

QUALITY ASSURANCE SURVEILLANCE PLAN
FOR
GLOBAL BATTLESTAFF AND PROGRAM SUPPORT

Attachment 1
H92222-10-D-0016,
H92222-10-D-0017,
H92222-10-D-0018, and
H92222-10-D-0019

HQ USSOCOM
MACDILL AFB, FL

1. Objective. The objective of this plan is to provide the Primary Contracting Officer Representative (PCOR), all Contracting Officer Representatives (CORS) and any Technical Representatives (TRs) they appoint a formal, effective and systematic surveillance method for monitoring, reporting, evaluating the performance, and providing feedback on the Global Battlestaff and Program Support (GBPS) Services. Additionally, the objective of this plan is to provide the Contractor with the information that the Government team will use to evaluate performance and provide the Contractor feedback on the services provided. This information is provided to enable the Contractor to be a partner with SOCOM in continuously improving the quality of programs and services offered to customers. This QASP has been developed to evaluate Contractor performance while implementing the Performance Work Statement (PWS). It is designed to provide an effective surveillance method of monitoring Contractor performance for each listed objective in the Service Delivery Summary (SDS) under the GBPS contract(s) and task orders. The QASP provides a systematic and consistent method to evaluate the services and products the Contractor(s) are required to furnish. This plan is based on the premise that the Contractor(s), and not the Government, are responsible for management and quality control actions to meet the terms of the contract. The role of the Government in using this QASP is to ensure contract standards are achieved. In this contract the quality control program is the driver for service quality. The Contractor is required to develop a comprehensive program of inspections and monitoring actions. The roles and responsibilities of each of the key stakeholders in this process are located in Section 9.

2. Flow of Process The process for evaluating and reporting Contractors performance under this contract will occur as follows with further details for each step outlined below:

| POC | Task | Timeframe |
|----------------|---|------------------------------|
| Government | Identifies a requirement, creates a Task Order Statement of Objectives (SOO) and identifies possible deliverables | As Required |
| Contractor (s) | Proposes a PWS with SDS items and standards/metrics | As Required |
| COR(s) | Determines methods of surveillance per QASP for ensuring standards are met in accordance with the awarded task order during SOO development | As Required |
| Contractor (s) | Report data as required per PWS for each task order | Monthly |
| COR(s) | Submits performance assesement via PEAC Database | Monthly |
| PCOR | Inputs Annual CPAR for PCO | NLT 15th Day June Each Yr |
| PCO | Submits CPAR to Contractor | NLT 30 June Each Year |
| Contractor (s) | Respond (if desired) to CPAR report | Within 30 days |
| Government | Assesses CPAR reports and Individual Task Order Assessments when determining to exercise an option period | As Required |

2.1 Task Order Procedures, Section H. When the Government has a requirement for work to be performed it will be outlined in a Government Statement of Objectives (SOO) which will normally include (1) Purpose; (2) Scope or mission; (3) Period and place of performance; (4) Background; (5) Performance objectives, *i.e.*, required results; (6) Any operating constraints, and (7) the below task order SDS tailored to the requirement if necessary. In response to the Government's SOO, contractors are responsible for proposing a PWS. The PWS will be performance-based IAW FAR 37.602 to the maximum extent practical for the requirement.

Contractors will include the task order SDS table from the SOO in all PWS submissions. The SDS performance metrics/thresholds will be completed by each Contractor for each task order. Contractors may also add objectives and corresponding metrics or provide explanation for deletion of objectives or metrics/SDS items for consideration that are applicable to that specific task order. All additions must be incorporated within the predetermined five categories of the SDS; no new categories will be added.

