Policy Guide for Assessment and Use of Contractor Performance and Integrity Information

A Mandatory Reference for ADS Chapter 302

Partial Revision Date: 12/30/2015
Responsible Office: M/OAA/P
File Name: 302mbh_123015

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

SECTION 1. PURPOSE AND APPLICABILITY 3
SECTION 2. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES 3
2.1 M/OAA Director. 3
2.2 Agency Past Performance Coordinator. 3
2.3 Supervisory Contracting Officer. 4
2.4 CPARS Roles and Responsibilities: 4
2.4.1 Focal Point: 4
2.4.2 Super Focal Point: 5
2.4.3 Assessing Official (AO): 5
2.4.4 Assessing Official Representative (AOR): 5
2.4.5 Contractor Representative: 6
2.4.6 Reviewing Official (RO): 6
2.5 CPARS Roles Performed by Personal Service Contractors (PSCs): 6
SECTION 3. PAST PERFORMANCE REPORTING 7
3.1 Past Performance Regulatory Requirements. 7
3.2 Reporting under various ordering mechanisms. 7
3.3 Frequency and types of reports. 8
3.4 Acknowledging Performance of Small Business Subcontractors. 9
3.5 Areas of Evaluation, Ratings and Narrative. 10
3.6 Best practices: 11
3. 7 Impact. 11
3. 8 CPARS Reporting Schedule. 12
3.9 CPARS Quality Checklists and file documentation. 13
3.10 Performance Assessments of Multi-Year Contracts. 13
3.11 Performance Assessments of Expired Awards. 13
3.12 FAPIIS. 14
3.13 CPARS Reports And Reminders. 14
3.14 USAID-specific reports. 15
3.15 Internal quality reviews and other compliance assessments. 15
SECTION 4. SOURCE SELECTION 16
4.1 CPI as a Comparative Evaluation Factor. 16
4.1.1 CPI in solicitations. 17
4.1.2 Obtaining CPI from PPIRS. 17
4.1.3 Obtaining CPI from other sources. 18
4.1.4 Additional Research and Outreach Required for All High-Risk Acquisitions. 18
4.1.5 Evaluating CPI. 19
4.1.6 Best Practices: 20
4.1.7 Documenting CPI as a Comperative Evaluation Factor. 21
4.1.8 Monitoring the Use of CPI in Source Selection. 21
4.2 CPII in Determining Responsibility. 22
SECTION 5. MANDATORY TRAINING REQUIREMENTS. 22
ANNEX – Solicitation Template for Contractor Performance Information 23
APPENDIX I – BACKGROUND 27
APPENDIX II – DEFINITIONS 28
APPENDIX III – CPAR QUALITY CHECKLIST (Standard) 29
APPENDIX IV - CPAR Quality Checklist (USAID short version, xx 2015) 34
APPENDIX V –ADDITIONAL RESEARCH AND OUTREACH STEPS(USAID version) 35
APPENDIX VI - TRAINING COURSES BY ROLE : 36
APPENDIX VII – REFERENCES, LINKS AND QUESTIONS 38

SECTION 1. PURPOSE AND APPLICABILITY

The purpose of this document is to provide consolidated policy guidance on the assessment and use of contractor[1] performance and integrity information (CPII). This manual supersedes Acquisition and Assistance Policy Directive (AAPD) 06-05 and supplements the requirements in the Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR[2]) , Agency FAR supplement (AIDAR), the policy guidance for the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS[3]) and other information available on the CPARS website.[4] The guidance from Office of Federal Procurement Policy (OFPP), issued by memorandums dated July 2009, January 2011, March 6, 2013 and July 10, 2014[5], is also reflected in this manual.

This guide is organized to focus on the importance and relevance of contractor performance information during two phases of the procurement cycle, i.e., 1) contract administration and 2) source selection.

SECTION 2. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

2.1 M/OAA Director

The M/OAA Director is responsible for overall effective implementation of OMB and OFPP guidance on contractor performance information and the Agency's compliance with the applicable requirements in the FAR, AIDAR, policy guide available on the CPARS website and this manual.

2.2 Agency Past Performance Coordinator

The Past Performance Coordinator is responsible for:

- Administrative oversight of the CPARS process;
- Granting and managing individual access to the various past performance and integrity systems (CPARS, PPIRS and FAPIIS);
- Establishing procedures to assess contractor past performance and use of past performance in selection of contractors across the agency;
- Monitoring and reporting to OMB on the Agency's compliance with reporting requirements;
- Coordinating management decisions and resolution of OIG and GAO audit findings pertaining to contractor performance.

At USAID/Washington, the Past Performance Coordinator signs off on Exit Checklists for the departing COs/CORs, verifying completion of any due/overdue assessments or pre-assessment notes in CPARS.

---

[1] Consideration of performance under assistance mechanisms is outside the scope of this directive.
[2] Please refer to www. Acquisitions.gov
[3] See https://www.cpars.gov/pdfs/CPARS-Guidance.pdf
[4] Please refer to www.cpars.gov
[5] Links to OFPP memorandums are provided in Appendix VII of this guidance.

2.3 Supervisory Contracting Officer

The Supervisory Contracting Officer[6] of each contracting activity[7] is responsible for:

- Monitoring the timely completion of reports and report integrity (e.g., quality of reports) by periodically reviewing rating metrics, and both system-generated and M/OAA/CAS-provided reports, for all awards under their supervision. The SCO may establish a process to monitor and improve the quality of all evaluations.
- Systematically monitoring actions at pre-award stage for use of past performance information when selecting contractors and ensuring adequate file documentation;
- Selecting and nominating focal point(s) to the super focal point. When that individual separates or transfers, the SCO must ensure that another individual is assigned the focal point responsibilities.

2.4 CPARS Roles and Responsibilities:

Each CPARS report requires the following roles (for ease of reference, these roles are provided in the order in which they are utilized during the reporting process):

2.4.1 Focal Point

The focal point is the primary CPARS system administrator and liaison between the systems users. Individuals assigned this function are responsible for the startup of the assessment process for all awards in their portfolio, from which all other actions in the contractor performance assessment process cascade. More specifically, responsibilities include:

- Collecting and distributing relevant contract and assessment information;
- Registering contracts in CPARS within 30 days of contract award using the auto-registration function (the preferred method) or by entering them manually;
- Obtaining all required training certificates or otherwise ensuring that the individual's training requirements are met, before granting CPARS system access to Alternate Focal Points, Assessing Officials, Assessing Official Representatives and Reviewing Officials;
- Accepting, reviewing and forwarding Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA) forms for Personal Service Contractors (PSCs) to the super focal point and ensuring the original is filed in accordance with Section 2.5 below;
- Controlling registration of contracts for assessments, ensuring that all user roles are assigned upon registration of a contract and providing notifications to assessing officials (AOs) and their representatives (AORs);
- Guiding AOs or AORs in entering correct CPARS User Access Matrix data and contacting Naval Sea Command for assistance as needed; and
- Monitoring CPARS for the status of overdue evaluations and notifying the Assessing Official of reports more than 30 calendar days overdue.

In USAID Missions, The focal point must sign off on exit checklist of departing AOs or AORS, taking into account assessments completed, notes entered into CPARS (mid-period of

[6] In AID/Washington, this role is performed by the Division Chief. In missions with one CO this role is performed by the CO.
[7] Refer to AIDAR 720.170 for the definition of "contracting activity".

performance), transfer of responsibilities in CPARS and, when necessary, rescind the separating individual's access to CPARS. When the AO/AOR separates from the Agency, the focal point must contact the Agency Past Performance Coordinator at pperformance@usaid.gov to ensure that PPIRS access is rescinded.
The SCO may assign as many focal points as needed. If necessary, up to five (5) alternate focal points may assist the focal point in performing any of the duties specified above. Alternate focal points are not authorized to assign additional alternate focal points.

2.4.2 Super Focal Point

This individual is the overall coordinator of all of the focal points at the agency level. This individual maintains a direct relationship with the NAVSEA Program Manager by serving as the point-of-contact for the Agency for resolving system issues, and recommending/coordinating changes to the CPARS. The super focal point keeps the record of Non-Disclosure Agreement forms submitted for PSCs, approves and assigns focal points and maintains regular progress and compliance reporting at the Agency level.

2.4.3 Assessing Official (AO): The Contracting Officer (CO) is the Assessing Official (AO)[8]

The AO is in charge of the overall contract execution and is responsible for the accurate and timely review and processing of past performance evaluations in CPARS. During the CPAR process, the AO performs the quality review of the entire evaluation and validates the proposed ratings and remarks entered by the AOR(s).

The AO has the authority to forward assessments to the Contractor Representative for review and comment through the CPARS. When the contractor's comments are received or the comments period has passed, the AO may finalize evaluations, modify evaluation ratings, and/or forward the assessment to the RO.

The AO must complete all mandatory training courses, as specified in Appendix V and ensure that all users of CPARS under the AO's management are informed about the CPARS trainings requirements[9].

2.4.4 Assessing Official Representative (AOR)

The AOR, who is typically the contracting officer's representative (COR[10]), assists the AO by providing a timely and quality narrative and the proposed ratings for all evaluated areas. The Contract Specialist may also serve in this capacity, provided the Contract Specialist (CS) has sufficient personal knowledge of the contractor's performance to provide a quality assessment. The AO may assign multiple AORs per contract. Each assigned AOR has the capability of inputting and reviewing information input by the other AORs.

The AOR must monitor and document contractor's performance throughout the period of an assessment and discuss performance with the contractor on a regular basis throughout the contract implementation.

---

[8] Both acronyms (CO and AO) are used interchangeably throughout this document.
[9] See section 5 of the manual and Appendix VI for more information on training.
[10] Acronyms AOR and COR are used interchangeably throughout this document.

After the contract has been registered in CPARS, an AOR must initiate an assessment by entering the proposed ratings and narratives, unless the AO has already started the process and informed the AOR accordingly. When preparing an assessment of a contractor's performance, an AOR may seek input from the project manager, program office, auditors, any other technical or business advisors and, if applicable, end users of the product or service, as appropriate.

