SURVEILLANCE ASSESSMENT SCORING MATRIX - QUALITY ASSURANCE EXHIBIT A[1]

(For use with Work Tasks under CPAF-type Contracts/CLINs)

FIRM: _____ PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FOR THE ~90-DAY PERIOD (QQYY): _____ EVALUATOR: _____ DATE (MMDDYY): _____

STATEMENT OF WORK TASKS/SUB-TASKS	RATING FACTORS	ADJECTIVAL and NUMERICAL RATINGS (Check One Block per Individual Rating Factor)	FACTOR INDIV WEIGHT	ADDED FACTOR X 100	SCORES
		0.0 .25 .50 .75 .80 .85 .90 .92 .94 .95 .96 .97 .98 .99 1.00 1.01 1.02 1.03	Times VALUE	SCORE	
I. PROGRAMMING, SYSTEM & TECHNICAL SUPPORT & ADMINISTRATION (CLINS 1001, 2001 , 3001 ,4001 & 5001)		STD --Excellent--- Good ---Fair---- ---Moderate=AQL---- -Unsat— --Poor----			
1. RSIS System Maintenance Tasks See C.3.1.1 Requirement & Standards	Quality of Service		X 14%		
	Timeliness of Service		X 13%		
	Technical Ingenuity		Not Rated		
	Cost Management		Not Rated		
2. Security, Storage & Maint. of Data See C.3.1.2 Requirement & Standards	Quality of Service		X 14%		
	Timeliness of Service		X 13%		
	Technical Ingenuity		Not Rated		
	Cost Management		Not Rated		
3. Technical Support Help Desk See C.3.1.3 Requirement & Standards	Quality of Service		X 13%		
	Timeliness of Service		X 13%		
	Technical Ingenuity		Not Rated		
	Cost Management		Not Rated		
4. Forms & Instructional Manuals Prep See C.3.1.4 Requirement & Standards	Quality of Service		X 5%		
	Timeliness of Service		X 5%		
	Technical Ingenuity		Not Rated		
	Cost Management		Not Rated		
5. Management Reporting See C.3.1.6 Requirement & Standards	Quality of Service		X 5%		
	Timeliness of Service		X 5%		
	Technical Ingenuity		Not Rated		
	Cost Management		Not Rated		
				TOTAL	

TOTAL PERCENTAGE (%) OF CLIN NEUTRAL DOLLAR ($) VALUE FOR PERIOD RATED. % OF CLIN NEUTRAL $ VALUE RECOMMENDED FOR PAYMENT==>

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY - SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION

SURVEILLANCE ASSESSMENT SCORING MATRIX - QUALITY ASSURANCE EXHIBIT A[1]

(For use with Work Tasks under CPAF-type Contracts/CLINs/Sub-CLINs)

GENERAL INFORMATION, INSTRUCTIONS AND GUIDELINES

The Surveillance Assessment Scoring Matrix or "Scoring Matrix" (**Exhibit A**), for the purposes of the subject solicitation, DTFR53-03-R-00003, is an evaluation tool used by the Government to rate and document the contractor's performance over a specified period of time (typically 90 days). It is designed to measure the contractor's level of success or failure --in the Government's estimation -- in satisfying the performance requirements and standards, as defined in the Statement of Work (SOW).

The Scoring Matrix serves a dual purpose-- (1) It provides the Government and the contractor relatively quick feedback on contractor performance of various work tasks, in terms of how well or how poorly performance is gaged as meeting the specific rating factors listed. (Note: Rating factors (e.g., quality, timeliness, technical ingenuity, and cost-effective management) function here as collective, judgmental concepts that embody or encompass the miscellaneous performance expectations outlined in the SOW. They are both the impetus or driving force of those very same performance expectations and their sum total.) This feedback serves to identify and motivate the contractor to strive for excellence in specific areas judged below that model of performance, and to sustain performance at or above acceptable levels of performance. (2) It is used to make subsequent recommendations and determinations --on a quarterly basis-- on the amount of payment to or recovery from the contractor of positive or negative fee incentives or other moneys for work performed.

The Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR), and designated Quality Assurance Evaluators (QAEs) are authorized to function as "evaluators" in completing the Scoring Matrix in accordance with (IAW) procedures established herein, or pursuant to the subject contract or related Incentive Plan documentation. The evaluator should use the adjectival and corresponding numerical ratings --as outlined below-- which best measure, in his/her judgement, the value and merits of the contractor's performance for the period rated.

