



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY  
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY  
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT AND ACQUISITION  
1000 NAVY PENTAGON  
WASHINGTON DC 20350-1000

NOV - 6 2013

MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION

SUBJECT: Department of the Navy (DON) Procurement Performance Management Assessment Program (PPMAP) Rating System

This memorandum provides the DON's process for assigning adjectival ratings under PPMAP reviews. This process finalizes the interim PPMAP rating system established by our memorandum of September 29, 2009. Effective immediately, all DON contracting activities shall use the attached process for the PPMAP rating system.

This new process establishes the procedures for assigning and documenting the rationale in support of an adjectival rating for a contracting activity, a subordinate contracting organization or a field activity with delegated procurement authority. Key aspects of this new process include the following:

- Retention of the previous four-tier adjectival rating scheme of *Highly Satisfactory*, *Satisfactory*, *Marginal*, and *Unsatisfactory*
- Identification of relevant key terms used in PPMAP reviews and their meaning
- Identification of key stakeholders, including their roles and responsibilities
- Specific guidance on assigning ratings based upon review outcomes

Each Head of the Contracting Activity shall incorporate this process in the HCA's implementing procedures for PPMAP and ensure that personnel responsible for performing procurement management oversight functions through PPMAPs adhere to this process.

Annually, our PPMAP Council will evaluate the effectiveness of this process and recommend changes, as appropriate.

My point of contact for this memorandum is Evelyn Ortiz, available at telephone (703) 693-4012 or by email at [evelyn.ortiz@navy.mil](mailto:evelyn.ortiz@navy.mil).

  
Elliott B. Branch  
Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy  
(Acquisition and Procurement)

Distribution:  
See page 2

Attachment:  
As stated

**SUBJECT: Department of the Navy (DON) Procurement Performance Management  
Assessment Program (PPMAP) Rating System**

**Distribution:**

CMC (DC, I&L)

CNR

COMMARCORSYSCOM

COMNAVAIRSYSCOM

COMNAVFACENGCOM

COMNAVSEASYSYSCOM

COMNAVSUPSYSCOM

COMSC

COMSPAWARSYSCOM

DRPM SSP

**Copy to:**

AGC

CMC(LB)

DON OSBP

MARCORSYSCOM (CT)

MSC (N10)

NAVAIRSYSCOM (2.0)

NAVFACENGCOM (ACQ)

NAVSEASYSYSCOM (02)

NAVSUPSYSCOM (N7)

ONR (02)

SPAWARSYSCOM (2.0)

SSP (SPN)

**DON Process for the Procurement Performance Management Assessment Program (PPMAP) Rating System (11/06/2013)**

1. **Purpose.** To establish a common process within the Department of the Navy (DON) for assignment of adjectival ratings to a DON contracting activity or a subordinate contracting organization or a field activity with delegated procurement authority in connection with the outcome of procurement management oversight reviews performed in support of the DON Procurement Performance Management Assessment Program.
  
2. **Applicability/Scope.** The procedures set forth in this document apply to all Navy/Marine Corps contracting activities assigned to perform procurement management and oversight functions. Outcomes of activity self-assessments do not require assignment of a PPMAP adjectival rating and, therefore, are not covered by this process.
  
3. **Background.**
  - a. Navy Marine Corps Acquisition Regulation Supplement (NMCARS) 5201.691 establishes the DON PPMAP review process as one of the key procurement management oversight methods the Department uses to validate sound contracting practices throughout the DON. PPMAP encourages and assists DASN(AP)/HCAs in effecting continuous improvements in acquisition processes and serves as a means for sharing of best practices throughout the Department. PPMAP review outcomes enable DASN(AP) and HCAs to evaluate, among other elements, the quality of procurement processes and management systems employed to ensure execution of authority is performed according to law, regulation, policy and guidance.
  
  - b. This common process formalizes an adjectival rating system for PPMAP reviews to determine the quality of a procurement operation. It provides the framework to assess how well each HCA within DON, including any subordinate contracting organization/field activity or other activities with delegated authority, manages, controls, and continually improves the acquisition processes used to execute delegated procurement authority. This process instills accountability for ratings below “Satisfactory” and promotes standardization in assignments of adjectival ratings within the DON. It supersedes the PPMAP rating system established by DASN(AP) policy memorandum of 29 September 2009.
  