Individuals assigned AOR responsibilities must be fully trained on the use of the CPARS system and well-equipped to provide accurate and complete evaluations. To accomplish this, all prospective AORs must take the CPARS Overview and CPARS Quality and Narrative Writing web based trainings and complete all other mandatory training courses, as specified in Section 5 and Appendix VI below.

2.4.5 Contractor Representative

This is the individual responsible, on behalf of the contractor, for receiving, reviewing, and submitting comments, if the contractor chooses to do so, under a specific contract or task order within the allotted time period, as provided in the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR).

2.4.6 Reviewing Official (RO)

The RO's role in the main CPARS module is to review and sign the assessment when the contractor indicates non-concurrence with the CPAR. The RO ensures that the evaluation is accurate, fair and supported by objective evidence of the Contractor's performance for the specific contract/order and performance period. At USAID, the RO is authorized to resolve any disagreements between the AO and the Contractor. When doing so the RO must consider any significant discrepancies between the AO's evaluation and the Contractor's remarks.

FAR 42.15 requires that RO's role is performed by a Government employee at an organizational level above the CO. At USAID, the RO is the CO's supervisor (typically the Supervisory Contracting Officer). For Missions with only one CO, the RO is the Deputy Mission Director or other officer to whom the CO reports. For M/OAA Operations, if an M/OAA Division Chief is the administering CO, then the Deputy Director for AID/W Operations is the RO. For other USAID/W awards, the COs direct supervisor will be the RO.

2.5 CPARS Roles Performed by Personal Service Contractors (PSCs)

At USAID, the following roles may be performed by Personal Services Contractors[11] (including U.S. PSCs, Third Country National PSCs (TCNPSCs) and Foreign Service National PSCs (FSNPSCs)):

- ✓ Focal Points,
- ✓ Alternate Focal Points;
- ✓ Assessing Official's Representatives (AORs); and
- ✓ Assessing Official, when a deviation to the AIDAR 701.603-70 allows the individual to be issued a warrant.

[11] The term PSC refers to all categories of PSCs (U.S.PSCs, TCNs and FSNs) throughout this document.

When a PSC perfoms any of these roles and, therefore, requires CPARS access, the individual and AO must sign **AID Form 302-1, Non-Disclosure Agreement for USAID Personal Services Contractors**[12]. The focal point must then submit the form to the super focal point at **pperformance@usaid.gov**. The original NDA form must be filed in the PSC award file.

SECTION 3. PAST PERFORMANCE REPORTING

3.1 Past Performance Regulatory Requirements

Contracting Officers must prepare an evaluation of contractor performance in CPARS for each contract or task/delivery order when the contract (including individual orders) exceeds the thresholds established in FAR 42.1502.

AIDAR 742.15 exempts personal services contracts and FAR 42.15 exempts contracts awarded under FAR 8.7, Acquisition from Nonprofit Agencies Employing People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled (AbilityOne Program), from the requirements for conducting these assessments. CPARs are not required in these cases."

3.2 Reporting under various ordering mechanisms

3.2.1 CPARs for USAID Basic Purchase Agreements (BPAs), and Basic Ordering Agreements (BOAs)

For BOA and BPA orders, CPARS requires that an evaluation is completed on each order meeting the reporting threshold for each reporting period. No other CPARs are necessary.

3.2.2 CPARs for USAID Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contracts (formerly known as Indefinite Quantity Contracts (IQCs)

Using the ratings and definitions in the FAR 42.15[13] and the guidance below, the CO awarding the IDIQ contract will determine and specify in Section G of the IDIQ contract, whether CPARs will be completed:

- On each order meeting the FAR thresholds; and combine all other orders that do not meet the FAR thresholds into one CPAR;
- On individual orders regardless of the dollar value;
- By combining all orders into one CPAR under the base contract, regardless of the dollar value of each individual order; or
- By combining some orders into one CPAR, regardless of their dollar value, and reporting orders that cannot be combined individually.

Combining orders into one CPAR is not feasible when the requiring activities and/or places of performance differ, or when scopes of work of individual orders are significantly different.[14]

---

[12] For Internal Use Only: http://auslnxapvweb01.usaid.gov/forms/formsnumeric.html
[13] See Table 42-1—Evaluation Ratings Definitions; and Table 42-2—Evaluation Ratings Definitions (for the Small Business Subcontracting Evaluation Factor when the FAR clause at 52.218-9 is used).
[14] See FAR 42.1502(d)

When reporting IDIQ awards in CPARS, the COs must consider the following:

Contract award & amount:	**CPARS Requirements:**
Basic IDIQ contracts	A CPAR at the basic IDIQ level is not needed when all orders are reported individually. A consolidated CPAR is required when some or all the individual orders are less than the applicable threshold but the combined value of the orders exceeds the threshold. When preparing a consolidated report, the AO must: a) report at the basic IDIQ/IQC or agreement level with a consolidated information on all orders included; b) reflect in CPARS the base indefinite-delivery contract number only but list the orders included in the assessment in the "Contract Effort Description" section of the CPAR; c) include the narrative describing the contractor's performance on each order, both positive and negative, so that the breadth and quality of information is available for use in source selection; d) ensure that the period of performance for such assessments is based on the effective date/award date of the basic contract or agreement.
Individual orders[15] under IDIQ mechanisms above the applicable threshold	Generally, orders above the threshold are reported individually. However, as specified above, the CO for the basic award may elect to combine individual orders when separate evaluations would not produce more useful past performance information for source selection officials (e.g. when orders are similar in scope and are issued and performed in the same location). When making this determination, the CO must ensure that all orders above the applicable threshold are evaluated in CPARS.
Individual orders under IDIQ, BPA and BOA mechanisms below the applicable threshold	Generally, as with contracts below the applicable thresholds (see 6.1.2.2), performance under orders at or below the applicable threshold does not need to be assessed. However, a Task Order CO may, after consultations with the Task Order COR, elect to conduct a CPARS evaluation in extraordinary circumstances (e.g., exceptional or unsatisfactory contract performance). To facilitate the CPARS reporting, the focal point manually registers the contract/order in CPARS.

As specified in the OMB's memo entitled "*Improving the Collection and Use of Information about Contractor Performance and Integrity*" dated March 6, 2013, evaluators should prioritize assessments for all high-risk acquisitions[16].

3.3 Frequency and types of reports

To comply with the requirements in FAR 42.15, COs and CORs must ensure that the contractor performance is assessed in CPARS (1) at least annually[17] (for contracts and orders exceeding

[15] TOCO is responsible for evaluation of individual orders.
[16] See Appendix II for the list of high-risk acquisitions.
[17] In CPARS annual reports fall under the "interim" report type category.

one year in duration) and (2) on completion of the contract period of performance.[18] For contracts and/or orders with a period of performance of less than one year, a single report is due when the period of performance expires. The same frequency of contractor reporting applies to Architect-Engineer and Construction contracts/orders[19].

COs may choose to assess contractor performance more often than the minimum periods required or when the contract awards are below the above thresholds if such an assessment is in the best interests of the Government. Such assessments may be appropriate when:

- Sharing significant information about a contractor will promote greater confidence in future acquisition decisions,
- Making information available in a more timely manner will serve and protect the Government's interests, or
- Assessing performance under contract awards not exceeding the thresholds promotes increased numbers of awards to U.S. small businesses and small disadvantaged businesses that are performing particularly well.

COs may choose to prepare addendum reports after the final past performance evaluation is completed to record the contractor's performance relative to contract closeout, warranty performance, compliance with court ordered settlements and other administrative requirements. An administrative report may be necessary in the event that there is no contract/order performance during an annual evaluation period, for example:

- a contract option is not exercised;
- no order is placed against an indefinite-delivery contract,
- the IDIQ contains orders that have a combined value that exceeds the threshold and the orders are evaluated individually.

When this happens, COs must rate the management evaluation area as "Satisfactory" and provide a rationale for issuing an administrative report in the Assessing Official's narrative.

The administrative report can also be used for a completed award that has not passed the PPIRS 3-year expiration date and for which no factual information on the contractor's performance is available, as discussed in more details in Section 3.10.

3.4 Acknowledging Performance of Small Business Subcontractors

CPARS assessments apply to the performance of prime contractors only. However, if a small business subcontractor completes a critical aspect or 25 percent or more of the work, evaluators may acknowledge subcontractor efforts by including comments about the subcontractor in the assessment area entitled "Small Business Utilization." Including the subcontractor's full legal name and its DUNS# in this section is a best practice and strongly recommended.
COs must use the assessment area entitled "Small Business Utilization" to evaluate the contractor's performance in meeting the goals in its small business subcontracting plan or other similar small business incentive programs set out in the contract. For contracts and/or task

[18] In CPARS such reports fall under the "final" report type category.
[19] For Architect-Engineer and Construction contracts/orders, the evaluations will be retained for 6 consecutive years, however, PPIRS will display only the most recent evaluation.

orders in which the contractor uses small business subcontractors, evaluators must include comments about the prime contractor's ability to manage and coordinate small business subcontractor efforts in the assessment area entitled "Subcontract Management." Additionally, CPARS requires that the following questions are addressed in each report:

Small Business Utilization:
Does this contract include a subcontracting plan?
Date of last Individual Subcontracting Report (ISR) / Summary Subcontracting Report (SSR):

3.5 Areas of Evaluation, Ratings and Narrative

3.5.1 Areas of Evaluation

Past performance information provides relevant information on an offeror's actions under previously awarded contracts for future source selection purposes. It includes, for example, the contractor's record of conforming to contract requirements and to standards of good workmanship; the contractor's record of forecasting and controlling costs; the contractor's adherence to contract schedules, including the administrative aspects of performance; the contractor's history of reasonable and cooperative behavior and commitment to customer satisfaction; the contractor's reporting into databases (see **FAR subparts 4.14** and **4.15**); the contractor's record of integrity and business ethics, and generally, the contractor's business-like concern for the interest of the customer.

Based upon the fields provided in CPARS, the contractor may be evaluated in the following areas. The commonly used areas are *italicized* below.

