

T3.2.2 - Source Selection Revised

7/2009

A Source Selection

1 Source Selection Guide Revised 7/2010

2 Public Announcement and Announcement of Competing Offerors Revised 7/2007

3 Past Performance Revised 4/2013

4 Cancelling a Screening Information Request Revised 10/2010

5 Section 508 of Rehabilitation Act Revised 7/2007

6 Spare Parts

7 Source Selection Team Responsibilities Revised 7/2007

8 Supplier Process Capability Evaluation and Appraisal Revised 10/2010

9 Tiered Evaluation Added 10/2007

B Clauses

C Forms

1 Section 508 Checklist Added 7/2007

D Appendix

1 Source Selection Guide Revised 10/2010

2 Past Performance Samples Revised 7/2007

2.1 Sample 1 - Past Performance Instructions

2.2 Sample 2 - Past Performance Evaluation Factors Revised 10/2010

2.3 Sample 3A - Past Performance Evaluation Record Revised 4/2012

2.4 Sample 3B - Past Performance Questionnaire

2.5 Sample 3C - Business Management Past Performance Summary

2.6 Sample 4 Survey Form

T3.2.2 - Source Selection Revised 7/2009

A Source Selection

1 Source Selection Guide Revised 7/2010

A guide to source selection is in Appendix 1 to this section T3.2.2.

2 Public Announcement and Announcement of Competing Offerors Revised 7/2007

All procurements over \$100,000 must be publicly announced on the Internet or through other means. If the Internet is used, as a minimum the announcement should be placed on the Contracting Opportunities page contained in the FAST. This requirement does not apply to emergency actions, purchases from an established QVL or FSS, exercise of options, or changes. For actions under \$100,000, a public announcement is optional.

Publicizing the names of offerors competing for FAA contracts can be a method of encouraging small businesses to seek subcontracting opportunities with potential FAA contractors. When appropriate, the Contracting Officer (CO) may publicly announce names and addresses of offerors responding to a screening information request. Also, the CO, *after* making a down select decision, may announce names and addresses of offerors remaining in the competition leading to award provided the SIR includes a notice to the offerors and no offeror objects to the release of this information.

3 Past Performance Revised 4/2013

a. General. Past performance can be one indicator of a prospective contractor's future performance. To help ensure that the best performing contractors are providing products and services to the FAA, past performance should be evaluated during source selection whenever appropriate.

b. Instructions for Using Past Performance in a Screening Information Request (SIR).

(1) General Considerations. Factors chosen for evaluation should be reasonable, logical, coherent, and directly related to requirements in the statement of work (SOW). The key to successful use of past performance in the screening process is a clear relationship between the SOW, instructions to offerors, and evaluation criteria. Past performance information that is not important to the current acquisition should not be included. For instance, there would be no point in considering poor subcontract management if there were no subcontract management needed on the contract. Alternatively, if there were a significant amount of software development, it would be important to know the offeror's record with estimating lines of code, providing software builds on time with few errors, and accomplishing the effort within the estimated cost. At a minimum, the quality of contractor's past performance should be assessed during the evaluation.

(2) Responsibility Determination. When appropriate, the SIR should state past

performance will be used to evaluate the responsibility of the contractor and as an evaluation factor. A contractor with a record of unsatisfactory past performance should be screened out of the selection process as part of the responsibility determination. If a contractor's past performance record passes the responsibility determination, then the past record should be compared to the other responsible offerors to determine the offeror that provides the best value to the Government.

(3) Past Performance as a Separate Non-Cost/Price Factor. It is best to include past performance as a stand-alone factor, as opposed to integrating it with other non-cost/price factors. Making it distinct and identifiable will reduce the chances of its impact being lost within other factors and should make evaluation easier. The relative importance of past performance compared to price or cost and any other evaluation factors is left to the broad discretion of the procurement team (CO, legal counsel, program official and other supporting staff) as is the source and type of past performance information to be included in the evaluation.

(4) How to Weigh Past Performance. Past performance should be ranked to ensure it is meaningfully considered. To be meaningful in the screening process (and to ensure offerors are aware that actual contract performance will be a significant factor in future awards), past performance may be at least equal in significance to any other non-cost evaluation factor. If a numeric weighting system is used, past performance may be rated at 25 percent or more. For example, if there were five non-cost evaluation factors including past performance, then any of the following examples of weightings or relative importance would suffice:

- Past performance at 25 percent with the other four factors rated at 18.75 percent each ($75/4=18.75$)
- Past performance at 25 percent, technical excellence at 25 percent, management at 20 percent, the other two factors at 15 percent each
- All five factors rated at 20 percent
- Technical approach rated at 30 percent, past performance rated at 30 percent (to equal the highest rated other non-cost factor), management at 20 percent and the other two factors rated at 10 percent each
- Technical capability and past performance are considered equal in importance followed by test and evaluation, logistics management, and subcontract management in descending order of importance

(5) Non-Relevant Contract Experience/New Contractors. The SIR should state whether new contractors, or contractors with non-relevant contract experience will be considered, or rated negatively. For example, if the offeror has a performance history on non-relevant contracts, i.e., prior Government or commercial performance record, but not specifically on the type of work solicited, this information might be used to demonstrate management potential. New contractors may have key management or technical or scientific personnel proposed for the contract that have some relevant experience. An evaluation of the performance of the proposed key personnel on relevant contracts can be used, as appropriate, as part or all of the past performance evaluation. In addition, teaming relationships and subcontractors can enhance the capability of potential offerors to perform, depending on the relationships that exist within the teaming process.

(6) Time-frame, Size, Scope, Complexity. The SIR should ask the contractor for references for ongoing or contracts completed within a specified period of time. A period of three to five years is considered reasonable, depending on the particular circumstances. For small dollar contracts where there are many actions and contractors that provide the products or services, a shorter period may be appropriate. Offerors may attempt to "cherry pick" references to provide selected information on past history. To minimize this, the procurement team should attempt to gather past performance history from sources other than those provided by the offeror. Such sources might include the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) database for ongoing efforts, other agency contracting personnel, and listings of contract awards posted on the FAA Contract Opportunities. All on-going or completed contracts performed during the identified period, or the last "X" contracts performed by the entity within the identified period should be sought. Instructions to offerors should ask only for a list of the previous contracts and contact points and for a description of any quality awards earned by the offeror. It is not necessary to burden the process by asking that the offeror prepare a description of its past performance history in the proposal. The procurement team should request references for contracts that are similar in size, scope and complexity to the statement of work in the SIR. Each of these terms should be defined in the SIR to alert the offeror to the type of data that is required.

(7) Discriminators/Sub-factors.

(a) Attention should be paid to what discriminates a "good" performer from a "poor" performer for the type of work that will be performed on the specific acquisition. Past performance sub-factors should be shaped by those discriminators, be limited in number, and should be tailored to the key performance criteria in the SOW. For certain prime contracts, the ability to manage subcontracts, or software development capability may be important discriminators. The following are some other examples of sub-factors that may be used to evaluate past performance: quality, timeliness, cost control, business practices, customer satisfaction, key personnel, and/or quality awards and recognition.

(b) The sub-factors in the SIR should reflect the questions to be used in interviewing references or reviewing any written evaluations provided by the references. For example, sub-factors with corresponding questions under business practices could include:

- Management Responsiveness - Is the offeror cooperative, business-like and concerned with the interests of the customer?
- Contract Change Proposals - What is the contractor's history on contract change proposals? This includes, changes that lower the overall cost or improve performance - timely and accurate proposals for equitable adjustments - changes that have been withdrawn or dismissed as invalid.

(8) Relative Importance. The SIR should state whether all sub-factors are relatively equal, or whether certain sub-factors are more important than others. For example, on

a contract where most of the work is done for end users and it is difficult for the contract administration team to observe the contractor's performance in a cost-effective manner, significant weight might be placed on customer (end user) satisfaction ratings from the references.

(9) Major Subcontractors. If major subcontractors are likely to perform critical aspects of the contract, the procurement team should evaluate past performance of these subcontractors to determine the overall likelihood of success of the prime contractor. The SIR should state how such information will be evaluated.

(10) Affiliates, Divisions, etc. For large organizations with many divisions, consider the past performance of the affiliate, division, etc., that will perform the actual work. In making such decisions, the procurement team must consider the degree of control that a parent organization will exert over the affiliate. If a parent organization has an excellent or poor performance record and the affiliate is going to be closely controlled and managed by the parent, then the procurement team should consider the parent organization's performance record in making the performance evaluation.

(11) Number of References. It is important to ask for at least two references for each contract (program/technical and contracts) to assure that all aspects of the offeror's performance will be discussed. The name of the organization providing the report should be released to the offeror; however, the names of individuals should generally not be released without the individual's consent.

(12) Use of Other Sources. The instruction to the offerors should include a statement that the Government may use past performance information obtained from other than the sources identified by the offeror, and that the information obtained may be used for both the responsibility determination and the best value decision. For each non-Federal reference, the SIR should include an authorization to release information.

(13) Inclusion of Survey Form. The survey form need not be included as an attachment in the SIR. However, if the procurement team elects to release the questionnaire, the SIR should note that the questions to be asked would not be limited to those on the questionnaire.

(14) Sample SIR Provisions. Appendix 2 to this Guidance contains examples of SIR provisions and an example client authorization letter. The example is not the only way to include past performance in the SIR. Each SIR must contain instructions and evaluation information that best reflects the individual acquisition.

c. Evaluating Past Performance.

(1) Applicability. Past performance is one measurement of an offeror's ability to perform.

(2) Relation to SIR. Instances of performance, both good and poor, should be noted and related to the SIR requirements. If problems were identified on a prior contract, the role the sponsor may have played in that result should be taken into account. Evaluations should consider the number and severity of problems, the demonstrated

effectiveness of corrective actions taken (not just planned or promised), and the overall work record.

(3) Disclosure of Negative Information. If the procurement team receives negative information that will have a significant impact on the likelihood of award to an offeror, then the procurement team should disclose the information and provide an opportunity to respond. This is true even if the SIR states that award may be made on initial offers. The SIR should include the appropriate provisions notifying the offerors that FAA retains this option.

(4) Current Versus Older Performance. The age of the performance being evaluated may be weighted so that performance on older contracts receives less weight than performance on more recent contracts. More weight may be given to those evaluations on prior FAA or Federal contracts as opposed to contracts with state/local governments or private parties or to prior contracts of a similar nature to the SIR.

