CBDAIF Meeting Minutes

29 January 2016

ANSER Headquarters, Falls Church, VA

0830-0900	**Welcome** *Mr. Karl Semancik, CBDAIF Chairman* *Mr. Doug Bryce, 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 29 January 2016 at 0830 hours.

- **Mr. Semancik made administrative notes and reviewed the agenda.**

- **Mr. Bryce provided some opening remarks.**
  - He emphasized that one of the JPEO-CBD's primary problems is getting people to understand where we are and where we're going.

0900-0930	**Review of Previous Actions and Sector Lead Transitions** *Mr. Karl Semancik, CBDAIF Chairman* **NDIA Announcements** *Mr. Armando "Mandy" Lopez, Jr., NDIA Representative*

See PowerPoint briefing posted to the NDIA website.

Mr. Semancik discussed sector lead transitions.

- This Meeting:
  - CBDAIF Chair – Karl Semancik to Dave Cullin
  - Medical Sector – John Wade to Sean Kirk
  - Consequence Management Sector – Tim Henry to Amit Kapoor
  - Demilitarization and Non-Stockpile Sector – Chris Lesniak to Venkat Rao
  - Services Sector – Bruce Philips to Gabe Patricio
  - Surety Sector – Michael MacNaughton to Matthew Shaw

National Defense Industrial Association (NDIA) Updates

Mr. Armando "Mandy" Lopez presented NDIA updates.

- The NDIA CBRN/JPEO Defense Conference will be held August 1-4 in Edgewood where it was last year. It is expected to be a bigger venue this year, with no waiting list. The Green Dragon Ball will be held on August 5th at Marriott
- The first CBRN Defense Roundtable Breakfast of 2016 will be in early April, with Doug Bryce as the guest speaker.
- Bates: NDIA just completed a 6 month strategic review and is beginning the process of developing a strategic plan. Previously NDIA's focus has been on networking and improving relations between government and industry. A new leg will be added to the organization to conduct thought leadership. NDIA is still working to define this concept and figure out how to operationalize it.

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

Discussion of Directed Action 3: Metrics on JPEO Acquisition Environment

- Industry (Mr. Phillips): At the previous CBDAIF, we talked about the numerous acquisition initiatives and how it would be good to have overall metrics on what's being bought and how much is being spent. Are there things that could be shared with industry to frame what's happening, and how well we're doing to accomplish our mission?
- Government: As part of program status reviews to the ASA(ALT), there was a requirement to create contracting-related metrics. JPEO created 40-50 such metrics and is getting close to finalizing them. The metrics that industry proposed at the last meeting were included. Once they are finalized and approved, we will post them to the JPEO public website and brief them to the CBDAIF.
- Industry (Mr. Phillips): It's important to look at not just quantity, but also quality, e.g. the time that the contracting process takes.
- Industry: Do the metrics apply to service contracts only?
- Government: No, they apply to all sectors

DIRECTED ACTION 1: Government to update on status of JPEO Acquisition Metrics

0930-1030 **State of Sector Briefs**
Sector Leads

See PowerPoint briefings posted to the NDIA website.

Detection Sector Brief – Mr. Tim Moshier, SRC Inc.

- **Connection between S&T and Acquisition**
  - **Industry (Mr. Moshier):** One sector concern is that the LPTA environment limits opportunity to propose new, enhanced capabilities.
  - **Government (Mr. Bryce):** Is this issue referring to the CBD enterprise, or specifically the JPEO? JSTO has lots of efforts to bring in new technologies.
  - **Industry (Mr. Moshier):** This was a concern from one of the companies in my sector, so I'm not sure, but the company had seen the 30-year plan.
  - **Government:** DTRA has an open BAA that we're always willing to accept new ideas and see how it fits in.
  - **Industry:** If industry is talking to JPEO about new concepts, do the JPMs point them to the DTRA BAA?
  - **Government (Mr. Bryce):** yes, we're teaming closely with DTRA, so they should automatically feed things to S&T community, whereas DTRA should pass ideas for advanced development to the JPEO. We're working closely with DTRA to avoid the awareness gaps.
  - **Government (Mr. Bryce):** In order to use the requirements process, there have to be multiple candidates within DTRA for a technology that the JPEO can compare. JPEO does also have an RFI process.