Technical (Quality of Product)[20]	Product Performance
Schedule	Systems Engineering
Cost Control	Software Engineering
Business Relations	Logistic Support/Sustainment
Management of Key Personnel	Product Assurance
Subcontract Management	Other Technical Performance
Program/Other Management	Other[21]
Small Business Utilization	
Regulatory Compliance	

When performing CPARS evaluations, COs must ensure that all required evaluation factors, as specified in FAR 42.1503(b)(2), are adequately addressed.

3.5.2 Ratings & Evaluation Areas

[20] Discuss the details about a contractor's innovative approaches for addressing sector-specific challenges in this section of the assessment. If the innovation exceeds the contract requirements and resulted in a government benefit, this could qualify the contractor's performance for a higher rating.

[21] In critical priority country (CPC) areas, this field may be used to capture a contractor's performance in the area of security. Violations of the Federal Acquisition Regulations Clause 52.222-50, Combating Trafficking in Persons, must also be reported under this rating.

Per FAR 42.1503, AORs and AOs must rate each area of evaluation in accordance with a five scale rating system (exceptional, very good, satisfactory, marginal, and unsatisfactory). The ratings and narratives must reflect the definitions in the FAR 42.1503 tables 42-1 or 42-2.

3.5.3 Narrative

It is essential for the evaluation report to include clear, relevant, and substantive information that accurately depicts the contractor's performance. The evaluation must be based on objective facts supported by performance data. The report must include a clear, non-technical description of the principal purpose of the contract or order.

The narrative must be robust and must clearly and definitively support the correlating rating. Do not use acronyms or agency-specific terminology. Include examples demonstrating a contractor's performance for ratings of other than satisfactory. The completed report may be viewed and considered by source selection officials across Government agencies. Therefore, the report must be easily understood by persons throughout the U.S. Government.

3.6 Best practices

- Include performance expectations in the post award orientation meeting and explain the functions of the CPARs, the contractor's responsibilities in contractor's performance evaluations and CPARS training available to contractors.[22]
- This is particularly true for contractors that are new to the Government.
- Communicate with the contractor throughout the performance period, giving approriate and timely feedback on their performance. This way the CPARs ratings will come as no surprise to the contractors.
- Address any performance issues with a contractor at the time they occur and document the file accordingly.
- To improve efficiency in preparing the evaluation report, create a working evaluation in CPARS (clearly marked as such) and document performance on a quarterly basis or whenever a major program event occurs. Keeping the draft evaluation in CPARS ensures that it is available to the alternate COR and, in case of a AOR's transfer or separation, to the potential successors and the AO.
- Work on the CPARS evaluation simultaneously with other reviews that are focused on contractor's performance (e.g., annual portfolio review and other program evaluations, contract management plans and award fee determinations).

3.7 Impact

Contractors use the completed past performance reports in order to secure new contracts, by including reference to specific reports in their offers. AOs and AORs must be vigilant to ensure that the report contains an accurate portrayal of the contractor's performance. The past performance reports are a tool for use by the CO and COR in order to incentivize contractors to provide USAID with superior products and services.

COs, CORs, or Contr act Specialists must not "downgrade" past performance evaluations if an offeror or contractor has exercised its right to file protests, claims, or not use Alternative Dispute

[22] See Appendix VI.

Resolution (ADR) to resolve disputes. Likewise, offerors/contractors who have refrained from filing protests or claims or who have agreed to use Alternate Disputes Resolution must not receive more positive performance evaluations on that basis in source selection decisions.

3.8 CPARS Reporting Schedule

Within 30 days of award, the focal points must initiate auto-registration of all new contracts/orders above the reporting threshold in CPARS. If a new award is not included on the CPARS "Auto Register Contracts" report, then the focal point must manually register it.

The AO or AOR must initiate the CPAR for contracts/orders with a period of performance exceeding one year (including options) as soon as possible after the anniversary of the first day of the contract/order's period or, for the consecutive evaluations, the anniversary of the preceding CPAR. The CPAR must be completed and submitted to the Contractor Representative as soon as possible but no later than 45 days after the final acceptance of supplies/services, contract termination or completion of the period of performance.

After the AO validates the ratings, the CPARS electronically notifies the contractor that the evaluation is available for review. The evaluation is automatically transmitted to PPIRS 15 days after it is received by the contractor regardless of whether or not the contractor has submitted comments and whether or not the evaluation has been closed by the government.[23] This is done to make past performance evaluations available to Source Selections Officials early.

Contractors may provide comments[24] up to 60 days following the receipt of the evaluation. When the contractor's comments are not recevied by day 61, the evaluation is returned to the AO and the contractor's comments are no longer accepted.

If the contractor concurred with the evaluation or did not submit comments, the AO may:

- ✓ Close the evaluation or modify and close the evaluation.
- ✓ Send the evaluation to the RO or modify and send the evaluation to the RO.

If the Contractor disputes the CPAR, the AO may:

- ✓ Send the evaluation to the RO or modify and send the evaluation to the RO.

Note: RO comments and signature are required when the contractor does not concur with the AO's evaluation and when the AO has sent the evaluation to the RO for closure. When this happens, the RO must provide comments, sign, and close the evaluation.
Upon completion of each past performance evaluation, the AO must provide a copy of the assessment to the contractor.

The entire CPARS evaluation process must be completed within 120 days following the end of the period of performance, including the 60-days contractor comments period. For multiyear contracts, a completed evaluation is due 485 days from the contract award date and every 365 days thereafter through contract completion.

---

[23] If the evaluation has not been closed by the AO or RO, it will be marked as "pending" until either the contractor provides comment or the time allowed for contractor's comments has elapsed.
[24] For more information on the timeline for contractor comments, see https://www.cpars.gov/ctrComments.htm.

3.9 CPARS Quality Checklists and file documentation

As required in 302.3.8.7(d), a CPAR Quality Checklist (see Appendix III and Appendix IV) must be used for all evaluations. The first checklist (Appendix III) is the USAID-adapted version of the CPAR checklist developed by the NAVSEA, which provides step-by-step guidance on writing a quality CPAR. It is a valuable tool for AORs new to the CPARS process and individuals occasionally performing this role. The checklist in Appendix IV will help experienced AORs reflect on the quality of their narratives. The AO must choose the checklist to be used for each individual evaluation and advise the AOR(s) accordingly. The AOR(s) must use either the checklist in Appendix III or the one in Appendix IV, as instructed by the AO, when preparing an evaluation. The checklist must be forwarded to the AO together with the evaluation.

To ensure that evaluations are accurate, detailed and complete, AOs must review all evaluations using the CPAR Quality Checklist (Attachment III or Attachment IV), prepared by the AOR(s), before validating the rating and sending the CPARS evaluation to the contractor.

Upon completion of each past performance evaluation, the AO must retain a copy of the completed evaluation, the CPAR Quality Checklist, contractor response, and any review comments in the official award file[25]. For awards issued After March 31, 2014, all documents must be available in the Agency Secure Image and Storage Tracking System (ASIST) (see ADS 302.3.7.4).

3.10 Performance Assessments of Multi-Year Contracts

For multi-year contracts where the factual information on the contractor's performance for the previous year(s) is not available (or where there is a gap between an earlier assessment that has been completed and the most recent period of performance requiring an assessment), the AOR must ascertain that no substantive notes were left or entered into the system. The AOR will then make one attempt to contact the former AO and AOR to obtain the necessary information. If the former AO/AOR declines to assist or does not respond, the current AOR must perform a CPARS assessment for the current period of performance, explaining the absence of previous assessments in the "Assessor" tab. To accomplish this, the individual initiating the assessment must manually enter the period of performance to be evaluated and, if necessary, contact pperformance@usaid.gov for system support. A single assessment covering multiple periods of performance should be avoided, but may be approved by the Agency Past Performance Coordinator on a case-by-case basis.

3.11 Performance Assessments of Expired Awards

For completed awards that have not passed the PPIRS 3-year expiration date, where the factual information on the contractor's performance for the previous year(s) is not available, the AO, or another individual as designated by the AO, must make one attempt to contact the former AO and AOR to obtain the necessary information. If the former AO/AOR declines to assist or does not respond, the current AO must use the "administrative report" as described in section 3. 3, rate the management evaluation area as "Satisfactory" and provide the following suggested rationale for issuing an administrative report in the Assessing Official's narrative:

[25] The Checklist is an internal document and should not be shared with the contractor.

"The available factual information on the contractor's performance is insufficient to produce a reliable quality assessment. Please concur with this conclusion and return this report to the Assessing Official for closure."

The report must then be routed through the normal CPARS workflow. If the contractor does not provide its concurrence, the assessment is forwarded to the RO for consideration and closure.

3.12 FAPIIS

Separate from CPARS requirements above, the FAR[26] requires contractor data to be reported in FAPIIS within 3 calendar days after a CO:

- Issues a final determination that a contractor has submitted defective cost or pricing data, or makes a subsequent change to this determination;
- Issues a final termination for cause or default notice or makes a subsequent withdrawal or conversion to termination for convenience;
- Makes a non-responsibility determination; or
- Enters into an administrative agreement with a contractor to resolve suspension proceeding.

Immediately upon entering the information into FAPIIS, the CO must also transmit copies of all relevant documents to the Office of Acquisition and Assistance, Compliance Division, (M/OAA/Compliance) via **compliance@usaid.gov**, including a brief explanation of the actions taken and the date the information was posted in FAPIIS.

The workflow process for entering the above documents is specified in Mandatory Reference: Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS) User Manual (**http://www.CPARS.csd.disa.mil/CPARSfiles/pdfs/FAPIISUserManualFinal.pdf**).
COs must contact the USAID **Past Performance Coordinator** at **pperformance@usaid.gov** to request access to the FAPIIS input module.