4. **References/Resources.** Table 4-1 below lists and describes the documents that serve as a reference or resource tools in support of the procedures outlined herein

**Table 4-1  
REFERENCES/RESOURCES**

<b>Reference/Resource</b>	<b>Description</b>
SECNAVINST 4200.37	Organic Department of the Navy Procurement System Oversight and Management
NMCARS 5201.691	Procurement Management Oversight

**DON Process for the Procurement Performance Management Assessment Program (PPMAP) Rating System (11/06/2013)**

5. **Roles and Responsibilities of Key Stakeholders.** Table 5-1 lists key stakeholders of this process and their roles/responsibilities.

**TABLE 5-1  
ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES OF KEY STAKEHOLDERS**

<b>Key Stakeholder</b>	<b>Roles and Responsibilities</b>
DASN(AP)	Manages and oversees performance of the DON contracting/procurement system by reviewing the procurement operations at HCAs and other designated DON contracting organizations. Provides PPMAP guidance for Navy/Marine Corps contracting activities. Adjudicates the PPMAP adjectival rating for an HCA.
Head of the Contracting Activity	Manages and oversees reviews of all procurement operations performed within Headquarters and at any subordinate contracting organization or field activity with delegated procurement authority. Issues PPMAP implementing procedures for the HCA.
Chief of the Contracting Office	Performs and documents PPMAP activity self-assessments, internal reviews and/or onsite reviews of subordinate contracting organizations or field activities per DON/HCA policy and procedures. Ensures corrective actions are implemented to maintain a quality procurement operation within the HCA.
PPMAP Lead	Executes the DON PPMAP review process for assigned contracting activity/subordinate contracting organization/field activity areas of responsibility. Recommends, or if delegated by the HCA assigns, a PPMAP adjectival rating. Participates in DON PPMAP Council initiatives.
PPMAP Member <i>e.g.</i> Contracting Officer, Contract Specialist, Procurement Analyst, etc.	Participates in PPMAP reviews. Performs assessments of assigned review elements. Documents outcome of each review element. Participates in deliberations of the PPMAP adjectival rating.
DON Small Business Office Representative	Performs the assessment of the Small Business review element. Documents the outcome of the review. Participates in deliberations of the PPMAP adjectival rating.
Ad-Hoc Technical Expert, <i>e.g.</i> Contracting Officer Representative, Program Manager, Service Contracts Manager, Labor Advisor, etc.	Provides subject-matter-expertise in reviewing designated functional areas or special interest review elements during PPMAP review process. Documents outcome of review efforts. Participates in deliberations of the PPMAP adjectival rating.
Counsel	Performs legal reviews/provides advice on acquisition issues arising from PPMAP review process.

