

Contractor Performance Information



Guiding Principles

- The primary purpose of past performance evaluations is to ensure that accurate data on contractor performance is current and available for use in source selections.
- A past performance evaluation report provides a record of a contractor's performance, both positive and negative, on a given contract during a specified period of time.
- The quality of the narrative component supporting the past performance information evaluation is critical.
- If the evaluator takes the time to prepare an accurate and complete report, the evaluator helps ensure better quality in the products and services DOE buys now and those DOE plans to buy in the future.

References

Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Subparts

- 8.4 Federal Supply Schedules – 8.406-7 Contractor performance evaluation
- 9.1 Responsible Prospective Contractors – 9.104 Standards and 9.105 Procedures
- 12.2 Special Requirements for the Acquisition of Commercial Items - 12.206 Use of past performance
- 13.1 Procedures – 13.106-2 Evaluation of quotations or offers
- 15.3 Source Selection - 15.305 Proposal evaluation
- 36.2 Special Aspects of Contracting for Construction - 36.201 Evaluation of contractor performance
- 36.6 Architect-Engineer Services - 36.603 Collecting data and appraising firms qualifications and 36.604 Performance evaluation
- 42.15 Contractor Performance Information

DEAR and Acquisition Guide

- 936.602-70 DOE selection criteria
- 970.1706-1 Award, renewal and extension
- 970.4402-2 General requirements
- Chapter 15.1 Source Selection Guide

- Chapter 15.3 Establishing Evaluation Criteria
- Chapter 70.9 Contract Options: Evaluating Contractor Past Performance

This chapter has three sections. Section I provides an overview of DOE’s policy and procedures on evaluating contractor performance information. Section II describes DOE’s application of the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS). Section III addresses DOE’s internal management controls and the compliance assessments of contractor performance information.

Section I. OVERVIEW

The Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 42.15 – Contractor Performance Information requires that contractor performance information be collected and maintained. This information is used to evaluate past performance of an offeror as described in a solicitation in accordance with FAR Part 15. This chapter sets forth policy, assigns roles and responsibilities, and provides procedures for evaluating contractor performance as required by FAR Part 42.15.

A. OFPP Guidance

The Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994, at section 1091, amended the Office of Federal Procurement Policy (OFPP) Act to specify that past performance is a relevant factor to consider in contractor selection. It directs OFPP to issue guidance on the use of past performance in contractor source selections.

In the July 29, 2009 OFPP memorandum on *Improving the Use of Contractor Performance Information*, the memorandum describes new requirements in the FAR to strengthen the use of contractor performance information, outlines associated management responsibilities that agency Chief Acquisition Officers (CAOs) and Senior Procurement Executives (SPEs) must take to support robust implementation of these practices, and establishes the review process that OFPP will use to further improve contractor performance information. A copy of this memorandum is available at http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/procurement_index_memo/.

OFPP will be issuing a guide entitled *Contractor Assessment in the Acquisition Process*. This Guide will contain useful techniques for using contractor performance information. When the OFPP Guide is issued, DOE guidance, including this Guide Chapter, will be updated as necessary.

B. General

As of October 2008, Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) is the mandatory Department of Energy (DOE) system used to report contractor performance into Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS). PPIRS is the official Government source to retrieve contractor performance information.

The primary purpose of past performance evaluations is to ensure the contractor is held accountable for its performance and that accurate data on contractor performance is current and available for use in source selections. Performance evaluations will be used as a resource in awarding best value contracts and orders to contractors that consistently provide quality, on-time products and services that conform to contractual requirements. Evaluations can be used to effectively communicate a contractor's strengths and weaknesses to source selection officials.

DOE uses CPARS for reporting and collecting past performance evaluations, as required by the FAR. CPARS is an automated contractor performance information database that feeds the evaluations to the government-wide PPIRS, which is the single, authorized application to retrieve contractor performance information.

Contractor performance on a classified contract is not exempt from evaluation. Contractor performance evaluation on a classified program will be managed in accordance with the records management procedures in the DOE Information Security Manual (DOE M 470.4-A or its successor version). Copies of classified contractor performance evaluations will be maintained and distributed in accordance with the DOE Information Security Manual. ***Evaluations of classified contracts shall not be entered into CPARS or PPIRS.***

Through PPIRS, the contractor performance information can be retrieved by the contracting activity for use in the source selection process to support making an award based on a best value.

Government access to PPIRS is restricted to those individuals who are working on source selections. Each contracting activity shall have a PPIRS Access Authorization Agent who controls and provides government access. A contractor can obtain access to its performance information in PPIRS through the Central Contractor Registration process. To obtain access, a contractor must enter a Marketing Partner Identification Number (MPIN) in its profile in the Central Contractor Registration system (<http://www.ccr.gov/>). The contractor can use this number to access its reports in PPIRS. The contractor will need to know its DUNS in order to update contact information in its CCR profile. To access information in PPIRS, a contractor logs in using their DUNS and MPIN numbers.

Section II. CPARS Application

CPARS is a web-enabled application that collects and manages the library of automated evaluations and is accessible from <https://www.cpars.csd.disa.mil>. CPARS facilitates communication and cooperation between the Federal Government and industry. It provides contractor performance information to include Government ratings and narratives, as well as industry narratives.

Irrespective of the type or complexity of the contractor performance appraisal systems (e.g., performance based acquisition reviews, performance evaluation and measurement reports, contract management plans, award fee determinations, etc.) that are used by DOE program

elements, contractor performance evaluations required by FAR 42.15 must be entered into CPARS. MA-60 is available to assist in creating a crosswalk between the other contractor performance appraisal system ratings to CPARS ratings.

A. Roles and Responsibilities in CPARS

- **Contract Data Entry (Optional role) (This is the only role that a support contractor can perform.)**
 - Input contract information for specific contracts
 - Run evaluation status reports
 - View/print basic contract information

- **Assessing Official Representative (AOR) (Federal Acquisition Certification (FAC) Certified Contracting Officer Representative) (AOR is recommended by the Program Manager or designee.)**
 - Input/register contract information for specific contracts (if determined by the contracting activity that this responsibility belongs to an AOR)
 - Initiate evaluations (only an AOR responsibility) to include the interim report, if applicable and the final report
 - To ensure quality, accurate and complete evaluations, prepare the evaluations using the CPAR Quality Checklist (Attachment A) prior to sending to the contractor
 - Update incomplete evaluations for specific contracts
 - Delete incomplete evaluations for specific contracts
 - View/print evaluations
 - Run evaluation status reports
 - Run contract status reports

- **Assessing Official (Contracting Officer or Contract Specialist)**
 - Ensures the AOR and the Contractor are knowledgeable about CPARS and the available on-line training
 - Input/register contract information for specific contracts (if determined by the contracting activity that this responsibility belongs to an AO)
 - Update incomplete evaluations for specific contracts
 - Delete incomplete evaluations for specific contracts
 - View/print evaluations
 - To ensure quality, accurate and complete evaluations, review all evaluations using the CPAR Quality Checklist (Attachment A) prior to sending to the contractor
 - Run evaluation status reports
 - Run contract status reports
 - Review contractor comments for assigned contracts
 - Modify evaluation ratings, for specific contracts after contractor comments, if required
 - Finalizes each evaluation

- **Contractor Representative (Contractor/Vendor)**
 - Input contractor comments for specific contracts.
 - View completed evaluations for assigned contracts.
 - View status reports for assigned evaluations
 - View status reports for assigned contracts.

