Minuteman MEECN Program Upgrade (MMPU)

Minimum Essential Emergency Communications Network (MEECN)

Award Fee Plan

Attachment 5 to Contract FA8726-07-R-0018

Version 4
26 June 2007

Prepared By:

639 ELSS
5 Eglin Street
Hanscom AFB, MA 01731

APPROVED:

_____

ANITA E. LATIN, Col, USAF
Commander
653d Electronic Systems Group

Contractor: TBD

Table of Contents

1.0 Introduction

1.1 General. This Award Fee Plan is the basis for the Government's evaluation of the contractor's performance on the MMPU contract for purposes of determining earned award fee. It describes specific criteria and procedures used to assess the contractor's performance and to determine the amount of award fee earned. Actual award fee determinations and the methodology for determining award fee are unilateral decisions made solely at the discretion of the Government.

1.2 Award Fee Concept. The purpose of this plan is to facilitate the Government's management and mitigation of risks on the MMPU program. The concept behind this plan is to incentivize superior contractor performance and motivate the contractor to successfully provide a product that meets all technical performance characteristics and functions ahead of schedule and within or under cost. Award fee will be provided to the contractor through contract modifications. Award fee earned and payable will be determined by the Fee Determining Official (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 any evaluation period. The contractor will be notified of any changes to the Plan by the Contracting Officer, in writing, before the start of the affected evaluation period. Changes to this Plan that are applicable to a current evaluation period may be incorporated by mutual consent of both parties.

1.3 Major Performance Evaluation Areas. The MMPU award fee plan (AFP) is event/milestone driven with all award fee periods tied directly to the accomplishment and quality of implementation of significant activities supporting each program milestone as identified in Annex 3. The Government has identified four (4) key events that merit award fee evaluations and incentives in order to reduce major program risks associated with the events. Each event is assigned applicable event exit criteria, event/activities evaluation criteria, and an estimated event completion date. The event exit criteria define what must be accomplished before the award fee evaluation period ends and initiates the award fee evaluation process. The event/activities evaluation criteria define how the contractor's performance will be evaluated for the given award fee period. The event completion date defines the contractual completion date as days after contract award. Each award fee period will end upon either completion of the milestone or the anticipated milestone completion date (Annex 2) which ever occurs first. Subsequent award fee periods cannot commence until the current award fee period has completed.

2.0 Organization

The award fee organization consists of the FDO; an Award Fee Review Board (AFRB) which consists of a chairperson, the contracting officer, a recorder, other functional area participants, and advisor members; and the performance monitors. The FDO, AFRB members, other functional area participants, and performance monitors are listed in Annex 1.

The Program Attorney shall be an advisor to all ESC Award Fee/Award Term Review Boards, review all award fee/award term documentation prior to submission to the FDO, and be invited to all award fee briefings to the FDO.

3.0 Responsibilities

3.1 Fee Determining Official. The FDO is the final decision authority for all award fees allocated for contract performance and approves the Award Fee Plan and any significant changes. The FDO reviews the recommendations of the AFRB, considers all pertinent data, and determines the earned award fee amount for each evaluation period. The FDO will document, in writing, the amount of the award fee awarded for each key event, along with a description of the contractor's strengths, weaknesses and areas for improvement.

3.2 AFRB Chairperson. The AFRB Chairperson is responsible for managing, informing, and leading the AFRB members through the evaluation process. The Chairperson briefs the FDO on the AFRB's recommended earned award fee amounts and the contractor's overall performance, and recommends significant Award Fee Plan changes to the FDO. The Chairperson approves administrative and other Award Fee Plan changes as delegated by the FDO.

3.3 Award Fee Review Board. AFRB members review performance monitors' evaluations of the contractor's performance and the contractor's self-assessment when provided, consider all information from members of the award fee organization, prepare interim performance reports, and arrive at an earned award fee recommendation to be presented to the FDO. The AFRB may also recommend changes to this Plan.

3.4 AFRB Recorder. The AFRB recorder is a non-voting member of the AFRB and is responsible for coordinating all administrative actions required by the FDO, AFRB, and performance monitors, including: 1) receipt, processing, and distribution of evaluation reports from all required sources; 2) scheduling and assisting with internal evaluation events such as meetings and briefings; 3) maintaining the electronic tool (i.e. website) that will be employed to accomplish the above and 4) accomplishing other actions required to ensure smooth operation of the award fee determination process.

3.5 Contracting Officer. The Contracting Officer (CO) is the liaison between contractor and Government personnel. The CO will prepare and distribute unilateral contract modifications for the amount of award fee earned.

3.6 Performance Monitors. Performance monitors maintain written records of the contractor's performance in their assigned evaluation area(s) so that a fair and accurate evaluation is obtained. They prepare interim and end-of-period evaluation reports as directed by the AFRB. Performance monitors may be Government employees, military members, Federally Funded Research and Development Center (FFRDC) personnel, or Government support contractors as appointed by the AFRB chairperson. Any FFRDC or support contractors appointed by the AFRB chairperson will provide acquisition and systems engineering as well as other technical skills as required to perform the duties as performance monitors, AFRB Facilitator, and/or advisors to the AFRB. FFRDC and support contractors are not voting members of the AFRB.

4.0 Award Fee Process

4.1 Available Award Fee Amount. The award fee allocations for each evaluation period are listed in Annex 2. Mitigating circumstances beyond the contractor's control will be considered in the award fee evaluation. The earned award fee will be paid based on the contractor's performance during each evaluation period. Performance that is less than satisfactory is not entitled to any award fee.

4.2 Evaluation Criteria 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 criteria as stated in this plan shall be used for that evaluation period. During an award fee period, evaluation criteria may be changed by mutual written agreement of both the Government and the Contractor.

4.3 Evaluation Feedback. It is the Government's future plan that award fee evaluation information will be captured via use of an automated tool accessible to both parties to 1) capture comments/evaluations as effort progresses; 2) provide the Contractor with insight into feedback, strengths, and areas for improvement; and 3) ease the burden of award fee administration.

