



Procurement Countdown

Summer 2007 No. 133

Sweeping Changes at Headquarters

By Susie Marucci, *Procurement Countdown* Editor

[Ed. Note: This issue of the Procurement Countdown was going to be totally dedicated to the Long Beach Procurement Training Conference. However, as the Procurement Countdown was being put together, sweeping changes did indeed occur. This article describes those changes. Beyond the front page, the rest of the Procurement Countdown covers the experiences and knowledge of people at the Procurement Training Conference.]

Some things never change. Taxes in April, hot weather in July, and the front office of the Office of Procurement.

For the past nine years, that had been true. Since 1998, Tom Luedtke has been the head of the Office of Procurement, first as acting, then as the AA for Procurement.

All of that changed Monday, April 9, when Tom announced that his boss, the head of I&M was being promoted — and Tom was being promoted into that job. It was a stunning announcement to everyone here and to many people throughout Headquarters and the Centers. It was



Tom chats with Procurement Officer Russ Davis who retired shortly after the Training Conference

even more surprising because until the afternoon of the Friday before he made the announcement, Tom didn't know he was

being promoted either. If all of that weren't enough fun, his new job started one week later.

While Tom had been running the Headquarters Procurement Organization for nine years, he had been in the front office for 14. His titles during that time were Acting Deputy Associate Administrator for Procurement, Deputy Associate Administrator for Procurement, Acting Associate Administrator for Procurement, Associate Administrator for Procurement, Assistant Administrator for Procurement, Director of Procurement, and finally Assistant Administrator for Procurement (again).

Now, Tom is the Associate Administrator for Institutions and Management. In his new job, he oversees numerous organizations including Diversity and Equal Opportunity, Human Capital Management, Infrastructure and Administration, Internal Controls and Management Systems, Security and Program Protection, Small Business Programs, the NASA Shared Services Center, and, of course, Procurement. There will be a lot to learn in this

new job. But Tom is up to the challenge. If you have worked with Tom over the past years, then you know that if there is one person who can take all of this in



Tom Luedtke at the December Training Conference

and run with it, it is Tom. He will bring the same mixture of common sense, foresight, and intelligence to I&M that he has brought to Procurement for all of these years.

There has been a flurry of activity since the announcement was made. Sheryl Goddard, the Director of the Program Operations Division, has been named as Acting Assistant Administrator for Procurement. Diane Thompson has been named the Acting Director of the Program Operations Division while Sheryl is

(continued on page 2)

A Message from the Editor: What's in a Name?

This issue covers one area: The Biennial Procurement Training. “The WHAT?” you might ask. The Biennial Procurement Training is the official name of the Procurement Training Conference that took place in Long Beach, CA, in December.

Several years ago, the word “conference” was defined by NASA to mean a certain type of meeting with certain people attending and certain restrictions associated with it. Technically, our training is not a conference at all. But you will see it referred to as a conference throughout this newsletter. You also may see it referred to as the “December Training,” “The December Conference,” “The Procurement Training,” “The Trip That Got Me Away From My Center,” and others. You probably won’t see it referred to as “The Biennial Procurement Training.”

Most of the articles in this issue cover sessions from the point of view of the attendees. One session is covered solely from the presenters. Another has articles from both.

This issue is also the one where we relax a bit so people may describe in their own words what they experienced. Within these pages, you will find more humor than normally appears in the *Procurement Countdown*. You will find author’s comments about what they experienced along with what they learned. You’ll even find a poem.

If you weren’t able to attend the conference, this should give you an idea of what some of the sessions were like. I could not go either, but what I learned from reading these articles is that many people shared ideas, spent time with people from other centers, learned a great deal, and had a good time while doing it.

The other thing you should know is that the training you attended, or will read about here, took a huge amount of work beforehand and behind the scenes. Please stop what you are doing and give around of applause (or a toast, depending on where you are) to Yolande Harden and Rebekah Brewer of Headquarters. These two women put in more work than you could ever imagine to make this “training meeting” a great experience.

Susie Marucci
Editor

Farewell Tom

(continued from page 1)

occupied with a job she had no idea she would be doing. Tom is taking Becky Brewer our amazing administrative officer with him. If any of you have gone to the Procurement Training Conferences and enjoyed the excellent surroundings, location, and meals, you can be in the Institutions and Management

administrative officer here. The search for a new
No one in the office wanted Tom to thought he would be here until he retired. we could keep him here, we all are happy for new office. The good news is he is still our (down). We hope he and Becky enjoy their working with them all these years.



The “Official” Tom Luedtke

thank Becky. LaVerne Randolph, who has office, will be replacing Becky as the administrative Assistant Administrator is well underway. leave. No one expected it, either. We all Tom thought so too. Despite our wish that him. We know he will do a great job in the boss, though one level up (and one floor new positions as much as we have enjoyed

View the presentation charts at: <http://ec.msfc.nasa.gov/hq/library/conf2006/>

The Whole Thing

By Suzanne Honeycutt, NASA Shared Services Center

In April 2006, I received the call many hope for and few receive. I could not believe I was going to be part of the NASA Team. As the days then weeks passed, my excitement escalated. Finally the day arrived. I reported to duty, adrenaline level at full throttle – yet extremely nervous and unsure of what to expect.

In November, I was selected to participate in the 2006 Procurement Training. Being new to NASA, I was a little apprehensive, again unsure of what to expect. The agenda was published. I was surprised to find out that I was scheduled as a co-presenter. As December 11 approached, I was starting to feel as I had on my first day with NASA. However, I learned my apprehension was unfounded.

I was totally surprised the first day at the number of procurement personnel in attendance. I sat in the grand ballroom in awe of the amount of procurement knowledge and experience that was contained in one room. Plus there were so many in attendance I wondered who was manning the ship back at the home Centers.

One of my first impressions was the relaxed atmosphere. Mr. Luedtke warmed up the group in the first presentation and showed his sense of humor not only then but on several other occasions throughout the week. I was totally at ease. I settled in, listening to the next presentations. It wasn't long before I was reminded of my first few weeks with NASA – when I

had been introduced to an unfamiliar world of Procurement acronyms: NAIS, PPDB, JOFOC, CCI, UCA, ULO, PBA – just to mention a few.



Rick Keegan

DOPEY OR OPII?