## DON Process for the Procurement Performance Management Assessment Program (PPMAP) Rating System (11/06/2013)

6. **Key Terms.** The PPMAP review process uses certain terms to describe the review outcome (*i.e.* findings). The PPMAP review may find evidence of actions that foster operational efficiency and effectiveness or, conversely, that are cause for concern, because they increase the risk of losing the public's trust as stewards of taxpayer funds; pose unnecessary risk to efficient and effective procurement operations; may have an adverse impact in meeting customer needs according to law, regulation or policy; and, may result in unfavorable media, criticism or exposure. As described below, the review may find noteworthy accomplishments and/or conditions that warrant management attention or corrective action that pose a certain level of risk to the contracting activity/organization.
- a. **Noteworthy accomplishments.** These are commendable actions that result from the use of a process, procedure, practice or resource in a manner that optimizes effective and efficient execution of procurement operations while complying with law, regulation and policy. When documenting the outcome of such actions, they are further classified by the positive effect on the execution of procurement operations, as follows:
- 1) ***Strength:*** A noteworthy process, procedure, or resource (*e.g.* business system), internal to the activity/organization, that exceeds standards established by law, regulation or policy for effective and efficient execution of procurement operations.
  - 2) ***Promising Practice:*** A process, program, resource, activity or strategy within the activity/organization that shows the potential, during its early stages, for becoming a best practice with long term sustainable impact. A promising practice must have some objective basis for claiming effectiveness and may have the potential for replication among other organizations.
  - 3) ***Best Practice:*** A method or technique that has consistently shown results superior to those achieved with other means, is used as a benchmark, and may be adopted as a standard way of doing work across multiple activities/organizations.
- b. **Conditions that warrant management attention or corrective action.** These are specific findings that arise from actions that do not adhere to law, regulation, policy or guidance in the conduct of executing delegated procurement/contracting authority. They pose unnecessary risk to efficient and effective procurement operations and may result in unfavorable media, criticism or exposure. These may result from the inefficient use of processes; the use of questionable practices to perform operations; the lack of effective internal controls and management controls which result in increased vulnerabilities for fraud, waste or abuse to occur; among others. They are further classified by the severity of their impact in terms of performance risk and/or occurrence trends, as follows:
- 1) ***Significant finding:*** A condition that impairs or may impair the ability of an activity/organization to perform its procurement mission; violates or may violate statutory requirements; significantly causes degradation or may cause degradation of safeguards against waste, unauthorized use or misappropriation of funds, loss of property or other assets; and results or may result in a conflict of interest. A significant finding requires immediate corrective action.

## DON Process for the Procurement Performance Management Assessment Program (PPMAP) Rating System (11/06/2013)

- 2) **Deficiency:** A condition that results from notable weaknesses in an activity's management/internal controls that have led or may lead to *systemic noncompliance* with applicable policy, regulations or key procurement processes. A deficiency requires corrective action.
  - 3) **Weakness:** An *isolated condition* that arises from a breakdown of an activity's management/internal controls and that may not reasonably ensure effective and efficient execution of procurement operations. Weaknesses may result in recommendations for improvements to internal policies, procedures and/or practices.
- c. **Risk.** A performance concept used to express the extent of uncertainty of events and/or their outcomes that could have a major effect on a DON contracting activity's assigned acquisition mission, strategic goals and objectives. Risk results from any course of action or inaction as an activity/organization pursues its goals and objectives. Risk levels vary in degree. For purposes of this process, there are four severity risk levels, as follows:
- 1) **Negligible Risk:** The contracting activity/organization has few weaknesses, no deficiencies or significant findings, and no indications of vulnerabilities to fraud, waste or abuse. The risk of adversely impacting procurement operations in meeting customer requirements according to law, regulation or policy is insignificant.
  - 2) **Low Risk:** The contracting activity/organization has a few significant findings that are isolated occurrences, and some deficiencies and/or weaknesses. The risk of adversely impacting procurement operations in meeting customer requirements according to law, regulation or policy is minor. The contracting activity/organization may easily institute corrective actions without external assistance.
  - 3) **Medium Risk:** The contracting activity/organization has some significant findings and some deficiencies and/or weaknesses. The contracting activity/organization is moderately at risk of adversely impacting procurement operations in meeting customer requirements according to law, regulation or policy. The activity/organization requires some external assistance implementing corrective actions.
  - 4) **High Risk:** The activity/organization has many significant findings and/or deficiencies and weaknesses. The activity/organization is imminently at risk of or is adversely impacting procurement operations in meeting customer requirements according to law, regulation or policy. The activity/organization requires external assistance implementing corrective actions.
7. **PPMAP Adjectival Rating Scheme.** There are four adjectival ratings that shall be used to determine the quality rating of procurement operations at a DON contracting activity, subordinate contracting organization, or field activity with delegated procurement authority. The ratings, which are described in Tables 7-1 through 7-4 below, are: *Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginal, and Unsatisfactory.*