Numerical Rating	Adjectival Rating	Performance Guidelines for Adjectival and Corresponding Numerical Ratings (Note: Numerical allows for a judgmental gradation within adjectival.)
.95 or 1.0	Excellent	Exceptional with no omissions/shortcomings/weaknesses of consequence. Greatly exceeds all standards and expectations.
.8 or .9	Very Good	Well above average with no or minimal (corrected)omissions/shortcomings/weaknesses of consequence. Exceeds standards/expectations.
.6 or .7	Good (Standard)	Average with no or a sparse few (corrected) omissions/shortcomings/weaknesses of consequence . Standards/expectations fully met.
.4 or .5	Fair (Acceptable)	Marginal/below average with more than a few (correctable) omissions/shortcomings/weaknesses of consequence. Standards barely/passably met.
.2 or .3	Poor	Far below average with (uncorrectable) omissions/shortcomings/weaknesses of consequence. Standards/expectations are not met.
0 or .1	Unsatisfactory	Unacceptable/inept with (uncorrectable) omissions/shortcomings/weaknesses of consequence. Standards far from met. Success is jeopardized.

The evaluator must document all ratings, in writing, --other than ratings of Good (i.e., the "standard" or level of achievement or discharge of services at which performance is considered fully acceptable,) or Fair (i.e., a level of deviation from the standard that is considered as having marginally met the criterion for acceptable performance). Documentation will typically be a summary of general performance or specific activities or incidents reflective of the strengths, effectiveness, or diligence verse the weaknesses, omissions or deficiencies (or the like) in contractor performance --that occurred during the rating period-- to support the higher or lower ratings. Narrative summaries must contain sufficient information to substantiate the evaluator's rationale for his/her scored determination. Customer surveys may be used to supplement supporting documentation.

The term "point value" is used to describe the ratio or proportional significance or worth each sub-task has in relation to the task as a whole. The sum of the point value for all subtasks or Sub-CLINs must equal 100 --the associated value of the parent task or CLIN. Although it is not expressed as a percentage it is more or less parallel to that system. The term "weight value" is used to describe the breakout of the available points under the assigned point value to denote the level of importance that is placed on the individual rating factors. Rating factors that are listed, may not be assigned a portion of the point value and as such are identified as "not rated." A rating fact identified as not rated, does not mean it is not applicable. In such instance, the unrated factor is considered to be other than a critical element in determining the level of success or failure in performance, but may be considered in overall evaluation when warranted. The assigned weight values are multiplied by the numerical ratings chosen by the evaluator to determine the raw scores for each sub-task. The sub-task raw scores are added to arrive at a total point score for the task out of a possible 100 points. (Note: The contractor must be informed beforehand if the Government changes the rating factors or their relative degree of strength and importance (i.e., the assigned point and weight values). Likewise, the contractor must be informed, in advance, on the types of questions and feedback sought on customer surveys that may impact its ratings. Unless the CO or COTR determines otherwise, the contractor will not be privy to the identity of customer survey respondents.)

Under cost-plus-award-fee (CPAF) type contracts (the same principals apply to contracts with elements awarded on a CPAF basis (e.g. Contract Line Item Numbers (CLINs)), "The amount of award fee to be paid . . ." IAW FAR 16.405-2(a), ". . . is determined by the Government's judgmental evaluation of the contractor's performance in terms of criteria stated in the contract. This determination is made unilaterally by the Government and is not subject to the Disputes clause." This policy shall not be countermanded not its spirit violated. However, in the interest of better service and cooperation between the contracting parties, the COTR will provide upon its completion, a copy of each Scoring Matrix evaluation to the contractor, and the contractor will be allowed to furnish supportable comments, rejoinders, or rebuttals. Such statements may be considered at or before the time of each cyclic determination by the Government on payment for or recovery of incentive fees or other moneys. With due consideration of all the information at its disposal, the Government's determination on the amount of fee payout or recovery will be final. To the maximum extent practicable, the following schedule of events should be adhered to:

10th day of the month or sooner following the 3rd month evaluated for quarterly fee payout/recovery - COTR/QAE should complete Scoring Matrix
15th day of the month or sooner following the 3rd month evaluated for quarterly fee payout/recovery - COTR/QAE should furnish contractor copy of Scoring Matrix
20th day of the month or sooner following the 3rd month evaluated for quarterly fee payout/recovery - contractor shall affirm receipt and furnish any responses to Scoring Matrix
25th day of the month or sooner following the 3rd month evaluated for quarterly fee payout/recovery - COTR should make recommendations on positive/negative incentives
30th day of the month or sooner following the 3rd month evaluated for quarterly fee payout/recovery - Chief of Contracting Ofc. should make determination on payout/recovery of fees