

Award Term Plan

For

**NATO IMPROVED LINK ELEVEN (NILE)
IN SERVICE SUPPORT (ISS)**

N00039-13-R-0010

SUBMITTED:

APPROVED:

Mark R. Schneider 19 DEC 2012 *Mark G. Goy* 12/19/2012
Procuring Contracting Officer **Term Determining Official**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.0	Introduction	3
2.0	Organization	3
3.0	Responsibilities	3
4.0	Award Term Evaluation Process	4
5.0	Award Term Plan Change Procedure	5

ANNEXES

<u>Annex</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
1	Award term Organization	5
2	Evaluation Criteria/Weighting	5
3	Award term Allocation by Evaluation Periods	6
4	Award term Evaluation Methodology	7

AWARD TERM PLAN

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Award Term Plan is the basis to evaluate contractors' performance and to present an assessment of that performance to the Term Determining Official (TDO). This plan describes specific criteria and procedures used for assessing contractors' performance and for determining award terms earned or lost. The TDO will utilize the performance assessment information generated under this plan to determine whether the contractor has earned award terms or lost previously earned award terms. All TDO decisions and the methodology used to determine award terms are unilateral actions made solely at the discretion of the Government.

The contract awarded under this solicitation will have a one-year base period, two one-year option periods and the potential to earn two years of award terms. Any award terms earned will be reflected in unilateral contract modifications based upon determinations by the TDO. Award terms earned by the contractor may be cancelled by the Government if the requirement no longer exists, funding is unavailable, the contract is terminated, or the award term is lost by the contractor's evaluated substandard performance. This plan may be changed during contract performance according to the procedures detailed in paragraph 5.0.

2.0 ORGANIZATION

The award-term organization includes the TDO and an Award-Term Review Board (ATRB) consisting of a Chairperson, the Contracting Officer, other technical participants, and advisory members. Annex 1 provides additional detail on the organization.

3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES

a. Term-Determining Official. The TDO approves the award-term plan and any major changes to it. The TDO reviews the recommendations of the ATRB, considers all pertinent data, and determines whether award terms are earned or lost for each evaluation period. The TDO may designate an alternate to act in his/her place should the need arise.

b. Award-Term Review Board Chairperson. The ATRB Chairperson chairs the meetings of the ATRB and appoints members of the board. The ATRB Chairperson briefs the TDO on the contractor's overall performance and recommends whether award terms should be earned or lost. He/she also recommends award term plan major changes to the TDO, if necessary.

c. Award-Term Review Board Members. ATRB members evaluate the contractor's performance, consider all information from pertinent sources including the contractor's self-assessments and prepare a report supporting their recommendation to the TDO, as to whether award terms should be earned or lost. The ATRB will also draft recommended changes to this plan, if necessary.

d. Procuring Contracting Officer (PCO). The PCO is the liaison between contractor and Government personnel. Subsequent to the TDO decision, the PCO modifies the contract period of performance, as necessary, to reflect the decision. The PCO may make minor changes to this plan and to Annexes of this plan without prior TDO approval.

4.0 AWARD-TERM EVALUATION PROCESS

a. Evaluation System. The Contractor Performance Assessment Report System (CPARS) will be utilized to assess the contractor's performance for award term purposes on this contract. CPARS normally covers twelve months of performance, beginning on the date the contract is awarded. Evaluation criteria are listed in Annex 2 and correspond to the five areas evaluated in CPARS. Evaluation criteria and their relative weight may change during the life of the contract. Changes to evaluation criteria will be handled in accordance with paragraph 5.0. Award terms may be earned during the first formal assessment; however, none are available to lose. Should an unsatisfactory rating occur during the first assessment period, termination for default, rather than loss of non-existent award terms may result.

b. Interim Evaluations. Interim evaluations may be conducted approximately six months prior to the end of the formal evaluation period, or at other times at the discretion of the TDO. Interim evaluations are advisory, providing mid-year performance feedback, and will not result in earning or losing award terms. A contractor self-assessment may be submitted for the interim evaluation. If an interim evaluation is conducted, the ATRB will prepare their evaluation of the contractor's performance no later than six months prior to the end of the formal evaluation period using the CPARS format. Upon completion of the interim evaluation, the ATRB will prepare a brief summary report of the contractor's strengths and weaknesses and provide it to the contractor in a timely manner. TDO approval of an interim evaluation and summary report is not required. Proposed changes to the award term plan may be raised at this point. The PCO may notify the contractor at any time it is deemed necessary to highlight areas of government concern about their performance.

c. Formal Annual Assessments. Formal assessments will be conducted annually, beginning at the end of the first year of contract performance. The annual assessment may result in the contractor earning or losing (except in year one) a one-year award term, or may result in no change to the term of the contract. The ATRB will formally assess the contractor's performance for each evaluation period listed in Annex 3, using CPARS documentation. The Contractor shall submit self-assessments to the PCO no later than 30 days after the end of each formal evaluation period. The self-assessment should be consistent with contractor rebuttal information provided via CPARS, if any, and may not exceed five pages. The ATRB Chairman, at his/her discretion, may convene forums with selected contractor and government personnel to clarify performance issues.