**DON Process for the Procurement Performance Management Assessment Program (PPMAP) Rating System (11/06/2013)**

<b>TABLE 7-1: HIGHLY SATISFACTORY</b>	
<b>Principal Assessment Factor</b>	<b>Assessment Description</b>
Organizational Leadership	Leadership demonstrates a strong commitment towards responsible and accountable performance that clearly resonates throughout the contracting activity/subordinate contracting organization/field activity, and notably enables the effective and efficient execution of assigned acquisition/contracting mission and responsibilities.
Management Controls and Internal Controls	Highly effective management controls and internal controls are in place to enable execution of the acquisition mission. Acquisition staffing and workload analyses, including other management actions, are performed to identify and maintain optimal resource levels necessary for efficient execution of assigned acquisition mission. Key acquisition and procurement processes are fully implemented, managed, controlled, and periodically improved. Timely policy dissemination and implementation occurs and enables the workforce to effectively execute the contracting mission. Vulnerabilities to fraud, waste or abuse are essentially non-existent as there are highly effective management/internal control plans in place to mitigate vulnerabilities or to execute corrective actions if any found. No repeat findings remain as corrective actions from earlier PPMAP or internal reviews have been fully implemented. The overall tenets of DON's PPMAP review process have been implemented and are being followed.
Regulatory Compliance	The contracting activity/subordinate contracting organization/field activity clearly demonstrates a systematic approach to adhering to procurement law, regulation and policy. There are no significant findings or deficiencies. There are few weaknesses that are quickly correctable by the contracting activity/subordinate contracting organization/field activity. A demonstrated superior quality of contract files and thoroughly documented business decisions is prevalent throughout the contracting activity/subordinate contracting organization/field activity.
<b>Findings represent negligible risk</b>	

**DON Process for the Procurement Performance Management Assessment Program (PPMAP) Rating System (11/06/2013)**

<b>TABLE 7-2: SATISFACTORY</b>	
<b>Principal Assessment Factor</b>	<b>Assessment Description</b>
Organizational Leadership	Leadership demonstrates a commitment to responsible and accountable performance that resonates throughout the contracting activity/ subordinate contracting organization/field activity and enables the effective and efficient execution of assigned acquisition/contracting mission and responsibilities.
Management Controls and Internal Controls	Effective management controls and internal controls are in place to enable execution of the acquisition mission. Acquisition staffing and workload analyses are performed to identify and maintain sufficient resource levels necessary for efficient execution of assigned acquisition mission. Key acquisition and procurement processes are implemented, managed, controlled, and improved. Timely policy dissemination occurs to enable effective execution of contracting mission. Vulnerabilities to fraud, waste or abuse are negligible and there is an effective plan in place to mitigate vulnerabilities or to execute corrective actions if any found. Few repeat findings remain as corrective actions from earlier PPMAP or internal reviews have not been fully implemented. The basic tenets of DON's PPMAP review process have been implemented and are being followed.
Regulatory Compliance	The contracting activity/subordinate contracting organization/field activity demonstrates a systematic approach to adhering to procurement law, regulation and policy. Few significant findings, some deficiencies and/or weaknesses are noted that are easily correctable by the activity. A demonstrated good quality of contract files and sufficiently documented business decisions is apparent throughout the contracting activity/subordinate contracting organization/field activity.
<b>Findings represent low risk</b>	

**DON Process for the Procurement Performance Management Assessment Program (PPMAP) Rating System (11/06/2013)**

<b>TABLE 7-3: MARGINAL</b>	
<b>Principal Assessment Factor</b>	<b>Assessment Description</b>
Organizational Leadership	Leadership demonstrates a limited commitment to responsible and accountable performance within the contracting activity/subordinate contracting organization/field activity which hinders the effective and efficient execution of assigned acquisition/contracting mission and responsibilities.
Management Controls and Internal Controls	Effective management controls and internal controls are not always maintained to enable execution of the acquisition mission. Acquisition staffing and workload analyses, including other management actions, are not always performed to identify and/or maintain sufficient resource levels for efficient execution of assigned acquisition mission. Key acquisition and procurement processes are not fully implemented, managed, controlled, and improved. Timely policy dissemination does not always occur, negatively impacting effective execution of the contracting mission. Some vulnerability to fraud, waste or abuse exists and requires immediate action. A plan to mitigate vulnerabilities or to execute corrective actions is not in place or if in place is not being followed. Some repeat findings remain as corrective actions from earlier PPMAP or internal reviews have not been fully implemented. The overall tenets of DON's PPMAP review process have not been fully implemented or are not being followed.
Regulatory Compliance	The contracting activity/subordinate contracting organization/field activity does not always employ a systematic approach to adhering to procurement law, regulation and policy. There are some significant findings, deficiencies or weaknesses that are not isolated occurrences and require corrective action by the contracting activity, subordinate contracting organization/field activity with minimal, level-above management oversight. The quality of contract files is substandard and there is a lack of sufficiently documented business decisions.
<b>Findings represent medium risk</b>	

