First, some recent personnel changes within the MDA Office of Small Business Programs (OSBP). Scott Crosson, our Subcontracting Oversight Manager is transferring within the Agency to support the Aegis BMD program in Dahlgren, VA as a full time contracting officer representative. This is obviously a big loss for the MDA OSBP, but Scott’s talents will be well used in support of our Aegis BMD Program and this is an excellent opportunity for him. We wish him well in his new assignment and I’m fully confident he’ll do a great job there. Jerrol Sullivan, our former Outreach Manager, will now be the Acting Subcontracting Oversight Manager and Becky Martin will be the new Outreach Manager. Both Jerrol and Becky are outstanding folks and I’m sure will do well in their new positions.

In this newsletter I’d like to cover a topic about which I receive many questions…Organizational Conflict of Interest or OCI. Full disclosure up front: I’m not a lawyer, but I did sleep in a nationally branded hotel one night. How that makes me any kind of an expert in OCI, I have no clue. In fact, I’m not an expert in OCI by any stretch of anyone’s imagination. Regardless, I’m going to venture into this murky area and provide my opinion as I see the situation. If you want advice on your specific circumstance, I highly encourage you to contact your legal advisor.  You should also coordinate with the cognizant contracting officers for the procurements around which you have questions to get the specific advice you need to make sound business decisions. What I will cover are my impressions having dealt with OCI issues over the last several years in preparation for and execution of our Missile Defense Agency Engineering and Support Services (MiDAESS) program.

Why the big uproar over OCI? The Government’s whole procurement process integrity hinges on treating all offerors in a fair and equitable manner. It strives to provide as level a playing field as possible for all those who desire to participate so that no one entity has an unfair advantage over anyone else. When any one individual or company has access to information that skews this playing field by either gaining information ahead of their competition, by shaping procurement requirements in their favor or by providing advice to the Government that favors their interests, it begins to give them an unfair advantage and destroys the public confidence in the entire procurement process. Recent changes to law and regulation have forced a more rigorous look at OCI and situations that previously may have been allowable or mitigated are now no longer allowed.

The first thing one learns when dealing with OCI is that it is very individual to the specific circumstances of any given person or company. There are no blanket “one size fits all” solutions. While some things on the margins are very “black and white” such as, if you’re assisting the Government in the development of requirements for a system, you can’t participate as an offeror in the acquisition of that system; other areas are much murkier with lots of shades of gray involved.

There are basically three types of OCI that you should watch out for:

- **Unequal access to non-public information.** That is, because of the job you are doing you have access to information that is non-public and may very well give you a distinct advantage in any particular acquisition.

- **Biased ground rules.** That is, because of your work in shaping the requirements or evaluation factors of any given acquisition, you produce requirements that are skewed to give your company (or another company with whom you have a business relationship) an advantage in subsequent procurements over those that are competing against you; and,
Impaired objectivity. That is, in the job you are doing, you have the ability, through rendering advice and assistance to the Government, to skew the outcomes of that advice favorably towards your business or another company with whom you have a business relationship, or against a competitor.

What is particularly important to understand regarding OCI is that your intentions may have nothing to do with whether an OCI is created. In fact, most OCI’s are not created for nefarious reasons by someone who is intentionally trying to gain an advantage over their competitors. Rather, most OCI situations revolve around an appearance of a conflict and not an actual conflict or a conflict set up to intentionally give one company an advantage over another. Again, when we’re dealing with public perception of how taxpayer dollars are spent, perceptions are equally important in maintaining public confidence in the Government’s procurement process. Regardless of the type of OCI we’re talking about or whether it is an actual OCI or just gives an appearance of a conflict, getting caught in an OCI situation may create severe problems for a small business.

To make it simple, there are two sides of the fence you can play on: the Government side where you provide advisory and assistance services to the Government to assist it in doing its job and the Contractor side where you provide products and services that provide solutions to the Government’s needs. One side is not better than the other and which side you play on depends largely on your business and what you provide in the way of products or services. The problem comes in when you try and play on both sides of the fence within the same government agency. While it is not impossible to do so, more and more, it is becoming difficult to play on both sides as prime contractors, particularly for service providers, and the consequences of getting caught up in OCI more and more costly.

