# General Services Administration (GSA) Acquisition Policy Federal Advisory Committee (GAP FAC) Full Committee Meeting

**January 12, 2023**

The General Services Administration (GSA) Acquisition Policy Federal Advisory Full Committee convened for a public meeting at 1:00 P.M. on January 12, 2023, virtually via Zoom, with Troy Cribb, Chairperson, and Cassius Butts, Co-Chairperson, presiding.

In accordance with FACA, as amended, 5 U.S.C. App 2, the meeting was open to the public from 1:00 P.M. to 4:30 P.M. EST

**Committee Members Present:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Troy Cribb, Chairperson | *Partnership for Public Service* |
| Cassius Butts, Co-Chairperson | *Global Leader Group* |
| Antonio Doss | *Small Business Administration* |
| Kristin Seaver | *General Dynamics Information Technology* |
| Dr. David Wagger | *Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries* |
| Clyde Thompson | *GovStrive, LLC* |
| Steven Schooner | *George Washington University* |
| David Malone | *City of St. Petersburg Florida* |
| Farad Ali | *Asociar, LLC* |
| Dr. Amlan Mukherjee | *Michigan Technological University* |
| Nicole Darnall | *Arizona State University* |
| Nigel Stephens | *U.S. Black Chambers of Commerce (USBC)* |
| Anne Rung | *Varis, LLC* |
| Darryl Daniels | *Jacobsen Daniels Assoc.* |
| Luke Bassis | *Port Authority of New York and New Jersey* |
| Jennie Romer | *Environmental Protection Agency* |
| Anish Tilak | *Rocky Mountain Institute* |
| Gail Bassette | *Bowie State University* |
| Richard Beutel | *George Mason Center for Government Contracting* |

**Absent:** Denise Bailey, Leslie Cordes, Mark Hayden, Susan Lorenz-Fisher, Mamie Mallory, and Stacey Smedley

**Guest Speakers & Presenters:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Tiffany Hixson | *Assistant Commissioner Office of Professional Services & Human Capital Categories, Federal Acquisition Service, GSA* |
| Paul Bowen | *Director for GWAC Programs Office of Information Technology Category Federal Acquisition Service, GSA* |

**GSA Staff Present:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Boris Arratia | *Designated Federal Officer* |
| Stephanie Hardison | *Deputy Designated Federal Officer* |
| David Cochennic | *GAP FAC Support Team* |
| Adam Sheldrick | *GAP FAC Support Team* |
| Skylar Holloway | *GAP FAC Support Team* |
| Anne Armstrong | *Closed Captioner* |
| Daniel Swartz | *ASL Interpreters* |
| Beth Zuriff | *ASL Interpreters* |

## CALL TO ORDER

Boris Arratia, Designated Federal Officer, opened the public meeting by welcoming the group before reminding the public that there would be time for comments and statements at the end of the meeting. Boris reviewed the agenda, with the bulk of the agenda being to hear updates from each subcommittee on what they've been working on in their meetings.

## WELCOME & OPENING REMARKS

Troy Cribb welcomed everyone to the third GAP FAC public meeting and thanked the GAP FAC members for their participation. The committee is off to a strong start because of the work done within the subcommittees. It's great that each of the subcommittees has worked on  a mission statement that would be presented today. These statements will help  communicate to the public, the acquisition workforce and industry about what we are trying to do.

Cassius Butts thanked everyone for their participation and efforts and all the discussion that's gone into the subcommittees' deliberations.

Krystal Brumfield thanked the committee members for all the hard work and time they have committed to the GAP FAC.

Jeff Koses spoke about the two presenters from GSA  presenting on how GSA is currently trying to motivate federal contractors to think about how they can move out on climate and sustainability. The two programs we will be hearing about today are OASIS and Alliant. They are both planning the next-generation solutions and have recently issued draft solicitations for comment. Both draft solicitations are intended to credit bidders who report their greenhouse gas emissions.

