**CPARS Configuration Management Board (CMB)**
**Meeting Agenda**
**SPAWAR, Charleston, SC**
**May 6, 2004**

**1300 – 1500 Meeting Open to Industry, CMB Members, and CMB Member Guests**
**1300 Welcoming Remarks & Introduction of Members and Guests – All**

**1315 Contractor Specific Narrative Collection & Non-Contractor Specific Global Metrics – Mr. Brad Gale (Lockheed Martin)**
Lockheed has developed a proposal for several changes to the Senior Contractor Representative status report. Proposed changes include ability to search the database based on CAGE code, evaluation period, contracting activity (DoDAAC), and rating area and display of program title, color rating, and narrative on the status report.

**Outcome:** CMB decided this was a functionality that may be better served by PPIRS, as it makes more sense to perform such analysis on all Federal report cards as opposed to just those contained in CPARS. **Action:** NSLC will refer this suggestion to the PPIRS CMB for consideration.

The proposal also includes the ability to sort the monthly ratings metrics (published on the CPARS web site) by contracting activity (DoDAAC), evaluation period, business sector, FSC, and rating area.

**Outcome:** Board members expressed concern that such benchmarking metrics may enable contractors in industries with limited competition to extrapolate performance metrics of their competitors, thus compromising the sensitive nature of CPARS information. In addition Bob J. expressed concern that such modifications do not result in a benefit to the government. Brad G. noted that the Air Force used to publish similar metrics under their Lotus Notes report card tool and that he is willing to discuss these issues with his industry counterparts to see if they share similar concerns. Doreen P. noted that improved data analysis capabilities in CPARS/PPIRS may the reduce labor-intensive analysis processes currently performed by contractors, thus lowering overhead rates. **Action:** Dave P. to research old AF Lotus Notes CPARS report metrics to determine if a CPARS Metric could be modeled on the old reports. Doreen P. and Stan D. noted the need to seek legal opinion prior to implementing benchmarking metrics. **Action:** Brad G. suggested that PPIRS and CPARS boards consider what overall metrics can be provided and possibly develop benchmarking data to be presented annually at the Procurement and Quality Conference. Stan D. is concerned that there is a lot of potential for abuse in compiling such metrics; CPARS information should be used for source selection only, not for management purposes.

**1345 CPARS Policy Questions for Possible Inclusion in DoN & AF Guides – Various**

**- Novation Agreements – Ms. Doreen Powell (NSLC):** Per last CMB, CPARs for contracts which have gone through a novation should be listed under the new contractor's name and should reference the name of the prior contractor within the body of the CPAR. How do we handle cases where a novation agreement is executed in the middle of the CPAR assessment period? Should CPARS allow me to pull in a CCR record for a company which has gone through a novation after the end of the CPAR assessment period so that I can write a CPAR on the prior company?

**Outcome: Action:** Stan D. to provide federal CCR novation process to Doreen P. for distribution to CMB. Margaret G. concerned with CAGE/DUNS connection in CPARS, novations and name changes are very confusing. The Board advised that novation questions should be addressed to contractor point of contact indicated in CCR. **Action:** Stan D. to provide more information on CCR process and Novation policy; he suggested it should be reviewed by Legal to ensure that assessments are associated with the proper contractor and that there are no violations in contractor access to other company's assessments. **Action:** NSLC to revise CPARS transmittal letter to advise contractor to review information in blocks 1-17 for accuracy. Further discussion tabled to next CMB meeting pending review of information provided by Stan D. and Legal's review.

**- Questionnaires - All:** Should the DoN and AF CPARS Guides be updated to discourage the use of questionnaires? Should this issue be addressed with the DoD Past Performance IPT instead?

**Outcome:** Linda L. expressed concern that she is still receiving lots of questionnaires as opposed to source selection officials using PPIRS. Sue L. expressed concern that source selection officials feel that CPARS are too "watered down" to serve as an effective discriminator in source selection. **Action:** Linda L. to provide solicitation clause samples that state the use of PPIRS as the source of past performance info; NSLC to post on CPARS web site as Best Practice. Bill B. uses a questionnaire to ask if there have been any changes since last the CPAR as part of the source selection. **Action**: Doreen P. to ask Bill B. for sample questionnaire to post on CPARS web site as Best Practice. **Action:** Doreen P. to see if Bob J. will address questionnaire issue at 02 meeting. **Action:** Jean K. volunteered to write NAVAIR policy to use PPIRS for source selection. The CMB agreed that it is not necessary to address questionnaires in DoN or AF CPARS guides as the guides cover report card collection, not source selection.

