

<b>AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT</b>				I. CONTRACT ID CODE M - FPAF	PAGE OF PAGES 1 of 2
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. P00065		3. EFFECTIVE DATE <b>30 JUN 2003</b>		4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.	
6. ISSUED BY ASC/ENVK CODE FA8623		7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6) CODE FA8631			
USAF/AFMC AERONAUTICAL SYSTEMS CENTER BLDG. 1801 10TH STREET SUITE 2 WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB OH 45433-7626 GAIL M. PORUMB (937) 255-3187 GAIL.PORUMB@WPAFB.AF.MIL		AF PLANT 42 ASC/DET 1 (AFMC) 2503 EAST AVENUE P PALMDALE CA 93550-2196			
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, county, State and ZIP Code) PYRAMID SERVICES, INC 115 SOUTH FLORIDA AVE ALAMOGORDO NM 88310 (505) 434-0239				(X) MAILING DATE  <b>JUN 30 2003</b>	
CODE OTLA5 FACILITY CODE				9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO.	
				9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11)	
				10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO. F33657-99-C-0021	
				10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13) 28 APR 2000	
<b>11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS</b>					
<input type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers <input type="checkbox"/> is extended, <input type="checkbox"/> is not extended.					
Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods:					
(a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning _____ copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. <b>FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER.</b> If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.					
12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)					
<b>13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATION OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS, IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.</b>					
(X) A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: ( ) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. ITEM 10A.					
B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation data, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).					
C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:					
X D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority) AFMC FAR 5352.216-9003(d)					
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is not, <input type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.					
14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)					
SUBJECT: Incorporate Revised Award Fee Plan (Attachment 3)					
CHANGE IN PRICE: NONE					
CHANGE IN OBLIGATION: NONE					
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.					
15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)			16A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)		
			GAIL M. PORUMB Contracting Officer		
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR		15C. DATE SIGNED		16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	
				BY  27 Jun 03	
(Signature of person authorized to sign)				(Signature of Contracting Officer)	

1. Contract F33657-99-C-0021 is hereby modified pursuant to AFMC 5352.216-9003(d) Attachment 3 is hereby replaced in its entirety.

2. The contract is specifically modified as follows:

*a. The following clauses are changed in Section I:*

**AFMC 5352.216-9003 AWARD FEE (AFMC) (Jul 1997)**

Para (a), Dollar Amount is 'Up to \$876,568 in any 12 month contract period. For Options 4 and 5 (Each 6 months) if exercised the maximum amount is \$438,234.'

Para (e), Number of pages '23'

*b. The following attachment/exhibit(s) are modified in Section J:*

**Attachment 3 AWARD FEE PLAN**

3. All other contract terms and conditions remain unchanged and in full force and effect as a result of this modification.

**AWARD FEE PLAN**  
**FOR**  
**AIR FORCE PLANT 42 OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE CONTRACT**

**Revised 19 Jun 03**

**APPROVED:**



**AERONAUTICAL SYSTEMS CENTER**  
**DIRECTOR OF ENGINEERING**  
**FEE DETERMINING OFFICIAL**

**DATE: JUN 27 2003**

**Table of Contents**

<b><u>Section</u></b>	<b><u>Title</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
1.0	Introduction	3
2.0	Organization	4
3.0	Responsibilities	4
4.0	Award Fee Process	5
5.0	Award Fee Plan Change Procedure	6
6.0	Contract Termination	6

**Annexes**

<b><u>Annex</u></b>	<b><u>Title</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
1	Award Fee Organization	7
2	Award Fee Allocation by Evaluation Periods	8
3	Evaluation Criteria	9
3a	Management	9
3b	Engineering Services	12
3c	Telecommunications/Information Management	14
3d	Maintenance	15
3e	Fire Protection	17
3f	Security Guard Force Services	20
3g	Cost Accounting and Control	22

## **AWARD FEE PLAN**

### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

This award fee plan details the basis for which the Air Force will perform an evaluation of the Air Force Plant (AFP) 42 Operations and Maintenance (O&M) contractor's performance. It also provides the outline for presenting an assessment of that performance to the Fee Determining Official (FDO). The specific criteria and procedures used to assess the contractor's performance and to determine the amount of award fee earned are described herein. All FDO decisions regarding the award fee, including but not limited to: the amount of the award fee, the methodology used to calculate the award fee; the calculation of the award fee; the contractor's entitlement to the award fee; and the nature and success of the contractor's performance, shall not be subject to the "Disputes" clause nor reviewed by any Board of Contract Appeal (BCA), court, or other judicial entity. There is one evaluation period every 6 months for the duration of this contract, except for the first evaluation period, which is 5 months full contractor effort plus a 1 month transition. The award fee pool for each contract period is based on a maximum of 8 percent of the fixed price O&M Contract Line Item Numbers (CLINs), including options, if exercised, for that contract period. There will be no rollover of any un-awarded fees to a subsequent period. [Effective with Option 3, the maximum award fee pool for a 12 month period shall be \\$876,568.00.](#) All decisions by the FDO are final (see AFMCFARS 5352.216-9003, Award Fee, Jul 97).