One Acquisition Solution for Integrated Services (OASIS) is GSA's premier governmentwide professional services family of contracts.  It's designed around complex requirements and across multiple disciplines, such as financial services, program management, engineering, logistics, etc.

Alliant is GSA's premier enterprise Governmentwide Acquisition Contract (GWAC). Alliant covers customized Information Technology (IT) services and solutions for federal agencies.  It's been a tremendously successful program and currently includes cloud and sustainability features.  Alliant was designed for the high dollar, most complex IT acquisitions.

GSA has a full family of IT GWACs focused on the small business community, but Alliant focuses on highly complex tasks.  We are actively moving to replace Alliant years ahead of plan. Tiffany Hixson and Paul Bowen will discuss how they thought about climate's impact in their draft solicitations.

**GUEST SPEAKERS**

Tiffany Hixson shared that she still serves as the category manager and executive for professional services governmentwide. In addition, she spends a lot of time talking to Industry and federal agencies about their professional services and human capital requirements. She spoke about the new contract program being put in place and the sustainability features they have baked into the draft Request for Proposals (RFP).

The current contract program is called OASIS, and the next-generation contract is OASIS+. GSA has been  listening to industry and federal agency partners about what they need in the government-wide contract for professional services.  We're structuring it to achieve the best-in-class contract standards that the Office of Federal Procurement Policy (OFPP) has laid out for federal agencies. We are focused on attracting highly qualified contractors to this contract program.  It is not a contract program for inexperienced contractors or contractors new to performing professional services. This doesn't include IT services primarily. IT services can be part of a larger

solution acquired under OASIS+, but the primary purpose of the contract is professional and human capital services.

OASIS+ is not a one-contract program but six standalone contract programs organized by socioeconomic categories. Under each contract program there are domains and we're pre-qualifying contractors based on their expertise. We need to ensure they have experience in specific domains or functional areas. The contract provides both commercial and non-commercial services and global access, which means we can do overseas and have contractors be Continental US (CONUS).

We're also utilizing GSA's new 876 authority, granted to GSA in the 2019 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), which drives pricing at the task order level. We're looking at the competition at the task order level based on actual requirements to drive pricing. There is no contract level pricing, so you're not going to see labor categories with rates on this contract program. Another unique feature is that this contract program will have no ceiling and most importantly, no cap on the number of awards they will make. If a company qualifies and they're responsible, it could receive a contract. We're not restricting ourselves to only 60 contractors. If you qualify, you qualify, which is a lesson learned from the previous contract vehicle.

The ordering period would be ten years, which is unusual for a non-IT contract. Doing so will bring consistency in terms of competition and participation from federal agencies across the government. Because it's got a longer performance period, after getting through the initial source selection, instead of doing successive onramps, the intent is to open solicitations back up, so they're continuously open through the ordering period. As we end the ordering period, we may stop taking new contractors because it may not be worthwhile for them or us to bring them onto the contract.

After getting through initial source selections, we're looking at opening the contract back up. That is something that was heard loud and clear from federal agencies. They'd like their industrial base or new industry partners to come onto the contract if qualified. We will use technology-based ordering and market research tools that should make it easier for ordering contracting officers and program managers to do their market research online instead of having to issue requests for information. We are looking at leveraging technology to streamline that market research process for Industry and the federal acquisition workforce.

The six contract programs under the OASIS contract family are small business administration (SBA)-certified 8(a) firms, SBA-certified HUBZone firms, women-owned small businesses, service-disabled veteran-owned small businesses, a total small

4

businesses set-aside, and an unrestricted contract program. Under each of those contract programs is a set of domains.

The first phase of awards is focused on technical engineering, research and development, management and advisory assistance services, environmental, intelligence services, enterprise solutions, facility services, and logistics. After setting up the contract with those domains and setting up prequalified contractors, the focus moves on to the next tranche of awards and domains.

The contract is also set up to be able to add additional domains in the future. Since this is the only government-wide contract covering non-IT professional services, the contract needs to be flexible.