- **Senior Contractor Representative (Contractor/Vendor – Optional)**
 - View completed evaluations for assigned contracts
 - View contract status report for assigned contracts
 - View evaluation status report for assigned contracts
 - View rating metric report for assigned contracts
 - View consolidated report (in ACASS/CCASS only)

- **Reviewing Official (One level above Assessing Official)**
 - View/print evaluations
 - Ensure that the AOR is preparing and submitting quality, accurate and complete evaluations in accordance with the CPAR Quality Checklist (Attachment A)
 - Ensure that the AO is reviewing the evaluations for quality, accurate and complete evaluations in accordance with the CPAR Quality Checklist (Attachment A)
 - View evaluation status report
 - View contract status report
 - Resolves disagreements

- **Focal Point (CPARS point of contact at contracting activities)**
 - Input/Register contract information.
 - Authorize access to evaluations within own contracting activity (source selection access not included)
 - View status report for assigned evaluations.
 - View contract status report for assigned contracts
 - View rating metrics for assigned evaluations
 - View processing times report for assigned evaluations
 - View/print evaluations
 - Input a completed evaluation
 - Delete a registered contract

- **Agency Point of Contact (Agency Coordinator)**
(On-line CPARS information will title this position as the Command Point of Contact)
 - Authorize access to Senior Agency Official (*Designated representative or Head of the Contracting Activity*)
 - View evaluation status report within agency
 - View contract status report within agency
 - View rating metric report within agency

- **Senior Agency Official (Designated representative or Head of the Contracting Activity)** (On-line CPARS information will title this position as the Senior Command Official)
 - View evaluation status report within agency
 - View contract status report within agency
 - View rating metric report within agency
 - View processing times report within agency

- **Program Offices**
 - The Program Manager, or designee, shall recommend a FAC certified COR* (AOR) to be the Assessing Official Representative. This representative shall be trained in the use of the CPARS and perform the related responsibilities to include initiating and maintaining the evaluations. AORs typically are assigned from the technical, functional, or quality assurance areas.

 - The Program Manager, or designee, shall ensure that other relevant personnel communicate with the AOR regarding contractor performance. The personnel can provide technical information about the contractor's performance to the AOR who can include this information in the evaluation.

* For information on a FAC certified COR, see DEAR 901.603-70 Appointment of Contracting Officers and Contracting Officer's Representatives and the Department of Energy Orders (DOE O) 541.1B Appointment of Contracting Officers and Contracting Officer Representatives and DOE O 361.1B Acquisition Career Management Program.

B. Reporting Criteria and Responsibility for Completing Evaluations

In order to ensure consistent, comprehensive, and meaningful contractor past performance information, the information shall be collected for all contract actions that require reporting into the Federal Procurement Data System-Next Generation (FPDS-NG) in accordance with FAR Subpart 4.6 – Contract Reporting. It involves all contracts to include contracts for indefinite delivery, Management and Operating (M&O), national laboratories, major sites and facilities, Federal Supply Schedule orders, orders placed using Basic Ordering Agreements or Blanket Purchase Agreements, and task orders and delivery orders.

The thresholds for preparing past performance evaluations as stated at FAR 42.1502 are as follows:

- Supplies (products) and services > \$100,000 (simplified acquisition threshold)
- Construction > \$550,000 (or any amount in the case of a default termination)
- Architect-Engineer (A&E) services > \$30,000 (or any amount in the case of a default termination)

In addition, when the contract includes the clause 52.219-9, Small Business Subcontracting Plan, the evaluation shall include an evaluation of the contractor's performance against, and efforts to achieve the goals identified in the plan.

A past performance evaluation report provides a record of a contractor's performance, both positive and negative, on a given contract during a specified period of time. Each evaluation should use supportable program and contract management data and should be based on objective data, to the maximum extent practicable or subjective data, when objective data is not available. When a contract or order includes appropriated funds and non-appropriated funds, the contracting activity shall evaluate the contractor's performance as a whole and submit an evaluation report in accordance with the procedures in this chapter. Examples of supportable program and contract management data include cost performance reports, customer comments, quality reviews, technical interchange meetings, financial solvency assessments, construction/production management reviews, subcontracting reports, contractor operations reviews, functional performance evaluations, earned contract incentives, relationships with subcontractors and/or the government, resolution of labor issues, and timely payment to subcontractors.

To improve efficiency in preparing the evaluation report, it is recommended that the evaluation be completed together with other reviews e.g., performance based acquisition reviews, performance evaluation and measurement reports, contract management plans, award fee determinations, major program events, and quality assurance surveillance records.

C. Types of Contract Actions to Report in CPARS

The following actions shall be reported to CPARS in accordance with the thresholds prescribed in paragraph B of this Guide Chapter.

- **Definitive contracts* to include M&O and non-M&O major site and facility contracts** (**Definitive contract is any contract that must be reported to FPDS-NG*):
 - Individual evaluation for the contract.
- **Indefinite-Delivery-Indefinite-Quantity contracts, to include Energy Savings Performance Contracts:**
 - For multi-agency contract(s) or Governmentwide acquisition contract(s), prepare an individual evaluation for each order that exceeds the simplified acquisition threshold. If orders are similar in scope, the contracting officer may consider consolidating the evaluations. Refer to FAR 42.1502 (c).
 - For single-agency task order and delivery order contract(s), the contracting officer may require evaluations for each order in excess of the simplified acquisition threshold when such evaluations would produce more useful past performance information for source selection officials than the overall contract evaluation (e.g.,

when the scope of the basic contracts is very broad and the nature of individual orders could be significantly different). Refer to FAR 42.1502 (d).

- **Blanket Purchase Agreements and Basic Ordering Agreements:**
 - Prepare an individual evaluation for each order in excess of the simplified acquisition threshold. Consolidation of the orders is appropriate for the evaluation if the orders are similar in scope and are issued during the 12 month rating period.
 - If there is only one contractor or vendor and the orders are similar in scope, one evaluation for the agreement covering all the orders issued during the 12 month rating period under the agreement is acceptable.

- **Federal Supply Schedules orders:**
 - Requiring activity or ordering agency prepares an evaluation for each order that exceeds the simplified acquisition threshold.

- **Joint Ventures:**
 - Single evaluation is prepared if there is a unique DUNS number.
 - Multiple identical evaluations are prepared if there are separate DUNS numbers.

