

SOLICITATION NO. USZA22-03-D-0006
SECTION J
ATTACHMENT 06

AWARD FEE PLAN
FOR
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
OF THE
SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES SUPPORT ACTIVITY
(SOFS)

USZA22-03-D-0006

1 April 2003

DATE:

APPROVED:

1.0 POLICY. This Plan outlines the policies and procedures, which will be used by the government to recommend and determine the amount of award fee earned by the contractor on contract number USZA22-03-D-0006, for the Operation and Maintenance of the Special Operations Forces Support Activity (SOFSA). It also delineates the duties and responsibilities of the personnel associated with the award fee process.

2.0 SCOPE. The purpose of this Plan is to outline the award fee process as well as the duties and responsibilities of the personnel involved with the award fee process. Additionally, the Plan provides for information to be shared with the contractor, thereby allowing the contractor to take appropriate action on the results. A brief overview of the evaluation process is as follows: The Award Fee Evaluation Board (AFEB) Recorder will receive input from the performance monitors and customers, consolidate the information, and from these inputs develops a summary rating reflecting numeric award fee rating. The AFEB Recorder will then prepare and forward the summary rating and source documents to the Executive Summary Official (ESO), SOFSA Director or Deputy. The ESO will review the documents and provide an Executive Summary. The Executive Summary will provide an overview of the summary rating, highlighting the major evaluation areas: Technical Performance of Work, Business Management, Quality Assurance, and Management Information Systems (MIS) Operations and Information Technology (IT) Support. The completed Executive Summary along with the summary rating and source documents will then be forwarded to the AFEB for their review, evaluation, and potential inclusion in the Award Fee Recommendation to the Fee Determining Official (FDO). A copy of the Executive Summary and source documents, without the performance ratings, will also be provided to the contractor prior to the AFEB meeting to facilitate the contractor's briefing to the AFEB. Within seven days after contractor notification of the award fee, the contractor may request a formal debriefing. The AFEB Chairman, Procurement Contracting Officer (PCO), ESO and SOFSA Contracting Officer will conduct a briefing to the contractor during which they will provide information about the contractor's semi-annual performance evaluation and earned award fee. A written copy of the final Award Fee determination will also be provided to the contractor.

3.0 PURPOSE.

A. It is the Government's intent in utilizing the award fee process to encourage and reward contractor excellence in performance of contract requirements. This process should allow the contractor to maximize earnings when excellent performance, schedule and cost control are achieved. The criteria and rating plan should motivate the contractor to improve performance where required, but not at the expense of at least minimum acceptable performance in all other areas.

B. The FDO makes the final determination of the amount of award fee earned for each evaluation period. That determination is based upon the AFEB's evaluation of the contractor's performance. The decision of the FDO with respect to the award fee, including but not limited to the amount of award fee, if any; the methodology used to calculate the fee; the calculation of the award fee; the contractor's entitlement to the fee; and the nature and success of the contractor's performance shall be a unilateral decision made solely at the discretion of the Government.

C. The Government will continuously monitor and report on the manner in which the contractor attains the stated objectives. This will be accomplished by on-site SOFSA inputs from the three performance monitors on a monthly basis. Customer comments will be utilized where available. In addition, the Government will collect data from databases, which provide the current status of each project ongoing at the SOFSA. The contractor will be allowed to provide a self-assessment at the monthly performance reviews as well as the award fee board. The award fee boards will be conducted on a semi-annual basis. Additionally, monthly performance reviews will be conducted at SOFSA and will include as a minimum, the ESO and the SOFSA Contracting Officer.

D. The weights assigned to each of the performance categories, the criteria for performance evaluation, and the distribution of available award fee may be modified unilaterally by the Government, provided the Government notifies the contractor at least thirty (30) calendar days prior to the start of the first affected evaluation period (changes to any of the above referenced areas may be implemented during the 6-month evaluation period only when both government and contractor parties agree to its implementation on such short notice). In the absence of such notification, the performance evaluation criteria, performance category weights, and the process for distribution of available fee dollars will remain unchanged.

E. Although the award fee process is recognized to be subjective in nature, every effort will be made to ensure reasonableness and fairness. The written record of the performance monitors, ESO, customers, and the contractor's self-assessment, if provided, provides the checks and balances necessary to ensure award fee integrity. Though weights and other calculations may be used as aids in determining the fee, this in no way implies that mathematical precision can be applied to the judgments of the evaluators.

4.0 **ORGANIZATION.** The award fee organization consists of the FDO, AFEB, an ESO, performance monitors, AFEB Recorder and customers. The organization is listed in greater detail in Attachment 1.

5.0 **RESPONSIBILITIES.** The responsibilities of each member in the award fee process are outlined below:

A. The FDO is the designated official who determines the amount of award fee earned by the contractor during a given performance period. The determination is based on the AFEB recommendations, which are presented to the FDO semi-annually. The FDO may accept the recommendation presented by the AFEB or he/she may set another fee. If the FDO's final decision on award fee varies upward or downward from the AFEB's recommendation, the rationale for the change shall be documented in the official contract file and explained with reference to the award fee plan. The FDO's decision is provided to the PCO for issuance of the unilateral modification and discussion with the contractor. The FDO is also responsible for (1) approving the Award Fee Plan; (2) appointing membership of the AFEB; (3) appointing the AFEB Chairperson; and (4) appointing the ESO. The FDO is the Acquisition Executive, USSOCOM. If another FDO is appointed, he/she will be appointed, in writing, by the Acquisition Executive, USSOCOM. The alternate FDO is appointed, in writing, by the Acquisition Executive, USSOCOM.

B. The AFEB Chairperson is appointed by the FDO. The Chairperson oversees the AFEB discussions on the contractor's performance and serves as a voting member. The AFEB Chairperson briefs and provides a written summary to the FDO on the recommended earned award fee amount and summary of the AFEB's evaluation of contractor performance. The summary should include recommendations for improvements in contractor performance. The AFEB Chairperson also: (1) recommends significant award fee plan changes to the FDO (minor Plan changes are executed by the AFEB Chairperson with agreement of AFEB); (2) approves selection of the customer representatives, and (3) approves minutes and supporting documentation. Documentation should include the rationale used in arriving at the recommended earned award fee amount when it is provided to the FDO. Documentation should also include the Executive Summary, supporting summary rating, contractor self-evaluation, if any, briefings and other pertinent data; (4) encourages unanimity in the AFEB's recommended award fee percentage to the FDO, but ensures those minority opinions or split decisions are set forth in the AFEB meeting minutes.

C. The AFEB members are appointed initially, in writing, by the FDO. The AFEB members will serve to evaluate the contractor's overall performance by reviewing the Executive Summary, the summary rating, contractor's self-assessment, and other pertinent information as necessary. They assure that the award fee recommendation is consistent with the available data, and recommend the fee to the FDO. Recommendations must be documented and are presented to the FDO by the AFEB Chairperson. The designated AFEB members are listed in Attachment 1 to the Plan.

D. The ESO, SOFSA Director or Deputy, is appointed by the FDO and is the individual designated to review all inputs, as well as, the summary rating and write the Executive Summary which is presented to the AFEB. The Executive Summary will be structured to provide an overview of the summary rating and highlight the three major evaluation areas: Technical Performance of Work, Business Management, and Quality Assurance. The summary rating itself will contain evaluations of contractor performance from performance monitors; a summary of the customer surveys; a listing of the evaluation criteria; and a summary of the numeric and adjectival results of the evaluations. The Executive Summary and supporting documents will be made available to all AFEB members, the contractor less performance ratings and the FDO no later than three days prior to the scheduled AFEB.

E. The AFEB Recorder is an individual appointed by the AFEB Chairperson. The AFEB Recorder collects evaluations from performance monitors. The AFEB Recorder will accomplish this task by: (1) notifying respective evaluators when evaluations are due; (2) mailing customer assessments to customers and coordinating timely receipt of assessments for inclusion in the Narrative Summary; (a) assembling customer assessment reports and quality control reports; (b) insuring ratings are substantiated by written comments; (c) collating customer assessments; (3) assembling records for review by the AFEB; (4) scheduling AFEB no later than 27 calendar days after the end of the evaluation period; (5) developing the AFEB agenda with assistance; (6) maintaining the official files and customer assessments; (7) recording minutes of the AFEB; and (8) performing other actions, as required, to ensure smooth operation of the award fee process.