4.4 Interim Evaluation Process. The AFRB Recorder notifies each AFRB member and Performance Monitor fourteen (14) calendar days before the midpoint of the evaluation period. Performance Monitors submit their evaluation reports to the AFRB twenty-eight (28) calendar days after this notification. The AFRB and FDO determine the interim evaluation results and notify the contractor of the strength and weaknesses for the current evaluation period. The CO may also issue letters at any other time when it is deemed necessary to highlight areas of Government concern.

4.5 End-of-Period Evaluations. The AFRB Recorder will notify each AFRB member and performance monitor fourteen (14) calendar days before the end of an evaluation period. Performance monitors will submit their evaluation reports to the AFRB Chairperson fourteen (14) calendar days after the end of the evaluation period. The AFRB then prepares its evaluation report and recommendation of earned award fee. The AFRB Chairperson will brief the evaluation and offer a recommendation to the FDO. The FDO will determine the overall grade and earned award fee amount for the evaluation period within forty-five (45) calendar days after each evaluation period. The FDO letter will inform the contractor of the earned award fee amount. The CO will issue a contract modification within fifteen (15) calendar days after the FDO's decision is made authorizing payment of the earned award fee amount.

4.6 Contractor's Self-Assessment. When the contractor chooses to submit a self-evaluation, it must be submitted to the CO within five (5) working days after the end of the interim and end of final evaluation period. This written assessment of the contractor's performance throughout the evaluation period may also contain any information that may be reasonably expected to assist the AFRB in evaluating the contractor's performance. The contractor's self-assessment may not exceed ten (10) pages single-sided. Additionally, the FDO may request an oral presentation by the contractor of the contractor's self assessment.

5.0 Award Fee Plan Change Procedure

The Government may unilaterally change the events in this plan. All significant changes are approved by the FDO; the AFRB Chairperson approves other changes. Examples of significant changes include changing exit criteria, evaluation criteria, adjusting weights to redirect the contractor's emphasis to areas needing improvement and revising the distribution of the award fee dollars. The contractor may recommend changes to the CO no later then thirty (30) calendar days prior to the beginning of the new evaluation period. If approved, the CO shall notify the contractor in writing of any changes. Unilateral changes may be made to the award fee plan by the government/USAF if the contractor is provided written notification by the contracting officer before the start of the upcoming evaluation period. Changes affecting the current evaluation period must be made by mutual agreement of both parties.

6.0 Contract Termination

If this contract is terminated for the convenience of the Government after the start of an award fee evaluation period, the award fee deemed 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.

Termination for default will constitute unsatisfactory performance resulting in zero award fees being earned for the period in which the termination for cause occurred.

ANNEX 1 AWARD FEE ORGANIZATION

Members

Fee Determining Official: Commander, 653rd Electronics Systems Group	653 ELSG/CC
Award Fee Review Board Chairperson: Commander, 639th Electronic Systems Squadron	639 ELSS/CC
Award Fee Review Board Members:	
MMPU Program Manager	639 ELSS
MMPU Deputy Program Manager	639 ELSS
MMPU Contracting Officer	653 ELSG
MMPU Financial Management Staff Member	653 ELSG
Recorder	639 ELSS
MMPU Program Attorney	ESC/JA

Performance Monitors

Program Management	639 ELSS
Contracts	639 ELSS
Configuration Management	639 ELSS
Engineering	639 ELSS
Test	639 ELSS
Cost	639 ELSS
Schedule	639 ELSS
Logistics	639 ELSS
Security	639 ELSS
Manufacturing/QA	639 ELSS
DCMA Representative	DCMA

ANNEX 2 AWARD FEE POOL BY AWARD FEE PERIOD

The award fee earned by the contractor will be determined at the completion of evaluation periods shown below. The percentage and dollars shown corresponding to each period is the maximum available-award-fee amount that can be earned during that particular period. All Cost Plus Award Fee (CPAF) work shall have a base fee component of 3% and the available maximum award fee pool of 9%. Below is the Award fee Allocation table for this contract:

Evaluation Period	From	To	Duration	Cost	Schedule	Tech	PM	Available Award Fee
Award Fee Period I	Beginning of SDD Contract	Closure of PDR or 9 months, whichever is sooner	TBD	10%	10%	40%	40%	15%
Award Fee Period II	End of Award Fee Period I	Closure of CDR or 9 months after Period I	TBD	20%	20%	30%	30%	20%
Award Fee Period III	End of Award Fee Period II	Closure of TRR or 9 months from Period II	TBD	20%	20%	30%	30%	25%
Aware Fee Period IV	End of Award Fee Period III	Closure of PCA or 9 months from Period III	TBD	20%	20%	30%	30%	40%
TOTAL								100%

Figure 1.
Award Fee Pool

ANNEX 3 - SDD EVALUATION CRITERIA (AWARD FEE PERIOD 1)

3-1. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND WEIGHTING

The criteria to be evaluated are listed below along with the relative weights of those criteria.

a. Cost Performance evaluation will be 25% quantitative and 75% qualitative. The quantitative assessment will be based on the contractor's cost performance index as defined in Table 3-1. Qualitative performance will be based on the evaluation criteria defined in Table 3-3.

b. Schedule Performance will be 50% quantitative (Table 3-2) and 50% qualitative (Table 3-4). The quantitative assessment will be based on the contractor's timely completion of milestones as defined by the exit criteria in Table 3-2. The completion criteria for each accomplishment and event or will be defined in Table 3-2. For a scheduled accomplishment or event to be considered complete, the Government must agree that the accomplishment or event is closed in a satisfactory manner in accordance with contract requirements. Each milestone has equal weighting in determining the quantitative score.

c. Technical evaluation will be qualitatively based on the evaluation criteria defined in Table 3-6.

d. Program Management will be qualitatively based on the evaluation criteria defined in Tables 3-7a – 3-7e.

3-2. EVALUATION GRADES

A key element of this award fee program is to motivate the Contractor to control costs so that the work accomplished across the total MMPU contract is completed within the proposed schedule and cost. A further objective is for the Contractor to manage the work authorized within the approved funding for cost/schedule performance using an approved Earned Value Management System (EVMS) and to maximize the Contractor's work within the available funding levels. The cost control progress will be evaluated using EVMS information, and the results will earn the Cost Performance Index (CPI) values shown in Table 3-1.