The award fee process is recognized to be subjective in nature, but every effort will be made to assure fairness. The process is explicit enough to allow the contractor an opportunity to understand how the award amount can be earned. Contractor performance, as assessed by the performance monitors, will form the basis for the award fee earned. Notice of deficiencies in performance will be provided to the contractor in a timely manner. Upon fee award, the government will advise the contractor of the rationale for the award fee determination.

The award fee will be provided to the contractor through contract modification and is in addition to the fixed price provisions of the contract. The amount of award fee earned and payable will be determined by the FDO based upon review of the contractor's performance against the criteria set forth in this plan. The FDO may unilaterally change this plan prior to the beginning of an evaluation period. The contractor will be notified in writing of changes to the plan by the Contracting Officer (CO) before the start of the new evaluation period. Changes to the award fee plan that are applicable to a current evaluation period will be incorporated by mutual consent of both parties.

### **2.0 ORGANIZATION**

The award fee organization consists of: the FDO, an Award Fee Review Board (AFRB), and the performance monitors. The FDO, AFRB members, and performance monitors are listed in Annex 1.

### 3.0 **RESPONSIBILITIES**

a. **Fee Determining Official.** The FDO approves the award fee plan and any significant changes. The FDO reviews the recommendation(s) of the AFRB, considers all pertinent data, determines the earned award fee amount for each evaluation period and notifies the contractor in writing of the amount of the fee awarded for the evaluation period, with a description of the contractor's performance, strengths, and weaknesses. The FDO also appoints the AFRB Chairman and approves the members of the AFRB.

b. **Award Fee Review Board.** The AFRB, as a minimum, consists of a chairman, CO, and recorder. Additional membership may include personnel from key functional organizations. AFRB members review performance monitors' evaluation of the contractor's performance, consider all information from pertinent sources, prepare interim performance reports, and arrive at an earned award fee recommendation to be presented to the FDO. The AFRB will also recommend changes to the award fee plan. AFRB membership is listed in Annex 1.

c. **AFRB Chairman.** The AFRB chairman conducts the AFRB and acts as the general advisor to the FDO. The AFRB chairman approves minor changes to the award fee plan that do not require FDO approval.

d. **AFRB Recorder.** The AFRB recorder is responsible for coordinating the administrative actions of the performance monitors, the AFRB, and the FDO, including: (1) receipt, processing, and distribution of evaluation reports from all required sources; (2) scheduling and assisting with meeting internal evaluation milestones such as briefings; and (3) accomplishing other actions required to ensure the proper execution of the award fee plan.

e. **Contracting Officer.** The CO acts as the liaison between contractor and Government personnel. Transmits the FDO letters to the contractor. Prepares and distributes the modification awarding the fee authorized by the FDO. Notifies the contractor in writing of any change(s) to the award fee plan, after FDO/AFRB Chairperson approval.

f. **Performance Monitors.** Continually evaluate the contractor's performance in specifically assigned areas of responsibility. Provide evaluation inputs and support preparation of the interim report and final evaluation report/briefing which support conclusions reached concerning the contractor's performance. Maintain open, honest, and frequent communication with the contractor. Recommend changes to the award fee plan.

### 4.0 **AWARD FEE PROCESSES**

a. **Available Award Fee Amount.** The earned award fee will be paid based on the contractor's performance during each evaluation period. The award fee pool for each contract period is based on a maximum of 8 percent of the fixed price O&M CLINs, including options, if exercised for that contract period. Effective with Option 3, the maximum award fee pool for a 12 month period is \$876,568.00. The available award fee for each evaluation period is shown in Annex 2.

b. **Evaluation Criteria.** The areas of evaluation to be measured are listed in Annex 1 and will be measured using the criteria in Annex 3. The contractor shall be entitled to receive, in any evaluation period, an award fee commensurate with the overall performance rating within the following ranges:

Excellent	91-100%
Very Good	71-90%
Satisfactory	50-70%
Unsatisfactory	zero

If the CO does not give specific notice in writing 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 award fee evaluation period. Any changes to evaluation criteria will be made by revising Annex 3 and notifying the contractor.

c. **Interim Evaluation Process.** The AFRB recorder notifies each AFRB member and performance monitor 45 calendar days before the midpoint of the evaluation period. Performance monitors submit their evaluation reports to the AFRB 30 calendar days after this notification. The AFRB reviews the interim evaluation reports. As a result, the AFRB Chairperson will send an interim performance evaluation and notify the contractor of the strengths and weaknesses for the current evaluation period. Further, the interim evaluation report provides recommendations for improvements in the weak areas, if any. The CO may also issue letters, at any other time, when it is deemed necessary to highlight areas of government concern. This interim evaluation report will not result in a determination of an award fee. At this time, the AFRB may also recommend any significant changes to the award fee plan for FDO approval to be effective the next award fee period.