(5) Method of Scoring. The final past performance rating may be reflected by a color, a number, adjectival, or a combination of these methods, depending upon what system is being used overall to indicate the relative ranking of the offerors. A past performance rating is not a precise mechanical or scientific process and must include sound business judgment. Therefore, the documentation of the final rating should include a logical description of the underlying reasons for the conclusions reached.

(6) Evaluating Disputed/Negative Information. When the procurement team receives negative information, or information that is disputed, they should carefully consider the offeror's response and determine what weight to apply, based on the facts obtained from the questionnaire, interview, or other sources. The file must be documented to explain why the procurement team assigned a particular rating. This is especially important in situations involving unresolved disputes.

d. Obtaining Information on an Offeror's Past Performance.

(1) Applicability. There are various methods of obtaining information on a contractor's past performance.

(2) Reference Checks. The most commonly used method of obtaining past performance is to conduct reference checks from a variety of sources, including previous FAA program and contracting personnel, other Federal agencies, state and local governments, and commercial contractors.

(3) Other Sources. Dun & Bradstreet can obtain information on past performance on specific contractors for the FAA (Dun & Bradstreet charges for this information). In lieu of FAA paying for the report, the SIR may require offerors to provide a copy of a recent past performance report prepared by Dun & Bradstreet. In this case, the offerors would see the report and have an opportunity to resolve any disputed data before the report is submitted to FAA. Using this process could save time and money, but should not be relied on as the only source of data. Quality certifications and awards can also serve as a useful source of past performance information.

(4) Timetable. The process of collecting information should begin as soon as the proposal evaluation begins. Collecting information can be time consuming. Researchers must locate and question sources of information, either in person, by telephone or in writing. Obtaining this information as early as possible in the evaluation process gives the procurement team invaluable information in determining the viability of the individual offerors. If the information shows a history of poor performance, the procurement team can eliminate the proposal from the competition as non-responsible. It may be best to establish a team devoted entirely to this task during the screening, especially if FAA anticipates receiving a large number of proposals.

(5) Questionnaire or Survey Form. The first step in obtaining information from sources is to develop a questionnaire, or survey form, that reflects the evaluation rating system that will be used to assess the offerors strengths and weaknesses for the contract being considered. Questions should be worded so that interviewees understand precisely what they are being asked to describe. To maintain accurate records and facilitate verification, the questionnaire (survey) record form should include: Interviewer's name, company name, reference's name (to be held in confidence), full mailing address and telephone number, date and time of the call, and description of the contract effort discussed. An example of a questionnaire is found in Appendix 2.4 Sample 3B.

(6) Information Collection. Once the questionnaire is prepared, the procurement team should contact references. For all interviews, the questions should be stated to the interviewees exactly as on the questionnaire. There are various ways to collect the information: Face-to-face interviews, mailing the questionnaires, telephone interviews, electronic mail (ensuring security measures are taken), or some combination of these.

(7) Number of References. At least two references should be contacted on each previous contract effort. This should be specified in the instruction to offerors. Additional references may often be identified during the interviews. It is also important to survey reasonably large numbers of references in order to look for patterns in their description of performance - individual ratings may be personal and biased. Numerous ratings can show patterns and are therefore much more likely to be a valid indicator.

(8) Setting Up Interviews. Being well organized and efficient is important when conducting the interview so as not to waste the interviewee's time. It is helpful to call the reference to make an appointment to conduct an interview, rather than telephoning the references unannounced, thereby catching them unprepared or with little time to respond. If possible, the questionnaire should be mailed or faxed to the reference in advance of the appointment. Interviewers should take copious notes on the questionnaire to ensure that all information is captured. Tape recording is a good means for capturing all of the conversation, however, tape recording the conversation may cause the interviewee discomfort and reduce the amount of information provided. If tape recording is used during the interview, ensure the interviewee is aware of and agrees to the use of recording devices.

(9) Conducting Interviews. Evaluators should look for patterns of either favorable

or unfavorable overall performance, rather than focusing on individual successes or failures. It is important to look for actions that demonstrate high performance and not just unfavorable performance. This will help to get away from the old responsibility determination mode of just looking at performance problems. There appears to be a tendency for references to give an upward bias to ratings. The interviewer should ask enough questions to discriminate between "good" and "excellent." Evaluators should request any existing documentation in support of excellent or negative findings (i.e., correspondence, modifications, determinations, etc.). Investigating negative findings in-depth prior to presenting them to offerors, in discussions if held, will alleviate unnecessary delays. Prior to concluding the interview, the evaluator should ask the reference for a summary opinion, e.g., how would the interviewee rate the contractor's overall performance and would the interviewee like to do business with the contractor again?

(10) Concluding Telephone and Face-to-Face Interviews. Immediately following a telephone or face-to-face interview, the interviewer should prepare a narrative summary of the conversation (this can be the questionnaire as filled in by the interviewer) and send it to the reference for verification, preferably by certified mail return-receipt requested, fax, or electronic mail. The narrative should state explicitly that if the reference does not object to its content within the time specified, it would be accepted as correct. If the reference indicates that the narrative is incorrect, then a corrected narrative should be sent for verification. If a reference will not agree to the record and satisfactory corrections cannot be agreed upon, the record cannot be relied upon and should not be included in the offeror's rating. Another source may provide the same information, however.

(11) Mailing Questionnaires. If mailing questionnaires is the chosen method for collecting past performance information, mail the questionnaires to the references, provide a time-frame for return of responses, and wait for the responses. If mailed questionnaires are not received in a timely manner, follow-up telephone interviews are suggested (following guidance above if telephone interview occurs).

4 Cancelling a Screening Information Request Revised 10/2010

The CO, with the concurrence of the procurement team, may cancel a SIR at any time during the solicitation process. The notification of cancellation may be made through the same mechanism as the initial or subsequent SIRs. The CO must document cancellation for the contract file.

5 Section 508 of Rehabilitation Act Revised 7/2007

a. Requirements for Accessibility.

Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794d) requires that persons with disabilities that are either Federal employees or members of the public seeking information or services from a Federal department are to have the access to and use of information and data comparable to the access and use of the information and data by Federal employees or members of the public who do not have disabilities. Section 508 applies to contract awards,

task orders, delivery orders, orders under Government-wide Schedules and Interagency Agreements for electronic and information technology (EIT), as defined below. The procurement team (CO, program official, legal counsel, and other supporting staff) will insert Section 508 requirements into SIRs that include development, procurement, maintenance, or use of electronic and information technology unless an exception applies (see Exceptions to Section 508 below).

b. *Definition.*

Electronic and information technology (EIT) means any equipment or interconnected system or subsystem of equipment used in automatic acquisition, storage, manipulation, management, movement, control, display, switching, interchange, transmission, or reception of data or information. For purposes of the preceding sentence, equipment is used by the FAA:

- (1) If the equipment is used directly by FAA; or
- (2) Is used by a contractor under a contract with FAA that:
 - (a) Requires use of such equipment; or
 - (b) Requires use, to a significant extent, of such equipment in performance of a service or furnishing of a product.

c. *EIT Products.* EIT includes, but is not limited to:

- (1) Computers and other office equipment;
- (2) Software and firmware;
- (3) Services (including support Services);
- (4) Telecommunication products;
- (5) Information kiosks;
- (6) Office equipment such as copiers and fax machines; and
- (7) Websites.

d. *Exceptions to Section 508.*

- (1) Section 508 does not apply to EIT:
 - (a) Acquired by a contractor incidental to a FAA contract;

- (b) For a national security system;
- (c) Located in space frequented only by service personnel for maintenance, repair, or occasional monitoring of equipment;
- (d) That would impose an undue burden on FAA (see paragraph g. below); or
- (e) That would impose a fundamental alteration in the nature of an EIT product or its components.

(2) EIT is not available

- (a) When procuring commercial items, FAA must comply with those EIT standards that can met with supplies or services that are available in the commercial marketplace in time to meet FAA's delivery requirements.
- (b) When EIT is not available, the contract file must be documented as outlined below.

(3) Documentation supporting a Section 508 exception must be maintained in the contract file. The FAA Section 508 Procurement Checklist found in below in C. "Forms" can aid in regulatory compliance. Required documentation includes (if applicable):

- (a) Applicable technical provisions of the Access Board's standards;
- (b) Market research performed to locate items that meet the applicable technical provisions;
- (c) The specific provisions that cannot be met;
- (d) Undue burden documentation (see paragraph g. below); and
- (e) Other applicable documentation.

(4) If an exception applies preventing FAA from meeting all of the applicable technical provisions, FAA may acquire EIT that meets some of those provisions.

e. Applicability.

- (1) All EIT procured on or after June 21, 2001 must comply with Section 508 standards.

(2) The FAA does not have to retrofit EIT procured before June 21,

2001. f. *Approval of Undue Burden.*

When applying the requirements of Section 508 (see paragraph b. "Requirements for Accessibility" above) would impose an undue burden, FAA must provide individuals with disabilities covered by Section 508 the information and data involved by an alternative means of access that allows the individual to use the information and data. Undue burden is defined as a significant difficulty or expense to the FAA.

(1) Documentation of an undue burden must include:

(a) A thorough and fully supported explanation as to why and to what extent compliance with each provision of 36 CFR Part 1194 would create an undue burden for the EIT being procured; and

(b) Dollar value, market research performed, and alternative means of access that would be provided for individuals with disabilities to use the information or data. Alternative means of access include (but not limited to):

(i) Voice, fax, or relay service;

(ii) Qualified sign language interpreters;

(iii) Teletypewriters (TTY);

(iv) Internet posting;

(v) Captioning;

(vi) Text-to-speech synthesis;

(vii) Readers;

(viii) Personal Assistants; or

(ix) Audio description.

(2) Final approval authority of an undue burden determination resides with the FAA Administrator. The Secretary of the Department of Transportation (DOT) formed the Undue Burden Advisory Board (UBAB), which will advise FAA on undue burden matters. The process for undue burden determinations is:

(a) Review by DOT Chief Information Officer;

(b) Review by DOT General Counsel;

(c) Review by UBAB and their submission of a recommendation to the FAA Administrator in the form of an "Undue Burden Report"; and

(d) Consideration of the report by the FAA Administrator or delegate. The resulting decision is final.

g. Sources of Further Information.

