

**INFORMATION MANAGEMENT AND
COMMUNICATION SUPPORT**

ATTACHMENT J-5

AWARD FEE EVALUATION PLAN

A. Purpose

The Award Fee Evaluation Plan defines the process by which the Government will encourage and reward the Contractor for safe, high quality, cost effective performance in fulfilling the requirements set forth in the Information Management and Communication Support Contract (IMCS) contract; to provide flexibility for changes in management, business and performance emphasis; and to promote effective communications and customer service. The award fee process enables the Government to focus on successful outcomes, overall operational and cost performance, and to emphasize those aspects of critical milestone achievements essential to reach performance objectives. The award fee process includes an objective and subjective assessment by the Government.

B. Evaluation Procedures

Performance evaluation and Award Fee will be determined semi-annually in accordance with the KDP-KSC-P-2402, Award Fee Evaluation Process. The Award Fee Board (AFB) membership for IMCS is documented in KDP-KSC-P-2402. The AFB will review and consider the summary evaluation report, prepared by the Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR). The COTR will be the focal point for the accumulation and development of Award Fee evaluation reports, reviews, and presentations, as well as discussions with contractor management on Award Fee matters.

Performance metrics and Areas of Emphasis (AOE) will be established for each evaluation period and communicated by the Contracting Officer (CO) to the contractor at least 15 calendar days prior to the start of the evaluation period. The metrics and AOE's will identify the performance elements of particular importance which are deserving of special attention during the evaluation period. The metrics and AOE's will not detail the entire spectrum of performance that will be evaluated in determining the performance score and award fee. Other pertinent factors included under the contract and general factors bearing upon overall contractor performance will be considered as the facts and circumstances of each period may require.

The award fee plan and J-1 Appendix 5, *Expectations, Performance Standards*, and Metrics may be revised unilaterally by the Government prior to the beginning of any evaluation period as long as the CO notifies the contractor, in writing, of any such changes 15 calendar days prior to the start of the relevant evaluation period. Changes within the evaluation period require mutual agreement of the Government and contractor.

The contractor's performance will be continually assessed by Government technical monitors throughout the evaluation period. Contractor performance levels which require remedial attention, or which may adversely affect Award Fee ratings, will be made known to the contractor by the COTR.

The Government will formally assess the contractor's overall performance at the mid-point of each evaluation period. A mid-term report will be provided to the contractor. Copies will also be provided to AFB members.

Within 10 days following each semi-annual evaluation period, the Contractor shall prepare and submit their self-assessment report to the COTR.

Within 30 calendar days following each semi-annual evaluation period, the COTR will prepare a summary report on the evaluation of the contractor's performance based on all metrics, Government surveillance data, customer inputs, contractor's response to AOE's and other contractor furnished data. The contractor will be furnished a copy of the evaluation report for the period. Within 5 working days from receipt of the evaluation report, the contractor may submit additional data relevant to the performance evaluation in writing to the COTR. The contractor also has the option of making a self-evaluation presentation to the AFB and Fee Determination Official (FDO).

C. Evaluation Factors and Scoring Criteria

The Government will use objective and subjective criteria as a basis for arriving at award fee score. Objective metrics will be used to measure the contractor's performance and assist the Government in the Award Fee evaluation process. The contractor's performance as measured by established metrics and the Government's subjective assessment will be used to arrive at an overall award fee score.

The award fee criteria consists of three categories (1) Subjective Performance in areas such as process improvement, customer satisfaction, and management effectiveness, AOE's, and Indefinite Delivery / Indefinite Quantity (ID/IQ) Task Order Performance; (2) Objective performance metrics emphasizing safety and health, technical performance standards and the health of the KSC system infrastructure; and (3) Cost Control focusing on contract cost, variance analysis / mitigation /cost management effectiveness.

The final determination of the award fee amount payable to the contractor will be made by the NASA/KSC FDO on a semi-annual basis, in accordance with the timetables outlined in clause G.11 of the IMCS contract, the performance evaluation criteria established in this plan, and the recommendations provided by the AFB. Only the award fee performance evaluation factors set forth in this plan shall be used to determine award fee scores.

Table AF-1 below summarizes the Award Fee Factors and the associated point allocation.