d. **End-of-Period Evaluations.** The AFRB recorder notifies each AFRB member and performance monitor 15 calendar days before the end of the evaluation period. Performance monitors submit their evaluation reports to the AFRB 30 calendar days after the end of the evaluation period. The AFRB prepares its evaluation report and recommendation for an award fee percentage. The AFRB briefs the evaluation report and recommendation to the FDO within 60 calendar days after the end of the evaluation period. The FDO determines the overall performance rating and earned award fee amount for the evaluation period within 75 calendar days after each evaluation period. The FDO will send a letter informing the contractor of the earned award fee amount within 90 days after the end of the evaluation period. The CO issues a unilateral contract modification authorizing payment of the earned award fee amount within 30 calendar days after notification to the contractor of the FDO's decision. A contractor debrief will be granted upon request.

e. **Contractor's Self-Assessment.** The contractor may submit a written self-evaluation of his performance to the CO within 5 working days after the end of the evaluation period. This written assessment by the contractor may be used by the AFRB to assist in the award fee evaluation. The contractor's self-assessment may not exceed 10 single sided pages.

## **5.0 AWARD FEE PLAN CHANGE PROCEDURE**

All significant changes to the award fee plan, including weighting of factors, will be forwarded to the FDO for approval. The contractor can also propose changes to this plan. All proposed changes will be evaluated by the AFRB and, if approved, submitted to the FDO for final approval. The AFRB Chairperson may approve minor administrative changes. Upon approval, the CO shall notify the contractor in writing of any change(s). Unilateral changes may be made to the award fee plan if the contractor is provided written notification by the CO before the start of the upcoming evaluation period. Changes affecting the current evaluation period must be by mutual agreement of both parties.

## **6.0 CONTRACT TERMINATION**

If the contract is terminated for the convenience of the Government after the start of an award fee evaluation period, any award fee amount earned for that period shall be determined by the FDO using the normal award fee evaluation process. After termination for convenience, the remaining award fee amounts allocated to all subsequent award fee evaluation periods cannot be earned by the contractor and, therefore, shall not be paid.

**ANNEX 1 (19 Jun 03)**

**AWARD FEE ORGANIZATION**

Members

Fee Determining Official: Director, Engineering *ASC/EN*

Award Fee Review Board Chairperson: Chief, Environmental, Safety, and Health Division *ASC/ENV*

Award Fee Review Board Members:

Detachment 1 Commander	<i>Det 1/CC</i>
Administrative Contracting Officer	<i>Det 1/CO</i>
Procuring Contracting Officer	<i>ASC/ENVK</i>
Recorder (AFP 42 IPT Administrative Specialist)	<i>ASC/ENV</i>
Facilities Staff Member (AFP 42 IPT Lead)	<i>ASC/ENVP</i>

Award Fee Review Board Advisors	
Financial Management Staff Member	<i>ASC/ENVF</i>
Contracting Staff Member	<i>ASC/ENVK</i>
Judge Advocate Staff Member	<i>AFMC LO/JAN</i>

**Performance Monitors**

<b><u>Area of Evaluation</u></b>	<b><u>Performance Monitor(s)</u></b>	<b><u>Weight</u></b>
Management	<i>Det 1/PKI</i>	22%
Cost Control	<i>Det 1/PKI</i> <i>ASC/ENVK</i>	8%
Technical Operations (Engineering Services)	<i>Det 1/CE</i>	4%
Technical Operations (Telecommunication/Information Management)	<i>Det 1/IM</i>	8%
Technical Operations (Maintenance)	<i>Det 1/AM</i>	16%
Technical Operations (Fire Protection)	<i>Det 1/SE</i>	22%
Technical Operations (Security Guard Force Services )	<i>Det 1/SF</i>	20%

***Should the Operations and Maintenance Security Guard Force Services Option not be exercised, the weightings shall be re-allocated to maintain a total weighting of 100%.***

**ANNEX 2**

**AWARD FEE ALLOCATION BY EVALUATION PERIODS**

The award fee earned by the contractor will be determined at the completion of evaluation periods shown below. The percentage shown corresponding to each period is the maximum available award fee percentage that can be earned during that particular period.

