

**COLLECTING AND USING PAST PERFORMANCE
INFORMATION (PPI) DESKBOOK**



JULY 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAST PERFORMANCE TOP TEN TIPS

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Purpose

Sources for Additional Guidance

Organization of the Deskbook

CHAPTER 2

When to Use Past Performance Information

Collecting Past Performance Information

Individuals in the Collection Process

The Collection Process and PPIMS

Performance Rating Elements

The DOD Mandatory Ratings and Mandatory Colors

Subcontractors, Teaming, and Joint Venture Partners

Performance Assessment Report

CHAPTER 3

Solicitation Considerations

Developing Section L (Instructions to Offerors)

Developing Section M (Evaluation Factors)

Evaluating Past Performance in Source Selection

Conducting Discussions

APPENDIX A: PAST PERFORMANCE INTERVIEWS

Overview

Past Performance Survey

Interview Confirmation

FIGURES

Figure A-1: Sample Interview Questions and Topics

Figure A-2: Evaluation Elements of a PAR

Figure A-3: Past Performance Risk Assessment Ratings

Figure A-4: Past Performance Survey Questionnaire

APPENDIX B: Administrative Data

Administrative Data Sheet

APPENDIX C: Instructions to Evaluators

Instruction for Evaluators to enter data in Section V of the PAR

Past Performance Top Ten Tips

The following list contains the 10 most important tips on working with past performance.

1. Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) and Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS) rules apply to all past performance information (PPI), however and whenever collected. This includes ensuring that contractors have an opportunity to comment on adverse PPI on performance assessment reports as well as on other PPI gathered under less formal collection methods.
2. Mark all PPI “For Official Use Only” and “Source Selection Sensitive Information” in accordance with FAR Subparts 2.101 and 3.104.
3. The performance assessment process continues throughout contract performance, assessments for award fee, and past performance. This assessment continuum should be consistent as to form and content throughout the contract performance period.
4. The narrative is the most critical aspect of PPI assessments.
5. Performance assessments are the responsibility of the program manager/project manager/contracting team, considering the customer’s input. No single office or organization independently determines a performance assessment.
6. For a more balanced report, develop performance assessments throughout the period of contract performance; do not wait until the end of the performance period.
7. Tailor the use and evaluation of PPI for a specific acquisition to fit the needs of that acquisition and clearly articulate in the solicitation.
8. Source selection officials must use the most relevant, recent PPI available in making the source selection decisions. They must consider updated information provided by the contractor regarding relevant PPI.
9. Personnel collecting PPI for use in a particular source selection must consider whether the data come from reputable and reliable sources.
10. The Government must share adverse PPI on which contractors have not previously had an opportunity to comment.

THE KEYS TO EFFECTIVE PPI ARE FAIRNESS, OPENNESS, AND A COMMITMENT TO USING THE INFORMATION AS A TOOL TO IMPROVE CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE.

CHAPTER 1

A. Introduction

Recording contractor current performance information periodically during contract performance and discussing the results with contractors provides a powerful motivator for contractors to maintain high quality performance or to improve inadequate performance before the next reporting cycle. DISA's use of the United States Army Past Performance Information Management System (PPIMS) became effective 1 Oct 02. The PPIMS is a web-based tool that provides a real-time capability to collect Past Performance Information (PPI) for use in source selections.

When completed, current performance assessment reports (PARs) become past performance information for use in source selections. Completion of these evaluations improves the amount and quality of performance information available to source selection teams. The use of past performance as a major evaluation factor in the contract award process is instrumental in making "best value" selections. It enables agencies to better predict the quality of, and customer satisfaction with, future work.

B. Purpose. This Deskbook provides DISA procedures and guidance for **collecting** and **using** PPI in the PPIMS.

C. Sources of Additional Guidance

[Guide to Collection and Use of Past Performance Information](#), Ver 3, May 2003, Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics. The Guidebook is a virtual document developed and issued by the DoD Past Performance Integrated Process Team (IPT).

The Deskbook is consistent with [Federal Acquisition Regulation](#) (FAR) and [Defense FAR Supplement](#) (DFARS). In the event of conflict, these documents shall take precedence over this Deskbook.