Many of us have recently seen very large businesses divesting themselves of part of their businesses operating on one side of the fence so that they can devote their energies to maximizing their business on the other side of the fence. In most instances, small businesses don’t have this luxury, yet getting caught in an OCI situation may create a situation where you have to divest some of your business to gain other business. In the “good ole days” it was easy to throw up a “firewall” and go about playing both sides. As mentioned previously, the current OCI landscape has changed appreciably. Some of what used to be “mitigatable” in the past is no longer. The worst situation you could find yourself in as a small business is to put a lot of energy and bid and proposal expense into a winning proposal, banking on setting up a firewall to mitigate identified OCI issues, only to find out you can’t mitigate the OCI and have to divest your company of other lucrative business in order to receive the new contract. Note that the possibility of having an unmitigatable OCI is lower if you are playing “on both sides of the fence” for different agencies. For example, it is less likely that you will have an unmitigatable OCI if you are performing development work for MDA and decide to provide advisory and assistance services to a non-DoD agency such as GSA.

So, what’s my advice? Stay as “OCI pure” as you can. You have enough to do as a small business in just complying with all the requirements of the process to play in the game of Government contracting. You certainly don’t need to be expending all the resources it takes to constantly look over your shoulder and worry that something you are doing on one contract will impact your ability to win or perform on another. Pick one side of the fence where you think your business will generate the most revenue and stick with it. Again, which side of the fence you’re on doesn’t matter as long as it’s the right one for your business. Straddling that fence always brings the risk that you will slip and, well, that is not a pretty sight and can be very painful as well.

Message From the Director  (Continued from page 1)

Mentor Protégé Requirements

By Dennis Hartman

There are many types of mentor-protégé relationships, but in all cases the purpose is for a more experiences and skilled company (the mentor) to help with the development of a less skilled or inexperienced company (the protégé). There are several requirements that must be met for a mentor-protégé relationship to work.

Expertise - One of the most obvious requirements for a mentor is expertise. A mentor should possess a degree of knowledge or experience that the protégé couldn’t gain through a conventional approach or by simply reading a book. The mentor must have familiarity with the subject and also know enough about it to be able to teach it using a variety of techniques. Since, like students in a classroom, every protégé will have their own preferred learning method (such as visual or aural learning), the mentor must be able to express their knowledge in a way that the protégé can understand.

Trust - While the mentor must be able to share the expertise, the protégé needs to be willing to remain open and trusting of the mentor. Usually a protégé can gain a basic level of trust by examining the mentor’s credentials, and in many cases the protégé aspires to follow the path that resembles what the mentor has accomplished. However, mentors can use a more personal approach that may not seem like teaching per se, and the protégé needs to trust that the mentor is, in fact, giving useful information.
Goals - One of the first things every mentor and protégé team should do is write down a series of goals. This could be a vague indication of what skills the protégé hopes to gain, or a list of more specific achievements. It’s a good idea to assign deadlines to the goals so that both the mentor and protégé can track the progress of the relationship and decide how long they should continue to work together. Having shared goals also helps the mentor to know what to teach, and gives the protégé confidence that the mentor is helping to work toward achieving the set goals.

Communication - It’s also essential that the mentor and protégé have good communication. This includes logistical communication, such as phone numbers and e-mail addresses to schedule meetings and generally keep in touch. Communication also means being open; the protégé should be able to evaluate the level of instruction without worrying about hurting the mentor’s feelings, and also to show appreciation for the mentor’s help. At the same time the mentor needs to be able to make the protégé feel like their time is being well spent and to provide encouragement along with realistic evaluations of the protégé’s progress.

MDA’s Expectations

By Christopher Evans

With funding tight across DoD, MDA is looking for a “win - win - win” strategy as it relates to our Mentor-Protégé agreements. While a “win-win” for the mentor and the protégé is the essence of the program, MDA is looking for that third “win” for the Agency. What is it that is in your proposed agreement that will make our investing in your team a viable option for MDA? One way to garner this knowledge and show that the requirements mentioned in this article are being met is to start with a Credit Agreement. Credit Agreements involve no money, but rather count as credit towards the mentor’s Small Business goals. Credit agreements are also much easier to get approved (by DCMA). By establishing a positive working relationship and performance history on a credit agreement, you’re setting the stage for the third “win” scenario. With this approach, the mentor-protégé team can show where the expertise is being shared, trust has been formed, goals are being met, and lines of communication are open. This goes a long way in mitigating the risk of a new relationship and showing that the two companies are willing to work together to form long lasting partnership, while, at the same time, providing the most innovative products and technology to the warfighter.

