

## SeaPort-e Request for Information

Background: NAVSEASYSKOM's initial move to the SeaPort-e Multiple Award Contract (MAC) was to enable companies to propose more efficiently through usage of an electronic on-line portal. When adopted by other Navy activities and field offices, SeaPort-e also replaced a large number of stand-alone contracts. The goal was to increase standardization and efficiency regarding services awards, along with maximizing effective competition and small business opportunities utilizing a geographical zone based system. SeaPort-e MACs will expire in April 2019. In developing the acquisition strategy for the future of SeaPort-e, we want to consider all options for efficient and effective services contracting across the broader Navy community. We believe your responses to the questions below will help provide us with a basis upon which we can develop our strategy. This Request for Information (RFI) is centered solely on the contracting acquisition strategy, and not the IT platform or functionality of the portal as an electronic procurement system.

1. Do you have existing alternatives in conducting business with the Navy or other Government organizations? If so, please answer the following:
  - a. How many alternatives do you have (i.e. other MACs or GWACs)? Will they exist after April 2019?
  - b. What are they? (Please list)
  - c. For each of those listed, please identify whether there is a fee you pay to the servicing activity to participate in the MAC or GWAC, and if so, what the fee percentage is.
  - d. Are there aspects of the above that would be appealing if incorporated into how SeaPort develops and operates its IDIQs? Are there aspects that could be considered negative?
  - e. How do you capture costs (including B&P) associated with SeaPort-e compared with the alternatives listed in 1b above?
2. Are there improvements you would suggest to make the SeaPort-e process more efficient and user-friendly? What feature/change would you make to the SeaPort-e process?
3. We have received the suggestion to allow for usage of more than one NAICS code within SeaPort-e. Would you see this as a beneficial change? Why or why not?
4. We have received the suggestion to reduce administrative costs by permitting administrative termination of a MAC contract should a company not submit any proposals over a certain period of time, such as two years. How would you view this change, and why?
5. We have received the suggestion to change rolling admissions from an annual basis to every other year, in order to reduce administrative costs for both the company and the Government. Do you have an opinion on this? Do you anticipate this affecting you negatively in any way?
6. SeaPort-e MACs were made in geographic zones to align requirements with the performing vendor community, generate effective competition and enhance small business opportunities.
  - a. If you are a small business, does the current zone based strategy better enable your company to successfully compete for Navy work?

- b. Are there changes regarding the zones that you believe would open up additional opportunities or make the competitions more effective?
  - c. Is there an alternative to managing procurements under the zone construct (e.g. by functional domain or by Echelon II command) that you believe would make competition more effective?
- 7. We continuously look for best practices to improve the user experience and process efficiency. We are looking at suggestions regarding splitting the MACs and setting aside some functional areas to be exclusively available to small business MAC holders and possibly utilizing either multiple NAICS or multiple size standards (exceptions) within the current single NAICS 541330. As we consider these, we can foresee complications and we are analyzing whether there is any benefit realized when the option already exists under SeaPort-e to set-aside solicitations based upon business size. Based on your experience, do you believe incorporating any of these suggested changes will enhance or hinder effective competition? What do you see as the pros and/or cons associated with any of these approaches?
- 8. To further efforts to improve the user experience and process efficiency, what do you see as best practices that you have observed in working with other organizations and MACs?
- 9. What best practices do you believe are provided by SeaPort-e? What advantages do you believe participating in SeaPort-e provides to your company?
- 10. How does the process of submitting a proposal on SeaPort-e compare with other vehicles?
- 11. Are you a current SeaPort-e prime contractor? If so, please respond to the following questions.
  - a. In a typical year, how many proposals bids have you submitted as a prime contractor using SeaPort-e?
  - b. What are the factors that explain your level of activity?
  - c. What has been your win rate percentage? Has your experience on SeaPort-e differed by ordering activity?
- 12. What do you see as the barriers to entry for a SeaPort-e prime contractor? Subcontractor? Are there any recommendations to mitigate any real or perceived barriers to entry?
  - a. Relative to Cost-Type procurements?
  - b. Relative to FFP procurements?
- 13. Are there any other comments/suggestions/issues that you would like to make the SeaPort-e team aware of?

Please return answers by **July 1, 2016** to the following email address:

[seaport\\_rfi\\_ven.fct@navy.mil](mailto:seaport_rfi_ven.fct@navy.mil)

Thank you for your participation and continued support of SeaPort-e.