Table 3-1 Quantitative Cost Performance

Cost Quantitative Performance Ratings	
Cumulative CPI	**Rating**
≥ 1.00	100%
≥ 0.99	95%
≥ 0.98	90%
≥ 0.97	85%
≥ 0.96	80%
≥ 0.95	75%
≥ 0.94	70%
≥ 0.93	65%
≥ 0.92	60%
≥ 0.91	55%
≥ 0.90	50%
< 0.90	0%

Table 3-2: Quantitative Schedule Performance for period 1:

Milestone Event	Baseline Event Date*	% Allocation
Successful completion of Delta SRR	On or before a mutually agreed upon date in approved IMS	30%
Successful completion of IBR	On or before a mutually agreed upon date in approved IMS	30%
Successful completion of Delta PDR	On or before a mutually agreed upon date in approved IMS	40%

Table 3-3: Baseline Event Delay for Period 1

Baseline event date delays	**Maximum Potential Fee Allocation**
≤1 week	**90%**
≤2 weeks	**75%**
≤3 weeks	**50%**
≥ 4 weeks	**0%**

Table 3-4: Qualitative Cost Performance – Cost Performance grade definitions for period 1

	1. Cost Performance				
	Outstanding	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
C1	The contractor provides comprehensive cost management of the program and demonstrates foresight in cost containment management. Costs are at or below planned while successfully achieving all technical performance requirements and completing all work packages as planned.	The contractor provides comprehensive cost management of the program and demonstrates foresight in cost containment management. Costs are consistently at planned levels while successfully achieving all technical performance requirements and completing all work packages.	The contractor provides a comprehensive cost management program and demonstrates foresight in cost containment management. The contractor stays within the cost budgets assigned for each work package with little or no negative cost variance, while successfully completing those work packages.	The contractor provides a comprehensive cost management program. The contractor stays within the overall program cost budget with little negative cost variance and work plan overall.	The contractor's cost control planning is not comprehensive or complete and lacks efficiency with little or no evidence of a logical flow of events. The contractor is unable to contain costs.
C2	The contractor often experiences positive cost variances and no negative cost variances are reported The information reported is always the most current available with extremely accurate (e.g., 98% or better) forecasting of future status and variances when compared to actual performance. The very detailed and extremely accurate reporting provided Government full awareness and understanding of any variance and highest confidence in the performance of CAM reviews. Estimate at completion (EAC) is always updated, timely, and accurate for all work packages.	The contractor experiences some positive cost variances and negative cost variances are rare, with minimal impacts, and always include a complete explanation of the variance as well as contributing factors. Negative cost variances include comprehensive recovery plans that allow recovery without the need for baseline changes to CWBS elements or baseline schedules. The information reported is usually the most current available with highly accurate (e.g., 95%) forecasting of future status and variances when compared to actual performance. The detailed and highly accurate reporting provided the Government awareness and understanding of most variances and high confidence in the performance of CAM reviews. EAC is regularly updated, current, and accurate for all work packages.	Negative cost variances are few and predicted accurately with plans for proactive actions to recover the variances without adversely impacting the overall program baseline. Explanation of cost/schedule variances and baseline changes are comprehensive and track to prior reports. The information reported is often current with very accurate (e.g., 90% to 97%) forecasting of future status and variances when compared to actual performance. The detailed and very accurate reporting provided the Government some awareness and understanding of variances and some confidence in the performance of CAM reviews, requiring some Government requests for clarifications only in areas of highest risk. EAC is regularly updated for most work packages.	Negative cost variances occur, but explanations of cost/schedule variances and baseline changes are generally of sufficient detail to understand the issues and track to prior reports. Cost impacts of program changes can be clearly assessed and appropriate action is taken. No major resource management problems are apparent. The information reported is current and inaccurate (e.g., 80% to 89%) when compared to actual performance. The minimal detail and accurate reporting provided the Government minimal awareness and understanding of variances and little confidence in the performance of CAM reviews, requiring frequent Government requests for clarifications to fully understand program baseline performance and cost variances. EAC is periodically updated for most work packages.	Negative cost variances are common, and explanations of cost/schedule variances or baseline changes contain little or no detail. The information reported is not current and accurate (e.g., less than 80%) when compared to actual performance. The absence of detail and inaccurate reporting provided the Government no confidence in the performance of CAM reviews and necessitated frequent Government queries for clarification or amplification to thoroughly understand cost variances. EAC is rarely updated for work packages.

	1. Cost Performance				
	Outstanding	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
C3	The contractor implements cost avoidance activities and there are significant reductions in actual direct costs below contract estimated costs. The contractor initiatives significantly reduced total ownership costs through architecture, design, or other measures that provide significant operations or sustainment reductions in overall life cycle costs.	The contractor implements cost avoidance activities and there are substantive reductions in actual direct costs below contract estimated costs. The contractor initiatives substantively reduced total ownership costs through architecture, design, or other measures that provide substantive operations or sustainment reductions in overall life cycle costs.	The contractor implements cost avoidance opportunities and there are some reductions in actual direct costs below contract estimated costs. The contractor identifies fully documented opportunities for substantively total ownership cost reductions through recommended changes to architecture, design, or other measures that could provide substantive operations or sustainment reductions in overall life cycle costs.	The contractor implements cost avoidance opportunities so that negative cost impacts are contained within the overall baseline. The contractor identifies opportunities for substantively total ownership cost reductions via suggestion to the Government for investigation and action that could provide substantive operations or sustainment reductions in overall life cycle costs.	The contractor does not implement cost avoidance opportunities, thus negative impacts to costs are not predicted in advance and/or avoided. The contractor does not explore or identify methods for decreasing total ownership costs.

