

PRATT'S GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING LAW REPORT

VOLUME 6

NUMBER 12

December 2020

Editor's Note: Guidance

Victoria Prussen Spears 407

Department of Defense Overhauls Contractor Information Security Requirements Through Its Interim Rule Implementing the CMMC and DoD NIST SP 800-171 Assessment Methodology

Thomas Pettit, Ronald D. Lee, Charles A. Blanchard, and Tom McSorley 410

Defense Department Guidance for Government Contractors on Additional COVID-19-Related Costs

Joseph R. Berger, Thomas O. Mason, and Francis E. Purcell, Jr. 419

Federal Contractors May Face Immigration-Related Hiring Requirements and Barriers

Paul R. Hurst, Elizabeth Laskey LaRocca, Dana J. Delott, and Caitlin Conroy 422

What the "Essential Medicines" Executive Order Means for Federal Contractors and the FDA

James W. Kim, Brian J. Malkin, Peter M. Routh, and Gagan Kaur 427

Federal Circuit Revives Key Case Addressing Contractor's Ability to Include Offsets in Measurement of CAS Change Impacts

Kevin J. Slattum, Aaron S. Ralph, and Dinesh Dharmadasa 433

Eleventh Circuit Rules on FCA Materiality and Litigation Funding Agreements

Matthew J. Oster 438

QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the **Editorial Content** appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please call:

Heidi A. Litman at 516-771-2169
Email: heidi.a.litman@lexisnexis.com
Outside the United States and Canada, please call (973) 820-2000

For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call:

Customer Services Department at (800) 833-9844
Outside the United States and Canada, please call (518) 487-3385
Fax Number (800) 828-8341
Customer Service Website <http://www.lexisnexis.com/custserv/>

For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call
Your account manager or (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 © 2020 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved. Originally published in: 2015

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

MERLE M. DELANCEY JR.

Partner, Blank Rome LLP

DARWIN A. HINDMAN III

Shareholder, Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, PC

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 © 2020 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 11005, smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 646.539.8300. 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.

Federal Contractors May Face Immigration-Related Hiring Requirements and Barriers

*By Paul R. Hurst, Elizabeth Laskey LaRocca, Dana J. Delott, and Caitlin Conroy**

This article discusses an Executive Order that could potentially lead to restrictions on the ability of government contractors and subcontractors to use foreign labor in the performance of government contracts.

With continuing high unemployment rates and COVID-driven economic woes, President Trump issued an Executive Order (“EO”) that could potentially lead to restrictions on the ability of government contractors and subcontractors to use foreign labor in the performance of government contracts. Specifically, the EO (1) requires executive agencies to review and assess past contractor hiring practices, and (2) directs the secretaries of homeland security and labor to act to protect U.S. workers from any adverse effects of the employment or contracted use of specified foreign national workers.

REVIEW OF CONTRACTOR HIRING PRACTICES

Specifically, the order directs federal agencies to review, for fiscal years 2018 and 2019:

- Whether contractors (and subcontractors) used temporary foreign labor for contracts performed in the United States, the nature of the work performed by those workers, whether such hiring affected opportunities for U.S. workers or impacted national security.
- Whether contractors and subcontractors moved performance of contracts overseas and whether U.S. workers were affected by offshoring, whether affected U.S. workers were eligible for assistance under the Trade Adjustment Assistance program; and any potential effects on the national security caused by offshoring.

In addition, agencies must assess any negative impact of contractors’(and subcontractors’) reliance on temporary foreign labor or use of offshoring

* Paul R. Hurst (phurst@steptoe.com), a partner at Steptoe & Johnson LLP and chair of firm’s Government Contracts Group, regularly represents government contractors in the defense, construction, and healthcare industries. Elizabeth (Liz) Laskey LaRocca (elarocca@steptoe.com), of counsel at the firm and head of its Immigration practice, represents multinational corporations and individuals in immigration matters. Dana J. Delott (ddelott@steptoe.com) is an attorney at the firm focusing on business and family-based immigration and naturalization matters, as well as compliance strategies. Caitlin Conroy (cconroy@steptoe.com) is an associate at the firm representing clients in matters arising from contracting with the government, including bid protests, investigations, and compliance issues.

practices on the economy, efficiency of federal procurement, and on national security and propose any necessary action to address those impacts. Agencies also must coordinate with the Office of Management and Budget to assess compliance with EO 11935 (Citizenship Requirements for Federal Employment).

The EO requires agencies to submit a report with the results of the review to the Office of Personnel Management (“OPM”) within 120 days. The outcome of the report—which, notably, was scheduled for after the election—is an open question. However, in IT and other technical areas, it is common for employers to augment their workforce through sponsorship of foreign nationals within the United States, in addition to the use of offshore resources. In light of the clear disfavoring of these practices, a natural expectation is the enhancement of existing restrictions and compliance mechanisms. Potential areas for review include: E-Verify mandates, potential amendments to the Federal Acquisition Regulation (“FAR”) restricting contractor reliance on foreign labor, more burdensome reporting requirements, and increased enforcement actions.

