“The forecast data is for planning purposes, does not represent a pre-solicitation synopsis, does not constitute an invitation for bid or request for proposal, and is not a commitment by the government to purchase the desired products and services.”
Agenda

Communication
ACC-APG Organizational Information
  – Construct, Statistics, Customers, Personnel
  – AMSAA LPTA Study Results
  – Implementation of Better Buying Power: LPTA vs. Tradeoff
  – FY17 Initiatives

Service Contract Spend
Responsive Strategic Sourcing for Services (RS3)
Communication

Training with Industry
Red Team Debriefs
Communication Misconceptions
Communication Misconceptions

- The best way to present my company’s capabilities is by marketing directly to Contracting Officers and/or signing them up for my mailing list.

- Agencies generally have already determined their requirements and acquisition approach so our impact during the pre-RFP phase is limited.

- Industry days and similar events attended by multiple vendors are of low value to industry and the government because industry won’t provide useful information in front of competitors and the government doesn’t release new information.

- Conducting discussions/negotiations after receipt of proposals will add too much time to the schedule.
AMC Mission Command Alignment

Implemented 17 Feb 2016
Shifted operational control (OPCON) of ACC-APG from ACC to CECOM

Key Takeaways:

– Improves synchronization of equipping and sustaining across the Army Enterprise
– Integrates the Lifecycle Management Command (LCMC) sustainment considerations earlier in the acquisition process
– Earlier ACC-APG involvement to provide more timely business advice to both the Program Manager (PM) and the LCMC
– Improves ACC-APG understanding of the broader requirements which increases the ability to utilize the competitive marketplace to provide affordable sustainment solutions.
ACC-APG FY16 Statistics

Approximately 32K actions executed for $11.4B including grants and secure contract actions

Contract action statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Obligations</th>
<th>% Obligations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Army</td>
<td>$7,090,027,829.25</td>
<td>66.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense</td>
<td>$1,756,342,688.47</td>
<td>16.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXEC OFC PRES (FMS)</td>
<td>$976,636,651.87</td>
<td>9.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants (Army/Defense)</td>
<td>$594,130,323.00</td>
<td>5.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force</td>
<td>$127,802,254.81</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy</td>
<td>$85,922,128.37</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Corps</td>
<td>$69,608,773.85</td>
<td>0.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept of Veteran Affairs</td>
<td>$700,000.00</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland Sec</td>
<td>$649,247.82</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Communications Commission</td>
<td>-$8,650.50</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corp of Engineers</td>
<td>-$8,785.16</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept of Agriculture</td>
<td>-$78,580.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,701,723,881.78</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Type</th>
<th>Obligations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;M</td>
<td>$3,462,070,038.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDT&amp;E</td>
<td>$2,980,623,099.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>$2,612,833,465.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMS</td>
<td>$996,323,833.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Capital Funds</td>
<td>$276,115,237.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$215,247,283.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint IED Defeat Fund</td>
<td>$137,766,686.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense</td>
<td>$20,744,237.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,701,723,881.78</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACC-APG FY 16 Customers

- **ATEC**, $238,342,772, 2%
- **HQ, DA**, $256,274,922, 2%
- **PEO Aviation**, $351,184,560, 3%
- **MITRE FFRDC**, $483,271,127, 4%
- **Secure Mission**, $560,396,561, 5%
- **PEO Soldier**, $605,701,810, 5%
- **NETCOM**, $650,860,486, 6%
- **FMS**, $874,821,733, 8%
- **RDECOM (Grants/Agreements)**, $594,130,323, 5%
- **RDECOM (HQ, ARL, ECBC, NSRDEC, STTC)**, $801,502,559, 7%
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ACC-APG FY 16 Customers

$11.4B Obs
32,216 Actions

42% ASA(ALT) 35% AMC 23% OTHER

Other Customers Include but aren’t limited to:

