# Contract Appeals Board

http://cab.dc.gov

Telephone: 202-727-6597

Description	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Approved	FY 2015 Proposed	% Change from FY 2014
Operating Budget	\$1,040,820	\$1,059,490	\$1,426,098	34.6
FTEs	8.0	8.0	10.0	25.0

The mission of the Contract Appeals Board (CAB) is to provide an impartial, expeditious, inexpensive, and knowledgeable forum for the hearing and resolving of contractual disputes, protests, debarments, and suspensions involving the District and its contracting communities.

### **Summary of Services**

The Contract Appeals Board reviews and determines: de novo protests of District contract solicitations and/or awards; appeals by contractors of the District Contracting Officer's final decisions; claims by the District against a contractor; appeals by contractors of suspensions and/or debarments; and contractor appeals of interest payment claims under the Quick Payment Act.

The agency's FY 2015 proposed budget is presented in the following tables:

# FY 2015 Proposed Gross Funds Operating Budget, by Revenue Type

Table AF0-1 contains the proposed FY 2015 agency budget compared to the FY 2014 approved budget. It also provides FY 2012 and FY 2013 actual expenditures.

#### Table AF0-1 (dollars in thousands)

Appropriated Fund	Actual FY 2012	Actual FY 2013	Approved FY 2014	Proposed FY 2015	Change from FY 2014	Percent Change*
General Fund						
Local Funds	835	1,041	1,059	1,426	367	34.6
Total for General Fund	835	1,041	1,059	1,426	367	34.6
Gross Funds	835	1,041	1,059	1,426	367	34.6

<sup>\*</sup>Percent change is based on whole dollars.

Note: If applicable, for a breakdown of each Grant (Federal and Private), Special Purpose Revenue type and Intra-District agreement, please refer to Schedule 80 Agency Summary by Revenue Source in the FY 2015 Operating Appendices located on the Office of the Chief Financial Officer's website.

# FY 2015 Proposed Full-Time Equivalents, by Revenue Type

Table AF0-2 contains the proposed FY 2015 FTE level compared to the FY 2014 approved FTE level by revenue type. It also provides FY 2012 and FY 2013 actual data.

#### Table AF0-2

	Actual	Actual	Approved	Proposed	Change from	Percent
Appropriated Fund	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2014	Change
General Fund						
Local Funds	6.1	8.0	8.0	10.0	2.0	25.0
Total for General Fund	6.1	8.0	8.0	10.0	2.0	25.0
<b>Total Proposed FTEs</b>	6.1	8.0	8.0	10.0	2.0	25.0

# FY 2015 Proposed Operating Budget, by Comptroller Source Group

Table AF0-3 contains the proposed FY 2015 budget at the Comptroller Source Group (object class) level compared to the FY 2014 approved budget. It also provides FY 2012 and FY 2013 actual expenditures.

# Table AF0-3 (dollars in thousands)

	Actual	Actual	Approved	Proposed	Change from	Percent
Comptroller Source Group	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2014	Change*
11 - Regular Pay - Continuing Full Time	217	326	378	595	216	57.2
12 - Regular Pay - Other	444	521	470	525	55	11.6
14 - Fringe Benefits - Current Personnel	107	141	177	238	61	34.6
Subtotal Personal Services (PS)	769	989	1,025	1,358	332	32.4
20 - Supplies and Materials	13	13	3	13	10	375.0
31 - Telephone, Telegraph, Telegram, Etc.	8	11	6	8	2	34.9
40 - Other Services and Charges	14	10	12	25	13	101.8
41 - Contractual Services - Other	12	12	9	13	5	53.8
70 - Equipment and Equipment Rental	20	7	5	10	5	111.1
Subtotal Nonpersonal Services (NPS)	66	52	34	69	34	101.1
Gross Funds	835	1,041	1,059	1,426	367	34.6

<sup>\*</sup>Percent change is based on whole dollars.

### **Program Description**

The Contract Appeals Board operates through the following 2 programs:

**Adjudication** – adjudicates protests of District contract solicitations and awards, appeals by contractors of District contracting officer final decisions, claims by the District against contractors, appeals by contractors of suspensions and debarments, and contractor appeals of interest payment claims under the Quick Payment Act.

**Contract Appeals Board (Agency Management)** – provides for administrative support and the required tools to achieve operational and programmatic results. This program is standard for all agencies using performance-based budgeting.

#### **Program Structure Change**

The Contract Appeals Board has no program structure changes in the FY 2015 proposed budget.

### FY 2015 Proposed Operating Budget and FTEs, by Program and Activity

Table AF0-4 contains the proposed FY 2015 budget by program and activity compared to the FY 2014 approved budget. It also provides the FY 2013 actual data.