- **Government:** JSTO has been trying to change the Advanced Technology Demonstration (ATD) approach so that there's an opportunity to bring in high-risk technologies, put them in front of soldiers in operational setting, and see what they think of it. The HIBRID ATD is looking at decision-support tools, but in the future we will be looking to incorporate detection, other things.
- **Industry (Mr. Moshier):** is that for DTRA technology only?
- **Government:** We're looking to see what technologies work. Ideally we would be able to put multiple technologies in front of soldiers so that they can say what aspects of which technologies they like.
- **Industry (Mr. Moshier):** We weren't aware that DTRA was doing that.
- **Government:** We weren't until recently. The goal is to put technologies in front of soldiers earlier so that when they are transferred to the JPEO, we already have a 60% solution that soldiers like.
- **Industry:** The fusion between DTRA and JPEO may be worth further discussion. Industry is hearing some of this information for the first time. There is a tighter connection between DTRA and JPEO, but it's still hard for industry to see.
- **Industry:** Some companies focus more on advanced development, while others focus more on S&T. It would be good to understand how these things work together so that industry can better identify opportunities. But companies do not want to do multiple contract mechanisms.
- **Government:** The JRO is introducing a 60-day rapid review of the JCIDS process to make it faster. We're also looking at a rapid capability development process so we can speed up capability development and testing so that perhaps technologies can be fielded sooner.
- **Government:** Do we want to be a leader or a follower in terms of cutting edge technologies? Sometimes we go after cutting edge technology but then find that there's no market viability.
- **Industry (Mr. Moshier):** if industry is investing millions in a technology, they will be looking at a market beyond DoD. But there are also examples where COTS products developed for civilian use have military applications.

DIRECTED ACTION 2: Focus Next CBDAIF on Transition and Fusion between S&T and Acquisition

- **Communication between Government and Industry**
  - **Industry (Mr. Moshier):** Industry wants more and more timely information to plan pursuits of future opportunities.
  - **Government:** DTRA has quarterly transition meetings. We should try to time it so that the CBDAIF is looking at the same sector that DTRA is doing.
  - **Industry:** It can be difficult to coordinate because each of the programs are on different rhythms.
  - **Industry:** We often get these types of questions from companies in our sectors and have to coach them about where to look to find the right information – we point them to the websites, which have gotten much better.
  - **Government (Mr. Bryce):** Some of the concerns raised in these slides are things that we should be working to develop metrics on, for example to show whether or not the

government is communicating well with industry. Is the government actually withholding information or is it just an industry misperception? We have to find out and make it clear.

- **Internal Research and Development (IRAD)**
    - **Government (Mr. Bryce):** How do the companies in your sector work IRAD? Is there any collaboration with the government?
    - **Industry (Mr. Moshier):** There's IRAD, which the company pays for, and Internal Investment.
    - **Government (Mr. Bryce):** What are we investing in with IRAD? Do you ever sit down with government to discuss what the future looks like in terms of the operational environment, which would then drive your technology development? It's better to look at the future operational environment than simply to make better and better versions of existing technology.
    - **Government:** I agree. It tends to put us in a box. We should have a concept of how it should be done, and work on that until we realize it.
    - **Government (Mr. Bryce):** Is there any mechanism to improve this? I understand that companies won't share IRAD with each other. I've been invited by CEOs to talk about their IRAD, but only by a few companies. If they don't ask, I can't tell them.
    - Industry: As the government started using lowest price technically acceptable (LPTA) over the past few years, companies cut IRAD. Industry acknowledges the fact that LPTA is being used less now, which is good, and is leading to increased IRAD.
    - **Industry (Mr. Moshier):** The Advanced Planning Brief for Industry (APBI) is important – it lets industry know if the contract will be LPTA or best value. It would also be valuable for the JPEO and JRO to do things like Joint Field Trials.
    - **Industry:** IRAD is based on receiving future work. How can companies, especially small businesses, plan for that?
    - **Government (Mr. Bryce):** The 30-year plan should guide you.
    - **Industry:** How many dollars will be spent?
    - **Government (Mr. Bryce):** We can't provide that information.
    - **Industry:** Companies don't know where their next competitive win will be, so they don't know whether IRAD will impact their business
    - **Industry:** It is important that the government keeps doing things like the 30-year plan so that industry knows where to invest IRAD.
    - **Industry:** We also need feedback about what the government likes.
    - **Government:** In 1980s Army had the Air-Land Battle Concept, which led to Apache Helicopter and other technologies. Do your companies look at doctrine and consider what technologies soldiers will need to operate in those environments? You could look at Service Concepts such as on Megacities.
    - **Industry (Mr. Moshier):** industry does spend time looking at that

<u>System Integration Sector – Ms. Joan Black, Leidos:</u>

- **Industry (Ms. Black):** The government is doing innovative acquisition activities, like ATDs and OTAs, but it's challenging for industry to get a grasp on where the opportunities are coming,
- **Industry (Ms. Black):** There's a chicken and egg problem – the government wants innovative ideas from industry, but industry wants to know what the government needs. The 30-year plan is useful,

but industry wants to know more detail: for your next detector, what do you need, how is it going to be used, etc.