The draft RFP was issued in November. The first comment period has closed and produced feedback from Industry. The intent is to get all the feedback, process it, decide what needs to be changed and not changed, and then issue a second draft RFP. By doing this, everyone can ensure we didn't miss anything in the considerations before the final RFP is issued. The goal is to issue the final RFP by the end of the second quarter or the first quarter of this calendar year and make awards for this fiscal year.

The draft RFP builds a series of sustainability evaluation criteria and terms and conditions in the contract. The contract has a ten-year order to push the government toward the goal of net zero. This will position the industrial base to achieve or work toward those goals. Having these terms and conditions at the master contract level means the ordering agencies don't need to work on that in their task orders. This will increase efficiency and reduce the negative impacts of climate risk. It also prepares the industrial base for Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) compliance with the new regulations that are currently being vetted. When things start coming through the regulatory process, the terms and conditions will be added to the government wide contracts in anticipation of implementation.

There are a few FAR requirements for sustainability, and FAR 52.223-22 is included in the solicitation, which requires offerors in excess of $7.5 million in federal contract awards to represent whether they disclose greenhouse gas emissions.  It doesn't require disclosure.

A proposed FAR rule codifies the strategy included in the OASIS draft RFP, which is currently open for comments. Based on feedback through the proposed rule , we understand the draft RFP may need to change.

We'll have a qualification matrix for the pre-award evaluation criteria in the RFP. Offerors can receive credit based on different views of experience, past performance, business systems, and sustainability. In terms of evaluation criteria for OASIS+,, every offeror has to achieve a certain point threshold. For small businesses, it's six credits out of 50, and for unrestricted, 42 out of 50. Under sustainability, there's one point that offerors can achieve for publicly disclosing scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. They can also get credit for publicly disclosing scope 3 GHG emissions or publicly disclosing science-based reduction targets. For the environmental domain only, offerors can get an additional point or credit if they're participating in the National Science Foundation's pilot for the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) 391-1, a general sustainability assessment for professional services.

For post-awards, there are a series of terms and conditions contractors will have to comply with. These are focused on other than small business concerns under the OASIS program. The first post-award deliverable includes sustainable practices and an impact statement that has to be submitted within 12 months after issuance with their first task order. A post-award deliverable is submitting a GHG reduction progress report within 24 hours after the issuance of the first task order and annually thereafter. The report must include progress toward meeting GHG reduction targets or emissions from the contract. Additionally, a climate change risk management plan is to be submitted post-award within 12 months after issuance of the first task order. The plan has a series of requirements which is identifying what the process is for identifying, assessing, and responding to climate-related risks for successful performance or delivery, what inherent climate-related risks have been identified that may have a substantive financial or strategic impact on the business, and what the business continuity plan is.

The plan will also require an overview of the actions taken and opportunities identified to adapt to the climate-related risks that may have a substantial financial or strategic impact. The sustainability disclosures will be required to go on the contractor's webpage.

We are currently working through the feedback received. Based on the initial look, mid-sized and small companies won't be able to claim any credits in the pre-award phase when it comes to sustainability. Based on what we are hearing, small businesses don't have the resources to measure GHG emissions and costs for performance. Some in industry have mentioned that if the proposed rule doesn't reflect what's in the contract down the road, it could be easier for contractors to come onto the contract later rather than sooner.

Tiffany concluded her presentation and Paul Bowen then presented on Alliant 2 and 3.

Paul explained that when Alliant 2 was built around 2014, there were some environmental objectives the government was looking to achieve. It was recognized that GHGs have a negative impact on the economy, which the government was looking to address by reducing the impact from contractors. Under Alliant 2 & 3, the primary work is developing and integrating IT services. Both contracts will be unrestricted. On Alliant 2, through its first four years, there were an average of 68 completed for task orders a year, averaging $120 million each. A primary concern has been effective competition, a priority of our clients, including DOD.. Effective competition has three or more bids.