(1) U.S. Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board (U.S. Access Board)

(2) Government-wide Section 508 website

(3) FAA Section 508 website (FAA only)

6 Spare Parts

a. Shipping Spare Parts. For all shipments of spare parts, the contractor should include a packing list that includes at least the noun name, part number, Commercial and Government Entity (CAGE) Code, quantity, unit price, and national stock number (if available). Contracts that require shipment of spare parts should include Clause 3.2.2.3-73 to establish this contractual requirement.

b. Spare Parts for Nationally Furnished Project Materiel.

(1) *Requirements.* The contracting officer should include coverage for spare parts in the screening information request and subsequent contract that facilitates availability, accessibility and tracking of spare parts.

(2) *SIR Provision.* For contracts that will require the purchase and delivery of spare parts, the contracting officer should establish a discrete contract line item number for initial site and depot-level spare parts list contract line item number (CLIN) and corresponding delivery date. The CO should also include the SIR provision 3.2.2.3-74, "Submission of Initial Site and Depot-level Spare Parts List" as part of the instruction to vendors on the preparation of their SIR submissions to assure that the parts list will be furnished as part of the SIR submission.

(3) *Contract Requirements.* The contracting officer should include a separately priced CLIN for the site and depot-level spare parts list and corresponding delivery due date of this contract deliverable. The list will contain each item's noun name, part number, Commercial and Government Entity (CAGE) Code, unit price, national stock number (if available) and the quantity.

7 Source Selection Team Responsibilities Revised 7/2007

The responsibilities described below are guidelines to help ensure successful source evaluation and selection. The source selection team managing the procurement must

apportion these responsibilities to fit the specific procurement.

a. *Source Selection Official.* The service or product team lead or Director (or equivalent position) of the requiring organization is the source selection official (SSO) for procurement under an investment program subject to the Joint Resources Council (JRC) process (unless the JRC otherwise designates an SSO). For procurements not subject to the JRC investment-decision process, the CO is the SSO. The SSO's responsibilities include:

- (1) Assure team competence, cohesiveness, and effectiveness;
- (2) Assign responsibility to a source evaluation team member to mark all source selective sensitive information with the designation "**SOURCE SELECTION SENSITIVE INFORMATION.**"
- (3) Approve evaluation plans and assure the evaluation conforms to the stated evaluation criteria; and
- (4) Make down-select decisions and assume full authority to select the source for award.

b. *Source Evaluation Team.* The source evaluation team properly and efficiently performs source evaluation, and supports the source selection decision and related activities. Their responsibilities include:

- (1) Draft all SIRs;
- (2) Formulate the source evaluation plan;
- (3) Review existing lessons learned reports that provide meaningful insight into the procurement;
- (4) Ensure an in-depth review and evaluation of each submitted screening document against FAA requirements and stated evaluation criteria;
- (5) Prepare the evaluation report (including recommendations, if applicable), using sound business judgment, to assist the SSO make down selection and/or award decisions;
- (6) Oversee all procedural and administrative aspects of the procurement;
- (7) Select advisors to assist the team in its evaluation, if required;
- (8) Prepare documentation for the SSO's decision rationale, if requested by the SSO;
- (9) Participate in all debriefings; and

(10) Prepare a lessons learned memorandum after completing the source selection.

c. *Contracting Officer.* The CO's responsibilities include:

- (1) Serve as the SSO for procurements not subject to the JRC investment-decision process;
- (2) Ensure, when applicable, conflict of interest documentation is obtained from all source selection team members; with legal counsel, determine if any conflicts or apparent conflicts of interests exist; and if so, resolve them;
- (3) Ensure source selection team members are briefed on sensitivities of the source selection process, prohibition against unauthorized disclosure of information (including their responsibility to safeguard proposals and any documentation related to the source selection team proceedings), and requirements concerning conflicts of interest; ensure source selection team members provide nondisclosure of information statements;
- (4) Coordinate communications with industry and conducts all debriefings;
- (5) Control all written documentation issued to industry;
- (6) Participate during screening, selection, and debriefing phases of source selection to ensure fair treatment of all offerors;
- (7) Issue letters, public announcements, SIRs, SIR amendments, and other procurement documents;
- (8) Ensure the contract is signed by a contractor's representative with the authority to bind the contractor; with legal counsel, ensure all contractual documents comply with applicable laws, regulations, and policies;
- (9) Execute, administer, and terminate contracts and make related determinations and decisions that are contractually binding.

d. *Product or Service Team Lead or Director of the Requiring Organization.* The product or service team lead or Director's (or equivalent position) responsibilities include:

- (1) Serve as SSO if the procurement is subject to the JRC investment-decision process (unless otherwise designated by the JRC);
- (2) Assure FAA's program needs are acquired through the appropriate source selection process;
- (3) Assure SIRs include adequate definition of requirements; and

(4) Assure qualified technical evaluators, if required, assist the source evaluation team in the evaluation.

e. *Advisors.* The source evaluation team may appoint advisors to provide specialized expertise and guidance not otherwise available on the team.

f. *Nongovernmental Evaluators and Advisors.* The source evaluation team may use nongovernmental personnel as evaluators or advisors. Nongovernment personnel must comply with FAA's conflict of interest and nondisclosure of information policies. The SIR must include notice of any nongovernmental participation.

8 Supplier Process Capability Evaluation and Appraisal Revised 10/2010

a. *General.* This guidance is designed to assist the Source Selection Official (SSO) in considering process capability of potential suppliers during proposal evaluations, mitigating process-related risk of the supplier during contract/agreement performance, and for fostering process improvement of the supplier throughout the lifecycle.

b. *Scope/Applicability.* Supplier Process Capability Evaluation and Appraisal are intended for use in new acquisitions and agreements, but may also be incorporated into existing contracts or agreements.

c. *Expected Benefits.*

(1) *Acquirer.* The FAA can expect reduced risk in supplier selection and in meeting program objectives by motivating suppliers to improve their processes without forcing compliance to specific practices. Other benefits would include enhanced quality, predictability, performance and cost effectiveness of products and services acquired.

(2) *Supplier.* Suppliers can expect reduced risk in meeting contract requirements by identifying and addressing process deficiencies that might negatively impact project success. Other benefits would include improved performance by identifying and addressing process deficiencies in critical process areas and potential for earning additional award fee where such incentives are part of the contract.

d. *Pre-award.* In the early phase of planning a source selection, the SSO determines whether process capability will be considered as a risk factor for source selection. The following criteria should be considered when making this decision:

(1) The performance of specific processes is considered critical to accomplishment of the mission.

(2) The product or service being acquired is considered crucial to the FAA.

(3) A major component of the product or service to be provided is considered to be unprecedented.

(4) The total estimated value of a contract for research, engineering, and development (R,E&D) is equal to or greater than \$70 million, or a contract for acquisition is equal to or greater than \$300 million.

(5) There is lack of information on offeror's past performance or process capability data, or the past performance or process capability of the offeror is weak.

(6) The product or service is especially complex.

If process capability will be used as an evaluation factor, or as an adjustment to risk at either the area or factor level, the SIR must include request for information on current status and commitment to process improvement, including evidence indicating process capability. The SIR must also identify particular aspects of the suppliers' performance capabilities that are considered critical to success of the contract, such as architecture and design, safety, security, human factors, integration, risk management, or quality assurance.

Process capability appraisals can be used after award to validate and confirm the offeror's proposals and/or to identify risks associated with process deficiencies to be addressed during contract performance. If a decision is made to perform a post-award appraisal, the SIR must indicate that a post-award appraisal will be performed on the selected supplier's processes that are identified as critical or potentially risky.

e. *Post-award.* Post-award appraisals may be conducted on existing contracts with well-established project(s), or on new contracts using target projects selected from the supplier's sponsoring organization.

f. *Contract/Agreement Requirements.* Considerations in developing contract/agreement requirements include use of trade-off analysis to establish the level of surveillance of strong or weak areas. For example, if a supplier is strong in an area, it is inefficient to check on that area in the same way that would be applied in an area found to be weak. Additional Award fees may also be used as an incentive. Contract/Agreement performance requirements include completion of initiatives to remove critical deficiencies identified. Completion may be a factor in award fees. Depending on the decision of the SSO, contract requirements may include:

- (1) Risk mitigation plans to remove deficiencies noted during pre-award.
- (2) Performing scoped post-award and follow-up appraisal(s).
- (3) Risk mitigation plans to remove deficiencies noted in post-award appraisal.
- (4) Government "surveillance" for specific areas (weaknesses) to be addressed.
- (5) An adequate reporting or insight mechanism to facilitate monitoring the risk mitigation plan.

(6) Consideration for creating additional process strengths.

(7) Improvement in performing process improvement activities.

Risk mitigation planning describes in detail the schedule and actions that will be taken to remove deficiencies noted during the evaluation and selection process and those uncovered in the appraisal process, if a post award appraisal is performed.

9 Tiered Evaluation Added 10/2007

a. General.

(1) Tiered evaluation of offers is a process by which FAA promotes small business participation while providing FAA a means to continue the procurement if small business participation is insufficient.

(2) The Contracting Officer (CO) may use tiered evaluation of offers to promote competition in each tier of small business concerns while still allowing other than small business to participate without issuing another SIR.

(3) The CO must consider the tiers of small business concerns prior to evaluating offers from other than small business concerns.

b. Utilizing Tiered Evaluations.

(1) The CO must specify in the SIR that a tiered evaluation of offers will be used in source selection, and offers from other than small business concerns will only be considered after the determination that an insufficient number of offers from responsible small business concerns were received.

(2) The CO will specify the tiered order of precedence for evaluating offers in the SIR, and determine the applicable tiers based upon market research of the availability of small business concerns. An example of a tiered order of precedence is (descending in order):

(a) Socially and economically disadvantaged business (SEDB) expressly certified by the Small Business Administration (SBA) for participation in SBA's 8(a) program.

(b) Service-disabled veteran owned small business (SDVOSB);

(c) Very small business;

(d) Small business; and

(e) Other than small business.

(3) Once offers are received, the CO will evaluate a single tier of offers according to the order

of precedence specified in the SIR. If no award can be made at the first tier, the evaluation will proceed to the next lower tier until award can be made.