- **Government (Mr. Bryce):** The government always goes after the bright shiny object, but these technologies become completely unaffordable because they're made to do everything. How do we stop doing that? We need something that is capable of doing the same thing but smaller and cheaper so that we can buy more of them.
- **Industry (Ms. Black):** The only way to get over that hurdle is to keep talking about it.
- **Government (Mr. Bryce):** I agree, but somewhere we need to make a shift. We've been wrestling with these issues for a while. The Government has to change the way we do business, and industry has to adjust to that, so that ultimately we are supporting warfighters – get back to basics. Everybody wants to do business the way we used to do it, although we know we need to change.
- **Government:** We need to spur innovation, but ICDs are so broad that you could do anything under them. How do you bridge that so that industry knows what we need?
- **Government:** JSTO is creating a Warfighter Integration Office, including efforts such as ATDs and Scientists in the Foxhole, which aim to figure out what the warfighter wants and what the operational concept is. We may need to bring industry to tabletop exercises to get their input.
- **Government:** When talking about what new technology the Chem-Bio Enterprise needs next, we need to remember that there are some longstanding problems that people have been working on for a long time, such as reliable standoff detection and protection systems that are less burdensome. There will always be money for breakthrough technologies that can solve those problems.
- **Industry:** There should be a large CBD exercise that would show industry what the actual requirements are.
- **Government:** Is there an event to bring industry in to a test, like the Black Dart exercise for unmanned aerial systems?
- **Government:** The closest thing was the Combined Arms in a Nuclear Environment (CANE) Exercises back in the 1990s. The only current effort is related to protection suits (UIPI 2).
- **Government (Mr. Bryce):** Integration is also key – a single detector by itself doesn't do anything. Army 2025 has concepts related to Chem-Bio, but even that is hard to translate.
- **Industry:** It would be good to get industry input on the development of evaluation factors for government products. Integration with something else is never part of an evaluation factor – if integration was called out specifically, it would make industry focus on in it more.
- **Government:** We are doing that with ATDs.
- **Industry:** There is a starting point in the form of interoperability standards

DIRECTED ACTION 3: Consider tabletop exercise for Industry to better understand operational requirements

<u>Information System Sector – Mr. Michael Ricciardi, Relevant Technology</u>

- **Government:** Common CBRN Sensor Interface (CCSI) has come a long way. Version 1.0 was very complex to integrate thousands of systems to be plug and play. Now the standard has been refined to include only the parts that are actually mandatory. Originally there were no sensors that were using CCSI, but now there are, which enables us to implement and improve the standards.

- **Industry (Mr. Ricciardi):** Software development is underserved in the JPEO. We've come a long way, but once there are clear standards it will really help move things forward so we can focus on analyzing the data rather than just translating the data. Industry also needs a platform standard – a test bed.
- Government (Mr. Bryce): JEM and JWARN are tools, not programs. We have yet to put a system together in the Chem-Bio area. We shouldn't put programs in the 30-year plan.
    - Industry (Mr. Ricciardi): CBRN-IS is not a program, it's a platform. But how does that fit into the 30-year plan?
- **Government:** Has industry explored participation in the Network Integration Evaluation (NIE)? It's focused on the Army but is applicable more broadly.
- **Government (Mr. Bryce):** Cybersecurity is also an issue. Government-owned IT is getting hacked, but not nearly as much as the commercial sector. We need smart software that knows when it's getting hacked.

<u>Services Sector – Mr. Bruce Phillips, Engility</u>

- **Sector Questions**
    - **Industry:** There were several questions from the sector about DoD Policy 5000.74
    - **Government:** The intent was for 5000.74 to be the equivalent of 5000.02, but for services. It would create a structure and oversight mechanisms to govern services. But it's primarily aimed at non-acquisition offices, not the PEOs who already do this well
    - **Industry:** Are there any task order forecasts for OPETS and/or JPEO?
    - **Government:** The base contract has been awarded for JE-CLASS, and the first task orders should be awarded in the June/July timeframe
    - **Industry:** What are the product versus service considerations anticipated for JE-RDAP?
    - **Government (Mr. Bryce):** JE-CLASS is a services contract, as well as OPETS, but RDAP is not.
    - **Industry (Mr. Phillips):** If the JPEO needed a three month service support for testing of a product, they could use RDAP, but it could also be done through OPETS.
    - **Government (Mr. Bryce):** The government probably doesn't fully understand how to use OPETS

- **OPETS Competitiveness**
    - **Government (Mr. Bryce):** is OPETS competitive in terms of cost? Are we squeezing industry too much?
    - **Industry (Mr. Phillips):** It depends on geography. We can provide an answer.
    - **Government (Mr. Bryce):** I would appreciate your thoughts, because it will shape the OPETS follow-on.
    - **Industry (Mr. Phillips):** I understand your question to be, is the current state of affairs (e.g. rates, turnover, quality) working relative to other markets? Not just a rate comparison
    - **Government (Mr. Bryce):** We could follow a skill set. I used to pay an employee a certain amount, and then OPETS made me pay him a lower amount – is that making employees leave? I will use this data for other things, so has to be accurate.
    - **Industry (Mr. Phillips):** we'll look at answering this with a professional study, not just a survey of opinions.
    - **Government:** Does industry measure CB rates compared to other industries?

- **Industry (Mr. Phillips):** We would have to look at other commercial sectors.