In just about every session I attended, I heard/learned new acronyms. Did you know 'OPII' stands for Office of Program and Institutional Integration not the 'OPI' nail polish; 'KDP' means key decision point not 'Kennedy Documented Procedure' (KSC folks will understand); 'MD' means Mission Directorate not medical doctor; and 'SCAP' is Shared Capabilities Assets Program. My personal favorite came from, the 'DOPII' Director, Rick Keegan. I must confess that this GRITS (Girl Raised In The South) was wondering what one of the Seven Dwarfs had to do with NASA. My brain must have been in acronym overload. I will, however, never forget Mr. Keegan's statement that there are no 'dopey' questions.

I also learned that NASA team members like to use slang terms and slogans, in addition to acronyms. For example, "stepping on the air hose," "blow smoke up your skirt," "bait & switch," "chemical toilets" to name a few. Even now,

I'm not sure what a couple of those really mean.

AWARDS

The night of the awards banquet was very enjoyable. The dinner was not a serving of the traditional boring "cold chicken." I am, however, still wondering about the dessert. What was it? Does anyone know? As the night progressed, the anticipation of learning the Procurement category winners was evident. When the category winners were announced, it was obvious that we were in the middle of a fierce competition – as each Center cheered on its winners. The NSSC was new to this mode but we can hoot and holler with the best of them. Next time we'll be ready with confetti, bull horns, streamers...

For me, one of the most important aspects of the conference was the ability to put a face with a name. It's always nice to meet people face-to-face when you've exchanged so many emails and conversed via teleconferences for the past several months. It was a great pleasure to meet everyone. Then too, I'm sure the highlight for the "ole timers," pardon the expression, was to see old friends again and play catch-up. I could feel the excitement in the air as greetings were exchanged.

I was very fortunate that I was selected to attend, learned a lot that will benefit me in my career with NASA, and look forward to learning a myriad of new acronyms. AA! (Adios Amigos!)

View the presentation charts at: <http://ec.msfc.nasa.gov/hq/library/conf2006/>

Contingency Contracting - Hurricane Katrina

By Christopher J. Grubbe, Kennedy Space Center

Back in November 2006, I was asked to write an article on the Contingency Contracting – Hurricane Katrina Recovery Breakout Session that I would attend at the Procurement Training Conference being held in Long Beach, CA. My first thought was that I had no idea what Contingency Contracting was and no idea how I would write an article about it. I did know prior to attending the conference that



Hurricane Katrina not only wiped out little villages and towns but whole communities in her wake.

All of us, no matter where we live in the United States, read dozens of newspaper and saw dozens of television stories about how the aftermath of Katrina devastated Louisiana (especially New Orleans). However, I only read or saw a handful of stories regarding the devastation that took place in Mississippi. The stories showed pictures of before and after. They made references to how the Governor was doing a wonderful job of getting aid to all Mississippians.

Before attending the conference, I figured I would write an article that would cover all or as many of the aspects of contingency contracting that I could. I would try to briefly describe the many aspects, concepts, and/or procedures that I could. This could be

beneficial in the long run to all of us procurement people who would need to be aware of these activities if we were put in a similar situation as those individuals at the Stennis Space Center.

LIVING THROUGH IT

That all changed when I sat at the second row table in the corner of the breakout session and watched a stirring presentation of the reality of Hurricane Katrina. I want to thank Rob Harris and Valerie Holmes for giving their first-hand accounts of what transpired and presenting their personal experiences with us as well. Although I live in Florida and I am growing tolerant to the preparations needed for hurricanes, I was not truly prepared for the pictures and scenes that were shown in this presentation. For me this was more than a training session on contingency contracting, this was a life learning experience. It showed me how people from diverse backgrounds and social status could cast aside their own personal tribulations to work together for the greater good of the community and the human race.

PULLING TOGETHER

After a disaster hits, it is human nature to first ensure that your family is safe and healthy, and then to seek out the well being of your friends and neighbors. This hurricane did more than just damage a few buildings at Stennis or Michoud; it displaced one thousand Stennis employees from their homes and destroyed or

damaged 24 schools in South Mississippi. I still am amazed at those numbers.

We think of family as being husbands, wives, children, brothers, sisters, mothers, fathers, nephews and nieces, but we spend more time on a daily basis with our coworkers, team leaders, contractors, and supervisors. This we know as our extended NASA family. During the aftermath of Katrina, our Stennis counterparts showed with diligent perseverance how important our NASA family really matters. I am sure there were squabbles and arguments just like in any family, but as a whole they worked together as a family to get the Stennis Space Center and Michoud Assembly Facility up and running. This was all done while 20 percent of the Stennis workforce lost their homes, 30 percent had



inhabitable homes, and many businesses were closed or destroyed in the surrounding communities.

Stennis developed a Supply Distribution Point, which supported six counties with over two thousand trucks of supplies. The Stennis warehouse became the main storage area for baby formula, Meals Ready to Eat (MREs), water,

(continued on page 18)

View the presentation charts at: <http://ec.msfc.nasa.gov/hq/library/conf2006/>

Compliant Source Selection Statements and Effective Debriefings

By Vanessa R. Beene, Johnson Space Center

When I was told that I'd be given the opportunity to write an article on the Source Selection and Debriefing session of the 2006 Procurement Conference held in Long Beach, CA, I found myself in somewhat of a quandary. Writing is not really my forte. I thought to myself, "If I could only sing it, everyone would truly understand how fascinating each session was." When I came to myself and realized that singing the story was completely out of the question, I told myself, "Beene, stop talking to yourself and just write the article!" So here goes...

I suppose the concept for writing this article really began as I watched a film featuring Gene Kranz ("Making It Happen...It's up to you!") during Jeff Hanley's Constellation Overview. After being charged in my own quiet kind of way, I moseyed on down to the suite where the seminar on "Preparing Compliant Source Selection Statements and Conducting Effective Debriefings" was being presented. It was very apparent that these two milestones of the Source Evaluation Board process were of interest to others. The room was packed!

The scheduled presenters were Dee Morrison (ARC), Billie Smith (GSFC), and Rich Swanson (DFRC). Their overall objectives included the NASA Source Selection Statement Development Guide (PIC 04-10) and assessing how source selection statements are written; the NASA Procurement Debriefing Guide (PIC 04-11) and

how well the PICs are being used; and lessons learned. With a radiant smile on his face, Mr. Swanson stated... "I love debriefings!" My tickle box turned over...too funny. Most people cringe at the thought of conducting debriefings. I thought back to my one and only debrief participation. One of the SEB members trying, to make light



Rich Swanson

conversation, asked a "mother-to-be" member of an unsuccessful offeror if her preference was for a baby boy or girl. Her response, full of anger and with much attitude, was "I just hope it's human." So much for light conversation!