B Clauses

[view contract clauses](#)

C Forms

[view procurement forms](#)

1 Section 508 Checklist Added 7/2007

Standards	
Check the Access Board's standards that apply to the EIT purchase:	
	1194.21 Software Applications and Operating Systems
	1194.22 Web-based Information or applications
	1194.23 Telecommunication Products
	1194.24 Video and Multimedia Products
	1194.25 Self-Contained Products
	1194.26 Desktop and Portable Computers
	1194.31 Functional Performance Criteria
	1194.41 Information, Documentation and Support
	Request vendor Section 508 compliance template (e.g. vendor's website or other website location)
Exceptions	
	EIT acquired by a contractor incidental to a FAA contract
	EIT for a national security system
	EIT located in spaces frequented only by service personnel for maintenance, repair, or occasional monitoring of equipment
	EIT that would impose an undue burden on the agency
	EIT that would impose a fundamental alteration in the nature of an EIT product or its components
Research	
After market research, the product is considered:	

	Compliant
	Partially compliant
	Noncompliant
	EIT is not available

D Appendix

1 Source Selection Guide Revised 10/2010

1.1 Introduction

a. *Purpose.* AMS Policy Section 3.2.2 outlines requirements for source selection. This guide contains additional information about processes and techniques for conducting a competitive source selection. The Contracting Officer (CO) should use business judgment to tailor source selection based on factors such as complexity, dollar value, urgency, and resources available.

b. *Procurement Integrity.* The Procurement Integrity Act applies to personnel involved in source selection. This Act and other similar statutes and regulations impose stringent requirements for safeguarding source selection and contractor proposal information, and other integrity issues. There are civil and criminal penalties for violating these requirements. All personnel involved in the source selection process must maintain the integrity of the procurement, and should understand the prohibitions and certification requirements of the Act and similar statutes and regulations. Any questions or other issues regarding procurement integrity should be directed to legal counsel assigned to the source selection.

c. *Bias or Conflict of Interest.* Personnel involved in the source selection must not have any bias or conflict of interest that would impact the source selection. Financial interests in offerors or employment discussions with offerors are examples of conflicts of interests that would preclude an employee from participating in a source selection.

1.2 Getting Started

a. *Procurement Planning.* Procurement planning should start when FAA identifies a need for supplies or services. Early and effective planning helps ensure needs are satisfied with the right product or service and at the right time.

b. *Market Research.* Market research is the first step in procurement planning. It is the process of collecting and analyzing information about capabilities, products, services, or practices within the marketplace. Information from market research shapes a procurement strategy and other aspects of a procurement, such as the statement of work, evaluation factors, contract type, and the amount and type of information to be requested in a screening information request (SIR). The extent and degree to which you should document the results of

market research varies, based on factors such as urgency, estimated dollar value, complexity, and past experience. In some cases, one person can conduct market research but for more complex requirements, a team effort may be appropriate. (See AMS Procurement Guidance T3.2.1.2, Market Research and Analysis, for more information)

c. *Source Evaluation Team (SET)*. Source evaluation should be a multi-disciplined, team effort. As appropriate, the team should include representatives from functional areas such as contracting, program/technical, legal, logistics, and user organizations. The size and composition of the SET varies, depending on the nature of requirement. Whether the team is large or small, it should be structured to ensure teamwork, unity of purpose, and appropriate communication among the team members throughout the process. A key to selecting personnel is identifying experience, education, and business and technical skills required for the evaluation. Required skills and experience should be defined with enough flexibility to allow substitution of training for experience.

d. *Support Personnel*. Once the primary evaluation team is identified, additional support personnel may be desired or required. Examples of such personnel include administrative support, librarian/document-control personnel, and information technology support.

e. *Key Members and Responsibilities*.

(1) *Source Selection Official*. The SSO:

- Ensures the selection process is conducted properly and according to applicable policies and laws
- Establishes the SET and ensures the team has the skills, expertise, and experience to perform the evaluation
- Ensures actual or apparent conflicts of interest are avoided
- Ensures premature or unauthorized disclosure of source selection information is avoided
- Approves the evaluation criteria and plan, and ensures the SIR is consistent with both
- Concurs with the CO's decision to release the SIR (if the SSO is other than the CO)
- Makes down-select decisions
- Makes the final source selection decision for an award, and ensures the rationale is documented before contract award

(2) *Source Evaluation Team*. The team:

- Drafts evaluation criteria and plan
- Drafts SIRs and ensures an in-depth review of each SIR
- Selects advisors to the team, as necessary
- Conducts a comprehensive review and evaluation of proposals against SIR requirements and the approved evaluation criteria
- Prepares the necessary items for discussions with offerors, if applicable
- Prepares and submits the evaluation reports to the SSO
- Briefs the SSO, as requested

- Responds to special instructions from the SSO
- Provides information for debriefings of unsuccessful offerors
- Prepares a lessons learned memorandum after completing the source selection

(3) *Contracting Officer*. The CO:

- Serves as the SSO (unless otherwise designated)
- Acts as the business advisor to the SSO (if not the SSO)
- Coordinates and controls communications with vendors and issues written communication to vendors
- Participates during screening, selection, and debriefing phases of source selection to ensure fair treatment of all offerors
- Issues letters, public announcements, SIRs, SIR amendments and other procurement documents
- Chairs all required debriefings

f. *Advisors*. The CO serves as a business advisor to the SSO (if the CO is not the SSO). Additionally, legal counsel, technical experts, or small business specialists may advise the SSO. If non-Governmental advisors are part of the SET, the SIR must include notice about their participation in the evaluation. Non-Government advisors must not have any organizational conflict of interest.

g. *Required Certificates*. The SSO and each SET member (including support personnel and advisors) must sign nondisclosure of information and conflict of interest certificates.

h. *Administrative Considerations*. Each procurement varies, but administrative needs may include facilities for evaluators and discussions with offerors, securable storage space for source selection materials, and other items such as computers, special software, phones, copiers, etc..

i. *Handling Source Selection Information*.

(1) SET members must handle proposal and evaluation material in a manner consistent with “For Official Use Only” or, as appropriate, a higher security classification. The SET should establish sufficient safeguards to protect the material whether it is in their possession or it is being disseminated, reproduced, transmitted, or stored. Additionally, procedures should be established for proper disposal of the material when it is no longer required. (See AMS Procurement Guidance T3.13.1.A.7, Records Retention, and FAA Order 1350.15C Records Organization, Transfer and Destruction Standards).

(2) The Procurement Integrity Act precludes individuals from knowingly disclosing source selection information and contractor bid or proposal information before award of a contract to which the information relates. However, the SSO may authorize release of source selection information to other authorized Government personnel who have signed a non-disclosure statement, provided the release would not jeopardize the integrity or successful completion of the procurement (when the release is after the SIR is issued, but before contract award).

j. *Security Responsibilities*. All SET members are responsible for the security of source

selection information. In complex source selections, it may be beneficial to designate members of the SET to oversee and perform security control functions. Security procedures may also be needed for the source selection physical facilities, such as a sign in and out log, identification to access the area, visitor (e.g., maintenance/service personnel) control, or key or card control access. A security briefing for the SET may be used to emphasize that each member:

- Is responsible for security of the evaluation and proposal materials and other source selection and proprietary information related to the procurement
- Is knowledgeable of, and will adhere to, governing security procedures and regulations
- Will not discuss, communicate, or otherwise deal on matters related to the source selection with any individual not assigned by the SSO, and then only within appropriately secure areas
- Will challenge any apparent unauthorized person within the physical location of the evaluation

1.3 Evaluation Plan and Selection Methodology

a. *Evaluation Plan.* The evaluation plan outlines the people, schedule, process, criteria and other information relevant to evaluating offeror responses to a SIR, and the basis for selecting an offeror for award. It is approved before receiving responses to a SIR requesting screening or qualification information. The evaluation plan is source selection sensitive information, so it must not be disclosed to anyone not authorized by the SSO to receive the information. The size and detail of the evaluation plan is based on the complexity of the procurement, but at a minimum it includes:

- Name of the SSO and SET members
- Evaluation factors, relative importance of factors, and standards for rating offerors against the factors (SIR section M)
- Basis for selection and award

b. *Selection Methodology.* Designing a procurement strategy includes an effective evaluation methodology. Depending on the circumstances, it may be in FAA's best interest to either:

(1) *Award to other than the lowest-priced offeror.* Under this method, both cost/price and non-cost/price factors are assessed based on the evaluation criteria, and the SSO selects the offeror proposing a combination of these factors representing the best value to FAA. The SSO considers non-cost strengths and weaknesses, risks, and cost/price for each offeror and applies business judgment to select the offeror representing the best value.

(2) *Award to the lowest-priced, technically acceptable offeror.* This method may be the best value when FAA would not realize any value from a proposal exceeding minimum technical requirements. The SIR establishes certain standards that an offeror must meet to be considered technically acceptable. An offeror does not receive any additional credit for exceeding the established standards. The award is then made to the lowest-priced, technically acceptable offeror.

1.4 Screening Information Request (SIR)

a. *Purpose.* The FAA obtains information and offers from vendors through a SIR. The SIR includes information necessary for offerors to understand what FAA is buying, what information to provide, and how responses will be evaluated. The success of a procurement is directly linked to the quality of the SIR. A well-written SIR:

- Facilitates a fair competition
- Limits criteria to discriminators that add value
- Clearly details information required from vendors
- Clearly identifies evaluation and award criteria
- Conveys a clear understanding of FAA's requirements

b. *The SIR Process.* For a given procurement, FAA may make a selection decision after one SIR, or may have a series of SIRs (with a screening decision after each one) to arrive at the selection decision. This process depends on the types of products or services to be acquired and the specific source selection approach. Generally, when multiple SIRs are contemplated, the initial SIR should request general information, and subsequent SIRs should request successively more specific information. Initial SIRs need not state firm requirements, thus allowing FAA to convey its needs to offerors in the form of desired features, or other appropriate means. However, firm requirements ultimately are established in all contracts.

c. *SIR Contents.* Each SIR should contain the following information:

- Paper Reduction Act number on the cover page
- A statement identifying the purpose of the SIR (request for information, request for offer, establishment of a QVL or screening)
- A definition of need
- A request for specific information (with specific page and time limitations, if applicable)
- A closing date stating when submittals must be received in order to be considered or evaluated
- Evaluation criteria (and relative importance, if applicable)
- A statement informing offerors how communications with them will be conducted during the screening
- An evaluation/procurement schedule (including revisions, as required)

d. *Categories of SIRs.*

(1) *Qualification Information.* Qualification information, used to qualify vendors and establish qualified vendor lists (QVLs), should be requested when a resultant QVL will be used for multiple FAA procurements. Qualification information screens those vendors meeting FAA's stated minimum capabilities / requirements to provide a particular product or service. Once qualification information is requested, received, and evaluated according to the evaluation plan, a QVL is established for the given product/service and vendors meeting FAA's qualification requirements are listed on the QVL. (See AMS Procurement Guidance T3.2.2.3. for more information on QVLs.)