The ATRB formal assessment report shall support a recommendation to the TDO whether award terms should be earned or lost. The ATRB Chairman shall brief the assessment report and recommendation to the TDO. The TDO shall determine the overall assessment ratings and award terms earned or lost. The PCO will provide written notification to the contractor of the TDO's decision and modify the contract period of performance accordingly to reflect the TDO's decision.

5.0 AWARD-TERM PLAN CHANGE PROCEDURE

Either Government or contractor representatives may propose changes to the award-term plan. The Government may make unilateral changes to the plan for evaluation periods that have not already begun. All contractor proposed changes, and any changes proposed to take effect in evaluation periods that have already begun, will be bilaterally negotiated. The PCO will provide written notification of plan changes to the contractor prior to the changes taking effect. If the PCO does not give written notice to the contractor of any change to the evaluation criteria prior to the start of a new evaluation period, then the same criteria listed for the preceding period will be used in the following evaluation period.

ANNEX 1 AWARD TERM ORGANIZATION

Members

Term Determining Official:	NILE Project Manager
Award Term Review Board Chairperson:	NILE Deputy Project Manager
Award Term Review Board Members:	
4-6 Representatives	NILE Program Management Office
PCO	Code 2.1

The above are mandatory members. Representatives from Counsel, the Small Business Office and others may serve as non-voting subject matter experts.

ANNEX 2 EVALUATION CRITERIA/WEIGHTING

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Weight</u>
Quality of Product or Service	35%
Schedule	15%
Cost Control	30%
Business Relations	10%
Management of Key Personnel*	10%

* Includes not only all prime personnel, but also subcontractor personnel and achievement of small business subcontracting goals proposed.

ANNEX 3

AWARD TERM ALLOCATION BY EVALUATION PERIODS

The contract awarded under this solicitation will have a one-year base period, two one-year option periods and the potential to earn two years of award terms. The award terms earned by the contractor will be determined after the completion of evaluation periods shown below. Available award terms shown corresponding to each period are the maximum available award term amounts that can be earned during that particular period.

Evaluation Period	From	To	Available Award Terms**
1	Date of Award	12 Months ADA*	1 one-year Award Term
2	Start of Year 2	12 Months Later	1 one-year Award Term
3	Start of Year 3	12 Months Later	1 one-year Award Term

* ADA – After Date of Contract Award

** A net maximum of 2 one-year award terms may be earned. Evaluations will continue even if the maximum number of award terms has already been earned, as subsequent substandard performance may result in loss of previously earned award terms.

As defined in the CPARS Guide, performance will be rated using five adjectives:

- Exceptional
- Very Good
- Satisfactory
- Marginal
- Unsatisfactory

ANNEX 4

AWARD TERM EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The contract will be evaluated using CPARS. Criteria ratings shall be scored as follows:

- Each Exceptional will receive a score of four.
- Each Very Good will receive a score of three.
- Each Satisfactory will receive a score of two.
- Each Marginal will receive a score of one.
- Each Unsatisfactory will receive a score of zero.

- Quality of Product or Service will be multiplied by its weight of 35%
- Schedule will be multiplied by its weight of 15%
- Cost Control will be multiplied by its weight of 30%
- Business Relations will be multiplied by its weight of 10%
- Management of Key Personnel will be multiplied by its weight of 10%

The result will be a single overall score on a four point scale. **For example:**

Quality of Product or Service: Rating – Very Good	3 X 35% = 1.05
Schedule: Rating – Exceptional	4 X 15% = 0.60
Cost Control: Rating - Satisfactory	2 X 30% = 0.60
Business Relations: Rating – Marginal	1 X 10% = 0.10
Management of Key Personnel: Rating – Very Good	3 X 10% = 0.30
Contract Overall Score	<u>2.65</u>

The relationship between the overall score and award terms earned/lost will be as follows:

<u>Overall Score</u>	<u>Award Terms Earned/Lost</u>
3.00 – 4.00	1 one-year term earned
2.00 – 2.99	Nothing earned or lost
< 2.00	1 one-year terms lost*

* Only award terms that have been earned can be lost.