Alliant 2 was the first GWAC to incorporate GHG reporting as a post-award deliverable. There was a section G25, which discussed what was required. Starting within a year of the Notice to Proceed (NTP), all the awardees had to file the disclosures and have them publicly available. Within a year after initial disclosures, they had to conduct and complete GHG inventory, and within 24 months of the first disclosures, they had to set target reductions and have 12 months after that to start reporting on how their target reductions are going. This was all written in 2015, put out in 2016, awarded in 2017, and became effective with the NTP in 2018. Prime  contractors must provide evidence of ongoing emissions, GHG reduction goals, and achievements against those. Data is collected from contractors who supplied annual corporate reports from the Carbon Disclosure Project (CDP) database and other sources such as their website.

The results were that when Alliant 2 was first awarded, there were 60 awardees. Performance-based contracting measures are  heavily stressed, and no company is allowed more than one Alliant 2 contract. The awardees went from 60 to 40. Some companies fell off due to being unable to maintain performance standards and some merged with other Alliant 2 awardees. At that point, there were 40 awardees; of those 40 awardees, 18 have received waivers that they have no reportable or minimal GHG emissions for 2022. Of the 18 that received waivers from GSA, eight had a small, minimal amount of GHG that they reported, but it was low enough that they were still granted a waiver.  22 of the 40 currently have reportable emissions.

When submitting the first RFP draft for Alliant 3, it initially followed the Alliant 2 model. It wasn't going to have the GHG disclosures be an evaluated score for the initial award, but there was a plan on doing post-award deliverables. The draft RFP has since been updated to align with OASIS, where GHG reporting is an evaluation factor for award. For Alliant, the two factors are 1500 points for scope 1 and scope 2 reporting and 1500 points for scope 3 reporting. It's a maximum of 3,000 points or 3.8% of the total points that an offeror can achieve.

After making GHG reporting an evaluation factor, contractors will have to determine whether or not the cost of reporting is worth the points they will receive. It will be broken down into terms of revenue, where they're exempt from reporting under 7.5 million.  From 7.5 to 50, the significant contractors must report scope 1 and 2. Over 50 million a year, have to report scope 3.

The average award under Alliant 2  is $116 million, so if the contractor gets onto Alliant 3 unrestricted GWAC and has success, we would expect that contractor would be determined a major contractor and have to do all of this reporting. Going back and looking at Alliant 2, only 22 of the 40 current contractors that met the performance metrics have been required to report all through because this is IT services. There are not necessarily a lot of greenhouse gas disclosures to put in. Since we aren't the experts on GHG, we're looking for expertise on how to proceed with GHG from the subject matter experts within GSA.

The key points are the change from it being a post-award deliverable to an evaluated factor. Then the impact it will have on Industry is whether or not they do that reporting to get those points.

## GUEST SPEAKER QUESTION & ANSWERS

**Q:** Troy Cribb – How are we going to be able to make things easier for vendors to work with the government on this and make greenhouse gas more easily reportable? What are the lessons you've learned?

**A:** Paul Bowen – There's much confusion around this. It comes down to having as much clarity as possible for industry to minimize confusion. We need to make it as clear as possible when it comes to an evaluation factor for awards. We need to be crystal clear on how we do that.

**A:** Tiffany Hixson – Within GSA, we have a services marketplace working group. It's an entire conglomerate of GSA leaders across multiple services programs to come together to see how we can align those requirements so it's easier for industry. For Alliant 3 and Oasis+, we have looked to see how we can have consistent requirements so the reporting requirements are the same. We don't always achieve those goals, but it's something we are starting to work through.

**Q:** Nigel Stephens – It looks like OASIS+ has a rather robust small business strategy in order to ensure participation.  What's the plan for Alliant in order to make sure that smaller, non-large businesses have the greatest opportunity to participate? I don't see an opportunity for a prime contract portion of that, so if not, then will there be a robust and enforceable subcontracting requirement?