2.1.1 Basic Contract PWS SDS. Metric/Performance threshold numbers at the contract level performance thresholds apply for only contract level submission requirements. Task order level performance thresholds will be established at the task order levels (See 2.1.2).

| Contract Level Service Delivery Summary | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| Category | SDS - Objective | Metric – Performance Threshold | Method of Evaluation |
| Quality of Service | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are reports/data accurate? • Does the Contractor's work measure up to commonly accepted technical or professional standards? • What degree of Government technical direction was required to solve problems that arise during performance? • Were there any OCI concerns? • Were there any security violations? • Was the Contractor responsive to the PCO and ACO? • Was the Contractor's solution to problems timely and effective? • Is the Contractor's integration and coordination of all activities needed to execute the contract adequate - specifically the timeliness, completeness and quality of problem identification, corrective action plans, and proposal submittals? • Did the Contractor submit quality task order proposals and were they competitive at the task order level? • Does the Contractor maintain SIPRNet capability in off-site facilities when required? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No security violations acceptable. 100% Compliance. • No OCI violations acceptable. 100% compliance • Contract level reports and data submitted accurately and on time per PWS 90% of the time • Contractor's SIPRNET services will be available to the customer at least 85% of the operating hours during a calendar month. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% Inspections through EOD checks, and periodic surveillance by CORs • KO evaluates number of task orders awarded per contractor |
| Schedule | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the Contractor provide timely response to time-sensitive requirements, including short notice requirements and a large number of requirements in a short period (surge capability)? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No more than 5 late documents per year and no more than 2 working days late unless extension was granted. No more than | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PCO receives feedback from CORs through task order performance reports IAW QASP, and other |

| | | | |
|--------------------|--|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the Contractor provide accurate, current and complete data and reports that met the required timeline? • Did the Contractor submit task order proposals and modification requests on time? | two sets of corrections/ edits and all corrections must be accomplished within 5 working days for contract level requirements | <p>end users feedback, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PCO also evaluates objectives at the contract level through day to day interaction with the prime Contractors as well as consideration of Contract Specialist feedback |
| Cost Control | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the Contractor effective in forecasting, managing, and controlling contract cost: • Does the Contractor keep within the total estimated cost? • Recent audit results, maintaining approved accounting and purchasing systems? • Have overhead costs increased substantially? • Did the Contractor do anything innovative that resulted in cost savings? • Were billings current, accurate and complete? • Are the Contractor's budgetary internal controls adequate? • Did the Contractor do anything innovative that resulted in a cost savings? • Was the Contractor competitive offering fair and reasonable prices for task order competitions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The relationship of the negotiated costs and budgeted costs to actuals over awarded tasks remains within proposed ceilings • Maintains approved accounting and purchasing systems • Favorable audit results with only minor corrections necessary • Process improvement or change in providing support saved the Government time or money | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results of Audits by DCAA • Review of approved DCMA provisional rates from year to year • Review of cost proposals • Review of savings information provided by Contractor in final report • Review of Proposal Evaluation Information |
| Category | SDS - Objective | Metric – Performance Threshold | Method of Evaluation |
| Business Relations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the Contractor's integration and coordination of all activities needed to execute the contract adequate - specifically the timeliness, completeness and quality of problem identification, corrective action plans, proposal submittals, the Contractor's history of reasonable and cooperative behavior (to include timely identification of issues in controversy), customer satisfaction, timely award and management? • Include, as applicable, information on the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the Contractor customer oriented? • Is interaction between the Contractor and the Government satisfactory or does it need improvement? • Is the Contractor responsive to the PCO, the ACO? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No more than 5 validated customer complaints from the CORs within a task order period of performance. A subjective assessment by the PCO based upon if the performance is a systemic concern or just a focus of a small number of task orders. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PCO receives feedback from CORs through task order performance reports IAW QASP, and other end users feedback, and monthly PEAC data and other reports from CORs and Customers • PCO also evaluates objectives at the contract level through day to day interaction with the prime Contractors including consideration of Contract Specialist feedback |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| Management of Personnel | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How effective has the Contractor's performance been in selecting, retaining, supporting, and replacing, when necessary, qualified personnel? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Contractor effectively retains personnel with the appropriate levels of education, experience and expertise to accomplish the range of requirements described in the PWS/TO. The Contractor maintains a stable workforce without disruption of service in order to maintain continuity of services. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PCO receives feedback from CORs through task order performance reports IAW QASP, and other end users feedback, etc. PCO evaluates objectives at the contract level through day to day interaction with the prime Contractors including consideration of Contract Specialist feedback |
| Other, Meeting Small Business Subcontracting Requirements. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did the Contractor meet the requirements for subcontracting in Section H? Were efforts taken to ensure early identification of subcontract problems and the timely application of corporate resources to preclude subcontract problems from impacting overall prime Contractor performance Were the prime Contractor's demonstrated efforts devoted to developing and managing subcontracts effective? Were the subcontractors integrated as part of the prime Contractor's team? Is the prime Contractor growing its small business partners to become more capable (processes, financial capability, etc) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meets requirements in Section H.21 (30%) Any subcontracting issues addressed to the prime by the ACO are handled by the prime | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of data base submissions Review of ESRS submissions Review of task order proposals and number of task orders awarded based on competition between all prime Contractors |

