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What is a CPARS?

FAR 42.15

A Contractor Performance Assessment Report (CPAR) is a Government Report Card for a contractor’s work.

1. The **Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS)** is the electronic evaluation system the Gov’t uses to rate Prime Contractor performance.

2. Depending on the dollar value (above the simplified acquisition threshold for services, $750K for construction, and $35K for A/E) evaluations are required to be performed by the Gov’t at least **annually OR upon completion of the contract/task order**.

3. Contractors use this site to comment on and view **ONLY their** performance ratings received by the Government; access to CPARS is linked to a company’s unique entity identifier.

4. All Gov’t agencies can access CPARS reports and may be used for source selection to mitigate risk to the Gov’t on contractor’s performance during proposal evaluations.

5. These report cards are accessible **for up to 6 years from project (not contract) completion date**.
Poll: Do you feel CPARS are applied consistently within an agency?
Poll: Do you feel CPARS are applied consistently between agencies?
Poll: Do you collaborate closely with the agency on your CPARS?
Government is supposed to rate a CPAR within 120 days of end of PoP before it shows overdue. Through Q1 FY22, Government is overdue on **43,539 of 154,398 CPARS in process (28%)**.

Anecdote:
- Company “A” has nearly **$367M (280 CPARS) in ‘OVERDUE’ CPARS (old as 2013)**, that Gov’t has not rated
- Of those, $77M (60 CPARS, 54 of which are overdue) that have not been completed by the Gov’t (comments have been uploaded but still waiting for the Reviewing Official to close it out)
- This happens mostly but not solely with non-concurs
- **Gov’t can still review/evaluate these non-completed CPARS during source selection**

There is **no deadline** for the Gov’t to complete their process.
CPARS Industry / Government Engagement
CPARS Reform?

Issue:
Through discussion at SAME/AGC/DBIA events, discovered an undercurrent of dissatisfaction with the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) process by A/E/C industry. Many of the complaints revolved around the consistency of the ratings and lack of collaboration in the process. The taxpayers should benefit from a consistent and reliable performance rating system to incentivize performance and support future acquisition decisions.

SAME Tasking:
1. SAME appointed an Industry Government Engagement (IGE) team to evaluate the issues related to CPARS; initial tasking:
   a) Investigate and recommend an adjudication process of adverse interim and final CPARS ratings.
   b) How CPARS is currently used and identification of any gaps or inconsistencies
   c) Enhance understanding of CPARS
   d) This project will focus on results not requiring changes to the Federal Acquisition Regulations.
## CPARS Reform: Industry – Government Engagement Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Blount</td>
<td>SAME</td>
<td>Professional Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Biederman</td>
<td>SAME</td>
<td>Professional Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sal Nodjomian</td>
<td>SAME</td>
<td>Professional Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan Howard</td>
<td>AGC</td>
<td>Professional Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Stagner</td>
<td>DBIA</td>
<td>Professional Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Schlesinger</td>
<td>Prime AE</td>
<td>Architect/Engineer Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Alberghini</td>
<td>Michael Baker</td>
<td>Architect/Engineer Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Bowman</td>
<td>Siemens Government</td>
<td>Architect/Engineer Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Anne Bernard</td>
<td>AECOM</td>
<td>Architect/Engineer Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Waefler</td>
<td>RS&amp;H</td>
<td>Architect/Engineer Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Hopson</td>
<td>AECOM</td>
<td>Architect/Engineer Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacey Craven</td>
<td>NAVFAC</td>
<td>Government DCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberly Armstrong</td>
<td>NAVFAC</td>
<td>Government DCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrick Godfrey</td>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>Government DCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Biddle</td>
<td>AFCEC</td>
<td>Government DCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Savoy</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Government DCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shea DeLutis</td>
<td>Clark Construction</td>
<td>General Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chip Scott</td>
<td>Grunley Construction</td>
<td>General Contractor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CPARS Reform?

Discussion:
The IGE Team identified five focus areas to review:

1. Drive for consistency within an Agency and across all Agencies
2. Drive for incorporation of CPARS rating [sub]factors definitions and understanding into Partnering (written into Partnering and "Kickoff" documents/direction) with periodic follow up
3. Support a dispute resolution process for low ratings prior to recording in CPARS.
4. Drive for correlation between meaning of CPARS ratings given for a project/contract and interpretation by future source selection boards.
5. Promulgate and support CPARS training for contractor.

