CPARS CONFIGURATION MANAGEMENT BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
PATRICK AFB, FL
21 January 2004

0830—Welcoming Remarks—Mr. Ed Marceau (NSLC)

0845—Introduction of Members and Guests—(All)

0900—Status of CPARS Policy Guides—Ms. Doreen Powell (NSLC), Mr. David Powell (SAF/AQC), and Ms. Melody Reardon (HQ DLA)
Each service or agency representative will update the CMB on the status of their respective guide. There has been some recent email traffic discussing the possibility of consolidating the Air Force/Navy Policy Guides. The CMB should discuss pros and cons to this approach. If applicable, establish a sub-group to complete the task.

Outcome: The revised DoN CPARS Guide was provided to the CMB prior to the meeting for comment. Major changes include reporting thresholds for contracts/agreements with orders (i.e., BOAs, BPAs, IDIQs), contracting officers coordinating inputs on multiple activity use contracts, requiring activity and contracting activity responsibilities breakout, and removal of "non-disclosure agreement language". **Action:** NSLC to determine the number of times the contractor does not respond to the CPAR (broken out by AF and Navy) and to add verbiage in the DoN Guide that states that a Reviewing Official is required when the contractor fails to respond. **Action:** CMB members to provide additional comments on the revised guide by February 5, 2004. The Board also discussed consolidating the AF and DoN CPARS Guides, as this would provide a policy guide for smaller agencies without a guide of their own and would make complying with Section 508 requirements easier. The overall guide could include general policy and Navy, AF, and other agencies could issue their own unique policy via supplements. **Action:** NSLC to discuss feasibility with Bob Johnson of DASN(ACQ). **Action:** Dave Powell to discuss feasibility with AF chain of command. **Action:** Janet Gray to discuss feasibility with DLA chain of command.

0930—Discussion of RFP/Solicitation Clauses to Minimize the Use of Questionnaires when CPARs are Available—Ms. Linda Lunn (SPAWAR).
We started this discussion at our last meeting. All agreed that questionnaires are not going away, but their use should be minimized and tailored to the specific acquisition. However, some procuring activities continue to use clauses that do not allow contractors the flexibility to submit or reference CPARs when such information is available. Activities are continuing to require the use of questionnaires. Contracting Officers and contractors attending some of our recent training seminars have explained that this continues to be a problem. This is happening within the Navy and Air Force.

Outcome: Board members expressed concern that the use of source selection questionnaires puts contractors in a bad position if the Government refuses to answer a questionnaire because they have already completed a CPAR on the contract in question. Possible reasons for the ongoing use of questionnaires include a lack of current past performance info in PPIRS, lack of training on PPIRS, and lack of a policy which states that questionnaires are supplemental past performance info, as opposed to the prime source of past performance info. **Action:** CMB members to discuss this issue with their contracts policy folks. Possible solutions include implementing a policy requiring source selection teams to use PPIRS as the primary source of past performance info 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 info. **Action:** NSLC to discuss issue of questionnaire policy guidance with Bob Johnson of DASN(ACQ).

1000—Registering Contracts in CPARS for Foreign Companies—Mr. Steve Almeida (NSLC)
This continues to cause problems for some of our users. Steve will present a solution that will help users easily register contracts in CPARS for foreign companies.

Outcome: CPARS currently uses the CAGE and DUNS numbers pulled from CCR during contract registration. However, foreign contractors performing outside the U.S. are not required to register in CCR. **Action:** NSLC to develop enhancement to allow users to enter contractor name and address info for foreign companies (i.e., those with a CAGE code which begins/ends/begins & ends with an alpha character. CAGE and DUNS will still be mandatory fields for foreign contractors. **Action:** Charlean Sinkfield to determine if this is a viable solution for MSC.

1015—Break

1030--Discussion of CPARS/PMRS (DD350) Comparison Reports—Mr. Ed Marceau (NSLC)
Members should review the latest comparison reports provided by NSLC or SAF/AQC and be prepared to suggest improvements that will result in more accurate reports. The Board will discuss how the reports should calculate compliance for all contract types including GSA schedules, IDIQs, BOAs, and BPAs. Navy and Air Force will use the same logic for calculating/reporting compliance.

Outcome: CPARS/PMRS comparison reports will now be sent out on a quarterly basis. The board voted to make the following changes to the reports:
- do not list those contracts for which CPARs aren't required
- roll up total dollar value under each contract (i.e., don't report contract mods and orders separately)
- delete "Completed" column and use existing CPARS status reports to determine due/overdue CPARs
- add metric for # CPARs active / # CPARS required (i.e., % of required CPARs which have at least been registered)
- treat orders under NASA schedules as stand alone contracts (i.e., the same as we treat orders under GSA schedules); **Action:** CMB to provide input to NSLC on NASA schedule numbering convention
- re-categorize some FSCs into another business sector (i.e., construction FSCs); **Action:** Linda Lunn to provide list of FSCs needing re-categorization (e.g. those for C^4I program)
- provide the following columns
        - Contract Actions (contract numbers which require a CPAR)
        - Active (contracts which require a CPAR and for which the CPAR has been started)
        - % Active (# Active/# Contract Actions)
- delete "Completed" columns
- include FY03 & FY04 actions on each report; Note: There may be few FY04 actions as the SPS/PMRS interface for FY04 is not yet operational
Action: NSLC to provide updated reports to reflect changes above. **Action:** CMB members to review updated reports and be prepared to discuss at May CMB meeting.

Note: In the future, NAFI may be digitized, meaning that we may be able to use some of the data elements in NAFI to pre-populate some of the contract info in CPARS. **Action:** NSLC to provide additional feedback on possible NAFI interface at May CMB meeting.