**DON Process for the Procurement Performance Management Assessment Program (PPMAP) Rating System (11/06/2013)**

<b>TABLE 7-4: UNSATISFACTORY</b>	
<b>Principal Assessment Factor</b>	<b>Assessment Description</b>
Organizational Leadership	Leadership does not demonstrate any commitment to responsible and accountable performance within the contracting activity/subordinate contracting organization/field activity to ensure effective and efficient execution of assigned acquisition/contracting mission and responsibilities.
Management Controls and Internal Controls	Effective management controls and internal controls are not in place to enable execution of the acquisition mission. Acquisition staffing and workload analyses, including other management actions, are not performed to identify and/or maintain sufficient resource levels for efficient execution of assigned acquisition mission. Key acquisition and procurement processes have not been implemented and the few that are in place are not managed, controlled, or improved. Policy dissemination or implementation rarely occurs, negatively impacting effective execution of contracting mission. Vulnerabilities to fraud, waste or abuse have been positively identified, and appropriate corrective actions have not been initiated. There is no plan in place to mitigate these vulnerabilities or to execute required corrective actions. Many repeat findings remain as corrective actions from earlier PPMAP or internal reviews have not been implemented. The overall tenets of DON's PPMAP review process have not been implemented or followed.
Regulatory Compliance	There is a demonstrated systemic pattern of not adhering to law, regulation or policy in the execution of assigned acquisition/contracting mission and responsibilities. There are many significant findings and/or deficiencies or weaknesses requiring immediate corrective action by the contracting activity/subordinate contracting organization/field activity with increased management oversight. The quality of contract files is substantially lacking and business decision documents are not sufficiently supported or are consistently missing.
<b>Findings represent high risk</b>	

## DON Process for the Procurement Performance Management Assessment Program (PPMAP) Rating System (11/06/2013)

### 8. PPMAP Principal Assessment Factors.

- a. To ensure consistency in the PPMAP review process across the Department, the DON PPMAP review process shall encompass the following principal assessment factors: *Organizational Leadership, Management and Internal Controls, and Regulatory Compliance*. Each factor consists of individual assessment areas as stated below.
  - 1) **Organizational Leadership.** Individual assessment areas in this factor include SECNAVINST 4200.37 paragraph 4.a.(1) *Tone from the Top*; paragraph 4.a.(5) *Acquisition Staffing Analysis and Validation*; SECNAVINST 4380.8C *Implementation of the Department of the Navy Small Business Programs*; DASN (AP) Focus Area *Organization and Function*; and, any other relevant assessment areas established by an HCA for HCA performed reviews.
  - 2) **Management Controls and Internal Controls.** Individual assessment areas in this factor include, SECNAVINST 4200.37 paragraphs 4.a.(3) *PPMAP*, 4.a.(4) *Warrant File Review*, and 4.a.(6) *Contract Review Board*; DASN(AP) Focus Areas *Management of Key Procurement Processes, Special Interest Items, Activity Self-Assessments/Internal Reviews/PPMAPs*; and, any other relevant assessment areas established by an HCA for HCA performed reviews.
  - 3) **Regulatory Compliance.** Individual assessment areas in this factor primarily encompass the outcome of the contract file reviews (*i.e. DASN(AP) Contract File Review Focus Area*) and any other relevant assessment area established by each HCA for HCA performed reviews.
- b. The PPMAP team will assess findings resulting from the review in terms of their degree of severity and the extent they adversely impact or pose undue risk to efficient and effective procurement operations. See specific direction and guidance in Sections 6 (Key Terms), 7 (PPMAP Adjectival Rating Scheme), and 9 (Assigning a PPMAP Adjectival Rating) of this process.

