

AD-A147 179


AN EVALUATION OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR QUALIFICATION AND 1/2
WARRANTING OF ADM. (U) AIR FORCE INST OF TECH
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB OH SCHOOL OF SYST..


UNCLASSIFIED

E I FICKEN ET AL. SEP 84

F/G 5/9


NL





2

AD-A147 179



AN EVALUATION OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
QUALIFICATION AND WARRANTING OF
ADMINISTRATIVE CONTRACTING OFFICERS

THESIS

Earl I. Ficken Jr Wendy L. Motlong
Captain, USAF First Lieutenant, US.

AFIT/GLM/LSM/84S-21

DTIC FILE COPY

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
AIR UNIVERSITY

AIR FORCE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

DTIC
NOV 03 1984
E

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio

Approved for release by the
Department of Defense, its
components and its contractors.

84 10 31 008

AFIT/GLM/LSM/84

AN EVALUATION OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
QUALIFICATION AND WARRANTING OF
ADMINISTRATIVE CONTRACTING OFFICERS

THESIS

Earl I. Ficken Jr Wendy L. Motlong
Captain, USAF First Lieutenant, USAF

AFIT/GLM/LSM/84S-21

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

The contents of the document are technically accurate, and no sensitive items, detrimental ideas, or deleterious information are contained therein. Furthermore, the views expressed in the document are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the School of Systems and Logistics, the Air University, the United States Air Force, or the Department of Defense.

Association For	
NAME	X
ADDRESS	
CITY	
STATE	
ZIP	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

AFIT/GLM/LSM/84S-21

AN EVALUATION OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR QUALIFICATION AND
WARRANTING OF ADMINISTRATIVE CONTRACTING OFFICERS

THESIS

Presented to the Faculty of the School of Systems and Logistics
of the Air Force Institute of Technology

Air University

In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Science in Logistics Management

Earl I. Ficken, Jr.
Captain, USAF

Wendy L. Motlong
First Lieutenant, USAF

September 1984

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

Acknowledgements

The purpose of this study was to determine minimum qualification requirements for use when selecting individuals to hold positions as administrative contracting officers (ACOs) in Department of Defense plant representative offices (PROs). Contracting officer professionalism is a highly visible issue in view of the vast amount of public dollars which are controlled by these individuals.

Recommendations presented in this report specify minimum levels of experience, education and training for administrative contracting officers. These recommendations were based on requirements suggested for contracting officers by the interagency Task Group Six and survey results which provided the current ACO work force demographics and field ACO's opinions of their selection criteria. Selection and appointment procedures establishing minimum qualification standards would enhance the recognition of contracting officers as professionals.

In the completion of this thesis we have received considerable help from others. Special thanks is owed to our faculty advisor, Mr. John E. Verardo, Jr., for his unending patience and enthusiastic support and to Maj Joel Adkins for supplying a much needed critical eye. We also wish to thank Mr. Michael F. Miller and Mr. Joseph C. Spagnola Jr. of the Federal Acquisition Institute for their contributions to our

thesis background and in the construction of the survey instrument. We are also grateful to our ACO contacts who administered the survey in their PROs, and to Mr. A. Richard Apple, Lockheed Corporation who graciously provided a government contractor's version of the "ACO" profile. Finally, personal thanks goes to Myrna Neeley for her understanding and concern throughout this thesis effort.

Earl I. Ficken Jr.

Wendy L. Motlong

Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgements	ii
List of Figures	vi
List of Tables	vii
List of Abbreviations	viii
Abstract	ix
I. Government Contract Administration	1
Statement of the Problem	5
Scope	6
Narrative Style	7
Background	7
Research Objective	12
Research Questions	12
Approach	13
II. The Administrative Contracting Officer	14
ACO Authority	17
Contracting Officer Qualifications	19
Push for Professionalism	21
III. ACO Selection Criteria	30
Present ACO Selection Criteria	30
Task Group Six Recommendations	37
IV. Research Methodology	43
Survey Construction	43
Survey Instrument	44
Survey Validation	49
The Universe	50
The Population	50
Sample Surveyed	50
Data Collection Procedure	53
Analysis of the Data	55
List of Assumptions	55
List of Limitations	55

	Page
V. Findings	57
General Survey Results	57
Research Question Three	59
Composite Picture	59
Research Question Four	72
VI. Conclusions and Recommendations	74
Summary of the Research Findings	74
Research Question Five	75
Recommendations	77
Impact of the Recommendations	79
Recommendations for Further Study	80
DOD ACOs Versus Industry Counterparts	82
Concluding Remarks	82
Appendix A: Retention of Contract Administration	84
Appendix B: Contract Administration Functions	86
Appendix C: Contract Administration Service Locations	92
Appendix D: Contracting Officer Warrant	95
Appendix E: OPM Handbook X-118, GS-11 Qualification Standards	96
Appendix F: Contract Administration (GS-1102) Training Requirements	98
Appendix G: ACO Key Areas of Knowledge	99
Appendix H: Recommendation Form	101
Appendix I: Task Group Six's Model System	102
Appendix J: Survey of Administrative Contracting Officers	117
Appendix K: Surveyed PROs	127
Appendix L: Survey Results	130
Bibliography	154
Vita	160

List of Figures

Figure	Page
1. Primary Responsibilities in the Contracting Process	4
2. Contract Administration Services Community	10
3. Contract Administration Team Concept	15
4. ACO Categories - Composite	60
5. ACO Categories - Experience	62
6. Actual Experience Level -vs- ACO Recommended Experience Level	64
7. ACO Categories - Education	65
8. ACO Categories - Training	67
9. Air Force Plant Representative Offices	92
10. Army and Naval Plant Representative Offices	93
11. Defense Contract Administration Service Plant Representative Offices	94
12. Contracting Officer Warrant	95
13. Army CO Recommendation Form	101

List of Tables

Table	Page
I. Agency and Task Group Minimum Contracting Officer Qualification Criteria	41
II. Survey Variables	45
III. ACOs in Plant Representative Offices	51
IV. ACO Sample Surveyed	54
V. Summary Results: ACO Classifications by Criteria (Percentage of Total)	76

List of Abbreviations

ACO	Administrative Contracting Officer
ADARS	Army Defense Acquisition Regulation
AFCMD	Air Force Contract Management Division
AFIT	Air Force Institute of Technology
AFPRO	Air Force Plant Representative Office
AFSC	Air Force Systems Command
APRO	Army Plant Representative Office
CACO	Corporate Administrative Contracting Officer
CAO	Contract Administration Office
CAS	Contract Administration Service
CO	Contracting Officer
COGP	Commission on Government Procurement
DAR	Defense Acquisition Regulation
DCAS	Defense Contract Administration Service
DCASPRO	Defense Contract Administration Service Plant Representative Office
DCASR	Defense Contract Administration Service Region
DLA	Defense Logistics Agency
DLAM	Defense Logistics Agency Manual
DOD	Department of Defense
FAR	Federal Acquisition Regulation
HCA	Head of Contracting Activity
KSA	Knowledge, Skills, Ability
NAVAIR	Naval Air Systems Command
NAVAIRINST	Naval Air Systems Command Instruction
NAVPRO	Naval Plant Representative Office
NCMA	National Contract Management Association
NU	Northrup University
OFPP	Office of Federal Procurement Policy
OPM	Office of Personnel Management
PCO	Procuring Contracting Officer
PRO	Plant Representative Office
QA	Quality Assurance
SD	Space Division
TCO	Termination Contracting Officer

Abstract

Presidential Executive Order 12352 directed government agencies to develop contracting career programs that would produce a professional work force. Under this order an interagency group, Task Group Six, proposed minimum selection and appointment criteria for contracting officers. This study examined the Task Group's criteria as they relate to administrative contracting officers (ACOs) in Department of Defense plant representative offices. A survey was conducted to determine the demographic profile of the current ACO work force. Minimum experience, education and training requirements were then proposed based on the Task Group's recommendations, the ACO demographic profile and the work force's opinions.

AN EVALUATION OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR QUALIFICATION AND WARRANTING OF ADMINISTRATIVE CONTRACTING OFFICERS

I. Government Contract Administration

A government contracting officer (CO), is the only individual specifically authorized to enter into, administer, or terminate a contract on behalf of the government. Because the unique position requires interaction with contractors, superiors, advisors and specialists (23:48-49), the CO often single-handedly mediates incompatible needs (53:26).

The contracting officer is quite simply, the key person in government contracting. After the experts and advisors have come and gone, the contracting officer must make the decisions and stand responsible for the contract. NEVER FORGETTING, nonetheless, that his first purpose is to be the government's businessman--to possess knowledge and good business judgement and to make his own decisions in accordance with that judgement [27:1].

Qualification requirements for selecting government COs have been questioned for at least thirty years. The 1955 Hoover Commission (55:1), a 1970 Comptroller General Report to the Congress (50:7), and the 1972 Congressional Commission on Government Procurement (COGP) (55:1) each recommended improving CO selection and appointment criteria. In the 1980s, rising costs of weapons systems and media attention to the prices being paid for these systems have resurfaced the qualification issue.

Michael J. Tashjian, an outspoken advocate for contracting officer professionalism, testified at hearings held

in February 1982 by the Senate Subcommittee on Federal Expenditures, Research and Rules Committee on Governmental Affairs (53:27). The focus of these hearings was the 1982 proposed Uniform Federal Procurement System. All aspects of government procurement were addressed, including contracting officers. Tashjian told the subcommittee that:

...a large portion of procurement officers are true professionals dedicated to excellent performance. However,...the criteria for appointment of contracting officers is poorly defined. In some cases, untrained and unqualified personnel perform contracting functions...[53:27].

To preclude CO selections based on weak criteria, President Reagan issued Executive Order 12352 on Federal Procurement Reforms on 17 March 1982. It directed the heads of departments and agencies to establish procurement career management programs "...that will result in a highly qualified, well-managed professional procurement work force" (42). Under this order an interagency Career Management Task Group (Task Group Six) was formed. One of the Task Group's assignments was to identify the skills and knowledge which should be prerequisites to employment as a federal CO (24:8-9). Rear Admiral Joseph N. Sansone, Jr., Deputy Chief of Naval Material Command (Contracts and Business Management) and chairman of Task Group Six commented:

For the first time, to my knowledge, managers at all levels in government are all in agreement that procurement systems, no matter how well conceived on paper, will work well only if staffed by competent, highly qualified people [42].

Task Group Six's final draft report was circulated for

agency comments in November 1983. It recommended specific education, experience and training requirements for COs (44). A conversation with a coordinator for the task group's effort confirmed a suspicion that the recommendations were primarily directed toward COs performing the purchasing functions in the government contracting process (8).

This "contracting process" is often lengthy and complicated; therefore, large agencies may have officers who specialize in one of three aspects of contracting: procurement, administration or termination. A procuring contracting officer (PCO) develops and awards the contract. The PCO is responsible for the preliminary preparations for a contract and is authorized to contractually bind the government (14:1-402; 52:A-58). The government contracting process and the phases of the process for which the PCO is primarily responsible are illustrated in Figure 1. Also depicted are the phases for which the two other contracting officer "types" have responsibility.

If a contract is to be terminated any time after its award, termination matters are settled by the termination contracting officer (TCO) (15:2.1; 52:A-58); otherwise, the contract progresses through the contract administration phase of the contracting process. Administration of a contract may be retained by the PCO's buying office or delegated to a contract administration office (CAO). Reasons for retention of a contract are listed in Appendix A. At the CAO an administrative contracting officer (ACO) assumes responsibility




Figure 1. Primary Responsibilities in the Contracting Process (7)

for administering the contract to its completion (14:1-402; 15:2.1; 52:A-58).

The PCO performs the purchasing role emphasized in the Task Group's report. Failure of the Task Group to recognize differences in contract specialist responsibilities, specifically ACO/PCO, did not set a precedent. In fact, there has never been a distinction at the federal level in qualification requirements for ACO or PCO selection.

Statement of the Problem

The PCO has primary responsibility for the initial contract; however, the ACO must insure that the contract is delivered as scheduled, within cost constraints and to specified performance standards. Additionally, one of the ACO functions listed in Appendix B, indicates a unique relationship between the ACO and the contractor: the ACO approves payments to be made to the contractor. The PCO may have agreed to a particular progress payment arrangement, but it is the control of these progress payments that gives the ACO tremendous power over a contractor.

One author commented:

A good contract administrator, whether working for the government or the contractor, must be a kind of all-purpose person: part accountant, part lawyer, part engineer, part negotiator and part financier [38:263].

Despite the diversity of the ACO's responsibilities, the criticality of the ACO's role in the handling of public funds, and the variety of functional demands for which an ACO is responsible, ACOs were not specifically addressed in Task

Group Six's recommendations for CO qualification standards. This study focuses on qualification requirements for ACOs: Do ACOs fit the mold established for all contracting officers, or should they have their own set of selection criteria?

This research effort will also examine the comparability of the Department of Defense (DOD) ACO qualifications to those of an industrial counterpart. Industry recognizes the need for "purchasing professionals." A group of top industry executives summarized the current economic condition as definitely a buyer's market (17:67). This includes the defense market. As a result these executives see the need for their employees to expand traditional thinking of contract administration (17:77).

Scope

When a CAO is located in a contractor's plant, it is called a plant representative office (PRO). Government and contractor personnel work face-to-face, day-in and day-out. This constant contact with the contractor gives the ACO's role even greater significance. The ACO, in effect, becomes the government's theoretical "one face to industry."

This study concentrated on the civilian and military ACOs of the DOD; specifically, Air Force, Army, Navy and Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) personnel located at plant representative offices. Industrial ACO counterparts from one defense contractor were also considered.

Narrative Style

The terms "he," "him" and "his" were used throughout this thesis to represent "he/she," "him/her" or "his/hers." This terminology was not intended to belittle the contributions of women to the contracting profession; it merely serves as a convenience to the reader.

Background

Defense contracting evolved from a \$100 per month salary for purchasing commissaries in 1778 (9:5; 38:3), to a \$125 billion business in 1982 (19:5). Through the years, as the prices went up, private industry involvement increased and system complexity grew, contract administration responsibilities expanded in four incremental phases (7).

Contract administration began as little more than "Inspection" (7). During this first phase untrained government inspectors reviewed items delivered by contractors, and accepted them unquestioned. As defense system complexity increased, contracting officers recognized the inspectors' need to know more about the items they inspected. The "Lead-man" phase, (phase two) of contract administration, introduced training for inspectors and established the PCO as the point of responsibility (7).

The Defense Industrial Base started in 1947, and with it came phase three: "Contract Administration Proliferation" (7). Slow industrial start-ups for weapons production during previous wars contributed to national concerns leading to

post-World War II changes. The United States decided it wanted both "guns and butter" (18:13). "The civilian sector would not be mobilized to produce goods in crisis periods; rather, these crises would be met from within the defense industry" (18:13). The cold war, Korean War and the narrowing of oceanic dividers prompted Congress to provide DOD with unprecedented average budget levels to support this defense industry (18:12). As technology advanced, and funding increased, the Services became concerned about the management and progress of their weapon system programs. To keep a closer watch on their contractors, each military department established its own contract administration service (CAS) organization.

Each of these organizations included headquarters and field offices organized by function, commodity, or geographical area as seemed most appropriate for support of its procurement mission. In many instances, more than one Service administered contracts at a particular contractor's plant, thereby adding to the complexity of procurement management from the point of view of the contractor as well as the Department of Defense [5:146].

The confusion caused by the "many faces" to industry served as an impetus for Project 60, the fourth phase in contract administration development. Under the direction of Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, Project 60 was initiated to develop a plan for uniform field contract management covering all DOD CAS functions (5:146; 7; 38:268).

Project 60, completed in 1963, recommended a three-step approach to reorganize field contract administration (5:147). One of these steps established the Plant Cogni-

zance Program, and implementation of this program resulted in the present DOD CAS organization (5:146).

The program specifies that each defense contractor plant be assigned only one agency to administer the contracts performed at that plant (5:148). Generally, the plant will be assigned to the military department having contracted with the plant for a major system or subsystem, for which timely delivery and technical performance of that system are of "critical military importance" (5:148). Services' CAS offices located within contractors' facilities are designated Air Force PROs (AFPROs), Army PROs (APROs) or Navy PROs (NAVPROs), as appropriate.

If a program does not meet the requirements for military cognizance, the Defense Contract Administration Service (DCAS) is assigned responsibility. DCAS, another product of Project 60, was established as a separate organization under the DLA to provide centralized control and guidance for DOD contract administration (5:148; 38:265). Unless specifically assigned to a military department by the Secretary of Defense under the Plant Cognizance Program, defense contracts are administered by DCAS (5:148). DCAS plant representative offices (DCASPROs) are in-plant offices at contractor facilities having a large volume of defense business (5:149), but not dominated by a single service's critical program.

Figure 2 is an illustration of the current DOD contract administration services community. Today approximately 87 Army, Air Force, Navy and DCAS plant representative offices




Figure 2. Contract Administration Services Community (7)

function in the United States, Europe and Australia (Appendix C) (12). Each PRO represents the government for all Services having an active contract at the cognizant PRO's plant. The Plant Cognizance Program rules bind agencies requesting contract administration services to the cognizant Service's regulations unless otherwise specifically agreed to in formal cross-servicing arrangements (14:1-406(c); 15:42.301). Approximately 405 ACOs perform CAS functions delegated to the 87 PROs. Because the ACO

...represents a number of contracting officers in the administration of DOD contracts with one firm, he is 'one face' - a single spokesman - for the Department of Defense to the firm" [5:146].

Recently, horror stories of defense agencies paying \$1254 for \$5 electronic parts (48), \$109 for 89 cent diodes (32:21), and \$1118 for 35 cent plastic stool leg caps (20) have focused public scrutiny on DOD activities. Less than economic order quantities and/or distortions from application of company overhead rates explain many of the "excessive" prices paid for spare parts; however, suggestions that DOD agencies "waste" public funds raise the suspicions of taxpayers (21).

A few of these "horror stories" have occurred at PROs where ACOs are responsible for negotiating spare part agreements. As public officials, all contracting officers are "...subject to censure by the public and the press. Instances of malfeasance, misfeasance and nonfeasance are news" (38:1-2). With such responsibility, a highly qualified,

highly motivated professional work force is essential (53:26). To provide a professional work force, Task Group Six recommended minimum qualification requirements for selection and appointment of contracting officers (43).

Research Objective

The "Model System for the Selection, Appointment, and Termination of Appointment of Contracting Officers" designed by Task Group Six was geared for PCOs. However, the Task Group recognized the existence of the different types of contracting officers (43:2), and suggested that separate selection requirements be established for each type (43:7).

The objective of this research was to determine a coordinated, consistent set of minimum qualifications for DOD ACOs at plant representative offices. Task Group Six's recommendations were used as a benchmark. A secondary objective of this study was to determine how DOD ACOs compare with their industry counterparts.

Research Questions

In order to meet the above research objectives, the following questions were posed:

1. What are present ACO selection criteria?
2. What are the Task Group's recommendations?
3. How does the present ACO work force compare to the recommended standards?
4. What does industry require of their "ACOs"?

5. Are the recommended requirements needed for ACOs, and if so, are they adequate as stated, or should adjustments be made?

Approach

The ACO is the government's representative to industry. To better understand this individual's role in contract administration, ACO responsibilities and authority are delineated in Chapter II. The COs' pursuit of specific qualification requirements is also discussed.

Selection criteria for ACOs in each of the four DOD agencies are presented in Chapter III. Additionally, these criteria are compared to the Task Group Six recommendations thereby answering Research Questions 1 and 2 in Chapter III.

In the telephone conversation with Task Group Six's coordinator, it was found that the group's recommendations were formulated without any attempt to determine the existing levels of experience, education and training possessed by the current work force (8). A survey instrument was constructed to ascertain the ACO work force status. The instrument is explained in Chapter IV. Results of the survey are interpreted in Chapter V in response to Research Questions 3 and 4. In addition to answering Research Question 5, Chapter VI completes this project with research conclusions and recommendations.

II. The Administrative Contracting Officer

Contract administration progressed from simple inspection to a full-fledged discipline with many responsibilities. As a part of the government contracting process, it is the longest and most important phase (7). Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 42.302(a) specifically identifies 57 functions, enumerated in Appendix B, to be accomplished during the contract administration phase to the extent that those functions apply to a delegated contract (15:42.202).

The ACO's role is to assure the PRO performs its delegated responsibilities. A glance through Appendix B reveals the diversity of a PRO's duties. Although the ACO is the focal point for all administrative and technical matters relating to a contract (5:145; 52:A-58), a team of specialists assists the ACO in meeting these responsibilities. Quality assurance specialists, industrial engineers, production specialists and price analysts, among others may participate on this team. The Contract Administration Team concept is depicted in Figure 3. Team composition depends on the complexity and technical requirements of the contract, and duties assigned by the buying office (5:146). The ACO serves as the "team captain" for the PRO, coordinating price analysts and technical specialists in support of buying office delegations (26:9; 52:A-58).




