## PRATT'S GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING LAW REPORT

VOLUME 9	NUMBER 4	April 2023
Editor's Note: Representation Victoria Prussen Spears	ons and Certifications	117
What Are We Certifying to Exactly?Jarrod D. Blue and Tejani		119
A False Claims Act Year in Scott F. Roybal	Review, and a Look Forward	128
Fraud, Waste and Abuse: S Bryan Webster	potlight on Ancillary Services	140
Cybersecurity Today: What Eric S. Crusius	Government Contractors Should Know	145
	rants Judgment for Protester Because "Cost" "Price" Analysis and Agency Did Not Justify Its ons	149
	Compliance Programs' Affirmative Action Program actors Are Growing—and Fast	152
	Defense Authorization Act Muddies the Water on uctor Ban Applies to Contractors	155



#### QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the **Editorial Content** appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please call or email: Email: heidi.a.litman@lexisnexis.com For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call: Customer Services Department at ..... (800) 833-9844 (518) 487-3385 Customer Service Website . . . . . . . . . . http://www.lexisnexis.com/custserv/ For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call (800) 223-1940 Outside the United States and Canada, please call . . . . . . . . . . . . . (937) 247-0293

Library of Congress Card Number:

ISBN: 978-1-6328-2705-0 (print)

ISSN: 2688-7290

Cite this publication as:

[author name], [article title], [vol. no.] PRATT'S GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING LAW REPORT [page number] (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt).

Michelle E. Litteken, GAO Holds NASA Exceeded Its Discretion in Protest of FSS Task Order, 1 PRATT'S GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING LAW REPORT 30 (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

Because the section you are citing may be revised in a later release, you may wish to photocopy or print out the section for convenient future reference.

This publication is designed to provide authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of RELX Inc. Matthew Bender, the Matthew Bender Flame Design, and A.S. Pratt are registered trademarks of Matthew Bender Properties Inc.

Copyright © 2023 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved. Originally published in: 2017

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis or Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

Editorial Office 230 Park Ave., 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169 (800) 543-6862 www.lexisnexis.com

MATTHEW & BENDER

# Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors

#### **EDITOR-IN-CHIEF**

STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ

President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

#### **EDITOR**

VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS

Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

MARY BETH BOSCO
Partner, Holland & Knight LLP

PABLO J. DAVIS

Of Counsel, Dinsmore & Shohl LLP

MERLE M. DELANCEY JR.

Partner, Blank Rome LLP

J. ANDREW HOWARD

Partner, Alston & Bird LLP

KYLE R. JEFCOAT

Counsel, Latham & Watkins LLP

JOHN E. JENSEN

Partner, Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP

DISMAS LOCARIA

Partner, Venable LLP

MARCIA G. MADSEN

Partner, Mayer Brown LLP

KEVIN P. MULLEN

Partner, Morrison & Foerster LLP

VINCENT J. NAPOLEON

Partner, Nixon Peabody LLP

STUART W. TURNER

Counsel, Arnold & Porter

ERIC WHYTSELL

Partner, Stinson Leonard Street LLP

WALTER A.I. WILSON

Partner Of Counsel, Dinsmore & Shohl LLP

Pratt's Government Contracting Law Report is published 12 times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Copyright © 2023 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 9443 Springboro Pike, Miamisburg, OH 45342 or call Customer Support at 1-800-833-9844. Direct any editorial inquiries and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway Suite 18R, Floral Park, New York smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 631.291.5541. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to lawyers and law firms, in-house counsel, government lawyers, senior business executives, and anyone interested in privacy and cybersecurity related issues and legal developments. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Pratt's Government Contracting Law Report*, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 230 Park Ave. 7th Floor, New York NY 10169.

### Fiscal Year 2023 National Defense Authorization Act Muddies the Water on Whether Chinese Semiconductor Ban Applies to Contractors

#### By Robyn N. Burrows\*

In this article, the author explains that it remains unclear whether a Chinese semiconductor ban applies to government contractors.

In October 2022, a proposed amendment to the FY 2023 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) was introduced to prohibit contractors from selling certain Chinese semiconductor technologies to federal agencies and from using these same covered products and services. This measure was added through Section 5949 of the NDAA.