**A:** Paul Bowen – Absolutely. We do have small business GWACs. Under Alliant 2, we've always had one of the strongest subcontracting requirements. 50% of all subcontracted dollars over the life of the contract have to go to small businesses. We've opted for this for Alliant 3 and added additional elements. We have a focus on emerging technology. What we've done as an evaluated factor is that a small business offeror can gain points by meeting with another small business that has up to five emerging technology solutions to foster relationships between small businesses. A small business proposing on Alliant 3 gets those points right away. Once we have awards on Alliant 3, in addition to the robust small business subcontracting roles we have and reporting, we have measures in that their past performance ratings are going to be related to it. In Alliant 3, we will encourage more proposals with subcontracting to small businesses. In addition to that, we have mandatory participation in matchmaking events that we'll have with small businesses.  We take small businesses very seriously.

**Q:** Nigel Stephens – Was that tier 1 subcontracting also applicable to August 20th of last year that allowed first-tier subcontractor small businesses to get credit for records of past performance as if it was their prime contract?

**A:** Paul Bowen: Yeah, direct subcontracting.  When we went through GSA spend and our awards, and you look where the money actually went, the number of contracts these companies reached was staggering.  Our average award is 116 million and we're planning on having 60 awardees, and given we only have an average of 68 completed task orders a year, that's appropriate for us to maintain effective competition with our performance metrics.

**Q:** Nigel Stephens – Will GSA be tracking the new entrants? So that we're promoting bringing on new participants

**A:** Paul Bowen – I know we have different levels based upon the different socioeconomic categories within the small business community.  We're setting goals and subcontracting through that level.

**Q:** Richard Beutel – The scope and industry sectors addressed by OASIS and Alliant are interesting and cutting-edge, but they're not the primary source of industrial pollution.  Construction contracting, automotive leasing, and other related industry sectors put out a lot more GHG than professional services terms. To what extent will GSA address those sources of GHG and emissions that are far more susceptible to change and mitigation?

**A:** Troy Cribb – Jeff Koses commented in the chat, saying it's a great question for the policy subcommittee.

**Q:** Nicole Darnall – How is GSA thinking about assessing the information received through the climate risk plans and post-award reporting? Is it expected that individuals inside of GSA will be assessing what's in front of them? We're trying to think through how we will anticipate the needs of the workforce in assessing sustainability.

**A:** Tiffany Hixson – For OASIS+, we have standard templates that we will  collect and are in the contract itself in terms of post-award deliverables. Our contracting officers will be reviewing the data to make sure they are compliant with what's in the template. What we do with the data is an open question. Some of it could be proprietary. Some of it is required to be published publicly, but it's definitely an open question with what we do with the data. I think that would be a good area to hear your feedback on.

**A:** Paul Bowen – This is something good to look at. In our reports, we send them back to Jed Ela since he's the one doing the assessment. Through the reports that have been through Alliant 2, some of that data already exists within GSA, and they're working on it because they're the ones who are providing the waivers. We need to make sure that we have robust enough staff to handle all that's going to come in.

**Q:** Nicole – Can you give clarity on what you mean when you say you assess the data?

**A:** Paul – I can't because I'm not the one assessing it. As we move forward, all GSA contract vehicles do this and it's something to think about on how we can best utilize this information.

**A:** Tiffany – In terms of establishing standards, we are going to have to disclose that to industry. It needs to be clear to our staff and industry and we are in the process of working on that for our next contract program.

**Q:** Deryl McKissack – I heard that small businesses could only be the second-tier. Are you all doing something so small businesses can be first-tier?

**A:** Paul Bowen – We have Polaris, a small business GWAC. When you look at OASIS, it has multiple socioeconomic categories, including unrestricted. The way that GWACs are built, we have separate small business GWACs, specifically for them.  Alliant happens to be the unrestricted vehicle.  That's the way that we have chosen to do them. Effectively, OASIS+ will be a series of contracts with socioeconomic categories under the OASIS+ umbrella whereas, Alliant 2 and Alliant 3 should be unrestricted.  On the small business side, we've got Polaris, which is actually in evaluation right now, and there are four socio economic categories under that. We've got veterans and Americans with Disabilities (ADA) dollars as well.

**A:** Tiffany Hixson – That's true for OASIS+ as well.  Even for an unrestricted category.  Any company can come in.  If you qualify, it doesn't matter your socioeconomic status.