Across ACC-APG
Army Materiel Cmd
Dept of Defense
Army Sustainment Cmd
PEO EIS
TACOM
Div D
ARMY Acq Spt Ctr
PEO STRI
Adelphi
DTRA
Belvoir
PEO Ammo
PEO CS&CSS
Natick
PEO CS&CSS RTP
DARPA
Tenant
AMSA
Huachuca
TRADOC
Edgewood
CMA

IMCOM, $170,012,476, 1%
DTRA - JIDO, $172,480,988, 2%
ATEC, $238,342,772, 2%
HQ, DA, $266,631,317, 2%
NETCOM, $694,770,460, 6%
OTHER - AMC, $347,282,165, 3%
FMS, $874,821,733, 8%
RDECOM (Grants/Agreements), $594,130,323, 5%
RDECOM (HQ, ARL, ECBC, NSRDEC, STTC), $843,321,544, 7%
CERDEC, $424,543,631, 4%
CECOM HQ (ILSC, ISEC, SEC, TYAD), $875,732,245, 8%
OTHER - ASAALT, $127,838,339, 1%
PEO IEWS, $1,322,549,664, 12%
PEO C3T, $1,134,331,157, 10%
PEO Soldier, $605,701,810, 5%
Secure Mission, $560,396,561, 5%
JPEO CBD, $476,231,198, 4%
PEO Aviation, $352,030,810, 3%
PEO M&S, $199,969,905, 2%
OTHER - ASAALT, $127,838,339, 1%
Contracting – Years of Experience Distribution

**Early Career**
0-10 yrs of exp
DoD (FY12) 27.7%
ACC-APG (FY12) 58.8%
ACC-APG (FY16) 54.6%

**Mid Career**
11-20 yrs of exp
DoD (FY12) 17.6%
ACC-APG (FY12) 14.5%
ACC-APG (FY16) 21.9%

**Senior Career**
20+ yrs of exp
DoD (FY12) 54.7%
ACC-APG (FY12) 26.7%
ACC-APG (FY16) 23.5%

Experiential Deficit

- DoD (FY12) 27.7%
- ACC-APG (FY12) 58.8%
- ACC-APG (FY16) 54.6%
- ACC-APG (end FY12) 58.8%
- ACC-APG (end FY16) 54.6%
AMSAA LPTA Study Results

1.) In most cases it appears LPTA is being used appropriately for commercial, non-complex products and services IAW OSD guidance issued in March 2015.

- 47% of best value source selections.
- 45% of service contracts; 51% of product contracts.
- 90% of all construction, facility related, and transportation service contracts (commercial, non-complex services).
- 30% of knowledge-based and IT service contracts used LPTA.

2.) LPTA saves money and time (benefits Army acquisition).
- Averages 7% savings for recompeted contracts, with significant savings when original contract used Tradeoff (29%).
- Average cycle time is 17% less than Tradeoff, with significant time savings (28%) for base contracts.
- Significantly lower frequency of contract modification than Tradeoff (1% vs 5%).
AMSAA LPTA Study Results (cont.)

3.) LPTA does not have greater adverse impacts to industry than Tradeoff.
   – No significant differences between LPTA and Tradeoff with respect to
     frequency of incumbent selection and frequency of salary decreases for
     recompeted contracts.
   – Lowest price offer chosen in 65% of Tradeoff selections.

4.) Recommendations on the utilization of LPTA:
   – Continue to use LPTA when appropriate (e.g., commercial, non-complex
     services).
   – Consider further analysis of cost impacts associated with LPTA, salary
     decrease magnitudes, and appropriateness of LPTA use for knowledge-based
     and IT services.
ACC-APG FY16 Implementation of Better Buying Power

LPTA
- 55.4% of new actions over $1M which used a Best Value Source Selection approach were LPTA
- 11 LPTA actions were recompetes of previously competed tradeoffs, with essentially same scope
  - $7.6M savings
  - 5 of 11 actions were awarded to the incumbent

