



NAVFAC
Naval Facilities Engineering Systems Command

Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS)

Andy Mann
Contracting Division Director
NAVFAC SE

22 March 2023

AGENDA

- **Why Contractor Performance Reports are Important – Partner Interest**
- **Policy & Guidance**
- **Manage System Administration**
- **Meetings and Communications**
- **Suggestions for Contractors**
- **Timeliness**
- **FAR Adjectival Ratings and Guidance**
- **References**

Partner Interests

(Contractor Performance Assessment Reports are Important)

- Performance reviews are written by government agencies to track how well a company is meeting contractual requirements.
- The reviews are important because they can influence future contract award decisions, and consequently future business opportunities.
- Contractor business reputation.
- Identify risks associated with working with a company.
- Use assessments to make better informed decisions more quickly.
- Accurate and timely assessments ensure vendor contract requirement compliance and government awareness.
- *When writing Contractor evaluations, the goal is to provide source selection officials with contractor past performance information that they need to make best value contract award decisions.*

Policy and Guidance

- **Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 42.1502 & 42.1503:**
 - **Agencies Shall Prepare an Evaluation of Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) Contractor Performance**
- **FAR 15.304:**
 - **Past Performance Shall be Evaluated in All Source Selections for Negotiated Competitive Acquisitions**
- **CPARS has three components:**
 - **CPARS – used to report on contracts**
 - **Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS) – used to record adverse action (T4Ds, defective pricing, etc.)**
 - **View Performance Records: Used by Source Selection Personnel**

Evaluations are source selection information and they must be treated in accordance with the FAR. The only people that can view ratings and narratives, etc., for a specific contract are personnel with a need to know and the contractor.

Policy and Guidance - FAR 42.15 (cont.)

- FAR 42.1502 requires CPARS be prepared at least annually and at the time work under the contract or order is completed.
- CPARS uses data from FPDS to identify those contracts which require evaluations; therefore, it is important to ensure that we are using the correct Product or Service code when entering actions. Thresholds for CPARS includes all options:
 - AE – >\$35,000
 - Construction - >\$750,000
 - Services - >\$1,000,000
 - Others > SAP \$250,000
- FAR 42.1503 requires the contractors be evaluated on their performance in the areas of Technical, Cost Control, Schedule, Management, SB Subcontracting, Regulatory Compliance and other areas applicable.

CPARs are retained for 3 years following completion of contract or order; 6 years for AE and Construction. Note: An IDIQ K has a base + 4 Options. Each year the evaluation is completed and the contract ends after year 5. Those past 4 CPARs will remain in the system for the 3 years after CCD; so for the base year CPARs will be in the system for 7 years.

Manage System Administration

- Register Awarded Contract - ID appropriate Personnel - Assign Assessing Official (AO) and Rating Official (RO) who will require access to CPARS to evaluate Contractor performance. Obtain Contractor representative information.
 - Work with Focal Point to ensure designated individuals are assigned user access for each specific contract, TO, or DO.
- Understand Reporting Requirements and Due Dates for Evaluations
- Assessing Official (AO)/ Representative (AOR):
 - Review contract and related documents
 - Review all contract performance documentation and Contractor's responses
 - Input proposed rating and narrative for each category.
- Contractor reply is due w/in 60 calendar days *unless an extension was approved.*
- Assessing Official:
 - Contractor Concurs With Government's Evaluation Assessing Official
 - Contractor Does Not Concur With Government's Evaluation Assessing Official

Manage System Administration (cont.)

- **Ensure quality review of the entire evaluation including coordination with the Contracting Officer and RO, when necessary. (Refer to Section C, paragraph 3.5 of the Guidance for the CPARS.)**

Manage System Administration (cont.)

- **When there is a disagreement on the CPARS evaluation between parties. (Refer to FAR 42.1503, subparagraph (d).)**
- **Reviewing Official: Access evaluation via the CPARS Website.**
 - **Review AO rating/evaluation and ensure quality review of the entire evaluation including coordination with the Contracting Officer and RO, when necessary. (Refer to Section C, paragraph 3.5 of the Guidance for the CPARS.)**
 - **Contractor comments. Ensure rating is consistent with supporting narrative and rating definitions per CPARS guidance.**
 - **Acknowledge any significant discrepancies between the parties.**
 - **Provide additional comments. Validate and close evaluation.**
 - **CPARS can be protested.**

Performance Assessment: Meetings and Communications *(Are you...?)*

- Holding performance assessment meetings in accordance with the contract?
- Consistently holding Partnering Sessions in accordance with the contract and ensuring the expected level of attendance is met?
- Documenting clearly and concisely discussions held in meetings?
- Non-performance clearly documented – augmented with corrective actions?

Suggestions for Contractors

(Enhance Communication at every opportunity)

1. **Lay the foundation at contract award and follow through with the best performance possible.**
2. **Understand the Gov't's expectations at kickoff, and what it will take to get the highest ratings achievable.** Having open communications with the Government, demonstrating your involvement throughout the entire process, sets the stage for higher performance ratings.
3. **Hold periodic performance check-ins with the Government to ensure both the Government and the Contractor are in agreement towards successful project completion.** Ensure that the work being performed is meeting or exceeding the Government's expectations.
4. **Develop CPARS input throughout the period of performance.** If new/different individuals become associated with a project – make sure they have complete historic awareness.
5. **Consider including a CPARS checklist or self-evaluation as part of the routine check-in procedure to proactively track project optimization.**

Recommend use of the CPARS format to build self-evaluations and complete each applicable evaluation area in detailed paragraphs - not just bullets. Blank or minimal information areas are often not beneficial and/or lost opportunities.

Including recommended ratings of your performance (based on the FAR definitions) with supporting narrative details showing key examples of how your performance met or exceeded the requirements, is not only pragmatic, often may be significantly beneficial to the Government.

TIMELINES TO COMPLETE CPARS

- All evaluations are due within 120 days after the end of the evaluation period.
- One month prior to the end of the evaluation period an automatic email notification with a reminder to begin writing the evaluation will be sent.
- Another reminder will be sent every week until an evaluation is started and saved.
- The 120 days includes all steps in the process, including the contractors comment period of 60 days.
- Two options for reporting IDIQs:
 - A single evaluation that covers performance under all the orders.
This is appropriate when the orders are similar in scope.
 - An evaluation for each order when the orders are not similar in scope.

Adjectival Ratings

Note: *Only prime contractor is evaluated due to privity of contract. Acknowledge a subcontractor's efforts on the contract by noting the subcontractor's name and SAM ID.*

- **Exceptional:** Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds many to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being evaluated 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.*
- **Very Good:** Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds some to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being evaluated 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.*

Adjectival Ratings (cont.)

- **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/order. There should have been NO significant weaknesses identified. A fundamental principle of assigning ratings is that contractors will not be evaluated with a rating lower than Satisfactory solely for not performing beyond the requirements of the contract/order.
- **Marginal**: Performance does not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being evaluated 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).

Adjectival Ratings (cont.)

- **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).

REFERENCES

- **48 CFR 642.1503-70 Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System**
- **Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 42.15, Contractor Performance Information**
- **FAR 42.1502 & 42.1503, Policy & Procedures**
- **FAR 15.304, Evaluation Factors and Significant Sub factors**
- **<https://www.cpars.gov>**