2.1.2 Task Order Level SDS (Specific performance thresholds will be included as part of the Contractor's specific task order proposal and evaluated per Section H) Every proposed PWS will include the below SDS.

| Task Order Level Service Delivery Summary | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| Category | SDS - Objective | Metric – Performance Threshold(SAMPLE) | Method of Evaluation |
| Quality of Service | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the Contractor's performance conform to contract and task order requirements, specifications and standards of good workmanship (e.g., commonly accepted technical, professional, environmental, or safety and health standards)? For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are reports/data accurate? Does the product or service provided meet the standards for each applicable SDS item? Does the Contractor's work measure up to commonly accepted technical or professional standards? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contractor receives no more than <insert # of complaints> formal customer complaints/contract discrepancy reports per year for each task order. Contractor successfully resolves any customer complaint within <insert # of days> working days of receipt or less time as specified in the task order. No security violations acceptable. 100% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> COR selects from surveillance methods in QASP |

| | | | |
|-------------------------|---|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What degree of Government technical direction was required to solve problems that arise during performance? • Were there any security violations? | <p>Compliance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All reports and deliverables submitted accurately and on time X% of the time | |
| Schedule | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the Contractor accomplish tasks and delivery of products within schedule timelines, milestones, delivery schedules and administrative requirement? • Are requirements/deliverables completed in an accurate, timely manner in compliance with task order PWS requirements? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No more than X late documents per year and no more than X working days late. No more than two sets of corrections/ edits and all corrections must be accomplished within X working days or other such time periods as established in the task order. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of deliverables, feedback from Leadership on quality of submittals. |
| Cost Control | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the Contractor manage task order resources within funding constraints? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Labor hour execution • Travel funds • Material funds • Did the Contractor do anything innovative that resulted in a cost savings? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Execution within X % of budgeted resources, (delete this metric for FFP task orders) • Must accommodate fact of life changes and increases within scope • Execution of innovative solution resulted in savings (time, task order cost, extension of services, etc.) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly reports depicting actual execution vs. budget |
| Business Relations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the Contractor oriented toward the customer? • Is interaction between the Contractor and the Government satisfactory or does it need improvement? • Were products and/or services provided timely, complete? • Was the quality of problem identification and corrective action plans, if applicable, focused on customer satisfaction? • Did the Contractor personnel exhibit reasonable and cooperative behavior? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contractor receives no more than <insert # of complaints> formal customer complaints/contract discrepancy reports per year for each task order. Contractor successfully resolves any customer complaint within <insert # of days> working days of receipt or less time as specified in the task order. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • COR selects from surveillance choices in QASP |
| Category | SDS - Objective | Metric – Performance Threshold | Method of Evaluation |
| Management of Personnel | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How well did the Contractor select, retain, support, ensure training over time as required, and replace, when necessary, task order personnel. • For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How well did the Contractor match the qualifications of any key or SME positions, as described in the contract, with the person who filled the key position? • Did the Contractor support key personnel, SMEs and Action Officers so they were able to work effectively? • If a key person did not perform well, what action was taken by the Contractor to correct this? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No more than <insert # of violations> total validated violations. Upon notice of violation, Contractor shall immediately correct or establish acceptable corrective action plans within <insert # of days> working days. • No more than <insert # of required corrections. Total validated changes as a result of not following current policy or processes or having appropriate skill | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • COR selects from surveillance choices in QASP |