Figure 3. Contract Administration Team Concept (7)

Some of the ACO's specific responsibilities follow:

1. Negotiate forward pricing agreements.
2. Determine the allowability of costs suspended or disapproved as required..., direct the suspension or disapproval of costs....
3. Establish final indirect cost rates and billing rates....
4. Review and approve or disapprove the contractor's request for payments under the progress payments clause.
5. Ensure timely notification by the contractor of any anticipated overrun or underrun of the estimated cost under cost-reimbursement contracts.
6. Negotiate prices and execute supplemental agreements for spare parts and other items selected through provisioning procedures...[15:42.302].

The ACO's primary responsibilities, as depicted in Figure 1, and detailed in previous paragraphs, occur during the Contract Administration phase of the contracting process; however, the ACO's location within the contractor's facility makes him a valuable resource during other phases in the process. His detailed knowledge of the

...contractor's policies, operating methods and internal procedures makes [the ACO] best able to advise any PCO as to the status, performance, capability or condition of a particular firm as they affect DOD contracts with that firm [5:146].

As a result, ACOs often coordinate proposal analyses and contribute to preaward surveys for prospective buying organizations. Occassionally, an ACO participates in the negotiation of a contract.

After contract award, the ACO is the only individual in the PRO authorized to change a contract (52:A-58). The

contractor must be aware of the apparent authority of other PRO personnel. Technical specialists may recommend changes, but these recommendations must be coordinated with the ACO (46:94). Although most ACO's unilateral contracting authority exceeds a million dollars (31:6), contractors should also familiarize themselves with the limitations of an ACO's authority.

ACO Authority

The government, like corporations, must have agents who act as its representatives in contracting (5:34; 22:336; 46:89). The authority vested in these government agents, including ACOs, stems from the Constitution.

As a sovereign power under the Constitution, the United States government has inherent power to contract (46:88). Ultimate authority to make and administer contracts is the President's; however, executive department heads are delegated this authority from both the President and Congress to discharge the assigned duties of their departments (46:88-89). Congress allows the heads of the executive department "to further delegate to subordinate officials (e.g. the Secretary of Defense) authority vested in them" (46:89). Statutory delegation of contracting authority stops at this subordinate level. For the Department of Defense, delegation continues pursuant to the Defense Acquisition Regulation (DAR), and, now, the FAR. Government regulations have the force and effect of law. As such, appointing officials,

designated by the Secretary of Defense and directed by the FAR, are authorized to appoint contracting officers as agents of the government (46:127). Contracting officers receive a formal certificate or "warrant" from the appointing official. This warrant precisely states any limitations on the appointee's authority. A sample certificate is pictured in Appendix D.

In many respects the ACO is a limited agent (5:34). An ACO's authority to bind the government is subject to restrictions imposed by law and regulations, the directives of his department, interpretive decisions and opinions, delegations from PCOs and any limitations of the individual's appointment (5:34; 46:127). Some of the more common appointment limitations restrict an ACO to a particular dollar threshold, compensation arrangement or contract end purpose (e.g. Production, Services or Supplies).

In the making and administration of contracts, a contracting officer acts as the agent of the Government, and when he acts within the limits of his authority, his acts are the acts of the Government [46:127].

A government contractor must be familiar with the cognizant ACO's authority restrictions. There have been cases when contractors, remiss in checking CO authority, have been liable for contractual costs incurred from acting on a CO's unauthorized direction. To relieve a contractor from total liability in apparent authority cases, the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 and various court decisions made the government responsible for its agents' actions when "the contract

in question [is] not expressly prohibited by statute or regulation" (5:34). In other words, an agent's unauthorized acts may be "the acts of the government". The possible consequences of an ACO's actions emphasize the importance of selecting highly qualified persons for contracting officer positions (5:34).

Contracting Officer Qualifications

Concern for contracting officer qualifications is not new. In 1955, the "Hoover Commission" suggested "new attention should be given to improving the qualifications of contracting officers" (55:1); a 1970 Comptroller General's Report to the Congress recommended establishing experience and education standards for contracting positions (50:7); and in 1972, the Congressional Commission on Government Procurement (COGP) prescribed clarifying the methods for delegating contracting authority

...to assure that such authority is exercised by qualified individuals and is clearly understood by those within the agencies and by the agencies' suppliers of goods and services [55:1].

Despite the recommendations posed by these high-powered studies, contracting officer qualification requirements remained vague. The Defense Acquisition Regulation supplied the primary criteria prior to April 1984.

The DAR stated that expertise, training, education, business acumen, judgement, character, reputation and ethics shall be considered in selecting a CO (14:405.1). Additionally it provided the following evaluation criteria:

1. Experience in a Government procurement office, commercial procurement or related fields.
2. Formal education or special training in business administration, law, accounting, or related fields.
3. Completion of the Defense Procurement Management Course or other procurement courses.
4. Knowledge of the provisions of this Regulation and of other applicable regulations [14:405.1].

It must also be noted that the DAR allowed the designation of a CO by virtue of position (14:201.3). DOD organizations have assigned position authority to executive, director and Head of Contracting Activity (HCA) type positions (35:19). A 1976 survey of 14 government executive agencies performed by the Office of Federal Procurement Policy (OFPP), recommended deletion of the "by virtue of position" assignment of CO authority. The OFPP report stated that "...no contracting officer delegations of authority should be given to others than those fully qualified by background, experience, and their present position" (35:16).

Effective 1 April 1984 the FAR replaced the DAR. It attempts to consolidate acquisition regulations government-wide. The FAR lists verbatim the DAR CO selection considerations; however, it includes two additional example criteria:

1. Knowledge of acquisition policies and procedures.
2. Specialized knowledge in the particular assigned field of contracting [15:1.603(2)].

Thirty years after the Hoover Commission report, contracting officers still strive for specific qualification criteria. Though the FAR provides two more selection items than the

DAR, its criteria are offered as "examples": the DAR presented its criteria as mandatory considerations by using the term "shall." CO designation by virtue of position is excluded from the FAR. Also, the new regulation eliminates the term "PCO," relabeling the procuring contracting officer "contracting officer" (15:2.1).

PCO, ACO and TCO distinctions seldom occur. "Contracting officers" are usually perceived as and addressed as a composite group. Renaming the PCO the generic "CO" may further reduce recognition of individual contracting specialties. The FAR's nondifferentiation of selection criteria for the contracting specialties also fosters the collective perception of COs.

Push for Professionalism

While government commissions recommend improved qualification requirements and news media spotlight spare part "horror stories," contracting officers from government and industry pursue a professional designation for the contracting occupation. At the 1983 Air Force Systems Command (AFSC) contracting officer conference, Mr. Jim Williams, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Acquisition Management, identified five indicia of professionalism:

1. A defined body of specialized knowledge.
2. Undergraduate and graduate intellectual training.
3. Relationship to a professional organization with set standards, tests of competency and certification procedures.

4. A Code of Ethics enforced by members of the profession.

5. A high degree of autonomy and responsibility [2].

In the test for professionalism, the government contracting occupation has the basic framework of a profession: the introduction of the FAR offers an opportunity to refine the body of specialized knowledge; the proliferation of contracting in a number of degree programs at various colleges and universities provides training opportunities; and, the National Contract Management Association (NCMA) fulfills the professional organization requirement as well as offering a Code of Ethics. Because government contracting promotes the team concept, it somewhat restricts autonomy; however, the CO remains responsible for contractual actions.

Although the basic structure for professional designation is available, the boundaries are not firm. Members of the contracting community relentlessly pursue professionalism suggesting ways to improve contracting's status as a profession. Although the following literature review perpetuates the generic reference to COs, professionalism is a concern for all CO specialties.

CO's Concern. In Public Purchasing and Materials Management, Harry R. Page, Professor of Business Administration at the George Washington University, cites the Commission on Government Procurement 1971 survey of 110,000 federal civilian public-purchasing and material-management employees. Of the 53,568 persons responding to the COGP survey, "the work

force was characterized at that time by one commission member as 'over aged and under educated'" (38:69-70). Forty-one percent of the respondents were between the ages of 46 and 55, with an average educational level of high school plus three months of college (38:69-70). Page contends that "the competence of the work force is the most important factor in achieving organizational goals" (38:70). He further references the commission's report stating:

...more than half of the civilian agencies of the federal government were using as contracting officers personnel whose training, education, experience and expertise did not qualify them; personnel who did not have knowledge of applicable laws and regulations essential to the contracting function; and who were exercising the contracting officer authority that resided in the position occupied although no determination had been made of their qualifications to do so [38:78].

To avoid placement of unqualified persons in CO positions, Page identifies training and education in four skill areas which contracting officers should have:

1. Business knowledge and skills.
2. Communication skills.
3. General management skills.
4. Conceptual skills [38:71].

Two years after the publication of the book referenced above, Mr. Page testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Federal Expenditures, Research and Rules, Committee on Governmental Affairs on the 1982 proposed Uniform Federal Procurement System. Once again he emphasized the importance of business and management skills for the contracting officer for sound business judgement (37:7). He assured the subcom-

mittee that "competence in business and management can be taught and learned" (37:7), and that "the educational opportunities exist, and they are being utilized to advantage-by the private sector" (37:7). Page noted that procurement position announcements for private sector businesses require a bachelor's degree in a business related field while position announcements in federal government require no formal education (37:7). In fact, "under present standards, education cannot be a selection factor" (37:7). With only 1/3 of the present procurement force college graduates, Page indicated this lack of education standard as the principle reason for the relatively low level of professionalism in federal procurement (37:7). To improve the professional level of the work force, Page recommended to the subcommittee that

...the Office of Personnel Management needs to say that formal education in business and procurement management is necessary, and that professional certification is desirable [37:19].

The professional certification mentioned above would attest that the individual has attained a prescribed level of knowledge through formal course work or examination, has completed a prescribed minimum term of work experience in the contracting field, and has made a commitment to a standard of behavior and performance (40:80).

Another advocate of education and professionalism for contracting personnel is Robert Ragan. Presently a procurement manager for Bechtel National Incorporated, Ragan has been in contracting for over fifteen years both in government

and private industry. He writes, "Procurement to be a true profession must be considered as such not only by those who comprise its ranks but also by 'outsiders'" (40:12). Ragan considers one factor leading to this outside recognition to be the manner in which procurement personnel conduct their activities, including the daily demonstration of their business expertise (40:12). Like Page, he recognizes that there are people in procurement without college degrees, and comments:

It is difficult to be placed at the same level of esteem as doctors, engineers and other professionals who must hold a college degree in their discipline, when procurement professionals have no such requirement [40:12].

Ragan identifies a procurement professional as "a person with the specialized knowledge and often long and intensive academic training in procurement" (40:12). He does not feel enough schools offer undergraduate or graduate degrees in procurement; therefore, he advocates the promotion of procurement and contract management degree programs at local colleges and universities (40:12).

As Ragan alluded, defense contractors face the same need for professional contract managers as does the government. Efficient and effective contract administration reduces cost and therefore contributes directly to the corporate profit position. Top executives expect more than money management from contract administrators in today's environment. They expect purchasing and management professionals (39:67). To this end, one group of executives in a Special Chief Execu-

tive Report concluded that industry emphasis should be directed at more professional development through training programs (17:76). This emphasis even included attendance of government courses when possible (6:11). Another group, including Robert Howard, vice president-materials management, for GTE Corp echoed that professional development through training sentiment (39:77).

Corey M. Rindner, an adjunct professor at Northrup, reports on the 1982 establishment of an acquisition graduate program at Northrup University (NU) in Los Angeles CA. Government and industry have long recognized the need for a certification system for the purchasing profession (38:80). The Air Force finds military contracting officers frequently rotate to another assignment taking their contracting skills with them and leaving a novice negotiator in their stead (41:11). To alleviate this situation, an alliance was formed with NU and an on-site program was established at the AF Space Division (SD) in Los Angeles using SD "classrooms after hours and utilizing NU's instructors" (41:11). The National Contract Management Association, a professional organization for industry and government contracting personnel, assisted in the establishment of NU's curriculum (41:10). This NCMA focus helped NU "establish what the skills of a professional contracts work force should be" (41:10).

In his journal article Dale E. McNabb identifies what he considers "significant Government procurement problem areas" (29:39). One of these problems is that the training and

experience contract negotiators receive generally do not prepare them for the decision making role of the contracting officer (29:51). McNabb, an experienced government contracting officer-turned-industry contracting officer says that: "In dealing with the buying activities of all Government agencies across this broad land, he found that mediocrity reigned supreme..." (29:51). He feels that those agencies which are not mediocre have personnel with "the ability to make correct decisions in a timely manner" (29:51). McNabb's solution to CO decision making inadequacies is a one to two week course designed "to unlearn and relearn the fundamentals of decision making and standing behind those decisions..." (29:51).

In recent years the Air Force has sought ways to improve the COs' images. Brigadier General Bernard L. Weiss, Director of Contracting and Manufacturing Policy, Headquarters United States Air Force, offers an alternate approach to enhancing CO professionalism. General Weiss proposes a requirement that Air Force commands use written and oral examinations in the selection and appointment of contracting officers (2).

The Professional. In "The Public Purchasing Profession," S. D. Zemansky and Stephan B. Gordon suggest "professional designations" are recognized as the hallmark of outstanding performance indicating the highest quality of work the best people in the field can deliver (56:92). Because many groups claim professional status, they continue,

the definition of profession has been watered down (56:92). "Consequently, few, if any of these groups would satisfy the rigorous criteria that set the true professional apart from the individual practitioner of occupational specialty" (56:103). For public purchasing Zemansky and Gordon concluded that true professional status is structurally available, but still not fully a reality (56:101).

Although an individual may not be part of a "profession," he or she may still be a professional. "Of primary and therefore greater importance are the characteristics of individuals who want to apply their skills in a truly professional manner" (56:92). Zemansky and Gordon identify a professional purchasing officer by the following traits:

1. He is knowledgeable and competent in the areas of public purchasing, public administration, business management, and product/service responsibility.
2. He is dedicated to the public service and the best interests of the whole.
3. He is guided by a desire for excellence.
4. He is governed by the highest ideals of honor, integrity, and objectivity.
5. He is completely honest.
6. He is recognized as a professional by his peers.
7. He accepts responsibility for failure and is modest when successful.
8. He is a team player.
9. He is active in at least one professional organization of public purchasers.
10. He is friendly, courteous, and tactful at all times [56:103].

Government and industry contracting officers yearn for professionalism. The avenue to professional designation noted in the literature stresses various forms of CO qualification criteria and selection procedures:

1. Bachelor's degree.
2. Master's degree.
3. Training and education in various business skills.
4. Professional certification.
5. Decision making skills.
6. Written or oral examinations.

The COs' suggestions seem to emphasize minimum selection and appointment procedures which would convince "outsiders" of government CO professionalism.

Contracting officers' aspirations parallel government and media demands for qualifications improvement. COs are and should be professionals "dedicated to the public service and the best interest of the whole" (56:103). One CO aptly synopsisized the ACO qualification issue: "No matter how conservative you are, you want somebody with experience negotiating billion-dollar defense contracts" (29:53).

The following chapter delineates the criteria presently used by DOD agencies in the selection of their administrative contracting officers. It also presents the standards for CO selection proposed by Task Group Six.

III. ACO Selection Criteria

Task Group Six's draft report included a Model System for selecting and appointing contracting officers. The system was prefaced by the following statements:

...it should be noted that the instruction provides a recommended method and minimum criteria for the selection and appointment of contracting officers. Agencies are free to change and adapt the instruction to their needs, and to strengthen the criteria as they wish [43:11].

Before a revised instruction can be proposed for DOD ACO selection, existing procedures and criteria by which the current work force was selected must be determined. Delineation of the present criteria provides a baseline from which new criteria can be developed; therefore, in response to Research Question One, "What are present ACO selection criteria?", Air Force, Army, DCAS and Navy requirements for ACO appointments are reviewed in this chapter. These criteria are then compared to Task Group Six's model plan which are provided in answer to Research Question Two: "What are the Task Group's recommendations?"

Present ACO Selection Criteria

ACO selection criteria were solicited from each DOD agency by Mr. John Verardo, course director for Advanced Contract Administration at the Air Force Institute of Technology (AFIT), School of Systems and Logistics. A letter sent to each agency requested copies of regulations, instructions

or procedures by which the organization selected its ACOs (51).

The following four subsections summarize agency replies to Mr. Verardo's request. Minimum experience, education and training requirements are identified. Specified selection procedures are also provided. Note that information supplied by the agencies was compiled prior to 1 April 1984 and is therefore based on the DAR rather than the FAR suggested criteria.

Air Force. The Air Force Contract Management Division (AFCMD) headquartered in Albuquerque NM is the Air Force's parent organization for AFPROs. AFCMD currently has 215 ACOs assigned among 25 AFPROs and two operating locations in the United States. Additionally, one of these ACOs is located at a CAO in Europe.

AFCMD is responsible for the selection of each of its 215 ACOs. To ensure "...that only the most highly qualified individuals are appointed..." (1:1-405.50), AFCMD prepared and implemented AFCMD DAR Supplement 1-405.50. For civilian ACO positions (GS-11 and above), the supplement references the experience and education requirements outlined in the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) Handbook X-118, Qualification Standards, Contract and Acquisition Series, GS-1102. These requirements are provided in Appendix E. AFCMD augmented the OPM standards to make the CO selection criteria more specific to field organizations' needs. The following requirements and selection procedures were extracted from the

AFCMD DAR Supplement 1-405.50.

Experience/Education:

1. A minimum of one year of specialized experience which must have been full-time in a position in an Air Force or other DOD Contract Administration Contracting Office at the level of work commensurate with the contracting officer duties to be assigned; or,
2. One year of experience working for contractors engaged in performing DOD contracts or in DOD contracting offices as a contract administrator, accountant or lawyer; or,
3. A minimum of two years of full-time experience while working for industry in non-DOD related work as a contract administrator, accountant or lawyer; or,
4. Successful completion of one year of "on-the-job training" as a contract specialist/administrator at an AFCMD detachment.

Training. The individual must have completed three of those courses identified as mandatory by the DOD-wide Civilian Career Program for Acquisition Personnel, DOD 1430.10-M-1 [Appendix F]. At least one of the three courses should be from the following list:

1. Management of Defense Acquisition Contracts, (8D-4320).
2. Contract Administration (JT), PPM 152.
3. Advanced Contract Administration (JT), PPM 304.

This requirement will be given primary consideration in the review process. The individual's background, experience, and training in other areas will also be considered. Successful completion of the AFIT Graduate Logistics Management Program (Procurement Major) is considered equivalent to the above training requirement [1:1-405.50].

Procedure (1:1-405.50). An individual is nominated for appointment as a contracting officer by an AFPRO Commander. The nomination (or request for appointment) is

forwarded to the Commander of AFCMD who is the Contract Management Division's appointment authority. Each request includes a resume listing the designee's applicable experience, education and training, plus supporting documentation for any deviation from the AFCMD DAR Supplement requirements. Headquarters AFCMD interviews the candidate to determine warrantability. "The interview is not presented in a 'test' format, but rather as a forum for discussion" of key areas of knowledge (Appendix G) (25). AFCMD then advises the AFPRO Commander of the warrantability of the candidate or additional experience/training required.

Army. The US Army Aviation Research and Development Command located in St. Louis MO appoints APRO ACOs. Presently nine ACOs are assigned to three APROs. This Command indicated that it does not have a written local procedure for appointing ACOs, but uses the DAR and Army Defense Acquisition Regulation Supplement (ADARS) recommendations (45). DAR considerations are restated for the reader's convenience: expertise, training, education, business acumen, judgement, character, reputation and ethics. The DAR also provides the following evaluation criteria:

1. Experience in a Government procurement office, commercial procurement, or related fields.
2. Formal education or special training in business administration, law, accounting, or related fields.
3. Completion of the Defense Procurement Management Course or other procurement courses.
4. Knowledge of the provisions of this Regulation and of other applicable regulations [14:405.1].

The ADARS does not specify any additional experience or education requirements (16:1-405); however, training requirements and procedures for CO appointment were identified in the correspondence to Mr. Verardo:

Training. The candidate:

...must have completed the Management of Defense Acquisition Contracts (Basic) and Contract Administration (Basic) courses or other training which could be considered equivalent to these courses [45].

Procedure. ACO nominees are recommended by their immediate supervisors through the Commander of their APRO to the US Army Aviation Research and Development Command for appointment. The recommendation includes:

1. A resume of the candidate's experience and training.
2. Certification by supervisor as to candidate's knowledge of acquisition regulations and other information as to character, personality traits and business acumen [45].

To assist in the evaluation of a candidate's qualifications, the Army uses SAV Form 289, "Recommendation for Appointment as Contracting Officer". A sample is provided in Appendix H. The appointing official at the Command headquarters reviews the information (Form 289 and resume) to assure the "candidate has the necessary experience and training to qualify as an ACO" (45).

DCAS. Appointment authority for DCASPRO ACOs has been delegated by the DLA to the Commanders and Deputy Commanders for each of nine DCAS Regions (DCASRs) (10). Forty DCASPROs are presently operating among the nine regions and 102 ACOs are assigned to these PROs.

DCASR ACO selection procedures are dictated by the DLA Manual (DLAM) 8105.1. This instruction directs the use of the DAR requirements for selection of contracting officers. It qualifies ACO appointment to personnel who meet one or more of these criteria:

1. Are to be assigned one or more contracts for administration on a continuing basis.
2. Are to be designated a [Corporate Administrative Contracting Officer] CACO.
3. Are designated to fill in during the temporary absences of assigned ACOs [10:1-405.3(c)].

