Where Our National Security Begins...
Agenda

- Welcome & Introductions
- “Snapshots”
- “S2P Corner” & “C2S Corner”
- Action Team discussions
- Government Perspective
- Open Dialog
- No-Host Social

NRO/NGA IAWG Social @ Hyatt 5-6:30
“Snapshots”

Feedback on NGA Reverse Industry Day?
Feedback on NGA Industry Engagement Process?
Thoughts on “NRO Top 10 Issues with Industry” Concept?
Objectives

- Unify various disjointed government-industry dialog
- Improve alignment of industry capabilities to NGA needs…find the “right” person
- Normalize industry interactions at different echelons of NGA…stop “whack a mole”
- Extend opportunities to other IC agency and DoD mission partners
- Provide feedback & Follow up with industry to improve transparency and value

IAWG Task

- Review & comment on the process concept and flow
- Provide ideas for improvement and implementation
- What are the pros and cons from industry perspective?
- Should the NRO do something similar?
“C2S Corner”

Latest & Greatest…

Topics & Issues Discussion

Re:Invent Conference Recap
re:Invent 2018 recap

4 December 2018
## re:Invent 2018 Announcements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compute</th>
<th>Storage</th>
<th>Management &amp; Governance</th>
<th>Networking &amp; Content Delivery</th>
<th>Machine Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AWS Outposts</td>
<td>Amazon FSx for Lustre</td>
<td>AWS Control Tower</td>
<td>AWS App Mesh</td>
<td>Amazon Elastic Inference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run AWS infrastructure on-premises</td>
<td>Fully managed compute-intensive file system</td>
<td>Set up and govern a secure, compliant multi-account environment</td>
<td>Monitor and control microservices</td>
<td>Deep learning inference acceleration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robotics</td>
<td>Amazon FSx for Windows File Server</td>
<td>AWS License Manager</td>
<td>AWS Cloud Map</td>
<td>Amazon Forecast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWS RoboMaker</td>
<td>Fully managed Windows native file system</td>
<td>Track, manage, and control licenses</td>
<td>Service discovery for cloud resources</td>
<td>Increase forecast accuracy using machine learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop, test, and deploy robotics applications</td>
<td>Database</td>
<td>AWS Well-Architected Tool</td>
<td>AWS Global Accelerator</td>
<td>Amazon Personalize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet of Things</td>
<td>Amazon Quantum Ledger Database (QLDB)</td>
<td>Review and improve your workloads</td>
<td>Improve application availability and performance</td>
<td>Build real-time recommendations into your applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWS IoT Events</td>
<td>Fully managed ledger database</td>
<td>Satellite</td>
<td>AWS Transit Gateway</td>
<td>Amazon SageMaker Ground Truth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IoT event detection and response</td>
<td>Amazon RDS on VMware</td>
<td>AWS Ground Station</td>
<td>Easily scale VPC and account connections</td>
<td>Build accurate ML training datasets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWS IoT SiteWise</td>
<td>Automate on-premises database management</td>
<td>Fully managed ground station as a service</td>
<td>Analytics</td>
<td>Amazon Textract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IoT data collector and interpreter</td>
<td>Amazon Timestream</td>
<td>Security, Identity, &amp; Compliance</td>
<td>Amazon Managed Streaming for Kafka</td>
<td>Extract text and data from documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWS IoT Things Graph</td>
<td>Fully managed time series database</td>
<td>AWS Security Hub</td>
<td>Fully managed Apache Kafka service</td>
<td>AWS DeepRacer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easily connect devices and web services</td>
<td>Blockchain</td>
<td>Unified security and compliance center</td>
<td>AWS Lake Formation</td>
<td>Autonomous 1/18th scale race car, driven by ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWS Partner Device Catalog</td>
<td>Amazon Managed Blockchain</td>
<td>Migration &amp; Transfer</td>
<td>Build a secure data lake in days</td>
<td>AWS Inferentia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curated catalog of AWS-compatible IoT hardware</td>
<td>Create and manage scalable blockchain networks</td>
<td>AWS DataSync</td>
<td>Machine learning inference chip</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Services</td>
<td>AWS Transfer for SFTP</td>
<td>Simple, fast, online data transfer</td>
<td>AWS Amplify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWS Elemental MediaConnect</td>
<td>Fully managed SFTP service</td>
<td>Build and deploy mobile and web applications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© 2018, Amazon Web Services, Inc. or its Affiliates. All rights reserved.
Additional Compute and Storage Features