The announcement of the overall objectives for this session created an astounding amount of interest. The questions began. Isn't the purpose of source selection statements really to simply defend against a protest? (No.) Have we always been so open with publishing the source selection statements? (No.) What do we do with source selection statements once they are completed? (File them, but some Centers post them to the web.

Check out PIC 04-10 for more info.) Who writes the decision? (The SSA, with input from the SEB team and other organization like Legal as needed.) To what extent is it really an articulation of the Source Selection Authority's rationale? (Totally. It is the SSA's rationale.) Do you want to put everything in the source selection statement? (To the extent practicable, except for items like proprietary data.)

PROTESTS

A great amount of discussion was on the topic of protest. The consensus was, if a company's going to protest, it's going to protest, and that's that! PIC 04-11 tells us that "the debriefing guide is designed to facilitate open, appropriate, and meaningful information exchanges that reduce misunderstandings and protests." The more open we are; the less likely a protest will occur. Proprietary and trade secrets are not included in the source selection statement. Since the source selection statement has been made available to offerors, there have been fewer protests. Offerors have taken the advice of the source selection statement and proposals are written much better these days – so a lot of air has been let out of the protest balloon.

So, how do **we** make it happen? The source selection statement consists of three parts: the

(continued on page 15)

View the presentation charts at: <http://ec.msfc.nasa.gov/hq/library/conf2006/>

CMM: The Long and Winding Road

By Jeff Lupis, Headquarters

For those who attended the conference - do you recall the first day when two of the CMM team stepped to the podium to provide a quick (seven chart) overview entitled "What Did it Take to Launch CMM?" (I believe that it was after Jeff Hanley's presentation and before the first break.) Unfortunately, the presentation charts must have been too much for the laptop they were on, because the computer kept churning, and churning...and churning. Does that sound slightly familiar and just a little ironic? Well in the several months since CMM roll out and the Long Beach conference, many of the problems that were causing some daily frustration have now been resolved. In fact, this might be a good opportunity to not only revisit a number of the major CMM operational issues that were briefed during the conference but also to get an update of the progress we've made.

Obviously, it was the nuts and bolts of the operational roll out of CMM that was uppermost on people's minds during the conference. Ron Lentz, our CMM Project Manager, covered the full gamut of operational issues, including CMM stabilization progress, top issues that were impacting system performance, CMM workarounds and other CMM "tips and tricks" to address performance issues, as well as system enhancements that were being planned to address system issues. "Go-live" had occurred on November 13, and during the

training session Ron mentioned that system stabilization was continuing. (In fact, the stabilization period was extended through the end of March, at which point it transitioned into an operational stage.) Ron also mentioned that during the stabilization period both the NASA Centers and the Competency Center were providing the first line of defense for system issues



CMM Panel Members

through their "war rooms." Issues identified by the Centers were also being addressed through a daily "stabilization call" that provided a venue to discuss potential issues and workarounds. As a quick update on progress, Ron mentions now that many Centers have continued to operate their war rooms. The Competency Center war room did extend its support. However, as the issue goes to press, the war room is scheduled to be disbanded on June 15. Although daily stabilization calls have been replaced by a weekly Operational Support Telecon, Ron believes that the weekly telecons have been working well to ensure that issues are addressed in a timely manner.

One of the major areas of concern during the CMM briefing at Long Beach was a number of "top issues" that were having the biggest impact on the Centers successfully using the system. The most pressing of these was the "ALI (Accounting Line Items) Processing Time" issue, or more specifically, the problem with the excessive amount of time that was necessary to process documents that included a large number of ALI. Although the status of the Service Request (SR) to fix this problem was still outstanding at the time of the conference, since then the problem has been resolved to the extent that processing time has been greatly reduced. Transactions are now taking minutes versus hours since the system improvement was made. While the CMM team is still interested in finding ways to further decrease processing time, the situation has improved to the extent that the issue is now being worked along with a number of other improvements that are planned for the future.

A second "top issue" identified at the conference was that accounting information was automatically printing on system-generated forms even though many Centers did not want such information visible. This was discussed at the briefing with an emphasis on the fact that GSFC had provided a workaround (thank you GSFC!) demonstrating that a system override was possible to exclude accounting information from documents. The CMM team

(continued on next page)

View the presentation charts at: <http://ec.msfc.nasa.gov/hq/library/conf2006/>

Contract Management Module

(continued from opposite page)

had determined that there were no technical problems created by the override, and specific information has since been forwarded to the Centers on how to use this function.

Finally, a third issue noted during the conference discussion was that many people were experiencing a phenomenon while working in CMM where the system would randomly revert to the "Inside Marshall" Internet homepage. This problem has also since been resolved to a major extent. The occurrence of personnel being kicked-out of the system is becoming an increasingly rare circumstance.

One of the main goals of the CMM presentation at the conference was to discuss practical steps that people could take to overcome system problems. A "CMM Tips and Tricks" section of the discussion included a description of common best practices and reminders. These can help people with day-to-day navigation of some of the most common problems being experienced. Rather than an

in-depth re-hash of these tips here, I recommend that you take a quick look at the tips as you review the presentation charts Ron briefed at the conference. The charts are easily accessible at <http://ec.msfc.nasa.gov/hq/library/conf2006/etools/index.html#CMM>. There you can find Ron's "CMM Operational Issues" charts. You will also find the "CMM Templates Presentation" provided by Celeste Dalton as part of her briefing on the many commonly used document templates that NASA has developed for the system.

Finally, it is noted that as we continue to become more familiar with CMM and work to resolve any lingering problems, the CMM project continues to be ready to support us. However, it is important that you make your problems and frustrations known to the CMM team. Please continue to discuss your concerns with your Center Business Process lead, who

will make sure that problems are addressed at the weekly Operational Support Telecon. Since most problems are not unique to a particular Center, this will help ensure that our entire procurement community can benefit from solutions or workarounds that might be available. In fact, as Ron mentioned during our last discussion, there was a Center Business Process lead workshop held April 24 – 25. Its goal was to bring together the leads and other operational personnel to ensure we find ways to resolve CMM problems and make the system as user friendly as possible. So please make sure that your lead is aware of any remaining issues you have. And by the way, you might also want to take a minute to thank them (along with the rest of your Center's CMM project group) for their hard work and dedication which has made the roll out of the new system possible. Thanks all!