F. Performance Monitors are: The Chief, Industrial and Logistics Support Division, who will evaluate the contractor in Technical Performance of Work; The Chief, Operations Division, who will evaluate the contractor in Quality Assurance and MIS Operations and IT Support; The Chief, Contract Administration Division, who will evaluate the contractor in Business Management. When necessary, the SOFSA Director may select alternate personnel to conduct the duties of performance monitor. Performance monitors will use Attachment 2, Evaluation Criteria, to rate contractor performance with the format at Attachment 4. Personnel from the three SOFSA divisions will monitor contractor performance on a daily basis and provide weekly input to their respective performance monitors. The performance monitors will review and consolidate monthly input for inclusion in the semi-annual

performance monitor reports, which are submitted as part of the summary. Performance monitors will also: (1) insure ratings are complete and substantiated by written comments; (2) submit reports to the AFEB Recorder; (3) maintain written records of the contractor's performance that detail specific examples where (a) improvement is necessary or desired, (b) improvements have occurred, and (c) performance is below, meets or exceeds contract requirements; (4) verify performance issues with customers. Customer inputs will rate the areas of Technical Performance of Work and Quality Control on their individual projects.

G. Customers will be responsible for monitoring performance on their specific projects. Customer input to the Executive Summary will be obtained through the use of the Customer Assessment found at Attachment 3. Customers will be asked to assign an adjectival and overall numeric rating to each area. They will ensure the ratings are accurate, reflect actual performance and are in accordance with the grading scale provided with the survey. The Customer Assessment will coincide with the information found in this Plan. Written comments are required for technical and cost areas that are rated "Excellent" "Marginal", or "Unacceptable." Customers are responsible for promptly returning the assessments to SOFSA within the established suspense date. Customers may recommend changes to the award fee process and may participate as a member of the AFEB. Customer input will be obtained in the areas of Technical Performance of Work and Quality Control. Customer assessments will be outlined in the Summary presented to the AFEB every six months. When available, their input will also be part of the monthly reviews conducted at SOFSA.

H. The Contractor may provide a written self-assessment within fifteen (15) calendar days after the end of the award fee period and quarterly performance reviews. The self-assessment shall not exceed twelve (12) pages. The contractor's self-assessment will be provided to the AFEB Recorder/Coordinator for concurrent submission to the AFEB members and FDO with the Executive Summary. The contractor will also be offered an opportunity to provide an oral presentation to the AFEB. Any contractor presentation will be limited to one half-hour and no more than twenty-five (25) charts. A copy of those charts must be provided to the AFEB Recorder/Coordinator for submission to the FDO with the Executive Summary and AFEB recommendations.

I. Advisors are Government experts who may be called upon to provide advisory assistance to the AFEB and/or the FDO. They may not participate in AFEB meetings as voting members.

6.0 FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION. The financial administrator will be responsible for: (a) setting up award fee account for each MIPR and continuously loading amounts into database; (b) receiving and verifying the accuracy of the vouchered cost amount after each award fee period; (c) running a spreadsheet report giving available award fee, vouchered award fee pool and unvouchered award fee pool for each project; (d) determining the amount for contract modification; (e) receiving invoice from the contractor; (f) preparing SF 1034 and monitoring payment from DFAS; and (g) returning unearned award fee to customers.

7.0 EVALUATION CATEGORIES AND SUB-CRITERIA. The performance monitors will use the following evaluation categories and sub-criteria for their reports. See Attachment 2 for detailed explanation of the criteria. The performance monitors will provide weightings to each of the sub-criteria commensurate with the areas in which they want to incentivize the contractor to perform. Customers will use the same evaluation categories and ratings, which are set forth in the Customer Assessments for award fee determination.

A. **TECHNICAL PERFORMANCE OF WORK (41%)**: This area will look at all aspects of project performance to include cost control, project estimating, integrated logistic support, technical performance, management performance, and teamwork. Evaluation of the contractor's Technical Performance of Work will include the following areas:

- (1) Project/program requirements.
- (2) Project/program cost control/containment.
- (3) Project cost estimates.

B. **BUSINESS MANAGEMENT (26%)**: The contractor's overall management performance will be evaluated in terms of its effectiveness and economical organization in all areas of effort required to achieve contract objectives. Evaluation will focus on the overall business management and will include the following:

- (1) Contract management.
- (2) GFP/GFE use and management.
- (3) Subcontract management and Small Business Goals.
- (4) Contract cost control/containment.

C. **QUALITY ASSURANCE (21%):** Quality Assurance will focus on the contractor's implementation of the Quality System principles and practices, their reviews for corrective actions and improvement of processes, and product quality. Evaluation will include the following:

- (1) Quality assurance program requirements.
- (2) Project quality.

D. **MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS (MIS) OPERATIONS AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (IT) SUPPORT (12%):** The contractor's MIS/IT support to the Government staff at SOFSA, will be evaluated in terms of its effectiveness and cost efficiency. Evaluation will focus on the following:

- (1) Management Information Systems and Network Requirements
- (2) Maintenance/Operability of Government-Accessed Web Sites and Systems
- (3) Security

8.0 AWARD FEE PROCESS.

A. In accordance with the schedule shown in Section B of the contract, the government will conduct formal award fee evaluations of the contractor's performance every six months. The government will also conduct monthly performance reviews at SOFSA. The results of the monthly performance reviews as well as any other additional, pertinent information will be provided to the AFEB for their consideration at the semi-annual award fee boards.

B. The Award Fee will be distributed as a result of the government's monitoring of contractor performance throughout the performance period. Criteria have been established at Attachment 2 of this Plan. Personnel from the three SOFSA divisions will monitor contractor performance on a daily basis and provide weekly input to their respective performance monitors. The performance monitors will review and consolidate that input, along with their monthly reports, into semi-annual performance monitor reports, which are submitted as part of the Executive Summary rating. Performance monitors will subjectively evaluate these criteria against the contractor's performance for the award fee period and annotate their evaluation on the form found at Attachment 4. Customers will provide their evaluation on Attachment 3. Performance monitors and customers will then submit their evaluation to the AFEB Recorder for consolidation into the Summary. The performance monitors will provide adjectival and numeric ratings for the individual evaluation areas, which will be used to determine the amount of award fee for the period. The Percentage of Award Fee Earned Table is located below. Performance monitors will provide a weight for each evaluation criteria they are rating on the form found at Attachment 5. The weighting form will be provided to the AFEB Recorder/Coordinator prior to the start of the evaluation period in which the weights are applicable.

C. The numbers are intended to be advisory and guidelines for discussion by the AFEB and subsequent recommendation to the FDO. The AFEB, using this and other pertinent data, develops an award fee recommendation, which is then provided to the FDO. The FDO has broad discretion to incorporate subjective judgment into the process and will make a unilateral decision as to the percentage/amount of award fee earned. All decisions or changes must be documented.

D. The evaluation categories are weighted to express their relative importance to the overall mission. Performance monitors will weight the categories in which they are rating prior to the start of each evaluation period by using the form found at Attachment 5.

E. **Control of Documents.** The contents of the Executive Summary and the Summary Rating which includes the inputs from the performance monitors and customers to the AFEB and FDO, and all other documentation supporting the award fee determination are procurement sensitive and shall not be released outside of government channels except to the performing contractor. The AFEB Recorder will maintain only the minimum number of copies of all award fee documents and reports prepared in accordance with this plan. All working papers of the performance monitors, AFEB members and FDO shall be destroyed or given to the AFEB Recorder for safekeeping. Performance monitors will be responsible for maintaining file(s) of supporting documentation they used in developing their monthly input as well as the six- (6) month reports to the AFEB. The AFEB Recorder will ensure that AFEB results are mirrored in the appropriate CPARS database.