- **Undefinitized Contract Actions (UCAs):**
 - Prior to definitization
 - Address performance beginning with date UCA is issued
 - Address contractor's ability to remain within UCA cost limitations
 - Following definitization
 - Address contractor's efforts in promoting contract definitization
 - If definitized as cost type contract – continue to address cost control
 - If definitized as firm-fixed price contract – only address cost control efforts prior to definitization

- **Small Business Subcontracting Plan(s):**
 - When the contract includes the clause 52.219-9, Small Business Subcontracting Plan, the evaluation shall include an evaluation of the contractor's performance against, and efforts to achieve the goals identified in the plan.
 - When placing a task order or delivery order against a single-agency contract, the evaluation need not consider this subcontracting requirement, unless the contracting officer deems it appropriate. However, the evaluation of the contractor's performance against, and efforts to achieve the goals identified in the plan, is required at the contract level.

- **Construction Contract(s) or Architect-Engineer Services Contract(s):**
 - For construction contracts or architect-engineer services contracts, instead of reporting these contracts into CPARS, report these actions to Construction

Contractor Appraisal Support System (CCASS) or to Architect-Engineer Contract Administration Support Systems (ACASS), respectively.

D. Contract Performance Modules and Handling Information

The CPARS process is designed with a series of checks-and-balances to facilitate the objective and consistent evaluation of contractor performance. Both Government and contractor perspectives are captured. The opportunity to review and/or comment on an evaluation by the designated Government and contractor personnel together makes a complete evaluation. The application sends out automated email notifications on user access and reminders of evaluations to be entered and reviewed during each stage of the evaluation process. Please refer to the CPARS User Guide for a listing of all the email notifications that are offered. The User Guide can be found on the CPARS web site.

This application consists of three different contract performance modules that are designed for UNCLASSIFIED information and use only:

- Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS): Used to document contractor delivery and performance on systems and non-systems contracts including services, information technology, major systems, and operations support (spares and repair parts for existing systems, commercial off-the-shelf or non-developmental).
- Architect-Engineer Contract Administration Support Systems (ACASS): Used to document contractor performance on Architect-Engineer contracts.
- Construction Contractor Appraisal Support System (CCASS): Used to document contractor performance on construction contracts.

All CPARS, ACASS, and CCASS information is treated as “For Official Use Only/Source Selection Information” in accordance with FAR 2.101 and 3.104. It is protected by the Privacy Act and is not releasable under the Freedom of Information Act. Performance evaluations may be withheld from public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act exemptions.

The Government personnel, who are granted access to the CPARS, are responsible for ensuring that a CPAR evaluation is appropriately marked and handled. All CPAR forms, attachments and working papers must be marked “FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY/SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 2.101 AND 3.104” according to Freedom of Information Act Program, FAR 3.104, and 41 USC Sect. 423.

As CPARS contains Source Selection/Business Sensitive performance information, it is prohibited to transmit a CPAR evaluation as an attachment to an email. A CPAR evaluation may also contain information that is proprietary to the contractor. Information contained in the CPAR

evaluation, such as trade secrets and protected commercial or financial data obtained from the contractor in confidence, must be protected from unauthorized disclosure. To ensure that future readers of the evaluations in the PPIRS are informed and will protect the information as required, the Assessing Official and the Reviewing Official shall annotate on the CPAR if it contains material that is proprietary, a trade secret, etc.

Due to the sensitive nature of a CPAR evaluation, disclosure of CPAR data to contractors other than the contractor that is the subject of the report, or other entities outside the Government, is not authorized. Disclosure of CPAR data to advisory and assistance support contractors other than the contractor that is the subject of the report is strictly prohibited. A contractor will be granted access to its CPAR evaluation maintained in the CPARS by the activity Focal Point.

E. Categories of Business Sectors

Each evaluation must identify the applicable business sector for the supply or service. The Federal Supply Code (FSC) will determine the applicable business sector. In the Federal Procurement Data System-Next Generation (FPDS-NG), the code is called the Product Service Code (PSC).

FSC MAPPING: CPARS receives award information from FPDS-NG and makes it available in the Focal Point's Auto Register feature. CPARS uses the FSC/PSC code to map to the correct CPARS module; CPARS, ACASS, or CCASS. Here is how the FSC/PSC code for a procurement is used to map to the CPARS modules. The FSC/PSC is mapped to a business sector which determines the type of assessment form that is filled out in CPARS. The FSC mapping is fairly straight forward, however, there are a few exceptions as follows:

- For code "A", Research and Development, the mapping will be to either a service form or a system form. Note when a contract is registered in CPARS (this doesn't apply to ACASS and CCASS) the user can still change the business sector if needed from a Systems to a Services (or vice versa) with no issues. However, once they "Initiate a CPAR," the form is created (e.g. Systems or Service) so no further change is possible. Unless, the user notices the CPAR is the wrong form and decides to delete the CPAR and start over again.
- For code "B", Special Studies and Analyses, the mapping will be to CPARS, except for the following which will be mapped to ACASS:
 - B510 Study/Environmental Assessments
 - B517 Geological Studies
 - B518 Geophysical Assessments
 - B526 Oceanological Studies
 - B532 Soil Studies
 - B543 Energy Studies

- For code "C", Architect and Engineering Services, the mapping will be to ACASS, except for C124 - Utilities which will be mapped to CPARS.
- For code "F", Natural Resources and Conservation Services, the mapping will be to CPARS, except for the following which will be mapped to ACASS:
 - F109 Leaking Underground Storage Tank Support Services
 - F110 Dev of Environ Impact Statements & Assessments
 - F111 Surveys & Tech Support for Multiple Pollutants
- For all "Z" codes, Maintenance, Repair or Alteration of Real Property, the mapping is to CPARS, but the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) will also be used to determine whether an action should be considered Contracting and entered in the CCASS module. For all the Z codes, if the corresponding NAICS begins with 23XXXX, then the award/order becomes available in CCASS when it exceeds \$550,000. If the NAICS is other than 23XXXX, the award/order is a service and it becomes available in CPARS when it exceeds \$100,000.

CPARS forms for services or systems: There are only two forms used in CPARS - services or systems. A system sector/sub-element form is more technical than a service form. The system form has several sub-elements under the technical and management elements.

The rating elements on a service form (Information Technology and Operations Support business sectors also use this form) include:

- Quality of Product or Service
- Schedule
- Cost Control
- Business Relations
- Management of Key Personnel
- Utilization of Small Business
- Other Areas

The rating elements on a system form include:

- Technical (which includes additional sub-elements for product performance, systems engineering, software engineering, logistics support/sustainment, product assurance, and other technical performance)
- Schedule
- Cost Control
- Management (which includes additional sub-elements; management responsiveness, subcontract management, and program and other management)
- Utilization of Small Business
- Other Areas

Not all of the ratings apply to every contract and can be not applicable when necessary (e.g. Cost Control is not rated for Firm Fixed Price contracts). Each form includes "Other Areas," which are free text and allows rating unique elements not already covered.

The listing of the business sectors is as follows:

Based on DOE's FPDS-NG reporting, the facility management contracts which include M&Os and non-M&Os major site and facility contracts are under different Federal Supply Codes (FSC)/Product Service Code (PSC). Most of these contracts will be under the services business sector. A few of these contracts will be under the systems business sector. See FSC Mapping and CPARS forms for services or systems above for a detailed explanation.