DIRECTED ACTION 4: Industry to conduct a study on the competitiveness of the services sector market under OPETS

Small Business Sector

- **Government (Mr. Bryce):** does JE-RDAP help with on-ramp off-ramp issues?
- **Industry (Ms. Hoeber):** Yes, it does.
- **Industry (Ms. Hoeber):** Our sector recommended holding a working conference – for example before or after an APBI – to explain how opportunities with JPEO, ECBC, and DTRA work, and how companies can participate
- **Government (Mr. Bryce):** We'll take a look.
- **Industry:** There was a recommendation for the JPEO to look at the GSA IT 70 schedule as an option for small and easy contract awards.
- **Government (Mr. Bryce):** I don't know about that schedule, but I'll take a look. Industry should also look at what the Air Force has done for information systems. It's an OTA, and anyone that wants to participate can. We should look at that model.

Demil and Non-Stockpile Sector – Mr. Venkat Rao, Parsons

- **Government:** We have to take an operational perspective. There's no doctrine telling us how to do this mission, so we have to imagine how it would be done and develop technology accordingly. For example, is the country inviting us, or are we being fired at when operating the systems?
    - **Government:** This is a difficult problem area because we don't know how we want to utilize the technologies. Who is pressing the buttons to operate the system?

- **Industry:** This sector is at risk of losing the capability and human capital unless a mission suite is identified that can drive investment.
    - **Government:** We could look at technologies to tag, track, and secure materials before they can be eliminated.
    - **Government:** We know this is a mission that could happen, but we have no funding to address it.
    - **Government:** what about looking at civilian applications as countries build out their industries?
    - **Industry (Mr. Rao):** Those are examples of adjacent areas such as Toxic Industrial Chemicals (TICs) and Toxic Industrial Materials (TIMs), but this sector is really more focused on chemical weapons.
    - **Government (Mr. Bryce):** I have the same concerns, and have relayed them to USD(AT&L) Kendall. This is an area that we need to pay attention to or the capability will disappear in the U.S. Not just the companies, but the expertise will be gone, and won't be rebuilt in a long time. We'll regret if we don't take action
    - **Government (Mr. Bryce):** We want to figure out how to create a partnership. DoD can't put in all the money, but can contribute some to maintain the expertise. Also, we're moving into other areas, such as render-safe or disable instead of destruction, which would require the same types of expertise and technology.

- **Industry:** We should look at the Department of Energy and how they've maintained their capability in nuclear weapons design. They've done some things at the national labs to make sure there are still a few people with relevant expertise.
- **Government (Mr. Bryce):** I'll continue to be an advocate for this sector, but I don't have any money for this.

Surety Sector – Dr. Michael MacNaughton, SWRI

- **Government (Mr. Bryce):** This sector is another area of concern, but we have the opposite problem from the one in Demil. We have way too much capacity in the U.S. to do what this sector does. So we're forced to maintain capacity that is above what the needs are. We need to make hard decisions about how much to do government vs. commercial, but usually we just admire the problem rather than making those decisions. We need to do a study to figure out the right balance.
- **Industry:** You should include industry on the study. There is a lot of capacity, but not all providers are equally capable. When we visited Pine Bluff Arsenal, we saw a nascent capability that was under-utilized.
- **Government (Mr. Bryce):** I'm talking about capacity. There's too much, and everyone is expecting to be fed. A lot of welfare in the JPEO that has to be given to government, which therefore does not go into programs.
- **Industry:** those of us who do chemical technology but don't have chemical surety labs also depend on the industry surety labs, and we've found that the industry side is more cost-effective.
- **Government (Mr. Bryce):** I agree that we need a commercial marketplace in this area. The government needs to look at how many labs it needs. We should do a study to make sure we keep at least our most viable labs open.
- **Industry:** The study needs to look at both chemical and biological laboratories.

DIRECTED ACTION 5: Government to conduct a study on overcapacity of Chemical Surety Labs and provide status to CBDAIF

Medical Sector – Dr. John Wade, Battelle

- **Industry:** The sector is healthy because very few of the companies are solely reliant on DoD programs or funding. If we were dependent on DoD, the sector would not be healthy

1030-1100	**Training With Industry Update** Ms. Amie Hoeber, Small Business Sector Lead

- **Industry (Ms. Hoeber):** We finally have an agreed-upon TWI partnership agreement that has been approved by lawyers. The industry partner is a small company that does BD support for DoD contractors. It doesn't do anything with the JPEO. Once the document is signed and the government participant is identified, we'll be ready to go.
- **Government (Mr. Bryce):** There will be only one government participant for now?
- **Industry (Ms. Hoeber):** We should start with one person as a test case. The current plan is to go for 6 months and then reassess from there.

1100-1130 Operational & C2 from "The Cloud"
Mr. Michael Ricciardi, Information Systems Sector Lead

See PowerPoint briefing posted to the NDIA website.