9.0 AWARD FEE RATING TABLE. The following table will be used as an aid in determining the award fee:

Evaluation Rating
EXCELLENT

% Fee Earned
██████████

SOLICITATION NO. USZA22-03-D-0006

SECTION J

ATTACHMENT 06

GOOD

ACCEPTABLE

MARGINAL

UNACCEPTABLE



After determining the overall performance rating for the category by performance monitors, scores will be weighted in accordance with Attachment 2. Those weightings will be calculated to an overall score, which will then be multiplied by the amount of available fee to determine the amount of fee earned for the evaluation period. A score of "Marginal" and "Unacceptable" will result in no fee earned by the contractor.

ATTACHMENT 1

AWARD FEE ORGANIZATION

1. The FDO is the Acquisition Executive or his Designee, USSOCOM.
2. The AFEB voting members are:
 - Chief, SOAL-L Director of Logistics, USSOCOM- Chairperson
 - PCO, SOAL-KB, USSOCOM
 - Director, SOFSA
 - Program Executive Officer, USSOCOM
 - SOFSA Customer
 - SOFSA Customer
 - SOFSA Customer
 - SOFSA Customer
3. AFEB Advisors:
 - Director of Procurement, USSOCOM
 - Legal Advisor, USSOCOM
4. ESO Official:
 - Director or Deputy Director in absence of Director, SOFSA
5. Performance Monitors:
 - Chief, Industrial and Logistics Support Division, SOFSA
 - Chief, Operations Division, SOFSA
 - Chief, Contract Administration Division, SOFSA
 - Customers
6. AFEB Recorder:
 - SOFSA Contract Specialist
7. Special Notes:
 - a. The Chairperson of the AFEB may appoint additional members or advisors to the AFEB, subject to approval by the FDO.
 - b. A quorum for the AFEB shall include the PCO, Chief, SOAL-L Director of Logistics USSOCOM; Director SOFSA and SOFSA AFEB Recorder
 - c. The AFEB Chairperson will select customers for Board participation. Customers must be represented in the following grades (AFEB Chairperson reserves the right to approve anyone nominated to attend that is lower in grade):
 - Military – O-5 thru O-6
 - Civilian – GS-14 thru GM-15

Exceptions to the above policy will be approved by the AFEB Chairperson.

ATTACHMENT 2

EVALUATION CRITERIA

AREA A – TECHNICAL PERFORMANCE OF WORK (41%)

1.0 PROJECT/PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS (33.3%):

Project/program requirements refer to management's ability to meet technical requirements; track cost and schedule progress at all levels, meet milestones and maintain/update cost and schedule tracking system. The contractor is able to identify problems, causes, and solutions that have a potential for impact on cost, schedule, performance and overall program improvement. This includes, but is not limited to, systems engineering, configuration management, teamwork, technical data/support, integrated logistics support, and customer relations. The contractor will be rated on timeliness and responsiveness to requests from the Government for these requirements, accuracy of problem identification, effectiveness/efficiency of corrective actions, and consistency in meeting Government allotted suspense times.

EXCELLENT: Contractor performance is considered to be excellent if virtually all requirements, milestones and corrective actions are completed on or ahead of schedule. The contractor's lines of communication, in virtually all cases, facilitate rapid exchanges of information. Contractor takes a leadership role and is, in virtually all cases, proactive in identifying and resolving a vast majority of issues/problems. All technical reports and CDRLs are consistently clear, concise, accurate, and timely. Contractor's ability to perform the integrated logistics support functions enhances mission accomplishment. Performance in the areas of empowerment, teamwork, and customer relations are consistently of such a nature as to enhance the contractor's ability to meet or exceed customer mission requirements. Areas requiring improvement, if any, are minor.

GOOD: The contractor's performance is good if most requirements, milestones and corrective actions are completed on or ahead of schedule. The contractor's lines of communication facilitate exchanges of information and in most instances, exceed requirements. Contractor identifies and resolves most common issues/problems. Minimal government intervention is needed. Most technical reports and CDRLs are completed on or ahead of schedule, in a format that is clear, concise, and accurate. Contractor's ability to perform the integrated logistics support functions enhances mission accomplishment capabilities in some significant areas. In most cases, performance in the areas of empowerment, teamwork, and customer relations are of such a nature as to enhance the contractor's ability to meet or exceed customer mission requirements. Areas for improvement are more than offset by better performance in other areas.

ACCEPTABLE: Performance of the contractor is acceptable if many requirements, milestones and corrective actions are completed on or ahead of schedule. The contractor's lines of communication facilitate exchanges of information and occasionally exceed requirements. Contractor identifies and resolves many common issues/problems. Some government intervention is needed. Technical reports and CDRLs are usually in a format that is clear, concise, and accurate, with few exceptions. Contractor's ability to perform the integrated logistics support functions, meets and occasionally enhances mission accomplishment capabilities. Contractor performance is considered acceptable when it normally meets or exceeds the contract terms and conditions in the areas of staff management and personnel. Generally, performance in the areas of empowerment, teamwork, and customer relations are of such a nature as to enhance the contractor's ability to meet or exceed customer mission requirements. Areas for improvement are offset by better performance in other areas.

MARGINAL: Performance of the contractor is marginal if some requirements, milestones and corrective actions are completed on schedule and meet requirements. However, some milestones experience schedule slippage. The contractor's lines of communication generally facilitate exchanges of information. Contractor occasionally identifies and resolves some common issues/problems, but is not proactive in all situations. Government intervention is sometimes needed. Technical reports and CDRLs are sometimes in a format that is clear, concise, and accurate. Contractor shows minimal ability to perform the integrated logistics support functions, and therefore only occasionally exhibits mission accomplishment capabilities. Some of the time, performance in the areas of empowerment, teamwork, and customer relations are of such a nature as to enhance the contractor's ability to meet customer mission requirements. There are several areas that need improvement in order to enhance performance.

UNACCEPTABLE: Unacceptable performance occurs when few requirements, milestones and corrective actions are completed on schedule. The contractor's lines of communication do not facilitate exchange of information. Contractor is unable to identify and resolve some issues. Government intervention is often needed. Technical reports and CDRLs may be

inaccurate, not concise, and untimely. Unacceptable performance means that some logistics support functions do not meet requirements. Areas of good or better performance are offset by lower rated performance in other areas. Contractor performance is considered to be unacceptable if performance in the areas of empowerment, teamwork, and customer relations fail to enhance the contractor's ability to meet customer mission requirements.

2.0 PROGRAM/PROJECT COST CONTROL/CONTAINMENT (33.3%):

Cost control is concerned with how the contractor controls costs and prevents cost growth (or overrun) in order to contribute to the success of projects/programs. An actual cost vs. cost estimates (CEs) refers to how well the contractor's actual costs on negotiated projects vary from the negotiated cost estimates. Contractor is effective and efficient in utilizing financial resources and in controlling or reducing costs. The contractor will be rated on how timely/responsive he is to requests from the Government for these requirements, his actions accurately identify problems, and whether he initiates effective/efficient corrective actions and meets the Government allotted suspense time.

EXCELLENT: Contractor's performance is considered excellent if, the contractor is proactive in implementing cost controls that result in savings to the Government with no degradation to mission. Virtually all projects are completed within the fidelity range estimated in CEs to the agreed to metrics. Contractor is proactive in implementing cost controls that result in substantial savings to the Government with no negative mission impact. Contractor consistently provides cost reductions to the government through sound management, good business decisions and supervision in all areas. Areas for improvement, if any, are minor.

GOOD: Good performance is characterized when most projects are completed within the fidelity range estimated in approved baseline CEs. Few exhibit a significant variance from the fidelity range. Contractor implements many cost controls that result in savings to the Government with no degradation to mission. Contractor frequently provides meaningful cost reductions to the government through sound management, good business decisions and supervision in most areas. Areas for improvement are significantly more than offset by better performance in other areas.

ACCEPTABLE: Acceptable performance means many projects are completed within the fidelity range estimated in approved baseline CEs, with some exceptions. Contractor implements cost controls that meet and, in some instances, exceed requirements. Contractor occasionally provides cost reductions to the government. Contractor has taken corrective measures to alleviate problems. Areas for improvement are offset by better performance in other areas.