CPARS

- **Services –**
 - Professional/technical/management support
 - Healthcare
 - Repair and overhaul
 - Installation maintenance
 - Transportation
- **Information Technology – in accordance with FAR 2.101 definition**
 - Software
 - Hardware
 - Telecommunications – includes equipment and services
- **Operations Support – spares and repair parts for existing systems, commercial off the shelf or non-developmental, i.e., commodities, supplies, etc.**
 - Spares
 - Repair parts
 - Electronics
 - Ammunition
 - Mechanical
 - Electrical
 - Structural
 - Base supplies
 - Fuels
 - Troop support – for purchasing clothing, uniforms, protective gear, food/subsistence, medical supplies and equipment, medicines, and diagnostic equipment

- **Systems - products that require a significant amount of new engineering or development work**
 - Aircraft
 - Shipbuilding, repair and overhaul
 - Space
 - Ordnance
 - Ground vehicles
 - Training systems
 - Sub-systems
 - Other systems – when the list above does not apply

CCASS

- **Construction Services**

ACASS

- **Architect-Engineer Services**

G. Types of Evaluation Reports and Reporting Frequency

See Section A. Roles and Responsibilities for an explanation of the roles mentioned below.

1. Initial Report

- Required if period of performance is greater than 365 calendar days (the initial report may be the first interim report and reflect at least the first 180 days of performance) – reporting is done on an annual basis.
- Not required if period of performance is less than 365 calendar days – see final report below (the initial report will be the final report).
- No more than 12 months of actual performance.
- Evaluation period commences at contract award.

2. Interim (Intermediate) Reports

- Required every 12 months based on contract award date.
- Complete with other reviews (e.g., Performance Evaluation and Measurement Reports, Contract Management Plans, Option Exercise, Award Fee Determinations, and Program Milestones).
- Assessing Official Representative writes the evaluation and sends it to the Assessing Official.
- Assessing Official reviews and sends the report to the contractor.
- Required upon transfer of program management responsibility outside original contracting activity.

- Not cumulative. Assessment is done for the performance occurring since last evaluation period.

3. Out-of-Cycle Report

- Written, if there is significant change in performance that alters the evaluation in one or more evaluation areas, at
 - Government's discretion; or
 - Contractor's request.
- Address only those areas that have changed.
- No more than 1 out-of-cycle report may be completed per 12 month period of performance.
- Out-of-cycle evaluation does not alter the annual reporting requirement.

4. Final Report

- Assessing Official Representative writes the evaluation and sends it to the Assessing Official.
- Assessing Official reviews and sends the report to the contractor.
- Required at:
 - Contract completion (end of period of performance);
 - Delivery of final end item(s); or
 - Transfer of program management responsibility outside the original contracting activity.
- Required if there is a contract termination.
- Not cumulative. The report assesses only performance occurring since last evaluation period.
- All final reports are due within 120 calendar days after the end of the evaluation period.

5. Addendum Report

- May be prepared after the final report, to record the contractor's performance relative to contract closeout, warranty performance, and other administrative requirements.

H. Records Retention for Contractor Performance Evaluations

Contractor performance evaluations prepared in CPARS should be maintained in electronic form. In CPARS, the evaluation reports are retained for a period of one year after the FINAL CPAR evaluation is completed. For Architect-Engineer and Construction evaluations, these reports are retained for six years. The reports are then placed in an archive table where they can be retrieved if necessary. In PPIRS, CPAR evaluations reports are retained for three years after the contract completion date. Architect-Engineer and Construction evaluations reports are retained for six years.

I. Narrative Guidelines for Evaluation Report

The quality of the narrative component supporting the past performance information evaluation is critical. The narrative is necessary to establish that the ratings are credible and justifiable. These narratives need not be lengthy, but need to be as clear, comprehensive and concise as possible. A description of the problems or successes experienced and how well the contractor worked with the Government to resolve the problems shall be addressed. This description shall include but is not limited to issues with subcontractors or “partners” in joint venture or teaming arrangements, delivery milestones, etc. The narrative is also useful for future acquisitions; it helps Assessing Officials to establish the relevancy of the work covered to the current requirement. In advance of finalizing a significant negative past performance rating or where the Government may have contributed to, or reflected on the performance outcome, the contracting officer should consult with local counsel as appropriate. For examples of narratives, see Attachment C.

- **Narrative descriptions shall include, as applicable:**
 - Detail of scope
 - Complexity of contract
 - Key technologies
 - Quality of product or service
 - Schedule
 - Business relations (e.g. how well the contractor communicates and works the Government and others to perform the contract work)
 - Subcontracting effort
 - Small business utilization
 - Management of key personnel (e.g. how the key personnel are managing the contract work)
 - Definitions of acronyms and technical terms
 - Cost control
 - Other areas necessary to support contractor performance

- **The narrative should:**
 - Address recent and relevant contractor performance
 - Collect input from entire program/project team
 - Provide reader a complete understanding of the contractor’s performance
 - Have a narrative for each rated element
 - Address
 - Rating changes from prior reports
 - Benefit and/or impact to the Government
 - Recognize risk inherent in the effort
 - Recognize the Government’s role, if any, in contractor’s inability to meet requirements.

- Where the Government's role may have negatively contributed to, or reflected on the contractor's performance, the contracting officer should consult with local counsel as appropriate prior to submitting an evaluation report.
 - Indicate major and minor strengths and weaknesses
 - Be consistent with
 - Program metrics
 - Ratings (For CPARS evaluation ratings definitions, see Attachment B.)
 - Contract objectives
 - Document problems and solutions
 - Contain non-personal and objective statements
- **Statements to avoid in a narrative are as follows:** (*Attachment A provides more information.*)
 - Outside contract scope
 - In our opinion
 - It appeared
 - We believe
 - We hope
 - We were not happy
 - We did not like
 - We think

J. CPAR quality checklist

This checklist will guide an evaluator in creating a quality CPAR (report) which allows a reader, with no personal knowledge of the procurement, to gain a complete understanding of the Contractor's performance. If the evaluator takes the time to prepare an accurate and complete report, the evaluator helps ensure better quality in the products and services DOE buys now and those DOE plans to buy in the future. Attachment A is the CPAR quality checklist.

K. System reminder emails

To facilitate the reporting process, CPARS provides a variety of system reminder e-mail for the Government and the contractor. A list of the system reminders is as follows:

- **System Reminders**
 - Evaluation due (Assessing Official, Focal Point)
 - 30 calendar days before the evaluation is due
 - Helps to ensure that reports are completed in timely manner
 - Evaluation overdue (Assessing Official, Focal Point)
 - Contractor comments due (Assessing Official, Contractor)
 - Contractor comments overdue/review period expired (Assessing Official)

- Evaluation complete (Contractor/Vendor)
- Access Assignment (All Roles)

L. CPARS Training

The Assessing Official (contract specialist or contracting officer) is responsible for ensuring that the contracting officer's representative (COR or as the Assessing Official Representative (AOR)) and the contractor are knowledgeable about the CPARS and the on-line training that is available to them. Training for both the Government and contractors is offered monthly via webcast and the calendar can be found on the CPARS web site. The following classes are highly recommended to all DOE employees who are responsible at any stage of past performance evaluations:

- CPARS Overview
- ACASS/CCASS Overview
- Quality and Narrative Writing
- Focal Point Functions

For contractors to become familiar with CPARS, the following class is highly recommended:

- Contractor Overview

Section III. Internal Management Controls -- Compliance Assessments of Contractor Performance Information

Each contracting activity shall establish a process for conducting regular compliance assessments to include assigning a primary point of contact responsible for the compliance assessments. Part of the compliance assessment shall be to review the process and review the performance metrics used to measure compliance and quality on a regular basis. The objective is to achieve 100% quality CPARS submission and completion of all applicable contract/orders of contractor performance information.