View the presentation charts at: <http://ec.msfc.nasa.gov/hq/library/conf2006/>

Technical Evaluations and Surveillance Plans

By Audrey A. Guerra, Contracting Officer, Ames Research Center

On December 14, 2006, a group of dedicated and energized contracting professionals from all across NASA met to hear a multi-Center creative and innovative presentation on preparing NASA technical evaluations and surveillance plans. Rob Kolb from JSC started the presentation off with the Introduction and Agenda. Andrea Browne and Laurie DeClaire from JSC presented key elements in preparing successful technical evaluations. The presenters discussed who conducts a technical evaluation, what information should be included, and why technical evaluations are needed. They said it is important to emphasize the COTR's role in conducting the technical evaluation and that a well-done technical evaluation supports a successful negotiation of the proposal. We were reminded that a technical evaluation is a quantitative and qualitative assessment of the proposal and provides the documentation to support the negotiation. A technical evaluation is NOT an estimate, is NOT a document to restate a proposal, and is NOT a restatement of the contract requirements.

The highlight of the presentation came when GRC's Richard Amiot and Mark Manthey demonstrated an automated Word macro created by Elaine Shuman, also from GRC. The macro is a tool to help fill out technical evaluations. Amiot played the role of the contract specialist. He filled out the

"request" portions of the electronic form to demonstrate how the form works. It was routed electronically to the COTR using Microsoft Outlook. Unfortunately, the tool at this time does not integrate with Eudora email. Manthey then played



Mark Manthey's presentation

the role of the technical evaluator as the form was completed. Major features of the form include completion instructions, one-page guidelines on proper rationale and instructions, a sample of a completed technical evaluation, an automatic email generation feature (with the form and the sample automatically attached), and pop-up help messages for the evaluator.

As if that were not enough the Macro creates and labels the file automatically. The first objective is to make it easy for the COTR to understand the technical evaluation requirement. The second objective is to prepare the documentation of the evaluation of each cost element (i.e. labor hours/dollars, materials/subcontracts, and ODCs) using an easy step-by-step process. This tool also has an automatic validation

feature to check the forms accuracy before sending. The GRC team would like to see their automated tool for completing technical evaluations put on the Virtual Procurement Office for others to access. It is hoped that this evaluation tool will soon be rolled out to other Centers; however, some refinements are necessary before that happens.

The group finished with a short presentation on the importance of surveillance plans/methods given by Liliana Richwine, Tim Canella (both from LaRC) and Rob Kolb (JSC). They gave a brief overview of the ways that surveillance plans provide a baseline and a mechanism for technical assessment and compliance commensurate with the complexity and risk of the contract. Again, it was emphasized that COTRs are responsible for providing both the technical evaluations and surveillance plans.

Overall, the presentation on technical evaluations and surveillance plans was received well by the attendees and provided a catalyst for many comments and questions to the presenters. JSC, GRC, and LaRC did a good job making a dry topic like technical evaluations and surveillance plans into an interesting and educational experience for all who attended this workshop.

View the presentation charts at: <http://ec.msfc.nasa.gov/hq/library/conf2006/>

Award Term Panel Discussions

By Kari Alvarado, Dryden Flight Research Center

[Ed. Note: Unlike most articles in this issue, this one was written by the presenters, rather than the people attending.]

A wealth of knowledge and experience was shared at the Award Term (AT) panel discussions held during the 2006 NASA Procurement Conference. Presenters included Kelly Kaplan of Ames, Kari Alvarado of Dryden, Leah Stervagi, and Ron Sepesi of Glenn, Bernie Pagliaro of Goddard, and Stephanie Hunter and Billy Autry of Johnson. An introduction, including policy history, was presented by Jim Balinskas of Headquarters (workshop moderator) and Carl Weber, Headquarters AT Lead CAP.

The Award Term Pilot Program was established in 2000. On January 25, 2006, PIC 06-02 was issued to provide guidance on the transition of the Award Term Contracting Pilot Program to a more formalized process for using Award Term incentive. NASA currently has fourteen AT contracts in place, totaling a potential value of \$1.8 billion. With the exception of two, these contracts were put in place under the pilot program. The workshop speakers shared the knowledge gained throughout the pilot program.

Center representatives presented the titles and descriptions of their AT contracts, along with the values and the description of the AT set-up and evaluation criteria. The Center-specific presentations can be viewed at <http://ec.msfc.nasa.gov/hq/library/conf2006/process/index.html#AT>.

An area of importance in any pilot program is the terminology, often laden with terms of art. This terminology develops as buyers become more experienced in the program. Mr. Pagliaro shared a helpful list of definitions during his



Carl Weber discussing the Award Term Policy

presentation. Participants in the panel discussion advocated the use of common terminology across the Agency in the interest of clarity. Two terms which drew interest and questions from both panel members and workshop participants included “set,” meaning that point when the contractor can earn no additional ATs and “gateway,” meaning a specified “Cost Range” that a contractor must meet before being eligible to compete for ATs (e.g., within +2 percent of baseline target cost).

AWARD TERM/AWARD FEE

Lessons learned were shared by panel members as well as workshop participants. Questions and information exchanges took place throughout each AT session. Some common themes developed as presenters from the different Centers shared their experiences.

Simplicity was emphasized, specifically when creating the evaluation timing scheme. For example, the terms should be kept to one year or six month increments. Additionally, the Award Term approach should be kept simple, using a small number of criteria which is concise (two or three elements); having separate, distinct evaluation criteria for award fee (AF) and AT; and providing continuous feedback on performance to the contractor.

The processes and approaches have evolved during the time NASA has been doing AT contracts. Early in the program, the approach was to use AT or AF, but not both in the same contract, as mentioned above. PIC 06-02 now provides specific guidance, stating that AT features can be used in concert with AF features. Evolution of the process was also evident as cancellation provisions were discussed. Early AT contracts address cancellation, but it is not always clear whether this means earned or unearned. There was also confusion during the pilot program relative to whether a cancellation clause was required at all. PIC 06-02 specifically addresses cancellation of unearned award terms, and states that language allowing for either the Government or contractor to cancel is recommended but optional.

Some innovative approaches were also shared during the panel discussions. JSC has a provision in its Occupational Medicine and

(continued on page 16)

View the presentation charts at: <http://ec.msfc.nasa.gov/hq/library/conf2006/>

Strategic Sourcing - From the Team

By Monica Manning, Headquarters; Teri Osabutey, NSSC; and Ron Sepesi, GRC

[Ed. Note: Unlike most articles in this issue, this one was written by the people presenting, rather than the people attending. To get a view from someone attending, see GSFC's article on the opposite page.]

Following the findings of an interagency study group, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) issued a memorandum in August 2005, supporting the concept of Strategic Sourcing for the Federal Government. In November 2005, GSA and the Department of Treasury launched the Federal Strategic Sourcing Initiative and requested participation from the various agencies. NASA joined in the Strategic Sourcing Initiative and its participation will have an impact at the Center level.