Recommendation:
Have IGE address following; report back at JETC 2022:

1. Liaison with GSA regarding development of CPARS modules on Construction and Architectural Services that provide more consistent rigor and detail in the rating process (similar to the rigor of the old CCASS and ACASS). If GSA is not amenable to a change, develop tri-service (DCAs) sub-factors for consistent application for construction and AE contracts.
2. Incorporate CPARS rating [sub]factors definitions and understanding into the DCA's Partnering Directives
3. Develop a plan to promulgate and support CPARS training for all contractors via Society/Association educational forums, DCA outreach and other vehicles.
Recommendation 1: CPARS Consistency
CPARS Consistency Recommendation

For the three DoD Design and Construction Agents (DCAs) and the VA, develop consistent modules for Construction and Architectural/Engineering Services CPARS like the preexisting CCASS and ACASS and informed by NAVFAC worksheets. These modules will add guidance and rigor in the reporting process by providing subfactors to the Quality, Schedule, Management, Cost Control and Small Business rating categories defined by FAR 42.15.

Once developed, the above DCAs will use this system on all CPARS for Construction and AE Services.
# CPARS Consistency

## Evaluation Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Areas</th>
<th>Past Rating</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Exceptional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Exceptional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Control</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Exceptional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Exceptional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Subcontracting</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Exceptional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Compliance</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Exceptional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Quality

**PART III: EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE ELEMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Control</th>
<th>N/A/O/A</th>
<th>S/M/U/M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. Adequacy of Submittals</td>
<td>b. Coordination and Control of Subcontractor Issues</td>
<td>b. Compliance with Laws and Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Quality of Documentation</td>
<td>d. Storage of Materials</td>
<td>d. Storage of Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Efficiency of Job Site Supervision</td>
<td>e. Adequacy of Materials</td>
<td>e. Adequacy of Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Use of Specified Materials</td>
<td>g. Professional Conduct</td>
<td>g. Professional Conduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Identification/Correction of Deficient Work in a Timely Manner</td>
<td>h. Responsibility</td>
<td>h. Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Implementation of the CCQ Plan</td>
<td>i. Adequacy of AS-BUILTS</td>
<td>i. Adequacy of AS-BUILTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TYPICAL LEASE CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION CRITERIA**

- Quality of Workmanship
- Adequacy of the CCQ Plan
- Management of Resources - Prepared
- Coordination and Control of Subcontractor Issues
- Prevention of Deficient Work in a Timely Manner
- Implementation of Subcontracting Plan
- Storage of Materials
- Adequacy of Materials
- Adequacy of Submittals
- Adequacy of QC Testing
- Adequacy of AS-BUILTS
- Professional Conduct
- Responsibility
- Compliance with Safety Standards

---

Sources: samejetc.org, @SAMENational, @SAME_National, #SAMEJETC22, "Society of American Military Engineers"
NEW CPARS Policy for NAVFAC Construction Contracts

January 2019

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND
WASHINGTON NAVY YARD, DC 20370-5000

4315
SETH COYNE
3 JAN 2019

From: Commander, Naval Facilities Engineering Command

Subj: CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT REPORTING SYSTEM

Ref: (a) PHN Subpart 42.15-Contractor Performance Information
(b) PHN 15.365 Performance Evaluation

Enclosure: (1) NAVFAC CPARS Ratings Process
(2) NAVFAC CPARS Ratings Matrix
(3) Summary of Recommendations and Rating

1. Purpose. To promulgate updated policy to improve the performance, timeliness, and consistency of construction Contractor Performance Assessment (CPARS) documentation and ratings.

2. Background. Reference (a) provides requirements for contractor post-performance evaluations, including contract thresholds, definitions (i.e., ratings), and application (i.e., use of CPARS at http://www.cpars.gov/). Reference (b) establishes the use of post-performance information in source selection evaluations.

3. Policy. This instruction applies to all construction contracts and task orders.

(a) Initial and/or final performance ratings must not be a surprise to the construction contractor. Fair treatment and professionalism requires open, two-way communications with the contractor throughout the performance of the contract.

(b) Post-performance evaluations must be provided in a timely manner to support on-going or future source selections.

(c) Fair rating standards must be consistently applied to all post-performance information and must accurately reflect actual contractor performance. Rating standards should be mutually understood by the Government and the Contractor.

(d) Post-performance information must include performance details of prime contractor safety as well as key sub-contractors (sub) and architectural-engineers (A/E).

4. Action. Per Enclosure (1) and as appropriate, the contractor Assessing Official (typically the construction manager) shall perform the following functions:

(a) Review enclosure (2) with the contractor at each pre-construction conference (prcon) or post-contract kick-off meeting (PKOF). Note, this ratings matrix was developed with input from various industry groups as an acceptable standard. Ensure documentation of contractor performance in accordance with the established Business Operations Plan and leverage existing tools, such as standard NAVFAC QA Form(s) and checklists within the NAVFAC Electronic Construction and Facility Support Contract Management System (C2S).

(b) For all construction contracts or task orders greater than $700,000:

(i) Submit annual evaluations to the Reviewing Official (typically the Contracting Officer) within 30 days after the contract is completed or after any termination for default, regardless of contract amount.