Table 3-5: Qualitative Schedule Performance – Schedule Performance grade definitions for period 1

	1. Schedule Performance				
	Outstanding	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
S1	The contractor provides extremely comprehensive schedule management of the program as well as accurate and complete real time reporting available to the Government via an Integrated Digital Environment (IDE). The contractor always provides the critical path, shows schedule performance trends, and includes extremely accurate forecasting through the next milestones and out to EAC. The contractor manages at all levels with a single, fully integrated program schedule that encompasses all of the work performed in a sound comprehensive manner. All Technical Performance Indicators (TPIs) trace to the IMS to illustrate product performance and accomplishments. Schedule shows all dependencies on other programs, includes extremely reliable predictions of reuse product integration, and anticipates potential problems with deliveries in time for resolution without negative program impacts.	The contractor provides highly comprehensive schedule management of the program as well as accurate and complete real time reporting available to the Government via an IDE. The contractor usually provides the critical path, shows schedule performance trends, and includes highly accurate forecasting through the next milestones and out to EAC. The contractor manages at most levels with a single, fully integrated program schedule that encompasses most of the work performed in a sound comprehensive manner. All key TPIs trace to the IMS to illustrate product performance and accomplishments. Schedule shows most dependencies on other programs, includes highly reliable predictions of reuse product integration, and anticipates potential problems with deliveries in time for resolution without negative program impacts	The contractor provides very comprehensive schedule management of the program as well as accurate real time reporting available to the Government via an IDE. The contractor often provides the critical path, shows schedule performance trends and includes very accurate forecasting through the next milestones and out to EAC. The contractor manages at some levels with a single integrated program schedule that encompasses some of the work performed in a sound comprehensive manner. T Most key TPIs trace to the IMS to illustrate product performance and accomplishments. Schedule shows some dependencies on other programs, includes very reliable predictions of reuse product integration, and anticipates potential problems with deliveries in time for resolution without negative program impacts	The contractor provided adequate reporting of IMS information in real time available to the Government via an IDE. The contractor provides adequate critical path, performance trend and forecasting through the next milestones and out to EAC. The contractor adequately manages an integrated program schedule that encompasses the key work performed in a sound comprehensive manner. Some key TPIs trace to the IMS to illustrate product performance and accomplishments. Schedule illustrates and supports management of program dependencies and product reuse.	The contractor rarely provided adequate reporting of IMS information or real time reporting available to the Government via an IDE. The contractor provides inadequate critical path, performance trend and forecasting through the next milestones and out to EAC. The contractor inadequately manages an integrated program schedule that rarely encompasses the key work performed in a sound comprehensive manner. Key TPIs rarely trace to the IMS to illustrate product performance and accomplishments. Schedule does not support management of program dependencies and product reuse.

	1. Schedule Performance				
	Outstanding	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
S2	All required changes to IMS dates are coordinated first through the IPT (including Government membership) prior to reporting to both respective program managers. The Government has extremely high confidence (95% or above) in the contractor's schedules as well as the contractor's ability to satisfy technical requirements and complete all planned work packages within those schedules.	All required changes to IMS dates are coordinated first through the IPT (including Government membership) prior to reporting to both respective program managers. The Government has very high confidence (90% or above) in the contractor's schedules as well as the contractor's ability to satisfy technical requirements and complete all planned work packages within those schedules.	All required changes to IMS for key event dates are coordinated first through the IPT (including Government membership) prior to reporting to both respective program managers. The Government high confidence (85% or above) in the contractor's schedules as well as the contractor's ability to satisfy technical requirements and complete all planned work packages within those schedules.	Most changes for key event dates are coordinated first through the IPT (including Government membership) prior to reporting to both respective program managers. The Government has a reasonable degree of confidence (75% or above) in the contractor's schedules as well as the contractor's ability to satisfy technical requirements and complete all planned work packages at or very near those schedules.	The contractor does not provide consistent coordination for IMS changes and frequently has inaccuracies or mistakes in the program schedule. Schedule maintenance and visibility are poor.
S3	Contractor schedule deliverables are complete, accurate, without inconsistencies or omissions (e.g., "TBD"), of extremely high quality in all aspects, satisfy all contractual requirements, and are always on or regularly ahead of schedule.	Contractor schedule deliverables are complete, accurate, on time, without inconsistencies or omissions (e.g., "TBD"), of high quality in all aspects, and satisfy all contractual requirements.	Contractor schedule deliverables are complete, accurate, on time, without inconsistencies or omissions, of very good quality in all aspects, and satisfy all contractual requirements.	Contractor schedule deliverables are complete with minimal inconsistencies or omissions, and are of good quality in all aspects. Late or incomplete deliverables are rare and do not hamper Government reviews and approvals or have adverse impacts to the program schedule.	Contractor often fails to deliver schedule deliverables on time, delivers incomplete products, delivers products with errors and inaccuracies, and generally provides poor quality resulting in additional Government review time and resources. Poor quality of schedule products results in adverse impacts to the program.
S4	The IMS includes all risk trigger points and all risk program updates are integrated into the IMS within one update cycle. The IMS always project the additional schedule risk for delayed implementation of risk mitigation strategies and actions.	The IMS includes high and medium risk trigger points and most risk program updates are integrated into the IMS within one update cycle. The IMS often projects the additional schedule risk for delayed implementation of risk mitigation strategies and actions.	The IMS includes high risk trigger points and key risk program updates are integrated into the IMS within one update cycle. The IMS sometimes projects the additional schedule risk for delayed implementation of key risk mitigation strategies and actions.	The IMS includes key risk trigger points and key risk program updates are integrated into the IMS within no more than two update cycles. The IMS rarely projects the additional schedule risk for delayed implementation of key risk mitigation strategies and actions.	Contractor fails to include key risk trigger points and risk program updates are not integrated into the IMS within two update cycles. The IMS never projects the additional schedule risk for delayed implementation of key risk mitigation strategies and actions.

