

## AFSPC Checklist for Documenting Past Performance for PPT and AFFARS 5315.3 Source Selections

*The answers to these questions should be in the affirmative.*

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Have *more relevant* past performance assessments contributed more to the overall rating than those that were less relevant? Does the final rating and documentation convey this?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Have *more recent* past performance assessments contributed more to the overall rating than those that were less relevant? Does the final rating and documentation convey this?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Have you accessed information from automated past performance collection systems (ACCAS, CCAAS, PPAIS) local databases? Have you contacted other bases in the same geographic area to obtain information?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. If there were any adverse past performance issues have they been communicated to the offeror? Does the Proposal Analysis Report (PAR) document the resolution of any discussions about adverse past performance and the impact of the adverse information on the overall confidence rating?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. If any past performance information was discounted from evaluation because it was found to be non-relevant, was the rationale for this determination addressed?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. Have you reconciled any conflicting information that you obtained? If information on survey responses conflicts with information in the automated systems (PPAIS, ACASS, CCASS) for the same effort and period of performance, have you relied on the information in the automated systems?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. If subcontractors are proposed, is the proposed scope of effort (both amount of work and type of work) for the prime and subcontractors addressed?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8. In the areas dealing with program and contract management, does the confidence rating assigned reflect the past performance of the proposed prime in these areas?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 9. Have you evaluated relevancy "broadly" considering similar skills, management, work requirements that might exist in the past and present work?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10. Does the overall rating tie the relevancy and recency of the past performance information to the scope of the proposed effort for the prime and subs?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 11. When a team member lacks past performance in a specific area have you considered the experience of other team members and their role in performance when assigning a confidence rating?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 12. When a team lacks past performance in a specific area of the work effort have you conveyed the impact of that lack of experience and how it contributed to the final confidence rating assigned? Is the evaluation of impact consistent with the criticality and complexity of the work?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 13. For offerors with the same final confidence ratings, does the documentation convey consistency of evaluation?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 14. Are the confidence assessment ratings assigned and the documentation used to support the rating consistent with the definitions listed in AFFARS 5315?