D. Organization of the Deskbook

- **Chapters 1 and 2** deal with Collecting Past Performance Information (PPI) as it relates to **post-award** activities.
- **Chapter 3** discusses using PPI in source selections and relates to **pre-award** PPI activities.
- **Appendix A** contains past performance interviews (sample questions and topics), past performance survey, evaluation elements of a PAR, past performance risk assessment ratings, past performance survey questionnaire, and information on the interview confirmation.

- **Appendix B** contains the contract administrative data sheet for required data that must be entered into a Performance Assessment Report (PAR) in addition to the qualitative narratives.
- **Appendix C** contains a short “instruction to evaluators” section.

CHAPTER 2

A. When to use Past Performance Information. Past performance information is relevant information, for future source selection purposes, regarding a contractor's actions under previously awarded contracts. It includes the contractor's record of conforming to contract requirements and standards of good workmanship; the contractor's record of forecasting and controlling costs; the contractor's adherence to contract schedules, including the administrative aspects of performance; the contractor's history of reasonable and cooperative behavior and commitment to customer satisfaction; and the contractor's business-like concern for the interest of the customer. The Government evaluates PPI in all source selections for negotiated contracts with an estimated total value of \$1,000,000 or greater unless the contracting officer determines that it is inappropriate and documents the rationale in the official contract file.

B. Collecting Past Performance Information. Section 804 of the Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 National Defense Authorization Act requires that source selection for software-intensive acquisitions address past performance. The DoD policy requires agencies to prepare an evaluation of contractor performance for each contract or task order with a cumulative total of \$1,000,000 or greater regardless of date of contract award. This threshold (base plus option years) applies to all contracts, task orders, orders under GSA schedules, Basic Ordering Agreements (BOAs), Commercial Service Authorizations (CSAs), and etc. Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) require reporting past performance information for all contracts. For continuity, use of PPIMS for those reports below the mandatory threshold is recommended. DISA's acquisitions normally are under the **Services Business Sector** (Information Technology and Telecommunications Equipment or Services) and must be evaluated against mandatory elements. The objective when collecting PPI is to employ a consistent evaluation methodology to identify and describe the performance of the wide array of DoD contractors and suppliers to include foreign companies, educational and non-profit institutions, and other federal agencies in source selection.

C. Individuals in the Collection Process

- **Contracting Officer.** The contracting officer ensures that all evaluations of a contractor's past performance are objective, fair, and accurately reflect the contractor's performance. The contracting officer is ultimately responsible for completion of the PAR.
- **Contracting Officer Representative (COR).** The COR is the authorized representative designed in writing by the contracting officer to assist with the technical monitoring or administration of a contract. The COR is normally the evaluator but see Task Monitor (TM) below.
- **Contractor.** A contractor is the prime contractor.
- **Evaluator.** The evaluator of a contract, order, BOA, or CSA to include orders under GSA schedules is the person designated by the contracting officer to monitor the contractor's progress on a routine basis. The evaluator may be a COR, TM, or another individual designated by the contracting officer.

- **Reviewing Official (RO).** Each Head of the Contracting Office (HCO) is the designated reviewing official should there be a disagreement between the PAR and the contractor. This duty may be not be delegated lower than Deputy for each contracting office.
- **Task Monitor (TM).** The contracting officer may designate TMs in addition to a COR. The TMs may perform technical and administrative duties at the task order level, and may be the evaluator.

D. The Collection Process and PPIMS. The PPIMS is a web-based tool used by DISA to collect PPI for completing a PAR. Unique user IDs and passwords control access to PPIMS. Authorized users may add, modify, and print PARs as required according to the user's profile and level of authorization. To register and input data, access PPIMS at

<https://apps.rdaisa.army.mil/ppims/prod/ppimshpdisa.htm>.

The contract specialist enters the initial PAR data (see Appendix B). Once a PAR is completed and sent to source selection, PPIMS populates the database for the next PAR for that contract/task order predicated on the timeframe selected by the contracting officer at contract award. The contracting officer also determines whether the PARs will be completed at the contract or task order level. Most PARs are completed on a 12-month basis, but may be completed for a shorter period of performance.

The evaluator logs in to PPIMS and enters data in Section V of a PAR. Upon completion of an evaluation, to include the contractor concurrence or rebuttal if any, the data are returned to the contracting officer for review and released for transmission to the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) where the data are available for use in making source selection decisions. Past performance data are retained in the PPIRS for three years after contract or task order performance completion, then archived. The contracting officer maintains a copy of each PAR in the official contract file.