- **Government:** Have to consider what drives good analytics. Also need the ability to act in a disruptive environment, when soldiers don't have access to the cloud.
- **Industry (Mr. Ricciardi):** Yes, there is a requirement for the system to have a degraded mode operation.
- **Government (Mr. Bryce):** There's more to JUPITR than there is to JCACS

1130-1200 JRO: Joint Concept for Preventing Use or Transfer of WMD Overview
COL Scott Estes, Deputy Director, Joint Requirements Office for Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear Defense (JRO-CBRND)

- **Government (COL Estes):** The Joint Concept sets the foundation for other activities, such as Capability-Based Assessments, which may lead to new or revised ICDs, CPPs, etc. So there's a lot of work and time between this document and any future requirements. But this sets the direction.
- **Government:** Who takes the lead in looking at the manpower requirements? Is there enough manpower to absorb those CB capabilities?
- **Government (COL Estes):** Joint Concepts are not programmatic documents that decide what resources go to where. A Capability-Based Assessment will say how many people are needed to execute the mission, and then decision makers will have to decide how to allocate resources and manpower.
- **Government:** The Army is not getting larger, so it's an issue of training. Have we looked at how long it would take to train general service forces rapidly to assist in decontaminating or securing a site?
- **Government:** It's very difficult to train soldiers to use CBRN technologies. It would take 3 years to teach everything, by which point they move to different position.

1245-1315 JSTO: Strategic Perspective
Dr. Ron Hann, Director, Joint Science and Technology Office, DTRA

See PowerPoint briefing posted to the NDIA website.

- **Government (Dr. Hann):** About 50% of JSTO's budget goes to government, and 50% to industry.
- **Government (Dr. Hann):** DTRA is going through reorg

- **Medical Countermeasures**
    - **Government (Dr. Hann):** On the medical side, we're putting more risk in S&T rather than acquisition – JSTO will bring capabilities to a more advanced stage of development before transferring them to JPEO.
    - **Government (Dr. Hann):** Previously, there was a long gap between when DTRA suggested a candidate and when JPEO approved project to continue development.
    - **Government:** We need to incentivize industry. Medical industry is "green" because it's not reliant on DoD, but DoD is "red" in terms of delivering capabilities.

- **Industry:** In many cases the companies doing the R&D are not doing the production, so it can be hard to bridge the gap
- **Industry:** There's also a liability issue when the government changes contractors mid-stream
- **Government (Dr. Hann):** JPEO and DTRA need to think from an enterprise perspective
- **Government (Dr. Hann):** DTRA will be able to participate directly in OTAs.
- **Industry:** Do you allow OTAs on your BAAs?
- **Government (Dr. Hann):** No.
- **Government:** How do we get from strategic to tactical? E.g. Biological prophylaxis – do you want a couple of good candidates, or a larger number of less developed ones?
- **Government (Mr. Bryce):** It's a misperception that vaccines have to be FDA approved. But although we can discuss this amongst ourselves in the CB world, ultimately the Defense Health Agency makes the decision on whether a non-FDA approved vaccine can be used on soldiers.
- **Industry:** Have there been interagency discussions?
- **Government (Mr. Bryce):** We're talking about DoD specifically
- **Government (Dr. Hann):** If we know who the product will be used on, it helps guide the S&T.
- **Government (Mr. Bryce):** Yes, there are several drugs administered through IV, which is impractical for soldiers to use.
- **Industry:** Is anyone systematically looking at currently licensed vaccines, and those under development, and which ones could be repurposed? It's a very different mindset from dedicated medical countermeasures to a specific disease.

1315-1345 20th CBRNE Command: Scientists in Foxhole
LTC Barry McDowell, Combat Developer DTRA
LTC Mary Miller, Microbiologist 20th CBRNE.

See PowerPoint briefing posted to the NDIA website.

- **Government (LTC Miller):** The Scientists in Motion program allows scientists to observe CBRN operations in action to look for DOTMLPF-P suggestions. This experience is good for scientists to understand operational limitations. It's also good for soldiers because scientists can explain how important it is to use the protective measures
- **Industry:** Are there After-Action Reports or lessons learned?
- **Government (LTC McDowell):** Yes, we do hotwashes
- **Industry:** Can you share the findings that soldiers and scientists found with industry??
- **Government (LTC McDowell):** We're currently capturing comments, and will then brief it to DTRA leadership.
- **Government (Dr. Hann):** We will check with DTRA public affairs to see if it can be shared.
- **Industry:** It would also be great if industry could participate in these experiences.
- **Government:** Industry probably will not be allowed at the National Training Center, but we can look for more informal experiences that industry could participate in.
- **Industry:** What comes out of the program? Will there be a more formal approach, such as a study to see how to bridge the requirements/operations gap?

- **Government:** We're at the "walk" phase now, but may consider doing a more formal experience later. For now, we're just glad to be getting the PhDs into those experiences so that they better understand requirements.

DIRECTED ACTION 6: DTRA to provide AARs from Scientists in the Foxhole, and consider expanding program to industry.

1345-1415 ECBC: Command Update
Mr. Lowry Brooks, Associate Director of Engineering, Edgewood Chemical and Biological Center

See PowerPoint briefing posted to the NDIA website.