DLAM 8105.1 does not specify minimum experience, education or training requirements for ACOs; however, the selection procedure is furnished:

The Chief of the applicable functional element will attach to a resume of the applicant's qualifications... a justification for the recommended appointment. The resume and justification will be forwarded to the [Contract Management] Director, DCASR, through channels, for endorsement and submission to the Commander, DCASR.

If approved, the Commander or Deputy Commander, DCASR will issue the appointment document [10:1-405.3(a-b)].

Although DLAM 8105.1 does not delineate specific qualification requirements, personal interviews with DLA headquarters personnel revealed three areas in which DLA evaluates individuals: knowledge, skills and ability - "KSA". Knowledge is the individual's understanding of statutes, regulations and guidelines; writing, price analysis and negotiation are skills an individual may possess; and, ability is measured in terms of a person's analytical, leadership and adaptation capabilities.

Navy. NAVPROs are a segment of the Naval Air Systems Command (NAVAIR) headquartered in Washington DC. Currently NAVAIR has 79 ACOs distributed among 14 NAVPROs and two Navy Branch PROs.

Naval ACOs are labeled "Class V" contracting officers (33:Encl 1). The Class designation indicates the type of authority the CO is delegated. In the ACO's case, "Class V" denotes the ACO's authority to perform the functions set forth in DAR 1-406 (FAR 42.302) (33:Encl 1). Specific requirements for the selection of Class V COs are outlined in NAVAIR Instruction (NAVAIRINST) 4330.16A. This instruction requires each ACO nominee to be the "Naval Plant Representative or a qualified person in the Contracts Division of a NAVPRO" (34:1-2.3(b)). Minimum experience, education and training requirements, and the procedure for selecting the qualified individual are presented in the following paragraphs.

Experience/Education.

1. A college degree with at least 12 semester hours in subjects as accounting, industrial management, finance, law, or business administration, plus one year experience as described in paragraph (3) below; or
2. A minimum of two years experience as an accountant, plus a minimum of two years experience as described in paragraph (3) below; or
3. A minimum of three years journeyman-level experience in procurement or contract negotiation or administration in NAVAIR procurement or other government procurement, including experience acquired while working for contractors full-time on Defense Department procurement [34:1-2.3(b)].

Training. The ACO candidate must have completed the following four Defense Contracting Training Program courses.

1. Contract Administration or Defense Procurement Management.
2. Defense Contract Negotiation Techniques.
3. Defense Cost and Price Analysis.
4. Defense Termination Settlement [34:1-2.3(b)].

An option allows the candidate to have completed two of the courses and be scheduled to attend the remaining courses (34:1-2.3(b)).

Procedure. Requests for NAVAIR ACO appointments must include:

...a resume of the nominee's qualifications, justification for the need of ACO authority, and facts indicating that the individual selected meets the qualification requirements [34:1-2.3(a)].

These requests are forwarded by the NAVPRO Commander to the NAVAIR Contracts Group for appointment approval by the Assistant Commander for Contracts (33:4b).

Task Group Six Recommendations

The Task Group Six report states:

The purpose of selection and appointment systems is to identify individuals who have acquired the skills, knowledge, experience and other attributes necessary to competently exercise the delegated contracting authority as the Government's contracting officers [43:6].

A copy of Task Group Six's Model System for the Selection, Appointment and Termination of Appointment of Contracting Officers is available in Appendix I. Based on the premise

that the contracting authority inherent in a given position should dictate the selection criteria for that position, the Model System proposes three categories of COs and recommends selection criteria commensurate to the authority delegated to each category. The three broad categories of COs are Small Purchase, Intermediate and Senior. The sample instruction does not

...define the distinguishing characteristics of these three classes, other than to specify that Small Purchase selection requirements apply to all contracting officers with purchasing authority up to the small purchase threshold [43:7];

however, it does recommend minimum experience, education and training requirements for each category. These criteria are cited for each category in the following paragraphs. The Model System's recommended selection procedure is also addressed.

Small Purchase CO.

Experience. Shall have at least one year of procurement experience, preferably including six months recent experience in small purchases or simplified purchasing.

Education. A high school diploma or its equivalence is desirable.

Training. Shall at the time of appointment have successfully completed training in Government small purchases to reach Level I [of the proposed training plan]...Level I is an introduction to the procurement and contracting process and a treatment of fundamental principles and techniques with emphasis on public sector procurement through small purchase procedures, orders against Federal Supply Schedule (FSS) contracts, and purchases from mandatory sources....It is suggested that a minimum of 120 hours are necessary to accomplish this purpose.

Contracting Officer (Intermediate).

Experience. Shall have at least three years of current, progressively complex, and responsible procurement experience which has provided on-the-job training

in researching and recommending the contract-related business decisions generally inherent in intermediate-level appointments. Experience in the GS-1102 or GS-1105 series (or directly comparable military or private sector experience) is highly desirable.

Education. Preferably an associates degree in a field of study appropriate for procurement such as procurement and contracting, business administration, accounting, economics, marketing, or law.

Training. Shall meet at the time of appointment, applicable training standards to Level II [of the training plan]...Level II develops functional knowledge of the laws, policies, procedures and methods pertaining to Federal contracts....It is suggested that a minimum of 320 hours are necessary to accomplish this purpose.

Contracting Officer (Senior).

Experience. Shall have at least five current years of progressively complex and responsible procurement experience which has provided on-the-job training in researching and recommending the contract-related business management decisions generally inherent in senior-level appointments.

Education. A Bachelor's degree is highly desirable, preferably in an appropriate field of study, such as procurement and contracting, business administration, accounting, economics, marketing or law.

Training. Shall meet, at the time of appointment, applicable training standard to Level III [of the training plan]...The training requirements for Level II are also prerequisites for Level III. The essential difference between Level II and Level III courses is that Level II conveys general procurement knowledge, while Level III concentrates on the in-depth analysis of more complex and specialized procurement areas and presents a strategic overview of procurement management....It is suggested that a minimum of 520 hours are necessary to accomplish this purpose [43:App 1, p. 1-2, Atch 1, p. 1-2, 6].

General and core subject areas are suggested for each

training level in an attachment to the Model System. The Task Group also provides general education, experience and training equivalencies (43:App 1, p. 2).

Procedure. Task Group Six recommends reviewing a CO candidate's experience, education and training records. Selection should be made based on the candidate's possession of minimum qualification requirements and the candidate's "potential to competently make the central contract-related business decisions for which they will be responsible under the terms and conditions of the appointment" (43:App 1, p. 3). For Level II and III appointments, the group suggests establishing advisory panels to assist in the selection procedure (43:App 1, p. 3).

This chapter reviewed ACO selection criteria and procedures available in Air Force, Army, DCAS and Navy regulations. Recommendations in Task Group Six's November 1983 draft report were also presented. The current qualification requirements and the proposed criteria are summarized in Table I.

Task Group Six's Model System introduces the concept of CO categorization and progressive minimum requirements. Based on the recommended criteria, agencies' current regulations require, at most, the experience, education and training of a Small Purchase CO. The next chapter describes the data collection procedure used to determine the status of the

TABLE I

**Agency and Task Group Minimum
Contracting Officer Qualification Criteria**

AGENCY/ CATEGORY	C R I T E R I A			BASIC APPOINTMENT PROCEDURE
	EXPERIENCE	EDUCATION	TRAINING	
AIR FORCE	1 Year in DOD Contracting -OR- 2 Years non- DOD	None None	3 DOD Courses Same	Review Recommendation/ Interview Same
ARMY	None	None	2 DOD Courses	Review Recommendation
DCAS	None	None	None	KSA and Review Recommendation
NAVY	1 Year in DOD Contracting -OR- 2 Years in Accounting + 2 Years in DOD Contracting -OR- 3 Years in DOD Contracting	College Degree (12 sem hours in business) -OR- None -OR- None	4 DOD Courses Same Same	Review Recommendation Same Same
TASK GRP				
Small Purchase	1 Year Contracting (Current)	High School Diploma (Desirable)	120 Hours	Records Review
Intermedi- ate	3 Years Contracting (Current)	Associates Degree (Preferred)	320 Hours	Records Review/ Advisory Panel Assist Recommended
Senior	5 Years Contracting (Current)	Bachelor's Degree (Highly Desirable)	520 Hours	Same
NOTE: Although an agency may not have documented minimum requirements for experience, education or training, all are subject to OPM's Handbook X-118 requirements for civilian hires.				

present work force in relation to the recommended criteria,
and ACOs' opinions regarding their selection criteria and
procedures.

IV. Research Methodology

Chapter I introduced the research problem, emphasized the importance of considering ACOs as a unique portion of the contracting community and stated the research objective and the research questions used to accomplish the objective. Chapter II provided background on ACOs, identifying their responsibilities and authority, discussing the general criteria used in the selection and appointment of contracting officers, and reviewing literature on the COs' pursuit of professional designation. Chapter III responded to Research Questions 1 and 2 delineating the ACO selection criteria specified in DOD regulations and the criteria recommended by Task Group Six.

This chapter describes the development and validation of the survey instrument used to answer the remaining research questions. It also identifies the universe, population and sample to which the survey was administered and relates the data collection and data analysis procedures used to determine survey results. Finally, assumptions and limitations of the survey are stated.

Survey Construction

During performance of this research effort, the Task Group Six recommendations went through several revisions. The criteria presented in Chapter III were taken from a November 1983 draft of the Task Group's report received

5 April 1984. The questionnaire described in this chapter fell victim to the dynamically changing environment in which CO criteria are developed: it was based on an August 1983 draft report. Table II summarizes the three CO categories and their respective minimum requirements as recommended in the August 1983 draft of Task Group Six's Model Selection System. Note that the experience levels are higher than those cited in Chapter III (1, 3 and 5 years for Small Purchase, Intermediate and Senior, respectively). In the construction of the survey, years of experience, educational degree and training hour ranges proposed by the Task Group were used as question response alternatives. For example:

What is your current contract administration experience?

- | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| a. 2 years or less | d. 6 - 10 years |
| b. 2 - 4 years | e. More than 10 years |
| c. 4 - 6 years | |

The experience level was the only measure altered by the November 1983 revision.

Survey Instrument

The Task Group Six recommendations were composed without ascertaining the demographic profile of the existing work force; therefore, it is not known how contracting officers will compare to the Task Group recommendations for minimum levels of experience, education or training. Making the necessary comparison requires asking specific questions of the

TABLE II
Survey Variables

CO	Experience	Education	Training
Small Purchase	2 years	High School	120 hrs
Intermediate	4 years	Associates	320 hrs
Senior	6 years	Bachelors	520 hrs

current work force. These questions could be posed through either personal interviews, telephone interviews or mailed surveys. Since ACOs are located in PROs throughout the country, personal interviews were considered logistically unfeasible. Telephone interviews were overruled based on the detail of information required. A mail survey was selected as the best method for gathering the necessary data to make meaningful comparisons between the qualifications possessed by the work force and those recommended by Task Group Six.

The resulting survey instrument involves three parts: Demographics, ACO/Counterpart Position Selection and Recommended Standards. The following discussion relates the contents of each part. A copy of the survey is available in Appendix J.

Part I - Demographics. This section contains 32 questions designed to identify the current ACO work force. It is this information that will be used to compare the work force to the Task Group's criteria in response to Research Question 3: "How does the present ACO work force compare with the recommended minimum standards?"

The first three questions of Part I categorize respondents by agency, sex and grade/rank. Question four identifies a respondent's highest educational level achieved. Collegiate educational experience is then characterized by the amount of contracting background provided by the degree program. Each of the possible degree programs (Associate, Bachelor's and Master's) is rated using the following scale:

- a. I do not have a(n) (appropriate) Degree.
- b. No contracting background.
- c. Some contracting background.
- d. Extensive contracting background.
- e. Entire degree emphasis was contracting.

Questions eight through 10 indicate experience in contract administration, the duration of employment with the respondent's current organization, and the length of time the respondent has lived in the area where his organization is located. In addition to providing the present experience level of an ACO, this set of questions allows the determination of total organizational experience for the individual. The next four questions in Part I determine the complexity of the administrative work done by the respondent. COs are classified as Small Purchase, Intermediate and Senior by the Task Group recommendations. These four questions provide a basis for determining potential categories for ACO categorization. Two of the questions ask the respondent to specify the type of contract he administers most often. Response choices specify two fixed price and two cost type contracts as well as a response for "other." Contract type options provided are believed to be the most prevalent types being administered at plant representative offices. The other two questions ask the respondent to specify dollar values of contracts most frequently administered.

Questions 15 - 32 identify training courses for contracting personnel. The list contains courses mandatory for career progression, as dictated in the DOD Civilian Career Program for Contracting and Acquisition Personnel (13), and courses listed in the Task Group recommendations. While indicating whether or not the course has been completed, the respondents rate the utility of the course. Answers provide possible training recommendations. The following rating scale is used.

- a. I have not had the course.
- b. I have had the course but found it of little use.
- c. I have had the course and use the material some.
- d. I have had the course and use the material extensively.
- e. I have had the course and feel the material is mandatory for my job.

Part II - ACO/Counterpart Position Selection Criteria.

The second section consists of seven questions. Four questions determine if the respondent was interviewed, required to take an examination, inherited the warrant by virtue of position, or some combination of these methods. Additionally, the respondent is asked his experience level and education level at the time of selection. This information provides a check on agencies written selection procedures identified in Chapter III. Finally, this section asks the ACOs if they believe they were qualified for the ACO position when selected.

Part III - Recommended Standards. The last section of

the survey instrument asks the opinions of the respondents regarding selection criteria for ACOs. This section was included because this input was not considered by the Task Group when formulating its recommendations.

The first six questions in the section ask for specific opinions on the importance of experience, education, training, and examinations in the ACO selection process. The last eighteen questions are a list of the same courses identified in Part I of the survey. In this section however the respondents are asked to rate the importance of each course as a qualification requirement for selecting ACOs. The rating scale used has five responses.

- a. Not important at all.
- b. Limited importance.
- c. Somewhat important.
- d. Very important.
- e. Extremely important.

Recognizing that no instrument is perfect and not wanting to restrict the input of the respondents, the questionnaire is concluded with a statement requesting the respondent to provide any additional comments he feels are important for the research effort.

Survey Validation

The survey instrument went through several editions before assuming its final form. Early versions of the questionnaire were administered to members of Advanced Contract

Administration classes at the Air Force Institute of Technology, and revised pursuant to comments and observations received (28). Additionally, interviews with Mr. Joseph Spagnola, (49), Procurement Research Analyst, and Mr. Michael Miller, (30) Procurement Career Management Specialist, of the Federal Acquisition Institute, Washington DC provided further input to the final survey instrument. Mr. Miller had participated in a 1979 effort which surveyed 20,000 acquisition personnel with a much more indepth survey instrument.

The Universe

The universe for this research project was all Administrative Contracting Officers. The population of interest from the universe is described below.

The Population

Functions assigned by the Federal Acquisition Regulation give ACOs considerable responsibility. Additionally, ACOs located in plant representative offices are in constant contact with contractors representing the government's "one face to industry." This research study concentrates on ACOs in plant representative offices.

The present population of ACOs in DOD PROs is 405. Table III displays the distribution of ACOs by agency. The population consists of both military and civilian employees.

Sample Surveyed

The original intent of this survey was to poll the

TABLE III
ACOs in Plant Representative Offices

Agency	Number of Plants	ACOs
1. Air Force	28	215
2. Army	3	9
3. DCAS	40	102
4. Navy	16	79
Totals	87	405

entire DOD ACO population. To this end the survey instrument and the necessary documentation were forwarded on 16 April 1984 to Headquarters Air Force Manpower and Personnel Center, Division of Research and Measurement for approval to conduct the survey. On 25 May 1984, survey approval number USAF SCN 84-53 was issued; however, it restricted distribution to Air Force military personnel (4). Although the number of Air Force military ACOs was not known, any sample ignoring the civilian portion of the population could not be considered representative of the population of Air Force ACOs, let alone the entire population of DOD ACOs.

Surveying the civilian portion of the population and the other agencies would require approval by the Defense Manpower Data Center in Arlington VA as well as the need for national union coordination. The time necessary to obtain approval from the Defense Manpower Data Center was estimated by AFMPC to be six weeks. Additional time would be required for union coordination. Time constraints of this research effort did not allow pursuit of this alternative; therefore, it was decided to conduct a purposive survey using a portion of the population willing to administer the survey within their organizations.

The Advanced Contract Administration class at AFIT is a required course for career progression within DOD; therefore, members of all the Services and DCAS attend the course. Course Director, Mr. John Verardo, provided a list of potential contacts for survey distribution. These individ-

uals were contacted by telephone to verify their willingness to administer the survey within their organizations, and to determine the number of ACOs in their organization (Appendix K). Based on these calls, a total of 96 ACOs (nearly one fourth of the entire population) were exposed to the survey instrument. Table IV depicts the breakdown of the surveyed sample.

In addition to the ACOs mentioned above, Mr. A. Richard Apple, Corporate Director, Contract Risk Assessment for Lockheed Corporation, Burbank CA agreed to administer the survey to ACO counterparts within his organization. This contractor participation would provide a limited comparison between DOD ACOs and their private industry counterparts. Ten surveys were sent to Mr. Apple.

Data Collection Procedure

Survey packets were mailed to each organization identified in Appendix K. The packets included questionnaires, computer readable answer sheets for survey responses, and one return envelope for each location. Instructions and a brief explanation of the survey were provided in a cover letter. Respondents were requested to complete and return the questionnaires within one week after receipt. Organizations not responding in the specified time period were given a courtesy call to determine their intentions for survey completion.

TABLE IV
ACO Sample Surveyed

Agency	Total Plants/ Surveyed	Total ACOs/Surveyed
1. Air Force	28/11	215/60
2. Army	3/3	9/9
3. DCAS	40/6	102/14
4. Navy	16/3	79/13
Totals	87/23	405/96

Analysis of the Data

Respondent-coded answer sheets were read by a pre-programmed computer. The computer tallied the results by question and response category. It also provided category percentages. ACO answer sheets were tallied as a whole and by agency. The contractor responses were handled separately in a similar manner. Cross-tabulations were performed manually. Training courses attended by respondents were manually converted to hours using a six hour day/five day week, multiplied by the course length as prescribed by the DOD Civilian Career Program for Contracting and Acquisition Personnel. Use of the purposive sample precluded any statistical methods of analysis.

List of Assumptions

1. The sample surveyed is representative of the ACO PRO population. This assumption is based on agency personnel's impressions that ACOs in one PRO are representative of ACOs in all PROs.
2. ACO selection criteria can be quantified.
3. The number of ACOs in each PRO, as identified by the four agencies, was correct.
4. There were no errors in computer tallies, manual cross-tabulations or course hour conversions.
5. Mr. Apple's industry survey participants are in positions comparable to DOD ACOs.

List of Limitations

1. Survey questions may have been unclearly worded causing misinterpretation by respondents.
2. Some variables may have been omitted from data collection and analysis.

3. Experience, education and training equivalencies were not considered.
4. ACO contracting "experience" results will be conservative because of the survey's August 1983 baseline.

This chapter presented the development of the survey instrument, the ACO sample targeted, and the plans for collection and analysis of survey data. The following chapter discusses the findings based on ACO responses to the survey.

V. Findings

Chapter III delineated the minimum contracting officer standards proposed by Task Group Six and introduced the Group's concept of three CO categories. Chapter IV described the construction of a survey instrument utilizing the Task Group's categorical requirements as response alternatives.

This chapter presents findings based on the survey responses and compares those responses with the recommended standards of the Task Group. The first part of this chapter identifies general survey results. The next part of the chapter discusses findings relative to Research Question 3. The chapter concludes with survey results addressing Research Question 4.

General Survey Results

By contacting the ACOs from Mr. Verardo's prior Advanced Contract Administration classes, a purposive sample group of 96 ACOs was identified. This group comprises approximately one fourth of the population. The sampled ACOs work in 23 plant representative offices. Table IV (Chapter IV) depicts the distribution of surveys among the various agencies.

The requested one week response time for survey completion stretched to six weeks. In the fifth week courtesy calls were made to five organizations to determine the status of their survey participation. At the conclusion of the data collection process, responses had been received from all 23

V. Findings

Chapter III delineated the minimum contracting officer standards proposed by Task Group Six and introduced the Group's concept of three CO categories. Chapter IV described the construction of a survey instrument utilizing the Task Group's categorical requirements as response alternatives.

This chapter presents findings based on the survey responses and compares those responses with the recommended standards of the Task Group. The first part of this chapter identifies general survey results. The next part of the chapter discusses findings relative to Research Question 3. The chapter concludes with survey results addressing Research Question 4.

General Survey Results

By contacting the ACOs from Mr. Verardo's prior Advanced Contract Administration classes, a purposive sample group of 96 ACOs was identified. This group comprises approximately one fourth of the population. The sampled ACOs work in 23 plant representative offices. Table IV (Chapter IV) depicts the distribution of surveys among the various agencies.