	1. Schedule Performance				
	Outstanding	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
S5	All IBR material is complete, comprehensive, well described and documented, accurate, easily traceable to the lowest level of work performed, and delivered to the Government at least fourteen (14) days prior to the IBR. Only administrative revisions required to the IMS after completion of the IBR and require no more than two days to be resolved. All CDRL items in support of the IBR (e.g., SEMP, SDP, HDP, FDP) are delivered and fully comply with the data item requirements.	Most IBR material is complete, comprehensive, well described and documented, accurate, easily traceable to the lowest level of work performed, and delivered to the Government at least fourteen (14) days prior to the IBR. Substantive revision required to the IMS and resolved to the satisfaction of the Government within one (1) week following IBR. All CDRL items in support of the IBR (e.g., SEMP, SDP, HDP, FDP) are delivered and most fully comply with the data item requirements.	Key IBR material is complete, accurate, well documented, and available to the Government, at least fourteen (14) days prior to the IBR. Substantive revision required to the IMS and resolved to the satisfaction of the Government within three (3) weeks following IBR. Majority of CDRL items in support of the IBR are delivered and substantially comply with the data item requirements.	Key IBR material is complete and available for Government review seven (7) days prior to the IBR. Substantive revision required to the IMS and resolved to the satisfaction of the Government within five (5) weeks following IBR. CDRL items in support of the IBR adequately comply with the data item requirements.	Key IBR material is incomplete or unavailable for Government review seven (7) days prior to the IBR. Substantive revision required to the IMS and resolved to the satisfaction of the Government more five (5) weeks following IBR. CDRL items in support of the IBR delivered late and only minimally comply with the data item requirements.
S6	The contractor's development schedules for software, hardware, firmware, product integration, and development test are very detailed and representative of very well thought out plans that are demonstrative of thorough consideration of all schedule drivers. These detailed development schedules are always proven to be accurate predictors of schedule performance when compared to actual performance.	The contractor's development schedules for software, hardware, firmware, product integration, and development test are detailed and representative of well thought out plans that are demonstrative of thorough consideration of all schedule drivers. These detailed development schedules are regularly proven to be accurate predictors of schedule performance when compared to actual performance.	The contractor's development schedules for software, hardware, firmware, product integration, and development test are somewhat detailed and representative of good plans that are demonstrative of consideration of key schedule drivers. These detailed development schedules are usually proven to be accurate predictors of schedule performance when compared to actual performance.	The contractor's development schedules for software, hardware, firmware, product integration, and development test are sometimes representative of adequate plans that sometimes consider some key schedule drivers. These detailed development schedules are sometimes proven to be accurate predictors of schedule performance when compared to actual performance.	The contractor's development schedules for software, hardware, firmware, product integration, or development test are rarely representative of adequate plans that sometimes consider some key schedule drivers. These detailed development schedules are rarely proven to be accurate predictors of schedule performance when compared to actual performance.

Table 3-6: Qualitative Technical Performance – Technical Performance grade definitions for period 1

	1. Technical Criteria				
	Outstanding	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
T1	Contractor completes requirements analysis and requirements allocation with full bidirectional traceability of all requirements in an industry standard electronic requirements database from the Technical Requirements Document (TRD) to the lowest level hardware and software Configuration Item (CI) specifications, including full bidirectional traceability between unclassified and classified data bases. All specifications are delivered complete, accurate, without omissions and inconsistencies, and with only minor administrative changes required. Contractor has fully implemented all CMMI Level 3 or higher practices and goals as specifically tailored for MMP Upgrade for requirements development (RD), requirements management (REQM), requirements validation, configuration management (CM), and technical solution (TS).	Contractor completes requirements analysis and requirements allocation with almost full bidirectional traceability of all requirements in an industry standard electronic requirements database from TRD to lower level hardware and software CI Specifications, including full traceability between unclassified and classified data bases. Most specifications are delivered complete, accurate, without omissions and inconsistencies, and with only minor administrative changes required. Contractor has fully implemented most CMMI Level 3 or higher practices and goals as specifically tailored for MMP Upgrade for RD, REQM, requirements validation, CM, and TS.	Contractor completes requirements analysis and requirements allocation with full bidirectional traceability of all requirements in an industry standard electronic requirements database from TRD to most lower level hardware and software CI Specifications, including some traceability between unclassified and classified data bases. Many specifications are delivered complete, accurate, and without many omissions and inconsistencies. Contractor has largely implemented CMMI Level 3 or higher practices and goals as specifically tailored for MMP Upgrade for RD, REQM, requirements validation, CM, and TS.	Contractor completes requirements analysis and requirements allocation with bidirectional traceability of all requirements in an industry standard requirements database from TRD to most lower level hardware and software CI specifications, including limited traceability between unclassified and classified data bases. Many specifications are delivered complete, accurate, and without many substantive omissions and inconsistencies Contractor implemented minimum CMMI Level 3 practices and goals largely tailored for the MMP Upgrade for RD, REQM, requirements validation, CM, and TS.	Contractor completes requirements analysis and requirements allocation with limited traceability of all requirements in a requirements database from TRD to most lower level hardware and software CI specifications, including no traceability between unclassified and classified data bases. Few specifications are delivered complete, accurate, and without many substantive omissions and inconsistencies Contractor implemented less than minimum CMMI Level 3 practices and goals tailored for MMP Upgrade for RD, REQM, requirements validation, CM, or TS.