A. Process Reviews

The regular compliance assessments of contractor performance information are comprised of several process reviews. These reviews are (1) the Balanced Scorecard (BSC), (2) self- assessment and (3) CPARS data quality reviews.

- **BSC and Self-assessment**

The Balanced Scorecard/Procurement Management Review (BSC/PMR) self assessment checklist shall be performed and submitted on a yearly basis. The purpose of the BSC/PMR self

assessment checklist is to ensure proper monitoring of whether the CPARS objectives are being met, and the extent to which the planned actions to achieve them are working. The BSC/PMR checklist contains specific criteria to assess the use of contractor performance information for pre-solicitation, source selection and contractor performance.

- **CPARS Data Quality Reviews**

The CPARS data quality reviews shall be performed and submitted on a quarterly basis. The CPARS data quality reviews are part of the DOE Data Quality Reviews. The CPARS data quality reviews shall regularly measure the contractor performance information for compliance and quality. Each contracting activity shall review the activity's performance metrics to evaluate and validate the quality and timeliness of contractor performance evaluations. This review shall include the contracting activity's corrective action plan to address any unregistered contracts/orders/agreements, overdue evaluations and incomplete evaluations. The Contract Administration Division (MA-622) site assigned procurement analysts will provide oversight to ensure compliance with CPARS reporting requirements.

- **Procurement Management Reviews**

The DOE Procurement Management Reviews (PMRs) will validate site compliance with the requirement for submitting past performance data into CPARS. Prior to performing a site PMR, the PMR team will request that Office of Management Systems (MA-623) examine the FPDS-NG database to determine what contract actions require CPARS data submittals. MA-623 will perform a CPARS data run, on those contract actions identified by the FPDS-NG search. If CPARS reports were required but not performed, the PMR team will identify those contract actions to the site being reviewed to determine why the reports were not completed. The field sites will be required to perform corrective action to comply with CPARS reporting requirements. Additionally, the PMR team will examine the timeliness, accuracy, and quality of the CPARS submittals.

- **General guidance in preparing the CPARS data quality review**

There are two parts to the review and reporting required by the contracting activity. The ***Summary CPARS Review and Report*** is based on CPARS report capabilities generated by the local contracting activity. The other is the ***Individual Contractor Performance Evaluation Review and Report*** of the applicable procurement actions that require performance evaluations.

To ensure compliance, review those actions based on the applicable dollar thresholds for supplies/services, construction, and architect-engineer services, exclude AbilityOne actions.

Use FPDS-NG and CPARS data for the review. CPARS data includes ACASS and CCASS.

Since the reporting frequency requires evaluating no more than 12 months of actual contractor performance, the quarterly review shall include all the applicable evaluation reports that require some action during the preceding quarter. Also, the quarterly review shall include a follow-up on the status of any corrective action plan from the previous report.

➤ **Questions to be answered and summarized in a narrative and a spreadsheet for the review are the following:**

- How many contracts, order, and agreements does the contracting activity have in FPDS-NG that requires a contractor performance evaluation report? Of these actions, how many require a Small Business Subcontracting Plan (clause 52.219-9)?
- Of these contracts, orders, and agreements, how many are registered in CPARS?
- What are the ratings of these evaluations?
- What is the corrective action plan for the following:
 - Unregistered contracts, orders, and agreements
 - Overdue evaluation reports
 - Incomplete evaluation reports

IV. Best Practices

A. General

- Past performance information is “For Official Use Only” and “Source Selection Information” and should be so marked.
- The narrative is the most critical aspect of past performance information evaluations.

B. Solicitation and source selection

- See the Acquisition Guide Chapter 15.1, Source Selection Guide, for its discussion and guidance on source selection.
- See the Acquisition Guide Chapter 15.3, Establishing Evaluation Criteria, for its discussion and guidance in the development of evaluation criteria for source selection.

C. Contract performance

- If the AOR communicates with the contractor throughout the performance period, the evaluation should be easier to write. Then, the AOR can create a working evaluation

draft off-line by documenting the important significant metrics and/or events and cut and paste this documentation into CPARS for the evaluation period.

- Include performance expectations in the Government's and contractor's initial post award meeting.
- Performance evaluations are the responsibility of the program/project/contracting team, considering the customer's input. Feedback to contractors regarding ongoing performance issues should be developed through discussions with reviews occurring on a regular basis and transmitted through CPARS. The Reviewing Official resolves disagreements in the evaluation report between the contractor and the Government. The Assessing Official (contracting officer or contract specialist) finalizes the evaluation.
- See Acquisition Guide Chapter 70.9, Contract Options: Evaluating Contractor Past Performance, for model guidelines to use in assessing a contractor's past performance for the purpose of making decisions regarding the exercising of contract options.
- Contracting activities should not downgrade a contractor for filing protests or claims or not agreeing to use alternative dispute resolution (ADR) techniques. Conversely, contracting activities should not rate a contractor positively for not having filed protests or not having made claims or agreeing to use ADR techniques. However, the quality of a contractor's performance that gave rise to the protest or claim may be considered. In other words, while performance must be considered, a contractor exercising its rights may not.

D. Advise the contractor:

- To take the CPARS Contractor Overview training
- That past performance information is handled with the same procedures as if it were "source selection information" in PPIRS.
- To acknowledge receipt of the Government's request to the contractor to provide comments on an evaluation and to respond to this request within 30 calendar days

V. Future Interface between FPDS-NG and CPARS

For civilian agencies using CPARS, efforts are on-going to develop an interface between FPDS-NG and CPARS. Once this interface is activated, the data from FPDS-NG will pre-populate the appropriate CPARS reporting module.

VI. Points of Contact

- Questions regarding past performance policy issues may be directed to the Office of Procurement and Management Assistance Policy, MA-611, at (202) 287-1330.
- Questions on how to use the CPARS system and the CPARS Data Quality Review may be directed to the Agency Coordinator, Office of Management Systems, MA-623, at 202-287-1365.
- Questions on internal management controls and compliance assessments may be directed to Office of Contract Administration, MA-622, site assigned procurements analyst at (202)287-1365.
- Questions regarding the use of past performance information for source selection may be directed to the Office of Acquisition Planning and Liaison Division, MA-621, at 202-287-1364.

CPAR Quality Checklist

(DOE version December 2009)

This checklist will guide you in creating a quality CPAR which allows a reader, with no personal knowledge of your program/effort, to gain a complete understanding of the Contractor's performance.