Compute
- EC2 C5n Instances – up to 100 Gbps of throughput, HPC workloads
- Elastic Fabric Adapter (EFA) – high levels of inter-instance communications
- EC2 A1 instances – AWS Graviton Processors with 64-bit ARM cores
- EC3 P3Dn – CPUs, GPUs, Memory, and 100 Gbps
- Firecracker – MicroVMs for multitenant containers and functions
- EC2 Spot – Spot instances in auto scaling groups
- Lambda Runtime API - use any programming language for functions

Storage
- Amazon S3 Batch Operations – easy to manage billions of objects in S3
- Amazon S3 Intelligent Tiering – automatic tiering of less frequently accessed data
- Snowball Edge Compute Optimized – 52 vCPUs and optional GPU
“S2P Corner”

Latest & Greatest…

Topics & Issues Discussion

Explore on CWAN/JWICS @ https://jportal.S2P.proj.nro.ic.gov
NRO IAWG
Action Teams & Topics

Discussions & Updates
NRO IAWG Action Team

Incentivizing adoption of FGA approach

Update to Working Session

4 December 2018

Gavin Greene
Alex Fox
Marlu Oswald
John Hays
Myles Nakamura
Clark van Buskirk
Pam Arya
Software developments encompasses a wide spectrum of solutions

- Minimal or no “development” – Code predominately glue ware, configuration, and translators between existing/known interfaces
- Unique, new, and proprietary code – Solutions with non industry standard software, tightly coupled with hardware and other software services (system essentially is a black box)

Government motivated to minimize OCI restrictions:

- Maximize competition by removing barriers to bid
- Enterprise/mission architecting and enterprise services benefit from vertically and horizontally engineered solution
- FGA and multi-INT capabilities rely on integration

Industry also motivated:

- More opportunities to bid and flexibility to prime/sub
- Increase growth and profit

Current OCI approach is avoidance w/ Framework & Apps separation
OCI & Government Trends

- General purpose rights in RFPs and contracts
  - Source code
  - Full API documentation
  - SW Development Toolkits (SDKs)

- Adoption of commercial standards and infrastructure GFX
  - Standardized formats, compression, protocols, message formats
  - COTS/FOSS, tools, visualization, networking and interfaces
  - S2P, Gforge, DCGS-XX, DI2E, WANs, C2S/AWS, AUE

- Existing, stable interfaces and government change management
  - RFC process provides notification and configuration control

- Communication with transparency and real-time information distribution
  - C2S/S2P and Confluence/JIRA pages document program information
  - Full program engineering/architecture, APIs, data available to the entire community

Technology and Government implementation changes industry’s access and provides full technical information and data
OCI Alternatives to Promote FGA Adoption

- Government specify OCI concerns and narrowly limit restrictions
  - Government can restrict scope of the OCI
  - Ex. Government concern about a particular framework interface that impacts a limited number of apps can restrict OCI to a particular app or set of apps

- Government specify solutions in the RFP that eliminate OCI concerns
  - RFP requirements can specify an industry or open source, GOTS, or other government controlled solution

- Remove OCI restriction after a technical/contract milestone
  - Government OCI can be limited to the time the developer has control
  - Government control of the solution (Government acceptance, delivery into ops, Government design control/CDR, documentation/source code) can serve as the decision point

- Allow OCI mitigation plans
  - Allow contractors to propose an approach to mitigate specific concerns and conflicts of interest identified by the government
NRO IAWG Action Team

Attracting & Retaining Talent: Business & Operating Models

Ann Waynik           Pam Arya               Ben Avicoli
Ken Bonner           Tom Davidson            Keith Morgan
Sonny Sarkar         Marc Snyder
The Talent & Employment Environment

• **BABY BOOMERS:**
  - Next 20 years, ~10K People Each Day will Reach age 65

• **MILLENNIALS:**
  - Flooding the Market; Anxious to be on the “Bleeding Edge”
  - Getting Larger Salaries (Equal to SMEs) without a Clearance

• **INDUSTRY (FFRDC, SETA AND Development):**
  - VA Unemployment at ~2.1% Available Talent is Limited – even w/Bonus
  - Willing to Pay for the Cutting-Edge Technology – but Clearance Constraints

• **GOVERNMENT:**
  - Need: SME (Institutional Knowledge) “+” Millennials (Cutting-Edge Technology)
  - Shrinking experience base in Contracting & Program Management