(ii) Submit an annual evaluation covering the entire contract performance to the Reviewing Official within 30 days after the contract is completed or after any termination for default, regardless of contract amount.

(iii) If an evaluation is required, select the appropriate rating for each sub-factor in enclosure (3). A sub-factor does not apply or is not observed, select the “N/A” rating. Copy the auto-generated narrative from enclosure (3), then within CPARS select the appropriate rating for each factor and paste the copied narrative and provide examples (e.g., site safety manager, project engineer) as required. Incorporate contractor performance feedback from key parties (e.g., design manager, project construction specialist, site safety engineer, engineering technician, etc.). Note, all contracts terminated for default shall be issued an unsatisfactory rating using the appropriate factor (e.g., Quality, Schedule, Management).

(iv) Provide the name of company, DUNS number, and description of services of the key sub(a) and A/E under "Key Subcontractors and Effort (Project)" section in the "Main Information" tab in C2S. Include a rating and narrative for the prime contractor safety program, as well as key sub(a) and A/E, using separate "Other Areas" sub-tabs.

5. The NAVFAC Business Management System (NBMS) process B-1.7.5 will be updated to reflect these changes. Training and questions will be addressed by Norman Pohlm, at 202-480-9170, or hpmn.navalafety.e11.

Joseph S. Cody, C.E.
Chief Engineer and
Assistant Commander, Capital Improvement

Distribution:
Electronic only, via Mary Tuskeas - https://aqf.us/5ol.navy.612/
### Ratings: Exceptional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Overall Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adherence to the Design QC Plan was HIGHLY EFFECTIVE. The composition of the bid documents were MOSTLY clear, which resulted in little to no re-work that was immediately addressed.</td>
<td>Exceptional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adherence to the Design QC Plan was EFFECTIVE.</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adherence to the Design QC Plan was SATISFACTORY.</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adherence to the Design QC Plan was SATISFACTORY.</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adherence to the Design QC Plan was SATISFACTORY.</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adherence to the Design QC Plan was SATISFACTORY.</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cost Estimate and Risk Assessment Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Cost Estimate and Risk Assessment Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional</td>
<td>Architect-Engineer Cost Estimates and Risk Assessment documents were HIGHLY ACCURATE with respect to the award amount, even at early stages of design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Architect-Engineer Cost Estimates and Risk Assessment documents were ACCURATE with respect to the award amount. Basis of Cost Estimate CLEARLY showed derivation of contractor markups and sources of material, equipment and labor cost data backed by industry data and calculations – accuracy of individual line items was ADEQUATE and CLEARLY addressed in the project scope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Architect-Engineer Cost Estimates and Risk Assessment documents were SATISFACTORY, enabling the Gov't and Architect-Engineer to award the project. Cost estimating and risk assessment identified that were SATISFACTORY addressed in an agreed upon timeframe without serious problems and MODERATELY EFFECTIVE or NOT YET IDENTIFIED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>Architect-Engineer Cost Estimates and Risk Assessment documents were SATISFACTORY, meeting contractual requirements with SOME MINOR DEFICIENCIES and SATISFACTORY corrective actions in a mutually agreed upon timeframe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Architect-Engineer Cost Estimates and Risk Assessment documents were NOT SATISFACTORY, meeting contractual requirements with SERIOUS problems and MODERATELY EFFECTIVE or NOT YET IDENTIFIED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Architect-Engineer Cost Estimates and Risk Assessment documents were NOT SATISFACTORY including UNSATISFACTORY, assumptions, accounting inaccurate quantities. Overall project execution was SERIOUSLY IMPACTED by accuracy of cost estimating and risk assessments. Basis of Cost Estimate did not address derivation of contractor markups and sources of material, equipment and labor cost.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation 2: CPARS Integration into Partnering
Integration of CPARS into Partnering Recommendation

As part of the Agency’s existing Partnering (Formal and Informal) and Collaborative Working programs/directives/instructions, insert the following:

• CPARs Training and Understanding
  • Partnering together at Project Kick Off
• Agency/Field Office CPARS Rating Definitions
  • Set expectations upfront!
• Explanation of Agency/Field Office CPARS processes
• Frequency of Reports
Why incorporate CPARS into Partnering?