- **Government (Mr. Brooks):** We are working on an analytic framework to measure future investments by how they reduce operational risk on the battlefield, rather than simply increasing the capability of an existing technology. Driven by mission success rather than capability baseline. This includes:
    - System of Systems Engineering Trade space – engineering tools, system engineering, modeling, etc – to test solutions earlier before committing to a certain course;
    - Strategic campaigns – use collaboration across ECBC to make use of all the physical and intellectual capital; and
    - CBRNE Prototype Consortia
- **Government:** How much do we study the enemy in order to adjust our capabilities accordingly?
- **Government:** The intelligence community does a lot trying to figure out what the enemy is doing.

1415-1500 Other Transaction Agreements
Mr. John Eilenberger, Chief, Contracting Office, Army Contracting Command – New Jersey

See PowerPoint briefing posted to the NDIA website.

- **OTA Process**
    - **Government (Mr. Eilenberger):** There are three ways to do an OTA:
        - Must be at least one nontraditional defense contractor; OR
        - All significant participants are small businesses or nontraditional defense contractors; OR
        - Mandatory one third cost sharing agreement for traditional defense contractor.
    - **Industry:** If government wants to use an OTA, do they choose to use an OTA, or do they say that it is an option to be used?
    - **Government (Mr. Eilenberger):** The government does market research to see whether a consortium is interested.
    - **Industry:** Does the government have to first look at alternate procurement methods and find that one is not available?
    - **Government (Mr. Eilenberger):** No, the government can choose an OTA directly
    - Industry: The cost-sharing requirement for a traditional defense contractor can't be a product that came out of an existing contract?

- **Government (Mr. Eilenberger):** Correct.
- **Industry:** What's the typical turnaround for an OTA?
- **Government (Mr. Eilenberger):** It depends, but it's always quicker than the FAR.
- **Government:** it's just a matter of negotiating the proposal
- **Government (Mr. Eilenberger):** Once government gets the proposal, it takes about 30-45 days to get approval and award.
- **Industry:** Can you submit an unsolicited proposal through an OTA?
- **Government (Mr. Eilenberger):** No, it has to be through an RFP
- **Government (Mr. Eilenberger):** Government and industry can talk right until the proposal is submitted. Don't have to stop talking after release of RFP.
- **Industry:** How many lawyers will it take to do an OTA?
- **Government (Mr. Eilenberger):** A lot of lawyers won't do it because they don't understand it.

- **Why do an OTA?**
  - **Government (Mr. Bryce):** A lot of people don't understand why one would choose to do an OTA instead of the FAR. The answer is that the FAR really imposes lots of restrictions.
  - **Industry:** Was this established to address what the SecDef wants to do with Silicon Valley companies?
  - **Government:** The initiative with Silicon Valley will be done through an OTA, but it's not exclusive.
  - **Industry:** Why is it looking at non-traditional *defense* companies, rather than nontraditional government contractors? For example, a company could do lots of work for the federal government but not specifically for DoD.
  - **Government (Mr. Bryce):** If a company does all those other things, it usually just brushes off the DoD because it doesn't want to deal with FAR restrictions.
  - **Government (Mr. Bryce):** Regarding our previous discussion about how companies can find and introduce innovative technologies, this is a mechanism where you could bring people together. All you have to do is submit a white paper to tell us about the technology.
  - **Government (Mr. Bryce):** Take a look at what the Air Force did for information systems with OTAs – you'll be amazed.

- **Consortium Structure**
  - **Industry:** What is the role of the "lead" of the consortium?
  - **Government (Mr. Eilenberger):** Once the consortium is picked, they have a consortium manager who receives and distributes the white papers, looks at pricing. Normally a consortium will set up a board, with committees of government and industry. Each consortium has a management agreement with each other about how they're going to share data.
  - **Industry:** Can one of the companies be the consortium lead, or does it have to be a third party?
  - **Government (Mr. Eilenberger):** It can be done either way, but it is typically done by a third party. The structure can also change over time
  - **Industry:** Is a consortium a self-sustaining entity or just a framework?

- **Government (Mr. Eilenberger):** It's self-sustaining. For example, industry associations could turn into a consortium.
- **Industry:** How many members do most consortia have?
- **Government (Mr. Eilenberger):** Some have 30-40, some over 250
- **Government:** It's flexible. Members can join at any time.

- **Prototypes**
  - **Government:** OTAs are used to develop prototypes. Is there an expectation that it should go into production?
  - **Government (Mr. Eilenberger):** No, it does not necessarily have to lead to production.
  - **Government (Mr. Eilenberger):** The initial point of OTAs was to do R&D with non-traditional defense contractors.
  - **Industry:** Prototype concept is quaint in medical sector because a company can develop a prototype to a certain point, but then not compete for the full production
  - **Government:** We think that prototype means all the way up to FDA approval
  - **Government (Mr. Bryce):** Regarding the question of where the JPEO ADM fits in: OTAs can be used for RDT&E but not production, so ADM picks up from there.