### 9. Assigning a PPMAP Adjectival Rating.

- a. Upon conclusion of a PPMAP review, one of the four adjectival ratings described in Section 7 of this process shall be assigned to a DON contracting activity, subordinate contracting organization or field activity with delegated procurement authority. This rating will establish the overall quality of procurement operations at the activity/organization given the outcome of the PPMAP.
- b. Personnel who perform PPMAP reviews must have the expertise necessary to participate in these reviews. This includes having knowledge of and/or experience using the PPMAP review procedures and tools the HCA (or DASN(AP) when participating in PPMAPs of HCAs) has in place for conducting PPMAPs. Good communication (oral, written) and analytical skills are paramount, because each member is required to thoroughly document the assessment of their assigned areas for review. Table 5-1 in

## **DON Process for the Procurement Performance Management Assessment Program (PPMAP) Rating System (11/06/2013)**

Section 5 of this process identifies some of the roles and responsibilities of PPMAP personnel.

- c. To ensure consistency in the process leading to the recommended final rating of an activity/organization, PPMAP teams shall follow these general directions:
  - 1) The PPMAP review shall encompass the principal assessment factors in Section 8 of this process.
  - 2) The assessment methodologies include, but are not limited to reviews of source documentation in support of the individual assessment areas; interviews of key stakeholders who participate in the execution of procurement and contracting operations, reviews of a reasonable sample of contract files.
  - 3) PPMAP team members shall follow Section 6, Key Terms, of this process to determine whether an action or a condition noted during a PPMAP review is a noteworthy accomplishment (*i.e.* strength, promising practice, best practice) or a condition that warrants management attention or corrective action (*i.e.* significant finding, deficiency, weakness). It is paramount that PPMAP team members clearly understand the difference between each of the key terms in these two categories.
  - 4) PPMAP team members shall sufficiently document the rationale in support of each action or condition noted using the format provided by the PPMAP Lead. The written assessment for each factor shall clearly identify and sufficiently support, why an action or condition is noted as a strength, promising practice, best practice, significant finding, deficiency, and/or weakness, as appropriate.
  - 5) The PPMAP team will discuss the outcome (*i.e.* findings) of each individual assessed area within the principal assessment factors. The PPMAP team will consider the degree of severity and the extent findings requiring management attention and/or corrective action adversely impact or pose undue risk to efficient and effective procurement operations.
  - 6) The PPMAP team is to deliberate on the preponderance of the findings using as a baseline the guidance in this process to determine the risk severity level in Section 6, Key Terms, and use Section 7, PPMAP Adjectival Rating Scheme (Tables 7-1 through 7-4) to determine the overall adjectival rating for each principal assessment factor.
  - 7) The PPMAP Lead, in consultation with the PPMAP team and through consensus, will recommend or assign, if this authority has been delegated to the PPMAP Lead, a final adjectival rating that best describes the overall quality of procurement operations at the contracting activity/organization. In the event consensus is not reached, a PPMAP team member may submit a written opinion to the PPMAP Lead stating the member's rationale in support of a different adjectival rating for the contracting activity/organization. The PPMAP Lead shall consider any dissenting

## **DON Process for the Procurement Performance Management Assessment Program (PPMAP) Rating System (11/06/2013)**

opinion submitted by a team member during the deliberative process when recommending or determining the adjectival rating.