The requested one week response time for survey completion stretched to six weeks. In the fifth week courtesy calls were made to five organizations to determine the status of their survey participation. At the conclusion of the data collection process, responses had been received from all 23

organizations. Unfortunately, two questionnaires from one PRO had been accidentally discarded. A total of 69 responses were collected (exclusive of the two just mentioned): 42 Air Force, 8 Army, 10 DCAS and 9 Navy. This represents roughly 17 percent of the ACO population in DOD PROs. Possible reasons for nonresponse by ACOs include:

1. Disinterest in the survey.
2. Nonavailability because of vacations or temporary duty assignments.
3. Completion of the questionnaire was a low priority in a busy work schedule.
4. Possible mishandling of the completed surveys in the mail channels.

Although 25 of the distributed questionnaires were unanswered, several of the ACOs responding reacted quite positively to the survey. One respondent commented that it was nice having someone interested in the working ACO's viewpoint.

Some respondents did not answer every question. If more than 10 percent of the questions were unanswered by a respondent, the questionnaire was omitted from the survey results. Ten percent is a generally accepted error rate when manual operations (e.g. coding answer sheets) are performed (54). This criteria eliminated only one questionnaire. Findings are presented based on the total responses received for each question exclusive of the contractor's input. Total responses for each survey question are presented in Appendix L, categorized by agency for reader convenience.

Research Question Three

This portion of the chapter compares the PRO ACOs to the Task Group's recommended standards thereby answering Research Question Three: "How does the present ACO work force compare to the recommended minimum standards?" The breakout of ACOs meeting all three criteria in a given category is presented first. This composite picture is followed by sections discussing particular findings in the areas of experience, education, training and procedures. The figures presented in the following sections are based on a total of 68 responses.

Composite Picture

Figure 4 displays the percentage of DOD ACOs that would be classified in each of the three CO categories (Small Purchase, Intermediate and Senior) recommended by the Task Group. Only ACOs possessing all the minimum requirements for a category (see Table II) were included in that category. For example, to be considered in the senior category, an ACO would have to possess at least a Bachelor's degree, six years of experience and 520 hours of documented training.

If the Task Group's recommendations were implemented as stated, roughly six percent of the ACOs would not be qualified for any ACO position, and 50 percent of the respondents would only qualify as Small Purchase COs. Small Purchase COs are limited to a \$25,000 signature authority. Ninety-nine percent of the ACOs indicated they presently administer at




Figure 4. ACO Categories - Composite

least one contract valued at more than \$500,000. Task Group Six's standards would therefore disqualify over half of the ACO work force. Perhaps more startling, of those in the unqualified and small purchase categories, approximately 61 percent (23 of 38) now administer a contract valued at over \$100 million.

When each of the components of this picture is viewed separately, there is a marked difference in the composition of the CO categories. For this reason the three qualification criteria will be discussed individually in the following sections. The sections first address ACO demographics and then present opinions expressed by the respondents regarding the given criteria. Additionally, ACO selection procedures are discussed..

Experience.

Demographics. Figure 5 shows how PRO ACOs would be classified if experience were the only factor considered. The predominant category would be senior level ACOs with 69.1 percent currently having six or more years of contract administration experience. Of the ACOs that would be categorized as Senior COs, 70 percent (33 of 47), possess more than 10 years of experience. Having less than two years of experience, 4.4 percent of the ACOs would be unqualified for any position.

Recommendations. Less than six percent of the ACOs were selected for their present position with less than two years of experience. In fact, three out of five of them had




Figure 5. ACO Categories - Experience

more than six years in contracting. Figure 6 compares ACOs' experience levels when selected for their present positions to their recommendations for minimum requirement standards. Although 57 percent of the ACOs had six or more years of experience at the time of their appointment, 81 percent recommended that two to six years of experience was sufficient for selection. Only four of the respondents suggested two years or less would be acceptable. Interestingly, each of these four respondents had at least a Master's degree at the time of his selection and had less than six years of experience.

Education.

Demographics. When education is used as the only qualification criteria, the ACO picture is even more concentrated in the senior CO category. As displayed in Figure 7, 86.8 percent of the ACOs possess at least a Bachelor's degree and therefore qualify for a Senior CO position. The remaining ACOs fall in the small purchase or intermediate categories. Of those in the senior category, 37.3 percent (22 of 59) possess either a Master's degree or something beyond a Master's degree.

Recommendations. Although the questionnaire did not ask ACOS to recommend a minimum educational level, it did ask the respondents' views of undergraduate and graduate study in business or contracting as a factor in the selection of ACOs. Undergraduate study was considered important, very important or mandatory by 70.6 percent of the ACOS. Well over half of the respondents indicated that graduate study in




Figure 6. Actual Experience Level -vs- ACO Recommended Experience Level




Figure 7. ACO Categories - Education

business or contracting was of little importance. Considering 87 percent of the ACOs had, at the minimum, a Bachelor's degree when selected for their present position, the 30 percent electing a less important status for education was noteworthy. One possible reason for the nonemphasis of educational requirements is that the survey question qualified study to business or contracting. Perhaps opinions would have been different if the question addressed a generic educational requirement. A further comment by one respondent indicated that continuing education should be important after selection; however, possession of a degree should not be a prerequisite for an individual's selection if that individual is determined to be qualified by the selecting authority.

Training. As seen in Figure 8, with training the only qualification factor, the classification of the ACOs is very similar to the composite picture presented in Figure 4. Since previous demographic discussions indicate a considerable portion of PRO ACOs have senior level experience and education, training (or the lack of it) seems to be the primary driver for the composite profile. In fact, if the required 520 training hours for the senior level were reduced to 320, and the 320 hours for the intermediate level were reduced to 120 hours, the composite picture presented in Figure 4 would be significantly altered. Thirty seven percent of the ACOs (versus 22.1 percent) would be classified as Senior COs and 40 percent (versus 22.1 percent) of the ACOs would become qualified for intermediate level positions. As




Figure 8. ACO Categories - Training

the requirements stand however almost half of the ACOs have less than 320 hours of training, placing them in the small purchase category, and only a quarter of the ACOs meet the 520 hour minimum for senior level qualification.

Influences. Two factors influenced the training hour results making them less accurate than is desired. First, equivalencies were not addressed in this study. Omission of this information proved most detrimental to those with extensive graduate and undergraduate work. For example, three Navy ACOs were graduates of the Naval Post Graduate School; however, counting strictly DOD training hours all three qualify only as Small Purchase COs.

The second factor affecting the training results was the use of Task Group Six's recommended study areas. Seven of these courses were included in the questionnaire:

1. Ethics and Standards.
2. Federal Procurement Responsibility and Authority.
3. Social and Legal Environment of Business.
4. Marketing, Bid and Proposal Preparation.
5. Business Policy.
6. Data Management.
7. Project Management and Systems Procurement.

Because the study areas could not be equated to DOD courses, hours were not credited to individuals claiming attendance at a course of the specified or similar name. Fortunately, few respondents were affected.

Recommendations. ACOs feel training should be an important criteria in the selection of ACOs. Ninety-three percent indicated that training was important, very important, or mandatory as a selection factor; however, very few courses were considered prerequisites for qualification as an ACO. In fact, only half of the respondents felt completion of the Contract Administration course should be a qualification requirement. Other than Contract Administration (recommended most), three courses were considered mandatory for ACO qualification by 25 percent or more of the respondents: Defense Contract Negotiation Workshop, Advanced Contract Administration and Government Contract Law.

Although respondents felt few of the courses provided in the questionnaire should be mandatory, they suggested other courses as preselection requirements:

1. Central Systems Contracting.
2. SYS 100 System Acquisition.
3. Cost Accounting Standards.
4. Overhead or Accounting Principles and Techniques.
5. Independent Research and Development/ Bid and Proposal Expenses Analysis.

Some respondents commented on the quality or structure of some of the DOD courses. One ACO felt most DOD courses were directed toward the procurement aspects of contracting rather than contract administration.

Two respondents shared the opinion that DOD courses should put more emphasis on problem-solving. The use of case

studies was suggested as well as the use of essay examinations which would measure the student's ability to solve a problem (e.g. write a correct contract modification). Another felt that the courses were not tailored enough to the PRO level of procurement and suggested that classes should include an overview of policies and procedures.

Still another suggestion was the combination of several courses into a block, possibly six weeks long. This one block would serve as a mandatory training core that all potential ACOs must complete. Additional courses could then be obtained after the individual is appointed an ACO.

Refresher courses were also suggested. Contracting is a dynamic environment and course content changes over time to the extent that a refresher would be beneficial. An alternative to refresher courses was a contracting officer newsletter published to keep people apprised of current issues.

There was also a suggestion that mini-versions of all the courses should be available to military personnel occupying managerial positions such as Division Chiefs or PRO Commanders. It was felt that these individuals would benefit by knowing the basics of the business.

Procedures. In Chapter III, the procedures for selecting ACOs were explained from the perspective of the various DOD headquarters. The section on selection criteria was included in the questionnaire in an attempt to determine if standard selection procedures or selection criteria were evident from the selectee's perspective. Five selection

factors were included in the questionnaire: interview, oral examination, written examination, experience and "other".

Before they were selected for their positions, 88.2 percent of the ACOs were interviewed by various levels of management. Only 22.1 percent of those interviewed felt that the interview was the primary criteria used in their selection. The Air Force is the only agency whose Headquarters is an active participant in the interview process. More than half (52 percent) of the Air Force ACOs indicated that they were interviewed by the Headquarters.

An oral examination was required of 42.6 percent of the sample group; however, this is misleading because that figure includes 28 Air Force ACOs and one DCAS ACO. Half of the Air Force ACOs completing the oral exam believed it was the primary selection criteria. The DCAS ACO indicated that it was not. None of the ACOs had to take a written examination prior to their appointment.

Experience was believed to be the primary selection criteria by 52.9 percent of the respondents. All the Army respondents and seven of ten DCAS ACOs felt that they were selected based primarily on their experience.

Three of the Navy ACOs indicated that they were selected based on completion of the Naval Post Graduate program.

The selection procedures reported by the ACOs were consistent with the agencies' regulations and instructions. The primary difference was the Air Force ACOs' perception of AFCEM's interview. Though the headquarters refers to their

discussions with an ACO candidate as an interview, some of ACOs considered the exchange an oral examination.

Research Question Four

The final part of this chapter discusses survey input received from ACO counterparts from Lockheed Corporation. Although written selection criteria were not available, broad inferences can be made from various survey questions. The information presented below addresses Research Question 4: "What does industry require of their "ACOs"?"

Industry ACO Counterparts. Responses from the six industry counterparts were compared to the Task Group's recommended standards. The results of this comparison were similar to the DOD ACO's. All six would have been qualified as Senior COs based on experience, and each possessed over ten years of experience when he was selected for his current position.

In education, all six possessed at least a Bachelor's degree qualifying all for Senior CO positions. Three of the six industry ACOs possess a Master's degree and one has beyond a Master's degree. Industry ACOs all felt that undergraduate and graduate study in business and contracting was important as a qualification criteria for selection.

Industry ACO counterparts would be expected to document far less training than DOD ACOs based on the fact that the courses listed were DOD courses and generic study areas. Unexpectedly, only two of the industry respondents would have

been unqualified for any CO position. Two would have been Small Purchase and two Intermediate COs based on the training documented.

Four of six industry ACOs were interviewed; however, all indicated that experience was the primary criteria when they were selected. None of the respondents completed any type of examination before being selected.

This chapter responded to Research Questions 3 and 4. ACOs were compared to Task Group Six's recommended criteria. It was found that less than half of the work force is eligible for their present positions based on the recommended standards. If selection components are considered separately, ACOs, for the most part fall into a Senior level CO category for experience and education; however, training requirements were identified as the skewing factor for the composite figures. The same was found true for industry counterparts. The final chapter recommends a set of criteria for ACOs in DOD plant representative offices.

VI. Conclusions and Recommendations

The primary objective of this research project was to determine a coordinated, consistent set of minimum qualifications for Department of Defense Administrative Contracting Officers at plant representative offices. The previous chapters provided the introduction and background leading to this research objective, and reviewed the present administrative contracting officer selection criteria and Task Group Six's proposed standards. Chapter IV described the method used to determine the status of the present ACO work force, and Chapter V discussed the research results. This chapter summarizes the research findings, answers the final Research Question and suggests new criteria for ACOs in DOD PROs.

The secondary objective, to determine how DOD ACOs compare with their industry counterparts is also addressed in this final chapter.

Summary of the Research Findings

Demographic Summary. One fourth of the ACO population at PROs was surveyed. Using as a baseline for comparison, Task Group Six's August 1983 edition of their "Model System for the Selection, Appointment, and Termination of Appointment of Contracting Officers," six percent of the present ACO work force would not qualify for any CO position, 22.1 percent would be classified in each of the Senior and Intermediate categories and the remaining 50 percent would be be

qualified to hold Small Purchase CO positions.

The experience, education and training criteria results are summarized in Table V. The training hours were the restricting factor when respondents were classified across all three criteria.

Recommendations Summary. Judging from the "mandatory" and "very important responses, the respondents regarded experience as the most important ACU qualification criteria, followed by training and then undergraduate study in business or contracting.

Almost half of the ACOs recommended a minimum of four to six years of contracting experience before someone should be selected as an ACO. Only four training courses were recommended by more than a quarter of the respondents as ACO selection prerequisites.

Procedure Summary. The survey results indicated almost all (88 percent) of the ACOs had been interviewed for their positions and a sixth of the interviewees felt the discussion had been the primary criteria in their selection. The majority of respondents however identified experience as the primary criteria. Interestingly, two-thirds of the Air Force ACOs were given oral examinations--called interviews by AFCMD--prior to their appointment and approximately half of that group felt it had been the key selection factor.

Research Question Five

This section answers the final research question: "Are

TABLE V

Summary Results:
ACO Classifications by Criteria (Percentage of Total)

Criteria Classification	Experience	Education	Training
Small Purchase	7.4%	10.3%	44.1%
Intermediate	19.1%	2.9%	25.0%
Senior	69.1%	86.8%	26.5%
Unqualified	4.4%	-----	4.4%

the recommended requirements needed for ACOs, and if so, are they adequate as stated, or should adjustments be made?"

Selection requirements are needed for any position including an ACO's; however, the Task Group's recommended criteria should not be strictly applied to ACOs. The Task Group established criteria based on varying degrees of authority and recommended that agencies develop selection criteria accordingly. Using this guideline, recommendations for DOD plant representative office ACOs are presented in the following section.

Recommendations

An ACO's responsibility and authority is dictated by the Federal Acquisition Regulation. This responsibility is especially awesome in plant representative offices. The survey found that 87 percent of the ACOs administered at least one contract valued over \$10,000,000. When similarity in authority and responsibility is considered, as the Task Group suggests, it follows that ACOs in PROs should be viewed as one category. Assuming a person can be evaluated strictly by quantitative means, the following minimum qualification requirements are recommended for PRO administrative contracting officers.

Experience: 5 years

Education: Bachelor's Degree

Training: 408 hours

These criteria are similar to those recommended for Senior COs in Task Group Six's November 1983 edition of the Model System. Selection of these minimum criteria is explained below.

Experience. The Task Group suggested five years as a minimum experience level for Senior Level COs. This number was confirmed in the ACO survey responses. Although 56 percent of the respondents had over six years of experience, a four to six year minimum was the most recommended range.

Education. A Bachelor's degree must be a minimum requirement for ACOs. Agencies should not hesitate to demand a college degree from applicants. Recently, Headquarters Air Force Logistics Command hired 600 personnel from 2000 interviewed for contract pricing positions. Every applicant had a Bachelor's degree and 30 percent of them had a Master's degree (47). The resources are available and they should be used. Almost 90 percent of the ACO work force already has a Bachelor's degree. Demanding the degree from future hirees is not out of line.

Training. The training hours suggested by this research project are considerably lower than those recommended for the Senior Level COs by the Task Group (408 compared to 520). Training seems to be the most difficult standard to achieve. ACO survey respondents possessed a range of 138 to 702 hours of training, averaging 376 hours.

The DOD Civilian Career Program for Contracting and

Acquisition Personnel identifies seven courses (and offers three alternatives) totalling a minimum 408 hours (13:4-6). These courses are mandatory for career progression in the GS-1102 series which is the series for ACOs. It is recommended that 408 hours be established as the minimum for ACO qualification. Minimum requirements are developed to ensure an individual has a basis of knowledge; the DOD courses provide that foundation.

The research problem initiating this study was to determine whether ACOs fit the contracting officer mold or whether they should have their own criteria. The recommendations above indicate that DOD ACOs in plant representative offices basically conform to Senior Level contracting officer requirements. The possible impact of the recommended criteria is discussed in the next section.

Impact of Recommendations

Because the recommendations were based on a survey of the present ACO work force, implementation of this project's proposed experience, education and training standards by any DOD agency should not severely impact its work force. The primary hurdles will be training and experience. It is recommended that equivalencies be established to compensate for weak areas, and that these equivalencies be documented in each ACOs training file. The Task Group's recommended equivalencies follow:

III. Equivalencies. Completion of a two year associate's degree program in procurement may be substituted for six months of procurement experience. Completion of a four year undergraduate program in procurement from an accredited college or university may be substituted for one year of procurement experience. Completion of graduate work in procurement from an accredited college or university may be substituted for procurement experience at the rate of twelve semester credit hours for three months of procurement experience. One year of concentrated experience in an advanced procurement subject area beyond the three year minimum for the intermediate level and the five year minimum senior level may be substituted for twenty-four classroom hours of formal training in procurement. The maximum credit for the total additional years of experience in separate concentrated subject areas is ninety-six classroom hours [43:App 1, p. 2].

Equivalencies should be employed to establish the present work force as qualified ACOs; however, use of equivalencies should be avoided when appointing new officers. The minimum criteria were established for this later purpose.

ACOs' authority and responsibilities were found to classify them in the Senior Level CO category (with the exception of the training requirement). Until the criteria become established, equivalencies will have to be accepted. While ACOs await full qualification of their contemporaries, further areas of exploration are proposed in the next section.

Recommendations for Further Study

During performance of this research, areas worthy of further study were identified concerning ACO selection, training and qualification.

Written Examinations. Only a quarter of the survey respondents felt successful completion of a written examina-

tion would be an important criteria for selecting an ACO; however, it is suggested that the feasibility of a standard qualification exam be explored. The National Contract Management Association's certification exam requires applicants to discuss various aspects of contracting. Some survey respondents suggested that essay examinations--such as NCMA's--better reveal an individual's knowledge and problem solving abilities. Imposition of an examination requirement would not only move ACOs one step closer to a professional designation, but it would also insure a gaining organization of its applicant's skill level.

Training Program. The Air Force Systems Command employs an extensive program to train its Quality Assurance (QA) personnel. Called the AFSC Civilian QA Intern Program, 25 candidates are selected each year for two to three years of highly structured, intensive training (3:6-8). Development of a similar program for ACO potentials would assure the availability of "highly motivated,...competent people to fill...work force vacancies created by retirement and other types of attrition" (3:6).

Professional Development. For ACOs already qualified as Senior Level COs, maintenance training should be developed to keep the ACOs abreast of changing contracting issues (43:9-10). The Task Group recommended refresher courses "be presented at least once every three years" (43:10). This study concurs with the Task Group suggestion; however, ACOs should not only maintain a baseline of knowledge, but they should

continue to expand that base. Milestones should be established in individual training plans, and yearly reviews of these plans should assure accomplishment of training objectives.

Other Contracting Officers. Although this study focused on PRO ACOs, it is recognized that other CO types exist. As the Task Group suggests, each group should develop its own criteria. This study highly encourages agencies to heed the Task Group's advice, and offers a format by which to conduct future analyses. Base level, buying office and logistics support COs should all consider various applications of the Task Group's categories and criteria.

Industry's contracting officers offer another challenge for future research efforts. The following section discusses the secondary research objective of this study. Although the Lockheed "ACOs'" contributions were much appreciated, they must not be construed to represent all of industry.

DOD ACOs Versus Industry Counterparts

Surprisingly, the surveyed industry contract administrators did not have qualifications far different from DOD's ACOs. The greatest disparities were in experience (all industry "ACOs" exceeded 10 years of experience) and in training. The training differences would be expected since the courses listed in the survey were government provided.

Concluding Remarks

For thirty years government contracting officer selec-

tion criteria remained ambiguous. Though contracting officers and government commissions recommended criteria improvement, no revisions were made until the media discovered inappropriate expenditures of public funds. President Reagan ordered reform, and in 1983, Task Group Six recommended specific criteria for the selection and appointment of contracting officers. This study refined the Task Group's recommendations for DOD ACOs at PROs.

Although it is difficult to evaluate an individual by quantitative means alone, a basis must be established for those individuals who handle public funds. In the COs push for a professional designation, this project's recommended criteria promote the goal one step further by establishing a Bachelor's degree as a minimum educational requirement. Having responsibility for \$10,000,000 contracts, an administrative contracting officer in a contractor's plant handles a considerable portion of the taxpayers money. Agencies should demand more from the people who handle these funds. As Thomas Paine once stated:

Public money ought to be touched with the most scrupulous consciousness of honor. It is not the produce of riches only but of the hard earnings of labor and poverty. It is drawn even from the bitterness of want and misery. Not a beggar passes, or perishes in the streets, whose mite is not in that mass [7].

AD-A147 179

AN EVALUATION OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR QUALIFICATION AND
WARRANTING OF ADM. (U) AIR FORCE INST OF TECH
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB OH SCHOOL OF SYST..