	1. Technical Criteria				
	Outstanding	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
T2	Contractor anticipates all technical design/performance risks/opportunities, designs effective mitigation strategies, and follows through on them, eliminating all design/performance problems.	Contractor anticipates all key technical design/performance risks/opportunities, designs effective mitigation strategies, and follows through on them, eliminating all but few minor design/performance problems.	Contractor anticipates all key technical design/performance risks/opportunities, designs effective mitigation strategies, and follows through on them, eliminating all but few design/performance problems.	Contractor anticipates most technical design/performance risks/opportunities, designs reasonable mitigation strategies, and follows through on them, eliminating most design/performance problems.	Contractor fails to anticipate technical design/performance risks/opportunities, to design reasonable mitigation strategies, or to follow through on them, resulting in design/performance problems.
T3	Contractor demonstrates a preliminary (PDR-level) MMP-U design that will meet or exceed all TRD performance requirements. Contractor has conducted comprehensive and consistent supporting design analyses, and has factored all their results into the MMP-U design.	Contractor demonstrates a preliminary (PDR-level) MMP-U design that will meet all TRD performance requirements. Contractor has conducted comprehensive and consistent supporting design analyses, and has factored key results into the MMP-U design.	Contractor demonstrates a preliminary (PDR-level) MMP-U design that will meet all TRD performance requirements. Contractor has conducted critical supporting design analyses, and has factored key results into the MMP-U design.	Contractor demonstrates a preliminary (PDR-level) MMP-U design that will meet all TRD performance requirements. Contractor has conducted most supporting design analyses, and has factored most results into the MMP-U design.	Contractor failed to demonstrate a preliminary (PDR-level) MMP-U design that will meet all TRD performance requirements.
T4	Contractor presents a preliminary security architecture that satisfies all security performance requirements, with no unresolved issues. Security design documentation is complete, accurate, and consistent, and has completed all required reviews consistent with the development phase.	Contractor presents a preliminary security architecture that satisfies all security performance requirements, with only minor unresolved issues. Security design documentation is complete, accurate, and consistent, and has completed all required reviews consistent with the development phase, with only minor outstanding comments.	Contractor presents a preliminary security architecture that satisfies all security performance requirements, with only few unresolved issues. Contractor presents a viable approach plan for resolving the remaining issues. Security design documentation is complete, accurate, and consistent, and has completed most required reviews consistent with the development phase, with few outstanding comments.	Contractor presents a preliminary security architecture that satisfies most security performance requirements, with some unresolved issues. Contractor presents a viable approach plan for resolving all but few minor issues. Security design documentation is mostly complete, accurate, and consistent, and has completed most required reviews consistent with the development phase, with some outstanding comments.	Preliminary security architecture does not satisfy all security performance requirements; security documentation is not complete, accurate, or consistent, and has not completed most required reviews consistent with the development phase.

	1. Technical Criteria				
	Outstanding	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
T5	The contractor maintains a system architecture representation consistent with the development phase, optimizing system performance and fault management.	The contractor maintains a system architecture representation consistent with the development phase, providing effective focus on system performance and fault management.	The contractor maintains a system architecture representation consistent with the development phase, providing focus on system performance and fault management.	The contractor maintains a system architecture representation consistent with the development phase, and system performance and fault management are adequately addressed.	The contractor maintains a system architecture representation consistent with the development phase, but system performance and fault management are not adequately addressed.
T6	Actual software/firmware sizing for new, modified, and reused code has experienced no statistically significant variability from planned. Any changes in software/firmware reuse promptly identified to the Government with a detailed description of rationale and any potential impact on MMP-U technical performance, cost, or schedule.	Actual software/ firmware sizing for new, modified, and reused code has experienced little statistically significant variability from planned. Any changes in software/firmware reuse promptly identified to the Government with a detailed description of rationale and any potential impact on MMP-U technical performance, cost, or schedule.	Actual software/ firmware sizing for new, modified, and reused code has experienced some statistically significant variability from planned. Most changes in software/firmware reuse promptly identified to the Government with a good description of rationale and any potential impact on MMP-U technical performance, cost, or schedule..	Actual software/ firmware sizing for new, modified, and reused code has experienced moderate statistically significant variability from planned. Significant changes in software/firmware reuse promptly identified to the Government with an adequate description of rationale and any potential impact on MMP-U technical performance, cost, or schedule..	Actual software/ firmware sizing for new, modified, and reused code has experienced large statistically significant variability from planned. Few changes in software/firmware reuse promptly identified to the Government with an adequate description of rationale and any potential impact on MMP-U technical performance, cost, or schedule.

	1. Technical Criteria				
	Outstanding	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
T7	Thorough TPIs are identified that provide detailed insight into product maturity and functional capability very early in the design and development stages. TPIs are fully linked to the Earned Value Management System (EVMS) and provide indications of technical performance and product maturity achieved versus plan including cost and/or schedule allocations. Comprehensive gap analyses are conducted to evaluate all variances; with no gaps present. Contractor develops and successfully executes plans for recovery from all technical performance issues with little or no adverse impacts to the program.	Thorough TPIs are identified that provide insight into product maturity and functional capability early in the design and development stages. TPIs have linkage to the EVMS to provide indications of performance achieved versus plan including cost and/or schedule allocations. Comprehensive gap analyses are conducted to evaluate all technical variances; only minor gaps are present. Contractor develops and successfully executes plans for recovery from all key technical performance issues without adverse impacts to the program	TPIs are identified and generally linked to the EVMS. Comprehensive gap analyses are conducted to evaluate most variances; no significant gaps are present. Contractor develops and successfully executes plans for recovery from most key technical performance issues without adverse impacts to the program.	TPIs are identified and generally linked to the EVMS. Gap analyses are conducted to evaluate all variances; some gaps are present. Contractor develops and successfully executes plans for recovery from key technical performance issues with no significant impact to the program.	TPIs are rarely identified and very loosely linked to the EVMS. Gap analyses are rarely conducted to evaluate all variances; significant gaps are present. Contractor develops and marginally executes plans for recovery from key technical performance issues.

Table 3-7: Program Management – Documentation and Deliveries grade definitions for period 1