**OVERALL:**
Commercial (AWS, GOOGLE, SPACE-X) is Hiring Away from GOV & GOVCON
Commercial is the “Latest” Leading Edge causing a Resource Shortage for All
Observations: Primary Drivers Given the Environmentals…

1. **Nature of the Work: Is it Cutting Edge, Impactful, Meaningful?**

2. **Contracting & Solicitations: Price vs. Cost**
   - Price/Performance is most effective measure of value delivered
   - Rates are not a viable measure of performance (potential to pay more for less value)
   - Pre-eminence of direct rates and wrap rates over price creates LPTA “conditions”
   - Salary, fringe, incentives (student debt relief), etc directly impacted
   - Rate pressure without considering impact on performance creates talent pressure
   - GED emphasis on Price Realism has potential to normalize this issue

3. **Contracts Portfolio: IDIQ vs Single Award, FFP/CP vs LOE**
   - Contracts mix can impact overhead vs direct billable
   - FFP/CP deliverable contracts offer more options to retain talent than LOE contracts

4. **Security Clearance Sponsorship: Requires an Onboarding Pipeline**
   - Chicken & Egg: must have a contract to sponsor. Can’t get a contract without.
   - Clearance “pipelines”: fundamental to attracting & retaining talent. 2-year lead time.
   - IC has instances of successful expertise-base or industry-base “pipeline contracts”.
   - Ultimately connected to Contracting approaches due to overhead pool impact.
Observations: SETA vs Development Acquisition

- **SETA:**
  - Reliant on SME Experience, Years and Knowledge “Networking”
  - Costs are Inherently Higher (Level/Years of Experience & Clearances)
  - Solicitations Must Achieve “Best Value” (don’t go LPTA on your “brain trust”)
  - Idea: Sponsor “Interim” Cross-overs and Clearance to Get Skill Mix
  - Idea: Set-aside “Junior and Uncleared Portions” within Solicitation

- **Development:**
  - Solicitations typically “Technical Significantly More Important than Cost”
  - Greater Emphasis on Latest Technology (~ 5 to 10 Years)
  - Idea: Provide Weighed Factors in Solicitation for XX% for Uncleared Support
  - Idea: Reward Offerors who are Innovative with Use of “Waiting for Clearance”
  - Idea: Leverage Cutting Edge COTS to Draw in the Leading Edge Talent

Government –

*Must* Differentiate between SETA & Development Talent Attraction and Solicitations
Business & Operating Model Ideas for Government

GOVERNMENT “Attract” the Talent by creating market conditions

- Consider a portfolio approach to Contract Types (IDIQ vs Single Award)
  - Balance flexibility and speed of IDIQ TO approach with continuity and base of Single Awards
  - Investigate relationship between size/segmentation and contracting strategy impact on industry base

- Focus on Price/Performance and Cost Realism over Labor & Wrap Rates
  - Recognize that Talent drives fully-burdened and direct labor costs
  - Higher quality, faster delivery is less expensive and more predictable over course of program

- Emphasize Deliverable- or Milestone-Performance Based Contracts vs LOE
  - Provides Government leverage; provides Contractor flexibility to deliver talent
  - Buy “Capabilities” instead of Candidate Resumes
  - Reward risk taking (Innovation is typically risked up in proposals)

- Use established contracts practices to create resilient security pipelines
  - Use “Security CLINs” on established contracts, CRADAs, Marketplace (ala C2S sponsorship)
  - Clearance investigation sponsorship for IR&D projects that will move low-to-high
  - Consider Continuous Evaluation or Interim Security Clearances pending backlog reduction

- Enable “green to blue” opportunity for industry-government career mix
INDUSTRY: “Retain” the Talent to deliver on commitments

- **Meet Needs**
  - Sign-on Bonus, Retention Bonuses, Pay off School Loan
  - Quicker Promotions, More Career Flexibility

- **Provide Continuing Training**
  - Agile Processes/MBSE, Renewal of Certificates, Latest Seminars/Conferences
  - Provide “RIDE ALONG” Mentors

- **Provide Corporate and Program IRADs**
  - Accept Risk with Performance-Based Deliverable Contracts
  - Be More Creative with Cost/Schedule/Performance Constraints
  - Look at Functional versus Technical experience (to broaden talent pool)
  - Similar Pay Scales for those with “Functional” Experience