2/2


UNCLASSIFIED

E I FICKEN ET AL. SEP 84

F/G 5/9

NL





Appendix A: Retention of Contract Administration
(11:42.203(a))

The DOD FAR Supplement identifies the following reasons for which a purchasing office may retain responsibility for contract administration functions normally done by a CAO.

1. Contracts of or in support of the National Security Agency.
2. Contracts for coal or bulk petroleum.
3. Research and development contracts.
4. Grants.
5. Contracts for flight training.
6. Contracts for headstones and gravemarkers.
7. Contracts for industry technical representatives.
8. Contracts for consultant support services.
9. Geodetic mapping, air charting, and information center contracts.
10. Base, post, camp, and station purchases.
11. Contracts for operation or maintenance of, or installation of equipment at radar or communications network sites, e.g., SAGE, BMEWS, JCSAN, WHITE ALICE, etc.
12. Communications service contracts.
13. Contracts for installation, operation and maintenance of spacetrack sensors and relays.
14. Dependents Medicare Program contracts.
15. Stevedoring contracts.
16. Contracts for construction and maintenance of military and civil public works, including harbors, docks, port facilities, military housing, development of recreational facilities, water resources, flood control, and public utilities.

17. Architect-engineer (A-E) contracts.
18. Contracts for airlift and sealift--Military Airlift Command and Military Sealift Command may perform contract administration services at contractor locations involved solely in performance of airlift or sealift contracts.
19. Contracts for subsistence supplies.
20. Ballistic missile site contracts--supporting administration of these contracts may be performed at missile activation sites during the installation, test, and checkout of the missiles and associated equipment.
21. Contracts for operation and maintenance of, or installation of equipment at, military test ranges, facilities, and installation.

Appendix B: Contract Administration Functions

The following functions are quoted directly from FAR 42.302 and DOD FAR Supplement 42.302.

42.302 Contract administration functions.

(a) The following are the normal contract administration functions to be performed by the cognizant CAO, to the extent they apply, as prescribed in 42.202:

- (1) Review the contractor's compensation structure.
- (2) Review the contractor's insurance plans.
- (3) Conduct post-award orientation conferences.
- (4) Review and evaluate contractor's proposals under Subpart 15.8 and, when negotiation will be accomplished by the contracting officer, furnish comments to that officer.
- (5) Negotiate forward pricing rate agreements (see 15.809).
- (6) Negotiate advance agreements applicable to treatment of costs under contracts currently assigned for administration (see 31.111).
- (7) Determine the allowability of costs suspended or disapproved as required (see Subpart 42.8), direct the suspension or disapproval of costs when there is reason to believe they should be suspended or disapproved, and approve final vouchers.
- (8) Issue Notices of Intent to Disallow or not Recognize Costs (see Subpart 42.8).
- (9) Establish final indirect cost rates and billing rates for those contractors meeting the criteria for contracting officer determination in Subpart 42.7.
- (10) Prepare findings of fact and issue decisions under the Disputes clause on matters in which the ACO has the authority to take definitive action.
- (11) In connection with Cost Accounting Standards (see Part 30)---
 - (i) Determine the adequacy of the contractor's disclosure statements;
 - (ii) Determine whether disclosure statements are in compliance with Cost Accounting Standards and Part 31;
 - (iii) Determine the contractor's compliance with Cost Accounting Standards and disclosure statements, if applicable; and
 - (iv) Negotiate price adjustments and execute supplemental agreements under the Cost Accounting Standards clauses at 52.230-3, 52.230-4, and 52.230-5.
- (12) Review and approve or disapprove the contrac-

tor's request for payments under the progress payments clause.

(13) Make payments on assigned contracts when prescribed in agency acquisition regulations (see 42.205).

(14) Manage special bank accounts.

(15) Ensure timely notification by the contractor of any anticipated overrun or underrun of the estimated cost under cost-reimbursement contracts.

(16) Monitor the contractor's financial condition and advise the contracting officer when it jeopardizes contract performance.

(17) Analyze quarterly limitation on payments statements and recover overpayments from the contractor.

(18) Issue tax exemption certificates.

(19) Ensure processing and execution of duty-free entry certificates.

(20) For classified contracts, administer those portions of the applicable industrial security program designated as administrative contracting officer responsibilities (see Subpart 4.4).

(21) Issue work requests under maintenance, overhaul, and modification contracts.

(22) Negotiate prices and execute supplemental agreements for spare parts and other items selected through provisioning procedures when prescribed by agency acquisition regulations.

(23) Negotiate and execute contractual documents for settlement of partial and complete terminations for convenience, except as otherwise prescribed by Part 49.

(24) Negotiate and execute contractual documents settling cancellation charges under multiyear contracts.

(25) Process and execute novation and change of name agreements under Subpart 42.12.

(26) Perform property administration (see Part 45).

(27) Approve contractor acquisition or fabrication of special test equipment under the clause at 52.245-19, Special Test Equipment.

(28) Perform necessary screening, redistribution, and disposal of contractor's inventory.

(29) Issue contract modifications requiring the contractor to provide packing, crating and handling services on excess Government property. (When the ACO determines it to be in the Government's interests, the services may be secured from a contractor other than the contractor in possession of the property).

(30) In facilities contracts---

(i) Evaluate the contractor's request for facilities and for changes to existing facilities

and provide appropriate recommendations to the contracting officer;

(ii) Ensure required screening of facility items before acquisition by the contractor;

(iii) Approve use of facilities on a noninterference basis in accordance with the clause at 52.245-10, Use and Charges;

(iv) Ensure payment by the contractor of any rental due; and

(v) Ensure reporting of items no longer needed for Government production.

(31) Perform production support, surveillance, and status reporting, including timely reporting of potential and actual slippages in contract delivery schedules.

(32) Perform pre-award surveys (see Subpart 9.1).

(33) Advise and assist contractors regarding their priorities and allocations responsibilities and assist contracting offices in processing requests for special assistance and for priority ratings for privately owned capital equipment.

(34) Monitor contractor industrial labor relations matters under the contract; apprise the contracting officer and, if designated by the agency, the cognizant labor relations advisor, of actual or potential labor disputes; and coordinate the removal of urgently required material from the strikebound contractor's plant upon instruction from, and authorization of, the contracting officer.

(35) Perform traffic management services, including issuance and control of Government bills of lading and other transportation documents.

(36) Review the adequacy of the contractor's traffic operations.

(37) Review and evaluate preservation, packaging, and packing.

(38) Ensure contractor compliance with contractual quality assurance requirements (see Part 46).

(39) Ensure contractor compliance with applicable safety requirements, including contractual requirements for the handling of hazardous and dangerous materials and processes.

(40) Perform engineering surveillance to assess compliance with contractual terms for schedule, cost, and technical performance in the areas of design, development, and production.

(41) Evaluate for adequacy and perform surveillance of contractor engineering efforts and management systems that relate to design, development, production engineering changes, subcontractors, tests, management of engineering resources, reliability and maintainability, data control systems, configurations management, and independent research and development.

(42) Review and evaluate for technical adequacy of the contractor's logistics support, maintenance, and modification programs.

(43) Report to the contracting office any inadequacies noted in specifications.

(44) Perform engineering analyses of contractor cost proposals.

(45) Review and analyze contractor-proposed engineering and design studies and submit comments and recommendations to the contracting office, as required.

(46) Review engineering change proposals for proper classification, and when required, for need, technical adequacy of design, producibility, and impact on quality, reliability, schedule, and cost. Submit comments to the contracting office.

(47) Assist in evaluating and make recommendations for acceptance or rejection of waivers and deviations.

(48) Evaluate and monitor the contractor's procedures for complying with the Restrictive Markings on Technical Data clause at 52.227-X.

(49) Monitor the contractor's value engineering program.

(50) Review, approve or disapprove, and maintain surveillance of the contractor's purchasing system (see Part 44).

(51) Consent to the placement of subcontracts.

(52) Obtain the contractor's currently approved company or division-wide plans for small business and small disadvantaged business subcontracting for its commercial products, or, if there is no currently approved plan, assist the contracting officer in evaluating the plans for those products.

(53) Assist the contracting officer, upon request, in evaluating an offeror's proposed small business and small disadvantaged business subcontracting plans, including documentation of compliance with similar plans under prior contracts.

(54) By periodic surveillance, ensure the contractor's compliance with small business and small disadvantaged business subcontracting plans and any labor surplus area contractual requirements; maintain documentation of the contractor's performance under and compliance with these plans and requirements; and provide advice and assistance to the firms involved, as appropriate.

(55) Maintain surveillance of flight operations.

(56) Assign and perform supporting contract administration.

(57) Ensure timely submission of required reports.

(b) The CAO shall perform the following functions only when and to the extent specifically authorized by

the contracting office:

(1) Negotiate or negotiate and execute supplemental agreements incorporating contractor proposals resulting from change orders issued under the Changes clause. Before completing negotiations, coordinate any delivery schedule change with the contracting office.

(2) Negotiate prices and execute priced exhibits for unpriced orders issued by the contracting officer under basic ordering agreements.

(3) Negotiate or negotiate and execute supplemental agreements changing contract delivery schedules.

(4) Negotiate or negotiate and execute supplemental agreements providing for the deobligation of unexpended dollar balances considered excess to known contract requirements.

(5) Issue amended shipping instructions and, when necessary, negotiate and execute supplemental agreements incorporating contractor proposals resulting from these instructions.

(6) Negotiate changes to interim billing prices.

(7) Negotiate and definitize adjustments to contract prices resulting from exercise of an economic price adjustment clause (see Subpart 16.2).

(8) Issue change orders and negotiate and execute resulting supplemental agreements under contracts for ship construction, conversion, and repair.

(c) Any additional contract administration functions not listed in 42.302(a) and (b), or not otherwise delegated, remain the responsibility of the contracting office.

Part 42--CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION

Subpart 42.3--CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION OFFICE FUNCTIONS

42.302 Contract Administration Functions

(a)(11)(ii) & (iii) For those contractors with which the Tri-Service Contracting Officer negotiates advance agreements pursuant to FAR 42.10, he shall have full authority for determinations related to CAS 420.

(70) Perform industrial readiness and mobilization production planning field surveys and schedule negotiations.

(71) Perform post award surveillance of contractor progress toward demonstration of Cost/Schedule Control Systems to meet the Cost/Schedule Control System Criteria, provide assistance in the review and acceptance of contractors' Cost/Schedule Control Systems, and perform contractors' accepted systems. The contracting officer shall insert the clauses at 52.242.7001, Notice of Cost/Schedule Control Systems, and

52.242.7002, Cost/Schedule Control Systems, when required by DODI 7000.2.

(72) Monitor the contractor's costs as prescribed under FAR 42.302(a).

(73) In connection with classified contracts, administer those portions of the Industrial Security Program designated as ACO responsibilities in the ISR and ISM. (See Appendix C, Industrial Security Regulation, DOD 5220.22-R, for partial listing of primary responsibilities (also see FAR 4.401)).




Figure 10. Army and Naval Plant Representative Offices (12:I-10-12)




Figure 11. Defense Contract Administration Service Plant Representative Offices (12:I-1-8)

Appendix D: Contracting Officer Warrant

Department of Defense 	
Certificate of Appointment	
Pursuant to authority vested in the undersigned and in accordance with Section I, Part 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Regulation,	

is hereby appointed	
Contracting Officer	
for the	
United States of America	
subject to the limitations contained in the Armed Services Procurement Regulation and to any further limitations set forth herein:	
Unless sooner revoked, this appointment is effective as long as the appointee named herein is assigned to:	
_____ DATE	_____ SIGNATURE
_____ SERIAL NO	_____ TITLE
DD FORM 1550 1 SEP 65 0101-000-0000	

Figure 12. Contracting Officer Warrant

Appendix E: OPM Handbook X-118, GS-11 Qualification Standards (36:5-6)

Requirements for the GS-11 level and above include:

...background which includes one year of work experience or equivalent to the next lower grade in the normal line of promotion, and which demonstrates possession of the following:

1. Thorough knowledge of contracting methods, contract types, and procedures applicable to the full range of preaward, postaward, or price/cost analysis activities involving complex and diversified products, service, or construction (e.g., engineering and manufacturing requirements of major types of equipment, technical services or services involving major equipment and vehicle overhaul, research and development including technology development or demonstration projects, design and construction of buildings requiring architect and engineering services, compiles computerized management information and process control systems or a system in support of research and development, or large-scale procurements of specialized commodities or services to meet the consolidated requirements of the agency, department, or departments).
2. Familiarity with business practices and market conditions applicable to program and technical requirements sufficient to identify or develop new sources; evaluate the responsibility of the contractor to perform the contract in terms of present commitments, financial soundness, adequacy of management systems, and capacity of facilities; determine the reasonableness of price and/or cost proposals including evaluation of individual cost elements; evaluate the progress and performance of the contractor; or evaluate the extent of work completed and negotiate settlements.

--Or for some positions--

1. Intensive and detailed knowledge of special programs or a specialized area of contracting and skill in applying this knowledge to the resolution of complex problems or development of contracting plans or procedures in the role of a technical specialist or consultant.

2. Thorough knowledge of trends, program requirements, and operating policies and procedures to coordinate plans and programs with a variety of related activities, e.g., program or technical offices, other contracting specialists, legal counsel, small and disadvantaged business representatives, auditors, transportation specialists, subordinate activities, or higher headquarters.

OR

Successful completion of two full academic years or 60 semester hours of graduate education, with or without a master's degree, in an accredited college or university with major study in procurement or in a field directly related to the position to be filled. Directly related means that the completed course work provided both the type and level of knowledge and skills required in the work of the position to be filled.

OR

An appropriate combination of graduate study and work experience which provided the required knowledge and skill.

OR

Completion of all requirements for an LL.B. or J.D. degree.

AND

Evidence that the candidate possesses any selective factors appropriate to the position to be filled.

The knowledge and skill required for positions at GS-11 and above are typically gained through progressive work assignments in the GS-1102 series. This does not preclude obtaining directly comparable knowledge and skill through work in other series. ...Responsible experience in private industry contracting work may also have provided the requisite knowledge and skill.

Appendix F: Contract Administration (GS-1102)
Training Requirements (13:4-6)

<u>Level</u>	<u>Mandatory Course</u>
1. <u>Entry</u>	Contract Administration PPM 152 (JT) - 3 weeks; or Management of Defense Acquisition Contracts 8D-4320 (JT) - 4 weeks Principles of Contract Pricing QMT 170 (JT) - 3 weeks; or Defense Cost and Price Analysis (PN) (JT) - 2 weeks Defense Contract Negotiation Workshop CN (JT) - 1 week
2. <u>Intermediate</u>	Advanced Contract Administration PPM 304 (JT) - 2 weeks and 3 days; or Management of Defense Acquisition Contracts (Advanced) 8D-F12 (JT) - 2 weeks and 4 days Government Contract Law PPM 302 (JT) - 2 weeks
3. <u>Senior</u>	Management of Managers 7A-F38 (JT) - 2 weeks Defense Acquisition and Contracting Executive Seminar ER (JT) - 1 week.

Appendix G: ACO Key Areas of Knowledge (25:Atch 3)

Contracts

- 0 Role of Tech Advisors
- 0 Requirements for Prenegotiation Conferences and Briefings and Pricing Review Board
- 0 Remedies available to the ACO in influencing contractor performance
- 0 Funds Control
- 0 Responsibilities regarding approval of cost vouchers, subcontract consent, industrial security, STE, billing price adjustment, and liability for loss or damaged government property
- 0 Use of financial reports
- 0 Process involved in Undefined Actions
- 0 Basic structure of contract types
- 0 Use of mechanized systems (AMIS, PRISM, TURF, etc)
- 0 Supporting Contract Administration
- 0 Disputes and Appeals
- 0 Negotiation
- 0 Clauses

Business Management

- 0 Final overhead settlement process
- 0 Forward pricing rate arrangements
- 0 Working knowledge of DAR Section XV, Parts 1 and 2 Cost Principles
- 0 Working knowledge of Cost Accounting Standards
- 0 General knowledge of the Cost Monitoring Program - DAR 20-1000
- 0 General knowledge of the ICMO function - DAR 3-1400

0 Compensation reviews

Pricing

0 AFCMDR 70-8

0 Guidance for preparing PNMs

0 Current WGL

0 Inflation

0 Cost Estimating Relationships (CERs)

0 Technical Support

0 Learning Curves

0 Labor Standards

0 Computerized Cost Models

Appendix H: Recommendation Form

* RECOMMENDATION FOR APPOINTMENT AS CONTRACTING OFFICER		DATE	
NAME		CS GRADE/DEL RANK	
PRESENT POSITION TITLE		CS CLASS OR MOS NO	
1. THE NAMED INDIVIDUAL IS DEEMED QUALIFIED FOR APPOINTMENT AS CONTRACTING OFFICER, BASED ON CRITERIA IN ARMED SERVICES PROCUREMENT REGULATION (ASPR), PARA 1-405.1, AS FOLLOWS:			
a. MANAGEMENT			
☐ (1) HAS SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED DEFENSE PROCUREMENT TRAINING COURSE, CLASS NO			
☐ (2) HAS SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED THE FOLLOWING ALTERNATE ARMY-APPROVED COURSE:			
☐ (3) IS OTHERWISE QUALIFIED BY TRAINING AND EXPERIENCE AND HAS DEMONSTRATED:		CHECK APPROPRIATE BLOCK	
(a) KNOWLEDGE OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACT LAW:		EXCELLENT	GOOD
(b) FAMILIARITY WITH THE PREPARATION OF CONTRACTS AND PURCHASE ORDERS:			
(c) THOROUGH KNOWLEDGE OF ARMY PROCUREMENT REGULATIONS AND POLICIES:			
(d) FAMILIARITY WITH COMMERCIAL PURCHASING AND CONTRACTING METHODS AND PRACTICES:			
(e) ABILITY TO ANALYZE, INTERPRET AND EVALUATE THE FACTORS INVOLVED IN THE DETERMINATION OF REASONABLE PRICE:			
b. HAS DEMONSTRATED EVIDENCE OF BUSINESS ACUMEN AND ABILITY TO EXERCISE NATURAL JUDGMENT:			
c. HAS DEMONSTRATED HIGH STANDARDS OF CHARACTER, REPUTATION, AND BUSINESS ETHICS: ☐ YES ☐ NO			
d. HAS DESIRABLE PERSONALITY TRAITS:			
e. ☐ HAS, ☐ HAS NOT, HAD PREVIOUS ON-THE-JOB TRAINING IN A PURCHASING OFFICE.			
2. THE APPOINTMENT AS CONTRACTING OFFICER SHOULD BE LIMITED TO:			
a. NAME OF INSTALLATION/ACTIVITY:			
b. FOR THE PROCUREMENT OF THE FOLLOWING SUPPLIES AND/OR SERVICES:			
c. METHOD OF PROCUREMENT: ☐ ADVERTISED ☐ NEGOTIATED			
d. DOLLAR VALUE LIMITATION			
☐ (1) PROCUREMENTS WHICH, INDIVIDUALLY, ARE NOT IN EXCESS OF \$			
☐ (2) PROCUREMENTS WITHOUT MONETARY LIMITATION OTHER THAN THOSE ESTABLISHED BY LAW, REGULATION AND DIRECTIVE.			
3. AS CONTRACTING OFFICER, THE NAMED INDIVIDUAL WILL BE UNDER THE ADMINISTRATIVE SUPERVISION OF, AND REPORT TO:			
(Position Title)			
4. JUSTIFICATION FOR THIS APPOINTMENT IS:			
5. I HAVE REVIEWED AND EVALUATED THE QUALIFICATIONS OF THIS INDIVIDUAL AND RECOMMEND APPOINTMENT AS CONTRACTING OFFICER WITHIN THE LIMITATIONS SET FORTH HEREIN.			
TYPED NAME OF REVIEWER		SIGNATURE	
COMMANDER'S STATEMENT			
Pursuant to authority held by me, I hereby recommend appointment of _____ (Name)			
Contracting Officer with authority limited to _____ (Shown in par 2; otherwise, spell out limitation)			
and request that an appropriate official order be issued.			
TYPED NAME OF COMMANDER		SIGNATURE	

SAV Form 289
3 Dec 71

Edition of 10 Nov 69, may be used.

Figure 13. Army CO Recommendation Form (45:Encl)

Appendix I: Task Group Six's
Model System (43:App 1)

MODEL SYSTEM FOR THE
SELECTION, APPOINTMENT, AND
TERMINATION OF APPOINTMENT
OF CONTRACTING OFFICERS

This is a sample instruction for signature by an agency head. It was prepared with a moderate to large agency in mind. This instruction includes minimum contracting officer selection requirements, provides agency guidance, and is intended to reflect a model of a system for implementing the requirements of Section 1.603 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation. The actual instruction utilized by an agency may be one of the products of the initial analysis of the Selection and Appointment System made by the Procurement Executive.

This instruction prescribes the rigorous training needed to develop the cadre of professional contracting officers. It is predicated, with respect to non-Defense agencies, on passage of an Executive Order or legislation which would assure a long-term commitment of the resources necessary for such training. Of course, agencies would be expected to conduct contracting officer training programs within the limits of available funding if the additional resources are not provided.