- Partnering early leads to successful project outcomes
- Clear and Defined CPARS ratings
- CPARS ratings have a great impact. Contractors want a successful project
- Internal CPARS Process
What should be discussed in Partnering WRT CPARS

• What categories beyond the required will be evaluated?
• What will it take to get a Very Good / Exceptional rating?
• What will be the frequency of reports? Once a year?
• Who is the Assessing Official (AO)?
• What is the escalation process for disagreement on scores/ratings? An informal and formal (FAR cited) process should be discussed.
• Any specific concerns from the client that will drive the evaluations?
• Can the contractor prepare a draft CPARS and see the Government’s draft prior to submitting in the system?
AHU design review comments at the 50% and 100% design reviews did not get addressed in the contract documents. As a result several coordination meetings were necessary during construction performance to redesign the fire alarm system and gain approval. The AE reaction time to resolve was slow resulting in a building that lacked protection during much of construction and added time requirement to address the issue.
Contractor Response

We respectfully disagree that 50% and 100% comments from the Government Agency Fire Protection reviewer were not addressed. We followed the direction received from the Authority Having Jurisdiction (Tyndall AFB Fire Department AHJ) during early site visits and discussions related to fire alarm systems as follows:

- **2/12/21 - Direction** during scoping phase
  - Jane Doe, Tyndall Fire Department, directed the design team …
- **5/23/21 - Comment** provided at 50%
  - John Smith, acting as Agency reviewer, commented that the new system should have …
- **8/3/21** – Comment provided at 50%
  - Sally Green, Tyndall Fire Department, commented that …
- **11/20/21** - Comments at 100% design and Final
- The 100% and final design was submitted with a system that ….
How to incorporate CPARS into Partnering

1. Introduce CPARS
2. Project Award
3. Alignment / Kick-Off
4. Quarterly Partnering
5. Start of Major Project Activity
6. Project Debrief
7. CPARS Check
8. Partnering and Planning

CPARS Check

Include CPARS
Recommendation 3: CPARS Training and Understanding
Training and Understanding Recommendations

1. Gov’t to implement consistency across agency websites for CPARS references.
   - Include a link that directs to CPARS.gov training site

2. Gov’t to develop more/better training for rating officials (housed with other training on CPARS.gov website)
   - Training exists for how to enter ratings into CPARS.gov, but now how or what criteria to use to evaluate the contractor
   - (Engage IGE to help promote)

3. IGE to seek training opportunities at professional organizations/associations.
   - Examples: COAA, DBIA, SAME, ACEC, AGC, AIA, CMAA

4. Gov’t to stress importance of robust, on-time reviews to lessen ‘overdue’ CPARS.
   - Overdue CPARS tend to affect the integrity of the ratings/narrative (i.e., Gov’t staff turnover, contractor performance not tracked)
### Nuts and Bolts of the CPAR Evaluation

**Red highlights** = Key Government fields to complete  
**Green highlights** = Contractor fields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Name/Address of Contractor:</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vendor Name:</strong></td>
<td>CONTRACTOR, INC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Division Name:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street:</strong></td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City:</strong></td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State:</strong></td>
<td>Zip: XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country:</strong></td>
<td>XX CAGE Code:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unique Entity ID (DUNS):</strong></td>
<td>XX Unique Entity ID (SAM):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product/Service Code:</strong></td>
<td>XX Principal NAICS Code: XX Evaluation Type: Interim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contract Percent Complete:</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period of Performance Being Assessed:</strong></td>
<td>08/21/2019 - 08/19/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contract Number:</strong></td>
<td>XXXXXX XXX Business Sector &amp; Sub-Sector: Nonsystems - Facilities Services Contracting Office: XX Contracting Officer: XX Phone Number: XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location of Work:</strong></td>
<td>XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date Signed:</strong></td>
<td>09/15/2017 Effective Date: 09/15/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Est. Ultimate Completion Date/Last Date to Order:</strong></td>
<td>09/14/2020 <strong>Estimated/Actual Completion Date:</strong> 09/24/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base and All Options Value:</strong></td>
<td>$XX Action Obligation: $XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complexity:</strong></td>
<td>High Termination Type: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extent Competed:</strong></td>
<td>Full and Open Competition <strong>Type of Contract:</strong> Firm Fixed Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Subcontractors and Effort Performed:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unique Entity ID (DUNS):</strong></td>
<td>Unique Entity ID (SAM):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effort:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unique Entity ID (DUNS):</strong></td>
<td>Unique Entity ID (SAM):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effort:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unique Entity ID (DUNS):</strong></td>
<td>Unique Entity ID (SAM):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effort:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Number:</strong></td>
<td>Project Title: XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contract Effort Description:</strong></td>
<td>This is a compliance cleanup (CC) project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Contractor Comments:**

ADDITIONAL/OTHER: Contractor, Inc. would like to thank the Government for the opportunity to participate in this project and we look forward to working together in the future.