(2) *Screening Information.* Screening information allows FAA to determine which offeror(s) are most likely to receive the award, and ultimately which offeror(s) will provide FAA with the best value. The screening information requested in the SIR

should focus on information that directly relates to the key discriminators for the procurement.

(3) *Request for Offer.* A request for offer is a request for an offeror to formally commit to provide the products or services required by FAA under stated terms and conditions. The response to the request for offer is a binding offer, which is intended to become a binding contract if signed by the CO. The request for offer may take the form of a SIR, a proposed contract, or a purchase order.

e. *Changes in SIR Requirements.* If FAA's requirements change after release of a SIR, then all offerors competing at that stage should be advised of the change(s) and allowed to update their submittals accordingly. However, the SSO may waive a requirement at any time after release of a SIR, without notifying other offerors, if the SIR states offeror specific waiver requests will be considered, and the waiver does not affect a significant requirement that changes the essential character or conditions of the procurement.

f. *Common Problems.*

(1) *Inconsistency among the SIR and related documents.* It is critical for the SIR and related documents to be aligned. It is particularly important for the evaluation plan and the SIR to be consistent.

(2) *Inconsistency Within the SIR.* It is important to avoid inconsistencies between the description of FAA's requirements, instructions on how to prepare a proposal, and information related to the evaluation factors. These inconsistencies may be caused by different groups of people developing the different SIR sections without proper coordination. Such inconsistencies can result in less advantageous offers, necessitate changes to the SIR, cause delays, lead to offerors losing confidence in the process, or result in litigation.

(3) *Requesting Too Much Information from Vendors.* The instructions for preparing and submitting proposals should focus on requesting only information necessary for the evaluation. The SIR requirements, each evaluation factor and subfactor, and the SIR preparation instructions should be linked. Request only the essential information needed to evaluate SIRs against the evaluation factors and subfactors and do not ask for information that will not be evaluated. Instructions that require voluminous information can cause potential offerors to forego responding in favor of a less costly business opportunity. Excessively large proposals may increase the time and costs associated with the evaluation. Proposal page limitations are encouraged, but need to be clearly defined and tailored to the needs of the acquisition. Focus exclusively on discriminators; failure to do so compromises the ability to identify the best offeror.

(4) *Unnecessary Use of Design Requirements.* The description of FAA's requirements in the SIR can have a significant impact on a source selection using a tradeoff process. Use of detailed design requirements or overly prescriptive statements of work statement severely limits the offerors' flexibility to propose their best solutions. Functional or performance-based requirements provide flexibility and should be used to the extent practicable. While it may be more difficult to develop evaluation criteria and conduct the evaluation process using this approach, the benefits warrant it. These

benefits include increased competition, access to the best commercial technology, better technical solutions, and fewer situations for protests.

g. *Ways to Improve the SIR.* A multi-disciplined team should develop the SIR. The members should be stakeholders in the procurement and should continuously coordinate with each other to ensure consistency of the SIR with other documents such as the evaluation plan. Open communications with vendors should also be used to improve the SIR and to also promote understanding of FAA's requirements. This can be accomplished through various forms of communication, such as releasing draft statements of work or SIRs, advance procurement planning briefings for vendors, one-on-one meetings, or conferences with potential offerors.

1.5 Communications with Offerors

a. Communications with potential offerors should take place throughout the source selection process. During the screening, selection, and debriefing phases of source selection, communications are coordinated through the CO. All SIRs should clearly inform offerors how communications will be handled during the initial screening phase. The purpose of communications is to ensure mutual understanding between FAA and offerors about all aspects of the procurement, including the offerors' submittals/ proposals. Information disclosed as a result of oral or written communication with an offeror may be considered in the evaluation of an offeror's submittal(s). To ensure that offerors fully understand the intent of the SIR and FAA's needs, FAA may hold a pre-submittal conference and/or one-on-one meetings with individual offerors. One-on-one communications may continue throughout the process, as required, at the discretion of the SET.

b. Communications with one offeror do not necessitate communications with other offerors, because communications will be offeror-specific. Regardless of the varying level of communications with individual offerors, the CO should ensure such communications do not give any offeror an unfair competitive advantage. During these and future communications, as applicable, FAA should encourage offerors to provide suggestions about all aspects of the procurement. Communications may necessitate changes in FAA's requirements or SIR. Where communications do not result in any changes in FAA's requirements, FAA is not required to request or accept offeror revisions. The use of technical transference is always prohibited. Technical leveling, and auctioning techniques are prohibited, except in the use of "commercial competition techniques."

1.6 Evaluation Factors

a. *Evaluation Factors and Subfactors.*

(1) Selecting the appropriate evaluation factors and subfactors is key to the source selection process. The factors and subfactors give offerors an insight into significant considerations FAA will use to select the best value offer. Structure the evaluation factors and subfactors and their relative importance to clearly reflect the needs of the acquisition. Evaluation factors and subfactors from the evaluation plan must be in Section M (or equivalent) of the SIR.

(2) Factors and subfactors are definable and measurable in readily understood quantitative and/or qualitative terms. They also represent the

key areas of importance and emphasis to be considered in the source selection decision. Factors and subfactors should be limited to the essential elements to distinguish among the information/offers; i.e., will be true discriminators.

(3) Common evaluation factors are technical, cost/price, past performance, and small business participation. Other evaluation factors may be appropriate, and one or more levels of subfactors may be needed.

(4) Steps involved in formulating evaluation factors and subfactors include:

- Conduct market research as a starting point for developing criteria
- Brainstorm critical factors and subfactors
- Identify key discriminators
- Define the discriminators as evaluation factors and subfactors and
- their relative order of importance
- Assess feedback during SIR(s)

(5) *Evaluation Weights.* Assign relative importance to each evaluation factor and subfactor. Tailor the relative importance to specific requirements. Use priority statements to express the relative importance of the evaluation factors and subfactors. Priority statements relate one evaluation factor (or subfactor) to each of the other evaluation factors (or subfactors). For example:

“Technical is the most important factor and is more important than all of the remaining factors combined. Technical is significantly more important than past Performance. The past performance factor is more important than the cost factor and small business participation factor combined. The cost factor is more important than the small business participation factor.”

b. *Numerical and Adjectival Ratings.* When using the tradeoff process, the evaluators assess the non-cost portion(s) of the offer and associated performance and proposal risks using numerical or adjectival ratings. The success of an evaluation is not so much dependent upon the type(s) of ratings used, but rather on the consistency with which the evaluators use them. For this reason, adjectival ratings must include definitions for each rating so that the evaluators have a common understanding of how to apply them.

c. *Result of Proposal Evaluation.* At the end of an evaluation, the result is each factor and sub-factor are evaluated, the merits and risks of a proposal are documented and numerical or adjectival ratings, when appropriate, are assigned.

1.7 Evaluation

a. *Conduct Training.* Before receipt of proposals, each evaluator should become familiar with all pertinent documents, e.g., SIR, evaluation plan, and rating scales, etc.. The SET should conduct training that includes an overview of these documents and the source selection process, with instructions on properly documenting each offeror's strengths, weaknesses, and risks. Training should also include ethics information and the protection of source selection information. This training is especially crucial when evaluators have little or no source selection experience.

b. *Documenting the Evaluation.* The SET performs an in-depth, systematic evaluation of offerors' proposals against evaluation factors and subfactors in the SIR(s). All evaluations must be documented. While the specific evaluation processes and tasks vary, the basic objective is to provide information about each offeror's strengths and weaknesses so the SSO can make an informed and reasoned decision. It is imperative that there be an orderly method for identifying, recording, and tracking strengths and weaknesses. Also, it is critical that evaluation findings be supported with narrative statements. Ratings alone are not conclusive data on which to make a source selection decision. All determinations relating to changes in requirements after release of the SIR should also be documented in the evaluation report.

c. *Assignment and Use of Offeror Code Names.* Once proposals are received, the SET should consider establishing a code name for each of the offerors. This would help protect the identities of offerors submitting proposals, the proprietary information in their proposals, and the contents of the evaluation reports and source selection documentation. The code names would be assigned by the SET and then communicated to all evaluation personnel prior to the start of proposal evaluation. All SET members, evaluation team members, and support personnel involved in the evaluation and source selection must then use any assigned code names vice the actual offeror names in all discussions and in all written documentation and communication (including the SSO Briefing). The SSO would then not know the actual offeror names until after contract award. Additional guidance related to the assignment of code names is as follows:

- (1) Code names should be based on a series of like items (e.g., states such as Missouri, Arkansas, and Nebraska for an acquisition with three offerors);
- (2) Care should be taken to avoid choosing a series of names where one may be perceived as more valuable than another (e.g., if using precious metals, Gold may be perceived as more valuable than Bronze, or if using colors, Red may be perceived more negatively than Green);
- (3) If there are more than three or four offerors, alphabetic characters should be used for ease of reference (e.g., Offeror A, Offeror B etc.); and
- (4) Code names would not be assigned in the following situations:
 - Only one proposal received; or
 - Where the names of all offerors competing are publicly known in accordance with AMS clause 3.2.2.3-72 "Announcing Competing Offerors" (July, 2004).

Note: Regardless of whether code names are used, SET members, evaluation team members, and support personnel are responsible at all times for the proper treatment of source selection

sensitive information from the evaluations and/or proposals.

d. *Past Performance Evaluations.* The past performance evaluators assess the performance risk associated with each proposal. The final assessment describes the degree of confidence in the offeror's likelihood of successful contract performance based on that offeror's demonstrated record of performance under similar contracts. (See AMS Procurement Guidance T3.2.2.A.3.c. for guidance on evaluating past performance.)

e. *Cost/Price Evaluations.* For fixed priced contracts, the evaluation could be as simple as assessing adequate price competition and determining prices are fair and reasonable. Fixed priced contracts also should be evaluated for appropriateness (i.e., consider market prices, appropriate risk and the possibility of a "buy-in") for what is being offered. For cost-reimbursement contracts, the offerors' estimated costs should be analyzed for both realism and reasonableness. The cost realism analysis enables evaluators to determine each offeror's most probable cost of performance. This precludes an award decision based on an overly optimistic cost estimate. Additionally, whenever cost analysis is performed, profit or fee analysis is conducted. (See AMS Procurement Guidance T3.2.3 for guidance on cost and price methodology.)