MARGINAL: Marginal performance means some projects are completed within the fidelity range estimated in approved baseline CEs. Contractor implements cost controls that occasionally meet, but sometimes fail to meet requirements. Contractor occasionally provides cost reductions to the government. Contractor has taken some corrective measures to alleviate problems in a few areas; however, there are several areas that require improvement in order to enhance performance.

UNACCEPTABLE: Unacceptable performance means many of the completed projects do not meet the approved baseline CEs, and several exhibit significant variance from the fidelity range. Contractor implements little cost control which results in unnecessarily high spending and costs. Areas of good or better performance are more than offset by lower rated performance in other areas.

3.0 PROJECT COST ESTIMATING (33.3%):

Contractor prepares program/project cost estimates and schedule data that provides clear Government visibility into current and forecast program costs and schedules. Cost estimates are accurate within fidelity ranges, reasonable, timely, and responsive. Forecasts are accurate, cost variances outside the fidelity range are fully explained, and the contractor proposes cost-effective approaches to problem solving. The contractor will be rated on how timely/responsive he is to requests from the Government for these requirements, his actions accurately identify problems, he initiates effective/efficient corrective actions and meets the Government allotted suspense time.

EXCELLENT: Excellent performance is characterized when, in virtually all cases, cost/schedule/funding forecasts exceed requirements, the contractor provides accurate, reasonable initial estimates, changes in scope, cost impacts and estimates at completion (EACs). These reflect actual, projected, and total cost at completion for projects and are provided in a timely manner. In virtually all cases, the contractor's ability to be consistent and accurate in the reflection of the correct financial

position through performance within the fidelity range significantly enhances mission accomplishment. Areas for improvement, if any, are all minor.

GOOD: The contractor's performance is considered good if, in most cases, cost/schedule/funding forecasts exceed requirements. In most cases, contractor provides accurate, reasonable initial estimates, changes in scope, cost impacts and estimates at completion (EACs). These reflect actual, projected, and total cost at completion for projects and are provided in a timely manner. Contractor's ability to accurately reflect correct financial position through performance within the fidelity range in most instances enhances mission accomplishment. Areas for improvement are significantly more than offset by better performance in other areas.

ACCEPTABLE: The contractor's performance is considered acceptable when, in many cases, cost/schedule/funding forecasts meet and in many cases exceed requirements. In many cases, contractor provides accurate, reasonable initial estimates, changes in scope, cost impacts and estimates at completion (EACs). These reflect actual, projected, and total cost at completion for projects and are provided in a timely manner. In many cases, the contractor's ability to accurately reflect correct financial position through performance within the fidelity range enhances mission accomplishment. Areas for improvement are more than offset by better performance in other areas.

MARGINAL: Performance is considered marginal if, in some cases, cost/schedule/funding forecasts meet and occasionally fail to meet requirements. Contractor provides initial estimates, changes in scope, cost impacts and estimates at completion (EACs) reflecting actual, projected, and total cost at completion for projects, which sometimes meet government requirements. However, there are times when estimates are inaccurate, resulting in significant disparity between projected and actual costs. Contractor has minimal ability to accurately reflect correct financial position through performance within fidelity ranges. Several areas require improvement in order to enhance performance.

UNACCEPTABLE: Performance is considered unacceptable if, in few instances, cost/schedule/funding forecasts meet requirements. Contractor provides initial estimates, changes in scope, cost impacts and estimates at completion (EACs) which rarely meet government requirements. Cost estimating definitely needs improvement since actual costs rarely resemble costs projected at the beginning of the project. Areas of good or better performance are more than offset by lower rated performance in other areas.

AREA B – BUSINESS MANAGEMENT (26%)

1.0 CONTRACT MANAGEMENT (25%):

Contractor continuously complies with the contract terms and conditions. The contractor insures that the KO is informed of all changes and potential cost impact. When required, the contractor provides a comprehensive plan of action for correcting problem areas to include a time line for completion. The contractor adheres to suspense set for provision of information in the contract. The contractor will be rated on how timely/responsive he is to requests from the Government for these requirements, his actions accurately identify problems, he initiates effective/efficient corrective actions and meets the Government allotted suspense time.

EXCELLENT: The contractor's performance is considered excellent if the contractor complies with all terms and conditions in the contract. In virtually all cases no notifications required by clauses are missed. Virtually all information provided to the KO is timely (within stated suspenses), accurate, and comprehensive. Virtually all information provided requires little or no further clarification. The contractor readily and proactively identifies problem or potential problem areas and takes proactive steps to correct. When the KO notifies the contractor of a problem, the contractor immediately takes steps for corrective action. If a problem is of such a nature that a written plan of action is required, that plan completely outlines the actions to be taken and timelines for resolution. In virtually no case is the timeline missed. The contractor meets or is early on suspenses set for provision of information either in the contract or by the KO. There are virtually no instances of the KO being notified of changes and potential cost impact presented after they have been implemented.

GOOD: The contractor's performance is considered good if the contractor complies with all terms and conditions in the contract. In most cases, notifications required by contract clauses are provided on or ahead of schedule. (No notifications required by a contract clause are provided to the KO more than two days late.) In most cases, all information provided to the KO is both accurate and comprehensive. Information provided requires, in few instances, further clarification. The contractor readily identifies problem areas and takes proactive steps to correct. When the KO notifies the contractor of a problem, the contractor immediately takes steps for corrective action. If a problem is of such a nature that a written plan of

action is required, that plan completely outlines the actions to be taken and timelines for resolution. In most cases, the contractor meets suspenses set for provision of information either in the contract or by the KO. There are only a couple of instances of the KO being notified of changes and potential cost impact presented after they have been implemented.

ACCEPTABLE: The contractor's performance is considered acceptable if the contractor complies with all terms and conditions in the contract. In many cases, notifications required by contract clauses are provided on or ahead of schedule. (No notifications required by clauses are provided to the KO more than two days late.) In many cases, the information provided to the KO is accurate and comprehensive. Information provided requires, in some instances, further clarification. The contractor identifies problem areas and takes steps to correct. When the KO notifies the contractor of a problem, the contractor proactively takes steps for corrective action. When a problem is of such a nature that a written plan of action is required, that plan outlines the actions to be taken and timelines for resolution. In no more than six cases is the timeline missed. There are only a few instances of the KO being notified of changes and potential cost impact presented after they have been implemented.

MARGINAL: The contractor's performance is considered marginal if the contractor complies with all terms and conditions in the contract. In some cases, notifications required by contract clause are provided on or ahead of schedule. (No notifications required by clause are provided to the KO more than four days late). In some cases, information provided to the KO is accurate and comprehensive. Information provided requires, in many instances, clarification. The contractor sometimes identifies problem areas and takes steps to correct. When the KO notifies the contractor of a problem, the contractor sometimes takes steps for corrective action. If a problem is of such a nature that a written plan of action is required, that plan outlines the actions to be taken and timelines for resolution. In no more than eight cases is the timeline missed. In some cases, there are instances of the KO being notified of changes and potential cost impact presented after they have been implemented.

UNACCEPTABLE: The contractor's performance is considered unacceptable if the contractor complies with most terms and conditions in the contract. No more than ten notifications required by clauses are provided to the KO more than two days late. On no more than five occasions is information provided to the KO inaccurate and not comprehensive. Information provided requires, in many instances, clarification. The contractor sometimes identifies problem areas and is irregular in taking steps to correct. When the KO notifies the contractor of a problem, the contractor many times takes steps for corrective action. If a problem is of such a nature that a written plan of action is required, that plan incompletely outlines the actions to be taken and provides no timelines for resolution. In no more than ten cases is the timeline missed. The contractor meets suspenses set for provision of information either in the contract or by the KO, and is late no more than ten times. There are no more than five instances of the KO being notified of changes with potential cost impact presented after they have been implemented.