I. Purpose. This instruction establishes a system for the selection, appointment and termination of appointment of contracting officers.

II. Selection Criteria. The following minimum criteria for contracting officers shall apply to the selection and appointment of, and delegation of authority to, all contracting officers other than the heads of contracting activities.

1. Contracting Officer (Small Purchase)* (Obligation authority up to the small purchase limitation on the open market, and up to the maximum order limitation on Federal Supply Schedule contracts or other mandatory sources):

- a. Experience. Shall have at least one year of procurement experience, preferably including six months recent experience in small purchases or simplified purchasing.
- b. Education. A high school diploma or its equivalent is desirable.
- c. Training. Shall at the time of appointment have successfully completed training in Government small purchases to reach Level I of Attachment 1.
- d. Duties. The individual regularly dedicates a significant portion of his/her time to procurement duties.

2. Contracting Officer (Intermediate):*

- (a) Experience. Shall have at least three years of current, progressively complex, and responsible procurement experience which has provided on-the-job training in researching and recommending the contract-related business decisions generally inherent in intermediate-level appointments. Experience in the GS-1102 or GS-1105 series (or directly comparable military or private sector experience) is highly desirable.
- (b) Education. Preferably an associates degree in a field of study appropriate for procurement such as procurement and contracting, business administration, accounting, economics, marketing, or law.
- (c) Training. Shall meet, at the time of appointment, applicable training standards to Level II of Attachment 1.
- (d) Duties. The individual dedicates the large majority of his/her time to procurement and contracting duties.

3. Contracting Officer (Senior):*

- (a) Experience. Shall have at least five current years of progressively complex and responsible procurement experience which has provided on-the-job training in researching and recommending

*These terms would be defined in the actual instruction developed by the agency. Moreover, the instruction may enumerate the decisions typically made by each class of contracting officer as an inherent aspect of their appointment.

the contract-related business management decisions generally inherent in senior-level appointments.

- (b) Education. A Bachelor's degree is highly desirable, preferably in an appropriate field of study, such as procurement and contracting, business administration, accounting, economics, marketing, or law.
- (c) Training. Shall meet, at the time of appointment, applicable training standards to Level III of Attachment 1.
- (d) Duties. The individual dedicates the large majority of his/her time to procurement and contracting duties.

III. Equivalencies. Completion of a two year associate's degree program in procurement may be substituted for six months of procurement experience. Completion of a four year undergraduate program in procurement from an accredited college or university may be substituted for one year of procurement experience. Completion of graduate work in procurement from an accredited college or university may be substituted for procurement experience at the rate of twelve semester credit hours for three months of procurement experience. One year of concentrated experience in an advanced procurement subject area beyond the four year minimum for the intermediate level and the six year minimum for senior level may be substituted for twenty-four classroom hours of formal training in procurement. The maximum credit for the total additional years of experience in separate concentrated procurement subject areas is ninety-six classroom hours.

IV. Interim Provisions for Designating Contracting Officers. Personnel (civilian or military) shall not ordinarily be appointed as contracting officers if they do not meet the applicable criteria prescribed in this selection and appointment system. In those circumstances where it is necessary to appoint a contracting officer who has not completed the required training, a six month (maximum) "Interim Certificate" may be granted. The appointing official may consider experience and past performance before issuing an interim certificate. Failure to successfully complete the training requirements during the interim period shall result in the loss of the delegated contracting officer authority or (if due to lack of training funds, unavailability of a course quota, or other situation beyond the control of the agency or individual) the issuance of one additional six month "Interim Certificate," whichever is deemed necessary by the appointing official. Such actions are to be fully documented.

V. Appointing Officials. The Procurement Executive is the appointing official for all contracting officers. The Procurement Executive shall determine whether to designate additional appointing officials and shall select such officials and define in writing any limits on their authority to appoint Contracting Officers. All appointing officials selected by the Procurement Executive shall meet the selection requirements for the highest level contracting officer that they have authority to appoint.

VI. Evaluation.

- (a) Appointing officials shall solicit the names of employees who meet the minimum criteria for selection and appointment as Contracting Officers, along with appropriate data on their training, experience, and background.
- (b) In selecting Contracting Officers, appointing officials shall consider the experience, education, and training of the employees, in terms of their potential to competently make the central contract-related business decisions for which they will be responsible under the terms and conditions of the appointment.
- (c) When appointing Level II and Level III Contracting Officers, appointing officials may establish advisory panels comprised of procurement managers and the representatives of other appropriate disciplines. Final authority for selecting and appointing contracting officers shall remain with the appointing official.

VII. Documentation. A record of the employee's relevant experience, training, and education shall be completed for each person appointed a Contracting Officer. A copy of these statements shall be maintained by the Procurement Executive or a senior contract and procurement manager on his/her staff, as well as by the appointing official.

VIII. Certificates of Appointment.

- (a) Contracting Officer authority shall be delegated only to an individual and not to a position.
- (b) Contracting officers shall be appointed in writing on a "Certificate of Appointment" (SF-1402), which shall state any limitation on the scope of authority to be exercised, other than limitations contained in applicable laws or regulations. Files containing a copy of the Certificate of Appointment, along with a record of the employee's relevant experience, training, and education, shall be maintained by the appointing official.
- (c) At the time of termination, the appointing official shall take back any Certificate issued to the employee.
- (d) The appointing official shall also be responsible for recovering, updating, and reissuing Certificates to incorporate any necessary changes in the terms and conditions of appointment.

IX. Conflict of Interest Statement. All contracting officers must comply with the existing conflict of interest regulations. Contracting Officers must file the approved form in accordance with the required procedures.

X. Accountability. The Procurement Executive shall be responsible for establishing and prescribing a contracting officer accountability system. This

system will set performance standards, include an adequate set of checks and balances, include external as well as internal review coverage, and recognize effective as well as ineffective contracting officer performance. The procurement executive shall also develop procedures concerning the termination of contracting officer appointments.

XI. Maintenance Training. At least once every three years, or as dictated by events or situations, contracting officers shall, as a condition for retaining their appointments, attend a minimum of two weeks of formal training in procurement covering such areas as new requirements, techniques, or procedures brought about by changes in law, regulation, policy, reviews, or business research.

XII. System Review. The Procurement Executive, at least once every three years, shall thoroughly review, and ascertain the need to amend, the system for selecting, appointing, and terminating the appointments of contracting officers. The Procurement Executive shall report the findings and recommendations of this review to the head of the agency.

Attachment 1

General

Contracting officer training must be directly related to the body of knowledge of contract management and it must include most of the described topics within the core subject areas. Courses completed prior to the effective date of this standard may be accepted if accompanied by a copy of a certificate of completion (e.g., SF-182).

Training may be cumulative, i.e., work done to satisfy the requirements of Level I or II below, at the agencies discretion, may be used toward satisfaction of a higher level.

Level I

Level I is an introduction to the procurement and contracting process and a treatment of fundamental principles and techniques with emphasis on public sector procurement through small purchase procedures, orders against Federal Supply Schedule (FSS) contracts, and purchases from mandatory sources. The training program must convey an understanding of the general and core subjects listed below. It is suggested that a minimum of 120 hours are necessary to accomplish this purpose.

A. General Subjects

1. Principles of buying, market conditions, and competition
2. Use of business judgement
3. Federal procurement responsibility and authority
4. Ethics and standards
5. Purpose and objectives of small purchasing and use of mandatory sources
6. Socio-economic requirements

B. Core Subjects

1. Small or simplified purchasing requirements for planning, requisitioning, competition, solicitation, evaluation, pricing, and documentation
2. Small purchase methods such as purchase orders (priced and unpriced), SF-44, blanket purchase arrangements, request for quotes, open market, imprest funds, and credit cards

3. Government sources of supply
4. Requirements for selection, terms and administration of FSS contracts, delivery orders, mandatory versus optional schedules, and term contracts
5. Administration of orders, payment procedures, including fast pay, method of inspecting and testing, transportation and deliveries
6. Purchasing reports
7. Imprest fund requirements

Level II

Level II develops functional knowledge of the laws, policies, procedures and methods pertaining to Federal contracts.

The training program must convey an understanding of the following general and core subjects listed below. It is suggested that a minimum of 320 hours are necessary to accomplish this purpose.

A. General Subjects

1. Federal procurement policies
2. Explanation of the procurement cycle
3. Overview of budget and appropriation cycle
4. Ethics and conduct standards
5. Basic contract laws and regulations
6. Socio-economic requirements in procurements
7. Identification and comparison of types of contracts and clauses
8. Advertised and negotiated methods of procurement
9. Definition of value, cost, price, and profit
10. Simplified (Small Purchase) negotiation techniques
11. Protests, claims, and disputes
12. Contract administration responsibilities
13. Contract modifications
14. Special procurement methods and reports

15. Technical data requirements

16. Preparation of the procurement request

B. Core Subjects

1. Formal Advertising

- Procedures
- Bidder responsibility
- Responsiveness and timeliness of bids
- Evaluation and verification of bids for award
- Protests

2. Negotiation

- Circumstances permitting negotiation
- Determinations and findings
- Negotiation procedures
- Negotiation objectives and sessions
- Simplified source evaluation and selection techniques
- Offeror responsibility
- Techniques and strategy of successful negotiation

3. Cost and Price Analysis

- Fair and reasonable price determinations
- Economic concept of value, cost, and profit
- Cost and price analysis techniques
- Profit factors
- Awareness of cost principles
- Identification of elements of financial statements
- Simple cost control techniques

4. Contract Administration

- Responsibilities and functions of contract administrators
- Proper authority for change orders/supplemental agreements
- Identification of equitable adjustment factors
- Quality assurance, inspection and compliance with contract terms
- Delays/suspension of work
- Labor provisions
- Contract payments
- Disputes and remedies
- Liquidated damages
- Terminations for convenience of Government and for default
- Contract close out

5. Contract Law

- Basic contract law principles
- Federal contractual authority

- Federal procurement regulations (FPR, DAR, FAR)

For a course to qualify as credit toward a core subject area, it should contain most of the topics listed above under the subject area. A course which specializes in only one or two topics does not satisfy the entire subject area requirement for Level II. For example, a contract claims course does not fulfill all the requirements for a basic course in contract law.

C. Related Business Disciplines

1. Accounting
2. Corporate financial management
3. Industrial Marketing
4. Acquisition Management (logistics, supply, transportation, quality assurance, et. al.)
5. Project/Program management
6. Other disciplines directly related to decisions made by contracting officers.

D. Intermediate Skill and Knowledge Requirements

1. Knowledge of Government Contract Law; and Federal regulations and policies for the solicitation, award and administration of contracts.
2. Knowledge of the budget execution process and procedures for verifying that funds are available for the procurement.
3. Skill at determining whether a sole source procurement is necessary, given the nature of the requirements, market conditions and procedural constraints.
4. Ability to identify and develop sources of supply.
5. Knowledge of the procedures for small business and labor surplus set asides (including class set asides); knowledge of the process for procuring goods and services from 8(a) suppliers.
6. Ability to determine the best method of procurement, under more complex conditions, given the nature of the requirement and market conditions (e.g., simplified purchase methods, formal advertising, formal negotiations, etc.).
7. Skill at identifying and developing special provisions and options for solicitations to protect and further the Government's interests.
8. Knowledge of methods for preparing and publicizing solicitations.
9. Skill at evaluating and responding to inquiries regarding solicitations.

10. Knowledge of the process for amending solicitations, extending the solicitation period, and disposing of late bids or proposals.
11. Knowledge of the conditions and process for cancelling solicitations.
12. Basic knowledge of the process for evaluating bids, including such aspects as verifying bids, determining the allowability (post-award) of mistakes in bids, and determining responsiveness.
13. Ability to identify and obtain data for evaluating proposals from both Government (i.e., technical evaluators and auditors) and non-Government sources.
14. Skill at analyzing market conditions and historical pricing data to determine the fairness and reasonableness of proposed prices; and to develop and support the Government's pre-negotiation positions, based on data from the offerors, in-house estimates, technical evaluations and audit reports.
15. Basic skill at analyzing proposed elements of cost to develop cost and profit pre-negotiation positions, based on data from the offerors, in-house estimates, technical evaluations and audit reports.
16. Ability to determine the competitive range.
17. Skill at developing negotiation objectives, strategies and tactics.
18. Skill at conducting negotiation conferences with the offerors' representatives.
19. Ability to determine the necessity and extent of pre-award surveys.
20. Skill at determining the responsibility of proposed offerors.
21. Ability to make and justify final source selection decisions.
22. Knowledge of the procedures for awarding contracts and providing notice of the awards.
23. Ability to determine the necessity and conduct post-award conferences.
24. Knowledge of the methods and conditions for modifying contracts through formal change orders and supplemental agreements.
25. Skill at instructing technical representatives and quality assurance personnel of their authority and limits.
26. Knowledge of the process for settling claims; ability to determine the validity of claims and establish the Government's position on the amount of the equitable adjustment.
27. Knowledge of the process for ordering (a) temporary halts in work under contracts and (b) the resumption of work.

28. Ability to monitor the contractor's progress, determine whether delays are excusable, and grant performance time extensions for excusable delays.
29. Knowledge of the criteria for determining whether the contractor is failing to make due progress or not complying with other contract provisions.
30. Knowledge of the techniques and instruments for dealing with the contractor's failure to perform (e.g., cure and show cause notices).
31. Knowledge of the conditions and process for terminating contracts for the convenience of the Government or for default.
32. Ability to determine and assess liquidated damages; obtain consideration for delinquent deliveries or items not meeting specifications.
33. Knowledge of the consequences of breach of contract by either the Government or the contractor.
34. Knowledge of the process for inspecting and accepting the contractors' work.
35. Ability to manage the payment of contractors (e.g., requests for progress payments; the processing of contractor invoices; release of claims; assignment of payments; adjusting contract fund requirements; the withholding and set off of payments).

Level III

Level III courses concentrate on the analysis of advanced procurement methods and techniques to enable an individual to effectively manage more complex contractual relationships. The training requirements for Level II are also prerequisites for Level III. The essential difference between Level II and Level III courses is that Level II conveys general procurement knowledge, while Level III concentrates on the in-depth analysis of more complex and specialized procurement areas and presents a strategic overview of procurement management.

Advanced course content must include a combination of the following general and core subjects listed below. It is suggested that a minimum of 200 hours beyond Level II requirements (i.e. 520 hours) are necessary to accomplish this purpose ¹.

A. General Subjects

1. Acquisition management
2. Advanced procurement planning
3. Advanced procurement and contracting methods and techniques
4. Complex contract types
5. Procurement of major systems
6. Analysis and interpretation of private sector market conditions
7. Labor and socio-economic contract provisions
8. Data Management
9. Incentive contracting; cost reduction
10. Current policy issues

B. Core Subjects

1. Formal advertising
 - Specification and purchase description
 - Two-step formal advertising
 - Mistakes in bids
 - Protests
2. Negotiation (Art and Technique)
 - Techniques and strategy of effective negotiation
 - Competitive range determinations
 - Advanced source evaluation and selection process and techniques
3. Cost and Price Analysis (Advanced)
 - Contract risk allocation
 - Financial management and interpretation of financial statements and determination of viability of a business concern
 - Overhead analysis and negotiation
 - Quantitative techniques for evaluation
 - Cost accounting standards

¹This is somewhat less than the hours of training required on average in the Department of Defense for all intermediate level Contracts and Procurement Specialists (not just contracting officers).

- Cost control techniques
- Design to cost; life cycle cost

4. Contract Administration

- Change orders/supplemental agreements; forward pricing
- Settlement of contract claims and equitable adjustments
- Terminations for convenience or default
- Interpretation of specifications
- Contractor performance measurement

5. Contract Law

- Evaluation of procurement statutes
- Case studies and analysis of Comptroller General, Contract Appeals Boards, and court decisions involving major contract issues
- Understanding legal procedures and interpreting legal concepts
- Contemporary procurement law issues

C. Related Business Disciplines

1. Accounting
2. Corporate financial management
3. Industrial Marketing
4. Acquisition Management (logistics, supply, transportation, quality assurance, et. al.)
5. Project/Program management
6. Other disciplines directly related to decisions made by contracting officers

D. Advanced Skill and Knowledge Requirements

1. Knowledge of Government Contract Law; and Federal regulations and policies for the solicitation, award and administration of contracts.
2. Ability to develop, maintain and update advanced procurement plans.
3. Ability to advise and assist requiring activities in evaluating statements of work or specifications to yield the best market response, in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and price.
4. Skill at advising and assisting requiring activities in formulating and applying criteria for evaluating offerors' proposals.
5. Advanced skill at assisting the requiring activities in avoiding sole source situations and obtaining competition, when competition would best serve the public interest.

6. Skill at applying procedures for small business and labor surplus set asides (including class set asides); knowledge of the process for procuring goods and services from 8(a) suppliers.
7. Ability to determine the best method of procurement, under more complex conditions, given the nature of the requirement and market conditions (e.g., simplified purchase methods, formal advertising, formal negotiations, etc.).
8. Ability to select the most appropriate pricing arrangement (i.e., "type of contract"), given the nature of the requirement and market conditions.
9. Skill at determining the necessity for, and developing of contractor financing arrangements (e.g., progress payments, advance payments, etc.).
10. Skill at identifying and developing more advanced special provisions and options for more sophisticated procurements.
11. Advanced knowledge of methods and issues involving the solicitation of bids and proposals, from publication of the solicitation through receipt and opening of the bids and proposals.
12. Skill at determining the necessity for and, conducting pre-proposal (i.e., solicitation) conferences.
13. Advanced knowledge of the process for evaluating bids, including such aspects as verifying bids, determining the allowability (post-award) of mistakes in bids, and determining responsiveness.
14. Ability to identify and obtain data for evaluating proposals from both Government (i.e., technical evaluators and auditors) and non-Government sources.
15. Advanced skill at analyzing market conditions and historical pricing data to determine the fairness and reasonableness of proposed prices; and to develop and support the Government's pre-negotiation position on price.
16. Advanced skill at analyzing proposed elements of cost to develop cost and profit pre-negotiation positions, based on data from the offerors, in-house estimates, technical evaluations and audit reports.
17. Ability to determine the competitive range when complex technical issues are involved.
18. Advanced skill at developing negotiation objectives, strategies and tactics.
19. Skill at organizing and preparing the Government's negotiation team.
20. Skill at conducting pre-negotiation fact-finding conferences with the offeror's representatives.

21. Skill at managing team negotiation conferences with the offerors' representatives.
22. Advanced skill at determining the responsibility of proposed offerors.
23. Knowledge of advanced sole selection methods.
24. Skill at developing the Government's position on protests.
25. Advanced knowledge of the methods and conditions for modifying contracts through formal change orders and supplemental agreements.
26. Advanced skill at instructing technical representatives and quality assurance personnel on their authority and limits.
27. Knowledge of the process for settling complex claims; ability to determine the validity of complex claims and establish the Government's position on the amount of the equitable adjustment.
28. Advanced knowledge of, and skill at, monitoring the contractor's progress, determining whether delays are excusable, and granting performance time extensions for excusable delays.
29. Skill at determining whether the contractor is failing to make due progress or not complying with other contract provisions.
30. Skill at applying the techniques and instruments for dealing with the contractor's failure to perform (e.g., cure and show cause notices).
31. Advanced knowledge of the conditions and process for terminating contracts for the convenience of the Government or for default.
32. Skill at obtaining consideration for delinquent deliveries or items not meeting specifications.
33. Ability to obtain and review cost accounting standards disclosure statements; determine whether investigations of the statements are necessary; and negotiate cost impact adjustments.
34. Knowledge of the process for reviewing and approving the contractors' accounting and cost estimating systems.
35. Knowledge of quality assurance systems and processes.
36. Ability to review and consent to proposed placements of sub-contracts; knowledge of the procedures for reviewing contractor purchasing systems.
37. Knowledge of the techniques for identifying and resolving defective pricing actions.
38. Skill at negotiating forward pricing agreements, interim billing rates, and final overhead rates.

Appendix J: Survey of Administrative Contracting Officers

RETURN TO: AFIT/LSP, WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB, OH 45433

The data collected from this survey will be compiled using a computer. In order to facilitate the use of the computer we ask that you mark your answers on the answer sheet supplied with the survey. Use a No. 2 pencil to mark. You may find it useful to circle your answers on the survey and transfer them to the answer sheet.