If you have questions about the MDA Mentor Protégé program visit our website at www.mda.mil or call our office at 256-955-4828.

Outreach Program Changes

Becky Martin

An effective small business outreach program should be designed to locate and develop new small business sources resulting in increased small business opportunities. Lee Rosenberg, MDA SB Director, has taken the MDA Outreach Program to the next level through his personal commitment to assisting small businesses.

Jerrol Sullivan has been a valuable asset to the Small Business Community and profoundly expanded MDA OSBPs Industrial Database. I feel honored to have inherited an Outreach Program which has been so successful in the community.

Let’s just say, “I have some really big shoes to fill.”

Our Outreach Program is designed to raise awareness and offer support to small business concerns that need advice and/or guidance on how to do business with MDA. Currently we support numerous local, regional and national events; however, we are interested in hearing from the small business community if there are other events that would be beneficial to the small business community.

We are soliciting your input to further enhance our Outreach Program. Please let us hear from you regarding additional ideas on how we can further assist you in marketing to this agency. Please submit your ideas and suggestions to via e-mail to outreach@mda.mil or call our office at 256-955-4828.

We have received suggestions on enhancing our small business website to better serve you and we are implementing some changes. Please take a few minutes to review the website and let us hear from you regarding the changes made or any additional suggestions that you may have.

I look forward to serving as the Outreach Program Manager and hope that you will share your thoughts with me as to how we can continue to improve our program.
MiDAESS Scope Details
Full Open & Small Business

MiDAESS ...one odd looking word that means so much to so many! Here in the Office of Small Business Programs we thought that we could update you all on where we stand with MiDAESS and what IDIQ Contracts & Task Orders have been awarded to date. Keep in mind that this is only a snapshot of what MiDAESS is at this moment in time. If you would like the most up to date public information, please call our office at (256) 955-4828 or email us at outreach@mda.mil and we will be glad to give you the latest update.

MiDAESS Awards – Small Business Set-Aside

(*) Denotes Task Order Awards

### Quality, Safety, and Mission Assurance (QSMA)
#### Capability Group 1

**SBSA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Contract Number</th>
<th>Contract Award Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.i. Solutions</td>
<td>HQ0147-10-D-0027</td>
<td>January 21, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>QS-03-10: Quality Assurance</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-P-T Research, Inc.</td>
<td>HQ0147-10-D-0028</td>
<td>January 21, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>QS-01-10: System Safety &amp; Safety Occupational Health</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bastion Technologies, Inc.</td>
<td>HQ0147-10-D-0029</td>
<td>January 21, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>QS-02-10: Mission Assurance</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Acquisition Support
#### Capability Group 2

**SBSA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Contract Number</th>
<th>Contract Award Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition Services Corp.</td>
<td>HQ0147-10-D-0035</td>
<td>July 21, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCF Solutions Inc.</td>
<td>HQ0147-10-D-0036</td>
<td>July 21, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>DOB-04-10: Cost Estimating</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>DOB-06-10: EVMS</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantech Services Inc.</td>
<td>HQ0147-10-D-0037</td>
<td>July 21, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>DXL-01-10: Readiness Management</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>DA-01-10: Acquisition &amp; Program Management Support</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Agency Operations Support
#### Capability Group 5

**SBSA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Contract Number</th>
<th>Contract Award Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harlan Lee &amp; Associates</td>
<td>HQ0147-10-D-0030</td>
<td>August 20, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>DS-02-10: Exec. Admin. &amp; Exec. Support</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>DS-04-10: Strategic Planning &amp; Communication</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>DS-05-10: VIPC</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>PA-01-10: Public Information Support</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PeopleTec, Inc.</td>
<td>HQ0147-10-D-0031</td>
<td>August 20, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>DS-03-10: Protocol &amp; Event Management</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>DXH-01-10: Human Resources</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>DXH-02-10: Training and Development</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Solutions, Inc.</td>
<td>HQ0147-10-D-0032</td>
<td>August 20, 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes Task Order Awards