2.0 GFP/GFE USE/MANAGEMENT (25%):

Contractor continuously reviews GFP/GFE resources to insure availability for use on SOFSA projects/programs. Contractor assures the most efficient use of these resources while maintaining schedule, quality and maximum productivity. Contractor complies with the OSD initiatives to the maximum practical extent possible insuring that there is no excess or underutilized GFP/GFE. Contractor provides necessary maintenance. The contractor will be rated on timeliness and responsiveness to requests from the Government for these requirements, accuracy of problem identification, effectiveness/efficiency of corrective actions, and consistency in meeting Government allotted suspense times.

EXCELLENT: The contractor's performance is considered to be excellent if the contractor manages GFP/GFE by maintaining a government approved property control system meeting the requirements of FAR Part 45. Physical inventories and accountability audits meet or exceed quality performance objectives in virtually all cases. JOS/Weapons must meet or exceed requirements 100% of the time.

GOOD: Good performance occurs when the contractor manages GFE/GFP by maintaining a government approved property control system meeting the requirements of FAR Part 45. Results of the physical inventory and property accountability audits meet or exceed quality performance objectives in most cases. JOS/Weapons must meet or exceed requirements 100% of the time.

ACCEPTABLE: Acceptable performance occurs when the contractor manages GFE/GFP by maintaining a government approved property control system meeting the requirements of FAR Part 45. Results of the physical inventory and property

accountability audits meet or exceed quality performance objectives in many cases. JOS/Weapons must meet or exceed requirements 100% of the time.

MARGINAL: The contractor's performance is marginal if the contractor manages GFE/GFP by maintaining a government approved property control system that sometimes meets the requirements of FAR Part 45. Results of the physical inventory and property accountability audits occasionally meet, but sometimes fail to meet, performance objectives. The contractor has a minimal corrective action plan to resolve variances and only takes corrective action part of the time. JOS/Weapons must meet requirements 100% of the time.

UNACCEPTABLE: The contractor's performance is considered to be unacceptable if the contractor fails to maintain a government approved property control system with which to manage GFP/GFE. Contractor fails to meet several requirements of FAR Part 45. Results of the physical inventory and property accountability audits fail to meet performance objectives. The contractor has an ineffective corrective action plan to resolve variances and rarely takes corrective action in a timely manner. JOS/Weapons must meet requirements 100% of the time.

3.0 SUBCONTRACT MANAGEMENT AND SMALL BUSINESS GOALS (25%):

Contractor continuously reviews subcontracting opportunities for competition and potential award to small, small disadvantaged and women owned businesses. Contractor achieves competition and the subcontracting goals (through the contractor's best efforts) established in the contract, while maintaining the cost, schedule, quality, and maximum productivity. The contractor will be rated on timeliness and responsiveness to requests from the Government for these requirements, accuracy of problem identification, effectiveness/efficiency of corrective actions, and consistency in meeting Government allotted suspense times.

EXCELLENT: Performance is considered excellent if the contractor consistently proactively seeks to increase competition and identify and expand the list of small, disadvantaged and women owned businesses available for subcontract opportunities at the SOFSA. Contractor consistently meets or exceeds the established competition and subcontracting goals in virtually all cases or provides compelling evidence of best efforts. Contractor identifies current, future small business goals and consistently proactively seeks to meet/exceed them. Contractor consistently insures outstanding subcontractor cost and schedule performance.

GOOD: The contractor's performance is good if the contractor proactively seeks to increase competition and identify small, disadvantaged and women owned businesses for subcontract opportunities at the SOFSA. Contractor meets or exceeds, the established competition and subcontracting goals, including small business goals, in most cases. Contractor insures subcontractor performance meets or exceeds cost and schedule performance goals.

ACCEPTABLE: Acceptable performance is when the contractor seeks to use competition and, in many cases, exceeds competition goals. Contractor also seeks to identify small, disadvantaged and women owned businesses for subcontract opportunities at the SOFSA. Contractor, in many cases, meets or exceeds the established subcontracting goals, including small business goals. Contractor insures subcontracting performance meets or exceeds cost and schedule performance goals.

MARGINAL: Contractor performance is considered marginal if the contractor's use of small, disadvantaged and women owned businesses meets, and sometimes exceeds, the established subcontracting goals. Contractor uses competition. Contractor insures subcontracting performance meets cost and schedule performance goals.

UNACCEPTABLE: Contractor performance is considered to be unacceptable if the contractor's use of small, disadvantaged and women owned businesses occasionally meets, but sometimes fails to meet, the established subcontracting goals. Contractor's use of competition is minimal. Contractor's implementation of its subcontracting plan needs improvement.

4.0 CONTRACT COST CONTROL/CONTAINMENT (25%):

Cost control is concerned with the contractor's ability to control overall contract costs and prevent cost growth (or overrun) in order to contribute to the success of the SOFSA mission. Contractor is effective and efficient in utilizing financial resources and in controlling and reducing costs. Contractor utilizes cost savings and cost avoidance measures to the maximum extent possible. Contractor manages overheads and productivity to provide competitive, cost effective and efficient rates. Contractor takes initiative to identify potential cost/schedule/funding issues in order to prevent cost growth or overrun. Contractor provides cost reductions to the

government through sound management. The contractor will be rated on timeliness and responsiveness to requests from the Government for these requirements, accuracy of problem identification, effectiveness/efficiency of corrective actions, and consistency in meeting Government allotted suspense times.

EXCELLENT: Contractor's performance is considered excellent if, in virtually all cases, the contractor is proactive in implementing cost controls that result in substantial savings to the Government with no degradation to mission. Virtually all mandated programs show cost savings without negatively impacting the mission. Overhead rates and productivity, in virtually all cases, reflect cost efficiency. Contractor is proactive in identifying and resolving potential cost/schedule/funding issues and there is virtually no cost growth or overrun. In virtually all cases, the contractor provides significant cost reductions to the government through sound management, good business decisions and supervision in all areas. Areas for improvement, if any, are minor.

GOOD: Contractor's performance is considered good if, in most cases, the contractor is proactive in implementing cost controls that result in substantial savings to the Government with no degradation to mission. In most cases, mandated programs show cost savings without negatively impacting the mission. Overhead rates and productivity, in most cases, reflect cost efficiency. Contractor is proactive in identifying and resolving potential cost/schedule/funding issues and there is virtually no cost growth or overrun. In most cases, the contractor provides meaningful cost reductions to the government through sound management, good business decisions and supervision in all areas. Areas for improvement are significantly more than offset by better performance in most areas.

ACCEPTABLE: Contractor's performance is considered acceptable if, in many cases, the contractor implements cost controls that result in savings to the Government with no degradation to mission. In many cases, mandated programs show cost savings without negatively impacting the mission. Overhead rates and productivity, in many cases, reflect cost efficiency. Contractor in many cases identifies and resolves potential cost/schedule/funding issues, and there is no cost growth or overrun. In many cases, the contractor provides meaningful cost reductions to the government through sound management, good business decisions, and supervision in all areas. Areas for improvement are offset by better performance in other areas.

MARGINAL: Contractor's performance is considered marginal if, in some cases, the contractor implements, and sometimes fails to implement cost controls which result in minimal or no savings to the Government. Mandated programs are sporadic in their cost savings. Overhead rates and productivity, in some cases, reflect no cost efficiency. Contractor in some cases identifies and resolves potential cost/schedule/funding issues and there is some cost growth or overrun. Contractor occasionally provides cost reductions to the government. Contractor has taken some corrective measures to alleviate problems in a few areas; however, there are several areas that require improvement in order to enhance performance.

UNACCEPTABLE: Unacceptable performance means the contractor implements little cost control that results in unnecessarily high spending and costs. Mandated programs are costly. Overhead rates and productivity add to high spending and costs and reflect little effort to control. Areas of good or better performance are more than offset by lower rated performance in other areas.

1.0 QUALITY ASSURANCE PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS (50%):

Quality assurance refers to management's ability to implement and comply with principles and practices of ISO 9001:2000 and quality assurance standards across all functional areas. The contractor's continuous reviews/audits and corrective actions improve process capability, process control, and product quality with minimum rework and repair. Total Quality Management is evident throughout the organization. When necessary, contractor takes appropriate corrective action and insures accurate and timely documentation. The contractor will be rated on how timely/responsive he is to requests from the Government for these requirements, his actions accurately identify problems, he initiates effective/efficient corrective actions and meets the Government allotted suspense time.