E. Performance Rating Elements. The Information Technology business sector consists of five mandatory elements and one optional element.

- Quality of Product or Service
- Schedule
- Cost Control (Normally does not apply to firm fixed price contracts)
- Business Relations
- Key Personnel
- Other (Optional and used very infrequently e.g., conversion of a Termination for Default to a Termination for Convenience of the Government)

F. The DOD Mandatory Ratings and Mandatory Colors

- **EXCEPTIONAL (Dark Blue):** Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds many to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being evaluated was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were highly effective.
- **VERY GOOD (Purple):** Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds some to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being evaluated was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were effective.
- **SATISFACTORY (Green):** Performance meets contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor appear or were satisfactory.
- **MARGINAL (Yellow):** Performance does not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being evaluated reflects a serious problem for which the contractor has not yet identified corrective actions. The contractor's proposed actions appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented.
- **UNSATISFACTORY (Red):** Performance does not meet most contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains serious problems for which the contractor's corrective actions appear or were ineffective.

G. Subcontractors, Teaming, and Joint Venture Partners. It is important to enter on the PAR any **major** subcontractors, teaming efforts, or joint venture partners on the contract. This means firms participating in the contract and who are responsible for (if segregable for teaming or joint venture partners), and the key personnel. The Government only has privity of contract with the prime contractor; therefore, comments on performance of subcontractors will not be given a separate rating, but reflected in the ratings for the prime contractor. There is an exception to this rule: if the prime contractor is a legally binding joint venture, then a PAR shall be prepared for the joint venture as each is considered equals.

H. Performance Assessment Report (PAR)

The TM or COR prepares an evaluation as soon as possible after close of the rating period. A final evaluation must be prepared upon completion of the contract or order. Prepare PARs at the intervals specified by the contracting officer at time of contract award to provide current source selection data. If the period of performance exceeds 18 months, then a PAR must be prepared at least every 12 months. Most PARs will be completed on a 12-month basis.

Supporting narrative rationales for all performance ratings assigned are **mandatory** in DoD. The five mandatory ratings require narrative comments with one exception. The cost element does not normally apply to firm fixed price contracts. The optional sixth element (very infrequently used) may be used to report a significant action that is not addressed by the other elements. An example would be to report a conversion of a Termination for Default to a Termination for the

Convenience of the Government. The narratives are critical to the PPI evaluation, and necessary to establish that the ratings are credible and justifiable. These rationales need not be lengthy, but if there were performance successes or problems, they must be documented. For any rating other than satisfactory, the narrative must provide specific examples that support the rating. The narrative statements must be qualitative and document how the Government either benefited from the contractor's performance or must document how the Government was harmed by the contractor's failure to perform in accordance with the contract. Include a description of the problems or successes experienced; a discussion of whether the problems were caused by the contractor, the Government, or other factors; and how well the contractor worked with the Government to resolve the problems (including problems with subcontractors, partners in joint venture, or teaming arrangements).

A fundamental principle for ratings: A rating of satisfactory **equates** to performing just what the contract or task order requires. Evaluations must have the following minimum reviews **after** evaluator input: **Note: These reviews may not be delegated.**

- **Contracting Officer Review.** This review identifies business or contractual issues, and ensures no discrepancies in the PAR **prior** to release to the contractor. The contracting officer has three options: (1) agree with the PAR as written and transmit it via email to the contractor; (2) if discrepancies exist, return the PAR to the evaluator and mediate a resolution; or, (3) for issues that cannot be resolved, forward the PAR to the Reviewing Official. The objective is to provide a consistent and consolidated Government PAR to the contractor.
- **Contractor Review.** Upon receipt of an email from PPIMS informing a contractor that its PAR is ready for review, the contractor must register in PPIMS to receive a user ID and password. Contractor registration data are verified against the Central Contractor Registration (CCR) database. The user ID and password allows the contractor to view and provide comments for its PARs only. In accordance with FAR section 42.1503(b), the contractor shall be given a minimum of 30 days to (1) concur, or (2) nonconcur with comments regarding the PAR. In most instances, 30 days will be a sufficient response time. The contracting officer may extend the period, if warranted and requested by the contractor through PPIMS. If the contractor neither concurs nor non-concurs during the 30 day period, the PAR is returned to the contracting officer for final disposition. The contracting officer should contact the contractor to determine if additional review time is necessary. If the contractor does not request additional time for review, the contracting officer sends the PAR to source selection. If the contractor concurs with no comments, the PAR is automatically sent to source selection (the final stage where the PAR is transmitted to PPIRS for use in source selections and no longer available for modification.) If the contractor returns a PAR and "non-concurs, the PAR goes back to the contracting officer. If the contracting officer cannot resolve the issues, the PAR is forwarded to the Reviewing Office.
- **Reviewing Official Review (RO).** The RO "fact finds" to ensure no errors on either party's behalf exist. The RO's decision is final and not subject to the Disputes process. The RO has various options (1) issue a determination that the facts indicate the PAR is consistent with the contractor's position, (2) edit the PAR to reflect a mix of the