When forecasting the potential outcomes of the EO, it is important to also note a related development that was not widely reported. The EO came immediately after the Department of Labor (“DOL”) and the Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”) entered an immigration-sponsorship and compliance-related data sharing memorandum of agreement (“MOA”).¹ Under this MOA, the DOL and DHS will establish processes to share information about employer-sponsorship petition records and data contained within the Office of Foreign Labor Certification’s labor certification and labor condition application (“LCA”) databases.

The MOA provides two federal agencies responsible for interrelated components of the employment-based immigration sponsorship process the tools for data mining and assessing employer sponsorship and compliance information. It also greatly enhances their ability to act upon suspected non-compliance, as the MOA empowers USCIS to refer suspected H-1B employer violations to the DOL.

MEASURES TO PROTECT U.S. WORKERS

The EO requires the secretaries of labor and homeland security to “take action, as appropriate and consistent with applicable law, to protect United States workers from any adverse effects on wages and working conditions caused by the employment of H-1B visa holders at job sites (including third-party job sites)” within 45 days. Both direct H-1B employers and secondary employers (third-party job sites) are subject to the EO. The H-1B category is appropriate

¹ <https://www.dol.gov/newsroom/releases/dol/dol20200731>.

for temporary, professional workers. It is widely used for IT professionals, researchers, and other degreed technical positions. As mentioned above, it is common within IT to supplement staff through the use of contracted workers who may hold H-1B status.

The EO provides that the DOL and DHS must take “measures to ensure that all employers of H-1B visa holders, including secondary employers,” comply with specific U.S. wage level and worker protections contained in the Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”). These protections are tied to employer attestations contained within a LCA filed with the DOL. Notably, LCA database information is included within the information sharing MOA, discussed above.

This pertinent section of the INA requires H-1B sponsoring employers to make attestations to the DOL, all designed to protect the U.S. labor market and wage levels. These include verification that the employer:

- Will pay the higher of the prevailing or the employer’s actual wage paid to similar workers.
- Will provide working conditions for the foreign national that do not adversely impact other workers.
- There is no strike, lockout, or work shortage.
- The employer has complied with LCA notice requirements to employees or employee representatives.

Under current regulations, in very limited situations, employers are also required to make attestations as to non-displacement of U.S. workers both within the H-1B sponsoring employer’s workforce as well as the workforce of any secondary employer. Where such attestations are required, good faith efforts to recruit U.S. workers for the position are also required.

EXPECTATIONS AND ACTION ITEMS

The EO directs reviews of past contracting practices and current H-1B related U.S. worker protections over a period of 120 and 45 days, respectively. As such, the EO does not set forth any specific action items or mandates for government contractors or subcontractors. However, the EO indicates government contractors and subcontractors can anticipate inquiries from government auditors related to their use of temporary foreign workers in the United States and/or offshore workers.

As a result, contractors should be prepared to share information and documentation with contracting agencies related to their FY 2018 and 2019 reliance on temporary foreign workers to perform federal contracts (both in the

United States and abroad). This documentation should include an explanation of why the contractor required foreign labor and any supporting documentation. Contractors must consider that their use of foreign workers could include the workforces of companies with which they contracted for supplemental staff. Contractors should review their compliance protocols related to hiring, outsourcing, and contractual staff augmentation. Moreover, in light of the impact of COVID-19 on the U.S. economy, and the EO's clear focus on the protection of the U.S. labor market, contractors also should consider their current practices with respect to the use of foreign labor and evaluate their current justification and need for the continued use of foreign labor.

With respect to the H-1B related EO provisions, in addition to the expectation of enhanced monitoring and enforcement, what is most notable is the focus on secondary employers (third party worksites). These common third-party H-1B arrangements have long been an immigration restriction target. To that end, one of the results of this EO may be the addition of secondary employer attestations matching or similar to what is required of H-1B petitioning employers. This would potentially impose new accountabilities, compliance requirements, and liabilities on the third-party worksite employer.

Under current regulations, the LCA notice requirements extend to the worksite location—including third party worksites. Under the Trump Administration, the LCA was updated to require the sponsor to specify whether the H-1B employee would be placed at a secondary entity. In such instances, the LCA captures the name and location of the secondary entity. This, along with the enhanced data sharing under the MOA makes it much easier to identify the placement of H-1B workers with federal contractors and subcontractors and to execute on any enhanced compliance measures.

As an overarching consideration, federal contractors and subcontractors need to evaluate how this EO may impact their ability to staff, perform, and compete for federal contracts. The EO review of foreign national hiring and staffing practices and the emergence of a coordinated information sharing effort on the part of DOL and DHS drives home the point that federal contractors must assess both their level of reliance on foreign workers and the robustness of their related compliance regimes. The EO signals that federal contractors and sub-contractors should take proactive measures to mitigate disruption and potential enforcement action through self-assessments of hiring and staffing practices, self-audits of compliance-related records, establish or update best practice policies and procedures, and assure that the organization meets legal requirements with respect to immigration, employment, and government contracts.

While the EO is preliminary in nature, the legal areas at issue—government contracts and immigration—are already highly regulated. This provides multiple platforms for implementation of enhanced restrictions and compliance protocols—all aimed at reducing the ability of employers to draw upon foreign national labor sources. It follows previous EOs broadly restricting U.S. immigration based upon the state of the U.S. economy. However, notably, each of those restrictions also provided for exceptions for those who can establish that they provide an economic benefit.