3.13 CPARS Reports And Reminders

When working on contractor performance assessments, evaluators may rely on the system-generated reminders and reports to monitor the quality and timeliness of CPARS assessments. The following reports are particularly useful[27]:

- An Auto Register report shows contracts that are eligible for CPARS reporting and that have not yet been registered;
- The CPAR Status Report shows all evaluations in the system assigned to a user;
- The Contract Status report shows a list of all contracts/orders under the user's cognizance and whether the contract/order is current, due for an evaluation, overdue, or final;

[26] See FAR 42.1503, FAR 9.105-2 , FAR 9.407-3 and FAR 9.406-3
[27] Refer to the DOD CPARS user manual for a complete list of available reports.

- The Processing Times Report displays a summary of the time it took to complete evaluations which were finished within the past year.

3.14 USAID-specific reports

In addition to the system-available resources discussed in section 3.13 above, M/OAA/CAS generates the following reports. The reports not only assist contracting activities in tracking CPARS reporting progress, but also help raise awareness of the Agency's Senior Leaders and management of agency high profile acquisitions.

- A sortable report detailing delinquent contractor performance evaluations. This monthly/quarterly report is based on all contract actions available for assessment in CPARS, cross-walked with both GLAAS and ePICS databases. The report is shared with Mission Directors and Agency Assistant Administrators.
- A list of the annual past performance assessments of the contractors performing on the agencies' highest risk[28], complex projects is shared with the Agency Assistant Administrators, Chief Information Officer, Chief Financial Officer, the Senior Procurement Executive, division chiefs for M/OAA and Mission Directors.

3.15 Internal quality reviews and other compliance assessments

The regular compliance assessments of contractor performance evaluations consist of periodic CPARS data quality reviews performed by the contracting activities (or internal quality reviews) and assessments completed by M/OAA Evaluation Division (M/OAA/E) as part of the procurement review process.

Internal quality reviews:
The SCO must regularly review the information provided by M/OAA/CAS and the reports available through the application, as discussed in Sections 3.13 and 3.14 above, to closely monitor the integrity (e.g., quality) and timeliness of contractor performance assessments. If necessary, contracting activities must develop corrective action plans to address any delinquent or deficient past performance reports.

Best practices:

- The CPARs focal points should regularly monitor system-generated and M/OAA/CAS-provided reports to: 1) identify and auto-register any unregistered contracts/orders; 2) keep the AOs informed of any reports that are more than 30 calendar days overdue.
- The SCO should periodically review rating metrics and system-generated and M/OAA/CAS-provided reports for all awards under their supervision to ensure timely and quality contractor performance evaluations. As part of this process, the SCO should ensure that AORs are preparing and submitting evaluations in accordance with the CPAR Quality Checklist (Appendix III or Appendix IV) and the AOs are reviewing the evaluations for quality using the checklist. The SCO may establish a process to monitor the quality and timeliness of all evaluations.

[28] See OFPP memo dated July 2014 at http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/procurement/memo/making-better-use-of-contractor-performance-information.pdf.

Other Agency Reviews:

M/OAA/E team will examine the timeliness and integrity of the CPARS submittals by reviewing the award file[29] for evidence of timely CPARS reporting and use of the quality checklists (Appendix III or Appendix IV) in the evaluation process. As a result of the review, M/OAA/E will identify procurements where the CPARS reports were required but not performed on time (or not properly documented) and report the findings to the SCO. The contracting activity will then perform corrective actions to comply with the CPARS reporting requirements.

For awards requiring a Justification and Approval (J&A), where a proposed action triggers the competition requirements, the Agency Competition Advocate[30] will also verify CPARS assessments before clearing on the J&A.

SECTION 4. SOURCE SELECTION

Prior to awarding a contract (including a task/delivery order under a multiple-award IDIQ[31]) anticipated to exceed the simplified acquisition threshold, the CO must consider CPII in the following circumstances:

- When making a best-value award decision.
- As part of responsibilities determination.

Originating from two distinct authorities (FAR 15.4 for comparative assessment of CPI and FAR 9.1 for responsibility determinations), the two evaluations combined, offer the CO a more complete understanding of an offeror's competences.

4.1 CPI[32] as a Comparative Evaluation Factor

As required by FAR 15.304, past performance must be included as an evaluation factor in all negotiated competitive acquisitions expected to exceed the simplified acquisition threshold[33]. While it is a separate (stand alone) evaluation criteria, it must be part of the overall points/rating of the technical evaluation. As such, past performance must be evaluated as a part of the overall technical evaluation and must be considered in the total technical ranking.

As specified in ADS 302.3.6.3, the CO must give the comparative evaluation factor for CPI sufficient weight to make it a significant element in distinguishing between the offerors and the outcome of the selection. The expected weight range for CPI is 20-30% of the total non-cost evaluation criteria.

Following the requirements in FAR 17.2, COs must also consider contractor's past performance evaluations on other contract actions when exercising an option under a contract.

---

[29] For all awards issued after March 31, 2014, M/OAA/E may use ASIST to perform the reviews (see ADS 302.3.7.4).

30 See AIDAR 706.501

[31] Fair opportunity consideration and use of contractor performance information in the award of task orders under multiple-award, basic contract ordering mechanisms is addressed in FAR 16.505(b).

32 Integrity information is not appropriate as a comparative evaluation factor in source selection.

[33] COs are encouraged to evaluate performance in contracts below simplified acquisition threshold when such an evaluation is appropriate.

4.1.1 CPI in solicitations

When using CPI as a comparative evaluation factor, **the CO must base the solicitation provisions on the model language contained in ANNEX - Solicitation Template for Contractor Performance Information,** adapting it to the circumstances of the subject procurement but being sure to include the elements required by **FAR** 15.305(a)(2). The solicitation provision must also contain the sub-factor for the assessment of performance in using U.S. small business concerns substantially as stated in the template except for solicitations for:

- Personal services;
- 100 per cent small business set asides;
- Competitions limited to local (non-U.S.) organizations; or
- Other purchases with an approved justification for less than full and open competition.

To ensure that an offeror without a record of relevant performance history is not evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance, the CO must determine and include in the solicitation the general approach that will be used to evaluate offerors with no relevant CPI.

In addition, following the requirements in OMB memo dated July 10, 2014, the solicitation must describe the methodology for evaluating past performance information, "including the evaluation of similar work for State, local and foreign governments, commercial contracts and subcontracts of similar size, scope and complexity[34]".

COs should not, without good cause, combine past performance with corporate experience in the same evaluation criterion, since corporate experience is what the offeror and its subcontractors have done, while past performance is how well they did it.

The CO must not request that an offeror solicit assessments of its performance from its customers as a condition for submitting a proposal. The CO requests only contact information for the offeror's customers to allow U.S. Government personnel to solicit information to conduct these assessments when existing databases of CPI are found to be insufficient or unavailable, or as otherwise determined by the CO.

4.1.2 Obtaining CPI from PPIRS

When proposals are received, the CO identifies an individual involved in the source selection process to obtain the past performance information and provides it to the TEC. This individual, referred to below as the procurement official, may be the contract specialist, or a person on the technical evaluation committee (TEC) designated by the CO to perform this function, or the CO may choose to retain the responsibility.

The procurement official must attempt to obtain CPI for an offeror's contracts by searching the U.S. Governmentwide Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS), the primary source for contractor performance information for U.S. Government contractors. Note: performance assessments of contractors excepted from registration in the System of Award

[34] See http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/procurement/memo/making-better-use-of-contractor-performance-information.pdf

Management (SAM) and not assigned unique DUNS numbers, will not have their CPARs posted to PPIRS. For information on these awards the procurement official should contact the Past Performance Coordinator at **pperformance@usaid.gov**, who maintains access to a database of CPARs not accepted by PPIRS.

PPIRS access:
If the procurement official does not have access to PPIRS, the CO must request an account from the USAID Past Performance Coordinator at **pperformance@usaid.gov**, who will provide instruction for how to navigate the PPIRS Web site (**www.ppirs.gov**) for access to search the database. TEC members may be granted access at the CO's discretion. When applicable, the COs can stipulate if a TEC member should be provided with a restricted system access. This is typically the case when there is no expectation that the individual will participate in the source selection process under other awards in the near future.

In cases where the procurement official who requires PPIRS access is a PSC, the PSC and CO must sign and submit a nondisclosure agreement (AID Form 302-1, Non-Disclosure Agreement for USAID Personal Services Contractors) [For Internal USAID use only: **http://ausInxapvweb01.usaid.gov/forms/formsnumeric.html**] to the Past Performance Coordinator. The CO's signature indicates endorsement of the PSC's access to the systems. Submit the form by e-mailing an image file to **pperformance@usaid.gov**. File the form in the PSC contract folder after submission. The CO must also provide to the Past Performance Coordinator any applicable PSC contract term extensions to maintain this access beyond the expiration date listed on the form. U.S. direct hire (USDH) personnel do not need to complete this form.

4.1.3 Obtaining CPI from other sources

If the CO determines that PPIRS does not contain sufficient data for the purpose of adequate comparative evaluation, the CO has broad discretion to consider or authorize consideration of CPI from other sources deemed relevant and reliable. They may include but are not limited to:

- Business references named in the offeror's proposal;
- Commercial databases such as Dun and Bradstreet, Standard and Poors, et al;
- Interviews with others who may be known to have relevant information, to address the offeror's performance, including the members of the technical evaluation committee who have direct, personal knowledge of the offeror's performance;
- Other sources available to the Government, including Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), or other databases.

4.1.4 Additional Research and Outreach Required for All High-Risk Acquisitions

While timely and effective performance evaluations are necessary to the Government's ability to deliver results effectively, it is even more critical for high risk programs, major acquisitions, or other complex contracts with an increased risk of problems. To address this risk and ensure awards are made to contractors with good performance records, as required in 302.3.6.3, evaluators must perform the following additional research and outreach when assessing CPI for

complex information technology (IT) development, systems, and services over $500,000 and high-risk contracts[35] and orders (see steps described in Appendix V[36] for more details):

(1) Contact the CO, COR, or Project Manager of the offeror's two largest, most recently awarded Federal contracts or orders;
(2) Search for recent news articles and other publications about the offeror's performance or business integrity;
(3) Review public and commercial databases, or related services to gain a fuller understanding of a contractor's performance;
(4) Ask offerors to submit at least three to five references for recently completed contracts or orders;
(5) Consider past performance information on subcontractors and contractor team arrangements.