Government's and contractor's positions or (3) issue a determination that the original PAR stands as written

CHAPTER 3

Using Past Performance Information in Source Selections

A. Solicitation Considerations. The key to successful use of past performance and any other evaluation factor in the source selection process is the establishment of a clear relationship between the Performance Work Statement (PWS), and Sections L and M. The factors chosen for evaluation must agree with the requirements in the PWS, and be reasonable, logical, and coherent. Clearly state in Sections L and M what past performance information the Government will evaluate and how the evaluation will be completed. Do not include past performance information that is not important or relevant to the current acquisition.

B. Developing Section L (Instructions to Offerors). Consider the following when developing proposal submission requirements.

1. Advise offerors that the Government queries the [Past Performance Information Retrieval System](#) (PPIRS) as the first step in evaluating PPI. If adequate documentation is not readily available, then the Government may use a questionnaire to conduct a survey with follow up calls, or telephone interviews to verify past performance.
2. Ask offerors for a list of references for on-going contracts or contracts completed not more than three years ago that demonstrate performance relevant to the solicitation performance requirements. The FAR Subsection 42.1503(e) states that past performance information shall not be retained to provide source selection information for longer than three years after completion of the contract or order performance.
3. Include a statement in Section L that the Government may use past performance information obtained from other than the sources identified by the offeror, and that the information may be used for both the responsibility determination and the best value decision.
4. Where large, multi-function firms are likely to submit a proposal, ask for references only on work done by the segment of the firm (division, group, unit) that will perform the proposed contract.
5. Tailor the requirements of the solicitation to reflect the complexity of the procurement, the relative importance of past performance, and all subfactors.
6. Limit the contractor's ability to select only the best references by requesting the contractor submit a listing of all relevant contracts performed during the identified period, or relevant contracts performed by the entity within the identified period. The goal is to get a true picture of the contractor's overall, recent performance record.
7. Provide potential offerors an opportunity to comment on any problems encountered on the identified contracts. Limit this section to the discussion of problems and corrective actions taken.
8. Inform potential offerors that PPI on work performed for state, local governments, and private-sector clients similar to the Government requirement will be evaluated equally with similar federal contracts.

9. Inform potential offerors that they may submit information on key personnel and work performed as part of a team or joint venture if the company has no previous past performance history. This allows most firms without contract history to provide past performance information thus reducing instances of neutral past performance ratings.

C. Developing Section M (Evaluation Factors). Section M contains the evaluation factors and subfactors, and their relative importance. The Government describes the approach for evaluating past performance in this section, including how offerors with no relevant performance history will be evaluated. When drafting the past performance evaluation factor, remember:

1. The past performance factor stands alone.
2. To tailor the subfactors to match the requirement and to capture the key performance criteria in the PWS. The following elements are mandatory for Information Technology:
 - a. **Quality of Product or Service.** The Government evaluates the offeror on compliance with previous contract requirements, accuracy of reports, and technical excellence to include quality awards and certificates.
 - b. **Timeliness of Performance.** The Government evaluates the offeror on meeting milestones, reliability, responsiveness to technical direction, deliverables completed on-time, adherence to contract schedules including contract administration.
 - c. **Cost Control.** The Government evaluates the offeror on the ability to perform within or below budget, use of cost efficiencies, relationship of negotiated costs to actuals, submission of reasonably priced change proposals, and ability to provide current, accurate, and complete billing information.
 - d. **Business Relations.** The Government evaluates the offeror on the ability to provide effective management, meet subcontractor and Small Disadvantaged Business goals, cooperative and proactive behavior with the technical representative(s) and contracting officer, flexibility, and responsiveness to inquiries, problem resolution, and customer satisfaction.
 - e. The Government evaluates the offeror on satisfaction of the TMs or CORs with the overall performance, and final service. Base the evaluation of past performance on consideration of all relevant facts and circumstances. This includes a determination of the offeror's commitment to customer satisfaction and includes conclusions of informed judgment. The basis for the conclusions of judgment must be documented.