1100—Review of the Next Release of CPARS—Mr. Steve Eisenbrey (NSLC)
Steve will explain the changes and new features to be included in the next release.

Outcome: All enhancements recommend for release in CPARS version 2.0.10 were approved by the CMB. The most notable enhancement is the CAGE/DUNS validation which will be performed at each stage in the workflow process. Also noteworthy is the fact that the new Oracle password encryption will no longer allow the Help Desk to see a user's password or allow Focal Points to see users' temporary passwords once they have been issued. **Action:** NSLC to begin archiving records where the final CPAR is over a year old. NSLC will provide an email notification to all Focal Points advising of the change prior to the first archiving.

1115—Review of New Suggestions/Enhancements—Mr. Ed Marceau and Mr. Steve Almeida (NSLC)

Outcome: CMB concurred with all NSLC approval/disapproval recommendations. CMB also concurred with NSLC recommendations of enhancements slated for version 2.0.11 release. The most notable enhancement for the

2.0.11 release is the change disallowing Focal Points to give access at the DoDAAC level; access must be given on a contract-by-contract or order-by-order basis. **Action:** NSLC to notify Focal Points prior to implementing this change. Focal Points should be aware that if they have given access at the basic contract level, this will not enable users to view each order under that contract. Each order must be specifically added to their access matrix.

1200-1300—Lunch

1300—CPARS as a Special Interest Item During Procurement Performance Management Assessment Program (PPMAP) Reviews—Mr. Bob Desmarets (NAVSUP)
Bob will advise the Board of what NAVSUP is doing to help improve reporting compliance during their reviews. Each CMB member should verify their command is looking at CPARS compliance during their own reviews. Report findings/actions taken to the Board.

Outcome: NAVSUP looks at CPARS reporting compliance as one of their PPMAP assessment factors. NAVSUP has recommended to DASN(ACQ) that CPARS compliance be included as a factor in all Navy PPMAPs. **Action:** CMB members to determine if their own Command looks at CPARS compliance as part of PPMAP; if not, recommend that Command possibly consider doing so.
.

1315—Completing CPARS for Individual Healthcare Specialists—Mr. Bob Desmarets (NAVSUP)

Outcome: A question was raised regarding whether or not we should be writing CPARs on contracts issued to individual healthcare providers (i.e., doctors, nurses). The Board voted that there is no CPARS exemption in this case; CPARs should be written on these contracts.

1330—Update on CPARS Training and Future Opportunities—Mr. Ed Marceau (NSLC)

Outcome: NSLC provided a list of upcoming and completed CPARS training sessions. Web-based training will be available in the future, possibly on a weekly basis.

1345—Recent CPARS Policy Clarifications—Various

--Completing CPARs on letter contracts—Mr. Ed Marceau (NSLC)
Outcome: Since contractors are performing under letter contracts, CPARs should be written for these contracts, even if they are not yet definitized.

--Completing CPARs during or after contract novation—Ms. Margaret Gillam (HQ AFSPC)
Outcome: CPARs for contracts which have gone through the novation process should be listed under the new contractor's name, but should reference the old contractor's name within the body of the CPAR.

--Completing CPARs for Geographically Separated Units or Joint Programs—Ms. Margaret Gillam (HQ AFSPC)
Outcome: The GSU or customer with the preponderance of the program dollar value should have the final say on CPAR comments; however, those comments should reflect the input of the other customers under the contract.

--Emailing draft copies of encrypted CPARs for internal coordination—Mr. John Hein, WR-ALC
Outcome: Email policy to be determined by each individual Command.

1415—Outstanding Action Items (All)
--Proposed NAPS change.
Outcome: CPARS & PPIRS now listed in NMCARS (parts 42 & 15).

--Doreen will contact ASN (RDA) regarding a possible contract clause to prohibit contractors from using CPARS information for promotion/advertising purposes.
Outcome: Action item deleted.

--Ms. Sue Lake will identify the contract registration fields that are required in CPARS, but not available in SPS.
Outcome: Action item deleted.

--Ed will ask the CPARS web master if CPARS/PMRS comparison reports can be posted to the CPARS web site.
Outcome: Doreen to pursue this action item.

--Ed and Stan will work to have invalid PMRS/CPARS comparison reports removed from PMRS.
Outcome: Doreen to pursue this action item.

--Dave Powell asked the CMB to consider including a field on the registered contract that could be used to indicate whether a CPAR is to be completed at the order level or on a consolidated report. This is to help with the DD350/CPARS comparison reports. Ed took an action to provide the CMB with the current logic for producing the CPARS/PMRS comparison reports.
Outcome: Action item deleted.

--Discussion on inviting industry representatives to a future CMB meeting. Ed recommends inviting industry representatives as part of the conference registration process. Ed will keep the CMB advised.
Outcome: The morning session of the CMB meeting at the May conference will be open to industry. If we are unable to accommodate all interested industry participants, an industry panel will be responsible for choosing their representatives.

--Deleting inactive accounts from CPARS. Steve Almeida and Ed discussed the possibility of deleting accounts that have not been used in the past two years. The CMB asked Ed to notify the responsible Focal Point to obtain concurrence before deleting any accounts.
Outcome: Action: NSLC to begin deleting old accounts after checking with the applicable Focal Point. A Focal Point response is required only if an account should not be deleted.

--Mr. Dan Wilder asked the CMB whether a CPAR is required to be completed on government activities such as maintenance depots. As the service policy guides do not address this specific situation, Dave Powell agreed to bring this issue before the DoD Past Performance IPT.
Outcome: Dave Powell is currently researching with DoD Past Performance IPT. However, CPARs will likely not be required in this situation.

1445—New Business (All)

1500—List of Actions, Scheduling Next Meeting—All

Outcome: The next CMB meeting will be at the May Conference. The fall meeting will likely be in Portsmouth, NH.