**BOTTOM LINE**

**GOVERNMENT’S ROLE:** Attract the Talent

**INDUSTRY’S ROLE:** Train & Retain the Talent
NRO IAWG Action Team: Speed to Capability (STC)

Update to Working Session

4 December 2018

Ben Chicoski (Team Lead)
Scott Lawler    Joe Chioda    Marlu Oswald
Andy Cibula    Pete Epstein    Mike Moran

Ben Chicoski
bchicoski@cloudbees.com
202.746.1124
Flight Plan

Now:
- Homing in on most appropriate issues
- Restructured deck
- Created template for STC performance metrics

Next:
- ID real-world examples to cite and learn from; connect where possible
- Build out issues and recommendations

Qs to Answer:
- What do acquisition staff want to improve? What frustrates them?
- Who is actually receptive / motivated to change?
- What resonates (e.g., more $ for the mission, not bureaucracy)?

What can we realistically expect to influence?
## Speed to Capability

### Purpose / Overview

**Our Task**
- Identify process, development, and programmatic sources of delay to delivery of capabilities
- Make recommendations for **concrete action**
- Iterate and refine based on Government-Industry feedback

**Operating Principles**
- Consistent with IAWG mission: evolve business models to help government realize NRO vision
- Focus on items most in need of adjustment
- Be realistic about which needles can be moved
- Look beyond acquisition (e.g., tech, people, process)
- Cite real-world examples to learn from

### Initial Observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Contracting</th>
<th>RFPs</th>
<th>Tech Transfer</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dearth of contracting performance objectives / metrics means status quo wins</td>
<td>“Solicitation Bloat” creates work without benefit</td>
<td>Inconsistent capability delivery chain and clunky transition to operations</td>
<td>“Requirements lock-in” lead to inelastic programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Root Causes and Ideas for Improvement

### 1. Contracting

**Observation**
Lack of specific, shared objectives for improving contract(ing) performance. Lack of concrete actions = status quo wins.

**Root Cause**
Dearth of analysis of contracting performance

**Idea**
Measure against STC metrics based on industry standards and tailored to program profiles. *[See template in Backup]*

### 2. RFPs

**Observation**
“Solicitation Bloat” drives away qualified performers, creates extra work – on both sides – without necessarily providing benefit

**Root Cause**
Path of least resistance and lowest risk: “Include everything”

**Idea**
- Lighter on “compliance”
- Involve security teams in the solicitation creation
- More two-way exchanges
## Root Causes and Ideas for Improvement

### 3 Tech Transfer & Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Root Cause</th>
<th>Idea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistent capability delivery chain and clunky transition to operations</td>
<td>Inertia within current hybrid infrastructure and lack of end user involvement</td>
<td>Create nexus where technologist, operator/analyst, MSI, and acquirer can ID and advance solutions immediately, then document &quot;requirements&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4 Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Root Cause</th>
<th>Idea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Requirements “lock-in” inhibits ability for programs to weave in new capabilities | - Static requirements  
- SOWs that “bake out” innovation or don’t articulate means to innovate (e.g., a study CLIN)  
- RFC/Change processes biased toward the status quo | - Dynamic Requirements Management  
- Involve end users up front to define the “what” not the “how”  
- More IDIQs                                                                                                                                               |
**STC Metrics – Template**

**Presumed:** STC is inversely proportional to program size

There might be other relevant categories besides size (e.g., environment – legacy, modern, hybrid).

### Time-Based Metrics

Plot each program’s Actual performance relative to its defined Threshold / Objective

### SPEED TO CAPABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capability</th>
<th>Requirement-to-Award</th>
<th>Award-to-First-Capability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size</strong></td>
<td><strong>Program</strong></td>
<td><strong>Actual</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IAWG might offer an industry benchmark for the class of capability category**

1st graphic represents Requirement-to-Award (aka government)
2nd represents Award-to-First-Capability (aka industry)
NRO IAWG Action Team

Standardizing RFP language to increase speed to capability

Team Lead: Sonny Sarkar
“The contractor shall not use proprietary, vendor-unique or closed interfaces, code modules, hardware, firmware, or software. Examples of acceptable software licenses include, but are not limited to

- Government Off-The Shelf (GOTS),
- Government Open Source Software (GOSS)
- Free and Open Source Software (FOSS),
- Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) software,
- web-based RESTful services, and
- libraries (e.g., Apache) licenses

eliminating any vendor dependencies and proprietary software license restrictions and reduction in Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) of the system. “