WHAT IS IT?

OMB defined Strategic Sourcing as:

“Collaborative and structured process of critically analyzing an organization’s spending and using this information to make business decisions about how to acquire commodities and services more effectively and efficiently.”

WHAT ARE THE GOALS?

The stated OMB goals are clear and concise - institutionalize a strategic sourcing process and secure top management commitment. The desired results:

- Reduce prices and administrative costs
- Optimize performance and business acumen
- Increase achievement of socio-economic goals

WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS?

- Better value to Government with Agency-wide or regional acquisitions
- Gain better understanding of Agency spending patterns
- Maximize efficiencies, more standardization



Ron Sepesi

- Realize workload/resources savings
- Reduce procurement and contract administration costs

WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN COMPETITIVE SOURCING AND STRATEGIC SOURCING?

Competitive Sourcing’s primary focus is to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of commercial functions performed by Federal employees by exposing them to competition with the private sector.

Strategic Sourcing’s primary focus is the structured analytical approach to define spending patterns to obtain the best value on commonly acquired goods and

services by reducing the total cost of ownership.

WHAT IS INCLUDED IN THE STRATEGIC SOURCING INITIATIVE?

- Test ability to strategically source across Federal agencies
- Establish mechanisms to increase savings, value, and socio-economic participation
- Share good examples and build the strategic sourcing community of practice
- Learn lessons applicable to future strategic sourcing efforts at Federal or agency levels
- Avoid unnecessary duplication of effort in pursuing OMB Strategic Sourcing Initiative

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR STRATEGIC SOURCING AT THE AGENCIES?

The Agency Chief Acquisition Officer (CAO), Chief Information Officer (CIO), and Chief Financial Officer (CFO) are to develop and implement the strategic sourcing effort.

WHAT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE PARTICIPATING AGENCIES?

- Identify the initial commodities by October 1, 2006
- Develop strategic sourcing governance
- Charter identifying member’s roles and responsibilities and operations of an Agency-wide Strategic Sourcing Council

(continued on page 16)

View the presentation charts at: <http://ec.msfc.nasa.gov/hq/library/conf2006/>

Strategic Sourcing - An Attendee's View

By Donna Santos, Goddard Space Flight Center

An overview of NASA's Strategic Sourcing was effectively presented by the team of Monica Manning from the Headquarters Procurement Office, Ron Sepesi from the GRC Procurement Office, and Teri Osabutely from the NSSC. Monica provided the big picture which included the background, overall goals, and NASA's role in this Federal initiative; Ron presented the results to date of the NASA Protective Services Feasibility Study; and Teri provided the workshop with a better understanding of the NASA Shared Services Center.

As the procurement point of contact for the Agency's strategic sourcing efforts, Monica Manning provided a hands-on understanding of where this initiative came from, of what is hoped will be accomplished, and of what NASA's role and goals are. Basically, the requirement dates from a 2005 OMB directive to Federal agencies to implement strategic sourcing, and to develop Agency-specific plans of action by January 2006, with annual reports of efforts to begin in January 2007.

Strategic Sourcing is defined as the "collaborative and structured process of critically analyzing an organization's spending and using this information to make business decisions about how to acquire commodities and services more effectively and efficiently." The goal is to institutionalize strategic sourcing processes and ensure top management commitment. To that end, the Federal Strategic Sourcing Initiative has been launched by GSA and the Department of

Treasury to test the ability to strategically source across Federal agencies; establish mechanisms to increase savings, value, and socio-economic participation; share good practices and build the strategic sourcing community of practice; learn lessons applicable to future strategic sourcing efforts at Federal or Agency levels; and avoid unnecessary duplication of effort in pursuing OMB's Strategic Sourcing Initiative.

Monica summarized some current Government-wide activities designed to develop and implement Government-wide sourcing strategies for the acquisition of domestic delivery services (express mail), office supplies, copier/multifunctional devices, wireless hand-held devices and services and printers. She presented an update on NASA-unique strategic sourcing efforts, which included the Outsourcing Desktop Initiative for NASA (ODIN) and the Aircraft Maintenance and Manufacturing Program (AMMP). The AMMP will provide maintenance of all aircraft at three NASA Centers with expansion to cover services at a fourth Center in the near future. Monica wrapped up her portion of the presentation with a summary of near- and long-term planned activities and a brief overview of some Department of Defense initiatives.

Ron Sepesi detailed his personal participation in a strategic sourcing initiative when he became part of a team which was commissioned by NASA's Deputy Administrator, Shana Dale, to explore the feasibility of consolidating current

Agency protective services contracts into a single, integrated Agency-wide contract. The membership on this team included representatives from eight NASA Centers and included both technical and procurement personnel. Ron detailed the systematic approach and effectively communicated the magnitude of the study.

A decision to proceed must consider and address a number of significant issues which may ultimately prevent implementation in spite of anticipated procurement

Strategic Sourcing is defined as the "collaborative and structured process of critically analyzing an organization's spending and using this information to make business decisions about how to acquire commodities and services more effectively and efficiently."

efficiencies. Protective Services contracts contribute approximately \$38 million to the socio-economic goals of the Agency. Consolidating contracts into a single, integrated Agency-wide contract may be beyond the capabilities of current small businesses. If small businesses were effectively unable to compete, this would impact contributions toward the Agency's socio-economic goals commencing in FY 2008, and be considered as contract "Bundling" by the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

Additionally, the study highlighted issues and concerns as well as potential impacts that must be addressed and/or mitigated prior

(continued on page 17)

View the presentation charts at: <http://ec.msfc.nasa.gov/hq/library/conf2006/>

Contractor Performance Evaluations

By Janice Stewart, Marshall Space Flight Center

My name is Janice Stewart and I have been employed with NASA at the Marshall Space Flight Center for 25 years. During my career, I have worked in all areas of procurement. Recently, I attended the Procurement Conference in December 2006 in Long Beach, CA. It was really amazing for me to see the large number of new faces that had joined the acquisition world since I started in the Professional Intern Program in 1993. It made me realize that I probably had reached a senior status in my career. On the other hand, perhaps it just looks that way to all the young – I mean new – people.

When asked to write this article, I was not sure where to start, so I asked for guidance from a higher power. Hopefully, what I am about to write will be beneficial to those reading it, especially the new procurement employees.

