

APR 2 7 2006

Civilian Agency Acquisition Council Letter 2006-02

MEMORANDUM FOR CIVILIAN AGENCIES (EXCEPT NASA)

FROM:

GERALD ZAFFOS

CHAIR

CIVILIAN AGENCY ACQUISITION COUNCIL (CAAC)

SUBJECT:

Consultation - Class Deviation from Federal Acquisition

Regulation (FAR) 36.604(a) and 53.236-2(c), when using the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Contractor Performance

System (CPS)

This CAAC letter serves as evidence of consultation with the CAAC Chair as required by FAR 1.404 for a class deviation from FAR Subpart 36.604 and FAR Subpart 53.236-2(c). The NIH is requesting approval of a class deviation from FAR 36.604(a) and FAR 53.236-2(c) to permit substitution of the NIH Contractor Performance System (CPS) Architect-Engineer Contractor Performance Report in lieu of Standard Form (SF) 1421. This report has been revised to capture information that reflects the current needs of today's acquisition personnel (e.g., A-E evaluators, source selection officials, etc.).

On October 17, 2001, a class deviation was issued by the CAAC Chair for both SFs 1420, Performance Evaluation (Construction) and 1421, Performance Evaluation (Architect-Engineer) at the request of NIH. The class deviation for SF 1420, Performance Evaluation (Construction) is not affected by this class deviation.

Subpart 36.604(a) requires the preparation of a performance report, Standard Form (SF) 1421, Performance Evaluation (Architect-Engineer), when evaluating a contractor's performance under an architect-engineer contract. NIH offers a contractor performance system and many Federal agencies and departments are subscribers to the NIH CPS. The NIH CPS has an Architect-Engineer Contractor Performance Report with the system that captures the information required by the SF 1421. Therefore, the need to prepare the SF 1421 is not necessary.

The revised CPS Architect-Engineer Contractor Performance Report and the October 17, 2001 CAAC letter are attached for your information. This class deviation will remain in effect until an appropriate FAR change is made.

If you have any questions, please contact Cecelia L. Davis, on (202) 219-0202 or by email at cecelia.davis@gsa.gov.

Attachments

Architect - Engineer Contractor Performance Report

Report Type:(Select)	(% Complet	ted) Te	rmination Type: No	ne	Reportin	na Per	iod: F	rom.	-	o:		
Host Agency:			aluating Organization:		Contrac	ting O	ffice:	OIII.		<u>U.</u>		
Contract Number:					Order N							
Contractor Name and					TIN:	011100	, ,					
<enter contractor="" na<="" th=""><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th>DUNS:</th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></enter>					DUNS:							
<enter address="" line<="" th=""><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></enter>												
<enter address="" line<="" th=""><th>2></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th>NAICS:</th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></enter>	2>				NAICS:							
<enter and<="" city,="" state="" th=""><th>d Zip></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th>Procure</th><th></th><th></th><th>-</th><th>ect)</th><th></th><th></th><th></th></enter>	d Zip>				Procure			-	ect)			
Award Amount:	8.6 - 4161 41			•	Contrac	t Type	: (Sel	ect)	_		_	
Award Amount.	Modification		Claims By				Net A	mount	:			
	No.	Amount	No.	Amou	nt							
Award Date:	Donian Con	de oo Cor	amintian Dat	 				(calc	ulated	d field)		
Award Date.	Design Serv	vices Con	npletion Date:	Const	ruction F	hase	Service	ces Co	mplet	ion Da	te:	
Description of Requir	ement:											
Pre-Design/Planni U = Unsatisfactory		F = Fair	RATING G = Good E =	Exceller	Repo	rt Per		ng.	to			
Quality of Product a	and Complex					N/A	U	P	F	G	E	0
Thorough understand	na Service					l hamil						
Quality of site investig	ation/analysis	scope		_								
Quality of programmin	gauorirariarysis											
Quality control proced		tion										
Quality of deliverables		ulion										
Cost Control	5											
Cost estimating service	200					-						
Compliance with Pe		te - d										
Timeliness of perform	normance Sc	neaules										
Responsiveness to re	ance											
Effectiveness of Mar	view commen	IS										
Effectiveness of Mar	nagement and	a Busine	ss Practices									
Key personnel effective	veness											
Coordination of consu	แผกเร											
Security	n ma n m m m / ! -	6	1						-	_		-
	embers (i.e. go	overnmer	nt, customer, tenant,	consulta	ants)				ā			
Security Compliance with secu				consulta	ants)							