- **Competition**
  - **Government (Mr. Bryce):** You have to be careful about what you do with an OTA. It has to be something that results in more than just a single item.
  - **Government (Mr. Eilenberger):** OTAs actually encourage competition because many people can join the consortium.
  - **Government (Mr. Eilenberger):** The Competition in Contracting Act does not apply – it just has to be competitive to the maximum extent possible
  - **Government (Mr. Bryce):** Although you can do an OTA without a lot of competition, we try to encourage competition as much as possible.
  - **Government (Mr. Bryce):** Companies can't protest an OTA because the government does not run the consortium. Industry runs it, and government just chooses the best papers.
  - **Industry:** how do you do determine a "fair and reasonable price" for something that hasn't been done before?
  - **Industry:** Commercial companies should be considering the price because they eventually want to sell their product in the market.

- **JPEO's use of OTAs**
  - **Government:** The OTA for JPEO will also include DTRA. It will only be awarded to one consortium
  - **Industry:** Can JCACS be done through an OTA?
  - **Government (Mr. Bryce):** No. To date, there's no chance for any OTAs through JPEO except for the medical sector.
  - Industry: Once you award the OTA, how long until you deliver an RFP?
  - Government: It could be as soon as a day. We're looking at the near-term.
  - Industry: How long will this OTA last?
  - Government: 20 years. Can be changed at any time.

1500-1530 Industry Perspective on OTAs
Mr. Tim Moshier, Detection Sector LEad

See PowerPoint briefing posted to the NDIA website.

- **Industry (Mr. Moshier):** The money saved from proposal/business development in an OTA can be used on IRAD
- **Government:** There are a number of groups like the Countering Terrorism Technical Support Office (CTTSO). Does industry see us using these standing organizations, or establishing a separate entity for the CBRN space?
- **Industry (Mr. Moshier):** I haven't seen a lot of overlap between CTTSO and CBRN. We probably need something focused on CBRN.
- **Government:** From JPM Medical perspective, we're struggling to get products over the finish line. When Mr. Bryce asked us to use an OTA, the question was if we build it, will they come? After researching, I think the answer is yes, because:
    - It helps bridge the "valley of death" between S&T and advanced development
    - It's a much faster process, saving industry business development money
    - It helps industry meet the sweet spot of compiling the right group with the competency to get the work done. Previously, responses to RFP are sometimes unsatisfactory – one company has a 70% solution, and another could fill the 30% gap but there was no mechanism to do it. OTAs allow government to negotiate with industry and shape the capability in the right way. Does industry see it the same way?
- **Industry (Mr. Moshier):** Yes, in the medical sector, big pharma already is basically a consortium.
- **Industry:** There are successful models in the Department of Energy, such as the battery consortium – we could look at how they've done it so well.
- **Government (Mr. Bryce):** We're already past that point in the process. We've selected the consortium, just haven't announced it.
- **Industry:** The vision is that the consortium would deliver the product from beginning to end. So it has to provide a funnel of solutions to avoid latching on to one solution that may not be successful.
- **Government:** Yes. The government could specify that it wants 5 options to deal with tularemia.
- **Government (Mr. Bryce):** There are a number of ways it could be done. It could be as simple as the government asking for a tularemia MCM for a certain price, and then leaving it to the consortium to deliver. Or the government could be more specific and granular in what it requests. There is still a time and place to do FAR contracting in JPEO, but haven't been able to succeed in medical sector because we aren't getting the right companies to participate.
- **Industry:** Who's funding this? JPEO or DTRA?
- **Government:** Both. We can use all levels of RDT&E funds under the OTA. We could have a single effort that is initially funded by DTRA, then switch to being funded by JPEO in a seamless effort.
- **Government:** Big pharma has built big platforms. The consortium provides them an easy avenue to get DoD money without dealing with FAR, which is exactly what DoD wants.
- **Industry:** You also have to consider the dose size. If it's a small dose, higher cost per dose.
- **Government (Mr. Bryce):** We'd like to have that discussion about the cost of scaling. Our model is not to buy millions of doses.

1530-1615 Strategic Perspective & Industry Questions
Mr. Doug Bryce, JPEO-CBD

- Industry: Where is JCACS going in terms of funding?
    - Government: It's funded. The initial price tag was $30M. It was initially called the JCACS ATD, but has officially changed to an Enhanced Capability Demonstration (ECD), which allowed government to have more constructive conversations. It's under COL Woods' portfolio, DRSKO. It is here to stay, a way of doing business.
    - Government: The JUPITR ATD was good, but did not have acquisition rigor. Lessons learned from JUPITR are being applied to JCACS, which has slowed the process a bit, but will make it better in the long run.
    - Industry: The government may want to do a JCACS APBI to reset since it has changed.
    - Government (Mr. Bryce): JCACS is way bigger than DRSKO. It's at the whole-of-JPEO level to integrate across the JPMs.
- Industry: We've been hearing about changes to the Unified Command Plan for a while. Where is it?
    - Government (Mr. Bryce): It has changed. It's been approved.
    - Industry: But there's no implementation guidance?
    - Government: It's been pushed back to late March. USSOCOM is taking full ownership of mission, but they're still determining what STRATCOM will keep and what SOCOM will do. DTRA will get JIEDDO.
- Industry: Is there a way for industry to participate in the Scientists in Motion? Perhaps before an APBI?
    - Government: It's unrealistic to bring industry to National Training Center
    - Industry: It would be great just to have a way to talk to the soldiers.
    - Industry: We should be able to do something at Edgewood or Aberdeen.
    - Government: Yes, there should be some way to show what the CB environment is like.