Jamie Commodore, NASA Headquarters; Jackie Norman, Kennedy Space Center; and Nancy Sessoms, Langley Research Center covered a very interesting topic – Contractor Performance Evaluations. The presentation centered on policy changes, the Past Performance Database (PPDB), and the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PIRS), as well as, performance evaluations for Source Evaluation Boards (SEBs). The discussion introduced some to performance evaluations, familiarized others to a more detailed evaluation of complex procurements, and refreshed more seasoned procurement employees with recent policy updates.

It is good to remember that no matter what level you are, the world of acquisition is always changing. No matter how much you know today, our world could change tomorrow. It is all a part of the growth process. I know that there will be times of uncertainty about how to proceed when working procurement actions. The good news is there are always people working with you that are willing to assist.



When looking at a contractor performance evaluation, you can view it as if you were building your house. You would be the individual monitoring the construction of your house to satisfy you as the customer. If something were not going as stated in the requirements, you would question the contractor about things that you know are not being done correctly. If the work is completed and it does not reflect what you asked for, what is the chance of your recommending this contractor to someone else? Minuscule! Why? Because the experience that you had with that contractor was less than acceptable. In fact, you will probably tell other people the problems you had. They

would use your past performance data when making their choice of a contractor.

THE OTHER SIDE

Coming back to the office, contractor performance evaluation is similar to what we do on a daily basis. The only difference is that, as contracting officers, we are working on the pre-award side most of the time. We award contracts to companies using tools to determine if they are acceptable. These tools include market research, past performance surveys, and PPDB. It is the same process we perform in our personal lives when purchasing various items such as a car, clothing, etc. We make choices from recommendations received by word of mouth, historical knowledge, the quality of items, and/or services, and the reasonableness of the price. This is our evaluation of performance. The places that we purchase from are our sources.

The presenters reiterated that past performance is an indicator of whether the offeror will successfully perform. The PPDB is populated with the information on the NASA Form 1680 and addresses the contractor's performance in the areas of quality, timeliness, price/cost, or any other relevant information in order for us to determine that the contractor is acceptable. The information in PPDB is uploaded to the Government-wide system, PPIRS, for use by other Agencies. PPIRS can be found at www.ppirs.gov.

(continued on page 18)

View the presentation charts at: <http://ec.msfc.nasa.gov/hq/library/conf2006/>

Two Weeks Before Christmas

By Sharon A. Harper, Langley Research Center

The Langley Research Center procurement staff had the opportunity to attend the 2006 Procurement Conference and had a great time; to relay the experience, it was put to rhyme. (To the rhythm of the “Night before Christmas.”)

‘Twas just weeks before Christmas, with Procurement folks all in one place;
To attend the 2006 Procurement Conference at a fast pace.

The Westin Long Beach, California, was the spot;
The weather was perfect, not too cold or too hot.

The Westin is known for its heavenly beds;
And the robes were “quite cushy,” it was often said.
The training sessions were planned, all with great care;
After all, the Procurement Officers would be there.

The State of Procurement, Tom Luedtke said;
Was changing with emphasis on planning ahead.
Constellation was reviewed as was OPII (“OPIE”);
Small Business for a better report card was hoping.

To morning and evening sessions we went;
Topics were varied and our brains all were spent.
Acquisition Planning and Foreign Contracting sessions;
Best Practices and Contractor Performance Evaluations;
So many topics for discussions with experts consulting;
What a great venue, with learning and knowledge resulting.

The session given by Sheryl Goddard and Ken Sateriale;
Reiterated new planning tools; new acronym material.

ASM, PSM, and CMM to name just a few;
We are changing old names to the ones that are new.

So many friends and new acquaintances sharing;
New ideas, practices, experiences, and caring.
Lunch gave us time with new and old friends to chat;
Then there were evening meals and cookies to make us fat.

Scrumptious food and drink at a banquet was had;
Awards given to the “best of the best” made us glad.

We gathered early in the morning or late at night;
For the trip to the airport to catch the right flight;
We shared our last thoughts and noted with a bit of a tear;
This was a great experience - one we wish for every year!



View the presentation charts at: <http://ec.msfc.nasa.gov/hq/library/conf2006/>

GS-1102 Contracting Series Education and Certification Requirements

By Betty Jo Spiering, Stennis Space Center

For people experienced in the acquisition workforce, there are several changes to the certification process. These are the result of two statutes and two key policies governing the acquisition workforce concerning what needs to be accomplished and how the data will be collected and stored:

- (1) Clinger-Cohen Act (4307a)
- (2) Services Acquisition Streamlining Act (SARA)
- (3) OFPP Letter 05-01 (APR 05)
- (4) OMB Letter – JAN 06

Based on the OMB memorandum above, the new Federal Acquisition Certification in Contracting (FAC-C) was created as a common certification program, reflecting Government-wide standards of education, training, and experience. Anyone applying for a new certification from now on will be applying for a FAC-C. This Certification is **not** mandatory, **except** for all new Contracting Officer warrants issued after January 1, 2007. However, it will be needed in many new contracting positions at NASA or at other agencies, so it is important to know about the FAC-C. You can find a listing of mandatory education, training, and experience standards for the FAC-C in the new policy at <http://ec.msfc.nasa.gov/hq/library/training.html>.

WARRANTS

Depending on Headquarters and Center requirements, the three warrant levels are:

Certification Level	Warrant Authority
Level I	0-\$1M commercial (FAR Part 12)
Level II	0-\$100K non-commercial Up to \$10M commercial (FAR Part 12) Up to \$10M noncommercial Unlimited for incremental funding modifications
Level III	Unlimited

[Ed. Note: Since the Procurement Conference, the warrant levels have been revised, the ones above were correct as of April 2007. If you review the presentation charts, you will see the older version.]

FULFILLMENT

Training fulfillment credit may be granted to an employee whose current level is higher than the level from which the training is mandatory. For example, a

person with a Level II certificate can fill out the paperwork for a fulfillment for a Level I class. The individual must be current on the core courses for his/her level to be given credit for fulfillment at a previous level. Credit will not be granted to employees whose performance is not satisfactory.

[Ed. Note: Since the Procurement Conference, the Federal Acquisition Institute has determined that NASA Level I and II certifications are equivalent to FAC-C certifications at the same levels with evidence of the requisite elective courses.]

EDUCATIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Effective January 1, 2007, GS-1102 employees at Grades 5-12 must have a bachelor's degree **or** 24 semester hours in business-related fields. Employees at Grades 13-15 must have **both** a bachelor's degree and 24 semester hours, with a minimum of four year's experience in contracting or a related field **and** one year specialized experience.

CERTIFICATION TRAINING REQUIREMENTS

For each Certification Level there are mandatory training requirements, listed below.