EXCELLENT: Contractor performance is considered excellent if the documented Quality Management System IAW ISO 9001:2000 is successfully maintained, well defined, and adhered to by virtually all functional area employees. The system allows the quality program to exceed the objectives set forth within the quality plan, directives, tasks, SOW, and contract requirements. Contractor performance indicators used to provide a finished product consistently exceed the customers' expectations and objectives in virtually all areas of ISO 9001:2000. Contractor's corrective action program shall resolve difficulties and take immediate action in an expedient fashion. Areas for improvement, if any, are minor.

GOOD: Contractor performance is considered good if the documented Quality Management System IAW ISO 9001:2000 is well maintained, well defined, and adhered to by most functional area employees. The system allows the quality program to meet and often exceed, the objectives set forth within the quality plan, directives, tasks, SOW, and contract requirements. Contractor performance indicators used to provide a finished product meet, and often exceed, the customers' expectations and objectives in most areas of ISO 9001:2000. Contractor's corrective action program shall resolve difficulties and take immediate action in a timely fashion. Areas for improvement are minor.

ACCEPTABLE: Contractor performance is considered acceptable if the documented Quality Management System IAW ISO 9001:2000 is well maintained, well defined, and adhered to by many functional area employees. The system allows the quality program to meet or exceed the objectives set forth within the quality plan, directives, tasks, SOW, and contract requirements. Contractor performance indicators used to provide a finished product meet or exceed the customers' expectations and objectives in many areas of ISO 9001. Contractor's corrective action program shall resolve difficulties and take action in a timely fashion. Areas for improvement are significantly offset by performance in other areas.

MARGINAL: Contractor performance is considered marginal if the documented Quality Management System IAW ISO 9001:2000 is maintained, well defined, and adhered to by some functional area employees. The system allows the quality program to meet the objectives set forth within the quality plan, directives, tasks, SOW, and contract requirements. Contractor performance indicators used to provide a finished product meet the customers' expectations and objectives in some areas of ISO 9001:2000. Contractor's corrective action program shall resolve difficulties and take action in a timely fashion most of the time. Areas for improvement are offset by performance in other areas.

UNACCEPTABLE: Contractor performance is considered unacceptable if the documented Quality Management System IAW ISO 9001:2000 is maintained, well-defined, and occasionally not adhered to by all functional area employees. The system allows the quality program to meet the objectives set forth within the quality plan, directives, tasks, SOW, and contract requirements. Contractor performance indicators used to provide a finished product meet the customers' expectations and objectives in most areas of ISO 9001:2000. Contractor's corrective action program shall resolve difficulties and take action most of the time. Areas of acceptable performance are more than offset by lesser performance in other areas.

2.0 PROJECT QUALITY (50%):

The contractor must possess the ability to identify problems, causes, and provide solutions for individual projects without impact on schedule and performance. The contractor shall assure that documentation and trace ability for each project is adequate; the product meets specifications; and is fully operational when delivered. Shipments shall be complete and accurate. The contractor's management must utilize quality assurance information systems, inspection results, discrepancy material reporting, corrective action system, cost of quality reports, and internal/external quality deficiency reports to maintain product quality. Impact of government action will be taken into account. The contractor will be rated on timeliness and responsiveness to requests from the Government for these requirements, accuracy of problem identification, effectiveness/efficiency of corrective actions, and consistency in meeting Government allotted suspense times.

EXCELLENT: Contractor performance is considered excellent when all individual products are within specifications, fully operational, IAW drawing specifications, and the SOW. Contractor's performance indicators used to provide a finished product consistently exceed the customer's expectations and objectives for virtually all projects. Contractor shall resolve difficulties and take expedient action. Areas for improvement, if any, are minor.

GOOD: Contractor performance is considered good when most individual products are within specifications, fully operational, IAW drawing specifications and the SOW. Contractor's performance indicators used to provide a finished product consistently meet and often exceed the customer's expectations and objectives for most projects. Contractor shall resolve difficulties and take immediate action. Areas for improvement, if any, are minor.

ACCEPTABLE: Contractor performance is considered acceptable when many of the individual products are within specifications, fully operational, IAW drawing specifications, and the SOW. Contractor's performance indicators used to provide a finished product consistently meet the customer's expectations and objectives for many projects. Contractor shall resolve difficulties and take timely action. Areas for improvement are significantly offset by performance in other areas.

MARGINAL: Contractor performance is considered marginal when some of the individual products are within specifications, fully operational, IAW drawing specifications and the SOW. Contractor's performance indicators used to provide a finished product meet the customer's expectations and objectives for some projects. Contractor shall resolve difficulties and take timely action most of the time. Areas for improvement are offset by performance in other areas.

UNACCEPTABLE: Contractor performance is considered unacceptable when occasionally the individual products are within specifications, fully operational, IAW drawing specifications and the SOW. Contractor's performance indicators used to provide a finished product meet the customer's expectations and objectives for some projects. Contractor shall resolve difficulties and take timely action some of the time. Areas of acceptable performance are more than offset by lesser performance in other areas.

AREA D – MIS/IT SUPPORT (12%)

1.0 NETWORK AVAILABILITY (40%):

Performance in this area refers to the contractor's ability to maintain the operation and integrity of the SOFSANet (the management information system, local area network, wide area network, and web servers) to ensure that they are available at SOFSA designated times.

EXCELLENT: The contractor's performance is considered to be excellent if the percentage of time the SOFSANet is capable of processing all user requests is not less than 99% during SOFSA designated times (not including scheduled down times IAW SOFSA approved site procedures).

GOOD: The contractor's performance is good if the percentage of time the SOFSANet is capable of processing all user requests is not less than 97% during SOFSA designated times (not including scheduled down times IAW SOFSA approved site procedures).

ACCEPTABLE: Performance of the contractor is acceptable if the percentage of time the SOFSANet is capable of processing all user requests is not less than 95% during SOFSA designated times (not including scheduled down times IAW SOFSA approved site procedures).

MARGINAL: Performance of the contractor is marginal if the percentage of time the SOFSANet is capable of processing all user requests is not less than 93% during SOFSA designated times (not including scheduled down times IAW SOFSA approved site procedures).

UNACCEPTABLE: Unacceptable performance occurs when the percentage of time the SOFSANet is capable of processing all user requests is less than 93% during SOFSA designated times (not including scheduled down times IAW SOFSA approved site procedures).

**2.0 MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS MAINTENANCE/OPERABILITY AND SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT
(30%):**

The contractor will provide effective resources to meet SOFSA and customer operational support goals; establishing operational and quality management procedures for determining the most cost effective methods for obtaining and operating these resources; observing and reporting costs and managing all projects and services as specified in individual task orders. The contractor shall adhere to engineering principles that include lifecycle configuration management, interoperability, scalability, maintainability, fault tolerance and redundancy in the procurement and use of all computer systems and peripherals, and management of all IT assets from implementation through accreditation and obsolescence. The contractor will be rated on how timely/responsive they are to maintaining the operation, configuration, and connectivity of the networks as well as processing requests from the government for these requirements. The contractor will ensure full interoperability and seamless connection between all internal and external SOFSA approved systems. The contractor will be rated on his ability to accurately identify problems, initiate effective/efficient corrective actions, and meet Government allotted suspense times. MIS/IT support services include technology transfer support, applications and systems support, computer security and disaster planning, graphics support and presentation services, operational services, user support and data management. The contractor shall develop and maintain a Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) for each SOFSA site to determine how computer operations would proceed in the event a contingency plan was required, to include hardware and software requirements and back up of data to off-site locations. The contractor's emergency procedures should ensure that systems are recoverable within minimal time and with minimal data loss. The contractor will be rated on the software development work it provides to the Government, the quality, documentation, and timeliness of the work.