D. Evaluating Past Performance in Source Selection (See DISA Source Selection Plan Deskbook and Template for additional guidance)

1. The source selection team validates the offeror's past contract information as part of the overall evaluation process and assigns a performance risk rating. Performance risk assessments consider the number and severity of problems, the demonstrated effectiveness of corrective actions taken (not just planned or promised), and the overall work record. The evaluation team looks for indications of excellent or exceptional performance in the areas most critical to the requirement.
2. The source selection team evaluates how well an offeror performed, and rates the relevancy of that performance. An effective evaluation of past performance allows the contracting officer to focus on contractors with sound performance records that are among the most highly rated.

3. A significant achievement, problem, or lack of relevant data in any aspect of the requirement may become an important consideration in the source selection process. A negative finding may result in an overall high performance risk rating, depending upon the significance placed on that aspect of the requirement. Relate the ratings to the solicitation requirements and provide rationale that identifies the strength or weakness.
4. A past performance rating is not a precise mechanical process; therefore, include supporting rationale for the final rating. As long as the rationale is reasonable, i.e., based on analysis, verification, or corroboration of the past performance information, and evaluated against the evaluation factors stated in the solicitation, it should withstand scrutiny by the courts.
5. The source selection team **must not** downgrade or penalize offerors for using the contract claims process or for filing protests.
6. Past performance information must be relevant and recent regarding an offeror's actions under previously awarded contracts. Similar or relevant past performance efforts may be defined by the size, scope, complexity, similar requirement, and contract type.
7. For a newly formed business entity or in contractor teaming arrangements where the company relies mostly on the past performance and experience of its key personnel, or partners on the team, the proposal must clearly explain "whose" past performance, and "how" that past performance relates to the current procurement.
8. The past performance of the offeror's resources is a good indicator of future performance for new companies entering the marketplace that lack relevant experience, or mergers of previously established companies. If the key management personnel or other resources, have experience on contracts similar to the pending requirement for another contractor; state and local government contracts; or private contracts then the source selection team may perform the appropriate evaluation and risk assessment.
9. If the contractor is truly a new entity and none of the company principals **ever** performed relevant work for others, the company is considered to have no past performance. Special rules apply in this situation. Section 1091(b)(2) of FASA states that "in the case of an offeror with respect to which there is **no** information on past contract performance or with respect to which information on past contract performance is not available, the offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on the factor of past contract performance."

E. Conducting Discussions. The offeror must be provided an opportunity to address adverse past performance information obtained from references on which the offeror has not had a previous opportunity to comment. Any past performance deficiency or significant weakness must be discussed with offerors within the competitive range during discussions. This allows the offeror a fair opportunity to rebut any negative information that may not be due solely to the poor performance of the contractor, or that may not have been adequately resolved since the date of the information provided.

Allow offerors to rebut all negative past performance information or clarify relevance of past performance information even when discussions are not anticipated. These clarifications do not prevent the Government from making an award without discussion.

**APPENDIX A
PAST PERFORMANCE INTERVIEWS**

A. Overview. Figure A-1 provides sample questions and a Past Performance Survey. Mark the Survey in accordance with FAR Subparts 2.101 and 3.104, “Source Selection Information and For Official Use Only.” Explain the purpose of the interview, assure the interviewee’s anonymity, and provide a generic description of the instant requirement.