<b>Contract Period</b>	<b>Evaluation Period</b>	<b>From</b>	<b>To</b>	<b>% of Award Fee Available for Contract Period*</b>	<b>Associated FPAF CLINs**</b>	<b>Award Fee</b>
Basic	1	1-Aug-00	31-Dec-00	30%	0002, 0003, 0007, 0008	8% of FPAF CLINs
	2	1-Jan-01	30-Jun-01	70%		
Option 1	3	1-Jul-01	31-Dec-01	50%	0009, 0010, 0013, 0014	8% of FPAF CLINs
	4	1-Jan-02	30-Jun-02	50%		
Option 2	5	1-Jul-02	31-Dec-02	50%	0015, 0016	8% of FPAF CLINs
	6	1-Jan-03	30-Jun-03	50%		
Option 3	7	1-Jul-03	31-Dec-03	50%	0021, 0022	\$876,568.00
	8	1-Jan-04	30-Jun-04	50%		
Option 4	9	1-Jul-04	31-Dec-04	100%	0027, 0028, 0031, 0032	\$438,284.00
Option 5	10	1-Jan-05	30-Jun-05	100%	0033, 0034, 0037, 0038	\$438,284.00

The CO will notify the contractor of any changes in writing before the relevant period is started and the award fee plan will be modified accordingly. After an award period begins changes may only be made by mutual agreement of the parties.

\* The award fee will be computed in dollars using the percentages shown of the award fee pool. There is one evaluation period every 6 months for the duration of this contract, except for the first evaluation period. The first evaluation period is 5 months with an available pool of 30 percent. Evaluation period two will compensate for the lower award fee percentage and have an available award fee pool of 70 percent. Evaluation periods three through eight will have an available award fee pool of 50 percent of the total award fee pool available for that contract option period (12 months). Evaluation periods nine and ten correspond to contract periods of 6 months. Therefore the award fee pool available for those periods will be 100 percent of the total award fee pool for that contract period.

\*\* The maximum amount available for award fee is limited to a maximum of 8 percent of the fixed price O&M CLINs , including fixed price options if exercised for that contract period. **Effective with Option 3, the maximum award fee that can be eared in any 12 month period is \$876,568.00. For Options 4 and 5, each six months the maximum award fee for the period shall be \$438,284.00.**

**ANNEX 3a**  
**EVALUATION CRITERIA**  
**Management**  
**1 May 03**

**UNSATISFACTORY**

1. The contractor failed to identify problems and provide alternative solutions in a timely manner. Solutions, if implemented, had a negative impact on cost and performance of operations. Program planning does not contain logical flow of activities, and no status or visible results provided. The contractor required continuous Government intervention to identify potential problems and implement solutions.
2. The contractor failed to provide qualified personnel with duties, responsibilities and authority necessary to meet PWS requirements in a timely manner. The contractor failed to provide, implement and adhere to an adequate quality control plan.
3. The contractor's submittal of reports, data, and Government requested documentation is late, inaccurate, or incomplete with frequent re-submittals required.
4. No clear lines of effective communication with the Government, other agencies, and within the contractor's internal operation. The contractor failed to establish adequate lines of communication to facilitate timely exchange of information, both technical and contractual in order to meet Performance Work Statement (PWS) requirements.

**SATISFACTORY**

1. The contractor identified problems and provided alternative solutions in a timely manner. Program planning contains a logical flow of activities. Program status and visibility of contract actions are provided through schedules and status of tasks. Solutions were implemented without negative impact on cost and performance of operations. The contractor required some assistance from the Government to identify problems and implement solutions.
2. The contractor provided qualified personnel with duties, responsibilities and authority necessary to meet PWS requirements. An adequate quality control plan was adhered to. The contractor attempted to increase management effectiveness by identifying innovative approaches to improve contractor performance.
3. The contractor's submission of reports, data, and Government requested information is accurate and contains traceable data. Errors in calculation, justifications, missing information, etc, are few, and corrections are timely.
4. The contractor established adequate lines of communication with the Government, other agencies and internally to provide the ability to exchange information, both technical and contractual, in time to meet PWS requirements.

## **VERY GOOD**

1. The contractor identified problems and provided several alternative solutions early in the process with little revision or Government assistance. The Contractor's positive management control over problem areas results in early resolution and minimal program impact. The contractor anticipates new requirements, demonstrating a high level of sensitivity to identifying cost-saving opportunities. The contractor's solutions were implemented with a beneficial impact on cost and contract operations.
2. The contractor provided qualified personnel that have demonstrated the knowledge and expertise necessary to accomplish PWS requirements. The contractor's quality control procedures are effectively and consistently utilized. The contractor increased management effectiveness by promoting and incorporating continuous process improvement and best practices across all functional areas to maximize contractor performance.
3. The contractor's reports, data and documentation is highly accurate, concise and exceed the basic information required by regulation.
4. The contractor established effective internal and external lines of communication to facilitate the timely exchange of information, both technical and contractual in order to meet Performance Work Statement (PWS) requirements.