- 8) To determine the recommended final rating for the contracting activity/organization the following directions apply:
  - a) An assessment factor that is rated *Unsatisfactory* will result in the same final recommended overall rating for the Activity.
  - b) An assessment factor that is rated *Marginal* may result in the same final recommended overall rating for the Activity.
  - c) Two of the three assessment factors must receive a *Highly Satisfactory* rating for the final overall rating for an Activity to be *Highly Satisfactory*.
  - d) Under no circumstances shall the final overall rating of an Activity be above *Satisfactory* if a principal assessment factor is rated *Marginal*.
- 9) The rationale leading to the overall PPMAP rating shall be substantiated in the PPMAP report.
- d. Assignment of PPMAP ratings shall not be made on a “provisional” or “interim” basis, unless DASN(AP) approves, in writing, the rationale in support of the proposed provisional or interim rating. An interim or provisional rating may be appropriate in isolated cases where there is a clear indication of a positive trend of improvement due to recent turnover of leadership/key personnel; the adoption of new key procurement processes or other management controls/internal controls; among other actions.

### **10. Impact of a PPMAP Rating**

- a. The expectation is for all DON contracting activities, subordinate contracting organizations and field activities to be executing delegated contracting/procurement authorities at a “Satisfactory” quality level. Any DON contracting activity, subordinate contracting organization and field activity that is assigned a PPMAP rating of “Marginal” or “Unsatisfactory” is not performing efficiently and effectively its delegated authority. These ratings indicate that there are notable vulnerabilities and associated risk that must be promptly mitigated through increased procurement management oversight activities and defined corrective actions. Receipt of a *Marginal* or *Unsatisfactory* rating shall require a more frequent PPMAP review periodicity as reflected in the Table of paragraph 10.b.
- b. A PPMAP rating below “Satisfactory” will affect the PPMAP review periodicity. SECNAVINST 4200.37 requires a PPMAP review periodicity no greater than 36 months between PPMAPs, unless DASN(AP) approves an alternate schedule (Paragraph 4.a(3)(a) refers). DON policy also requires an increase in the frequency of reviews when vulnerabilities or risks are identified. The structure of these additional reviews may vary, e.g. on-site reviews; combination on-site and virtual reviews, or virtual reviews. To

**DON Process for the Procurement Performance Management Assessment Program (PPMAP) Rating System (11/06/2013)**

ensure consistency in the application of DON policy in this area, the duration between PPMAPs shall be as specified in the following table, unless prior approval is obtained, in writing, from DASN(AP):

<b>Activity PPMAP Rating of Record</b>	<b>PPMAP Review Periodicity *</b>
Highly Satisfactory	Within 36 months
Satisfactory	Within 36 months
Marginal	Within 18 months
Unsatisfactory	Within 12 months
	<i>*From last day of on-site PPMAP review</i>

- c. The review scope of a follow-up PPMAP review of a contracting activity, subordinate contracting organization, or field activity rated below “Satisfactory” is dependent on the preponderance of findings resulting from the earlier PPMAP. The outcome of the follow-up review will be assessed against this current process to determine an adjectival rating assignment.
- d. Other management actions, such as, increased or reduced HCA level-above management and oversight reviews as well as increased and/or reduced or revoked contracting/procurement authority, among other actions, may be taken commensurate to assigned ratings, as appropriate.
- e. Note that NMCARS 5201.691-2(d) requires HCAs to report on the outcomes of reviews performed under the HCA in accordance with the PPMAP review process. In addition, NMCARS 5201.691-2(e) requires HCAs to notify DASN(AP), in writing, within five calendar days, each time an HCA revokes, suspends or reduces contracting or purchase card authority to a cognizant field contracting activity or subordinate organization.

**11. Process Management and Oversight**

- a. Management and oversight of this process is a shared responsibility between DASN(AP) and HCAs. DASN(AP) will oversee HCA implementation and management of this process during PPMAPs of HCAs, reviews of HCA Annual PPMAP Reports, and PPMAP Council events.
- b. HCAs are responsible for implementing this process throughout the contracting activity and all subordinate contracting organizations and field activities. HCAs must ensure that management controls are in place to validate compliance with this process.
- c. The DON PPMAP Council will annually review and evaluate this process to determine whether the process remains effective for use by PPMAP teams within the DON or if revisions in the rating system are necessary. To facilitate this annual review, the HCA shall ensure that any recommendations for improvement to this process, including any lessons learned or promising practices associated with the process, are forwarded with the HCA's annual PPMAP report to DASN(AP) which is due by January 30th each year.