As a result of the research and outreach efforts, COs and CORs of USAID high-risk awards might be contacted by evaluators both within and outside the agency and are expected to cooperate by providing the requested information in a timely manner.

4.1.5 Evaluating CPI

In most cases the TEC will find some related CPI for each offeror and therefore will not need to assign the neutral rating. Such information is usually available when evaluators take into account performance information regarding key personnel who have relevant experience, as well as relevant information about subcontractors[37] which will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement.[38] TEC may also attribute the past performance information of a parent or affiliated company to an offeror when the proposal demonstrates that the parent or affiliate will provide its resources (e.g. its facilities, employees, etc.) or otherwise participate in a meaningful way in performance of the contract[39]. In case of a joint venture, each partner's performance record may be reviewed as well as the joint venture itself, as applicable.

When the necessary information is obtained, the TEC must consult the CO to determine the relevancy of the CPI as a predictor of the offeror's anticipated performance of the subject contract requirement (See Legal Trends and Caveats on the Evaluation of Past Performance Information (PPI) at **https://pages.usaid.gov/M/OAA**).

During the evaluation, the TEC must assess the CPI for each offeror against the solicitation Section M evaluation criteria and comply with **FAR 15.304(c)(3), FAR 15.305(a)(2)**, **AIDAR 715.303-70, AIDAR 715.305** and this Mandatory Reference. As part of the review, the TEC must consider the following:

(1) An offeror without a record of relevant performance history must be evaluated in accordance with the approach described in Section M of the solicitation. As a result, such an offeror must not be rated favorably or unfavorably on past performance.

---

[35] See Appendix II for the definition of a high-risk contract, provided by OFPP.
[36] See OFPP's memorandum dated July 10, 2014 entitled "Making Better Use of Contractor Performance Information" for more details on this new requirement.
[37] FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iii)
[38] See U.S. GAO B-291978.2, U.S. GAO B-285822.2 and U.S. GAO B-290137.2.
[39] See U.S. GAO B-409651, U.S. GAO B-407917.2 and U.S. GAO B-292865.4

(2) If the CPI contains adverse information on which the offeror has not previously been given an opportunity to comment, and such infomation is the determining factor preventing an offeror from being awarded a contracts or placed in the competitive range, the procurement official must provide the offeror a reasonable opportunity to comment on it prior to consideration of the CPI in the evaluation. Such interactions can be accomplished through clarifications (in case of an award without discussions) or communications with offerors before the competitive range is established (See FAR 15.306). Any offeror comment must be considered with the adverse CPI.

Note: CPARS provides contractors the opportunity to comment on any information included in individual performance reports during the process of assessment. Therefore, for the purpose of having given the offeror a "previous opportunity to respond" to adverse past performance information within the meaning of **FAR 15.306**, the CO may rely on the statement included within that report "The contractor has elected not to comment."

4.1.6 Best Practices

- Early communications with prospective contractors can help identify and resolve concerns regarding the approach to assessing past performance information. Such communications could consist of pre-solicitation conferences or requests for information;
- Develop a plan for evaluating past performance early in the process and make it a part of the source selection plan;
- When adapting the Solicitation Template (located in the ANNEX) to the circumstances of the individual procurement, remember that the solicitation must clearly describe the approach the Agency will use to evaluate past performance, including:

  a) What CPI will be evaluated;
  b) How CPI will be evaluated;
  c) The weight and relative importance of other evaluation factors and subfactors;
  d) How offerors with no past performance history will be rated.

- When considering the relevance of performance information for making a source selection decision, look for similarities in the following:

  ✓ Scope of work;
  ✓ Magnitude of effort;
  ✓ Contract complexity/diversity of tasks;
  ✓ Skills required to provide the service;
  ✓ Location of the work to be performed;
  ✓ Required levels of technology;
  ✓ Nature of the business area(s) involved;
  ✓ Contract types

- When evaluating offeror's past performance, first consider the most recent data available. Whenever possible, select similar ongoing contracts or contracts completed within the past year;

- Use the information available in the Source Selection Plan Guidance and Template, for assistance in requesting past performance information from offerors and conducting telephone interviews based on the information provided.
- Take into consideration the information known to the government that conflicts with the offeror's information, but remember to resolve apparent discrepancies prior to assigning a final evaluation rating;
- As with other non-cost factors, evaluate each past performance factor/sub-factor individually and make detailed notes.

4.1.7 Documenting CPI as a Comperative Evaluation Factor

After conducting the past performance evaluations, the TEC must document the results of evaluations in the technical evaluation memorandum (TEC memo). The section of the TEC memo relating to past performance evaluations must contain sufficient information that allows the CO to make informed decisions. This typically includes a list of projects evaluated and the ratings assigned under each factor and sub-factor; description of strengths and weaknesses of each offeror's performance; discussion of the analysis performed and evidence of a reasonable and well supported rationale for the conclusions reached. When applicable, the documentation must distinguish between evaluation of the offeror's past performance and the major subcontractors' past performance.

The CO must include in the negotiation memorandum (NEGMEMO) a clear and concise summary of how past performance information was considered and the findings and conclusions reached. Additionally, the file must reflect how the relevance of similar past performance information was considered during the source selection process and in the award decision[40]. If the CO determined that past performance was not an appropriate evaluation factor for the acquisition, the rationale for this determination must be documented in the NEGMEMO.

For all awards issued after March 31, 2014, all documents, discused above, must be available in ASIST (see ADS 302.3.7.4). All CPI obtained from PPRIS and other sources must be retained in the award file.

4.1.8 Monitoring the Use of CPI in Source Selection

As part of its procurement reviews, M/OAA/E team will maintain appropriate oversight through evaluation of pre-award contract files[41]. To accomplish this, the team will review selected best value awards exceeding simplified acquisitions for evidence of use of CPI in source selection or justification for not using CPI and proper documentation in the TECmemo and NEGMEMO. When repetitive issues are identified, they will be brought to the attention of the SCO[42]. The contracting activity must then develop a corrective actions plan. Such a plan may include

[40] See OFPP's memorandum dated July 10, 2014 entitled "Making Better Use of Contractor Performance Information".

[41] For all awards issued after March 31, 2014, the review may be performed using ASSIST.

[42] In missions with one CO, M/OAA/E will contact the CO's supervisor.

establishing procedures for systematic and targeted monitoring at the pre-solicitation stage, use of checklists and additional training of staff.

4.2 CPII in Determining Responsibility[43]

When conducting a responsibility determination of the apparently successful offeror, the CO considers whether the offeror is capable of performing a particular contract. The determination is based upon an assessment of different areas, including offeror's financial resources, operational controls, technical skills and satisfactory past performance. Using the "pass/fail' or "go/no-go" approach, the CO determines whether the offeror is responsible.

For awards above the simplified acquisition threshold, COs must use the information available through PPIRS to support determining the responsibility of prospective contractor. Particular attention should be given to any information concerning the offeror in FAPIIS (available through PPIRS at **http://www.ppirs.gov/**). COs must use sound business judgement when determining weight and relevance of the information in FAPIIS and how it relates to the new award.

To comply with the requirements in FAR 9.1, COs may document the complete determination of responsibility in the Memorandum of Negotiation: Acquisition Template (NEGMEMO) or summarize the determination in the NEGMEMO and identify where in the pre-award file the determination is retained. When applicable, the contract file must provide sufficient information to explain how the information in FAPIIS was considered and what actions were taken as a result. For all awards issued after March 31, 2014, all documentation must be available in ASIST(see ADS 302.3.7.4).

SECTION 5. MANDATORY TRAINING REQUIREMENTS.

As required in ADS 302.3.8.7(a), all participants of the contractor performance evaluation process must complete the mandatory trainings. The training is role specific, and is addressed in Appendix VI. It is offered electronically and the calendar can be found on the CPARS web site. Individuals new to the CPARS and FAPIIS process are required to complete the mandatory training prior to assuming this role and submit the certificates of completion to the focal point. Note: the same training requirements apply to PSCs performing various roles in CPARS.

In addition to CPARS-specific trainings, all participants of the acquisition process are encouraged to take other past performance courses, such as CLC 028, *Past Performance Information* course and CLC 106, *Contracting Officer's Representative with a Mission Focus* course, CLC 106. CLC 028 discusses how and why past performance information is collected and how to use it to improve program outcomes. CLC 106 provides an overview of the acquisition process including proper file documentation, performance assessment methods, remedies for poor performance, and contract management. Acquisition professionals and CORs should also visit DAU's website at www.dau.mil for other training courses related to past performance information.

[43] Guidance on determining responsibility can be found in FAR Parts 9.104-3, 9.105-2, and 9.404

ANNEX – Solicitation Template for Contractor Performance Information

COs must include solicitation provisions based on the model language below. They may adapt these provisions to the circumstances of the subject procurement but must include the elements required by FAR 15.305(a)(2).

Following the requirements in OMB memo dated July 10, 2014, the solicitation must also describe the methodology for evaluating past performance information in the solicitation, including the evaluation of similar work for State, local and foreign governments, commercial contracts and subcontracts of similar size, scope and complexity.

SECTION L - INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICES TO OFFERORS OR RESPONDENTS:

(*XXX*) **CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE INFORMATION** [See Section M.*XXX*.] [*CO must insert subsection number here and in paragraph (d)(2)*.]

(a) The offeror (including all partners of a joint venture) must provide performance information for itself, the contractor teaming arrangements, if any, and each major subcontractor (one whose proposed cost exceeds __% [*CO must insert a percentage if "major subcontractor" is not defined elsewhere in the solicitation*.] of the offeror's total proposed cost) in accordance with the following:

1. List in an annex to the technical proposal up to __ [*CO to insert a reasonable number Note: for high-risk contracts and orders, as defined in Appendix II and described in Appendix V of this manual, offerors must provide at least three to five references of recently completed contracts or orders]* of the most recent and relevant contracts* for efforts similar to the work in the subject proposal. The most relevant indicators of performance are contracts of similar size, scope, and complexity _____ _____

   [*CO must define relevancy based on input from the program office and add as necessary (e.g., contract types, type of work, scope of work, complexity/diversity of tasks, magnitude of effort; skills/ expertise required, location of work to be performed, required levels of technology; nature of the business area(s) involved, etc.*] and how recently they were performed.