10

The other contract programs are just focused on those socioeconomic programs. There's no restriction.

**Q:** Amlan Mukherjee – The Green Building Advisory Committee came up with specifications for environmentally preferred asphalt and low carbon concrete.  Where do the specifications fit within the two programs?

**A:** Tiffany Hixson – They don't fit into my contract program, OASIS or any contract program I'm responsible for.  Let's say GSA awarded a task order under our contract program with some small elements like asphalt. You can expect to see those specifications built in at the task order level.  The contract's primary purpose isn't construction, so you're probably not going to see a lot of that in the contract, at least for GSA's contracts.

**A:** Paul Bowen - Same for GWACs. Most of our work is the development and integration of IT systems, software, and things like that, so we don't get into anything like construction. If something ancillary is needed to support the IT. Asphalt and things like that would generally not ever be expected to show up.

**Q:** Kimberly Wise White – How does the data demonstrate progress towards GSA's sustainability metrics? If there's a percentage that you're looking for reductions, how does that data help support those goals? Paul, you mentioned that you guys had transitioned or are transitioning the GHG reporting to the pre versus post-award stage. How does that impact the submissions from those able to qualify, not just small businesses but even some large and midsize businesses?

**A:** Paul Bowen – That's something we can get you an answer on what they're doing with the data that's been submitted. We just put an amendment out where it's an evaluated factor up front. Companies will have to determine if they can afford to do the work to get those points and possibly get an award. On Alliant 2, we raised the bar on what they had to report each year, and some of the vendors were able to take that step in reporting more. They are reporting at the corporate level and not the legal level.

**Q:** Kimberly Wise White – As you all are moving through that process at the pre-award stage, is there a significant barrier to diversity in your supply chain?

**A:** Paul Bowen – I don't know how that will come out. I'm sure we will be getting feedback on it.  I'm sure that OASIS+ already has significant feedback on it. Doing this is going to represent a cost to Industry to do this in anticipation of receiving an award versus, here's the award, here's a deliverable performance measure in your contract.

Troy thanked the speakers for taking the time out of their day to speak to the group. She will forward any other questions the members might have to them.

Cassius Butts kicked off the next discussion with the Policy & Practice subcommittee.

**POLICY & PRACTICE SUBCOMMITTEE (PPS) MISSION & KEY PRIORITIES DISCUSSION**

Steven Schooner reviewed the agenda for the subcommittee's discussion, the membership of the committee, and the key speakers who have appeared before the subcommittee.

Co-Chair Luke Bassis reported  that the group is finalizing its mission statement and priorities. One more subcommittee discussion will be warranted before their mission statement and priorities are finalized. The group presented their current mission statement working draft and Luke explained how the group was able to get to that mission statement. The group focused on recommending actionable changes that will best serve the GSA.

When proposing priorities, the group looked at doing actionable changes for GSA and seeing if they could take on both short-term and long-term issues. There are many stakeholders here, and one of the things required is to make decisions on what can or can't be done. All small business issues are enormous and cut across all subcommittees

The group set priorities using a framework that assessed the level of impact and effort. Low impact, low effort was considered a quick win. High impact and low effort were considered low hanging fruit. Low impact and high effort were set aside as not viable. High impact and high effort were classified as long-term recommendations. Luke reviewed the priorities the group saw as low-hanging fruit, quick wins, and long-term recommendations.

The group requested full committee feedback on their priorities. Within the Policy & Practice subcommittee, they need to come to an agreement on priorities. The subcommittee will continue to schedule speakers and determine a work plan to develop expertise and turn these priorities into actionable changes.

Cassius thanked the group for the work they had done thus far. He restated the group's draft mission -  procurement policies and practices that encourage innovation and streamline the acquisition process to accelerate the demand and utilization of goods and services to achieve progress on climate and sustainable goals. This aligns with the administrator's initial remarks and is one of the reasons this committee was created. That will be a good benchmark to work off.

