



Industry Past-Performance Perspective

R. Bradley (Brad) Gale
LMTAS
Director, Customer Initiatives



Limited-Purpose Document

Use

- **Provide Relevant Contractor Performance Data for Future Source Selections – Government and Industry Narratives Should Address Needs/Concerns of the PRAG**
- **Near-Term Results – Select Contractors Who Are Delivering What They Propose**
- **Long-Term Benefit – Improved Contract Performance**

Misuse

- **Send a Message to the Contractor**
- **Establish a Negotiation Position**
- **Keep Program Sold**
- **Rate Government Program Manager**
- **“Nobody Grades as Hard as I Do”**



Characteristics of Ideal Past-Performance Evaluation

- **Relevant to Source Selection**
- **Reliable and Repeatable**
- **Timely (Recent) and Comprehensive**
- **Minimum Administrative Burden**
- **Yields Differentiation**

Lessons Learned

- **Focus on Critical Capabilities More Than Unique Occurrences**
- **Consider Performance Over Entire Reporting Period**
- **Year-to-Year Trend Data Often More Insightful Than Absolute Data Benefits/Understanding Increase Over Time**
- **Use as a Common Contractor/ Government Management Tool**
- **Objective Performance Data With Subjective Visibility Into Causes Rather Than Speculation or Conjecture**



Characteristics of Ideal Past-Performance Evaluation

- **Contractor Input (Not Explicit in Draft DoD Policy, but Essential)**
-
- **Senior-Level Review**
- **Consistent Standards**
- **Legally Defensible**
- **Provides Performance Incentive**

Lessons Learned

- **Issues Must Be Openly Discussed – Hidden Agendas Destroy Credibility/ Create Adversary Reactions**
- **Intractable Issues Reviewed in Context**
- **Year-to-Year, Program-to-Program, Command-to-Command Consistency Essential, but Will Take Time**
- **Follow All Critical Characteristics of Past-Performance System**
- **Contractor's Future Depends on Execution of All Elements of Current Contract, Not on Proposal Skills**

CPARS



Reasonable Contractor Expectations of Program Office

- **Not a Collection of Functional Inputs; Objective Is Improved Program Performance, Not Process Performance. Program Manager Owns the CPAR**
- **Identify OPRs for Each Evaluation Area Tied to Contract Performance Requirements – Contractor Has To Know Who the Customers Are To Satisfy Them**
- **Issues or Problems Normally Shouldn't "Bleed" Across Multiple Areas**
- **Make It Possible To Achieve Blue Ratings**
- **Don't Keep Raising the Bar – Motivate and Recognize Consistently Exceptional Performance**
- **Frequent Tracking Discussions/Incorporate in Program Reviews – No End of Report Surprises**



Reasonable Expectations From Your Contractor

- **Proactive Acceptance – After All, We Evaluate Our Suppliers the Same Way**
- **Recognize This Is an Important Management Tool**
- **Align Their Internal Company Management Metrics and Reviews With CPARs Criteria**
- **Develop Objective Criteria/Metric for Each Evaluation Area**
- **Continuous Self-Assessment**
- **Strive for Exceptional (Blue) Performance, Not Just Avoidance of Marginal or Unsatisfactory Performance**
- **Manage Process for Continuous Improvement**
- **Identify and Execute Reasonable Corrective Action Plans**



Development of Initial CPARs

- **Focus on Year Ahead/Develop Previous Year From Same Criteria (to the Extent Possible)**
- **Review Contract List for Applicability/Make Contract Selection**
 - **Considerations**
 - **System Versus Nonsystem**
 - **BOA and Task Order**
 - **Unique Versus Similar Tasks**
- **Group Contracts**
 - **Sufficiently Similar That Common Criteria Should Apply?**
 - **Level of Risk, Complexity?**
 - **Phase of Program**



Development of Initial CPARs (Continued)

- **Review 14 CPAR Evaluation Areas for Each Contract**
 - **Applicable if**
 - **Significant Contract Activity Throughout the Year**
 - **Some Objective Measures of Performance Available**
 - **Nonapplicable (Neither of Above Apply)**
 - **If in Doubt, Probably Do Not Include; PRAGs Tend To Focus on Relevance of the Core of the Contract, Not the Fringes**
- **Iteration**
 - **Quick Review of Previous Steps**
 - **Looking To Simplify and Combine**
 - **Contracts Really Different?**
 - **Objective Data Consistent With Activity**
 - **Criticality**
 - **Final Selection of Applicable Contracts and Evaluation Areas**



CRAD and Black Program CPARs

- **AFMC Instruction 64-107 Dated 1 February 1998**
- **6.4 Programs (or Programs Funded by Similarly Oriented Appropriations) Treated the Same as Systems; Full CPAR Required**
- **6.1-6.3 CPAR *NOT* Used for Basic Research and Some Applied Research, Including “Proof-of-Principle” Working Prototypes**
 - **Tailored PPI *WILL* Be Collected at the Time of Source Selection as Determined by PRAG. Emphasis on Key Personnel**
 - **No Dollar Threshold Limits**
 - **Must Use Common DoD Assessment Rating System**
- **CPARs Are Required on Appropriate Classified Contracts. Copies Will Be Controlled by AFMC/DRJ**