## **EXCELLENT**

1. The contractor was aggressive and proactive in identifying and anticipating problems prior to adverse impact. The contractor consistently provided well organized, viable and detailed alternatives including risk assessments; trade-off analysis between cost, schedule, and performance, action plans, and implementation schedules. The contractor continues to provide maximum cost saving benefits to the Government with his aggressive application of innovative problem solving techniques.
2. The contractor provided highly qualified personnel with duties, responsibilities, and authority necessary to exceed PWS requirements ahead of schedule. Strong corporate and managerial involvement in the quality control effort was demonstrated by the establishment of corporate quality measurement methods and management evaluation of performance. The contractor took steps to increase quality by use of many of the following tools: training, metrics, continuous process improvement encompassing all functional areas, and self initiated enhancement techniques. The contractor incorporated best practices into every facet of the operation.
3. The contractor's reports are invariably accurate, comprehensive and detailed. Information mandated by regulation exceeds the requirements. The data provided demonstrates exacting attention to detail and a thorough understanding of the contract requirements.

4. The contractor's internal and external lines of communication were well defined, clearly understood, and always facilitated the rapid exchange of information both technical and contractual in order to meet PWS requirements.

**ANNEX 3b**  
**EVALUATION CRITERIA**  
**Technical Operations**  
(Engineering)  
1 May 03

**UNSATISFACTORY**

1. The contractor failed to provide adequate engineering documentation to the government. Less than 80% of the engineering documents submitted were acceptable upon final submission due to incomplete data, inaccurate information, non-practical technical solutions, or project cost data.
2. The contractor failed to complete projects under the direction of the engineering department on schedule and on budget. Less than 80% of the projects were completed on or ahead of schedule.
3. The engineering department completed 69% or less of projects within +/-15% of the estimated costs.
4. There was little or no communication and coordination between the engineer and maintenance personnel resulting in continued poor performance.

**SATISFACTORY**

1. The contractor provided adequate engineering documentation to the government. More than 80% of the engineering documents were acceptable upon final submission.
2. The timeliness of completion of projects under the direction of the engineering department was adequate. More than 80% of the projects were completed on or ahead of schedule.
3. The engineering department completed 70-79% of projects within +/-15% of the estimated cost.
4. There was adequate communication and coordination between the engineer and maintenance personnel resulting in satisfactory performance with only occasional miscommunication.

**VERY GOOD**

1. The engineering documentation provided by the contractor was commendable. More than 90% of the submittals were acceptable upon final submission.
2. The timeliness of completion of projects under the direction of the engineering department was commendable. More than 90% of the projects were completed on or ahead of schedule.

3. The engineering department completed 80-89% of projects within +/-15% of the estimated cost.

4. There was open and frequent communication and coordination between the engineer and maintenance personnel resulting in commendable performance with only very minor miscommunication.

### **EXCELLENT**

1. The engineering documentation provided by the contractor was exceptional. More than 95% of the submittals were acceptable upon final submission.

2. The timeliness of completion of projects under the direction of the engineering department was exceptional. More than 95% of the projects were completed on or ahead of schedule.

3. The engineering department completed 90% or more of projects within +/-15% of the estimated cost.

4. Communication and coordination between the engineering staff and maintenance personnel was seamless resulting in a team approach to the relationship between maintenance and engineering. Performance was exceptional with no miscommunication.

**ANNEX 3c**  
**EVALUATION CRITERIA**  
**Technical Operations**  
(Telecommunications/Information Management)

**UNSATISFACTORY**

The contractor failed to provide adequate technical support and maintenance of telecommunications and information management equipment. The contractor failed to perform modifications, upgrades, and/or enhancements to hardware and software to maintain the AF Plant 42 office automation systems and local area network. The contractor failed to perform inter-plant mail, courier, and photographic services as required. Continuous quality assurance surveillance was required by the government to ensure contracted actions were performed.

**SATISFACTORY**

The contractor provided adequate technical support and maintenance of telecommunications and information management equipment. The contractor adequately performed required modifications, upgrades, and/or enhancements to hardware and software to maintain the AF Plant 42 office automation systems and local area network. The contractor adequately performed inter-plant mail, courier, and photographic services. A normal frequency of government quality assurance surveillance was required to validate performance of the contractor.

**VERY GOOD**

The contractor developed a schedule to ensure technical support and maintenance of telecommunications/information management equipment was conducted to optimize use of existing equipment. The contractor developed a long-term plan to perform modifications, upgrades, and/or enhancements to hardware and software to maintain the AF Plant 42 office automation systems and local area network. The contractor performed inter-plant mail, courier, and photographic services in a professional and responsive manner. A limited frequency of government quality assurance surveillance was conducted by the government to validate performance of the contractor.

**EXCELLENT**

The contractor developed and implemented a preventative maintenance plan providing exceptional technical support and maintenance of telecommunications/information management equipment. The contractor integrated the maintenance plan with a long-term plan to perform modifications, upgrades, and/or enhancements to hardware and software to maintain the AF Plant 42 office automation systems and local area network. The contractor provided outstanding inter-plant mail, courier, and photographic services in a very professional manner. On several occasions the contractor provided personnel to accommodate short notice requirements for courier and photographic services. Government quality assurance surveillance was conducted only to validate the contractor's excellent performance.