Thereafter, the House of Representatives passed a compromise version of the NDAA, which appears to scale back the semiconductor ban by applying it only to federal sales of covered products and services, without also banning contractors from using them. However, the explanatory statement accompanying the NDAA suggests contractors (including their affiliates and subsidiaries) may ultimately be prohibited from using covered semiconductor technologies—which would raise a host of compliance and implementation concerns.

## COMPROMISE VERSION OF NDAA LIMITS SEMICONDUCTOR BAN TO FEDERAL SALES

Section 5949 bans semiconductor products and services from Semiconductor Manufacturing International Corporation, ChangXin Memory Technologies, and Yangtze Memory Technologies Corp., plus their subsidiaries and affiliates. This ban was modeled after the supply chain restrictions from Section 889, which prohibit contractors from selling and using covered telecommunications and video surveillance equipment from five Chinese telecom companies.

Like Section 889, Section 5949 originally contained Part A and Part B prohibitions banning contractors from selling covered semiconductor products and services to the government (Part A) and also from using these same technologies (Part B). Structurally, the compromise version of Section 5949 retains Parts A and B, but both parts prohibit federal sales of covered semiconductor products and services:

<sup>\*</sup> The author, an attorney in the Washington, D.C., office of Blank Rome LLP, represents clients on a wide range of government contracts matters, including emerging supply chain issues. She may be contacted at robyn.burrows@blankrome.com.

- Prohibition on Use or Procurement.
- (1) IN GENERAL.—The head of an executive agency may not—
- (A) procure or obtain, or extend or renew a contract to procure or obtain, any electronic parts, products, or services that include covered semiconductor products or services; or
- (B) enter into a contract (or extend or renew a contract) with an entity to procure or obtain electronic parts or products that use any electronic parts or products that include covered semiconductor products or services.

Notably absent is any prohibition against contractors using covered semiconductor products or services. The "use" prohibition in Part B only bans agencies from procuring electronic parts and products that use covered semiconductor products or services. The elimination of a true use ban may have been in response to lobbying efforts by the semiconductor industry, as reflected in a November 22 letter¹ from a coalition of defense, technology, and business trade groups to lawmakers on the Senate Armed Services Committee.

## NDAA'S JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT—RULEMAKERS EXPECTED TO EXTEND BAN TO CONTRACTORS

Despite what appears to be a more limited semiconductor ban in Section 5949, contractors should not assume that the ban, once implemented, will only apply to their federal sales. In particular, the "Joint Explanatory Statement" accompanying the NDAA states Congress' expectation that the FAR Council implement rulemaking that extends Section 5949 to prohibit contractors from using covered semiconductor products:

We note that the intent of Congress in advancing this proposal is that, in serving federal supply chains, Federal contract recipients and their suppliers (including domestic and foreign subsidiaries, affiliates, distributors, and intermediaries) should not utilize companies connected to foreign countries of concern that threaten national security, such a Semiconductor Manufacturing International Corporation, Yangtze Memory Technologies Corp, and ChangXin Memory Technologies, or any other company identified under this section (including any affiliate, subsidiaries, successor, distributor, or intermediary thereof). . . .

With regard to the regulations to be prescribed by this Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council, the intent of this provision is to include both

https://www.uschamber.com/security/supply-chain/coalition-letter-on-section-889-of-thendaa.

contractors and suppliers, to the extent possible under the Federal Acquisition Regulation[.]<sup>2</sup>

While the text of Section 5949 only prohibits federal sales of covered semiconductor technologies, the joint explanatory statement reflects a Congressional intent that the ban be extended to use by contractors and suppliers—including their domestic and foreign subsidiaries and affiliates. This would be more onerous than Part B of Section 889, which currently only applies to the prime contracting entity and excludes affiliates, subsidiaries, and subcontractors. As noted by trade groups, covered entities would be required to trace their supply chain down to the component level to identify any covered semiconductor equipment used in the contractor's enterprise. Additional diligence would be required to identify whether third parties (such as payroll, accounting, or logistics support) use covered products or services.

Congress' disjointed approach to Section 5949 may have resulted from industry pressure against applying Part B to the semiconductor supply chain (achieved through the text of Section 5949), combined with a legislative desire to impose a "use" ban similar to Section 889 (as reflected in the Joint Explanatory Statement). The FAR Council will need to address these conflicting provisions during the rulemaking process. Until then, the scope of the ban remains unclear. Given the potential impact of an industry ban on using these semiconductor technologies, contractors should closely monitor and participate in future rulemaking.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Emphasis added.