1.8 Selection and Award

a. *Decisions.* After the evaluators complete their evaluation, the results of the evaluation are presented to the SSO. The SSO may:

- Make a selection decision (see below);
- Make a screening decision by screening those offerors determined to be most likely to receive award, thus continuing the screening phase;
- Amend and re-open to initial offerors; or
- Cancel the procurement.

b. *Presenting the Evaluation to the SSO.* The SET prepares documentation of the evaluation to present to the SSO. The SSO uses this documentation as an aid when making a decision based on business judgment about which proposal represents the best value. At the request of the SSO, the SET may present the evaluation results through one or more briefings.

c. *Source Selection Decision.* The SSO must document his/her rationale for selecting the successful offeror. The source selection decision document should explain how the successful proposal compared to other offerors' proposals based on the evaluation factors and subfactors in the SIR, and should discuss the judgment used in making any tradeoffs. If the SSO disagrees with a findings of the SET, the SSO's rationale is part of the decision document. When the SSO determines the best value proposal is other than the lowest-priced proposal, the decision document justifies paying a price premium regardless of the superiority of the proposal's non- cost rating. The justification clearly states the benefits or advantages FAA will receive for the added price and why it is in FAA's interest. This justification is required even when the SIR indicates non-cost factors are more important than cost/price. The SSO should consult with legal counsel to review of the source selection decision document to assure that the decision clearly articulates the business judgment of the SSO.

d. *Awarding the Contract.* After the SSO signs the source selection decision document, the CO

executes and distributes the contract, subject to completing other requirements before award such as Congressional notification.

1.9 Debriefing of Offerors/Lessons Learned

a. *Overview.* The CO notifies all offerors who participated in the competitive process that they may request a debriefing within three working days from receipt of award notification. Because each offeror puts considerable resources into preparing and submitting a proposal, fairness dictates a prompt debriefing and an explanation of why a proposal was unsuccessful.

b. *Purposes of a Debriefing.* A debriefing:

- Explains the rationale for the offeror's exclusion from the competition or non-selection for award
- Instills confidence in the offeror that it was treated fairly
- Assures the offeror that appropriately qualified personnel evaluated the proposal according to the SIR and applicable policies and laws
- Identifies strengths and weaknesses in the offeror's proposal so the offeror can prepare better proposals in future FAA procurements
- Gives the offeror an opportunity to provide feedback about the SIR process, communications, and the source selection
- Reduces misunderstandings and reduces the risk of protests

A debriefing is not a:

- Page-by-page analysis of the offeror's proposal
- Point-by-point comparison of the proposals of the debriefed offeror and other offerors
- Debate or defense of FAA's award decision or evaluation results

The debriefing must not reveal any information prohibited from disclosure or exempt from release under the Freedom of Information Act.

c. *Notification of Debriefing.* The CO should inform the offeror of the scheduled debriefing date by electronic means with return receipt to acknowledge receipt. If the offeror requests a later debriefing date, the CO should require the offeror to acknowledge in writing that it was offered an earlier date, but requested a later date instead. This procedure will protect FAA's interests if the offeror subsequently files a protest.

d. *Debriefing Methods and Location.* The CO debriefs one unsuccessful offeror at a time. The CO selects the method and location of the debriefing. Although face-to-face debriefings are frequently used, a debriefing may be by telephone or other electronic means acceptable to the offeror and FAA. It may be burdensome for an offeror to attend in person and the needs of the offeror should be given due consideration. The CO may provide an advance copy of the debriefing to the offeror and allow the offeror to provide written questions for FAA to review before the debriefing.

e. *Attendees.* The CO selects FAA attendees, and chairs and controls the debriefing. The CO should ask an offeror to identify all individuals by name and position who will attend the debriefing. Normally, the CO should not restrict the number of personnel the debriefed offeror may bring unless there are space limitations. It is important to ensure appropriate

FAA personnel attend for it to be a meaningful debriefing. The CO may rely on SET members to address specialized areas of the offerors' proposals. Legal counsel should participate in preparation and review of the debriefing materials. If the offeror's legal counsel will attend the debriefing, FAA legal should also attend. If there are indicators a protest is likely, inform FAA's legal counsel. However, the CO must not deny a debriefing because a protest is threatened or has already been filed.

f. *Preparing for a Debriefing.* The extent of preparation varies with the complexity of the source selection. Sometimes, preparing debriefing charts is sufficient. Other times, a written script and dry run rehearsals may be beneficial. Because debriefings are time sensitive, preparation may begin before proposal evaluation is complete. SET members may assist in preparing debriefing materials. The CO should brief all FAA personnel who will attend the debriefing on their roles during the debriefing.

g. *Information Provided.* In a post-award debriefing, the CO discloses:

- The evaluation rating and significant strengths and weaknesses of the debriefed offeror's proposal;
- The debriefed offeror's total evaluated price/cost and the awardee's total evaluated price/cost;
- A general summary of the rationale for the award decision.

h. *Handling Questions.* Ideally, the CO should get all questions in writing. As a general rule, FAA personnel should not answer questions "on the fly." The CO and other FAA personnel should caucus to formulate a response before providing an answer. At the end of the debriefing, the CO should advise the offeror that the debriefing is officially concluded. At the discretion of the CO, questions submitted by the offeror after the date on which the debriefing was conducted may be answered. However, in such cases, the CO must advise the offeror that the information is not considered part of the official debriefing (thereby not impacting the protest time period).

i. *Lessons Learned Memorandum.* The SET should prepare a lessons learned memorandum. A lessons learned memorandum is a valuable tool to relay procurement experiences to other FAA personnel. The memorandum should highlight issues/processes that had a significant impact on the procurement and changes that could be made to ensure a more comprehensive evaluation or more timely award.

1.10 Oral Presentations

a. *Introduction.* Oral presentations (sometimes referred to as oral proposals) provide offerors an opportunity to verbally present information they would normally provide in writing. Oral presentations may be beneficial in a variety of procurements, and are most useful when requirements are clear, complete, and stated in performance or functional terms. Oral presentations are ideal for gathering information about how qualified the offeror is to perform the work, how well the offeror understands the work, and how the offeror will approach the work. Oral presentations may be conducted in person or via video teleconference. However, a videotaped presentation does not constitute an oral presentation because it is not a real-time exchange of information.

b. *Scope of the Oral Presentation.* Before deciding if oral presentations are appropriate, the

SET must select the evaluation factors. Then the SET should decide whether the information needed to evaluate these factors can be better presented orally, in writing, or through a combination of both. Oral presentations can convey information in diverse areas such as responses to sample tasks, understanding the requirements, experience, and relevancy of past performance. Offerors should be required to submit briefing materials in advance of the presentations. This allows FAA attendees to review the materials and prepare any questions. Oral statements cannot be incorporated into the contract by reference, so any information to be made part of the contract needs to be submitted in writing. At a minimum, the offeror must submit certifications, representations, and a signed offer (including any exceptions to SIR terms and conditions) in writing. The offeror must submit any other factual data, such as cost or pricing data or subcontract commitments, as part of a written proposal also.

c. *SIR Information.* If oral presentations are appropriate, the SIR must notify offerors that FAA will use oral presentations to evaluate and select an offeror for award. The proposal preparation instructions must contain explicit instructions and guidance regarding the extent and nature of the process to be used. Instructions should discourage elaborate presentations since it may detract from the information being presented. At a minimum, include the following information in the SIR:

- The types of information the offeror must address during the oral presentations and how it relates to the evaluation criteria
- The required format and content of the presentation charts and any supporting documentation
- Any restrictions on the number of charts or the number of bullets per chart and how FAA will handle material that does not comply with these restrictions
- The required submission date for the presentation charts and/or materials
- The approximate timeframe when the oral presentations will be conducted and how FAA will determine the order of the offerors' presentations
- Whether any rescheduling will be permitted if an offeror requests a change after the schedule has been established
- The total amount of time each offeror will have to conduct their oral presentation
- Who must make the presentation and a requirement that the offeror provide a list of names and position titles of the presenters
- Whether the presentation will be video or audio taped
- The location of the presentation site and a description of the site and resources available to the offeror
- Any rules and/or prohibitions regarding equipment and media
- How FAA will treat documents or information referenced in the presentation material but never presented orally
- Any limitations on FAA-offeror interactions during and after the presentation
- Whether the presentation will constitute discussions
- Whether FAA will use the information in the oral presentation solely for source selection purposes or whether such information will become part of the contract (which will require a subsequent written submission of that information)
- Whether the offeror should include any cost (or price) data in the presentation

d. *Timing and Sequencing.* Because preparing and presenting an oral presentation involves time and expense, offerors not likely to be candidates for award should not have to conduct oral presentations. This can be an important consideration with small businesses. When this is

a concern, consider down selections to establish the likely candidates for award before oral presentations. The SIR should clearly articulate the methodology for down selection. The CO may draw lots to determine the sequence of the offerors' presentations. The time between the first and the last presentation should be as short as possible to minimize any advantage to the offerors that present later.

e. *Time Limits.* Establish a total time limit for each offeror's presentation. It is not advisable to limit the time for individual topics or sections within the presentation; this detail is the presenter's responsibility. If planning a question and answer session, it should be excluded from the allotted time and set a separate time limit for it. There is no ideal amount of time to be allotted. Make this decision using business judgment based upon the complexity of the procurement, experience, and lessons learned.

f. *Facility.* Usually, the presentations should be at a Government-controlled facility. This helps guard against surprises and ensures a more level playing field. However, nothing precludes conducting an oral presentation at an offeror's facility. This may be more efficient if site visits or other demonstrations are part of the source selection. If using a Government-controlled facility, it may be made available for inspection and, if warranted, a practice session. Allowing offerors to get acquainted with the facility will help ensure that it does not detract from the presentation content.

g. *Recording the Presentations.* Having an exact record of the presentation could prove useful both during the evaluation process and in the event of a protest or litigation. The oral presentations can be recorded using a variety of media, e.g., videotapes, audio tapes, written transcripts, or a copy of the offeror's briefing slides or presentation notes. The SET is responsible for determining the method and level of detail of the record. If using videotaping, allow for the natural behavior of the presenters. If slides or view graphs are used, the camera should view both the podium and screen at the same time. Place the microphones so that all communications can be recorded clearly and at adequate volume. Every effort should be made to avoid letting the recording become the focus of the presentation. The recording, which is considered source selection information, will become part of the official record. Provide a copy to the offeror and seal and securely store the master copy of the recording to ensure there are no allegations of tampering in the event of a protest or court action.

h. *FAA Attendance.* The CO should chair every presentation. All FAA personnel involved in evaluating the presentations should attend every presentation.

i. *Presenters.* The offeror's key personnel who will perform or personally direct the work being described should conduct their relevant portions of the presentations. Key personnel include project managers, task leaders, and other in-house staff of the offeror's or their prospective key subcontractors' organizations. This will avoid the oral presentation becoming the domain of a professional presenter, which would increase costs, detract from the advantages of oral presentations, and adversely affect small businesses.

j. *Reviewing the Ground Rules.* Prior to each presentation, the CO should review the ground rules with the attendees. This includes discussing any restrictions on FAA-offeror information exchanges, information disclosure rules, documentation requirements, and housekeeping items. These ground rules should also be included in the SIR. If the evaluation includes a quiz, the CO should discuss the related ground rules. For example,

whether the offeror may caucus or contact outside sources by phone before answering. The ground rules should avoid too much control because it could inhibit the presentation. However, the CO should control all exchanges during the presentation if discussions will not be conducted.

k. *Evaluation of Presentations.* Evaluations should be performed immediately after each presentation. Using evaluation forms will help the evaluators collect their thoughts and impressions. Evaluators must document the rationale for their evaluation conclusions.