\textit{AS OF 17 DEC 2010}
**MiDAESS Awards – Full and Open Competition**

(* ) Denotes Task Order Awards

### Acquisition Support
**Capability Group 2**
**F&O**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDIQ Contract Award Date: September 8, 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Booz Allen Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Sciences Corp. (CSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradigm Technologies, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odyssey Systems Consulting Grp.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Engineering Support
**Capability Group 3**
**F&O**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDIQ Contract Award Date: August 30, 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERC, Inc. (Small Business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Research Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Sciences Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Dynamics IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparta, Incorporated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Infrastructure and Deployment
**Capability Group 4**
**F&O**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDIQ Contract Award Date: June 23, 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer Sciences Corp. (CSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Dynamics IT, (GDIT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparta, Incorporated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Agency Operations Support
**Capability Group 5**
**F&O**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDIQ Contract Award Date: June 17, 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALATEC, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>DS-01-10: Functional Mgt. and Non-Matrix Admin. Support</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Sciences Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMC, Inc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Security and Intelligence Support
**Capability Group 6**
**F&O**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDIQ Contract Award Date: June 22, 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Booz Allen Hamilton, Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockheed Martin, Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QinetiQ North America, Inc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MDA Director is Impressed by University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Leah Garton, MDA Shield

The MDA Director recently visited the University of Nebraska-Lincoln and is directing a research team to go back to the campus soon. LTG Patrick O’Reilly visited the campus of UNL on October 25 to speak with faculty about the university’s potential in advanced research and to recruit students for the Missile Defense Career Development Program.

According to an article in the Lincoln Journal Star, Dr. Prem Paul, Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development, welcomed LTG O’Reilly as well as Senator Ben Nelson (D-Neb) to the campus of UNL where the Director spoke to an audience filled with science and engineering students and faculty.

MDA’s Technical Director of Science and Technology, Dr. David Burns, accompanied the Director at the UNL visit. He says the Director visits universities to seek new ideas and innovative ways for the Agency to fulfill our mission that he can’t find in industry.

“Often you can find an idea that prospers in the collaborative environment of a university that may not be mature enough to succeed in the competitive environment of industrial research,” said Dr. Burns.

The MDA’s budget provides for about $52 million a year for university research which is part of a $700 million expenditure for advanced technology research.

The Agency’s University research programs focus on advanced technology research that has defined missile defense applications. Other university research programs, such as those sponsored by the National Science Foundation, often investigate broad areas in science, where a specific application of the research is often not known.

“An example of broad research is the work at Bell Labs on the Laser; the researchers knew it would have applications in the future, but they did not know where exactly it would fit in,” said Dr. Burns. “MDA’s university research focuses on applications that are known when the research starts.” Dr. Burns says the Director was impressed by the research at UNL.

“The university has developed manufacturing techniques that have transitioned into the automotive sector, lowering production costs. In addition, their materials research program has developed corrosion resistant materials and techniques for constructing super capacitors that could improve the reliability of our systems. Their high power laser research could also help the Agency with the development of future missile defense directed energy programs,” said Dr. Burns.

LTG O’Reilly visits several universities a year in order to investigate a university’s research strengths and facilities, to inform faculty on how to apply for Agency sponsorship, and to recruit new career development participants. The visit to UNL stood out because of their solid manufacturing, materials, and high power laser research.
What You May Not Know...
About Security and Policy Review

Kristen Smith, CTR MDA/PA

Security and Policy Review (SPR) is a DoD requirement which coordinates review of information proposed for public release. The process ensures that material proposed for public release is accurate, does not contain classified or sensitive information, and does not conflict with established MDA, DoD, or U.S. Government policies. The process does not classify or declassify information, or change distribution statements.

MDA Public Affairs manages MDA's SPR process. Public Affairs does not review for public release.

This includes coordinating with appropriate internal/external stakeholders and maintaining the day-to-day activities necessary to ensure the proper review and adjudication of information in an efficient and timely manner. We do not solely clear material. Please do not contact Public Affairs officials for immediate approval.

SPR is a key component of an on-going, Agency-wide effort to inform and increase public understanding of the mission, operations and programs of the Missile Defense Agency. We know that the information you want to convey to public audiences is important, no matter what form it takes. With your help, the SPR process can run smoothly, ensuring that your information is reviewed and ready for any audience or event.

Here are some things you need to know about Security and Policy Review:

Publically released material can be seen by anyone, anywhere, at any time. That includes people who may be critical of the Ballistic Missile Defense System, learning about it for the first time, or hostile to the United States.

