractor and PBA each do a separate portion of work, it's relatively easy to understand. If it's a contractor bringing its own equipment to PBA, not clear on the details. Have to check what Anniston is doing, they're often mentioned as a model for PPP.
- Government (Mr. Bryce): We are not moving everything to PBA, but would look to manage a core capability at PBA, such as textiles/rubber/filter production.
 - Government: With ammunition, there are detailed specifications, so PBA can give the same response to each industry inquiry as to cost. But JPEO is looking to do much more amorphous work.

- Government (Mr. Bryce): that's why we plan to focus on specific things like textiles that are more defined.
- Industry: If the JPEO is issuing a contract, could they define the relationship between PBA and industry in the contract, or would industry and PBA need to have a teaming agreement and jointly submit a proposal?
 - Government: The solicitation could say that they expect the work to be done at PBA. There would be two funding sources – a commercial contract to a company, and a MIPR to PBA – and there would have to be an agreement between the company and PBA.
 - Government (Mr. Bryce): Then it seems easier if the government just states from the beginning that the work will be done in PBA. If industry receives a solicitation that states work will be done at PBA, they would know what to expect.
 - Government (PBA): if JPEO defines what they expect PBA to do, it also allows PBA to give more consistent answers to potential industry partners. For example, industry supplies the materials, PBA does the assembly/integration, then industry does the system integration.
 - Government: This is a good model because it allows industry to control costs through materials.
 - Government (PBA): JPEO can state right in the RFP what is expected of PBA. That way it's consistent, and industry can compete for its portion.
- Industry: The RFP needs to be very detailed as to what PBA will do so that industry understands.
 - Government (JPEO): The RFP can't direct that PBA be a sub.
 - Government (PBA/JMC): Yes it can, we've done it before.
 - Government: What if PBA or industry doesn't hold up their part of the contract?
 - Government: The art of public private partnerships is in shaping the RFP. That's the key step, to make sure it is consistent
- Government (PBA): Responding to proposals would be a lot of work for PBA. PBA would have to do the proposal multiple times for multiple companies, although only one of the proposals would actually win.
 - Industry: There's a similar issue with one company conducting animal studies in the medical sector. You're going to win, but you have to pay multiple times for the proposal effort.
 - Government (PBA): If PBA signs an engineering estimate to a contractor, then the contractor wins an award, is PBA bound to that estimate? There would need to be time after contract award to finalize details based on multiple clauses in the partnering agreement.
 - Industry: If a company responded to an RFP with an engineering estimate, it would be laughed off. Maybe just a terminology issue. Industry needs to have a locked estimate from PBA in order to determine its pricing.
 - Government (PBA): Estimates are accurate, but requirements change. The only time that an estimated price would change is if the requirements/scope are not well understood (by industry and/or by PBA).
 - Government: In that case you're a basic ordering agreement may be more appropriate.
- Industry: When considering a PPP, it's much easier if the government facility already has some kind of specialized facility or capability, such as a railroad.

- If a new production line needs to be established, then the government will either have to pay to set it up, or pay a contractor to set it up. Otherwise there's no incentive for industry to use the government facility.
- This arrangement can work so that eventually PBA becomes the expert, but it will take a lot of time and money.
- Government: What if a CLIN was CPFF, could there be an incentive to meet schedule and have a successful first article?
 - Government: Yes, could have a separate portion of dollars set aside for a successful first article.
- Industry: Could a CRADA be used?
 - Government: Typically CRADAs are done with labs, but that's not appropriate for PBA because it's not an R&D facility. Also, JPEO seldom issues CRADAs.
- Industry: For example, what if there was an RFP to build suits at PBA and a certain company wins. Can that company use the same production line for other clients, such as for foreign military sales?
 - Government: yes, but the company has to pay for that usage.

1445-1515 Public Private Partnership Industry Perspective

Ms. Joan Black, Systems Integration Sector Lead

See PowerPoint briefing posted to the NDIA website.