	1. Program Management				
	Outstanding	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
PM1	Contractor plans a comprehensive and complete IMS, IMP, EVMS, and Risk and Opportunity Management Program (ROMP) with logical flow of events. The contractor provides fully integrated IMS, IMP, EVMS, and ROMP, traceable to lowest WBS level used for program management. The contractor implements and manages the program using these documents, and makes them available to the Government in real-time via an IDE. Contractor has fully implemented all CMMI Level 3 or higher practices and goals as specifically tailored for MMP Upgrade for program planning (PP), integrated program management (IPM), risk management (RSKM), integrated product and process development (IPPD), process and product quality assurance (PPQA), and supplier management (SAM).	Contractor plans a comprehensive and complete IMS, IMP, EVMS, and ROMP with logical flow of events. The contractor provides fully integrated IMS, IMP, EVMS, and ROMP, traceable to lowest WBS level used for program management. The contractor implements and manages the program using these documents, and makes them available to the Government in real-time via an IDE. Contractor has fully implemented most CMMI Level 3 or higher practices and goals as specifically tailored for MMP Upgrade for PP, IPM, RSKM, IPPD, PPQA, and SAM.	Contractor plans a comprehensive and complete IMS, IMP, EVMS, and ROMP with logical flow of events. The contractor provides fully integrated IMS, IMP, EVMS, and ROMP, traceable to lowest WBS level used for program management. The contractor implements and manages the program using these documents, and makes them available to the Government in real-time via an IDE. Contractor has largely implemented CMMI Level 3 or higher practices and goals as specifically tailored for MMP Upgrade for PP, IPM, RSKM, IPPD, PPQA, and SAM.	Contractor plans a sufficient IMS, IMP, EVMS, and ROMP with logical flow of events. The contractor provides integrated IMS, IMP, EVMS, and ROMP, traceable to WBS. The contractor implements and manages the program using these documents, and makes them available to the Government in via an IDE. Contractor implemented minimum CMMI Level 3 practices and goals largely tailored for the MMP Upgrade for PP, IPM, RSKM, IPPD, PPQA, and SAM.	Contractor fails to plan a comprehensive and complete IMS, IMP, EVMS, and ROMP. The Government has to manage any or all of these documents. Contractor implemented less than minimum CMMI Level 3 practices and goals tailored for MMP Upgrade for PP, IPM, RSKM, IPPD, PPQA, or SAM

	1. Program Management				
	Outstanding	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
PM2	The contractor is innovative and always performs system design and implementation in accordance with program-defined development processes and procedures, with no exceptions, and integrates most industry best practices, increasing efficiency and greatly benefiting the Government. Government oversight is welcomed, but not required.	The contractor is innovative and always performs system design and implementation in accordance with program-defined development processes and procedures, with no exceptions, and integrates most industry best practices. No Government oversight is required.	The contractor always performs system design and implementation in accordance with program-defined development processes and procedures, with no exceptions, and integrates many industry best practices. Limited Government oversight is required.	The contractor always performs system design and implementation in accordance with program-defined development processes and procedures, with minor exceptions. Some Government oversight is required.	The contractor does not consistently perform system design and implementation in accordance with program-defined development processes and procedures. Substantial Government oversight is required.
PM3	Contractor's team always uses a formal, cross-functional integrated product team (IPT) with the Government and always works effectively with other IPTs. The IPTs also establish a formal IPT management agreement that outlines roles, responsibilities, purpose, and communication plan. No negative impact to program performance, because of early problem detection proactive, collaborative solution.	Contractor's team usually uses a formal, cross-functional integrated product team (IPT) with the Government and always works effectively with other IPTs. The IPTs also establish a formal IPT management agreement that outlines roles, responsibilities, purpose, and communication plan. Enhances program performance, because of early problem detection proactive, collaborative solution.	Contractor's team frequently uses a formal, cross-functional integrated product team (IPT) with the Government and effectively works with other IPTs. The IPTs also establish a formal IPT management agreement with the government that outlines roles, responsibilities, purpose, and communication plan with other IPTs.	Contractor's team often uses a formal, cross-functional integrated product team (IPT) with the Government and communicates with other IPTs. The IPTs also establish a formal IPT management agreement with the government that outlines roles, responsibilities, purpose, and communication plan with other IPTs.	Contractor's team seldom uses or fails to establish a formal, cross-functional integrated product team (IPT) with the Government. The IPTs do not establish a formal IPT management agreement that outlines roles, responsibilities, purpose, and communication plan.

	1. Program Management				
	Outstanding	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
PM4	The contractor provides an efficient staffing level and skill mix. Any changes to key personnel have no adverse impact to program performance. Personnel are experienced, trained, have proper clearances, and follow defined corporate processes. Contractor seamlessly brings in and integrates experts as necessary to accomplish tasks. Contractor communicates with the Government on all key personnel staffing changes. Replacements for key personnel are highly experienced and knowledgeable of the MMP-U program and are seamlessly integrated into the program team. Staffing enables the program to proceed with no impact to cost or schedule.	The contractor provides an efficient staffing level and skill mix. Any changes to key personnel have no adverse impact to program performance. Personnel are experienced, trained, have proper clearances, and follow defined corporate processes. Contractor seamlessly brings in and integrates experts as necessary to accomplish tasks. Replacements for key personnel are highly experienced and knowledgeable of the MMP-U program and are seamlessly integrated into the program team. Staffing enables the program to proceed with no impact to cost or schedule.	The contractor provides a staffing level and skill mix Any changes to key personnel have minimal adverse impact to program performance. Personnel are experienced, have proper clearances, and follow defined corporate processes. Contractor seamlessly brings in and integrates experts as necessary to accomplish tasks. Replacements for key personnel are highly experienced and are seamlessly integrated into the program team. Staffing enables the program to proceed with little or no impact to cost or schedule.	The contractor provides minimal staffing level and skill mix necessary to complete the program. Personnel are knowledgeable, have proper clearances, and follow defined processes. Staffing enables the program to proceed without significant impact to cost or schedule.	The contractor provides insufficient staffing level and skill mix necessary to complete the program in a timely manner.