**CONCURRENCE:** I concur.

ADDITIONAL/OTHER: Contractor, Inc. would like to thank the Government for the opportunity to participate in this project. We believe higher ratings would more accurately reflect our performance for Management and request reevaluation. We worked closely with the Government and the Task Manager to provide prompt and effective support to meet the Government’s needs and requirements. Our Project Manager reached out to the Government’s Operations Managers and Task Team Lead on a regular basis. We were very supportive of the Government’s efforts and routinely received positive feedback. Per the Assessing Officer’s comments, “Contractor Inc. exhibited exemplary customer service with the Government and maintained a high level of professionalism in its working relationships with all parties involved. Provided timely and responsive services to effectively support the Government in the accomplishment of its mission.” Based on this positive feedback and the significant benefits provided to the Government stemming from our outstanding project management, we respectfully request consideration of an Exceptional rating for Management.

**CONCURRENCE:** I do not concur with this evaluation and request that it be reevaluated.

**Name and Title of Contractor Representative:**

Name: Jana Smith  
Title: Project Manager  
Phone Number: 203-555-1212  
Email Address: jana.smith@company.com  
Date: 09/21/2020

**Review by Reviewing Official:**

**Name and Title of Reviewing Official:**

Name:  
Title:  
Organization:  
Phone Number:  
Email Address:  
Date:  

**Assessment of Small Business Subcontracting:**

- **Does the contract include a subcontracting plan?** No
- **Date of last Individual Subcontracting Report (ISR) / Summary Subcontracting Report (SSR):** N/A

**Evaluation Areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Past Rating</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Controls:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management:</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Subcontracting:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Compliance:</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Areas**

| (1): | N/A |
| (2): | N/A |
| (3): | N/A |

**Variance**

- **(Contract to Date):**
  - Current Cost Variance (%): ...
  - Variance at Completion (%): ...
  - Current Schedule Variance (%): ...

**Assessing Official Comments:**

QUALITY: Contractor Inc. furnished all required deliverables on schedule. All work was completed in accordance with the SDW and prior to the Period of Performance and date.

SCHEDULE: Performance to date has met the contract requirements.

COST CONTROL: The contract is fixed at a flat price.

MANAGEMENT: Contractor Inc. exhibited exemplary customer service with the Government and maintained a high level of professionalism in its working relationships with all parties involved. Provided timely and responsive services to effectively support the Government in the accomplishment of its mission.

REGULATORY COMPLIANCE: The contractor has performed in accordance with the contract for excavation and performing the pilot test. No significant weaknesses have been identified.

RECOMMENDATION: Given what I know today about the contractor’s ability to perform in accordance with this contract or order’s most significant requirements, I would recommend them for similar requirements in the future.

**Name and Title of Assessing Official:**

Name: John J. Smith  
Title: xx  
Organization: US Army Corps of Engineers  
Phone Number: xx  
Email Address: xx  
Date: 09/01/2020
CPARS Best Practices

1. Lay the foundation at contract award and follow through with exceptional performance.

2. Understand the Gov’t’s expectations at kickoff and what it will take to get exceptional ratings. By simply having open communications with the Gov’t, you can be involved throughout the entire process and help set the stage for higher performance ratings.

3. Hold periodic performance check-ins with the Gov’t to ensure both the Gov’t and the Contractor are in agreement towards successful project completion. Ensure that the work being performed is meeting or exceeding the Gov’t’s expectations. (See FAR Table 42-1 for definitions.)

4. Develop CPAR input throughout the period of performance. The Gov’t may only remember the last few months of work, which could negatively affect the CPAR for the entire period of performance.

5. Consider including a CPARS checklist or self-evaluation as part of the regular check-in procedure to proactively track project success.
   - It is recommended to use the CPAR format to build your self-evaluation and complete each applicable evaluation area in detailed paragraphs not bullets. (Blank areas or minimal information could cost you a good rating in those areas.)
   - Include recommended ratings of your performance based on the FAR definitions with supporting details showing key examples of how your performance met or exceeded the requirements and the resulting benefit to the Gov’t.

Don’t let CPARS become an afterthought.
Resources

• FAR Subpart 42.15
  – https://www.acquisition.gov/far/subpart-42.15

• CPARS Guidance

• CPARS Training
  – https://www.cpars.gov/lc_function.htm
Poll: Of the three recommendations, which do you feel is most important?
CPARS: Time Has Come for a Change
CPARS 101
SAME JETC 2022
A Contractor Performance Assessment Report (CPAR) is a Government Report Card for a Contractor’s work.

1. The Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) is the electronic evaluation system the Gov’t uses to rate Prime Contractor performance.

2. Depending on the dollar value (above the Simplified Acquisition Threshold for services, $750K for construction, and $35K for A/E) evaluations are required to be performed by the Gov’t at least annually OR upon completion of the contract/task order.

3. Contractors use this site to comment on and view ONLY their performance ratings received by the Government; access to CPARS is linked to a Contractor’s unique entity identifier.

4. All Gov’t agencies can access CPARS reports and may be used for source selection to mitigate risk to the Gov’t on Contractor’s performance during proposal evaluations.