2. For all contracts listed above that are not in CPARS, provide a list of contact names, job titles, mailing addresses, phone numbers, e-mail addresses, explanation of relevance to the proposed acquisition and a description of the performance to include:

   - Scope of work or complexity/diversity of tasks,
   - Primary location(s) of work,
   - Term of performance,
   - Dollar value, and
   - Contract type, i.e., fixed-price, cost reimbursement, etc.

   [*For any high-risk award, as defined in Appendix II of this guidance, CO must also request point of contact information for the CO, COR, or Project Manager of the offeror's two largest, most recently awarded Federal contracts or orders. Please refer to Appendix V for more details.]*

(USAID recommends that you alert the contacts that their names have been submitted and that they are authorized to provide performance information concerning the listed contracts if and when USAID requests it.)

(b) If extraordinary problems impacted any of the referenced contracts, provide a short explanation and the corrective action taken (FAR 15.305(a)(2)).

(c) Describe any quality awards or certifications that indicate exceptional capacity to provide the service or product described in the statement of work. This information is not included in the page limitation.

(d) Performance in Using Small Business (SB) Concerns (as defined in FAR 19.001)*.

(1) This section (d) is not applicable to offers from small business concerns.
(2) As part of the evaluation of performance in Section M.*XX* [*CO to provide section number]* of this solicitation, USAID will evaluate the extent you used and promoted the use of small business concerns under current and prior contracts. The evaluation will assess the extent small business concerns participated in these contracts relative to the size/value of the contracts, the complexity and variety of the work small business concerns performed, and compliance with your SB subcontracting plan or other similar small business incentive programs set out in your contract(s).

(3) In order for USAID to fully and fairly evaluate performance in this area, all offerors who are not small business concerns must do the following:

(A) Provide a narrative summary of your organization's use of small business concerns over the past three years. Describe how you actually use small businesses--as subcontractors, as joint venture partners, through other teaming arrangements, etc. Explain the nature of the work small businesses performed--substantive technical professional services, administrative support, logistics support, etc. Describe the extent of your compliance with your SB subcontracting plan(s) or other similar SB incentive programs set out in your contract(s) and explain any mitigating circumstances if goals were not achieved.
(B) To supplement the narrative summary in (A), provide a list of the recent contracts [*CO to establish the number of "recent" contracts and/or the timeframe for "recent" while keeping in mind that the number of reports could be significant over an extended period of time*] for which you submitted subcontract reports to eSRS (FAR 52.219-9(d)(10) and a copy of any similarly recent subcontracting reports if they were not submitted to eSRS.
(C) Provide the names and addresses of three SB concerns for us to contact for their assessment of your performance in using SB concerns. Provide a brief summary of the type of work each SB concern provided to your organization, and the name of a contact person, his/her title, phone number, and e-mail address for each.

[End of Section L provision]

*Required for all USAID solicitations other than personal services contracts, 100 percent small business set asides, and those for which a justification for other than full and open competition has been approved.

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD:

(*XXX*) CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE INFORMATION _XX_ [*CO to insert number of points, if using a point scoring system. See FAR 15.305(a)(2) for required elements and section 4.1.5 of this guidance on determining the relative weight for CPI. Note: Per ADS 302.3.6.3, the expected weight range for CPI is 20-30% of the total non-cost evaluation criteria.*] [See Section L.*XXX*.] [*CO must insert subsection number here and in paragraph (a)*.]

(a) Performance information will be used for both the responsibility determination and best value decision. USAID may use performance information obtained from other than the sources identified by the offeror/subcontractor. USAID will utilize existing databases of contractor performance information and solicit additional information from the references provided in Section L. *XXX* of this RFP and from other sources if and when the Contracting Officer finds the existing databases to be insufficient for evaluating an offeror's performance.

(b) Adverse past performance information to which the offeror has not previously had an opportunity to respond, will be addressed in accordance with the policies and procedures set forth in the FAR 15.3.

(c) USAID will initially determine the relevance of similar performance information as a predictor of probable performance under the subject requirement. USAID may give more weight to performance information that is considered more relevant and/or more current.

(d) The contractor performance information determined to be relevant will be evaluated in accordance with the elements below *[CO to insert number of points, if using a point scoring system. For adjectival or other rating systems, indicate the order of importance of the subcriteria below or how the weighting of the elements relate to each other. The optional subfactor of degree of relevancy may be given more weight than other subfactors]*:

(1)	Technical, including quality of product or service and consistency in meeting goals and targets	***XX***
(2)	Cost control, including forecasting costs as well as accuracy in financial reporting *(Note to COs: this element is not required for Firm-Fixed Price or Firm-Fixed Price with Economic Price Adjustment contracts)*	***XX***
(3)	Schedule, including the timeliness against the completion of the contract, task orders, milestones, delivery schedules, and administrative requirements (e.g., efforts that contribute to or affect the schedule variance).	***XX***
(4)	Management or business relations, addressing the history of professional behavior and overall business-like concern for the interests of the customer, including the contractor's history of reasonable and cooperative behavior (to include timely identification of issues in controversy), customer satisfaction, timely award and management of subcontracts, cooperative attitude in remedying problems, and timely completion of all administrative requirements:	***XX***
(5)	Management of key personnel, including appropriateness of personnel for the job and prompt and satisfactory changes	

in personnel when problems with clients where identified: ***_XX_***

(6) For prime offerors who are not small business concerns, their utilization of Small Business concerns as subcontractors, including efforts in achieving small business participation goals. [*Note to COs: This element is not required for 100% small business set aside, competitions limited to local organizations or purchases with an approved J&A or PSC contracts. See section 4.1.1 of this Mandatory Reference for guidance*] ***_XX_***

(7) [***OPTIONAL SUBFACTOR****: degree of relevancy. See 302mae, Source Selection Plan Guidance and Template for guidance.]* *_XX_*

Total Weight for Performance Evaluation ***_XX_***

(f) An offeror's performance will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably when:

(1) The offeror lacks relevant performance history,
(2) Information on performance is not available, or
(3) The offeror is a member of a class of offerors where there is provision not to rate the class against a sub factor.

When this occurs, an offeror lacking relevant performance history is assigned a "neutral" rating. [***CO to identify the approach that will be used to evaluate offerors with no relevant CPI. See FAR 15.305(a)(2)]***. For example, an offeror without relevant performance will be evaluated as follows: If this evaluation factor is worth a possible 20 points out of a total possible point value of 100 for the technical proposal, then this offeror's technical proposal will have a maximum of 80 possible points. If it was assigned a total score of 70 points out of the 80 maximum possible points, its total technical score for evaluation against the other offerors would be 87.5 (i.e., 70/80). USAID understands that there may be minor arithmetic differences in percentage terms as a result; however, it considers these differences to be minor and that they will not impact any best-value decision made under this solicitation.

Prior to assigning a "neutral" past performance rating, the contracting officer may take into account a broad range of information related to an offeror's performance.

[End of Section M provision]

APPENDIX I – BACKGROUND

The Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994, P.L. 103-355, mandated the Government's collection of Contractor Performance Information, or CPI, and its use in source selection. Since that time, USAID has used several systems to collect and disseminate this data, including the National Institutes of Health Contractor Performance System (CPS) (which was retired on September 30, 2010), and the currently utilized Naval Sea Logistics Center Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) and Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS).

The Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act of 2009, P.L. 110-417, mandated the collection and use of additional performance and integrity information. FAC 2005-40 implemented the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS), effective April 22, 2010. The Supplemental Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2010, P.L. 111-212, mandated that FAPIIS information, except past performance reviews, submitted on or after April 15, 2011, be made publicly available. FAPIIS information is now accessed through CPARS. "Integrity" was added to Contractor Performance Information, for the acronym CPII used throughout this document. Where "CPI" is used, it refers only to contractor performance information.

Effective October 1, 2010, USAID and most other civilian agencies were required to assess contractor performance using the Naval Sea Logistics Center's Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System[44] (CPARS), Architect-Engineer Contract Administration Support System (ACASS) and Construction Contractor Appraisal Support System (CCASS). Starting July 1, 2014, the three systems used to input contractor performance information were consolidated into the main CPARS module, creating a single CPARS application to evaluate all types of contracts with a common set of rating elements and data information fields implemented for all business sectors. This merger standardized evaluation factors and rating scales for all federal awards, increased efficiency by creating a common workflow process and reduced duplication of effort.

[44] CPARS does not accommodate assistance awards. No system currently exists to capture this data.

APPENDIX II – DEFINITIONS

1. General Terms

Contracting Officer (CO) and Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) are defined in **ADS 302.2** and the **ADS Glossary**.

High-risk acquisitions, as defined in OFPP memo dated March 6, 2013, include:

- ✓ Cost reimbursement or time-and-material contracts and orders;
- ✓ Awards that are complex in nature, such as large construction, architect-engineer, research and development, software development and implementation acquisitions, etc.;
- ✓ Awards involving high dollar values such as IDIQ contracts or major system acquisitions[45];
- ✓ Awards performed overseas and those for contingency operations, regardless of the contract type.

2. Past Performance Systems' Terms

Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS[46]): the Government-wide evaluation reporting tool for all past performance reports on contracts and orders. The following systems are also part of the overall CPARS tool:

- Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS): A web-enabled, enterprise application that provides timely and pertinent contractor past performance information to the Department of Defense and Federal acquisition community for use in making source selection decisions. PPIRS assists acquisition officials by serving as the single source for contractor past performance data (not publicly available). (Note: Completed reports are available to source selection officials for review in PPIRS.)

- Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS): A web-based system that contains specific information on the integrity and performance of covered Federal agency contractors and grantees. FAPIIS is available to Federal acquisition professionals for their use in making the award responsibility determinations (publicly available).