1615-1630 CY 2016 Meetings/Schedule
Mr. Karl Semancik, Outgoing CBDAIF Chair
Mr. Dave Cullin, Incoming CBDAIF Chair

- Industry (Mr. Semancik): The meetings for the rest of the year are unscheduled. We've discussed having two more this year.

ACTION ITEMS

DIRECTED ACTION 1	**Government to update on status of JPEO Acquisition Metrics**
Assignee(s)	Mr. Gary Wright
Originator	Mr. Doug Bryce, JPEO-CBD
Suspense	Update at next CBDAIF
Status	Open
DIRECTED ACTION 2	**Focus Next CBDAIF on Transition and Fusion between S&T and Acquisition**
Assignee(s)	JPEO Staff
Originator	Mr. Doug Bryce, JPEO-CBD
Suspense	Update at next CBDAIF
Status	Open
DIRECTED ACTION 3	**Consider tabletop exercise for Industry to better understand operational requirements**
Assignee(s)	JPEO Staff
Originator	Mr. Doug Bryce, JPEO-CBD
Suspense	Update at next CBDAIF
Status	Open
DIRECTED ACTION 4	**Industry to conduct a study on the competitiveness of the services sector market under OPETS**
Assignee(s)	Mr. Gabe Patricio, Services Sector Lead
Originator	Mr. Karl Semancik, CBDAIF Chair
Suspense	Update at next CBDAIF
Status	Open
DIRECTED ACTION 5	**Government to conduct a study on overcapacity of Chemical Surety Labs and provide status to CBDAIF**
Assignee(s)	JPEO Staff
Originator	Mr. Doug Bryce, JPEO-CBD
Suspense	Update at next CBDAIF
Status	Open
DIRECTED ACTION 6	**DTRA to provide AARs from Scientists in the Foxhole, and consider expanding program to industry.**
Assignee(s)	JSTO Staff
Originator	Dr. Ron Hann, DTRA
Suspense	Update at next CBDAIF
Status	Open
DIRECTED ACTION 7	**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 8	**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 9	**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	Joint Program Executive Officer for Chemical and Biological Defense (JPEO-CBD)
COL Alfred Abramson	Deputy Joint Program Executive Officer for Chemical and Biological Defense
COL Jeffery Woods	JPM Contamination Avoidance, JPEO-CBD
COL Russell Coleman	JPM Medical Countermeasure Systems, JPEO-CBD
COL James Choung	JPM Guardian, JPEO-CBD
Mr. Valentin Novikov	JPM Radiological and Nuclear Defense, JPEO-CBD
Mr. Donald Buley	Deputy JPM Guardian, JPEO-CBD
Mr. Michael Steinmann	Deputy JPM Information Systems, JPEO-CBD
Dr. Jeffrey Curry	Executive Officer, JPEO-CBD
Mr. Gary Wright	Director, Contracting Management, JPEO-CBD
Ms. Emma Wilson	Assistant Chief of Staff, JPEO-CBD
Ms. Katryna Trombetta	Engineer, JPEO-CBD
Ms. Lorrie Chieffo	Chief, Workforce Development, JPEO-CBD
LTC Mary Miller	Microbiologist, 20th CBRNE Command
Mr. John Eilenberger	Chief, Contracting Office, Army Contracting Command – New Jersey
Dr. Ronald Hann	Director, Joint Science and Technology Office, DTRA
LTC Barry McDowell	Combat Developer, DTRA
Mr. Lowry Brooks	Associate Director of Engineering, Edgewood Chemical and Biological
Ms. Sabrina Rawlings-Seiple	Chemical Engineer, Edgewood Chemical and Biological Center
BG Michael Bobeck	Director, Joint Requirements Office for Chemical, Biological,
COL Scott Estes	Deputy Director, Joint Requirements Office for Chemical, Biological,
Ms. Joan Black	Sector Lead, System Integration
Mr. Timothy Moshier	Sector Lead, Detection
Ms. Amoretta (Amie) Hoeber	Sector Lead, Small Business
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
Mr. Matt Shaw	Sector Lead, CB Surety Laboratories
Mr. Sean Kirk	Sector Lead, Medical Countermeasures, Diagnostics and Biotechnology
Mr. David Cullin	CBDAIF Chair
Mr. Gabe Patricio	Sector Lead, Professional Services