**Q:** Anne Rung - While your subcommittee will make recommendations to GSA, there's going to be broader applicability at some point across other agencies to whatever

policy recommendations you're proposing. Did you have a robust debate around that during your subcommittee meetings?

**A:** Steven Schooner – We haven't fully resolved this issue yet. The broadest possible interpretation requires us to think of GSA in all their roles. Not only as a buyer of commercial products and services but also as a policymaker, the chair of the FAR council, and an innovator. The question we are looking to answer is how we can best leverage that position.

**A:** Troy Cribb – I think we'll work through this with the full committee and agree with everything Steve said. Our specific charge is to make recommendations to the GSA administrator but we should also recognize the role that GSA plays and what a catalyst they are for spreading best practices across the government. It's good to think about how GSA could spread best practices across the government more broadly.

Kristin Seaver recommended bifurcating consideration of changes to existing policy versus making recommendations to create new policy, as a lens for looking at potential recommendations..

Boris Arratia paused committee talks for a 10-minute break.

**INDUSTRY PARTNERSHIP SUBCOMMITTEE (IPS) MISSION & KEY PRIORITIES DISCUSSION**

Kristin Seaver and Farad Ali introduced the Industry Partnership subcommittee and presented what the group has done so far. Farad reviewed the subcommittee's mission statement with the full committee. Kristin commented that the Industry Partnership subcommittee is aware that there is a high-level commitment to climate and sustainability considerations but there might be barriers to entry and risks that are inclusive. One of the hurdles is to make recommendations to help that.

Hearing from speakers has given them clarity on what they need to focus on. The group wants to be cognizant of who they want to hear from as they continue to refine recommendations. There are strong pipelines with big suppliers in the federal marketplace. The challenge is reaching the non-traditional businesses in the marketplace. That is something important to the subcommittee. We want a regionally diverse, resilient supplier base.There's been a lot of discussion around how we measure progress and have effective feedback within the Industry base and the government. That will be something the group thinks about as recommendations and paths for implementation are created, as well as how the federal marketplace can be an incubator for emerging businesses.

Kristin and Farad presented the subcommittee's priorities to the committee. The first priority relates to engaging and expanding the pool of viable suppliers, and the second relates to measures, methods and motivations. The group did not request a vote on their priorities to the full committee, but they envision they will be refining a list of recommendations within the two priority areas and then focus on which ones have the greatest impact on the mission of the subcommittee.

The subcommittee will continue to hear from speakers in the areas of recommendations they are looking at and plan on leveraging an ease of implementation against the level of impact analysis to come up with short-term and long-term wins.

Troy thanked the subcommittee and noted, as an example of the thoughtfulness of the subcommittees in drafting their mission statements, that there had been discussion in the subcommittee about using the word "engage" versus "communicate" or "outreach". Troy asked the group to elaborate on how they landed on the word "engage" and what it means.

Farad Ali explained that the subcommittee is focusing not just on speaking but on acting,

Gail Bassette commented that the government participates  in many outreach events but at the end of the day, what is accountability? What is real engagement? We need to ensure that there is some accountability, and "engage" is more of an action word than just "outreach."

Nicole Darnall added that outreach is often talking to and involves one-way exchange, whereas engagement requires two-way discussion and learning from each other.

Nigel Stephens added that the objective is to create a resilient supply chain for the federal government. With the influence that federal procurement has, we want to drive demand for innovation with climate change solutions and make sure everyone gets  a chance to participate to create a diverse, resilient supply chain. The group had discussions on how creative partnerships could bring large entities to the table and make sure the small minority women businesses, small businesses, and really all businesses are afforded every opportunity to access the Industry.

Anne Rung mentioned that the groups should challenge themselves to think about if there's a thread that weaves the three subcommittees together so that their recommendations would be complementary..

Antonio Doss added that we can be a demonstration project for what is possible in this new industry (sustainable products and services), and how the federal government can

take a leadership role through the GAP FAC process.  Done well, this group can be a catalyst for other parts of the federal government as well as state and local governments, who face the same challenges..