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If a replacement of a key person was necessary, did the replacement meet or exceed the qualifications of the position as described in the contract schedule? • Were off-site personnel effectively utilized? | set for position | |
|--|---|------------------|--|

The proposed performance standards establish the performance level required by the Government to meet the contract requirements. The standards shall be measurable and structured to permit an assessment of the Contractor's performance. The Government will evaluate the proposed standards to determine if they meet the Government's needs.

2.2. Methods of Surveillance/Metrics of Measurement Definitions and Descriptions. At the task order level critical SDS items and the standards at which the Government expects them to be performed at in support of the overall task order will be utilized in measuring the Contractor performance as it relates to the performance categories in CPARS. The methods that may be utilized by the COR to determine whether the standards have been met are as follows:

- a. **Customer Complaints.** Any customer receiving unacceptable service or sub-standard products/services should immediately submit notification to the COR. The COR will conduct an investigation to determine the validity of the complaint upon receipt. If the COR determines the complaint as invalid, he will document the written complaint of the findings and notify the customer. If the complaint is validated the COR shall verbally notify the Contractor's Task Leader or Point of Contact (POC) of the complaint. The Contractor shall be given an appropriate time frame (depending on the discrepancy identified) after notification to correct the unacceptable performance. The COR will inform the customer of the approximate time the discrepancy(s) will be corrected. A discrepancy will not be recorded if proper and timely correction of the unacceptable conditions(s), product or service is accomplished or thresholds listed in para 2, Service Delivery Summary, have not been breached. If the Contractor disagrees with complaint after investigation and challenges the validity of the complaint, the Contractor will notify the COR (see recommendation below). The Contractor shall return a written document, properly completed with actions taken, to the COR, who will file a copy of the complaint for future recurring performance. If the issue is not resolved at the COR level it will be elevated to the PCO for resolution and then on to the Ombudsman if necessary as the last course of appeal.
- b. **Periodic Surveillance.** The frequency of periodic surveillance is determined by the COR and any appointed TR. For any specific task order, the frequency of periodic inspections shall be at least monthly; it could be daily, weekly, or every two weeks. The CORs may use the review of Contractor submitted reports as a periodic method also, but it may not be the only method.
- c. **Other Methods.** CORs may utilize other methods in the performance of their duties in assessment of Contractor performance may include but are not limited to; first hand reviews of products/deliverables or feedback from reviewers/acceptors

applicable to that task order, notifications of security (either via End of Day (EOD) checks or reported by the Security management office (SMO)) or OCI violations, interactions with Contractor employees, feedback from Leadership, etc. As with CPARs the performance assessment is still highly subjective, however, negative performance issues will be documented in the COR files.

2.3 Performance Assessment. Task Order performance assessments will be provided by the Contracting Officer Representative (COR) who may utilize feedback from Technical Representatives (TR) (if formally appointed) based upon the specific objectives and standards outlined in the awarded task order SDS. This assessment will be input into the Performance Evaluation and Analysis for Contracts (PEAC) database on a monthly basis not later than the 10th working day of the month preceding the period (month) being evaluated. The COR will receive a notice when the contractor's task leader (or designee) has submitted the contractor assessment in PEAC. They will then review the contractor assessment and input their own assessment.