Taking the time to prepare an accurate and complete CPAR helps ensure better quality in the products and services we buy now and those we plan to buy in the future!

Name: _____ Date: _____

Schedule # (for GSA orders): _____

Contract Number: _____

Order Number: _____

Blocks 1 – 17: Registered Info is Accurate & Complete

X	Item	Remarks
	Block 1: DUNS, FSC (PSC) and NAICS codes are correct. <i>[NOTE: At some time auto-registration will be available for the civilian agency version of CPARS. When auto-registration is available and is used, the DUNS and FSC will be pre-populated for you from the Federal Procurement Data System – Next Generation (FPDS-NG).]</i>	Verify using "lookups" in CPARS or via CCR (http://www.ccr.gov/). Your Contracting Officer can assist you if you have questions.
	Block 2: Selected CPAR Report Type (i.e., Initial, Interim, Out-of-Cycle, Final Report, Addendum) is correct.	See the CPAR Report Type definitions in the DOE Acquisition Guide Chapter 42.15 Contractor Performance Information
	Block 4: Business Sector is correct in accordance with the Business Sector definitions in the CPARS online help and in the DOE Acquisition Guide Chapter 42.15 Contractor Performance Information. In the event there is conflict between the online help and the DOE guide, the DOE guide will be followed. <i>[Note: When auto-registration is available and used, the Business Sector and Subsector will be pre-populated for you.]</i>	The business sector must be correct to ensure that you are using the correct CPAR form (i.e. Systems, Services/IT /Operations Support). If the business sector is incorrect, go back to the main menu, enter the contract number, select "Register a Contract", correct & save. NOTE: if the CPAR has been saved it will be necessary to delete and restart the CPAR.
	Block 6: Location of Contract Performance is entered if work is not performed at Contractor's address. Include specific geographical location.	Some services require performance in another location other than the Contractor's address; if this is the case, then specify the geographical location and explain any conditions that may have affected performance.

	<p>Blocks 7, 9, 11, 12: Contracting Officer, Contract Completion Date, Awarded Value, and Current Contract Dollar Value are up to date. <i>[Note: When auto-registration is available and used, the Contract Completion Date, Awarded Value, and Current Contract Dollar Value will be pre-populated from FPDS-NG.]</i></p>	<p>Contract Completion Date and Awarded Value should include all option periods, even if the options have not yet been exercised.</p>
	<p>Block 15: Subcontractors performing 25% or more or a critical aspect of the work are identified.</p>	<p>This block is not a place to assess subcontractor performance. Due to privity of contract, the Government can only write a performance assessment for a prime Contractor.</p>
	<p>Block 17: Contract Effort Description is comprehensive. All acronyms are spelled out when first used. The introductory paragraph of your Statement of Work is a good starting point for identifying the general scope of the contract.</p>	<p>Source Selection Officials use the Contract Effort Description to determine if your CPAR is relevant to their source selection. If the description is incomplete, you may be contacted to answer numerous questions.</p>

Small Business Tab

X	Item	Remarks
	<p>Does this contract include a subcontracting plan in accordance with clause 52.219-9, Small Business Subcontracting Plan? Was the plan completed.</p>	<p>Any Contractor receiving a contract greater than \$550K (\$1M for construction) must agree to submit a subcontracting plan for small business.</p>
	<p>Was an assessment completed of the contractor's performance against, and efforts to achieve, the goals indentified in the Small Business Subcontracting Plan in accordance with clause 52.219-9?</p>	<p>If the contract includes a subcontracting plan, the answer must be yes. Be sure the narrative describes the contractor's performance against, and efforts to achieve the goals.</p>
	<p>Date of last Individual Subcontracting Report (ISR) / Summary Subcontracting Report (SSR) is completed.</p>	<p>An Individual Subcontracting Report (ISR) shall be submitted semi-annually during contract performance for the periods ending March 31 and September 30. Summary Subcontract Reports (SSR) shall be submitted semi-annually for the six months ending March 31 and the twelve months ending September 30. Reports are due 30 days after the close of each reporting period, unless otherwise directed by the Contracting Officer.</p>

Blocks 18 – 20: CPAR Ratings & Narrative are Consistent & Comprehensive

X	Item	Remarks
	Block 18: Ratings are consistent with color/adjective definitions in the DOE Acquisition Guide Chapter 42.15, Attachment A.	Rating definitions are available in the CPARS online help function and the DOE Acquisition Guide Chapter 42.15, Attachment A.
	Block 18: Each assessment area is rated.	In order to release the CPAR, you must rate each assessment area, even if the rating is "N/A". If the contract has a subcontracting plan, Utilization of Small Business cannot be "N/A".
	Block 18: Ratings are consistent with other program metrics. View sample narrative showing consistency which is attachment B of the DOE Acquisition Guide Chapter 42.15.	Ensure ratings are consistent with metrics or complex performance appraisal systems, (e.g., performance based acquisition reviews, performance evaluation and measurement reports, contract management plans, award fee determinations, etc.) contractor performance evaluations.
	Block 20: Narrative is provided to support each assessment area which has been rated. Even if the rating is "Green/Satisfactory", you must provide supporting narrative. View sample Green/Satisfactory Narrative in the DOE Acquisition Guide Chapter 42.15, Attachment B.	See the assessment area definitions in the CPARS online help or the DOE Acquisition Guide Chapter 42.15, Attachment B for examples to consider when writing the assessment.
	Block 20: Narrative is fully detailed. It provides solid examples of specific accomplishments and problems. The narrative must address the benefit/impact that the Contractor's performance has had on the Government. View sample detailed narrative in the DOE Acquisition Guide Chapter 42.15, Attachment B.	The narrative is the most critical part of the CPAR. Source Selection Officials rely on this narrative, not the ratings, in evaluating past performance. If the narrative is not clear and complete, you may receive numerous questions from Source Selection Officials.
	Block 20: Narrative is consistent with rating definitions. (view rating definitions). Narrative for Utilization of Small Business is consistent with rating definitions for this rating element. (view small business rating definitions). See the DOE Acquisition Guide Chapter 42.15, Attachment A.	It may be helpful to write the narrative first, and then assign a rating based on the rating definitions.

	Block 20: Narrative for Utilization of Small Business addresses the Contractor's efforts to meet small business subcontracting goals. View sample narrative for Utilization of Small Business in the DOE Acquisition Guide Chapter 42.15, Attachment A.	Assess whether the contractor provided maximum practicable opportunity for Small Business to participate in contract performance consistent with efficient performance of the contract.
	Block 20: Narrative documents and explains resolution of previous and current problems. View sample narrative showing problem discussion.	
	Block 20: Narrative does not include statements which could result in an equitable adjustment or constructive change to the contract. Narrative statements are not personal, subjective, or vague.	Do not use phrases such as "out-of-scope", "Contractor will lose business", "in our opinion", or "appeared". Do not use phrases which tell the Contractor how to do their job (e.g., "The Contractor should hire more people").
	Block 20: Recommendation of whether you (definitely would not, probably would not, might or might not, probably would, definitely would) award to this Contractor again is consistent with the CPAR ratings and narrative.	
Completing the CPAR		
X	Item	Remarks
	Contractor Representative is notified when the CPAR is available for comment. While CPARS provides an automatic email notification to the Contractor, it is always advisable to contact the Contractor via phonecon to let them know the CPAR is awaiting comment.	You must provide your CPARS Focal Point with the name and email address for your Contractor Representative in order to send the CPAR to the Contractor. If you have not provided the Focal Point with a Contractor name and email address, the system will not allow you to release the CPAR.
	Upon receipt of Contractor comments, all assessment areas indicated with a red checkmark are reviewed.	
	Assessing Official or Reviewing Official (as appropriate) selects option to "Close CPAR" upon CPAR completion.	In order for your CPAR to be completed and made available for use in source selections, you must select " Close CPAR " rather than simply selecting "Save".