Public Affairs cannot solely clear material. Please do not contact Public Affairs officials for immediate approval, but please call us if you have any questions regarding the SPR process.

SPR is required for all information proposed for release to the public by an MDA employee or contractor. If you don’t know if you need to submit information to the public release process, check out the MDA/PA portal page for more information and points of contact to help you.

It is extremely important that you submit material in its final form with a completed Form 3. Material that is marked “Draft” or “For Official Use Only” will not be processed or reviewed. You must allow at least 15-30 business days for processing. Your material and completed form must be submitted to PublicRelease@mda.mil.

Processing times are affected by several factors including the length and complexity of the material, the volume of submissions being processed, and the responses from reviewers.

If you are called upon to review material for public release, please do so thoroughly as soon as you can. Public Affairs is dependent on reviewers to ensure that information is appropriate for public release in a timely manner so that we can keep the process running.

For more information about SPR and points of contact, please visit the PA Portal Page at the following link: https://mko.mda.mil/sites/pa/IP_publicrelease/default.aspx.

Joint U.S. - Japan SM-3 Intercept Test a Success.

Oct. 29, 2010

A Standard Missile – 3 (SM-3) is launched from the Japanese Ship (JS) KIRISHIMA (DDG-174) in a joint missile defense intercept test with the Missile Defense Agency, in the mid-Pacific. The SM-3 successfully intercepted a separating 1,000 km class ballistic missile target that had been launched minutes earlier from the Pacific Missile Range Facility, Barking Sands, Kauai, Hawaii. The KIRISHIMA’s crew detected and tracked the target and its weapons system developed a fire control solution. The crew then launched the SM-3, with the intercept occurring three minutes later.
OSBP UPDATE:
Welcome One New Employee

Joshua Koger
Program Analyst,
Missile Defense Agency

Josh Koger serves as a Program Analyst for the MDA Office of Small Business Programs. Josh is a Quantech Services, Inc. employee working on a MiDAESS task order. Prior to his work at MDA, Josh attended the University of Alabama Huntsville (UAH). During his time at UAH, Josh made the Dean’s Honor List due to academic achievements. Josh graduated in Spring 2010 with a Bachelor of Arts for his focus in Communication Arts.

Calendar of Events
MDA OSBP Will Attend:

- **January 12-14, 2011**
  *Surface Navy Association Symposium*
  Washington, DC

- **January 13, 2011**
  *Federal Business Council*
  Huntsville, AL

- **March 14-17, 2011**
  *Reservation Economic Summit*
  Las Vegas, NV

- **April 11-14, 2011**
  *27th National Space Symposium*
  Colorado Springs, CO

- **April 21, 2011**
  *OSDBU Conference*
  Chantilly, VA

The OSBP Staff

Lee Rosenberg, Director
Donna Cancel, Deputy Director
Christopher Evans, Specialty Programs Manager
Jerrol Sullivan, Subcontracting Program Manager (Acting)
Becky Martin, Outreach Manager
Laura Anderson, Subcontracting Program Analyst
Nancy Hamilton, Sr. Administrative Assistant, ALATEC
Chad Rogers, Outreach Specialist, Paradigm Technologies
Joshua Koger, Program Analyst, Quantech Services

OSBP Main Office Numbers
Telephone: 256-955-4828
Facsimile: 256-313-0435

OSBP Main Office Mailing Address
ATTN: MDA/DAS
Building 5222, Martin Road
Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898

For additional information regarding Subcontracting activities at MDA, please email us at subcontracting-oversight@mda.mil.

For additional information regarding Outreach activities at MDA, please email us at missiledefenseagencyoutreach@mda.mil.

Websites of Interest

Missile Defense Agency (MDA) and MDA Office of Small Business Programs
www.mda.mil

MDA Business Acquisition Center
www.mda.mil/business/acquisition_center.html

MDA Marketplaces and Directory
www.mdasmallbusiness.com

MDA SBIR and STTR Programs
www.mdasbir.com

MDA OSBP Survey
www.surveymk.com/s/mdasmallbusiness

Fed Biz Opps – (MiDAESS)
www.fbo.gov

Electronic Subcontracting Reporting System – (eSRS)
www.esrs.gov

The Missile Defense Agency, Small Business Advocacy Council
www.mda.mil/business/bus_mdasbac.html