2.4 The monthly COR performance assessments provided at the task order level will be utilized by the PCO as the basis of the annual task order performance evaluations. Additionally, the PCO will input a contract level performance assessment for each prime Contractor utilizing the contract SDS objectives and in accordance with the same rating definitions outlined below. The final annual report (via CPARs) will be the subjective assessments for an overall direct (task order) rating and PCO rating at the contract level after consideration of all task order evaluations and contract level evaluations. (see relative weights in para 8)

2.5 Contract Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS). CPARS will be updated at least annually documenting Contractor performance for this specific contract as previously addressed above. More frequent updates may be made as required to document a significant improvement or degradation of the level of contract performance. The Assessing Official Representative (AOR) will be the PCOR if assigned; the Assessing Official (AO) will be the PCO; and the Reviewing Official will be appointed in the event of a disagreement between the Government and the Contractor evaluations for final resolution. Normally the reviewing official will be the SOAL PDAE. The CPAR system allows for all Contractors to provide input on their assessment within 30 days after it is input. Definitions of ratings from CPARS that will be utilized by the COR, PCOR, and PCO are as follows:

2.5.1 Performance Definition Ratings used at Contract and Task order Levels (Directly from CPARS)

2.5.2 Blue/Exceptional

Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds many to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the Contractor were highly effective. To justify an Exceptional rating, identify multiple significant events and state how they were of benefit to the Government. A singular benefit, however, could be of such magnitude that it alone constitutes an Exceptional rating. Also, there should have been NO significant weaknesses identified.

2.5.3 Purple/Very Good

Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds some to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the Contractor was effective.

To justify a Very Good rating, identify a significant event and state how it was a benefit to the Government. There should have been no significant weaknesses identified.

2.5.4 Green/ Satisfactory

Performance meets contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the Contractor appear or were satisfactory. To justify a Satisfactory rating, there should have been only minor problems, or major problems the Contractor recovered from without impact to the contract.

There should have been NO significant weaknesses identified. Per DoD policy, a fundamental principle of assigning ratings is that Contractors will not be assessed a rating lower than Satisfactory solely for not performing beyond the requirements of the contract.

2.5.5 Yellow/ Marginal

Performance does not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed reflects a serious problem for which the Contractor has not yet identified corrective actions. The Contractor's proposed actions appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented. To justify Marginal performance, identify a significant event in each category that the Contractor had trouble overcoming and state how it impacted the Government. A Marginal rating should be supported by referencing the management tool that notified the Contractor of the contractual deficiency (e.g., management, quality, safety, or environmental deficiency report or letter).

2.5.6 Red/ Unsatisfactory

Performance does not meet most contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains a serious problem(s) for which the Contractor's corrective actions appear or were ineffective.

To justify an Unsatisfactory rating, identify multiple significant events in each category that the Contractor had trouble overcoming and state how it impacted the Government. A singular problem, however, could be of such serious magnitude that it alone constitutes an unsatisfactory rating. An Unsatisfactory rating should be supported by referencing the management tools used to notify the Contractor of the contractual deficiencies (e.g., management, quality, safety, or environmental).

3. Performance Management and Option Exercises Contract Level (Section H). The final step in this process is to utilize all data in determining whether it is in the best interest of the Government to exercise the contract option period. Prior to exercising the option period, the Government will review each Contractor's performance based upon information obtained from all the evaluation areas in CPARS including meeting the contractual subcontracting requirements. At the time of review, if the PCO determines that a Contractor's performance is an overall unsatisfactory after compiling all data, the Government will not exercise the option period on that specific contract. If at the time of review the PCO determines that a Contractor's

performance to that point is satisfactory, the Government may unilaterally exercise the option period on that contract if all other FAR requirements concerning exercise of options are met.

4. Disputes. Attempts will be made to resolve all disputes arising under this plan using the Alternate Dispute Resolution (ADR) as outlined in FAR 33.214. The objective is to increase the opportunity mutually agreeable resolutions to disputes that are relatively inexpensive and expeditious. If no resolution can be made under ADR, the PCO shall be notified for a final decision. Accordingly, if there is a dispute with PEAC regarding a performance assessment between the Contractor Lead and the COR, the PCO will be the final dispute authority and input a final assessment in PEAC.

5. COR and TR training and appointments. All CORs and TRs will be properly trained prior to being formally appointed in accordance with DFARS, DOD policy, SOCOM policy, and Section G of this contract.