2 Past Performance Samples Revised 7/2007

2.1 Sample 1 - Past Performance Instructions

Instructions for Providing Past Performance Information

Offerors shall submit the following information as part of their proposal for both the offeror and proposed major subcontractors: (The information may be submitted prior to the other parts of the proposal, to assist the government in reducing the evaluation period).

A. A list of the last contracts and subcontracts completed during the past three years and all contracts and subcontracts currently in process. Contracts listed may include those entered into by the federal government, agencies of state and local governments, and commercial customers. Offerors that are newly formed entities without prior contracts should list contracts and subcontracts as required above for all key personnel. Include the following information for each contract and subcontract:

1. Name of contracting activity
2. Contract number
3. Contract type
4. Total contract value
5. Contract work
6. Contracting Officer and telephone
7. Program manager and telephone
8. Administrative Contracting Officer, if different from # 6, and telephone
9. List of major subcontractors

B. The offeror may provide information on problems encountered on the contracts and subcontracts identified in A above and corrective actions taken to resolve those problems. Offerors should provide general information on their performance on the identified contracts. General performance information will be obtained from the references. *(Use this paragraph if written input from the offeror is desired in addition to the information obtained from the references.)*

C. The offeror may describe any quality awards or certifications that indicate the offeror possesses a high-quality process for developing and producing the product or service required. Such awards or certifications include, for example, the Malcolm Baldrige Quality Award,

other government quality awards, and private sector awards or certifications (e.g., the automobile industry's QS 9000, Sematech's SSQA, or ANSI/EIA-599). Identify what segment of the company (one division or the entire company) that received the award or certification. Describe when the award or certification was bestowed. If the award or certification is over three years old, present evidence that the qualifications still apply.

D. Each offeror will be evaluated on his/her performance under existing and prior contracts for similar products or services. Performance information may be used for both responsibility determinations and as an evaluation factor against which offerors' relative rankings will be compared to assure best value to the government. The government will focus on information that demonstrates quality of performance relative to the size and complexity of the procurement under consideration. The Performance Information Form identified in the List of Attachments section will be used to collect this information. References other than those identified by the offeror may be contacted by the FAA with the information received used in the evaluation of the offeror's past performance.

E. Offerors should send their listed private sector references a letter to the following effect authorizing the reference to provide past performance information to the government.

Sample Client Authorization Letter (Optional)

Dear "Client":

We are currently responding to the Federal Aviation Administration's SIR No. _____ for the procurement of _____.

The FAA is placing increased emphasis in its procurements on past performance as an evaluation factor. The FAA is requiring that clients of entities responding to its SIRs be identified and their participation in the evaluation process be requested. In the event you are contacted for information on work we have performed, you are hereby authorized to respond to those inquiries.

We have identified Mr./Ms. _____ of your organization as the point of contact based on his/her knowledge concerning our work. Your cooperation is appreciated. Any questions may be directed to: _____.

Sincerely,

2.2 Sample 2 - Past Performance Evaluation Factors Revised 10/2010

Past performance will be evaluated as follows:

1. Past performance will receive 35 percent of the non-cost/price factors ratings. Sub-factors A, B, C, D and E are of equal importance and will receive up to 25 percent of the non-cost/price ratings with the other 10 percent allocated to sub-factor G, quality awards. The

criteria for a rating of excellent are described with each sub-factor.

A. Quality of Product or Service - compliance with contract requirements - accuracy of reports - technical excellence. Excellent = There were no quality problems.

B. Timeliness of Performance - met interim milestones - reliable - responsive to technical direction - completed on time, including wrap-up and contract administration - no liquidated damages assessed. Excellent = There were no unexcused delays.

C. Cost Control - within budget - current accurate and complete billings - relationship of negotiated costs to actuals - cost efficiencies. Excellent = There were no cost issues.

D. Business Practices - effective management - effective small/small disadvantaged business subcontracting program - reasonable/cooperative behavior - flexible - effective contractor recommended solutions - business-like concern for government's interests. Excellent = Response to inquiries, technical/service/administrative issues was effective and responsive.

E. Customer Satisfaction - satisfaction of end users with the contractors service. Excellent = 90 percent or more of end users surveyed rated the service as excellent or better.

F. Where the offeror has demonstrated an exceptional performance level in any of the above five sub-factors additional consideration can be given by the procurement team for that factor. It is expected that this rating will be used in those rare circumstances when contractor performance clearly exceed the performance levels described as "excellent."

G. Receipt of widely recognized quality awards or certifications. Excellent = Malcolm Baldrige Quality award, or equivalent award, covering the entity submitting the offer.

2. Assessment of the offeror's past performance will be one means of evaluating the credibility of the offeror's proposal, and relative capability to meet performance requirements.

3. Information utilized will be obtained from the references listed in the proposal, other sources known to the FAA, consumer protection organizations, and others who may have useful and relevant information. Information will also be considered regarding any significant major subcontractors, and key personnel.

4. Award may be made from the initial offers without discussions. However, if discussions are held offerors should be given an opportunity to address negative reports of past performance, if the offeror has not had a previous opportunity to review the rating. Recent contracts will be examined to ensure that corrective measures have been implemented. Prompt corrective action in isolated instances may not outweigh overall negative trends.

5. Lack of past performance history relating to this SIR (state how lack of past performance history will affect the evaluation, e.g. neutral rating).

2.3 Sample 3A - Past Performance Evaluation Record Revised 4/2012

A separate record must be completed for all contracts awarded the competing organization within the past five years. A performance evaluation document will be submitted to the COR for completion and used to evaluate your organization's past performance.

1. Contractor Identification			2. Contract No.:		
a. Name:			3. Date of Award:		
b. Address:			4. Type of Contract:	a. Negotiated	b. Sealed Bid
c. City:				c. Fixed Price	d. Cost Reimbursement
d. State:		e. Zip Code:		e. Other [Specify]	
5. Description and location of Work: <i>[Attach additional pages as necessary.]</i>					

6. Contracting Officer's Representative (COR):					
a. Name:				b. Telephone No.:	
c. Address:		d. City:		e. State:	f. Zip Code:
7. Contract Amount:			8. Complexity of Work:	a. Difficult	b. Routine
9. Status:	a. Active	b. Complete	10. Contract Completion Date [Include extensions]:		
11. Type and Extent of Subcontracting <i>[attach additional pages as necessary]:</i>					

2.4 Sample 3B - Past Performance Questionnaire

SAMPLE 3B - PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE		
I. CONTRACT IDENTIFICATION		
i.	Name:	
ii.	Description	
iii.	Geographic distribution of services under this contract, i.e., local, nationwide, worldwide:	
iv.	Number of locations serviced by this contract:	
II. EVALUATION		
A. PERFORMANCE HISTORY:		
1.	To what extent did the contractor adhere to contract delivery schedules.	Considerably surpassed minimum requirements 4 Exceeded minimum requirements 3 Met minimum requirements 2 Less than minimum requirements 1
	<i>Comment:</i>	
2.	To what extent did the contractor submit required reports and documentation in a timely manner?	Considerably surpassed minimum requirements 4 Exceeded minimum requirements 3 Met minimum requirements 2 Less than minimum requirements 1
	<i>Comment:</i>	
3.	To what extent were the contractor's reports and documentation accurate and complete?	Considerably surpassed minimum requirements 4 Exceeded minimum contractual requirements 3 Met minimum requirements 2 Less than minimum requirements 1
	<i>Comment:</i>	

4.	To what extent was the contractor able to solve contract performance problems without extensive guidance from government counterparts?	Considerably successful 4 Generally successful 3 Little success 2 No success 1
	Comment:	
5.	To what extent did the contractor display initiative in meeting requirements?	Displayed considerable initiative 4 Displayed some initiative 3 Displayed little initiative 2 Displayed no initiative 1
	Comment:	
6.	Did the contractor commit adequate resources in timely	Provided abundant resources 4
	fashion to the contract to meet the requirement and to successfully solve problems?	Provided sufficient resources 3 Provided minimal resources 2 Provided insufficient resources 1
	Comment:	
7.	To what extent did the contractor submit change orders and other required proposals in a timely manner?	Considerably surpassed minimum requirements 4 Exceeded minimum requirements 3 Met minimum requirements 2 Less than minimum 1
	Comment:	
8.	To what extent did the contractor respond positively and promptly to technical directions, contract change orders, etc.?	Considerably surpassed minimum requirements 4 Exceeded minimum requirements 3 Met minimum requirements 2 Less than minimum requirements 1
	Comment:	
9.	To what extent was the	Considerably surpassed minimum

	contractor's maintenance and problem tracking/reporting documentation timely, accurate, and have appropriate content?	requirements 4 Exceeded minimum requirements 3 Met minimum requirements 2 Less than minimum requirements 1
	<i>Comment:</i>	
10.	To what extent was the contractor effective in interfacing with the Government's staff?	Extremely effective 4 Generally effective 3
		Generally ineffective 2 Extremely ineffective 1
	<i>Comment:</i>	
B. TERMINATION HISTORY		
11.	Has this contract been partially or completely terminated for default or convenience?	Yes [Default Convenience] No If yes, explain (e.g., inability to meet cost, performance, or delivery schedules).
	<i>Comment:</i>	
12.	Are there any pending terminations?	Yes No If yes, explain and indicate the status.
	<i>Comment:</i>	
C. EXPERIENCE HISTORY		
13.	How effective has the contractor been in identifying user requirements?	Extremely effective 4 Generally effective 3 Generally ineffective 2 Extremely ineffective 1
	<i>Comment:</i>	
14.	What level of integration experience has the contractor demonstrated in the reconfiguration of government owned software, commercial software, and government furnished hardware?	Considerable surpass minimum experience 4 Exceeded minimum requirements 3 Met minimum contractual requirements 2 Less than minimum requirements 1
	<i>Comment:</i>	