**ANNEX 3d**  
**EVALUATION CRITERIA**  
**Technical Operations**  
(Maintenance)  
Revision 1  
1 May 03

**UNSATISFACTORY**

The contractor failed to provide adequate technical support, preventative maintenance, and repair of the airfield lighting and pavement areas, including taxiways, overruns, aprons, hardstands, shoulders, and holding areas. The contractor failed to adequately perform all operations necessary to accomplish maintenance as called for in the contract in accordance with the Normal Maintenance Plan and PWS. The contractor failed to adequately perform all operations necessary to develop and carry out a plan for logging, documenting and billing Landing Fees in accordance with PWS requirements. The contractor failed to adequately perform all operations necessary to adhere to an effective Quality Control Program for maintenance. Continuous quality assurance surveillance was required by the government to ensure contracted actions were performed. Communication within the maintenance department, between maintenance and other departments and with the government was inconsistent with frequent miscommunication.

**SATISFACTORY**

The contractor provided adequate technical support, maintenance and repair of the airfield lighting and pavement areas, including taxiways, overruns, aprons, hardstands, shoulders, and holding areas. The contractor adequately performed all operations necessary to accomplish maintenance as called for in the contract in accordance with the Normal Maintenance Plan and PWS. The contractor adequately performed all operations necessary to develop and carry out a plan for logging, documenting and billing Landing Fees in accordance with PWS requirements. The contractor adequately performed all operations necessary to adhere to an effective Quality Control Program for maintenance. A normal frequency of quality assurance surveillance was required by the government to validate performance of the contractor. Communication within the maintenance department, between maintenance and other departments and with the government was adequate to meet the contract requirements.

**VERY GOOD**

The contractor provided commendable technical support, maintenance, and repair of the airfield lighting and pavement areas, including taxiways, overruns, aprons, hardstands, shoulders, and holding areas. The contractor's performance of all operations necessary to accomplish maintenance as called for in the contract in accordance with the Normal Maintenance Plan and PWS was commendable. The contractor's performance of all operations necessary to develop and carry out a plan for logging, documenting and billing Landing Fees in accordance with PWS requirements was complete and efficient with only minor discrepancies. The contractor's performance of all operations necessary to adhere to an effective Quality Control Program for

maintenance was commendable. A limited frequency of quality assurance surveillance was required by the government to validate performance of the contractor. Communication within the maintenance department, between maintenance and other departments and between the Contractor and the Government was frequent and timely in order to ensure that all parties were able to efficiently meet the contract requirements.

## **EXCELLENT**

The contractor provided exceptional technical support, maintenance, and repair of the airfield lighting and pavement areas, including taxiways, overruns, aprons, hardstands, shoulders and holding areas. The contractor's performance of all operations necessary to accomplish maintenance as called for in the contract in accordance with the Normal Maintenance Plan and PWS was exceptional with no discrepancies. The contractor's performance of all operations necessary to develop and carry out a plan for logging, documenting and billing Landing Fees in accordance with PWS requirements was comprehensive with no discrepancies. The contractor's performance of all operations necessary to adhere to an effective Quality Control Program for maintenance was exceptional. The contractor was extremely proactive suggesting improvements and developing a plan to carry out a comprehensive preventative maintenance program. Quality assurance surveillance was conducted only to validate the contractor's excellent performance. Communication within the maintenance department, between maintenance and other departments and between the Contractor and the Government was exceptional in that all parties worked as a team to ensure exceptional performance of the contract requirements.

**ANNEX 3E**  
**EVALUATION CRITERIA**  
**Technical Operations**  
(Fire Protection)  
Revision 1  
1 MAY 2003

**UNSATISFACTORY**

1. The contractor's performance failed to meet PWS requirements for Fire Protection Services. The contractor's staffing fell below PWS requirements and/or the ACO was not notified immediately when staffing was compromised and/or the approved staffing deviation was not met. Contractor personnel assigned to Fire Protection Service duties failed to possess required equipment in a ready state, credentials or perform duties to a level commensurate with PWS requirements. The contractor failed to maintain an effective training and standardization evaluation program. The contractor failed to maintain an effective Fire Alarm Communication Section. The contractor failed to maintain an effective Fire Alarm monitoring procedures or Facility Fire Inspection procedures. The contractor failed to ensure adequate control and operation of government Furnished Property (GFP) and Government Furnished Equipment (GFE) assigned to the Fire Service. The Contractor's quality assurance surveillance program was ineffective and did not ensure contract requirements were performed. Continuous quality assurance surveillance was required by the government to ensure contracted actions were performed.
2. The contractor failed to properly annotate documentation in the form of technical and/or periodic reports and other deliverable data required by the PWS. Discrepancies were major and required extensive time and effort to correct. Communication within the fire department, between fire and other departments, and between the contractor and the Government was inconsistent with frequent miscommunication.