3. Other Terms Used in this Guidance

- CPAR or CPARs – The singular use or lower case "s" at the end of the term CPAR denotes the singular or plural (respectively) for specific report(s) (upper case "S" represents the system).
- CPI – Contractor Performance Information.
- CPII – Contractor Performance and Integrity Information is the integrity and past performance information recorded in the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS).

---

[45] Refer to AIDAR 734.002-70 for the definition of a major system acquisition.
[46] CPARS is located at *http://www.cpars.gov/ (not available to the public).*

APPENDIX III – CPAR QUALITY CHECKLIST (Standard)
(USAID version xx 2015)

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!

COR Name		**Date:**
Contract # (Schedule # for GSA orders)		
Order Number:		
Contractor's Name:		
Period Evaluated:		
Blocks 1 – 17: Registered Info is Accurate & Complete		
X	**ITEM**	**REMARKS**
	Block 1: DUNS, PSC and NAICS codes are correct. If auto-registration is used, DUNS and PSC will be pre-populated for you from the Federal Procurement Data System – Next Generation (FPDS-NG).	Verify using "lookups" in CPARS or via System for Award Management (SAM) (http://www.sam.gov/). Your Contracting Officer can assist you if you have questions.
	Block 2: Selected CPAR Report Type (i.e., Interim, Final Report, Addendum) is correct.	For the purposes of CPARS reporting, annual evaluations are reported as interim reports. When recording contractor performance relative to contract/order closeout or other administrative requirements, select "Addendum." See section 6.1.3 for more details on the use of interim or addendum reports.
	Block 4: Business Sector is correct in accordance with the Business Sector definitions in the CPARS online help and in the CPARS Guidance. If auto-registration is used, Business Sector and Subsector will be pre-populated for you.	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.	When services are performed in overseas locations, remember that some overseas posts require performance under particularly difficult or dangerous conditions. Specifying a geographical location allows the reader to take performance under such conditions into account.

	Blocks 7, 9, 11, 12: Contracting Officer, Contract Completion Date, Awarded Value, and Current Contract Dollar Value are up to date. If auto-registration is used, Contracting Officer will be pre-populated from Army Contracting Business Intelligence System (ACBIS). If auto-registration is used, Contract Completion Date, Awarded Value, and Current Contract Dollar Value will be pre-populated from FPDS-NG.	Contract Completion Date and Awarded Value should include **all** option periods, even if the options have not yet been exercised.
	Block 15: Subcontractors performing 25% or more or a critical aspect of the work are identified.	This block is not a place to assess subcontractor performance. Due to privity of contract, the Government can only write a performance evaluation for a **prime** Contractor[47].
	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/order.	Source Selection Officials throughout the Federal Government use the Contract Effort Description to determine if your CPAR is relevant to their source selection. If the description is incomplete or cannot be understood by outside evaluators you may be contacted to answer numerous questions. Make sure the description: • Spells out all acronyms when first used; • Clearly identifies the standards/requirements the contractor was expected to meet. Contractor's performance is then measured against these standard/requirements; • Addresses the complexity of the contract/order effort and the overall technical risk associated with accomplishing the effort; • If applicable, detail any relevant technologies required; • For task/delivery order contracts, states the number of orders issued during the period, the number of orders completed during the period, and the number of orders that remain active. • For interim CPARs, includes a description of key milestone events or major award modifications that occurred in the review period.
Small Business Tab		
X	**ITEM**	**REMARK**

[47] As specified in the Federal CPARS police guide, when the subcontractor's performance has significantly affected prime contractor's performance, you can records subcontractor's actions in the Assessing official's comments of the related evaluation area.

	The question "Does this contract include a subcontracting plan?" is completed.	Any Contractor receiving a contract greater than $650K ($1.5M for construction) **except for performance overseas**, must agree to submit a subcontracting plan for small business.
	Was an assessment completed of the contractor's performance against, and efforts to achieve, the goals identified in the Small Business Subcontracting Plan in accordance with clause 52.219-9?	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.
	Date of last Individual Subcontracting Report (ISR) / Summary Subcontracting Report (SSR) is completed.	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.
Blocks 18 – 20: CPAR Ratings & Narrative are Consistent & Comprehensive		
X	ITEM	REMARKS
	Block 18: Ratings are consistent with adjective definitions in FAR 42.1503, Tables 42-1 or 42-2.	Rating definitions are also available In the Appendix I and II of this guidance.
	Block 18: Each evaluation area is rated.	In order to release the CPAR, you must rate each evaluation 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.	Ensure ratings are consistent with metrics or other performance appraisals (e.g. portfolio reviews, performance evaluations, contract management plans, award fee determinations).
	Block 20: Narrative[48] is provided to support each evaluation area which has been rated. Even if the rating is "Satisfactory", you must provide supporting narrative.	• See the evaluation area definitions in the CPARS online help or the CPARS Guidance for examples to consider when writing the evaluation. • The amount of risk inherent in the effort should be recognized as a significant factor and taken into account when assessing the contractor's performance. When a contractor identifies significant technical risk and takes action to abate those risks, the effectiveness of these actions should be included in the detailed narrative supporting the ratings. The narrative must recognize the risk inherent in the efforts and Government's role, if any, in contractor's inability to meet requirements[49].

[48] View sample narrative on the CPARS website at https://www.cpars.gov/cparsfiles/pdfs/CPARSQualityChecklist.pdf and the CPARS Quality and Narrative Writing Training available at https://www.cpars.gov/allapps/cpartrng/webtrain/webtrain_auto.htm.

	Block 20: Narrative does not include statements which could result in an equitable adjustment or constructive change to the contract. Narrative statements are not subjective or vague.	Avoid using phrases such as "out of scope", "in our opinion" and giving instruction for contractor on how to do their job.
	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.	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. Before forwarding assessment to the AO, check that your narrative for each rated element: ✓ is limited to evaluation of contractor performance after the preceding CPAR and addresses any rating changes from prior reports; ✓ is at an appropriate level of documentation that provides evidence and establishes a basis for the rating assigned; ✓ indicates major/minor strengthes and weaknesses as well as benefit and/or impact to the Government; ✓ documents an explanation of how problems were resolved and the extent to which solutions were effective; ✓ correlates with the "Contract Effort Description" in Block 17.
	Block 20: Narrative is consistent with rating definitions and contract objectives. Narrative for Utilization of Small Business is consistent with rating definitions for this rating element. See rating definitions at FAR 42.1503, Tables 42-1 or 42-Rating definitions are also available In the Appendix I and II of this guidance.	It may be helpful to write the narrative first, and then assign a rating based on the rating definitions. Do not assign a rating lower than satisfactory solely for not performing beyond the requirements of the contract/order; Do not assign a rating higher than satisfactory solely for meeting the contract requirements[50].
	Block 20: Narrative for Utilization of Small Business addresses the Contractor's efforts to meet small business subcontracting goals.	Assess whether the contractor provided maximum practicable opportunity for Small Business to participate in contract performance consistent with efficient performance of the contract.

[50] Sometimes, due to the nature of the contract requirements, it may be difficult for a contractor to obtain a rating above satisfactory. When this happens, note in the narrative that the rating of Satisfactory indicates performance within the requirements of the contract and that there were no problems encountered during the reporting period.

	Block 20: Recommendation of whether you (definitely would not, probably would not, might or might not, probably would or definitely would) award to this Contractor again is consistent with the CPAR ratings and narrative.	Make sure the recommendation matches with the ratings and narrative provided.

APPENDIX IV - CPAR Quality Checklist (USAID short version, xx 2015)		
COR Name		**Date:**
Contract # (Schedule # for GSA orders)		
Order Number:		
Contractor's Name:		
Period Evaluated:		
CPARS Block#:	**X or N/A**	**Description**
Block 6		Specify the geographic location when services are performed overseas.
Blocks 7-12		Ensure that Contract Completion Date and Awarded Value include **all** option periods, even if the options have not yet been exercised.
Block 15		Identify subcontractors performing 25% or more or a critical aspect of the. Do not access the subcontractor performance.
Block 17		Make sure the Contract Effort Description is complete and allows a reader without personal knowledge of the program to understand the requirements. **Ensure that the description:**
		Identifies the standards/requirements the contractor was expected to meet. Performance will be measured against these standard/requirements;
		Addresses the complexity of the contract/TO effort and the overall technical risk associated with accomplishing the effort; details any relevant technologies required;
		For IDIQs, states the number of orders issued during the period, the number of orders completed during the period, and the number of active orders;
		For interim CPARs, contains a description of key milestone events or major award modifications that occurred in the review period.
Block 18		Ratings are consistent with other program metrics or performance appraisals (e.g., portfolio reviews, performance evaluations, award fee determinations).
Block 20		A Narrative is provided to support each evaluation area which has been rated. **Ensure that the narrative for each rated element:**
		is consistent with rating definitions (See FAR 42.1503, Tables 42-1 or 42-2 or Appendix I and II) and contract objectives.
		is limited to evaluation of the current period and addresses any rating changes from prior reports;
		provides fact-based evidence/justification for the rating assigned; indicates major/minor strengths and weaknesses as well as benefit and/or impact to the Government; documents an explanation of how problems were resolved and the extent to which solutions were effective;
		is well-written, contains objective non-personal statements, spells out all acronyms and explains the technical terms when first used; does not include phrases that may result in an equitable adjustment or constructive change to the contract.
		correlates with the "Contract Effort Description" in Block 17;
		recognizes the risk inherent in the efforts and Government's role, if any, in contractor's inability to meet requirements[51];
		Narrative for Utilization of Small Business addresses the Contractor's efforts to meet small business subcontracting goals.
		Your recommendation is consistent with the CPAR ratings and narrative.

[51] The CO must consult GC/RLO, when the Government's role may have negatively affected the ontractor's performance.