Discussion Points: Intent to reduce TCO and promote Open Systems

• Open Interfaces = good… What about Proprietary H/W or S/W?
• Complete coverage of license types
• “Reduction” should be “Reducing”
COTS/GOTS/FOSS Software Make-Buy Factors

COTS/GOTS Open Source Software Business Models

BUSINESS MODEL FACTORS
• Life cycle costs and cost recovery
• Data & Intellectual property rights
• Maintenance and licensing, royalties
• Patent protections and indemnification
• Licensing (incl OSS)
• Security certification & patching
• Govt vs Industry Funding models

Challenge: Must avoid recreating commercially available capability

ARCHITECTURAL FACTORS
• Level of componentization vs Functional Requirements
• Degree of API publication & openness
• 80% fit vs 100% fit vs not invented
• Open I/Fs vs Open Source code
• Development vs Integration

OPERATING MODEL FACTORS
• ABC (Adopt, Buy, Create) vs CBA?
• “Speed to Need: Day 1 capability”
• Different pots of money: Dev vs O&M?
• Waterfall vs Agile vs DevOps
## Risk Comparison – COTS/GOTS/Hybrid Models

**Is Hybrid the “Best of Both Worlds”?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RISK AREA</th>
<th>COTS</th>
<th>GOTS</th>
<th>Hybrid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COTS
- Minimizes development risk
- “Day 0” capability speed to mission
- Amortizes cost over large population
- May not meet performance or security requirements without mods
- COTS integration isn’t trivial but neither is GOTS

### COTS-GOTS “Hybrid”
- COTS “Day 0” = 80% of Requirement
- Govt assigns “delta” reqts to integrator
- GOTS builds extend COTS via API/SDK
Government Perspective
Open Dialog

Additional Topics for Consideration

Actions & Next Steps

No-Host Social
NRO IAWG Contact Information

• Nick Buck: nick@buckgroup.net  (703) 801-3405
• Ann Waynik: ann.m.waynik@saic.com  (703) 975-4456
• Mike Moran: mmoran07@peraton.com  (571) 524-1184
• Alex Fox: afox02@harris.com  (703) 203-0243

USGIF coordination:
• Shai Sobrino: shai.sobrino@usgif.org  (571) 392-7205
BACKUP
Category: Pre-Acquisition  
Also: Ops

Observation
Lack of specific, shared objectives for improving contract(ing) performance  
Result: A lack of concrete actions leads to a victory for the status quo

Root Cause
Dearth of analysis of contracting performance

Idea
Set targets and gauge performance against STC metrics based on industry standards and tailored to program characteristics. [Template created – see next slide]

What’s important:
- Right-sizing vice making absolute statements of right/wrong. [Could adapt DAU Adaptive Acquisition Framework Interactive Tool – shows thresholds, underlying policies, Rapid Prototyping Guidance, though structure needs to be in place – not just policy]
- Reducing variance and increasing precision will help Procurement meet timeline expectations
- Get actuals from Acquisition COE
- Factors that affect performance and – most importantly – can be controlled. For example:
  - # of CDRLs
  - # of compliance docs (and other sources of “Solicitation Bloat”)
  - # of formal program reviews required
  - serial vs. parallel sequence of events
- This emphasizes that STC is a joint endeavor

Observation
Lack of specific, shared objectives for improving contract(ing) performance  
Result: A lack of concrete actions leads to a victory for the status quo
Category: Acquisition

Observation
“Solicitation Bloat” drives away qualified performers (mostly SBs) and creates extra work – on both sides – without necessarily providing benefit.

Root Cause
Path of least resistance and lowest risk: “Include everything”

Idea
- RFPs lighter on “compliance” documents, especially documents listed as “reference” – can be misleading, overly onerous, or unnecessary.
- **Start with one area (e.g., security).** Involve security teams in the solicitation creation (e.g., more detail on A&A process; which security clauses to include; who to contact with security questions). Result: Industry prepares better proposals, deliver SW faster, shrink ATO timeline.
- More **two-way exchanges.** Allowed by FAR§15.201 (which addresses exchanges with industry) but detested by many Acquisition officials and lawyers, except in large “Industry Day” forums (where vendors won’t talk about their IP)
- **Proposed approach:**
  1. Draft RFP with SOO and as much compliance burden as agency wants
  2. Bidders submit “mini” Technical Volume
  3. Down-select
  4. Two-way exchanges with down-selected vendors; input on right-sizing compliance burden
Observation
Inconsistent capability delivery chain and clunky transition to operations

Root Cause
Inertia within the current hybrid infrastructure and lack of end user involvement

Idea

**Overarching need:** A nexus where the confluence of technologist (industry), operator/analyst (govt), integrator (MSI contractor), and acquirer (SPO/SETA) can lead to immediate identification and advancement of operationally relevant solutions – seize on immediate opportunities then document “requirements” thereafter.