6. Revisions to this QASP. Revisions to this Plan are the joint responsibility of the PCOR and PCO. The PCO will consider the feedback and recommendations from each prime Contractor. This is a living document that can be changed at any time. It is recommended that yearly, the PCO, PCOR, CORs of primary customers and the Contractors review this document in tandem in order to update the surveillance requirements and suggestions of measures to further ensure quality services are being delivered by all parties.

7.0 Continuous Feedback at the lowest levels. On-going feedback by the CORs and Contractor personnel should be done at the lowest levels in accordance with the contract Business Rules regarding the flow of this process. The basic premise is that on-going performance feedback and addressing issues at the task order levels between the COR and the Contractor is essential in the providing quality performance of this contract. CORs should not wait until it is time to submit a formal evaluation to the PCOR and PCO to address concerns with performance.

8.0 Performance Evaluation and Analysis for Contracts (PEAC) Database: This web-based database for performance documentation will be utilized for inputting performance data, review of current performance data, and assessing and retrieving information regarding performance data. It can be accessed at <http://apps2.socom.mil/PEAC/signin.aspx> or through the GBPS portal site at <https://sof.socom.mil/sites/SORDAC/GBPS/Pages/default.aspx>.

The performance assessment process will begin with the Contractor task leads (or designee) who will input the self assessment performance ratings for their specific task order. The CORs will be able to view the self assessment provided, utilize any or none of the information provided by the contractor and will finalize their assessment. On a yearly basis IAW Contract Requirements, the PCOR (if appointed) and PCO will gather all performance data for the year in question, assign an overall task order level rating and input the contract level performance assessment.

The PCO produces the annual CPAR based upon the data received at both the task order and contract level for the year, including input from the PCOR. Relative weights will be assigned at the task order levels and contract levels as follows:

Task order Level: Quality of Service: 30% Schedule: 15% Cost Control: 10% Business Relations: 20% Management of Personnel: 25%

Contract Level: Quality of Service: 15% Schedule: 5% Cost Control: 20% Management of Key Personnel: 25% Business Relations: 20% Small Business Management: 15%

All task order inputs will be rolled up for one task order rating using the following table;

| Adjectival Rating | Range of Evaluation Rating | Description |
|----------------------|----------------------------|-------------|
| Exceptional (Blue) | (91-100) | See above |
| Very Good (Purple) | (81-90) | See above |
| Satisfactory (Green) | (71-80) | See above |
| Marginal (Yellow) | (61-70) | See above |
| Unsatisfactory (Red) | (59-60) | See above |

The Task order roll-up weighting for the CPAR rating and is worth: 50%

Contract is the weighting for the CPAR rating is worth: 50%

9.0 The following organizational structure is established for administering the QASP processes of the contract.

9.1. SORDAC Acquisition Transformation Office (SORDAC-AT)

- a. The ATO will provide the Primary Contracting Officer Representative (PCOR) The primary responsibilities are:

- (1) Assist in reviewing services requirements
- (2) Provide contract level performance input to the PCO
- (3) Consolidating annual evaluations of Contractor performance through reviews with the Contracting Officer's Representatives (CORs).
- (4) Acts as the Assessing Official Representative in the CPAR system.

- (5) Provides and tracks training of all appointed Contracting Officer Representatives

9.2. Procuring Contracting Officer (PCO)

- a. The primary responsibilities of the PCO are:

- (1) Maintaining official contract file and performance evaluations.
- (2) Provide performance ratings on contract level metrics
- (3) Adjudicate disputes or complaints not resolved at the COR level
- (4) Acts as the Assessing Official in the CPAR system

9.3. Contracting Officer's Representative(s) (COR)

a. The COR responsibilities are:

- (1) Develop Task order Statements of Objectives
- (2) Provide Technical evaluations (Task Order Management and PWS) of all proposals to include proposed metrics/performance thresholds
- (3) Determine the methods of evaluations they will utilize per QASP
- (4) Monitoring, evaluating and assessing Contractor performance in assigned areas.
- (5) Provide monthly performance assessments in the PEAC database on their respective task order per the QASP