**Table AF0-4** (dollars in thousands)

	Dollars in Thousands				Full-Time Equivalents			
Program/Activity	Actual FY 2013	Approved FY 2014	Proposed FY 2015	Change from FY 2014	Actual FY 2013	Approved FY 2014	Proposed FY 2015	Change from FY 2014
(1000) Contract Appeals Board								
(1010) Personnel	0	6	9	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
(1030) Property Management	3	1	1	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
(1090) Performance Management	253	191	198	7	3.0	1.0	1.0	0.0
Subtotal (1000) Contract Appeals Board	257	197	208	10	3.0	1.0	1.0	0.0
(2000) Adjudication								
(2001) Adjudication	784	862	1,218	356	5.0	7.0	9.0	2.0
Subtotal (2000) Adjudication	784	862	1,218	356	5.0	7.0	9.0	2.0
Total Proposed Operating Budget	1,041	1,059	1,426	367	8.0	8.0	10.0	2.0

(Change is calculated by whole numbers and numbers may not add up due to rounding)

Note: For more detailed information regarding the proposed funding for the activities within this agency's programs, please see Schedule 30-PBB Program Summary by Activity in the FY 2015 Operating Appendices located on the Office of the Chief Financial Officer's website.

#### **FY 2015 Proposed Budget Changes**

The Contract Appeals Board's (CAB) proposed FY 2015 gross budget is \$1,426,098, which represents a 34.6 percent increase over its FY 2014 approved gross budget of \$1,059,490. The budget is comprised entirely of Local funds.

#### **Current Services Funding Level**

The Current Services Funding Level (CSFL) is a Local funds ONLY representation of the true cost of operating District agencies, before consideration of policy decisions. The CSFL reflects changes from the FY 2014 approved budget across multiple programs, and it estimates how much it would cost an agency to continue its current programs and operations into the following fiscal year. The FY 2015 CSFL adjustments to the FY 2014 Local funds budget are described in table 5 of this agency's budget chapter. Please see the CSFL Development section within Volume 1: Executive Summary for more information regarding the methodology used and components that comprise the CSFL.

CAB's FY 2015 CSFL budget is \$1,126,098, which represents a \$66,608, or 6.3 percent, increase over the FY 2014 approved Local funds budget of \$1,059,490.

#### **CSFL** Assumptions

The FY 2015 CSFL calculated for CAB included adjustment entries that are not described in detail on table 5. These adjustments were made for increases of \$66,131 in personal services to account for Fringe Benefit costs based on trend and comparative analyses and the impact of cost-of-living adjustments implemented in FY 2013, and \$477 in nonpersonal services based on the Consumer Price Index factor of 2.4 percent.

#### **Agency Budget Submission**

**Increase:** CAB's FY 2015 proposed budget includes a net increase of \$34,606 in nonpersonal services to support projected supplies and contract-related costs due to increased adjudication services. This increase includes an allocation of \$30,370 in the Adjudication program and \$4,236 in the Control Appeals Board program.

**Decrease:** The FY 2015 Local funds budget reflects a net decrease of \$34,606 in personal services, primarily in the Adjudication program, as an offset to the increase in nonpersonal services.

#### **Mayor's Proposed Budget**

**No Change:** The Contract Appeals Board's budget proposal reflects no change from the agency budget submission to the Mayor's proposed budget.

#### **District's Proposed Budget**

**Enhance:** CAB's proposed budget includes an increase of \$300,000 and 2.0 FTEs to support new attorney positions in the Adjudication program.

# FY 2014 Approved Budget to FY 2015 Proposed Budget, by Revenue Type

Table AF0-5 itemizes the changes by revenue type between the FY 2014 approved budget and the FY 2015 proposed budget.

# Table AF0-5 (dollars in thousands)

DESCRIPTION	PROGRAM	BUDGET	FTE	
LOCAL FUNDS: FY 2014 Approved Budget and FTE		1,059	8.0	
Other CSFL Adjustments	Multiple Programs	67	0.0	
LOCAL FUNDS: FY 2015 Current Services Funding Level Budg	nt Services Funding Level Budget (CSFL)			
Increase: To align funding with nonpersonal services costs	Multiple Programs	34	0.0	
Decrease: To adjust personal services	Multiple Programs	-34	0.0	
LOCAL FUNDS: FY 2015 Agency Budget Submission		1,126	8.0	
No Change		0	0.0	
LOCAL FUNDS: FY 2015 Mayor's Proposed Budget		1,126	8.0	
Enhance: To support additional FTEs	Adjudication	300	2.0	
LOCAL FUNDS: FY 2015 District's Proposed Budget		1,426	10.0	
Gross for AF0 - Contract Appeals Board		1,426	10.0	

(Change is calculated by whole numbers and numbers may not add up due to rounding)

# **Agency Performance Plan**

The agency's performance plan has the following objectives for FY 2015:

**Objective 1:** Promote public confidence in the integrity of the procurement process through timely, efficient, and legally correct adjudication of disputes and protests.

**Objective 2:** Enhance the Board's ability to efficiently and inexpensively manage and adjudicate cases.

**Objective 3:** Educate government and private contracting parties on resolving disputes through alternative dispute resolution methods.

# **KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
Measure	Actual	Target	Actual	Projection	Projection	Projection
Percent of protests resolved within 60 business days	89%	90%	96%	96%	96%	100%
Percent of appeals cases decided within 4 months of the cases being ready for decision	91%	90%	79%	90%	90%	90%_
Percent of new cases using electronic filing system	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Percent of decisions sustained on appeal	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Percent of cases closed by the Board in the current fiscal year that are electronically archived to permit web-based retrieval and full-text searching capability	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Percent of pending cases that are	Not	Not	Not	10070	10070	10070
less than 3 years old	Available	Available	Available	95%	100%	100%