15.	To what extent was the maintenance and	Considerably surpassed minimum
	problem reporting/ tracking documentation produced by the contractor's efforts satisfactory to the users?	requirements 4 Exceeded minimum requirements 3 Met minimum contractual requirements 2 Less than minimum requirements 1
Comment:		
16.	To what extent did the contractor coordinate, integrate, and provide for effective subcontractor management?	Considerably surpassed minimum requirements 4 Exceeded minimum requirements 3 Met minimum requirements 2 Less than minimum requirements 1
Comment:		
17.	To what extent did the contractor provide timely technical assistance, both on-site and off-site, when responding to problems encountered in the field?	Considerably surpassed minimum requirements 4 Exceeded minimum requirements 3 Met minimum requirements 2 Less than minimum requirements 1
Comment:		
18.	To what extent did the contractor achieve effective logistics support, i.e., replacement parts, personnel, etc.?	Considerably surpassed minimum requirements 4 Exceeded minimum requirements 3 Met minimum requirements 2 Less than minimum requirements 1
Comment:		
19.	To what extent did the contractor provide	Considerably surpassed minimum
	quality replacement parts?	requirements 4 Exceeded minimum requirements 3 Met minimum requirements 2

		Less than minimum requirements 1
	Comment:	
20.	To what extent did the contractor meet the repair/response times in the contract?	Considerably surpassed minimum requirements 4 Exceeded minimum requirements 3 Met minimum requirements 2 Less than minimum requirements 1
	Comment:	
21.	Did this contract include a Help Desk?	Yes No
	If yes, to what extent was the contractor responsive to users contacting the Help Desk for assistance?	Considerably surpassed minimum requirements 4 Exceeded minimum requirements 3 Met minimum requirements 2 Less than minimum requirements 1
	Comment:	
22.	If there was a Help Desk, were users able to make contact with the Help Desk personnel on their first attempt?	Always able on the first attempt 4 More often than not on the first attempt 3 Rarely able on the first attempt 2 Never on the first attempt 1
	Comment:	
23.	Were the Help Desk personnel courteous and responsive?	Always courteous and responsive 4 Usually courteous and responsive 3 Rarely courteous and responsive 2 Never courteous and responsive 1
	Comment:	
24.	Were user questions resolved in a timely manner?	Always resolved in a timely manner 4 Usually resolved in a timely manner 3 Rarely resolved in a timely manner 2

		Never resolved in a timely manner 1
	<i>Comment:</i>	
25.	How technically qualified were the Help Desk personnel?	Extremely qualified 4 Satisfactorily qualified 3 Minimally qualified 2 Technically deficient 1
	<i>Comment:</i>	
26.	How satisfied are you with the contractor's Help Desk problem escalation procedures?	Extremely satisfied 4 Satisfactorily satisfied 3 Minimally satisfied 2 Unsatisfied 1
	<i>Comment:</i>	
27.	How technically qualified were the maintenance personnel?	Extremely qualified 4 Satisfactorily qualified 3 Minimally qualified 2 Technically deficient 1
	<i>Comment:</i>	
D. COST MANAGEMENT		
28.	To what extent did the contractor meet the proposed cost estimates?	Less than estimated cost 4 Comparatively equal to estimate 3 Exceeded the costs 2 Considerably surpassed estimate 1
	<i>Comment:</i>	
E.	NARRATIVE SUMMARY	Use this section to explain additional information not included above.
	<i>Comment:</i>	

2.5 Sample 3C - Business Management Past Performance Summary

Part A. Contract Summary			
1. Contractor Name:		2. Contract Number:	

Street:		3. Contract Type:			
City:		4. Competitive:	yes	no	
State:	Zip Code:	5. Follow-on:	yes	no	
Telephone:		6. Period of Performance:			
7. Contract Cost Data		Estimated Cost	Fee		Total Value
		Firm Fixed Price			
	Initial Contract Cost	\$	\$	\$	\$
	Current Contract Cost	\$	\$	\$	\$
8. Product Description and/or Services Provided.					
Part B. Performance Evaluation of Contract (Summary)					
Performance Elements	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Unsatisfactory
9. Quality of Work					
10. Timely Performance					
11. Effectiveness of Management					
12. Compliance with Labor Standards					
13. Compliance with Safety Standards					
14. Handling Staff Integrity Issues					
15. Facility Maintenance & Repair					
16. Personnel Management Practices					
17. Overall Evaluation					
18. Remarks on excellent performance. Provide data supporting this observation. <i>[Continue on separate sheet(s) if needed.]</i>					
19. Remarks on unsatisfactory performance. Provide data supporting the observation. <i>[Continue on separate sheet(s) if needed.]</i>					

Part C. Identification of Evaluator			
20. Name:		21. Organization:	
22. Title:		23. Date:	
NOTE: If verbal telephonic response received, complete the following:		24. Information obtained by:	25. Signature

2.6 Sample 4 Survey Form

Please provide concise comments regarding your overall assessment of the contractor's performance on the contract identified. Because of the nature of the contract to be awarded, please focus on system integration and installation aspects, when possible, rather than development or production. Please respond to each question in a narrative format. Please telefax your response to the attention of the following point of contact. Please call the individual cited before faxing your response.			
		Responses are needed by	
Section 1. Identification of Point of Contact			
	Program Name		
	Name		Telephone Number
	Address		Voice
			FAX
Section 2. Performance Verification			
Fact Finding Questionnaire for			
NOTE: We have reviewed the latest Contractor's Performance Annual Review (CPAR) on file		<i>(dated)</i>	
If you can provide any further information, please respond to the questionnaire. If there are no further updates, no further information will be required. <i>(Use this paragraph when looking for additional information on CPARs.)</i>			
Contract Information			
Contractor/Division:			
Program Name:			
Contract Type		Contract Number:	
Period of Contract		to:	
Respondent Identification			

Name		Position	
Telephone No. (Voice)		Telephone No. (FAX)	
Business Address		City, ST	
		Zip Code	
Relation to Program:			
Give a brief, general description of what the contractor was required to deliver. (If the work included installation/integration of (WIDGET) systems, please identify locations and types of systems.) Please note that if a negative reply is supplied, a clarification request is submitted to the contractor, and they in turn have the right to be made aware of the comment.			
Evaluation Criteria			
1. Contractor Management			
	1.a. Discuss responsiveness of the contractor's upper level management to your organization's concerns and needs.		
	1.b. Describe how well the contractor's management interfaced with your staff and organization.		
	1.c. Discuss how well the contractor's management system provided visibility into progress/problems/risks in the technical, cost, and schedule areas, and how well the risks were minimized.		
	1.d. Discuss how well the contractor managed its subcontractors. (If there was a subcontractor, please include how the contractor maintained oversight of the sub.)		
	1.e. If your contract involved the issuing of delivery orders, please discuss any problems the contractor had in responding to them (e.g., excessive workload due to conflicts with other contracts).		
2. Technical			
	2.a. Did the contractor exhibit and exercise a sound engineering approach to the contract?		
	2.b. Did the contractor personnel have adequate experience to perform the tasks required? (Please include specifics as to personnel to perform design, system integration, test, and equipment installations.)		

	2.c. Discuss how well the contractor met the specification requirements for the system, hardware, and software.
	2.d. Discuss the contractor's ability to achieve the required reliability and maintainability without undue schedule delay or cost overrun.
	2.e. How well was the contractor able to achieve a final design which was producible and supportable?
	2.f. How well did the contractor respond when any technical problems were encountered (e.g., in areas of timelines and technical adequacy)?
	2.g. If the contractor was required to perform work outside the Continental United States (CONUS), please indicate locations and types of work done; also please discuss how familiar the contractor was with CONUS work (e.g., work permits, local taxes, host nation agreements, etc.).
	2.h. When encountering problems in the field, was the contractor able to provide timely technical assistance both on-site and off?
3. Logistics and Supportability	
	3.a. Discuss any major problems incurred by the contractor in achieving effective logistics support.
	3.b. Was Contractor Logistics Support (CLS) part of the contract? If so, was CLS timely and effective?
	3.c. Discuss whether the support equipment and manuals were adequate.
	3.d. Did any product failures occur while under warranty? If so, please indicate how responsive the contractor was to correct the deficiency.
4. Quality Assurance	
	4.a. Discuss the contractor's quality assurance plan and its effectiveness.
	4.b. Discuss the contractor's quality control during system design, integration, test, and installation. (Please include discussion on amount of scrap, repair, and rework activities.)

5. Schedule					
5.a. Did the contractor deliver on time? Discuss any schedule overruns and how the contractor minimized them.					
5.b. If there were schedule changes, please explain what percentage was attributed to government changes (or your organization's changes) or other factors.					
6. Cost					
6.a. Contract Dollar Amounts					
Original			For Award Fee Contracts		
Current			Percentage of Award Fee Paid		
Estimate of Final					
6.b. Were there cost overruns? If yes, how much was attributable to the contractor?					
6.c. Reasons for cost variances.					
7. Overall					
7.a. Based upon your answers to 1-6, how well did the contractor perform? (Mark with an "X".)					
		<u>Exceptional</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>Marginal</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>
Management					
Technical					
Log & Support					
Quality Assurance					
Schedule					
Cost					
7.b. Please provide any additional comments which you believe are important in the evaluation of the contractor's performance.					

	7.c. If you had the change to do this again, would you use this contractor again?	
Thank you for your efforts and timely response.		
	(Your Name)	Chairperson
	(Program Name)	