**SATISFACTORY**

1. The contractor's performance met PWS requirements for Fire Protection Services. The contractor's staffing fell below PWS requirements and the ACO was notified immediately and the approved deviation was met. Contractor personnel assigned to Fire Protection Service duties possessed required equipment in a ready state, the appropriate credentials and performed duties to a level commensurate with PWS requirements with minor discrepancies. The contractor maintained an effective training and standardization evaluation program. The contractor maintains an effective Fire Alarm Communication Section. The contractor maintained effective fire alarm monitoring procedures and facility fire inspection procedures. The contractor ensures adequate control over GFP and GFE assigned to the fire service and in a ready state. The Contractor's quality assurance surveillance findings were effective, resulting in ensuring contract requirements were performed. A normal frequency of government quality assurance surveillance was required to validate performance of the contractor.

2. The contractor properly annotated documentation in the form of technical/periodic reports and other deliverable data required by the PWS. Technical discrepancies were minor and took limited time and effort to correct. Communication within the fire department, between fire and other departments, and between the Contractor and the Government was adequate to meet the requirements of the PWS.

## **VERY GOOD**

1. The contractor's performance of PWS requirements for Fire Protection Services was commendable. Whenever the contractor's staffing fell below PWS requirements, the ACO was notified immediately and the approved deviation was met within the allotted time. Contractor personnel assigned to Fire Protection Service duties possessed required equipment, which were continuously maintained in a ready state and appropriate credentials were retained. The contractor's personnel were well trained, ensuring contract requirements were performed with only minor discrepancies successfully using the Training and Standardization Evaluation process. The contractor maintained a commendable Fire Alarm Communication Section and facility fire inspection process with minor discrepancies. The contractor maintained commendable control over GFP and GFE in continuous operational condition with minor discrepancies. The Contractor was proactive and assertive in their quality assurance surveillance process and successful in ensuring contract requirements were performed. Limited frequency of government quality assurance surveillance was conducted by the government to validate performance of the contractor.

2. The contractor provided consistent and properly annotated documentation in the form of technical/periodic reports and other deliverable data with few administrative discrepancies. Communication within the fire department, between fire and other departments, and between the Contractor and the Government was frequent and timely in order to ensure that all parties were able to efficiently meet the contract requirements.

## **EXCELLENT**

1. The contractor's performance of PWS requirements for Fire Protection Services was exceptional. The contractor's recall, holdover, and reassignment process was successful in ensuring proper staffing never fell below PWS requirements. The contractor was proactive in making every effort possible to continually upgrade fire protection equipment, while the equipment on hand was continuously maintained in a ready state. Contractor personnel were well trained and the Training and Standardization Evaluation process was used successfully used by the Contractor to ensure contract requirements were performed with no discrepancies. The contractor maintained an exceptional Fire Alarm Communication Section and facility fire inspection process with no discrepancies. The contractor was proactive in maintaining exceptional control over GFP and GFE and in ensuring the operational condition of the equipment with no discrepancies. The Contractor's quality assurance surveillance findings and process was proactive and comprehensive in ensuring contract requirements were performed. Quality assurance surveillance was conducted by the government only to validate the contractor's excellent performance.

2. The contractor provided consistent and properly annotated documentation in the form of technical/periodic reports and other deliverable data with no discrepancies. All documentation was in a format that was complete, clear, concise, technically accurate and easily understood. Communication within the fire department and between the Contractor and the Government was exceptional in that all parties worked as a team to ensure exceptional performance of the contract requirements.

**ANNEX 3f**  
**EVALUATION CRITERIA**  
**Technical Operations**  
**(Security Guard Force Services)**  
**1 May 03**

**UNSATISFACTORY**

1. The contractor's performance failed to meet PWS requirements. Serious problems existed for which the contractor's corrective actions were ineffective. Contractor personnel assigned to Security Guard Force duties failed to maintain a professional image, ensure required equipment was operational (exception being the weapons), or retain the knowledge to perform duties to a level commensurate with the PWS and Security Forces Procedures Manual. The contractor failed to maintain an effective Training and Standardization Evaluation program to meet the requirements of the PWS. The contractor failed to ensure the Pass and Registration and Reports and Analysis Sections remained efficient to meet PWS requirements. The contractor failed to maintain satisfactory control over government issued weapons/ammunition.
2. The contractor consistently failed to properly annotate documentation in the form of technical/periodic reports and other deliverable data required by the PWS. Discrepancies were major and required extensive time and effort to correct. Communication within the security department, between security and other departments, and between the contractor and the Government was inconsistent with frequent miscommunication.