- Industry has typically done PPPs on large, single-order IDIQ. We're still trying to figure out how to do it on a competitive task order under an IDIQ.
 - From industry perspective, look at what they get from teaming with PBA. Working with PBA needs to be an advantage.
- After the previous discussion, it appears that the best format would be a workshare agreement where the government specifies what it wants PBA to do so that it levels the playing field.
 - Most companies would be satisfied with this approach, although a handful who do production would be unhappy because they would want to do that work and would be put into competition against PBA. But those companies will be competing against PBA no matter what.
- Industry: There's paranoia in industry that the JPEO wants to move ALL production to PBA. Getting the message out that it's focused on some core capabilities may help alleviate those fears.
 - Government: 90% of what PBA will do is already done by industry.
 - Industry: The clearer you can be about what exactly you're trying to do at PBA, the better. Lots of confusion out in the community, and of course a lot is changing.
 - Government: How does industry get information?
 - Industry: Multiple sources, including industry groups and the website. In the absence of full information, people imagine things. Putting it on the website is useful so that there's something concrete to point to when other companies ask questions.
- Other PPP perceptions/misperceptions:
 - PPP requires justification that articles or services to industry cannot be obtained commercially - this only applies to direct sales, not to workshare
 - Government: If work is done for DoD, it is not necessary to have statement of commercial non-availability.

- It's very difficult to team with PBA on a competitive contract (2-3x more expensive hourly rate)
 - Government (PBA): Our staff does not have 2-3x the salary of industry.
 - Industry: It's in the overhead. Loaded rates are higher for PBA.
- Government: How do we counter misperceptions?

DIRECTED ACTION 4: PBA will respond to industry concerns and annotate the slides to indicate misperceptions before posting to the CBDAIF website.

- Industry: We want to know how the JPEO is going to evaluate proposals. Industry will not partner with PBA at a higher cost unless there is something explicit in the RFP. If the government values the use of PBA and is willing to pay a premium for it, industry will go along.
 - Government: From a source selection perspective, I have to choose the best value based on the information I have. We were told that we can't incentivize the use of PBA.
 - Industry: You don't have to incentivize it. Just level the playing field.
- Industry: JPEO needs to thoroughly define its objectives in priority order. For example, what's the priority between keeping PBA running and reducing cost?
 - Industry: Costs should come down in the long-term, but what will we do in the meantime?
 - Government: We've spent the last year better understanding PBA capabilities and deciding what should be done there. We will provide a briefing once decided.
 - Government: Ms. Shyu issued policy intent for PBA to remain as a production base. Providing that for industry could provide clarity on the government's policy objective, and now we're looking at how to get there.
 - Industry: Once industry understands the policy and objectives, industry has to explain what the impact would be.

DIRECTED ACTION 5: JPEO to define vision and articulate objectives for the future of PBA, and explain how it will communicate these with industry.

DIRECTED ACTION 6: Industry to review government objectives for the future of PBA and provide comments on the potential impacts to industry.

- Industry: It would be helpful to clarify the details: contract mechanisms (e.g. cost share, work share), partnership mechanisms (e.g. basic ordering agreement, letter of intent), what needs to go into the proposal, costing, etc.
 - Government: We're waiting and first trying to figure out what Anniston does – everybody points to them as a good example.

DIRECTED ACTION 7: Clarify PBA public private partnership process and mechanisms.

1515-1545 PBA Overview Brief
COL Chadwick Bauld, Commander, Pine Bluff Arsenal
See PowerPoint briefing posted to the NDIA website.

- PBA is a strategic military asset and critical part of the national technology industrial base, specializing in:
 - Chem/Bio Defense Items: PBA is a Center of Industrial Technical Expertise
 - Produces large filters, ICEMP, M295 Decon Kits
 - Mobile/powered systems, including M8E1 CBPS, DR SKO, and CP DEPMEDS
 - Testing and Surveillance of Boots/Gloves/JSLIST, M61 JSGPM Filters, and C2A1 Canisters.
 - Ammunition: White Phosphorous, Red Phosphorous, pyrotechnics.

1545-1600 **Adjourn**
Mr. Karl Semancik, CBDAIF Chairman

- Mr. Semancik: The next CBDAIF meeting will be held in the National Capital Region, likely in December 2015.