Tradeoff
- 40 actions sampled
- Tradeoff made
  - 35% of the time (14 actions)
  - Total premium paid = $22.3M (average 5.5%)
  - When tradeoff was made, 21.4% of awards went to incumbent
- Tradeoff not made (LPTA offer presented the best value)
  - 65% of the time (26 actions)
  - Total cost avoidance (difference between awardee and next in line) = $207M (average 14.2%) - $5.96M per contract, per contract year
  - When no tradeoff was made, 11.5% of awards went to incumbent
# ACC-APG FY17 Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIATIVE</th>
<th>DESIRED OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved Industry Engagement /</td>
<td>- Improved/Streamlined Acquisition Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing Protest Risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- APBI/Industry Days</td>
<td>- Buy More Readiness/Sustainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Training with Industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Red Team Debriefs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability Over Life Cycle</td>
<td>- Buy More Readiness/Sustainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Contracting for Sustainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early in Life Cycle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Warranties/NDI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fully Integrated into CECOM ALCC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle Rhythm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Intellectual Property &amp; Software</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ACC/CECOM Data Rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- IPT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Continued Use &amp; Refinement of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Buying Power Initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strategic Sourcing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ACC-APG FY17 Initiatives (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIATIVE</th>
<th>DESIRED OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process/Policy/Procedural Initiatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➡️ Acquisition Plan Briefing</td>
<td>- Improved/Streamlined Acquisition Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➡️ Paper Peer Reviews</td>
<td>- Buy More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➡️ Combined Acquisition Plan/Services</td>
<td>- Readiness/Sustainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➡️ Acquisition Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➡️ Streamlined LPTA Evaluation Procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➡️ PNM Approval Waiver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➡️ Red Team Debrief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➡️ Streamlined Technical Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➡️ Evaluation Criteria Simplification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➡️ Better Buying Power/Cost Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➡️ Metric Driven Behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➡️ Reverse Auction Technique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➡️ Training with Industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Structure Initiatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➡️ Divisional Alignment to Customer</td>
<td>- Affordable Workforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➡️ Chief of the Contracting Office (COCO) Delegation</td>
<td>- Efficiency of government operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➡️ Program Integrators</td>
<td>- Improved/Streamlined Acquisition Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➡️ Cost &amp; Pricing Decentralized</td>
<td>- Buy More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➡️ 1105 Contract Assistants (1100 Series workforce mix)</td>
<td>- Readiness/Sustainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➡️ Intern Retention Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total Service Contract Spend

Total ACC Service Contract Actions and Spend

ACC-APG Service Contract Actions and Spend
Responsive Strategic Sourcing for Services (RS3)

Knowledge based support services for requirements with Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (C4ISR) related needs to include:

— Engineering
— Research, Development, Test and Evaluation (RDT&E)
— Logistics
— Acquisition and Strategic Planning
— Education and Training

The forecast data is for planning purposes, does not represent a pre-solicitation synopsis, does not constitute an invitation for bid or request for proposal, and is not a commitment by the government to purchase the desired products and services.
RS3 (Continued)

RS3 will replace
- Rapid Response-Third Generation (R2-3G)
- Strategic Services Sourcing (S3)
- Warrior Enabling Broad Sensor (WEBS)
- Technical, Administrative and Operations Support Services (TAOSS)
- Technical Information Engineering Services (TIES)

RS3 will not replace
- Software and Systems Engineering Services Next Generation (SSES NexGen)
- Total Engineering and Integration Services (TEIS III)
- Omnibus Program Engineering and Technical Support (OPETS)
- Common Hardware Systems (CHS)
- Global Tactical Advanced Communication Systems (GTACS)
RS3 (Continued)

Tentative milestones:

– Acquisition Strategy Approval – Dec 2014
– Industry Day – 16 Dec 2014
– Proposals Due – 6 May 2015
– Phase 1 Contract Awards – May 2017
– Phase 2 – TBD
Submit questions in writing to Katie Thompson, katherine.c.thompson4.civ@mail.mil or Ashley Keating, ashley.e.keating.civ@mail.mil
“…effective communication requires more than an exchange of information. When done right, communication fosters understanding, strengthens relationships, improves teamwork, and builds trust.”

~Liz Papadopoulos