EXCELLENT: The contractor's performance is considered to be excellent if the management information system, local area network, and web server meet all requirements and recommended configurations/actions as prescribed by DOD and SOFSA directives. The contractor's MIS/IT staff has no vacancies. The contractor meets or exceeds all of the needs and requirements of the government and customers, and always delivers on or before established suspense times. Contractor is innovative in identifying problems and initiates effective, timely, and cost efficient corrective action. Maintenance activities are performed so as not to be intrusive to the normal operation of the systems. The contractor's COOP is up to date and acceptable to the SOFSA. The contractor emergency procedures ensure that all systems are fully recoverable within a few hours, with no data loss up to the latest backup. Software development work is completed with minimal errors, full documentation and in the allotted suspense time.

GOOD: The contractor's performance is good if the management information system, local area network, and web server meet most requirements and recommended configurations/actions as prescribed by DOD and SOFSA directives. The contractor's MIS/IT staff has no more than one vacancy. The contractor is responsive to the needs and requirements of the government and customers and consistently meets all established suspense times. Contractor identifies problems and initiates effective corrective action. Maintenance activities are performed with a minimal impact on the normal operation of the systems. The contractor's COOP is within a year old and acceptable to the SOFSA. The contractor emergency procedures ensure that critical systems are fully recoverable within a few hours, with no data loss up to the latest backup. Software development work is completed with minimal errors, 90% of the documentation and within one week of the allotted suspense time.

ACCEPTABLE: Performance of the contractor is acceptable if the management information system, local area network, and web server meet most requirements and recommended configurations/actions as prescribed by DOD and SOFSA directives. The contractor's MIS/IT staff has no more than two vacancies. The contractor is responsive to the needs of the government and customer and meets most suspense times. The contractor identifies problems and initiates corrective action in a timely manner. Maintenance activities are performed with only minor disruption to normal activities. The contractor's COOP is within a year old and any issues are being addressed with suspense dates acceptable to the SOFSA. The contractor emergency procedures ensure that most systems are recoverable within 24 hours, with minimal loss of data up to the latest backup. . Software development work is completed with no major errors, 75% of the documentation and within two weeks of the allotted suspense time.

MARGINAL: Performance of the contractor is marginal if the management information system, local area network, and web server meet some of the requirements and recommended configurations/actions as prescribed by DOD and SOFSA directives. The contractor's MIS/IT staff has up to four vacancies. The contractor is responsive to government and customer needs, but consistently fails to meet suspense times. The contractor does not identify problems or does not initiate corrective action. Maintenance interferes with the normal operation of the systems on a regular basis. The contractor's COOP is more than a year old and any issues are being addressed with suspense dates not coordinated with the SOFSA. Contractor emergency procedures do not ensure systems are recoverable within three (3) days of a loss, and minimal data loss up to the latest backup is not

assured. Software development work is completed with numerous errors, little documentation and within four weeks of the allotted suspense time.

UNACCEPTABLE: Unacceptable performance occurs when the management information system, local area network, and web server meet few of the requirements and recommended configurations/actions as prescribed by DOD and SOFSA directives. The contractor's MIS/IT staff has more than four vacancies. The contractor consistently fails to meet suspense times. The contractor fails to identify problems or does not initiate corrective action in a timely manner. Maintenance consistently impedes normal operation of the systems. The contractor's COOP is more than a year old and any issues are not being addressed. Contractor emergency procedures do not ensure recovery of systems within five (5) days or do not prevent significant data loss up to the latest backup. Software development work is completed with catastrophic errors, little or no documentation and more than four weeks after allotted suspense time.

3. SECURITY (30%):

The contractor will be rated on their ability to manage, maintain and operate all SOFSA management information systems, networks, and servers in a secure manner, as directed by DoD and SOFSA regulations, incorporating SOFSA-directed applicable Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) security, technical countermeasures, and architectural upgrades and patches. The contractor shall provide general Information Assurance (IA) engineering capabilities and services. The contractor shall perform Information Assurance assessments of proposed and existing systems to include assessing and certifying information systems, identifying and assessing security requirements and deficiencies in applications, systems, local and wide area networks and commercial switching, transmission and signaling networks. The Contractor shall provide technical support to conduct Certification and Accreditation (C&A) using the Defense Information Technology Security Certification and Accreditation Process (DITSCAP) to achieve uniform quality and a level of consistency throughout the life cycle of SOFSA Automated Information Systems. The contractor will perform this by reviewing and providing technical documentation required for the application, system, network and site certification and accreditation process. The contractor will be rated on how timely/responsive they are to maintaining the operation, configuration, and security of the networks as well as processing requests from the government for these requirements, and on the development and maintenance of DoD required Information Assurance documentation for Certification and Accreditation. The contractor will ensure that all above mentioned documentation and any other IT documentation will be available on the SOFSA WAN in a searchable format maintaining revision history.

EXCELLENT: Contractor performance is considered to be excellent if the SOFSA automated information systems, to include all servers and workstations, are in compliance with all applicable Information Assurance Vulnerability Assessments (IAVAs), Information Assurance Vulnerability Bulletins (IAVBs), Information Assurance Vulnerability Technical Advisories (IAVTs), STIGs and Special Advisory Reports (SARs). All applicable IAVAs, IAVBs, IAVTs, STIGs and SARs are received, reviewed, tested and implemented as necessary prior to the established suspense. The contractor staff actively monitors the networks and systems for vulnerabilities and/or intrusion attempts, and initiates and completes all corrective actions in accordance with DoD, DISA, and SOFSA directives. All Contractor supplied Information Assurance documentation is complete, accurate, up-to-date, and available for review on the network.

GOOD: The contractor's performance is good if the SOFSA automated information systems, to include all servers and workstations are in compliance with the requirements of all IAVAs and the contractor's MIS staff is working to bring all servers and workstations into compliance with the IAVBs, IAVTs and SARs. The contractor shall acknowledge receipt, review, test and implement all corrective actions to the extent possible IAW DoD, DISA, and SOFSA directives. 95% of all Contractor supplied Information Assurance documentation is complete, accurate, up-to-date, and available for review on the network.

ACCEPTABLE: Performance of the contractor is acceptable if the SOFSA automated information systems, to include all servers and workstations, are in compliance with the majority of the IAVAs and the contractor MIS staff is working on implementing, to the extent possible, the remainder of the applicable IAVAs, IAVBs, IAVTs, and SARs. The contractor shall acknowledge receipt, review, test and implement corrective action as soon as possible to meet DoD, DISA, and SOFSA directives, or advise the government why corrective actions cannot be met. 90% of all Contractor supplied Information Assurance documentation is complete, accurate, up-to-date, and available for review on the network.

MARGINAL: Performance of the contractor is marginal if the SOFSA automated information systems, to include all servers and workstations, are in compliance with comply with only a portion of the applicable IAVAs as required. The contractor's

staff did not receive, review, and implement IAVAs in a timely manner. At least 80% of all Contractor supplied Information Assurance documentation is complete, accurate, up-to-date, and available for review on the network.

UNACCEPTABLE: Unacceptable performance occurs when the SOFSA automated information systems, to include all servers and workstations do not comply with the applicable IAVAs. The contractor's staff did not acknowledge receipt, review, test and/or implement IAVAs in a timely manner. Less than 80% of all Contractor supplied Information Assurance documentation is complete, accurate, up-to-date, or NOT available for review on the network.

ATTACHMENT 3

CUSTOMER INPUT FOR AWARD FEE DETERMINATION

The Special Operations Forces - Support Activity (SOFSA) is providing all customers the opportunity to participate in evaluating the contractor's performance. Your evaluation and comments as a valued SOFSA customer are important and will be used to help determine the amount of award fee earned by the contractor during the current performance period. Please complete the following evaluation, and return the completed form to:

Customer Name: _____
 Date: _____
 Organization: _____
 Telephone: _____
 E-Mail Address: _____
 Government SOFSA POC: _____

For Use by SOFSA Personnel

For each question circle one letter. These letters correspond to the adjectival rating found on the last page. Write in the box the numeric rating provided to describe each part's overall rating. Comments are required for Unacceptable and Excellent ratings.