Kimberly Wise White added that to make sure we are aligned, we need to look across the subcommittees and ensure we have engagement and feedback on what we're recommending and how recommendations are implemented.  What are the measurable impacts? If we're focused on incorporating sustainability into federal acquisition, we need to ensure we aren't inadvertently adding barriers for some of those in the supply chain.

Cassius Butts turned the conversation over to Darryl Daniels to speak on the progress of the Acquisition Workforce subcommittee.

## ACQUISITION WORKFORCE SUBCOMMITTEE (AWFS) MISSION & KEY PRIORITIES DISCUSSION

Darry Daniels reviewed  the subcommittee's membership, and then, with Anne Rung and Nicole Darnall, reviewed the key takeaways from guest speakers who helped the subcommittee understand the current state, barriers, issues and priorities and of current training, technology and best practices.

The group shared their mission statement and how they developed it. The mission is: "Empower and equip the federal acquisition workforce to prioritize environmental outcomes and promote sustainability throughout the acquisition lifecycle." Darryl and Nicole described how, in addition to developing the mission statement, the subcommittee has spent time on figuring out what their priorities were going to be and the process to determine which would be most meaningful to the acquisition workforce. The priorities the group came up with are: (1)  Identify the essential pathways needed to make environmental and sustainability a core competency in Federal acquisition, and (2) Identify the critical levers needed to empower the acquisition workforce to prioritize environmental outcomes/promote sustainability with the least amount of effort.

The group's next steps are to hear from speaker Holly Elwood from EPA on sustainable marketplace and recommendations of specifications, standards, and ecolabels. The group will also continue to explore best practices and listen to the acquisition workforce.

The group asked for a vote from the committee to move forward with their priorities and move on with the next steps. Troy explained that the voting will give an imprimatur of support from the full committee for the direction of the subcommittee, and also clarified that the subcommittee will be able to take on additional topics as it moves

forward. Boris Arratia facilitated the voting. All committee members present voted to approve the Acquisition Workforce subcommittee pursuing the two priority areas presented. Nicole emphasized that the subcommittee would not just identify issues but create a roadmap for solving issues.

## PUBLIC COMMENTS

The discussion was opened to the public but there were no comments.

## CLOSING REMARKS

Troy thanked the subcommittees for their participation and work done so far.

Cassius thanked everyone for their time and participation and is looking forward to future work and the next opportunity for the committee to convene together.

Krystal Brumfield thanked the committee for their time, attention and expertise today and up to this point. She stated,  it's encouraging to see how the GAP FAC brings together the private and public sector collaborating in a meaningful and intentional way to help the government work in the most advanced way possible. She looks forward to seeing the final recommendations.

Jeff thanked the members for a tremendous meeting and felt that many members got a lot out of Tiffany Hixson & Paul Bowen's presentations today. The questions each subcommittee is asking aligns with the questions and topics he hoped would come up. Each subcommittee is thinking about the needed areas and are exploring those issues.

Jeff Koses particularly sees great potential in pursuing the Acquisition Workforce subcommittee's priorities presented in today's meeting. It's something GSA can't do on its own without the expertise of the subcommittee.  With respect to all three subcommittees, Jeff commented that the GAP FAC has the potential to exceed all expectations GSA had when it set up the committee.

## ADJOURNMENT

Boris Arratia reminded the public that subcommittee meetings were coming up again and that they are welcomed to register and join those. On the GSA GAP FAC webpage you can find registration information as well as meeting agendas, slides, minutes, and meeting recordings. The next full committee meeting will be in the latter part of April 2023.  Boris adjourned the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 P.M. EST

I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, the foregoing minutes are accurate and complete.

DocuSigned by:

*Troy Cribb*                                              7/12/2023

6DE702F54C314F2...

Troy Cribb
Chairperson
GSA Acquisition Policy Federal Advisory Committee

DocuSigned by:

                                                          7/12/2023

6E7D450F4AE649B...

Cassius Butts
Co-Chairperson
GSA Acquisition Policy Federal Advisory Committee