5. These report cards are accessible for up to 6 years from project (not contract) completion date.
# Projects that Qualify for a CPARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Sector</th>
<th>Reporting Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Systems & Non-Systems (Simplified Acquisition Threshold) – 3 years | • For Civilian agencies, contracts over Simplified Acquisition Threshold  
• For DOD, contracts over $1M* |
| Architect-Engineer – 6 years | • Civilian or DoD agencies  
• Contracts valued over $35K  
• All Terminations for Default |
| Construction – 6 years | • Civilian or DoD agencies  
• Contracts valued over $750K  
• All Terminations for Default |

*See FAR 42.1502

*See FAR 42.1502
**Evaluation Areas** for performance of specific aspects of work, with supporting with narrative.

**Adjectival Ratings** indicate the degree to which the Contractor met the standard for each evaluation area.

**Recommendation** for future similar work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Areas</th>
<th>Exceptional</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Marginal</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Subcontracting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CPARS Layout

The Nuts and Bolts of the CPAR Evaluation

**Red highlights** = Key Gov’t fields (Contractor, review for accuracy); Non-concur response will include additional signature and remarks from Reviewing Official.

**Green highlights** = Contractor fields to populate

CPARS are confidential in nature.

From the CPARS Guidance manual: “Evaluations may contain information that is proprietary to the contractor. Information contained on the evaluation, such as trade secrets and protected commercial or financial data obtained from the contractor in confidence, must be protected from unauthorized disclosure.”
CONCURRENCE: I concur.

ADDITIONAL/OTHER: Contractor, Inc. would like to thank the Government for the opportunity to participate in this project and we look forward to working together in the future.

CR:

ADDITIONAL/OTHER: Contractor, Inc. would like to thank the Government for the opportunity to participate in this project. We believe higher ratings would more accurately reflect our performance for Management and Support, Evaluation. We worked closely with the Government and the Task Manager to provide prompt and effective support to meet the Government's needs and requirements. Our Project Manager reached out to the Government's Operations Manager and Task Team Lead on a regular basis. We were very supportive of the Government's efforts and routinely received positive feedback. Per the Assessing Official's comments, "Contractor Inc. exhibited exemplary customer service with the Government and maintained a high level of professionalism in its working relationships with all parties involved. Provided timely and responsive services to effectively support the Government in the accomplishment of its mission." Based on this positive feedback and the significant benefits provided to the Government stemming from our outstanding project management, we respectfully request consideration of an exceptional rating for Management.

CONCURRENCE: I do not concur with this evaluation and request that it be reconsidered.

Name and Title of Contractor Representative:
Name: Jane Smith
Title: Project Manager
Phone Number: 703-555-1234
Email Address: jane.smith@company.com
Date: 09/21/2029

Review by Reviewing Official:
Name and Title of Reviewing Official:
Name: John J. Smith
Title: XX
Organization: US Army Corps of Engineers
Phone Number: XX
Email Address: XX
Date: 02/03/2020

Assessing Official Comments:
QUALITY: Contractor Inc. furnished all required deliverables on schedule. All work was completed in accordance with the SOW and prior to the Period of Performance end date.

SCHEDULE: Performance to date has met the contract requirements.

COST CONTROL: The contract is fixed price.

MANAGEMENT: Contractor Inc. exhibited exemplary customer service with the Government and maintained a high level of professionalism in its working relationships with all parties involved. Provided timely and responsive services to effectively support the Government in the accomplishment of its mission.

REGULATORY COMPLIANCE: The contractor has performed in accordance with the contract for execution and performing the pilot test. No significant weaknesses have been identified.

N/C or Exceptional: Given what I know today about the contractor's ability to perform in accordance with this contract or order's most significant requirements, I would recommend them for similar requirements in the future.

Name and Title of Assessing Official:
Name: John J. Smith
Title: XX
Caption: US Army Corps of Engineers
Phone Number: XX
Email Address: XX
Date: 09/21/2029

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Area</th>
<th>Pass Rating</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Control</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Subcontracting</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Compliance</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Areas</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variance (Contract to Date):
Current Cost Variance (K): Variance at Completion (K):
Current Schedule Variance (K):
CPARS Evaluation Areas + Criteria

Quality
- Product Performance Relative to Contract’s Performance Parameters
- Performance in Terms of Contract’s Quality Objectives
- Use Quantitative Indicators Wherever Possible
- Contractor’s Management of the Quality Control Program
- Quality of the Work or Service

Schedule
- Timeliness of Delivery
- Timely Completion of Contract/Order
- Milestones
- Timely Completion of Administrative Requirements

Cost Control
- Forecasting Cost
- Managing Cost
- Controlling Cost
- Overrun?
- Underrun?