	1. Program Management				
	Outstanding	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
PM5	The contractor consistently and effectively executed a documented ROMP; identifies and analyzes potential impact of all risks continuously and tracks risk/problem areas very early, risks identified are very specific, plans alternative/parallel courses of action, demonstrates the ability to implement when required, and briefs all risks, mitigation strategies and mitigation effects on the program at program management reviews and telecons with no Government direction required. In addition, Contractor clearly demonstrates the ROMP is fully integrated within the contractor's operations. The contractor monitors and regularly pursues opportunities that reduce risk as well as enhance program technical, cost, and/or schedule performance but always ensures that the opportunities are mature enough for smooth integration into the program.	The contractor usually and effectively executed a documented ROMP; identifies and analyzes potential impact of all risks continuously and tracks risk/problem areas very early, risks identified are very specific, plans alternative/parallel courses of action, demonstrates the ability to implement when required, and briefs all risks, mitigation strategies and mitigation effects on the program at program management reviews and telecons with little to no Government direction required. In addition, Contractor clearly demonstrates the ROMP is fully integrated within the contractor's operations. The contractor monitors and often pursues opportunities that reduce risk as well as enhance program technical, cost, and/or schedule performance but ensures that the opportunities are mature enough for smooth integration into the program.	The contractor frequently and effectively executed a documented ROMP; identifies and analyzes potential impact of high and medium risks and tracks risk/problem areas early, risks identified are very specific, contractor plans alternative/parallel courses of action, demonstrates the ability to implement when required, and briefs all risks, mitigation strategies and mitigation effects on the program at program management reviews and telecons with limited Government direction required. The contractor monitors and pursues some opportunities that could reduce risk and enhance program technical, cost, and/or schedule performance. Maturity of these opportunities is sometimes lacking.	The contractor often and adequately executed a documented ROMP; identifies and analyzes potential impact of high and medium risks and tracks risk/problem areas early, plans alternative/parallel courses of action, demonstrates the ability to implement when required, and briefs all risks, mitigation strategies and mitigation effects on the program at program management reviews and telecons. Contractor requires some Government direction to enable risk assessment and mitigation plans. The contractor suggested some opportunities that could reduce risk and enhance program technical, cost, and/or schedule performance. Maturity of these opportunities is often lacking.	The contractor seldom or ineffectually executed a documented ROMP; seldom tracked and managed programmatic and technical risks. The contractor rarely suggested opportunities that could reduce risk and enhance program technical, cost, and/or schedule performance. Maturity of any suggested opportunities is usually lacking

	1. Program Management				
	Outstanding	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
PM6	The contractor has implemented a comprehensive set of fully defined metrics effectively used to manage all aspects of the program. The metrics provided accurate, quantitative measures and trends for technical and program management performance insight into potential program issues. Always implemented early, proactive corrective actions to preclude any adverse impact to the program. All metrics, metrics reports, and trend data collected, accurate, and available to the Government in near real time via the IDE. Contractor has fully implemented all CMMI Level 3 or higher practices and goals as specifically tailored for MMP Upgrade for measurement and analysis (MA) and decision analysis and resolution (DAR).	The contractor has implemented a comprehensive set of fully defined metrics effectively used to manage almost all aspects of the program. The metrics provided quantitative measures and trends for technical and program management insight into potential program issues. Usually implemented early, proactive corrective actions to substantially minimize adverse impacts to the program. Most metrics, metrics reports, and trend data collected, accurate, and available to the Government in near real time via the IDE. Contractor has fully implemented most CMMI Level 3 or higher practices and goals as specifically tailored for MMP Upgrade for MA and DAR.	The contractor has implemented a metrics collection and reporting program effectively used to manage most aspects of the program and high risk areas. The metrics provided key measures and trends for technical and program management insight into program issues. Implemented some corrective actions for problems or negative trends minimizing adverse program impacts. Metrics, metrics reports, and trend data frequently accurate and available to the Government on the IDE. Contractor has largely implemented CMMI Level 3 or higher practices and goals as specifically tailored for MMP Upgrade for MA and DAR.	The contractor has implemented a metrics collection reporting program adequately used to manage key aspects of the program and high risk areas. The metrics provided adequate measures and trends for technical and program management insight into program issues. Implemented some corrective actions for problems or negative trends minimizing adverse program impacts. Metrics, metrics reports, and trend data often accurate and available on the IDE. Contractor implemented minimum CMMI Level 3 practices and goals largely tailored for the MMP Upgrade for MA and DAR.	The contractor inconsistently implemented a metrics collection reporting program rarely used to manage key aspects of the program and high risk areas. The metrics provided less than adequate measures and trends for technical and program management insight into program issues. Implemented few corrective actions for problems or negative trends to minimize adverse program impacts. Metrics, metrics reports, and trend data rarely accurate or available on the IDE. Contractor implemented less than minimum CMMI Level 3 practices and goals tailored for MMP Upgrade MA and DAR.
PM7	The contractor delivers all required CDRLs and other documentation ahead of schedule and document rarely required government comments.	The contractor delivers all required CDRLs and other documentation by the due data, many ahead of schedule, and rarely required more than minor administrative comments.	The contractor delivers all required CDRLs and other documentation by the due data, some ahead of schedule, and rarely required more than minor administrative and minor technical comments required.	The contractor delivers all required CDRLs and other documentation on schedule with some requiring major administrative and technical comments.	The contractor deliver some required CDRLs and other documentation after the due date, requiring several major administrative and technical comments

	1. Program Management				
	Outstanding	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
PM8	Assessments of program impacts due to technical and/or funding exercises are comprehensive and timely, and include effective recommendations for addressing these issues. Government participation is welcomed, but assistance is not needed.	Assessments of program impacts due to technical and/or funding exercises are usually comprehensive and timely, and require little, if any, government assistance.	Assessments of program impacts due to technical and/or funding exercises are mostly complete, accurate, and timely, but require minimal government assistance.	Assessments of program impacts due to technical and/or funding exercises are adequately complete, accurate, and timely, but require moderate government assistance.	Assessments of program impacts due to technical and/or funding exercises are seldom complete, or accurate, or timely. Significant government assistance required.

TABLE 3-8. EVALUATION SCORES

For each evaluation period a score will be assigned to the contractor's performance for each of the qualitative evaluation criteria (illustrated below in table 3.8).

Unweighted Ratings

Rating	**Rating % Range**
Outstanding	91-100
Excellent	76-90
Good	51-75
Satisfactory	No greater than 50
Unsatisfactory	0

TABLE 3-9. CALCULATION OF RECOMMENDED AWARD FEE

The award fee recommended by the AFRB is calculated as the cumulative total of the criteria weights multiplied by the criteria scores. For example:

Criteria	**Weight**	**Rating**	**Weighted Rating**
Qualitative Cost Performance	7.5%	85%	6.38%
Quantitative Cost Performance	2.5%	60%	1.5%
Qualitative Schedule Performance	5%	15%	0.75 %
Quantitative Schedule Performance	5%	75%	3.75 %
Technical Performance	40%	100%	40.00 %
Program Management	40%	70%	28.00 %
Total	100%		80.38%

The FDO reviews the recommendations of the AFRB, considers all pertinent data, and determines the earned award fee amount for each evaluation period.