- Review the Contractor's comments thoroughly and take the time to acknowledge their concerns. Addressing these issues in a modified CPAR or in the Reviewing Official comments will help Source Selection Officials understand both viewpoints.
- If the Government and Contractor disagree on the CPAR ratings and narrative, consider holding a meeting to discuss. There is no substitute for good, face-to-face communication. Consider granting the Contractor an extension of their 30 day comment period in order to allow them to fully address their concerns.
- If no Contractor comments are received, document the fact that the Government took reasonable steps to notify the Contractor that the CPAR was available for comment. This can be done by keeping a copy of the electronic email notification provided to the Contractor when the CPAR was released, documenting a telephone conversation in which the Contractor was notified that the CPAR was ready for comment, or including the efforts made to contact the Contractor in the Reviewing Official narrative.

Taking the time to prepare an accurate and complete CPAR helps ensure better quality in the products and services we buy now and those we plan to buy in the future!

Ratings & Narratives

Rating	Contract Requirements	Problems	Corrective Actions
Dark Blue (Exceptional, Outstanding)	Exceeds Many – Gov’t Benefit	Few Minor	Highly Effective
Purple (Very Good, Above Average)	Exceeds Some – Gov’t Benefit	Some Minor	Effective
Green (Satisfactory)	Meets All	Some Minor	Satisfactory
Yellow (Marginal)	Does Not Meet Some	Serious: Recovery Still Possible	Marginally Effective; Not Fully Implemented
Red (Unsatisfactory)	Does Not Meet Most	Serious: Recovery Not Likely	Ineffective

Evaluation Ratings Definitions (Excluding Utilization of Small Business)		
Rating	Definition	Note
Dark Blue/ Exceptional	Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds many to the Government’s benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were highly effective.	To justify an Exceptional rating, identify multiple significant events and state how they were of benefit to the Government. A singular benefit, however, could be of such magnitude that it alone constitutes an Exceptional rating. Also, there should have been NO significant weaknesses identified.
Purple/Very Good	Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds some to the Government’s benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were effective.	To justify a Very Good rating, identify a significant event and state how it was a benefit to the Government. There should have been no significant weaknesses identified.

Green/ Satisfactory	Performance meets contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor appear or were satisfactory.	To justify a Satisfactory rating, there should have been only minor problems, or major problems the contractor recovered from without impact to the contract. There should have been NO significant weaknesses identified.
Yellow/ Marginal	Performance does not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed reflects a serious problem for which the contractor has not yet identified corrective actions. The contractor's proposed actions appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented.	To justify Marginal performance, identify a significant event in each category that the contractor had trouble overcoming and state how it impacted the Government. A Marginal rating should be supported by referencing the management tool that notified the contractor of the contractual deficiency (e.g., management, quality, safety, or environmental deficiency report or letter).
Red/ Unsatisfactory	Performance does not meet most contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains a serious problem(s) for which the contractor's corrective actions appear or were ineffective.	To justify an Unsatisfactory rating, identify multiple significant events in each category that the contractor had trouble overcoming and state how it impacted the Government. A singular problem, however, could be of such serious magnitude that it alone constitutes an unsatisfactory rating. An Unsatisfactory rating should be supported by referencing the management tools used to notify the contractor of the contractual deficiencies (e.g., management, quality, safety, or environmental deficiency reports, or letters).

NOTE 1: Plus or minus signs may be used to indicate an improving (+) or worsening (-) trend insufficient to change the assessment status.

NOTE 2: N/A (not applicable) should be used if the ratings are not going to be applied to a particular area for evaluation.

Evaluation Ratings Definitions (Utilization of Small Business)		
Rating	Definition	Note

<p>Dark Blue/ Exceptional</p>	<p>Exceeded all negotiated subcontracting goals or exceeded at least one goal and met all of the other negotiated subcontracting goals for the current period. Had exceptional success with initiatives to assist, promote, and utilize small business (SB), small disadvantaged business (SDB), women-owned small business (WOSB), HUBZone small business, veteran-owned small business (VOSB) and service disabled veteran owned small business (SDVOSB). Complied with FAR 52.219-8, Utilization of Small Business Concerns. Exceeded any other small business participation requirements incorporated in the contract, including the use of small businesses in mission critical aspects of the program. Went above and beyond the required elements of the subcontracting plan and other small business requirements of the contract. Completed and submitted Individual Subcontract Reports and/or Summary Subcontract Reports in an accurate and timely manner.</p>	<p>To justify an Exceptional rating, identify multiple significant events and state how they were a benefit to small business utilization. A singular benefit, however, could be of such magnitude that it constitutes an Exceptional rating. Ensure that small businesses are given meaningful, innovative work directly related to the project, rather than peripheral work, such as cleaning offices, supplies, landscaping, etc. Also, there should have been no significant weaknesses identified.</p>
<p>Purple/Very Good</p>	<p>Met all of the negotiated subcontracting goals in the traditional socio-economic categories (SB, SDB and WOSB) and met at least one of the other socio-economic goals (HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB) for the current period. Had significant success with initiatives to assist, promote and utilize SB, SDB, WOSB, HUBZone, VOSB, and SDVOSB. Complied with FAR 52.219-8, Utilization of Small Business Concerns. Met or exceeded any other small business participation requirements incorporated in the contract, including the use of small businesses in mission critical aspects of the program. Endeavored to go above and beyond the required elements of the subcontracting plan. Completed and submitted Individual Subcontract Reports</p>	<p>To justify a Very Good rating, identify a significant event and state how they were a benefit to small business utilization. Ensure that small businesses are given meaningful, innovative work directly related to the project, rather than peripheral work, such as cleaning offices, supplies, landscaping, etc. There should be no significant weaknesses identified.</p>

	and/or Summary Subcontract Reports in an accurate and timely manner.	
--	--	--

<p>Green/ Satisfactory</p>	<p>Demonstrated a good faith effort to meet all of the negotiated subcontracting goals in the various socio-economic categories for the current period. Complied with FAR 52.219-8, Utilization of Small Business Concerns. Met any other small business participation requirements included in the contract. Fulfilled the requirements of the subcontracting plan included in the contract. Completed and submitted Individual Subcontract Reports and/or Summary Subcontract Reports in an accurate and timely manner.</p>	<p>To justify a Satisfactory rating, there should have been only minor problems, or major problems the contractor has addressed or taken corrective action. There should have been no significant weaknesses identified.</p>
---------------------------------------	---	--