Management
- Integration and Coordination of Activity
- Problem Identification
- Corrective Action Plans
- Reasonable and Cooperative Behavior
- Customer Satisfaction
- Subcontract Management
- Program Management
- Management of Key Personnel

Utilization of Small Business
- Compliance with Terms and Conditions for Small Business Participation
- Achievement of Small Business Subcontracting Goals
- Good Faith Effort to Meet Small Business Subcontracting Goals

Regulatory Compliance
- Compliance with Regulations and Codes
- Financial
- Environmental
- Labor
- Safety
- Reporting Requirements
## CPARS Evaluation Ratings Definitions

**FAR 42.1503(h)(4)**

### Table 42-1. Evaluation Ratings Definition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATING</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Exceptional</td>
<td>Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds many to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being evaluated was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were highly effective.</td>
<td>To justify an Exceptional rating, identify multiple significant events and state how they were of benefit to the Government. A singular benefit, however, could be of such magnitude that it alone constitutes an Exceptional rating. Also, there should have been NO significant weaknesses identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Very Good</td>
<td>Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds some to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being evaluated was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were effective.</td>
<td>To justify a Very Good rating, identify a significant event and state how it was a benefit to the Government. There should have been no significant weaknesses identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Satisfactory</td>
<td>Performance meets contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor appear or were satisfactory.</td>
<td>To justify a Satisfactory rating, there should have been only minor problems, or major problems the contractor recovered from without impact to the contract/order. The contractor should have been NO significant weaknesses identified. A fundamental principle of assigning ratings is that contractors will not be evaluated with a rating lower than Satisfactory solely for not performing beyond the requirements of the contract/order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Marginal</td>
<td>Performance does not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being evaluated reflects a serious problem for which the contractor has not yet identified corrective actions. The contractor's proposed actions appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented.</td>
<td>To justify Marginal performance, identify a significant event in each category that the contractor had trouble overcoming and state how it impacted the Government. A Marginal rating should be supported by referencing the management tool that notified the contractor of the contractual deficiency (e.g., management, quality, safety, or environmental deficiency report or letter).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CPARS Workflow Process

1. Gov’t “Focal Point” / PM
Registers Contracts, Assigns Users, Provides Support (within 30 days)

2. Assessing Official Rep (AOR)
Assists AO in Preparing Evaluations (day 365-485)

3. Assessing Official (AO):
Sends Evaluation to Contractor Rep

4. Contractor Representative (CR)
Provides and Uploads Comments (within 60 days)

5. Assessing Official (AO):
Reviews Contractor Comments

6. Reviewing Official (RO)
Reviews to resolve disputes, as applicable

7. Gov’t Source Selection Officials
Reviews Evaluations During Source Selection Process
Frequency of CPARS in the Life of Project

INTERIM RATING
After [duration]

Project start
Interim rating submitted
Contractor response
Interim rating completed

FINAL RATING
After [duration]

Project finish
Final rating submitted
Contractor response
Final rating completed

ALL CPARS STAY IN THE SYSTEM; FINAL CPAR REPRESENTS FINAL PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE, NOT ENTIRE PROJECT LIFE.

Repeat these steps for projects continuing for [duration]
CPARS Evaluation Timeline – Government

Day 0-30  Basic contract information is registered in Gov’t systems
Day 335  Evaluation appears on AOR/AO To-Do list
Day 365-485  AOR/AO enters Evaluation ratings and narratives and sends to Contractor Rep’s “To-Do” list for comment

↓ clock starts for Contractor
CPARS Evaluation Timeline – Contractor

Day 1  CPARS evaluation notification is received on Contractor’s “To-do” list; evaluation period begins. *The clock starts ticking for Contractor to respond!*

Day 15  Evaluation is migrated to CPARS *with or without Contractor’s response*. Source Selection Committee reviewers will see, “INCOMPLETE; AWAITING CONTRACTOR COMMENTS,” if Contactor has not submitted their response.

Day 61  Contractor comment period ends; further response is no longer allowed.

Evaluations remain in CPARS system for up to 6 years from completion date (not POP).
CPARS Resources

- FAR Subpart 42.15 - https://www.acquisition.gov/far/subpart-42.15
- CPARS Training - https://www.cpars.gov/lc_function.htm
CPARS.gov “Senior” Contractor Rep Capabilities
Must request access from CPARS.gov helpdesk; may include more options than Contractor Rep Access
CPARS.gov Reporting Features

Select Saved Report: COMPLETE

Report Name: COMPLETE

Select Report Type: Performance Evaluations-Source Selection

Select Data Element(s):
- AE ConField Consult Rating
- AE ConAcc Plans Spec Rating
- AE Con Con Op Response Rating
- AE Con Design Ques Rating
- AE Con Design Rating
- AE Con Drawings Rating
- AE Con Equip Avail Rating
- AE Con Plan Rating
- AE Con Submittal Rating
- AE Con Sup Discip 1 Rating