Table AF-1: Award Fee Point Allocation Table

Award Fee Factors	Point Allocation
Subjective Evaluation Factors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas of Emphasis • Process Improvement • Customer Satisfaction • Management Effectiveness • ID/IQ Task Order Performance 	50
Objective Evaluation Factors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety & Health • Technical Performance Standards • Health of KSC System Infrastructure 	25
Cost Control Evaluation	25
Total Points	100

The Subjective Performance Evaluation will be based on the Government evaluators’ opinions and impressions of the quality of the contractor’s performance with regard to the following factors: responsiveness to AOE’s, process improvement initiatives, customer satisfaction feedback, management effectiveness in maintaining excellent business relationships with the Government and other organizations at KSC, and overall responsiveness to contract requirements, including ID/IQ Task Order performance. The maximum possible score that the contractor may receive for subjective performance standards is 50 points.

The Objective Performance Evaluation will be based on a quantitative measurement of the contractor’s performance against the predefined metrics defined in Attachment J-1, Appendix 5. The maximum possible score that the contractor may receive for meeting performance metrics is 25 points. If the contractor meets or exceeds all of the performance metrics, a 100% score will result and the contractor will receive all 25 objective performance points. If the contractor fails to meet one or more of the performance metrics, then the objective performance points will become subjective and reduced based on the Government’s opinion of the significance, severity, and impact of the failure.

The Cost Control Evaluation will be based on the contractor’s actual incurred costs measured against the contract’s negotiated estimated costs. The maximum possible score the contractor may receive for cost control is 25 points. The maximum score will be awarded only when the contractor achieves a cost underrun, subject to the following conditions:

If the contractor's average score for all other evaluation factors is 81 or greater (very good or excellent) and it achieves a cost underrun, the contractor may receive up to the maximum score for cost control, depending on the Government's opinion regarding the size of the underrun.

If the average numerical score for all other factors is 80 or less but at least 61 (good or satisfactory) and an underrun is achieved, a contractor will only be rewarded for the cost underrun as if the contractor had met the estimated costs.

If the average score for all other factors is less than 61, the contractor will receive a cost control point score of 0.

In the event of a cost overrun that was within the control of the contractor, the cost control points will be reduced based on the Government's opinion of the significance of the overrun, as well as the contractor's efforts to control or mitigate the overrun. A significant cost overrun that was within the control of the contractor will result in a point score of 0.

An overall performance evaluation and fee determination of zero (0) shall be made for any evaluation period when there is a major breach of safety or security as defined in NFS 1852.223-75, "Major Breach of Safety or Security"

D. Award Fee Determination

After consulting with the Award Fee Board the FDO will make a final, unilateral performance score and award fee determination. The FDO will make the award fee determination within 40 calendar days from the end of the period being evaluated. The FDO's unilateral determination shall not be subject to the clause of this contract entitled "Disputes" and there are no provisions for additional appeal rights. After receipt of the FDO's Award Fee Determination Letter, the CO will promptly prepare a contract modification reflecting the award fee adjective rating, weighted evaluation score, and award fee earned.

Unearned fee in a given period is lost and cannot be reassessed or moved into subsequent fee evaluation periods for consideration.

E. Numerical Scores, Adjective Definitions and Award Fee Scale

1. Numerical Scores and Award Fee Scale. The FDO may award numerical scores from a range of zero (0) to 100. Total award fee scores of zero (0) to 60 earn zero (0) percent of available award fee for that evaluation period. Total Award Fee scores of 61 and greater have a linear relationship to the percentage of award fee earned for that evaluation period. For example, a numerical score of 85 would earn 85% of available award fee for that evaluation period.
2. Adjective Rating, Definitions and Numerical Range. The following adjective ratings, definitions and numerical ranges shall be used to define the various levels of performance under the contract:

NUMERICAL RANGE	ADJECTIVE RATING	ADJECTIVE DEFINITION
91 - 100	Excellent	Of exceptional merit; exemplary performance in a timely, efficient, and economical manner; very minor (if any) deficiencies with no adverse effect on overall performance.
81 - 90	Very Good	Very effective performance, fully responsive to contract requirements; contract requirements accomplished in a timely, efficient, and economical manner for the most part; only minor deficiencies.
71 - 80	Good	Effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable deficiencies, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance.
61 - 70	Satisfactory	Meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable deficiencies with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance.
60 and below	Poor/Unsatisfactory	Does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; deficiencies in one or more areas which adversely affect overall performance