- Establish *the* enterprise dev/ops environment – even just a starting point – common to all ops sites upon which mission apps can be conceived, built, tested, deployed….and scaled rapidly.
- Identify an unbiased entity (“Capability MSI”) whose sole job (and incentives) is to run that environment and move high-quality solutions (not their own!) into operational environments.
  - Structure incentives wisely. Metrics: # of relevant ideas for govt adoption; # of ideas that govt deems qualified.
  - Needs strong leadership backing.
  - Incumbent on govt to sniff out anything self-serving.
- Involve end users more deeply in the agile development process (e.g., sprints) in order to fine-tune requirements and tailor system being developed.
Category: Ops / Transition to Ops
Also: Pre-acq / Acq

Observation
Requirements “lock-in” inhibits ability for programs to weave in new capabilities

Root Cause
• Static requirements
• SOWs that “bake out” innovation or don’t articulate means to innovate (e.g., a study CLIN)

Idea
• Dynamic Requirements Management: As requirements (and the state of technology) evolve, there might be a need to rapidly incorporate new elements of a solution while a program is in midstream, without having to initiate a new procurement from whole cloth.
• Involve end users up front to define the “what,” not the “how.” This will ensure relevancy and enhance uptake/adoption.
• More IDIQs (e.g., a la OASIS) – broad scope, pools, periodic onramping and offramping
• “How” options:
  o More SOOs (less prescriptive) vice SOWs
  o Government buys X number of sprints
  o Capability MSI (see previous slide)
  o Start with Mission CONOPS and Capabilities as “requirements,” then poll industry for solutions. Selected solutions immediately proceed to sole source awards to refine/deploy solution.

Observation
Requirements “lock-in” inhibits ability for programs to weave in new capabilities
NGA’s “Top 20” Issues w Industry (1 of 3)

PERFORMANCE
• Overpromising capability and capacity, resulting in protracted vacancies and/or unnecessary turnover/churn in personnel (enterprise contracts)
• Recycling subpar talent and/or passing known problem employees from vendor to vendor, especially on FTE contracts
• Assigning untrained FTE staff who require months of training by NGA before they can perform the task they were expected to do on day one
• Perception that some vendors search for reasons to request extensions to delivery dates
• Invoicing NGA before a deliverable is accepted

BUSINESS PROCESSES
• Overbearing Primes
• Not allowing Subs to innovate
• Exclusive Teaming – Industry practice that locks small businesses into teaming arrangements with single prime. Stifles competition by binding teams together competition after competition, limits government access to small business expertise except through specific primes.
• Requesting green IC badges to support contracts, but instead using them to conduct business development with NGA and, as a result, often restricting access to limited overhead badges from subs who need them
NGA’s “Top 20” Issues w Industry (2 of 3)

RFI/RFP PROCESS
- Not sending helpful feedback to RFIs
- RFI responses provide marketing pitches regarding overall corporate capabilities rather than thoughtful responses to the questions posed
- Price or cost proposals are lacking in content and detail (e.g., basis of estimates not congruent with technical approach or other volumes of the proposal)
- Incomplete proposals
- Increasing number of protests strains limited government resources

MARKETING
- Guerilla marketing – tendency to haphazardly reach out to anyone within NGA, at any time, at various technical and leadership levels – creates confusion and mixed communication
- Direct marketing to NGA seniors; responding to requests by submitting proposals or white papers directly to Seniors rather than following established processes
- Sending BD people to Tech Days
- Rebranding products without prior notification to NGA, leading NGA to learn of the change at the time of contract renewals.
COMMUNICATION/FEEDBACK

- Inadequate communication during contract administration (e.g., taking action on direction received from the program offices or customers that is outside the authority of the COR or Task Manager)
- Latency in reviewing and signing contractual documentation (e.g., ECPs, bi-lateral modifications, etc.)
- Delays in providing required notices under Limitation of Funds provisions (e.g., alerting the CO when 75% of available funds have been expended)