**1400 Break**

**1415 CPARS Policy Questions for Possible Inclusion in DoN & AF Guides (cont) – Various**

**- Reservists as Focal Points – Mr. Dave Powell (SAF/ACQ):** If a contractor employee is also a military reservist, can this person still be a CPARS focal point?

**Outcome:** Yes, if the reservist is on "long duration" active duty orders. It is the responsibility of the signature authority requesting access for the focal point to determine appropriateness on case by case basis, and to notify NSLC when reservist leaves active duty. The CMB agreed that this issue does not occur frequently enough to merit being addressing in the DoN or AF CPARS Guide.

**- Contracts with Canadian Commercial Corps – Mr. Dan Wilder (Hill AFB) & Ms. Doreen Powell (NSLC):** If we have a contract with the Canadian Commercial Corps, should we write the CPAR showing the Canadian Commercial Corps as the contractor or should we use the name of the actual company performing the work?

**Outcome: Action:** Dave P. and Margaret G. to research with AF CCC point of contact. The CMB noted that it is also incumbent on source selection officials using PPIRS to string search on the name of the company actually performing the work in case that company's name is noted within body of a CPAR on CCC. Jean K. noted that she would prefer to use the name of the company actually performing the work in lieu of the CCC.

**1430 Registering Contracts in CPARS for Foreign Contractors – Ms. Doreen Powell (NSLC)**
The CMB has previously approved an enhancement to allow entry of foreign CAGE codes into CPARS for contractors not registered in CCR, with both CAGE & DUNS being mandatory fields on the CPAR. However, many foreign contractors still do not have CAGE codes and DUNS numbers and CPARs for contractors who are not registered in CCR will not be passed to PPIRS for retrieval.

**Outcome:** NSLC provided CMB with a matrix summarizing CAGE/DUNS/CCR regulatory requirements. **Action:** NSLC will modify CPARS to include a check box stating the contractor is exempt from CCR registration. The user will be able to check the box at time of contract registration. When this box is checked it will bypass the CCR validation step enabling the contract to be registered using whatever contractor name/CAGE/DUNS combination the user chooses. In addition, while DUNS will be mandatory for contractors exempted from CCR registration, CAGE will be optional. PPIRS will need to be modified to accept records where the contractor is not registered in CCR. The contractor will not have access to view such records in PPIRS as contractor access to PPIRS is granted through CCR. **Action:** Stan D. to present this proposed solution to DoD Past Performance IPT for approval at the PPIRS level.

**1500 Break**

**1500 – 1600 Meeting Open to CMB Members and CMB Member Guests Only**

**1515 Use of Acquisition Management Automation System (AMAS) to Register Contracts in CPARS – Mr. Steve Swiger & Ms. Linda Lunn (SPAWAR)**
SPAWAR has proposed developing an electronic upload from AMAS (electronic contracting vehicle based in ORACLE) to the CPARS contract registration data elements when the awarded contract is uploaded from AMAS to NAFI. The AMAS data can be transmitted to CPARS as a flat file.

**Outcome: Action:** NSLC will discuss with SPAWAR the possibility of an interface with AMAS system. Discussion indicates that it may be better to pursue an interface for registration and compliance reporting through the Federal Procurement Data System – Next Generation (FPDS-NG), as FPDS-NG is a federal level system and will provide a solution to benefit all CPARS users. FDPS-NG is scheduled to go live October 1, but that date will likely be extended. Doreen P. noted that CMB/NSLC will have to decide what to do about existing compliance reports using PMRS, as PMRS will be replaced by FPDS-NG. Is it worthwhile to continue updating these reports or just wait until FPDS-NG comes online? **Action:** Stan D. will pursue potential interface with IAE and NSLC will provide an update on FPDS-NG interface at next CMB meeting.

**1530 Outstanding Action Items**

**- NSLC to determine the number of times the contractor does not respond to the CPAR (broken out by AF and DoN) – Mr. Steve Eisenbrey (NSLC)**

**Outcome:** Steve E. provided AF and DoN totals on CPARs that fit into the following two categories: The Assessing Official "grabbed" the CPAR from the Contractor Rep after the 30 day window had ended; The CPAR was entered in as a completed CPAR by the Focal Point and no information was in the contractor comments field. Totals since May 03 AF: 214 DoN: 374 Other: 135 These total are cumulative across the above categories.