**SATISFACTORY**

1. The contractor's performance met PWS requirements. Occasional discrepancies, identified by quality assurance surveillance existed. Corrective actions taken by the contractor were satisfactory. Contractor personnel, assigned to Security Guard Force duties, maintained a professional image, ensured required equipment was operational (exception being the weapons), and retained the knowledge to perform duties to a level commensurate with the PWS and Security Forces Procedures Manual. The contractor established an adequate training and standardization evaluation program to meet PWS requirements. The contractor ensured the Pass and Registration and Reports and Analysis Sections remained efficient to meet PWS requirements. The contractor maintained satisfactory control over government issued weapons/ammunition.
2. The contractor properly annotated documentation in the form of technical/periodic reports and other deliverable data required by the PWS. Technical discrepancies were minor and took limited time and effort to correct. Communication within the security department, between security and other departments, and between the Contractor and the Government was adequate to meet the requirements of the PWS.

**VERY GOOD**

1. The contractor's performance of PWS requirements was commendable. Minor discrepancies were identified and corrected by the contractor with no impact on the mission. Contractor personnel, assigned to Security Guard Force duties, presented a very professional image, were well trained, continuously maintained on-hand equipment in a ready state, and the quality of their performance was commendable. The contractor personnel were extensively well trained and the Training and Standardization Evaluation program exceeded PWS requirements. The contractor maintained a commendably efficient Pass and Registration and Reports and Analysis Sections. The contractor maintained very good control over government issued weapons/ammunition.
2. The contractor provided extensive, consistent, and properly annotated documentation in the form of technical/periodic reports and other deliverable data required by the PWS with few administrative discrepancies. Communication within the fire department, between fire and other departments, and between the Contractor and the Government was frequent and timely in order to ensure that all parties were able to efficiently meet the contract requirements.

**EXCELLENT**

1. The contractor's performance of PWS requirements was exceptional. The contractor established a process which allowed for establishment of a proactive management approach including metrics. Contractor personnel assigned to Security Guard Force duties presented a highly professional image. The contractor exhausted every effort possible to continuously upgrade security equipment while continuously maintaining on-hand equipment in a ready state. The Training and Standardization Evaluation program far exceed PWS requirements. Assigned personnel were exceptionally well trained. The contractor maintained an exceptionally efficient Pass and Registration and Reports and Analysis Sections. The contractor maintained exceptional control over government issued weapons/ammunition.
2. The contractor provided exceptional, consistent, and properly annotated documentation in the form of technical/periodic reports and other deliverable data required by the PWS. All documentation was in a format that was complete, clear, concise, technically accurate and easily understood. Communication within the fire department and between the Contractor and the Government was exceptional in that all parties worked as a team to ensure exceptional performance of the contract requirements.

**ANNEX 3g**  
**Evaluation Criteria**  
**Cost Accounting and Control**  
**1 May 03**

**UNSATISFACTORY**

1. The contractor exceeded budget, did not maintain and manage CLIN information and cost data reconcilable to a common database. Vouchers, proposals, cost and schedule reports are unclear, without rationale or justification, and inadequate for technical review and cost analysis. No methodology was used to establish priorities and maintain schedules. The contractor exhibited no control over resource management, and did not meet schedules identified in the contract. The contractor did not identify potential delays, and was unable to adapt to changes in requirements. The Contractor remained passive about increases in health and welfare benefit increases.

**SATISFACTORY**

1. The contractor maintained budget control, and takes measures to adjust budget as needed. The contractor's CLIN data and cost reports meet the minimum standards for technical review. Vouchers, proposals, cost and schedule reports are adequate. Cost and schedule variances are identified and corrected in a timely manner. A milestone tracking system has been identified and implemented. The contractor was able to adapt to requirements changes with only minor impacts. The contractor's use of resources is adequate to meet contract schedule. The Contractor attempted to find ways to hold down the increasing costs of health and welfare.

**VERY GOOD**

1. The contractor's effective budget management system produces cost information that is logical, and clearly based on contract requirements. Baseline cost integrity is constantly maintained, and all changes are thoroughly explained. Well documented vouchers and CLIN cost data are provided, with justifications and rationale clearly documented. Schedule changes are analyzed for potential impact, risks communicated to the Government, and early corrective action is implemented to reduce impact. The contractor plans and executes procedures that meet requirements ahead of schedule with no adverse impact on cost or performance. Resources are utilized to maximum benefit. The contractor researched ways to hold down the costs of health and welfare, establishing a line of communication with the unions. Research and attempts and successes at holding down the cost of health and welfare were communicated frequently to the Government.

**EXCELLENT**

1. The contractor consistently submits high quality cost and schedule forecasts. The contractor's funds reports and requirements projections are extremely accurate and ahead of schedule. The contractor's CLIN management system anticipates cost problems and provides viable, innovative cost effective approaches. The contractor provides extremely early communication to the

Government any potential program or schedule risks, and supplies alternative solutions to eliminate or minimize the identified risks. The contractor aggressively seeks ways to avoid cost problems, and completes milestones well ahead of schedule. Highly effective use of resources reflects superior foresight into planning and forecasting. The contractor established a team approach with employees, union officials, and government officials for the purpose of finding ways to control the costs of health and welfare. All parties were kept abreast of opportunities and successes in controlling health and welfare costs.