APPENDIX V –ADDITIONAL RESEARCH AND OUTREACH STEPS[52]
(USAID version)

	Steps	Actions	Benefits
1.	Request information on recent Federal contracts.	Contact the CO, COR, or Program or Project Manager (P/PM) of the contractor's two largest, most recently awarded Federal contracts or orders so the history of a contractor's work can be reviewed. If this information is not readily available, request the contractor to provide points of contact.	Discussions with previous COs, CORs, and P/PMs that worked with the contractor on a regular basis may provide more visibility into contractor performance on recent work.
2.	Search for recent news about the company's performance (as appropriate).	Review articles and other publications and for timely and relevant news about a contractor's performance or business integrity. Use other publications similar to the sources used when making a responsibility determination. If warranted, search for pertinent contractor performance information in Government Accountability Office Reports available at www.gao.gov, and agency Inspector General (IG) Reports available on agency websites. Also, if necessary, review the company's past suspension and debarment record concerning incidents with other agencies and your own agency that are germane to your acquisition	This information may help uncover new information and recent performance or integrity issues that haven't yet been reported in PPIRS, or may raise awareness about a performance risk that may need further explanation from the vendor.
3.	Review reliable commercial sources of performance information (as appropriate).	In addition to PPIRS use public and commercial databases, or related services, to gain a fuller understanding of a contractor's performance. Some of these companies provide business reviews, past performance reports, consumer evaluations, contractor management reports, and other information that might be helpful in assessing a contractor's ability to perform the contract successfully.	This information may be helpful in evaluating the capabilities of small or new businesses that might otherwise not have had the opportunity to demonstrate their performance record on Federal contracts.
4.	Ask for a wide variety of references	Request that offerors provide at least three to five references of recently completed contracts or orders (within the last three to five years) from Federal, State, local or foreign government, and by commercial firms, business partners, subcontractors, etc. of similar size, scope, and complexity.	Learning about a vendor's performance on a wide variety of contracts may be useful in determining if an experienced contractor's performance is consistent, and will help provide small and new businesses with little or no Federal experience a fair opportunity to compete.
5.	Ask for information about sub-contractors and contractor team arrangements	Request that prime contractors provide past performance information on subcontractors and contractor team arrangements using the guidance above for sources of information.	This will give the source selection official a complete view and better understanding of the prime contractor, subcontractors and contractor team arrangement's performance capabilities.

[52] These requirements were established by OFPP memorandum dated July 10, 2014 entitled "Making Better Use of Contractor Performance Information".

APPENDIX VI - TRAINING COURSES BY ROLE :

A. TRAINING COURSES

CPARS role	Mandatory trainings	Elective trainings
USAID Past Performance Coordinator/Super Focal Point	✓ Focal Point and Agency POC Functions; ✓ CPARS Overview;	✓PPIRS, PPIRS-RC and/or PPIRS-SR as appropriate; ✓FAPIIS Overview (1 hour) or Trailer (4 minutes) as appropriate; ✓ USAID-developed CPARS Workshop
Focal Points/Alternate Focal Points	✓ Focal Point and Agency POC Functions; ✓ CPARS Overview	✓ USAID-developed CPARS Workshop
Assessing Official and Assessing Official Representatives in M/OAA (Contracting Officers/Contract Specialists)	✓ Quality and Narrative Writing ✓ CPARS Overview;	✓ USAID-developed CPARS Workshop; ✓PPIRS, PPIRS-RC and/or PPIRS-SR as appropriate ✓FAPIIS Overview (1 hour) or Trailer (4 minutes) as appropriate
Assessing Official Representatives (Contracting Officer's representatives)	✓ Quality and Narrative Writing ✓ CPARS Overview.	✓ USAID-developed CPARS Workshop; ✓ PPIRS, PPIRS-RC and/or PPIRS-SR as appropriate.
Reviewing Official		✓ CPARS Overview; ✓ Quality and Narrative Writing; ✓ USAID-developed CPARS Workshop

B. CPARS/FAPIIS/PPIRS COURSE DESCRIPTIONS

1) CPARS Training[53]:

CPARS Overview (2 hours) – This training will give the student an overview of the policies and regulations governing CPARS, the CPARS Workflow, and CPARS Application functionality. Taking the CPARS or Overview is a prerequisite to Quality and Narrative Writing and Focal Point Functions.

Target Audience: This course is specifically targeted for those users who have

[53] See https://www.cpars.gov/cpcbtdlf.htm to sign up for all CPARS trainings.

minimal familiarity with the CPARS process.

Quality and Narrative Writing (1.25 hours) – This training will give the student an understanding of the need for quality and accuracy in narrative writing, examples of narratives and resources to aid in creating quality Past Performance Evaluations, and examples of strategies for making the CPARS-FAPIIS process more effective. Taking the CPARS Overview is a prerequisite to taking this class.

Target Audience: This session is specifically targeted for Government users responsible for creating and reviewing Contractor Past Performance Evaluations, but could also be of benefit to Contractor Representatives. Students taking this class should already have a basic knowledge of policy and workflow, such as that presented in the CPARS Overview class.

Focal Point and Agency POC Functions (1.5 hours) – This training will give the student an understanding of the focal point and Agency Point of Contact levels of access, the assignment and control of CPARS user access, and the contract registration process. FAPIIS is not covered in this class; please see the FAPIIS Overview class below. Taking the CPARS Overview is a prerequisite to taking this class.

Target Audience: This session is specifically targeted for those Government focal point and Agency Point of Contact users responsible for establishing system access and managing the CPARS Workflow.

Contractor Overview (1.5 hours) - This is an online instructor-led webinar. The training will give the student an understanding of the Contractor Representative and Contractor Corporate Senior Management levels of access; the policies and regulations governing CPARS; and the electronic workflow with particular attention to the Contractor comment function.

2) FAPIIS Training:

FAPIIS Overview (1 hour) - This training will give the student an overview of the policies and regulations governing FAPIIS, including FAPIIS Application functionality, data entry, and FAPIIS focal point responsibilities.

Target Audience: This course is specifically targeted for those users who have minimal familiarity with the FAPIIS application.

APPENDIX VII – REFERENCES, LINKS AND QUESTIONS
REGULATIONS:

Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) (**http://acquisition.gov/comp/far/index.html**)

FAR Subparts:
8.4 Federal Supply Schedules – 8.406-7 Contractor performance evaluation and 8.406-8 Reporting
9.1 Responsible Prospective Contractors – 9.104 Standards and 9.105 Procedures
9.4 Debarment, Suspension and Ineligibility – 9.406 Debarment and 9.407 Suspension
12.2 Special Requirements for the Acquisition of Commercial Items - 12.206 Use of past performance
12.4 Unique Requirements Regarding Terms and Conditions for Commercial Items – 12.403 Termination
13.1 Procedures – 13.106-2 Evaluation of quotations or offers
15.3 Source Selection - 15.305 Proposal evaluation
15.4 Contract Pricing – 15.407-1 Defective cost or pricing data
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
49.4 Termination for Default – 49.401-8 Reporting information

AIDAR (**http://www.usaid.gov/ads/policy/300/aidar**)

Automated Directives System Chapter 302 USAID Direct Contracting (**http://www.usaid.gov/ads/policy/300/302**)

FORMS/TEMPLATES:

AID Form 302-1, Nondisclosure Agreement for USAID Personal Services Contractors Accessing Contractor Performance Information

(For Internal Use Only: http://auslnxapvweb01.usaid.gov/forms/formsnumeric.html)

CPARS/PPIRS WEB PAGES:

CPARS Web pages (**http://www.cpars.gov/cparsmain.htm**)
Policy Guidance for the CPARS (https://www.cpars.gov/pdfs/CPARS-Guidance.pdf)

FAPIIS (**http://www.cpars.gov/FAPIISmain.htm**)
FAPIIS User Manual (**http://www.cpars.gov/cparsfiles/pdfs/FAPIIS_User_Manual.pdf**)

PPIRS Homepage (**http://www.ppirs.gov/**)

(1) PPIRS-RC Software User's Manual (**http://www.ppirs.gov/ppirsfiles/pdf/PPIRS-RC%20User's%20Manual_3-26-2008.pdf**)
(2) PPIRS Federal Log-on (**https://ppirs.ppirs.gov/ppirs/banner.jsp?app=fed**)

DOD Guide: A Guide to Collection and Use of Past Performance Information (Version 3), May 2003 (**http://www.acq.osd.mil/dpap/Docs/PPI_Guide_2003_final.pdf**)

Step-by-step guide on creating a quality CPAR: **http://www.cpars.gov/cparsfiles/pdfs/CPARSQualityChecklist.pdf**

USAID CPII WEB PAGES:

USAID Past Performance FAQs (available at https://my.usaid.gov/tibbr/#!/subjects/39665)

OAA Solutions Center--eGov (For Internal Use Only: https://pages.usaid.gov/M/OAA/systems-support)

OFFICE OF FEDERAL PROCUREMENT POLICY (OFPP):

Improving the Use of Contractor Performance Information, July 2009
https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/assets/procurement/improving_use_of_contractor_perf_info.pdf

Improving Contractor Past Performance Assessments, January 2011
https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/procurement/contract_perf/PastPerformanceMemo-21-Jan-2011.pdf

Improving the Collection and Use of Information about Contractor Performance and Integrity, March 6, 2013
http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/procurement/memo/improving-the-collection-and-use-of-information-about-contractor-performance-and-integrity.pdf

Making Better Use of Contractor Performance Information, July 10, 2014
http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/procurement/memo/making-better-use-of-contractor-performance-information.pdf

Questions:

Questions concerning access to CPARS, FAPIIS, and PPIRS or questions concerning specific USAID reports may be directed to the USAID Past Performance Coordinator (super focal point) at **pperformance@usaid.gov**.

Questions concerning any statistics about number of reports and the reports that are registered, in process, or completed may also be directed to **pperformance@usaid.gov**.

Questions regarding the functionality of the CPARS/FAPIIS/PPIRS systems may be directed to the NAVSEA Help Desk at 207-438-1690 or **webptsmh@navy.mil**.

Questions or considerations on contractor suspension or debarment may be directed to M/OAA/Compliance at **compliance@usaid.gov**.

302mbh_123015