PART I

DEMOGRAPHICS

1. What is your agency?
 - a. USAF
 - b. ARMY
 - c. NAVY
 - d. DLA
 - e. contractor
2. What is your sex?
 - a. male
 - b. female
3. What is your grade/rank or equivalent level?
 - a. GS-11/Captain or lower
 - b. GS-12/Major
 - c. GS-13/Lt Col
 - d. GS-14/Col
 - e. GS-15 or Higher Grade
4. What is the last educational level you have completed?
 - a. High School graduate
 - b. Associate Degree
 - c. Bachelor's Degree
 - d. Master's Degree
 - e. Beyond Master's Degree

5. Did your Associates Degree provide you with any contracting background?

- a. I do not have an Associates Degree
- b. No contracting background
- c. Some contracting background
- d. Extensive contracting background
- e. Entire degree emphasis was contracting

6. Did your Bachelor's Degree provide you with any contracting background?

- a. I do not have a Bachelor's Degree
- b. No contracting background
- c. Some contracting background
- d. Extensive contracting background
- e. Entire degree emphasis was contracting

7. Did your Master's Degree provide you with any contracting background?

- a. I do not have a Master's Degree
- b. No contracting background
- c. Some contracting background
- d. Extensive contracting background
- e. Entire degree emphasis was contracting

8. What is your current contract administration experience?

- a. 2 years or less
- b. 2 - 4 years
- c. 4 - 6 years
- d. 6 - 10 years
- e. more than 10 years

9. How long have you been with your current organization?

- a. 2 years or less
- b. 2 - 4 years
- c. 4 - 6 years
- d. 6 - 10 years
- e. more than 10 years

10. How long have you lived in the area where your organization is located?

- a. 2 years or less
- b. 2 - 4 years
- c. 4 - 6 years
- d. 6 - 10 years
- e. more than 10 years

11. The majority of contracts you presently administer are?

- a. Firm Fixed Price
- b. Fixed Price Incentive Fee
- c. Cost Plus Award Fee
- d. Cost Plus Incentive Fee
- e. other

12. Considering individual contract values, most of the contracts you administer are in which range?

- a. 0 - \$100,000
- b. \$100,000 - \$500,000
- c. \$500,000 - \$10 million
- d. \$10 million - \$100 million
- e. Over \$100 million

13. The highest dollar value for a single contract for which you are presently the ACO is in which range.

- a. 0 - \$100,000
- b. \$100,000 - \$500,000
- c. \$500,000 - \$10 million
- d. \$10 million - \$100 million
- e. Over \$100 million

14. What is the contract type for the contract identified in question 13?

- a. Firm Fixed Price
- b. Fixed Price Incentive Fee
- c. Cost Plus Award Fee
- d. Cost Plus Incentive Fee
- e. other

Questions 15 - 32 identify courses for contracting and acquisition personnel. For each course identify your experience and attitude as detailed in the box below, and mark the appropriate letter for each course.

- a. I have not had the course.
- b. I have had the course but found it of little use.
- c. I have had the course and use the material some.
- d. I have had the course and use the material extensively.
- e. I have had the course and feel the material is mandatory for my job.

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15. Contract Administration (AFIT) | a | b | c | d | e |
| 16. Management of Defense Acquisition Contracts (ALMAC) | a | b | c | d | e |
| 17. Principles of Contract Pricing (AFIT) | a | b | c | d | e |
| 18. Defense Cost & Price Analysis (NAVY) | a | b | c | d | e |
| 19. Defense Contract Negotiation Workshop (NAVY) | a | b | c | d | e |
| 20. Advanced Contract Administration (AFIT) | a | b | c | d | e |
| 21. Management of Defense Acquisition Contracts (Advanced) (ALMAC) | a | b | c | d | e |
| 22. Government Contract Law (AFIT) | a | b | c | d | e |
| 23. Management of Managers (ALMETA) | a | b | c | d | e |
| 24. Defense Acquisition & Contracting Seminar (NAVY) | a | b | c | d | e |

- a. I have not had the course.
- b. I have had the course but found it of little use.
- c. I have had the course and use the material some.
- d. I have had the course and use the material extensively.
- e. I have had the course and feel the material is mandatory for my job.

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 25. Quantitative Techniques for Cost and Price Analysis (AFIT) | a | b | c | d | e |
| 26. Ethics & Standards | a | b | c | d | e |
| 27. Federal Procurement Responsibility and Authority | a | b | c | d | e |
| 28. Social & Legal Environment of Business | a | b | c | d | e |
| 29. Marketing, Bid & Proposal Preparation | a | b | c | d | e |
| 30. Business Policy | a | b | c | d | e |
| 31. Data Management | a | b | c | d | e |
| 32. Project Management & Systems Procurement | a | b | c | d | e |

List any other courses which you may have taken which are not listed here on the reverse side of the answer sheet or on a separate sheet of paper. Please include the location where the course was offered.

PART II

ACO/COUNTERPART POSITION SELECTION CRITERIA

33. Did you go through an interview process when you were selected for your current warrant or position?

- a. I was not interviewed when selected.
- b. I was interviewed by my supervisor when selected.
- c. I was interviewed by a division chief when selected.
- d. I was interviewed by the director when selected.
- e. I was interviewed by Headquarters when selected.

34. Did you have to take an examination when you were selected for your warrant or position?

- a. No, I did not take an examination when selected.
- b. Yes, I was given an oral examination when selected.
- c. Yes, I was given a written examination when selected.

35. Did you "inherit" your warrant by virtue of the position you now hold?

- a. yes
- b. no
- c. not applicable

36. What was your experience level when you were selected for your warrant or position?

- a. 2 years or less
- b. 2 - 4 years
- c. 4 - 6 years
- d. 6 - 10 years
- e. More than 10 years

37. What was your educational level when you received your current warrant or position?

- a. High School graduate
- b. Associate Degree
- c. Bachelor's Degree
- d. Master's Degree
- e. Beyond Master's Degree

38. What was the "primary" selection criteria for your warrant or position?

- a. Interview
- b. Oral Examination
- c. Written Examination
- d. Experience
- e. Other, please explain on the back of the answer sheet.

39. At the time of your selection, did you feel you were qualified to hold the position?

- a. Yes
- b. No, please explain on the back of the answer sheet.

PART III

RECOMMENDED STANDARDS

40. How important do you feel **EXPERIENCE** is as a qualification criteria for selecting ACOs?

- a. Not important at all.
- b. Limited importance.
- c. Important.
- d. Very important.
- e. Mandatory.

41. What do you consider to be the minimum number of years of contracting experience someone should have before being selected as an ACO?

- a. 2 years or less
- b. 2 - 4 years
- c. 4 - 6 years
- d. 6 - 10 years
- e. More than 10 years

42. How important do you feel undergraduate study in business or contracting related course work is as a factor in selecting ACOs?

- a. Not important at all.
- b. Limited importance.
- c. Important.
- d. Very important.
- e. Mandatory.

43. How important do you feel graduate study in business or contracting related course work is as a factor for selecting ACOs?

- a. Not important at all.
- b. Limited importance.
- c. Important.
- d. Very important.
- e. Mandatory.

44. How important do you feel written EXAMINATIONS are as a qualification criteria for selecting ACOs?

- a. Not important at all.
- b. Limited importance.
- c. Important.
- d. Very important.
- e. Mandatory.

45. Do you feel successful completion of a written examination is important as a qualification requirement for selection as an ACO?

- a. Not important at all.
- b. Limited importance.
- c. Important.
- d. Very important.
- e. Mandatory.

46. How important do you feel TRAINING is as a qualification criteria for selecting ACOs?

- a. Not important at all.
- b. Limited importance.
- c. Important.
- d. Very important.
- e. Mandatory.

Questions 47 - 64 list the same courses which were identified earlier. For this section we want your opinion of how important each class is as a qualification requirement for selecting ACOs?

- a. Not important at all.
- b. Limited importance.
- c. Important.
- d. Very important.
- e. Mandatory.

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 47. Contract Administration | a | b | c | d | e |
| 48. Management of Defense Acquisition Contracts | a | b | c | d | e |
| 49. Principles of Contract Pricing | a | b | c | d | e |
| 50. Defense Cost & Price Analysis | a | b | c | d | e |

- a. Not important at all.
- b. Limited importance.
- c. Important.
- d. Very important.
- e. Mandatory.

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 51. Defense Contract Negotiation Workshop | a | b | c | d | e |
| 52. Advanced Contract Administration | a | b | c | d | e |
| 53. Management of Defense Acquisition
Contracts (Advanced) | a | b | c | d | e |
| 54. Government Contract Law | a | b | c | d | e |
| 55. Management of Managers | a | b | c | d | e |
| 56. Defense Acquisition & Contracting
Seminar | a | b | c | d | e |
| 57. Quantitative Techniques for Cost and
Price Analysis | a | b | c | d | e |
| 58. Ethics & Standards | a | b | c | d | e |
| 59. Federal Procurement Responsibility
and Authority | a | b | c | d | e |
| 60. Social & Legal Environment
of Business | a | b | c | d | e |
| 61. Marketing, Bid & Proposal
Preparation | a | b | c | d | e |
| 62. Business Policy | a | b | c | d | e |
| 63. Data Management | a | b | c | d | e |
| 64. Project Management & Systems
Procurement | a | b | c | d | e |

List any other courses which you feel should be required as well as any other comments you have on the back of the answer sheet. Your participation in this survey effort is greatly appreciated.

Appendix K: Surveyed PROs

<u>Location</u>	<u># of ACOs</u>
<u>Air Force</u>	
1. AFPRO Hughes Aircraft Co P.O. Box 92463 Los Angeles CA 90009	12
2. AFPRO Rockwell International Corp, North American Air- CRAFT Operations P.O. Box 92098 Los Angeles CA 90009	6
3. AFPRO Northrop Corp One Northrop Ave Hawthorne CA 90250	6
4. AFPRO Martin-Marietta Denver Aerospace P.O. Box 179 Denver CO 80201	4
5. AFPRO General Electric Co Space Systems Div P.O. Box 8555 Philadelphia PA 19101	4
6. AFPRO Fairchild Industries Inc Fairchild Republic Co Farmingdale L.I. NY 11735	3
7. AFPRO General Electric Co Aircraft Engine Group Caller #1615 Cincinnati OH 45215	5
8. AFPRO Westinghouse Electric Corp P.O. Box 1693 Baltimore MD 21203	7
9. AFPRO Lockheed Missile & Space Co Space Systems Div P.O. Box 504 Sunnyvale CA 94088	7

<u>Location</u>	<u># of ACOs</u>
10. AFPRO Rockwell International Corp, OL-AB North American Aircraft Operations Columbus Div & Missile System Div P.O. Box 1259 Columbus OH 43216	3
11. AFCMD Operating Location OL-AD, AF Plant 42 2503 East Ave P Palmdale CA 93550	2

Army

1. ARPRO Textron Inc Bell Helicopter Textron Div P.O. Box 1605 Fort Worth TX 76101	4
2. ARPRO Hughes Helicopter Inc Centinela & Teale Sts Culver City CA 90230	1
3. ARPRO Boeing Co Boeing-Vertol Company Div P.O. Box 16859 Philadelphia PA 19142	4

DCAS

1. DCASPRO Sanders Associates Daniel Webster Hwy South Nashua NH 03061	2
2. DCASPRO Singer-Link Kirkwood Plant Binghamton NY 13902	2
3. DCASPRO Gould c/o Gould Defense Systems Inc Ocean Systems Div 18901 Euclid Ave Cleveland OH 44117	2

<u>Location</u>	<u># of ACOs</u>
-----------------	------------------

4. DCASPRO Williams International c/o Williams International Corp 2280 West Maple Rd Walled Lake MI 48088	2
--	---

5. DCASPRO FMC 333 Brokaw Rd P.O. Box 367 San Jose CA 95103	4
--	---

6. DCASPRO Bendix Corp Route 46 Tererboro NJ 07608	2
--	---

Navy

1. NAVPRO General Electric Co, Ordnance Systems 100 Plastics Ave Pittsfield MA 01201	5
--	---

2. NAVPRO FMC Northern Ordnance Div 4800 East River Rd Minneapolis MN 55421	5
--	---

3. NAVPRO Laurel Johns Hopkins Rd Laurel MD 20707	3
---	---

Contractor

1. A. R. Apple, Dept 02-30 Building 63 Lockheed Corporation P.O. Box 551 Burbank CA 91520	10
---	----

Appendix L: Survey Results

The total number of respondents who selected a particular answer is tabulated according to the question number and the agency. F - Air Force, A - Army, N - Navy, D - DLA (DCAS) C - Contractor, and T - Total responses for that answer.

PART I

DEMOGRAPHICS

1. What is your agency?

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a. USAF	42	0	0	0	0	42
b. Army	0	7	0	0	0	7
c. NAVY	0	0	9	0	0	9
d. DLA	0	0	0	10	0	10
e. Contractor	0	0	0	0	6	6

2. What is your sex?

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a. male	26	6	7	9	NA	48
b. female	16	1	2	1	NA	20

3. What is your grade/rank or equivalent level?

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a. GS-11/Captain/lower	8	0	1	0	0	9
b. GS-12/Major	20	4	7	7	0	38
c. GS-13/Lt Col	9	1	0	3	3	16
d. GS-14/Col	5	2	1	0	0	8
e. GS-15/Higher Grade	0	0	0	0	3	3

4. What is the last educational level you have completed?

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a. High School	3	3	0	1	0	7
b. Associate Degree	2	0	0	0	0	2
c. Bachelor's Degree	22	4	4	7	2	39
d. Master's Degree	12	0	4	1	3	20
e. Master's Degree Plus	3	0	1	1	1	6

5. Did your Associates Degree provide you with any contracting background?

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a. I do not have an Associates Degree	34	7	8	8	6	63
b. No contracting background	5	0	0	0	0	5
c. Some contracting background	3	0	1	1	0	5
d. Extensive contracting background	0	0	0	1	0	1
e. Entire degree emphasis was contracting	0	0	0	0	0	0

6. Did your Bachelor's Degree provide you with any contracting background?

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a. I do not have a Bachelor's Degree	5	3	0	1	0	9
b. No contracting background	13	1	6	5	5	30
c. Some contracting background	21	3	1	4	1	30
d. Extensive contracting background	3	0	2	0	0	5
e. Entire degree emphasis was contracting	0	0	0	0	0	0

7. Did your Master's Degree provide you with any contracting background?

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a. I do not have a Master's Degree	28	7	4	9	2	50
b. No contracting background	2	0	0	0	1	3
c. Some contracting background	8	0	1	1	3	13
d. Extensive contracting background	4	0	2	0	0	6
e. Entire degree emphasis was contracting	0	0	2	0	0	2

8. What is your current contract administration experience?

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a. 2 years or less	2	0	1	0	0	3
b. 2 - 4 years	3	0	2	0	0	5
c. 4 - 6 years	8	0	2	3	0	13
d. 6 - 10 years	8	3	1	2	0	14
e. more than 10 years	21	4	3	5	6	39

9. How long have you been with your current organization?

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a. 2 years or less	8	1	4	1	NA	14
b. 2 - 4 years	14	1	1	2	NA	18
c. 4 - 6 years	4	0	1	2	NA	7
d. 6 - 10 years	8	2	1	1	NA	12
e. more than 10 years	8	3	2	4	NA	17

10. How long have you lived in the area where your organization is located?

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a. 2 years or less	4	0	2	1	NA	7
b. 2 - 4 years	9	1	1	0	NA	11
c. 4 - 6 years	0	0	1	0	NA	1
d. 6 - 10 years	6	1	2	0	NA	9
e. more than 10 years	23	5	3	9	NA	40

11. The majority of contracts you presently administer are?

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a. Firm Fixed Price	18	2	4	5	2	31
b. Fixed Price Incentive Fee	10	4	1	4	0	19
c. Cost Plus Award Fee	3	0	1	0	1	5
d. Cost Plus Incentive Fee	4	0	3	1	1	9
e. Other	7	0	0	0	1	8

12. Considering individual contract values, most of the contracts you administer are in which range?

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a. 0 - \$100,000	3	0	3	4	0	10
b. \$100,000 - \$500,000	6	2	1	0	1	10
c. \$500,000 - \$10 M	12	2	1	2	1	18
d. \$10 M - \$100 M	12	0	4	3	1	20
e. Over \$100 million	7	2	0	1	2	12

13. The highest dollar value for a single contract for which you are presently the ACO is in which range?

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a. 0 - \$100,000	1	0	0	0	0	1
b. \$100,000 - \$500,000	0	0	0	0	0	0
c. \$500,000 - \$10 M	3	1	0	2	0	6
d. \$10 M - \$100 M	7	2	3	4	0	16
e. Over \$100 million	30	3	6	4	5	48

14. What is the contract type for the contract identified in question 13?

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a. Firm Fixed Price	14	2	1	3	1	21
b. Fixed Price Incentive Fee	15	4	3	4	0	26
c. Cost Plus Award Fee	2	0	2	1	2	7
d. Cost Plus Incentive Fee	7	0	3	2	1	13
e. Other	3	0	0	0	1	4

Questions 15 - 32 identify courses for contracting and acquisition personnel. For each course identify your experience and attitude as detailed in the box below, and mark the appropriate letter for each course.

- a. I have not had the course.
 - b. I have had the course but found it of little use.
 - c. I have had the course and use the material some.
 - d. I have had the course and use the material extensively.
 - e. I have had the course and feel the material is mandatory for my job.

15. Contract Administration (AFIT)

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	10	3	6	1	2	22
b.	1	0	0	0	0	1
c.	10	1	1	2	3	17
d.	7	0	0	1	0	8
e.	14	3	2	6	1	26

16. Management of Defense Acquisition Contracts (ALMAC)

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	24	2	4	6	5	41
b.	1	0	0	0	0	1
c.	7	1	2	2	1	13
d.	7	0	1	0	0	8
e.	3	4	2	2	0	11

17. Principles of Contract Pricing (AFIT)

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	14	4	9	8	4	39
b.	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	19	1	0	0	2	22
d.	4	1	0	0	0	5
e.	5	1	0	2	0	8

18. Defense Cost & Price Analysis (NAVY)

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	24	1	4	6	5	40
b.	1	0	1	0	0	2
c.	7	1	1	1	0	10
d.	4	2	2	1	0	9
e.	6	3	1	2	0	12

19. Defense Contract Negotiation Workshop (NAVY)

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	9	2	6	4	2	23
b.	5	0	2	0	0	7
c.	13	1	0	1	2	17
d.	8	0	1	2	1	12
e.	6	4	0	3	1	14

20. Advanced Contract Administration (AFIT)

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	13	1	4	3	2	23
b.	1	1	0	1	0	3
c.	10	1	3	1	2	17
d.	5	0	1	2	2	10
e.	13	4	1	3	0	21

21. Management of Defense Acquisition Contracts (Advanced)
(ALMAC)

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	27	0	7	6	3	43
b.	0	1	0	0	0	1
c.	6	2	0	2	1	11
d.	7	1	0	2	2	12
e.	2	3	2	0	0	7

22. Government Contract Law (AFIT)

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	7	0	2	0	1	10
b.	0	0	0	0	1	1
c.	12	3	4	4	2	25
d.	12	1	0	2	2	17
e.	11	3	3	4	0	21

23. Management of Managers (ALMETA)

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	37	6	9	10	6	68
b.	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	2	0	0	0	0	2
d.	2	1	0	0	0	3
e.	1	0	0	0	0	1

24. Defense Acquisition & Contracting Seminar (NAVY)

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	31	4	7	10	5	57
b.	2	0	0	0	0	2
c.	5	1	1	0	1	8
d.	4	1	0	0	0	5
e.	0	1	1	0	0	2

**25. Quantitative Techniques for Cost and Price Analysis
(AFIT)**

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	32	6	7	9	5	59
b.	0	0	0	0	1	1
c.	6	0	1	1	0	8
d.	2	0	1	0	0	3
e.	2	1	0	0	0	3

26. Ethics & Standards

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	37	6	8	9	5	65
b.	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	1	1	0	1	1	4
d.	1	0	0	0	0	1
e.	2	0	1	0	0	3

27. Federal Procurement Responsibility and Authority

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	38	7	8	10	6	69
b.	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	1	0	0	0	0	1
d.	1	0	0	0	0	1
e.	2	0	1	0	0	3

28. Social & Legal Environment of Business

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	39	7	8	10	5	69
b.	1	0	0	0	0	1
c.	1	0	1	0	1	3
d.	0	0	0	0	0	0
e.	1	0	0	0	0	1

29. Marketing, Bid & Proposal Preparation

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	39	7	8	10	3	67
b.	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	1	0	0	0	2	3
d.	1	0	0	0	1	2
e.	1	0	1	0	0	2

30. Business Policy

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	40	7	8	9	4	68
b.	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	0	0	0	1	1	2
d.	1	0	0	0	1	2
e.	1	0	1	0	0	2

31. Data Management

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	37	7	8	9	6	67
b.	1	0	0	1	0	2
c.	3	0	0	0	0	3
d.	0	0	1	0	0	1
e.	1	0	0	0	0	1

32. Project Management & Systems Procurement

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	38	7	8	9	6	68
b.	0	0	0	0	0	0
c.	2	0	1	0	0	3
d.	0	0	0	0	0	0
e.	1	0	0	1	0	2

PART II

ACO/COUNTERPART POSITION SELECTION CRITERIA

33. Did you go through an interview process when you were selected for your current warrant or position?

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a. I was not interviewed when selected.	4	0	4	0	2	10
b. I was interviewed by supervisor.	8	3	2	3	0	16
c. I was interviewed by division chief.	6	3	2	6	1	18
d. I was interviewed by director.	2	1	0	0	2	5
e. I was interviewed by Headquarters.	22	0	1	1	1	25

34. Did you have to take an examination when you were selected for your warrant or position?

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a. No, I did not take an examination.	14	7	9	9	6	45
b. Yes, I was given an oral examination.	28	0	0	1	0	29
c. Yes, I was given a written examination.	0	0	0	0	0	0

35. Did you "inherit" your warrant by virtue of the position you now hold?

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a. yes	2	3	6	3	2	16
b. no	38	4	1	6	2	51
c. not applicable	1	0	2	1	2	6

36. What was your experience level when you were selected for your warrant or position?

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a. 2 years or less	1	1	1	1	0	4
b. 2 - 4 years	9	0	3	2	0	14
c. 4 - 6 years	7	0	3	1	0	11
d. 6 - 10 years	10	3	1	4	0	18
e. More than 10 years	14	3	1	2	6	26

37. What was your educational level when you received your current warrant or position?

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a. High School	3	3	0	1	0	7
b. Associate Degree	3	0	0	0	0	3
c. Bachelor's Degree	22	4	4	7	2	39
d. Master's Degree	10	0	4	1	3	18
e. Master's Degree Plus	4	0	1	1	1	7

38. What was the "primary" selection criteria for your warrant or position?

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a. Interview	10	0	2	3	0	15
b. Oral Examination	14	0	0	0	0	14
c. Written Examination	0	0	0	0	0	0
d. Experience	18	7	4	7	6	42
e. Other	0	0	3	0	0	3

39. At the time of your selection, did you feel you were qualified to hold the position?

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a. Yes	42	7	9	10	6	74
b. No	0	0	0	0	0	0

PART III

RECOMMENDED STANDARDS

40. How important do you feel **EXPERIENCE** is as a qualification criteria for selecting ACOs?

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a. Not important at all.	0	0	0	0	0	0
b. Limited importance.	0	0	1	0	0	1
c. Important.	8	0	2	0	0	10
d. Very important.	17	3	3	3	3	29
e. Mandatory.	17	4	3	7	3	34

41. What do you consider to be the minimum number of years of contracting experience someone should have before being selected as an ACO?