* Classes are current classes for Level II followed by the future classes, which will be held once DAU releases them.

** Class is the former acceptable Level III class. It is equivalent to CON 353. CON 301 is not.

Level I	Level II	Level III
CON 100	*CON 202	CON 353
CON 110	*CON 204	**CON 333
CON 111	*CON 210	Elective
CON 112	CON 214	Elective
CON 120	CON 215	4 YRS EXP
Elective	CON 216	
1 YR EXP	CON 217	
	CON 218	
	Elective	
	Elective	
	2 YRS EXP	

(continued on page 17)

View the presentation charts at: <http://ec.msfc.nasa.gov/hq/library/conf2006/>

Source Selection

(continued from page 5)

source selection decision, the procurement history, and the findings. While the SSA is responsible for the preparation of the source selection decision, he or she may seek assistance from Contracting Officers/contract specialists. Our role is to draft a concise narrative for the Source Selection Authority. This narrative outlines the history of the progress of the procurement, which includes dates, evaluation criteria, weights, the disposition of the offerors not addressed in the source selection decision, and other unusual aspects of the procurement.

Debriefings are tough and sometimes emotional. Offerors are frequently angry and disappointed. No one likes to be the loser! It's an insult to an offeror's confidence. There's a huge financial impact for a company that has not been selected for a contract award.

So what do offerors expect? They want to redeem themselves. They want us to know that they're still a good company. At debriefings, keep this in mind, help them re-establish their confidence.

Why do we want consistency in debriefing? Offerors will see NASA-wide consistency rather than having to do things differently at each Center. It's best practices.

At times, debriefings can become adversarial. The presenters offered tips on how to conduct "smooth" debriefs:

- Establish ground rules.
- Start off formal then graduate to casual. Be cordial in your introduction.



- Debriefs are serious business and should always be spoken with one voice.
- Provide the presentation in a very structured, organized process.
- Explain what you went through to get where you are.
- Script what is to be read and used during the debrief. This script is not handed out before the debrief, but may be during the debrief.

- Don't take anything with you that you're not willing to share.
- Be prepared. Speak to the proposal, not the offeror.
- Ask for questions when you send out a notification of debrief.
- Always caucus. Call a timeout during the debrief, if necessary.
- Be willing to listen to the offeror on what you could have done as an SEB to make this procurement better for future solicitations. It shows we're human and are willing to listen to the offeror.
- Conduct a "Hot" dry run — with the SEB Team role playing unhappy, unsuccessful offerors.

The presenters pointed to a very humorous advantage to conducting debriefs via telecon...you can stick your tongue out and no one will see you! And don't forget the "mute" button.

The presenters offered one final suggestion: Allow potential and upcoming SEB Chairs to sit in on debriefs. This will give them an idea of what to expect.

I am so glad I stopped talking to myself and wrote this article!



View the presentation charts at: <http://ec.msfc.nasa.gov/hq/library/conf2006/>

Strategic Sourcing - Presenters

(continued from page 10)

- Develop Agency plan
 - Balance strategic sourcing goals and objectives with cost, performance, and socio-economic goals
- Develop communications strategy
 - Convey Agency's commitment, scope of efforts, and opportunities to strategically source
- Establish performance measures
 - Reporting requirements should monitor and continually improve the strategic sourcing program.
- Establish training strategy
 - Educate Agency personnel to gain support of strategic sourcing initiatives.
- Establish Commodity Teams

WHAT IS THE ROLE OF A COMMODITY TEAM

- Conduct detailed spend analysis
- Conduct supply market analysis
- Develop commodity strategy
- Develop acquisition strategy
- Implement and manage performance (post award)

WHAT ARE SOME OF THE COMMODITIES BEING CONSIDERED GOVERNMENT WIDE?

- Wireless telecommunication
 - Cell phones, blackberries, etc.
- Office supplies
- Copier services
- Mailroom services
- Domestic courier services
- Weapons
- Administrative services, temporary clerical

WHAT ARE SOME COMMODITIES BEING CONSIDERED BY NASA?

- Protective Services Strategic Sourcing Initiative
- Outsourcing Desktop initiative for NASA (ODIN)
- Aircraft Maintenance and Manufacturing Program (AMMP)
- Wireless telecommunications services
 - Domestic courier services
 - Acquisition of gases and fuels (i.e. liquid nitrogen, etc.)
 - Weapons and equipment for security guards and OIG
 - Satellite radios/communication devices, brought up during a previous PO Conference
- Copiers (multi-function devices)
- Oracle Software Enterprise Contract
- Enterprise software for forms documents and services

HOW WILL THE NASA SHARED SERVICES CENTER SUPPORT THE STRATEGIC SOURCING INITIATIVE?

NSSC Agency-wide Contracting program will:

- Assist in the development of Agency policy
- Coordinate and validate proposed Agency-wide contracting opportunities
- Review and transfer existing Consolidated Contract Initiative contracts of a business nature from other Centers to the NSSC
- Issue new awards and conduct the follow-on procurement

- NSSC has begun supporting the Agency by assuming the ODIN Program Office role and procuring some of the identified commodities listed above (i.e. Multifunctional devices and enterprise software for forms services).

IF I HAVE QUESTIONS, WHO IS THE CURRENT POINT OF CONTACT?

M. Manning (Agency POC),
monica.y.manning@nasa.gov

Award Term

(continued from page 9)

Occupational Health contract that permits exercising an option if an AT is not earned. This provision protects the Government from encountering a break in service while follow-on activities are taking place. Under GSFC/HQ's NASA Postdoctoral Program contract, there is a possibility to "resurrect" the contractor's opportunity to earn ATs if there are at least two years remaining on the contract. GRC has implemented use of a template to ensure consistency and simplicity.

AT turned out to be a topic of great interest to many of you attending the Procurement Conference. To learn more about Award Term contracting, you can look at the conference charts listed in this article and visit the Procurement Library's Award Term page at <http://ec.msfc.nasa.gov/hq/library/awardterm>.

View the presentation charts at: <http://ec.msfc.nasa.gov/hq/library/conf2006/>

Strategic Sourcing - Attendee

(continued from page 11)

to proceeding with any consolidation of services. For instance, Collective Bargaining Agreements which are currently in place at all but two operational sites must be addressed and a detailed Labor Relations Plan is required to address union issues at the Center level and at the Agency level. State training requirements vary and could minimize the sharing of resources during emergency periods. They may even add costs if security officers are trained to the highest standard of a particular state. Center autonomy and control issues, the impact to current tenant or to joint Agency operations, and the impact(s) to

current contract consolidations and Center operations must also be included in weighing the potential value of consolidation. The results of the study and recommendations were submitted to the Deputy Administrator. After the conference, in mid-January an affirmative decision to proceed was finalized with the appointment with a Source Evaluation Board.