**Figure A-1
Sample Interview Questions and Topics**

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm the following information related to the effort: contract number, contractor’s name and address, type of contract, complexity of work, description and location of work, contract dollar value, date of award, contract completion date, and type and extent of subcontracting. • Verify past performance data to which the Government may have access. • If the award amount or delivery schedule changed, find out why. • If the Government has evidence of a problem on the referenced contract that the interviewee is unfamiliar with, ask for the name of another individual that might have the information. • Ask for names and phone numbers of additional POCs. • What role in the contract effort did the interviewee play (e.g. COR, contract specialist, ACO, etc.) and during what time period did the interviewee hold this position? • If a problem surfaced, what did the Government and contractor do to fix it? • Did the contractor appear to use personnel with appropriate skills and expertise? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How did the contractor perform considering technical performance or quality of the product or service; schedule; cost control (if appropriate); business relations; and management? • Was the contractor cooperative in resolving issues? • Were there any particular significant risks involved in performance of the effort? • Did the company appear to apply sufficient resources (personnel and facilities) to the effort? • If the company used subcontractors, what was the relationship between the prime and the sub? How well did the prime manage the subcontractors? Did the subcontractors perform the bulk of the effort or just add depth on particular technical areas? • Has the firm performed other past efforts with the referenced agency/firm? • What are the company’s strong points? • What are the company’s weak points? • Does the interviewee have any reservations about recommending a future contract award to this company? • Does the interviewee know of anyone else who might have past performance information on the offeror?
---	---

Past Performance Survey (Survey should be completed and mailed or faxed to):

ATTN: (contracting officer's name)

1. Organization

2. Name & Title:

3. Email Address:

4. Telephone Number: XXX-XXX-XXXX Fax No. XXX-XXX-XXXX

5. Signature: _____ Date: _____

EVALUATION OF:

6. Contractor: _____

Prime _____

or Sub _____

(If Sub, name of Prime)

Percent of work _____

7. Contract Number: _____

8. Title of Contract:

**9. Type of Contract: () Negotiated, () Sealed Bid,
() Cost Plus Fixed Fee, () Fixed Price () Cost Plus Award Fee
() T & M () Other: _____**

10. Description and location of work: _____

11. Contract Value Base Year: _____

Value Each Option Year

_____ ; _____ ; _____ ; _____

12. Status: () Active () Completed

13. Date of award: _____

Date of completion: _____

**Figure A-2
EVALUATION ELEMENTS OF A PAR**

QUALITY OF PRODUCT OR SERVICE	SCHEDULE	COST CONTROL	BUSINESS RELATIONS	MANAGEMENT OF KEY PERSONNEL
<p>Conformance with contract requirements, specifications and standards of good workmanship - e.g., commonly accepted technical, professional, environmental, or safety and health standards.</p>	<p>Timeliness of contractor against the completion of the contract, task orders, milestones, delivery schedules, administrative requirements - e.g., efforts that contribute to or affect the schedule variance</p>	<p>Normally not required for firm fixed price or firm fixed price with economic price adjustment. Assess the contractor's effectiveness in forecasting, managing, and controlling contract cost</p>	<p>Integration and coordination of all activity needed to execute the contract, specifically the timeliness, completeness and quality of problem identification, corrective action plans, proposal submittals, and contractor's history of reasonable and cooperative behavior, customer satisfaction, timely award and management of subcontracts and, if the contractor met small, or small disadvantaged and women-owned business participation goals</p>	<p>Contractor performance in selecting key personnel, retaining key personnel, supporting key personnel, replacing when necessary key personnel</p>

**Figure A-3
Past Performance Risk Assessment Ratings**

Dark Blue	Performance meets contract requirements and <u>significantly exceeds</u> contract requirements to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were highly effective.
Purple	Performance meets contractual requirements and <u>exceeds some</u> to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were effective.
Green	Performance <u>meets</u> contractual requirements. The contractual performance contains some minor problems for which proposed corrective actions taken by the contractor appear satisfactory, or completed corrective actions were satisfactory.
Yellow	Performance <u>does not meet some</u> contractual requirements. The contractual performance reflects a serious problem for which the contractor has submitted minimal corrective actions, if any. The contractor's proposed actions appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented.
Red	Performance <u>does not meet</u> contractual requirements and <u>recovery is not likely</u> in a timely or cost effective manner. The contractual performance contains serious problem(s) for which the contractor's corrective actions appear or were ineffective.
White	Offeror <u>has no</u> past performance or past performance information cannot be obtained, and the lack of past performance information is not due to the failure of the offeror to supply information.

Past Performance ratings (except white) assess the risks associated with each offeror's likelihood of success in performing the requirements stated in the solicitation based on that offeror's demonstrated performance on recent, relevant contracts.