Logical Condition
- (Select Condition)

Data Element
- (Select Data Element)

Comparison
- (Select Comparison)

Where(s)
- Logical Condition
- Data Element
- Compare Condition
- Data Value

Add >>
- Agency
- Assessment Start Date
- Assessment End Date
- Assessing Official Name
- Assigning Official Organization
- Company Name
- Contract Completion Date
- Contract Effort Description
- Contract Number
- Contract Order Number

Delete
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSESSMENT START DATE</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT END DATE</th>
<th>CONTRACT COMPLETION DATE</th>
<th>QUALITY RATING</th>
<th>SCHEDULE RATING</th>
<th>COST CONTROL RATING</th>
<th>MANAGEMENT RATING</th>
<th>SMALL BUSINESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/30/2011</td>
<td>9/30/2014</td>
<td>9/30/2014</td>
<td>EXCEPTIONAL</td>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>EXCEPTIONAL</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/28/2011</td>
<td>9/28/2012</td>
<td>6/30/2014</td>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
<td>EXCEPTIONAL</td>
<td>EXCEPTIONAL</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/25/2012</td>
<td>2/27/2015</td>
<td>3/31/2015</td>
<td>EXCEPTIONAL</td>
<td>EXCEPTIONAL</td>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
<td>EXCEPTIONAL</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/28/2013</td>
<td>2/27/2014</td>
<td>9/30/2014</td>
<td>EXCEPTIONAL</td>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>EXCEPTIONAL</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/29/2013</td>
<td>9/28/2014</td>
<td>4/24/2015</td>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/20/2014</td>
<td>5/15/2014</td>
<td>5/15/2014</td>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/29/2014</td>
<td>2/14/2017</td>
<td>12/15/2015</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>EXCEPTIONAL</td>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/12/2015</td>
<td>2/11/2016</td>
<td>3/31/2016</td>
<td>SATISFACTORY</td>
<td>SATISFACTORY</td>
<td>SATISFACTORY</td>
<td>SATISFACTORY</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/28/2013</td>
<td>9/28/2014</td>
<td>2/9/2015</td>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
<td>SATISFACTORY</td>
<td>SATISFACTORY</td>
<td>SATISFACTORY</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/29/2014</td>
<td>8/9/2016</td>
<td>2/9/2015</td>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
<td>EXCEPTIONAL</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>EXCEPTIONAL</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9/2014</td>
<td>4/30/2017</td>
<td>4/30/2015</td>
<td>SATISFACTORY</td>
<td>SATISFACTORY</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>SATISFACTORY</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/29/2014</td>
<td>9/29/2015</td>
<td>10/15/2015</td>
<td>EXCEPTIONAL</td>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
<td>EXCEPTIONAL</td>
<td>EXCEPTIONAL</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30/2013</td>
<td>9/29/2014</td>
<td>9/30/2014</td>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
<td>EXCEPTIONAL</td>
<td>VERY GOOD</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notice

You currently have a pending action(s), would you like to go to this action(s) now?

Snooze for: 1 day

Yes, View To-Do List  No, Snooze and Continue

CPARS

[Menu options]

- Home
- To-Do List
- Dashboard
- Evaluations/Contract Status Report
- View Performance Records
- Reports (Admin)
- View/Print Evaluations
- View/Print Completed Evaluations

Include All
- Document Number:
- User:
- Unique Entity ID (SAM):

Show To-Do List
CPARS Best Practices

1. Lay the foundation at contract award and follow through with exceptional performance.

2. Understand the Gov’t’s expectations at kickoff and what it will take to get exceptional ratings. By simply having open communications with the Gov’t, you can be involved throughout the entire process and help set the stage for higher performance ratings.

3. Hold periodic performance check-ins with the Gov’t to ensure both the Gov’t and the Contractor are in agreement towards successful project completion. Ensure that the work being performed is meeting or exceeding the Gov’t’s expectations. (See FAR Table 42-1 for definitions.)

4. Develop CPAR input throughout the period of performance. The Gov’t may only remember the last few months of work, which could negatively affect the CPAR for the entire period of performance.

5. Consider including a CPARS checklist or self-evaluation as part of the regular check-in procedure to proactively track project success.
   - It is recommended to use the CPAR format to build your self-evaluation and complete each applicable evaluation area in detailed paragraphs not bullets. (Blank areas or minimal information could cost you a good rating in those areas.)
   - Include recommended ratings of your performance based on the FAR definitions with supporting details showing key examples of how your performance met or exceeded the requirements and the resulting benefit to the Gov’t.

Don’t let CPARS become an afterthought.