ACTION ITEMS

DIRECTED ACTION 1	Small Business Sector Lead will send out a white paper on the small business training with industry effort, with intent to expand to large businesses.
Assignee(s)	Ms. Amoretta (Amie) Hoeber, Small Business Sector Lead
Originator	Mr. Karl Semancik, CBDAIF Chair
Suspense	Update at next CBDAIF
Status	Open
DIRECTED ACTION 2	Government will send out a white paper on the ASA(ALT) training with industry effort.
Assignee(s)	JPEO Staff
Originator	Mr. Doug Bryce, JPEO-CBD
Suspense	Update at next CBDAIF
Status	Open
DIRECTED ACTION 3	Services Sector Lead to develop metrics on JPEO acquisition environment to enhance CBDAIF discussions on improving government-industry interactions across the acquisition lifecycle.
Assignee(s)	Mr. Bruce Philips, Services Sector Lead
Originator	Mr. Karl Semancik, CBDAIF Chair
Suspense	Update at next CBDAIF
Status	Open
DIRECTED ACTION 4	PBA will respond to industry concerns and annotate the slides to indicate misperceptions before posting to the CBDAIF website.
Assignee(s)	PBA Staff
Originator	Mr. Doug Bryce, JPEO-CBD
Suspense	Update at next CBDAIF
Status	Open
DIRECTED ACTION 5	JPEO to define vision and articulate objectives for the future of PBA, and explain how it will communicate these with industry.
Assignee(s)	JPEO Staff
Originator	Mr. Doug Bryce, JPEO-CBD
Suspense	Update at next CBDAIF
Status	Open
DIRECTED ACTION 6	Industry to review government objectives for the future of PBA and provide comments on the potential impacts to industry.
Assignee(s)	Sector Leads
Originator	Mr. Karl Semancik, CBDAIF Chair
Suspense	Update at next CBDAIF
Status	Open
DIRECTED ACTION 7	Clarify PBA public private partnership process and mechanisms.
Assignee(s)	JPEO and PBA Staff
Originator	Mr. Doug Bryce, JPEO-CBD
Suspense	Update at next CBDAIF
Status	Open

ATTENDEES

Mr. Doug Bryce	Deputy Joint Program Executive Officer for Chemical and Biological Defense (JPEO-CBD)
Mr. Mike Stevens	Project Manager, Omnibus Contracts Office, JPEO-CBD
Mr. Scott Paris	JPM Protection, JPEO-CBD
Ms. Donna Brown	Executive Officer for Deputy JPEO-CBD
COL Jeffery Woods	NBC Contamination Avoidance, JPEO-CBD
Ms. Emma Wilson	Deputy Chief of Staff, JPEO-CBD
Ms. Deborah Motz	Product Support Manager, Joint Portfolio, JPEO-CBD
Mr. Mark Zimmerman	Chief Operations Officer, Strategic Portfolio Integration, JPEO-CBD
Mr. Donald Buley	Deputy Joint Program Manager, Guardian, JPEO-CBD
Mr. Thomas Dickson	Senior Acquisition Manager, Evolution Enterprises, JPEO-CBD
Mr. John Gorrell	JERDAP Lead, JPEO-CBD
Ms. Rhonda VanDeCastelee	Executive Director for Ammunition, Joint Munitions Command (JMC)
Mr. Bryan Arensdorff	Chief of Sustainment Planning Division, JMC
Ms. Gail Tutt	PBA Liaison, JMC
Ms. Kristi Keller	Public-Private Partnering Manager, Sustainment Planning Division, JMC
Ms. Lori McFate	Logistics Specialist, Sustainment Planning Division, JMC
Ms. Debra Thedford	Associate Director, Business Management Integration, Edgewood Chemical Biological Center (ECBC)
Mr. Mark DeGroodt	Technical Program Manager, Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA)
Mr. Kevin Parker	Contracting Officer, Army Contracting Command – Aberdeen Proving Ground (ACC - APG)
COL Chadwick Bauld	Commander, Pine Bluff Arsenal (PBA)
Mr. Larry Wright	Pine Bluff Arsenal Deputy to the Commander
Mr. Roger Johnson	Director of Business Operations and Planning, PBA
Mr. Emami Esmailpour	Director of Engineering and Technology, PBA
Mr. Phillip Vick	Director of Chemical and Biological Defense, PBA
Mr. Ed Campbell	Director of Material Management, PBA
Ms. Aletha Lampkin	Director of Resource Management, PBA
Mr. Mark Lumpkin	Director of Risk Management and Regulatory Affairs, PBA
Ms. Julie Jafar	Public-Private Partnership Manager, PBA
Ms. Joan Black	Sector Lead, System Integration
Mr. Timothy Moshier	Sector Lead, Detection
Ms. Amoretta (Amie)	Sector Lead, Small Business
Mr. Timothy Henry	Sector Lead, Consequence Management and Response
Mr. Armando Lopez, Jr	NDIA Representative
Dr. Michael MacNaughton	Sector Lead, CB Surety Laboratories
Mr. Bruce Phillips	Sector Lead, Professional Services
Mr. Michael Ricciardi	Sector Lead, Information Systems
Mr. Karl Semancik	CBDAIF Chair
Dr. John Wade, DVM	Sector Lead, Medical Countermeasures, Diagnostics and Biotechnology