**Figure A-4
PAST PERFORMANCE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE**

		Blue	Green	Yellow	Orange	Red	White/ Unknown
	Quality of Product or Services						
1	To what extent did the contractor comply with the contract requirements?						
2	If reports were required, were they accurate in meeting contract requirements?						
3	To what extent did the contractor use appropriate personnel for contract requirements?						
4	To what extent did the contractor display technical excellence?						
	Cost Control						
	(Not applicable to Firm Fixed Price or Firm Fixed Price W/Economic Price Adjustment contracts)						
5	To what extent did the contractor remain within budget?						
6	To what extent did the contractor provide current, accurate, and complete billings?						
7	To what extent did the contractor maintain the relationship of negotiated costs to actuals?						
8	To what extent did the contractor maintain cost efficiencies?						
9	To what extent was the contractor effective in forecasting contract costs?						
	Schedule						
10	To what extent did the contractor meet interim milestones?						

		Blue	Green	Yellow	Orange	Red	White/ Unknown
11	To what extent was the contractor reliable?						
12	To what extent did the contractor respond to technical directions?						
13	To what extent did the contractor complete contract performance on time, including wrap-up and administration?						
14	To what extent were liquidated damages assessed?						
	Business Relations						
15	To what extent did the contractor display effective management?						
16	To what extent did the contractor generate businesslike correspondence?						
17	To what extent was the contractor responsive to contract requirements?						
18	To what extent did the contractor apprise the Government of problems or potential problems?						
19	To what extent was the contractor reasonable and cooperative?						
20	To what extent was the contractor flexible in responding to changing needs?						
21	To what extent did the contractor take pro-active measures in lieu of “knee-jerk” reactions?						
22	To what extent and how effective were contractor recommended solutions?						

		Blue	Green	Yellow	Orange	Red	White/ Unknown
23	To what extent did the contractor maintain an effective business-subcontracting program to meet subcontracting goals?						
24	To what extent did the contractor select key personnel appropriate to meet contract requirements?						
25	To what extent did the contractor retain qualified key personnel?						
26	To what extent did the contractor demonstrate that the corporation supported the decisions and actions taken by its key personnel?						
27	To what extent did the contractor replace key personnel due to cause or provide immediate replacement upon vacancies?						
28	To what extent was the key personnel's technical expertise used or the extent contractor key personnel gained expertise from the contract performance?						
Other Information Comments:							
Pro:							
Con:							

B. Interview Confirmation. Upon completion of the interview, prepare a summary of the interview, include the interviewee's name, mailing and electronic addresses, telephone number, the date and time of the interview, and a description of the contract effort discussed. Send it to the interviewee; stating that if the interviewee does not object to its content by a specified date and time, the Government will assume it is correct.

APPENDIX B
Administrative Data

To facilitate data entry in PPIMS have the following data available:

Contractor Name and Street Address

City, State, and Zip Code

Telephone Number:

Email address:

CAGE Code:

DUNS+4 Number:

FSC:

NAICS Code:

Report Type: (Interim or Final)

Period of Performance Being Assessed: From: _____ to _____

Contract/GSA Schedule/Other Agency/Basic Agreement Number:

CSA/GSA Order/Task Order Number:

Location of Contract Performance:

Contracting Office (i.e., DITCO-SCOTT, PAC, ALASKA, EUROPE, NCR, ETC.):

Contracting Officer:

Name:

Title:

Organization and Code:

Phone

FAX:

Email address:

Contract Award Date:

Contract Completion Date

Task Order Information:

Award Date

Completion Date

Awarded Dollar Value (Life Cycle Amount) must be in US dollars for base and all options:

Current Dollar Value (Obligated amount) must be in US dollars for total cumulative value:

Contract Type:

Contract Description

Key Subcontractor(s):

Street Address

City, State, and Zip Code

Telephone Number:

Email address:

CAGE Code:

DUNS+4 Number:

FSC:

NAICS Code:

Assessing Official (COR/TM):

Name:

Title:

Organization and Code:

Phone

FAX:

Email address:

Government Point of Contact (Contract Specialist):

Name:

Title:

Organization and Code:

Phone

FAX:

Email address:

Contractor Representative:

Name:

Title:

Organization and Code:

Phone

FAX:

Email address:

Reviewing Official:

Name:

Title:

Organization and Code:

Phone

FAX:

Email address:

APPENDIX C

Instructions to Evaluators

Effective 1 Oct 02, DISA resumed reporting past performance information. All DISA/DITCOs must use the Past Performance Information Management System (PPIMS), an automated, web-based tool to report information on contracts, task orders/delivery orders, GSA task orders/delivery orders, and CSAs with an estimated life cycle value of \$1,000,000 or greater. The FAR require reporting past performance information for all contracts. For continuity, use of PPIMS for those reports below the mandatory threshold is highly recommended. Some issues to consider when deciding whether to use PPIMS for instruments below the threshold include:

- Mandatory marking of all PPI “For Official Use Only” and “Source Selection Sensitive Information” in accordance with FAR Subparts 2.101 and 3.104.
- Past performance information is privileged source selection information and protected by the Privacy Act. The information is **NOT** releasable under the Freedom of Information Act and exempt under Exemption 5.
- The FAR requires contractors be provided a copy of the past performance assessment for review and allowed at least 30 calendar days for review.
- Ensure delivery of the PAR only to the individual(s) designated by the contractor to receive the data.
- Develop a process to ensure the contractor received the past performance report timely.
- Provide a process for review at the HCO level if the contractor non-concurs with the PAR, and the review officials must provide a final decision to the contractor timely.
- Provide a procedure for making available the PAR data to “need-to-know” individuals with the federal government upon receipt of a proper request.

Trained users register in the PPIMS database at <https://apps.rdaisa.army.mil/ppims/prod/ppimshpdisa.htm> and may also access the on-line Users’ Guide, a virtual document updated on-line on a regular basis. Users should review the Past Performance References link on a regular basis to ensure use of the latest information. The responsible Site Administrator approves both training and production passwords.

Past performance information is relevant information available for future source selections regarding a contractor’s actions under previously awarded contracts, task orders/delivery orders, GSA task orders/delivery orders, and CSAs. It includes (1) Quality of Product/Service, (2) Schedule, (3) Cost Control, (4) Business Relations, and (5) Key Personnel.

It is important that each COR, TM, PM, and customer understand the importance of providing relevant past performance information. The ratings must be fair and based **ONLY** on the requirements stated in the contract, task order/delivery order, GSA task order/delivery order, and/or CSA. A narrative must accompany each rating. Ensure the narratives are as detailed as possible to assist those using the information during future source selections. These narratives become part of the PAR that is provided to the contractor for review (concurrence or non-concurrence). In the event of a non-concurrence, the Reviewing Official (HCO) serves the final and unilateral dispute resolution authority. The completed PAR is transmitted to the [Federal Past Performance Information Retrieval System \(PPIRS\)](#) where the PARs are available to all

individuals in the federal government working on an active source selection project. The Office of the Under Secretary of the Department of Defense prohibits the use of these reports for market research.

Instructions for Evaluators to enter data in Section V of the PAR.

1. Register on the DISA/PPIMS website at <https://apps.rdaisa.army.mil/ppims/prod/ppimshpdisa.htm>. All users register in the **production system**. Users may register in the training database if they wish to review the process or become more familiar with PPIMS. Both databases operate identically.
2. The User will select a password upon registration. Once the Site Administrator approves the user registration request, an email is sent to the user advising that the user may log in to PPIMS.
3. Once logged in to PPIMS, click on “Modify PAR” on the left margin of the screen.
5. Click on “List All PARs”. This displays all contractual actions assigned to the user for completion.
6. Click on the PAR on the list that to which you wish to enter evaluator comments.
7. There are seven sections to a PAR, but CORs/TMs need only access Section V.
8. Section V contains six elements. If the contract, task order/delivery order, GSA task order/delivery order, and/or CSA is a Firm Fixed Price (FFP) instrument, then Element (C) Cost Control is optional. Element (F) is optional and should rarely be used. Examples of when to use Element (F) would be to report the conversion of a Termination for Default to a Termination for the Convenience of the Government. Elements (A) Quality of Product/Service; (B) Schedule; (D) Business Relations; and (E) Key Personnel are mandatory. Assign a rating and provide a narrative for each element. Use Microsoft Word to develop the narratives and **use** spell checker prior to cutting and pasting evaluator comments directly into the element. Narratives must be comprehensive and provide justification for the rating assigned. All ratings other than **Satisfactory** must contain statements that not only justify the rating assigned, but also discuss how the government benefited or was harmed that resulted in the assigned rating.
9. As each element is completed, save by clicking “SUBMIT”. Failure to click on the “SUBMIT” button each time will result in a loss of data.
10. Click on “View PAR Status” in the left margin of the screen to ensure all Section V elements are complete.
11. If you have any questions, contact your assigned Site Administrator, contract specialist, or contracting officer.