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a. 2 years or less	0	0	4	0	0	4
b. 2 - 4 years	18	3	1	2	0	24
c. 4 - 6 years	19	2	4	6	1	32
d. 6 - 10 years	5	2	0	2	3	12
e. More than 10 years	0	0	0	0	2	2

42. How important do you feel undergraduate study in business or contracting related course work is as a factor in selecting ACOs?

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a. Not important at all.	1	0	0	0	0	1
b. Limited importance.	12	4	2	1	0	19
c. Important.	16	2	3	5	3	29
d. Very important.	10	1	3	3	3	20
e. Mandatory.	3	0	1	1	0	5

43. How important do you feel graduate study in business or contracting related course work is as a factor for selecting ACOs?

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a. Not important at all.	7	1	0	0	0	8
b. Limited importance.	24	6	2	5	0	37
c. Important.	8	0	5	2	6	21
d. Very important.	3	0	2	2	0	7
e. Mandatory.	0	0	0	0	0	0

44. How important do you feel written EXAMINATIONS are as a qualification criteria for selecting ACOs?

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a. Not important at all.	4	2	1	3	0	10
b. Limited importance.	22	3	4	6	4	39
c. Important.	13	1	4	0	2	20
d. Very important.	1	1	0	0	0	2
e. Mandatory.	2	0	0	1	0	3

45. Do you feel successful completion of a written examination is important as a qualification requirement for selection as an ACO?

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a. Not important at all.	5	2	1	3	0	11
b. Limited importance.	22	3	3	5	3	36
c. Important.	13	1	5	0	2	21
d. Very important.	0	1	0	1	1	3
e. Mandatory.	2	0	0	1	0	3

46. How important do you feel TRAINING is as a qualification criteria for selecting ACOs?

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a. Not important at all.	0	0	0	0	0	0
b. Limited importance.	4	0	1	0	0	5
c. Important.	15	4	4	1	3	27
d. Very important.	10	1	2	4	3	20
e. Mandatory.	13	2	2	5	0	22

Questions 47 - 64 list the same courses which were identified earlier. For this section we want your opinion of how important each class is as a qualification requirement for selecting ACOs?

- a. Not important at all.
- b. Limited importance.
- c. Important.
- d. Very important.
- e. Mandatory.

47. Contract Administration

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	1	0	1	0	0	2
b.	2	0	1	1	0	4
c.	11	2	4	1	1	19
d.	6	1	1	1	3	12
e.	22	4	2	6	1	35

48. Management of Defense Acquisition Contracts

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	1	0	1	0	0	2
b.	9	1	1	3	0	14
c.	15	2	2	4	2	25
d.	6	1	3	0	3	13
e.	9	3	2	2	0	16

49. Principles of Contract Pricing

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	1	0	0	0	0	1
b.	4	1	2	1	0	8
c.	18	3	4	2	3	30
d.	9	1	2	2	2	16
e.	9	2	0	4	0	15

50. Defense Cost & Price Analysis

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	1	0	1	0	0	2
b.	6	0	2	1	0	9
c.	15	3	3	3	3	27
d.	10	1	2	3	2	18
e.	7	3	1	2	0	13

51. Defense Contract Negotiation Workshop

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	0	0	4	0	0	4
b.	8	0	2	1	0	11
c.	12	2	0	1	0	15
d.	11	3	2	3	4	23
e.	11	2	1	3	1	18

52. Advanced Contract Administration

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	1	0	0	0	0	1
b.	6	1	2	0	1	10
c.	11	1	2	1	0	15
d.	9	1	2	4	3	19
e.	14	4	3	3	1	25

53. Management of Defense Acquisition Contracts (Advanced)

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	0	1	0	0	0	1
b.	9	1	1	2	2	15
c.	16	1	4	3	1	25
d.	10	1	1	2	2	16
e.	5	3	2	2	0	12

54. Government Contract Law

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	1	0	0	0	0	1
b.	1	0	0	0	0	1
c.	14	3	3	1	3	24
d.	8	2	3	3	2	18
e.	18	2	2	5	0	27

55. Management of Managers

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	10	1	2	0	0	13
b.	13	4	4	5	1	27
c.	8	1	1	3	4	17
d.	7	1	1	0	0	9
e.	0	0	0	0	0	0

56. Defense Acquisition & Contracting Seminar

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	4	1	1	0	0	6
b.	17	1	3	4	2	27
c.	11	3	2	3	1	20
d.	3	1	0	1	2	7
e.	3	1	2	1	0	7

57. Introductory Quantitative Analysis

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	8	0	0	3	2	13
b.	20	5	5	3	2	35
c.	9	1	3	2	1	16
d.	3	1	0	0	0	4
e.	0	0	0	0	0	0

58. Ethics & Standards

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	4	0	0	0	0	4
b.	18	2	4	2	1	27
c.	8	3	2	4	1	18
d.	7	2	1	1	2	13
e.	1	0	1	1	1	4

59. Federal Procurement Responsibility and Authority

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	4	0	1	0	0	5
b.	15	3	2	2	1	23
c.	9	4	4	2	2	21
d.	7	0	1	3	2	13
e.	3	0	0	1	0	4

60. Social & Legal Environment of Business

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	8	1	0	1	0	10
b.	14	4	5	6	3	32
c.	9	2	3	1	2	17
d.	6	0	0	0	0	6
e.	1	0	0	0	0	1

61. Marketing, Bid & Proposal Preparation

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	7	0	1	0	0	8
b.	15	5	2	6	3	31
c.	12	1	4	2	1	20
d.	3	1	0	0	1	5
e.	1	0	1	0	0	2

62. Business Policy

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	5	0	0	2	0	7
b.	18	4	2	4	2	30
c.	12	1	5	2	2	22
d.	2	2	0	0	1	5
e.	1	0	1	0	0	2

63. Data Management

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	8	0	0	1	0	9
b.	18	5	4	5	3	35
c.	9	1	3	2	0	15
d.	2	1	1	0	2	6
e.	1	0	0	0	0	1

64. Project Management & Systems Procurement

	F	A	N	D	C	T
a.	5	0	0	0	0	5
b.	17	4	2	1	3	27
c.	7	2	5	4	0	18
d.	4	1	1	3	2	11
e.	3	0	0	0	0	3

Bibliography

1. Air Force Contract Management Division. AFCMD Defense Acquisition Regulation Supplement. Albuquerque NM: HQ AFCMD, 14 May 1981.
2. Air Force Systems Command. Minutes of AFSC Contracting Officer Conference, Washington DC, 16-17 November 1983. Provided by Mr. John E. Verardo, Jr., Associate Professor, Department of Contract Management, School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), Wright-Patterson AFB OH.
3. -----. "AFSC Civilian QA Intern Program (CQAIP)," AFR 40-110, Vol. I/AFSC Sup 3, Atch 5, App A. Washington: HQ AFSC, 24 May 1982.
4. Ballard, Maj John A., Acting Chief, Research and Measurement Division, HQ AFMPC, Randolph AFB TX. Personal correspondence to Mr. John E. Verardo, Jr., Associate Professor, Department of Contract Management, School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), Wright-Patterson AFB OH, 25 May 1984.
5. Belden, Col David L. and Ernest G. Cammack. National Security Management: Procurement. Washington: Industrial College of the Armed Forces, 1973.
6. Bennett, John J. "Changing Professional Patterns and the Meaning for the NCMA," Contract Management, 18: 10-12 (September 1978).
7. Brechtel, Capt Donald L., Assistant Professor of Management. Class lecture notes and overhead slides presented in CM 5.23, Contracting and Acquisition Management. School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), Wright-Patterson AFB OH, July-August 1983.
8. Courtney, Roy C., Special Assistant to RAdm Sansone. Telephone interview. HQ NAVMAT, Washington DC, 7 February 1984.
9. Culver, C. M. "Federal Government Procurement - An Uncharted Course Through Turbulent Waters: Part 1. From Colonial Times to World War I," Contract Management, 24: 4-7+ (May 1984).

10. Defense Logistics Agency. "Selection, Appointment, and Termination of Appointment of Contracting Officers." DLAM 8105.1, Section 1-405. Provided by Col Robert D. Hackett, Jr., Deputy Executive Director, Contract Management, HQ DLA, Cameron Station, Alexandria VA, 22 August 1983.
11. Department of Defense. DOD FAR Supplement. Washington: Government Printing Office, January 1984.
12. -----. DOD Directory of Contract Administration Services Components. DOD 4105.59-H. Baltimore: Air Force Publishing Distribution Center, July 1983.
13. -----. DOD Civilian Career Program for Contracting and Acquisition Personnel. DOD 1430.10-M-1. Washington: Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower, Reserve Affairs and Logistics), December 1982.
14. -----. Defense Acquisition Regulation. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1976.
15. -----, General Services Administration and National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Federal Acquisition Regulation. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1 April 1984.
16. Department of the Army. "Army [Defense Acquisition Regulation] DAR Supplement," Government Contracts Reporter. Chicago: Commerce Clearing House, 1982.
17. Drozodowski, T. E. "Remaking Today's Purchasing Professionals," Purchasing, 96: 76-77+ (26 January 1984).
18. Gansler, Jacques S. The Defense Industry. Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1980.
19. Gilleece, Mary Ann. "Professionalism - The Key to Our Public Image," Contracting and Manufacturing Newsletter, 20: 5. Washington: HQ USAF, December 1983.
20. Gottlieb, Daniel W. "Washington Outlook: Defense Department Flunks the Basics of Professional Buying," Purchasing, 96: 49 (26 January 1984).
21. Gregory, William H. "Anatomy of a Horror Story," Aviation Week and Space Technology, 120: 11 (19 March 1984).
22. Hanes, Chisman and Sherwood B. Smith, Jr. "The Contracting Officer: His Authority to Act and His Duty to Act Independently," Dickinson Law Review, 70: 333-355 (Spring 1966).

23. Hood, Joseph L. "Confusion: A Cause of Criticism of the Contracting Officers," National Contract Management Journal, 6: 33-49 (Spring 1972). As cited in Capts Leonard E. Hopkins and James A. Scheideman's Value Profile of the Air Force Contracting Officer. MS thesis, SLSR-36-76B. School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), Wright-Patterson AFB OH, September 1976 (AD-A032 486).
24. Hunter, William N. "Strategy for Professionalism," Contract Management, 22: 8-10 (July 1982).
25. Koch, Col William G., Director, Contract Administration, Air Force Contract Management Division, Albuquerque NM. Personal correspondence to Mr. Walker Lee Evey, Air Force Systems Command, Washington DC, 16 May 1983. Provided by Mr. Stanley J. Kominic, Chief, R & D/Base Contracts Division, Directorate of Systems and Support Contracts, HQ AFSC to Mr. John E. Verardo, Jr., Associate Professor, Department of Contracting Management, School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), Wright-Patterson AFB OH, 28 July 1983.
26. Logistics Management Institute. The Contract Audit/Contract Administration Interface. Report No 68-17. Washington: Logistics Management Institute, March 1969.
27. Mahoy, James O. "The Starting Points," The Contracting Officer, edited by N. P. Dalton. Washington: Federal Publications, 1981.
28. McGovern, Capt Thomas, Administrative Contracting Officer, Air Force Plant Representative Office at Fairchild Industries, Farmingdale NY. Personal interview. School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), Wright-Patterson AFB OH, 17 February 1984.
29. McNabb, Dale E. "Procurement Salad of Ten Icebergs of Government Procurement," National Contract Management Quarterly Journal, 12: 39-53 (September 1978).
30. Miller, Michael F., Procurement Career Management Specialist. Personal interview. Federal Acquisition Institute, Washington DC, 5 April 1984.
31. ----- Post Award Decisionmakers. Federal Acquisition Personnel Information System Report No 82-2. Federal Acquisition Institute, Washington DC, 13 July 1982.
32. Miller, William H. "DOD Opens War on Spare-Parts Costs," Industry Week, 218: 21-25 (19 September 1983).

33. Naval Air Systems Command. NAVAIR Instruction 4205.2D. Philadelphia: Naval Publications and Forms Center, 26 August 1977.
34. ----- NAVAIR Instruction 4330.16A. Provided by W. C. Stilwell, Naval Air Systems Command, as an enclosure to letter AIR-5192C/CCJ, Ser 2-116.
35. Office of Federal Procurement Policy. "Agency Replies to Questionnaire for Commission on Government Procurement Recommendations A-12, A-13 and A-14: Summary and Analysis," 2 December 1976. Provided by Mr. Michael F. Miller, Procurement Career Management Specialist, Federal Acquisition Institute, Washington DC, 5 April 1984.
36. Office of Personnel Management. "Qualification Standards, Contract and Acquisition Series, GS-1102," Office of Personnel Management Handbook X-118. Washington: Government Printing Office, November 1983.
37. Page, Harry R. "Page Testimony Advocates Higher Standards For Procurement Personnel," Contract Management, 22: 7+ (March 1982).
38. ----- Public Purchasing and Material Management. Lexington MA: Heath and Company, 1980.
39. "Purchasing Strategies: From Money Managers to Strategic Planners," Purchasing, 94: 67+ (27 January 1983).
40. Ragan, Robert. "What it Takes to be a Procurement Professional," Contract Management, 22: 12 (September 1982).
41. Rindner, Corey M. "NCMA Partnerships in Education: Northrup University's Master of Science in Procurement and Acquisition Management," Contract Management, 23: 10-11 (August 1983).
42. Sansone, RAdm Joseph N., Jr., Deputy Chief of Naval Material Command (Contract and Business Management). "A CM Report: A Mandate for Professionalism in the Federal Procurement Work Force," Contract Management, 23: 25 (November 1983).
43. ----- "Contracting Officer Selection and Appointment Systems." Draft report by Task Group Six in response to Executive Order 12352. HQ NAVMAT, Washington DC, November 1983. Provided by Mr. Michael F. Miller, Procurement Career Management Specialist, Federal Acquisition Institute, Washington DC, 5 April 1984.

44. ----- "Contracting Officer Qualification Programs." Draft report by Task Group Six in response to Executive Order 12352. HQ NAVMAT, Washington DC, August 1983.
45. Schneider, Maurice D., Acting Director of Procurement and Production, HQ US Army Aviation Research and Development Command, St Louis MO. Personal correspondence to Mr. John E. Verardo, Jr., Associate Professor, Department of Contracting Management, School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), Wright-Patterson AFB OH, 4 August 1983.
46. Shedd, Joel P. "Principles on Authority of Contracting Officers in Administration of Government Contracts." Public Contract Law Journal, 5: 88-128 (1972).
47. Smith, Brig Gen Richard D., Deputy Chief of Staff for Contracting and Manufacturing, HQ AFLC. "Contracting in the Logistics Arena." Address to AFIT students in CM 5.54, Seminar in Acquisition Management. School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), Wright-Patterson AFB OH, 2 August 1984.
48. Smith, Paul. "AF Contracting Official Urges Overhaul in Buying Practices," Air Force Times, 51: 30 (9 July 1984).
49. Spagnola, Joseph C., Jr., Procurement Research Analyst. Personal interview. Federal Acquisition Institute, Washington DC, 5 April 1984.
50. Staats, Elmer B., Comptroller General of the United States. Action Required to Improve Department of Defense Career Program for Procurement Personnel. Report to the Congress. Washington DC, 13 August 1970.
51. Verardo, John E., Jr., Associate Professor, Department of Contract Management. Personal correspondence. School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), Wright-Patterson AFB OH, 28 July 1983.
52. -----, editor. Advanced Contract Administration Textbook Vol I. Department of Contract Management, School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), Wright-Patterson AFB OH.
53. Walsh, Lloyd. "Management and Professionalism in the Contract Management Organization," Contract Management, 23: 4-5+ (July 1983).

54. Westfall, Lt Col Frederick W., Instructor Logistics Management. Class lecture in LM 5.42, Logistics Systems Overview. School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology (AU), Wright-Patterson AFB OH, 14 August 1983.
55. "What a Contracting Officer Is." Draft document provided by Mr. Michael F. Miller, Procurement Career Management Specialist, Federal Acquisition Institute, Washington DC, 5 April 1984.
56. Zemansky, S. D. and Stephen B. Gordon. "The Public Purchasing Profession," National Contract Management Journal, 15: 92-104 (Summer 1981).

VITA

Captain Earl I. Ficken, Jr. was born on 5 May 1950 in Sherburn, Minnesota. He graduated from high school in Mauston, Wisconsin in 1968 and attended Troy State University from which he received the degree of Bachelor of Applied Science in Resource Management in March 1980. Upon graduation, he received a commission in the USAF through the Airman Education Commissioning Program. Captain Ficken began active duty in September 1972. He worked as a procurement specialist in the Base Procurement Office at Williams AFB, Arizona through 1978 and in the Base Procurement Office at Hurlburt Field, Florida until receiving his commission 1 April 1980. He worked as a Staff Contracting Officer at HQ AFLC Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio until entering the School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology, in June 1983.

Permanent address: 721 1/2 Mansion St, #2
Mauston, Wisconsin 53948

VITA

First Lieutenant Wendy L. Motlong was born on 18 May 1958 in Urbana, Illinois. She graduated from high school in Lubbock, Texas in 1976 and attended Texas Tech University from which she received a Bachelor of Business Administration in Marketing in December 1980. Upon graduation, she received a commission in the USAF through the ROTC program. Lt Motlong began active duty in February 1981. She worked as a contracting officer at the General Electric Company Space Systems Division Air Force Plant Representative Office in King of Prussia, Pennsylvania until entering the School of Systems and Logistics, Air Force Institute of Technology, in June 1983.

Permanent address: 2601 York #118

Lubbock, Texas 79407

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED		1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS	
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY		3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited	
2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE			
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) AFIT/GLM/LSM/84S-21		5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)	
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION School of Systems and Logistics	6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) AFIT/LS	7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION	
6c. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code) Air Force Institute of Technology Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio 45433		7b. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code)	
8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION	8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER	
8c. ADDRESS (City, State and ZIP Code)		10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NOS.	
		PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.	PROJECT NO.
		TASK NO.	WORK UNIT NO.
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) See Box 19			
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Earl I. Ficken, Jr., Capt, USAF Wendy L. Motlong, 1Lt, USAF			
13a. TYPE OF REPORT MS Thesis	13b. TIME COVERED FROM _____ TO _____	14. DATE OF REPORT (Yr., Mo., Day) 1984 September	15. PAGE COUNT 173
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION Approved for public release; LAW, APR 1984. John E. Wolaver Dean for Research and Professional Development Air Force Institute of Technology (AFIT) Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio 45433			
17. COSATI CODES		18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)	
FIELD	GROUP	SUB. GR.	
05	09		
		Acquisition Contract Administration Government Procurement Personnel Selection Qualifications	
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)			
Title: AN EVALUATION OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR QUALIFICATION AND WARRANTING OF ADMINISTRATIVE CONTRACTING OFFICERS Thesis Advisor: John E. Verardo, Jr.			
20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED ☒ SAME AS RPT. ☐ DTIC USERS ☐		21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED	
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL John E. Verardo, Jr., Associate Professor		22b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (Include Area Code) 513-255-3944	22c. OFFICE SYMBOL AFIT/LSP

- Thesis

Presidential Executive Order 12352 directed government agencies to develop contracting career programs that would produce a professional work force. Under this order an interagency group, Task Group Six, proposed minimum selection and appointment criteria for contracting officers. This study examined the Task Group's criteria as they relate to administrative contracting officers (ACOs) in Department of Defense plant representative offices. A survey was conducted to determine the demographic profile of the current ACO work force. Minimum experience, education and training requirements were then proposed based on the Task Group's recommendations, the ACO demographic profile and the work force's opinions.

END

FILMED

11-84

DTIC