<p>Yellow/ Marginal</p>	<p>Deficient in meeting key subcontracting plan elements. Deficient in complying with FAR 52.219-8, Utilization of Small Business Concerns, and any other small business participation requirements in the contract. Did not submit Individual Subcontract Reports and/or Summary Subcontract Reports in an accurate or timely manner. Failed to satisfy one or more requirements of a corrective action plan currently in place; however, does show an interest in bringing performance to a satisfactory level and has demonstrated a commitment to apply the necessary resources to do so. Required a corrective action plan.</p>	<p>To justify Marginal performance, identify a significant event that the contractor had trouble overcoming and how it impacted small business utilization. A Marginal rating should be supported by referencing the actions taken by the government that notified the contractor of the contractual deficiency.</p>
<p>Red/ Unsatisfactory</p>	<p>Noncompliant with FAR 52.219-8, FAR 52.219-9, and any other small business participation requirements in the contract. Did not submit Individual Subcontract Reports and/or Summary Subcontract Reports in an accurate or timely manner. Showed little interest in bringing performance to a satisfactory level or is generally uncooperative. Required a corrective action plan.</p>	<p>To justify an Unsatisfactory rating, identify multiple significant events that the contractor had trouble overcoming and state how it impacted small business utilization. A singular problem, however, could be of such serious magnitude that it alone constitutes an Unsatisfactory rating. An Unsatisfactory rating should be supported by referencing the actions taken by the government to notify the contractor of the deficiencies. When an Unsatisfactory rating is justified, the contracting officer must consider whether the contractor made a good faith effort to comply with the requirements of the subcontracting plan required by FAR 52.219-9 and follow the procedures outlined in FAR 52.219-16, Liquidated Damages-Subcontracting Plan.</p>

Block 20: Sample Narrative Statements**➤ Examples of sufficient narratives in assessment reports****Subcontract Management – Rating: Yellow (Marginal)**

The contractor has exhibited marginal management of subcontractor operations during this reporting period. This is evidenced by inspections, quarterly program reports, and contractor communications with Government personnel and subcontractor. Specifically, for three consecutive deliveries subcontractor was more than 30 days late. In addition, delivered optics have experienced a 21% failure rate, 16% above established parameters. Delivery delays and quality failures have delayed program development by 6 to 8 months, and have caused a 6 month setback in projected system deployment. Contractor has made repeated complaints to subcontractor regarding delays and is soliciting alternate sources for optics and has submitted supporting documentation clearly indicating this has happened. Also contractor has proposed a receiving inspection process to detect quality deficiencies in delivered optics. However, to date no significant improvement is noted.

Software Engineering - Rating: Dark Blue (Exceptional)

The contractor has exhibited exceptional software engineering for assessment and analysis of the AN/XYZ-100 project. By integrating existing software they developed a set of applications combining supply data, production data, system testing, quality data, and trend analysis, which resulted in a 24% increase in data processing speed according to benchmark testing. Improved metrics and consolidated reporting was directly responsible for elimination of cost overruns experienced in the 1st & 2nd quarters and a net reduction of 7% in reimbursable costs for the reporting period. Minor discrepancies in application compatibility were quickly corrected using a new “Team Programming” system.

Quality of Product or Service - Rating: Green (Satisfactory)

This contract is for the collection of refuse at Field site XXX located near Anytown, USA. As part of its services, Contractor XXX is required to pick up 87 dumpsters across an approximate 30 square mile area, 12 hazardous waste containers, and 7 bio-hazardous waste material containers. Given the nature of the services performed for this contract and the schedule for refuse collection, it would be difficult to obtain above a Satisfactory rating for performance on this contract. During this evaluation period, Contractor XXX met all of its refuse collection requirements on time as stated in the contract. Further Contractor XXX ensured that all of the tops of the dumpsters were closed after dumping to ensure that no debris was left on the ground. There were no incidents of improper storage or disposal of the hazardous waste or bio-hazardous waste material during this reporting period. Therefore, the rating of Satisfactory indicates performance within the requirements of the contract and that there were no problems encountered during this reporting period with Contractor XXX.

Utilization of Small Business - Rating: Dark Blue (Exceptional)

The contractor exceeded their 27% small business goal by 2 percentage points and met all of the other subcontracting goals. The contractor awarded a subcontract to a small business for mission critical information technology for this program.

The contractor conducted three outreach events which directly led to award of subcontracts to Service Disabled Veteran Owned small businesses and HUBZone small businesses. The contractor exceeded the small business participation requirements of the contract that required the small business to be used for 25% of the R&D portion of the contract, by awarding 50% of this requirement to small business. The contractor submitted all required reports on time.

➤ **Sample Narrative Statements to Avoid**

The Contractor's performance in this area was exemplary. They were proactive in satisfying Electrical Kit Product Performance requirements. They produced a superior product for the customer. In many instances, they performed engineering tasks **outside the scope of the contract**.

“Outside the scope of the contract” – This phrase should not be in a CPAR narrative. It implies that the Contractor performed work not legally required and is eligible for an equitable adjustment to the contract. An equitable adjustment means that the program office/customer will have to come up with additional funds to pay for the additional tasks.

In our opinion, the Contractor's performance in the systems engineering area was very poor. Kit hardware deficiencies were observed and it **appeared** that the Contractor lacked systems engineering knowledge and expertise. **We believe** that some of the contractual kit requirements will not be met. **It is our hope** that additional factory testing will eliminate these hardware deficiencies. If management had responded in a timely manner, the requirement might have been satisfied. Additionally, **we were not happy** with the initial factory testing, and **did not like** their “fly and fix” philosophy of testing.

“In our opinion” – This is a subjective phrase which gives the impression that there is no firm evidence to prove poor performance.

“Appeared” – This is a speculative remark which does not prove that they lacked systems engineering knowledge.

“We believe” – This is also a speculative remark. It does not prove that they did not satisfy some kit requirements.

“It is our hope” – This statement does not belong in a CPAR narrative. The issue is whether the Contractor will correct the deficiencies using factory testing. If so, the

narrative should indicate the pending corrections. If not, justification should be provided as to why the factory testing failed to correct the problems.

“We were not happy” – This is an emotional and subjective statement which should be avoided. The CPAR should reflect justification for the successes/failures from the factory test.

“We did not like” – The customer should evaluate the results of the fly and fix tests in detail, not their testing technique.

The Contractor was late in delivering all of the 100 electric kits. **We think** that one reason is that their systems engineering effort was poor due to several electrical component deficiencies. Another reason **could be** that their ability to manage the electrical subcontracts left much to be desired. We established a 6 month extension to the contract. **We hope** they can deliver the 100 kits without significant discrepancies.

“We think” – This phrase implies that the customer has not proven the Contractor’s poor performance with evidence.

“Could be” – This phrase indicates that the customer is not sure that the reason for the deficiencies is poor management. There is no proof of poor management here.

“We hope” – This phrase implies that the delivery of the kits without deficiencies in the time period allotted is a desire, not a contractual requirement.