Scale:

	E - Excellent
	G - Good
	A - Acceptable
	M - Marginal
	U - Unacceptable

AREA A. TECHNICAL PERFORMANCE OF WORK

1.0 Project/Program Requirements. Project/program requirements refer to management's ability to track schedule progress at all levels and meet established milestones, accurately identify schedule problems, and efficiently and effectively initiate corrective actions. The contractor is timely and responsive in their actions. The contractor is able to identify problems, causes, and solutions that have a potential for impact on cost, schedule, performance, and overall program improvement. This area includes, but is not limited to, systems engineering, configuration management, technical data, technical support, integrated logistics support, teamwork, and customer relations.

How satisfied are you with the Contractor's:

1. Ability to meet your work requirement(s)?	E G A M U
2. Responsiveness/promptness in providing replies to your inquiries or concerns?	E G A M U
3. Ability to provide solutions or adapt to changes?	E G A M U
4. Technical knowledge and ability of contractor personnel?	E G A M U
5. Performance in developing statement of work? (understanding your needs)	E G A M U
6. Ability to deliver work requirement(s) in accordance with the agreed schedule?	E G A M U
7. Professional attitude of personnel?	E G A M U
8. Rapport with customers in the field? (customer relations)	E G A M U
9. Commitment to mission?	E G A M U

Overall Rating on Project/Program Requirements. (Use numeric rating from page 1, which corresponds best to your overall response to the questions for this area.)

	Comments in support of rating: _____

2.0 *Project/Program Cost Control/Containment.* Cost control is concerned with how the contractor controls costs and prevents cost growth or overrun in order to contribute to the success of the projects/program. Actual costs vs. cost estimates (CEs) refer to how well the contractor’s actual costs on negotiated projects vary from the negotiated cost estimates. Contractor is effective and efficient in utilizing financial resources and in controlling or reducing costs.

How satisfied are you with the Contractor’s:

1. Performance in meeting cost projections in the cost estimate?	E G A M U
2. Accuracy of cost data provided? (actuals)	E G A M U
3. Cost containment/avoidance?	E G A M U
4. Recommendations for greater productivity?	E G A M U

Overall Rating on Project/Program Cost Control/Containment (Use numeric rating from page 1 which corresponds best to your overall response to the questions for this area.)

	Comments in support of rating: _____

3.0 *Project Estimating.* Contractor prepares program cost estimates and schedule data that provides clear Government visibility into current and forecast program costs and schedules. Cost estimates are accurate within fidelity ranges, reasonable, timely and responsive. Forecasts are accurate, cost variances outside the fidelity range are fully explained, and contractor proposes cost effective approaches to problem solving. Contractor takes initiative to identify potential cost/schedule/funding issues in order to prevent cost growth or overrun. Contractor provides cost reductions to the government through sound management.

How satisfied are you with the Contractor’s:

1. Performance in developing cost estimates?	E G A M U
2. Ability to understand requirement?	E G A M U
3. Timeliness of estimate?	E G A M U
4. Performance in providing understandable cost estimates?	E G A M U

Overall Rating on Project Estimating (Use numeric rating from page 1 which corresponds best to your response to the questions for this area.)

	Comments in support of rating: : _____

AREA C. Quality Assurance

2.0 *Project Quality.* The contractor must possess the ability to identify problems, causes, and provide solutions for individual projects without impact on schedule and performance. The contractor shall assure that documentation and traceability for each project is adequate; the product meets specifications; and is fully operational when delivered. Shipments shall be complete and accurate. The contractor’s management must utilize quality assurance information systems, inspection results, discrepancy material reporting, corrective action system, cost of quality reports, and internal/external quality deficiency reports to maintain product quality.

How satisfied are you with the Contractor’s:

1. Quality of product/service/assets?	E G A M U
2. Delivery of a fully operational and complete product?	E G A M U
3. Technical data package?	E G A M U
4. Ability to meet product specifications?	E G A M U

SOLICITATION NO. USZA22-03-D-0006

SECTION J

ATTACHMENT 06

Overall Rating on Project Quality (Use numeric rating from page 1 which corresponds best to your overall response to the questions for this area.)

Comments in support of rating: _____

**CUSTOMER INPUT FOR AWARD FEE DETERMINATION
SCALE AND DEFINITIONS**

EXCELLENT PERFORMANCE: [REDACTED]

Contractor's performance is consistently noteworthy and provides significant, tangible and intangible benefits to the Government. The few areas for improvement are all minor. There are no recurring problems.

GOOD PERFORMANCE: [REDACTED]

Contractor's performance meets and, in most instances, exceeds the requirements. Although some areas may require improvement, these are offset by better performance in other areas.

ACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE: [REDACTED]

Contractor's performance meets tangible and intangible benefits to the Government. There are several areas that need improvement in order to enhance performance.

MARGINAL PERFORMANCE: [REDACTED]

Contractor's performance meets the requirements only part of the time. Although some areas may require improvement, these are offset by better performance in other areas.

UNACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE: [REDACTED]

Contractor's performance often fails to meet requirements with few tangible benefits to the Government. Contractor's performance overall is inadequate and inconsistent. Corrective actions have not been taken or are ineffective. Potentially adverse program impact is foreseen. Although there are areas of good or better performance, these are more than offset by lower performance in other areas.

ATTACHMENT 4

PERFORMANCE MONITOR EVALUATION REPORT

Office Symbol: _____

Date: _____

Performance Monitor: _____

AREA - A – TECHNICAL PERFORMANCE OF WORK (41%)

1.0 Project/Program Requirements:

Summary of Requirements:

Adjectival Rating _____ % Rating _____

2.0 Project Cost Control/Containment:

Summary of Requirements:

Adjectival Rating _____ % Rating _____

3.0 Cost Estimating:

Summary of Requirements:

Adjectival Rating _____ % Rating _____

ATTACHMENT 4

PERFORMANCE MONITOR EVALUATION REPORT

Office Symbol: _____

Date: _____

Performance Monitor: _____

AREA - B – BUSINESS MANAGEMENT (26%)

1.0 Contract Management:

Adjectival Rating _____ % Rating _____

Summary of Requirements:

2.0 GFP/GFE Use/Management:

Adjectival Rating _____ % Rating _____

Summary of Requirements:

3.0 Competition/Subcontract Management:

Adjectival Rating _____ % Rating _____

Summary of Requirements:

4.0 Contract Cost Control/Containment:

Adjectival Rating _____ % Rating _____

Summary of Requirements:

ATTACHMENT 4

PERFORMANCE MONITOR EVALUATION REPORT

Office Symbol: _____

Date: _____

Performance Monitor: _____

AREA - C – QUALITY ASSURANCE (21%)

1.0 Quality Assurance Program

Adjectival Rating _____ % Rating _____

Summary of Requirements:

2.0 Project Quality

Adjectival Rating _____ % Rating _____

Summary of Requirements:

AREA - D – MIS/IT SUPPORT (12%)

1.0 Management Information Systems and Network Requirements

Summary of Requirements:

Adjectival Rating _____ % Rating _____

2.0 Maintenance/Operability of Government-Accessed Web Sites and Systems

Summary of Requirements:

Adjectival Rating _____ % Rating _____

3.0 Security

Summary of Requirements:

Adjectival Rating _____ % Rating _____

ATTACHMENT 5

PERFORMANCE MONITOR WEIGHTINGS

Office Symbol: _____

Date: _____

Performance Monitor: _____

AREA A – TECHNICAL PERFORMANCE OF WORK (41%)

1.0 Project/Program Requirements: (____%)

2.0 Project/Program Cost Control/Containment: (____%)

3.0 Project Estimating: (____%)

AREA B – BUSINESS MANAGEMENT (26%)

1.0 Contract Management: (____%)

2.0 GFP/GFE Use/Management: (____%)

3.0 Competition and Subcontract Management: (____%)

4.0 Contract Cost Control/Containment: (____%)

AREA C – QUALITY ASSURANCE (21%)

1.0 Quality System (____%)

2.0 Project Quality (____%)

AREA D – MIS/IT SUPPORT (12%)

1.0 LAN and Web Server Requirements: (____%)

2.0 Maintenance/Operability of
Government-Accessed Web Sites and Systems: (____%)

3.0 Security: (____%)