**- NSLC to add verbiage to DoN CPARS Guide that states that a Reviewing Official is required when the contractor fails to respond to the CPAR – Ms. Doreen Powell (NSLC)**

**Outcome:** Doreen P. noted that this language has been added and that the current DoN CPARS guide is available on-line.

**- Determine feasibility of joint AF/DoN/ODA CPARS Guide – Mr. Dave Powell (SAF/ACQ), Ms. Jannet Gray (DESC), & Ms. Doreen Powell (NSLC)**

**Outcome:** Jean K. concurred that this is a good idea. Dave P. stated that a joint guide is not a viable option for the AF at this time.

**- Discuss issue of source selection questionnaires with contracting policy office - All** Possible solutions include implementing policy requiring source selection teams to use PPIRS as the primary source of past performance information and to tailor questionnaires to the specific source selection, review of solicitations for questionnaires before they are released, and modifying local solicitation clauses to allow use of PPIRS as a source of past performance information. *Issue discussed under a previous agenda item.*

**- Discuss questionnaire policy guidance with DASN (ACQ) – Ms. Doreen Powell** (NSLC) *Issue discussed under a previous agenda item.*

**- Determine if Command looks at CPARS compliance as part of PPMAP; if not, recommend that Command possibly consider doing so – All**

**Outcome:** CPARS compliance will be a mandatory element on NAVSUP, NAVFAC, and Marine Corps PPMAPs. Jean K. noted that while compliance is not currently addressed in NAVAIR PPMAP, it can be added, although the increased workload would fall on the Focal Point.

**- NSLC to develop enhancement to allow users to register CAGE, contractor name and address for foreign companies not in CCR, with CAGE & DUNS as mandatory fields. Is this a viable solution for MSC? – Ms. Doreen Powell (NSLC) and Ms. Charlean Sinkfield (MSC)**

**Outcome:** *Issue discussed under previous agenda item.* **Follow-up:** Per Doreen P. phone conference with Charlean S., this solution will work for MSC as long as CAGE is not a mandatory field.

**- NSLC to update CPARS/PMRS comparison reports – Mr. Steve Eisenbrey (NSLC)**

**Outcome:** Steve E. reviewed changes to the CPARS/PMRS comparison reports. Changes include the following: Totals on all forms should be for contracts, not for each action. Delete contract actions column from each report. Show Heath care contracts separately (denoted by FSC codes starting with Qxxx). Treat NASA contracts (contracts starting with NAS) like GSA Schedule contracts (order number is own unique contract). FSC coding is to be revisited, particularly FSCs that start with Yxxx and Zxxx; these should be coded as construction. Doreen P. noted that interface with FPDS-NG will affect these reports in future.

**- NSLC to provide feedback regarding possible NAFI interface – Ms. Doreen Powell (NSLC)**

**Outcome:** NAFI interface not feasible at this time, as NAFI information is not digitized (NAFI accepts pdf. files only).

**- NSLC to begin archiving records where the final CPAR is over a year old and to provide email notification to focal points prior to first archiving – Mr. Steve Eisenbrey (NSLC)**

**Outcome:** Steve E. reviewed this new enhancement to be released in version 2.0.10. He noted that the email notification would be provided to Focal Points along with the list of enhancements.

**- Can CPARS/PMRS comparison reports be posted to CPARS web site? – Ms. Doreen Powell (NSLC)**

**Outcome:** CMB concurred that this is acceptable. **Action:** NSLC to bring reports into section 508 compliance prior to posting.

**- Have invalid CPARS/PMRS comparison reports removed from PMRS – Ms. Doreen Powell (NSLC) and Mr. Steve Eisenbrey (NSLC)**

**Outcome:** No longer an issue, as PMRS will be replaced by FPDS-NG.

**- NSLC to begin deleting old user accounts after checking with the applicable focal point; a focal point response is only required if an account should not be deleted – Mr. Steve Eisenbrey (NSLC)**

**Outcome:** Steve E. Reviewed totals since February 04: 2704 inactive accounts identified, 1624 deleted with Focal Point concurrence.

**- Should a CPAR be completed on government activities such as maintenance depots? What does the DoD Past Performance IPT think? – Mr. Dave Powell (SAF/ACQ)**

**Outcome:** Jean K. stated that CPARS should only be completed on contractors. **Action:** Dave P. will address with the DoD PP IPT.

**1555 Scheduling Next Meeting – All Action:** Doreen P. offered NSLC at Portsmouth for next CMB meeting location in September; Date TBD.