Teri Osabutey from NSSC rounded out this workshop with her overview of the mission of the Center. Its purpose is to consolidate a variety of transactional and administrative activities which were being duplicated at NASA Centers and Headquarters. NSSC performs

pre- and post-award contract actions for a variety of requirements which include ISO registration services, copier services, ODIN support, COTR training and refresher courses, contract closeout services, HR relocation services, forms management, enterprise architecture, and miscellaneous IEM contracts which support the Competency Center. As with all Strategic Sourcing efforts, the ultimate goals are to provide better value to the Government, gain a better understanding of Agency spending patterns, maximize efficiencies, reduce procurement and contract administration costs, and increase socioeconomic participation.

Training Requirements

(continued from page 14)

APPLYING

FAC-C applications are initiated by the individual through the immediate supervisor. The supervisor must assess skills and competencies, complete checklist, and forward the information to the Center Training Coordinator. Certifications are issued by the SPE. The FAC-C application and instructions are found online at: <http://ec.msfc.nasa.gov/hq/library/training.html>.

AFTER CERTIFICATION

To maintain certification, individuals must complete 80 Continuous Learning Points

(CLPs) every two years. These are not restricted to procurement topics, but must be related to skills necessary for job performance or enhancement of skills for future positions. Examples of CLPs:

- Agency-sponsored training
- Brown-bag sessions
- Procurement Management Survey team membership

ACMIS

The Acquisition Career Management Information System is a database maintained by the Federal Acquisition Institute to track acquisition training and certification for civilian agency

personnel. Once fully operational, it will be used to officially record, maintain, and utilize information to allow effective management of the acquisition workforce.

FINAL THOUGHTS

Now, more than ever, individuals are responsible for their career progression and development. Individuals must seek out opportunities to enhance career development. They must maintain training records and provide a copy of course certificates to the Center Procurement Training Coordinator. All procurement personnel must complete Individual Development Plans each year.

View the presentation charts at: <http://ec.msfc.nasa.gov/hq/library/conf2006/>

Katrina

(continued from page 4)

tarps, diapers, and other essential emergency items that were needed by personnel in the immediate communities. Stennis supplied and distributed 2.4 million MREs, 3.9 million gallons of water, and 27.8 million pounds of ice to the surrounding communities. As procurement officials, we work in a world of numbers. These numbers are staggering.

The Stennis NASA family joined together to form a work group called “Stennis Helping Stennis.” This group of 299 volunteers broke into eight teams. They helped Stennis personnel with more than 1,000 tasks, such as, tree trimming or removal, cleaning houses of debris, and repairing homes to habitable again. I applaud all of you for your selfless acts of kindness.

During all of the chaos of trying to get the Center up and running, of trying to clean up and make repairs, there was a part of the NASA family that we normally do not see on Center. That was all of the employees’ children affected by this catastrophe. The children could not go outside to play at the park, schoolyard, or even in their own backyards. Key personnel at Stennis realized that the children were being affected much the same as the adults were — if not more — and would need to get back to some type of normal child-like behaviors. Thus, the creation of “Stennis Day Camp,” which had a total enrollment of 257 students.

The camp had participants from 53 schools and 32 agencies. The school was part day for the students, as kids were rotated in

and out. They did science projects, played games, and had a chance to be carefree for a little while. It was a great success. Rob Harris said after the briefing, “To me the awesome thing about the day camp was that it gave the children affected by the hurricane a place to be normal and interact in a school-like environment, as there was no school at that time. Additionally, at that particular time we were all extremely focused on what we lost and on the recovery efforts for ourselves and for the Center. Often times we felt like we were in a war zone due to the devastation. Seeing the children playing and learning

gave us an emotional boost that enabled us to see that we could recover.”

In closing, I would like to state that what I learned during those few hours in that session will last a lifetime. I have learned a great deal about the character of my colleagues and of the extended family members across NASA. I would like to applaud all of the personnel who assisted in the recovery of the SSC and Michoud, you did extraordinary work under extraordinary pressure. You are an example of the human spirit. You have showed great compassion and perseverance in a time of great turmoil.

Performance Evaluations

(continued from page 12)

There is a lot of information available in the system and although procurements are different in content, some of the information still remains the same. The variances that exist are due to the complexity, dollar value, and type of procurement. For example, construction and SEB and/or Source Evaluation Committee (SEC) procurements will warrant a more extensive performance evaluation to include security, safety, mission success, and occupational health.

In summary, a contractor performance evaluation is a critical part of the procurement process and is very important in meeting the Government’s needs in order to provide customer satisfaction.

View the presentation charts at: <http://ec.msfc.nasa.gov/hq/library/conf2006/>

2006 Procurement Award Winners

Nine NASA procurement professionals and one person from outside the procurement organization were chosen to receive the 2006 Annual Procurement Awards. These awards are the highest procurement honors at NASA. The procurement awards are used to recognize those people and Centers that have made outstanding contributions to the procurement effort throughout NASA. As in past years, it was a very tough competition with many worthy candidates nominated by the Centers. The awards were presented during the banquet dinner in Long Beach.

The recipients of the awards are:

- Contract Manager of the Year:** Mozetta Edwards (NMO)
- Contract Specialist of the Year:** Carol T. Burnside (SSC)
- Contracting Intern of the Year:** Kari Cezat (KSC)
- Simplified Acquisition Specialist of the Year:** Starr Strong (ARC)
- Commercial Person of the Year:** Maria McNamee (GSFC)
- Grants Specialist of the Year:** Saundra R. Gage (GRC)
- Procurement Analyst of the Year:** Rodney J. Etchberger (JSC)
- Procurement Support Person of the Year:** Jamie P. Narrell (MSFC)
- Procurement Supervisor of the Year:** Monique Sullivan (NSSC)
- COTR of the Year:** Timothy L. Regan (GSFC)



Award winners from upper left are, Mozetta Edwards, Carol Burnside, Kari Cezat, Starr Strong, Maria McNamee, Saundra Gage, Rodney Etchberger, Jamie Narrell, and Monique Sullivan. Timothy Regan is not pictured.



Procurement Countdown

Procurement Countdown is published by NASA's Office of Procurement.

Editor.....Susie Marucci
(202) 358-1896
susie.marucci@nasa.gov

View the presentation charts at: <http://ec.msfc.nasa.gov/hq/library/conf2006/>