Covernment Comments to D. D. J. H.					
Government Comments for Pre-Design/Planning					
<enter (2000="" character="" comments="" government="" maximum)=""></enter>					
Pre-Design/Planning Phase Evaluator: Name: Title:					_
II = I Description D.	rt Period:	to			
U = Unsatisfactory P = Poor F = Fair G = Good E = Excellent O	= Outstandin	ng			
Overther of Decident and Const.	N/A U	PF	G	E	0
Quality of Product and Service					
Thorough understanding of project scope					
Quality of deliverables					
Coordination of all documentation and among all disciplines					
Cost Control					
Concept on cost/within budget					
Cost estimating					
Compliance with Performance Schedules					Name of the last
Timeliness of performance					
Responsiveness to review comments				n	Ħ
Effectiveness of Management and Business Practices			1		-
Key personnel effectiveness					
Coordination of consultants					
Coordination with external review agencies/utilities					
Interaction of team members (i.e. government, customer, tenant, consultants)					
Quality control procedure and execution				Ī	
Security					
Compliance with security classification and handling					
Government Comments for Concept Design					
<enter (2000="" character="" comments="" government="" maximum)=""></enter>					
Line Government Comments (2000 character maximum)	<u> </u>				
Concept Design Phase Evaluator: Name: Title:					
Design Development Phase Repo	ort Period	to			
U = Unsatisfactory P = Poor F = Fair G = Good E = Excellent O	= Outstandin	g			
	N/A U	PF	G	E	0
Quality of Product and Service					
Incorporation of scope of work Quality of deliverables					
Coordination of all documentation and among all disciplines					
Cost Control					
DD on cost/within budget					
Cost estimating services					
Compliance with Performance Schedules					
Timeliness of performance					
Responsiveness to review comments					$\overline{}$

Effectiveness of Management 1 mg / mg							
Effectiveness of Management and Business Practices Key personnel effectiveness				-			
Coordination of consultants	\perp	Ш					
Coordination with external review agencies/utilities	14		14				
Interaction of team members (i.e. government, customer, tenant, consultants)	<u> </u>	Щ	Ш				
Quality control procedure and execution		Щ	Ш				
Value engineering							
Security .							
Compliance with security classification and handling							
Government Comments for Design Development							
<enter (2000="" character="" comments="" government="" maximum)=""></enter>							
(2000 officially)							
Design Development Phase Evaluator: Name: Title:							
	ort Peri	od:		to			
U = Unsatisfactory P = Poor F = Fair G = Good E = Excellent O	= Outst	andin	g				
	N/A	Ú	Р	F	G	E	0
Quality of Product and Service							
Incorporation of scope of work							
Quality of deliverables							
Coordination of all documentation and among all disciplines							
Cost Control							
CD on cost/within budget							
Cost estimating services							
Compliance with Performance Schedules							
Timeliness of performance							
Responsiveness to review comments							
Effectiveness of Management and Business Practices							
Key personnel effectiveness							
Coordination of consultants							
Coordination with external review agencies/utilities							
Interaction of team members (i.e. gov't, customer, tenant, consultants)							
			li				
Use of value engineering						16	15
Security							
Security							
Compliance with security classification and handling Government Comments for Construction Documents							
Compliance with security classification and handling Government Comments for Construction Documents							
Compliance with security classification and handling Government Comments for Construction Documents <enter (2000="" character="" comments="" government="" maximum)=""> Construction Documents Phase Evaluator: Name: Title:</enter>	ort Perio	od:		to			
Government Comments for Construction Documents <enter (2000="" character="" comments="" government="" maximum)=""> Construction Documents Phase Evaluator: Name: Title: Construction Administration Phase Repo</enter>	ort Perio		9	to			
Government Comments for Construction Documents <enter (2000="" character="" comments="" government="" maximum)=""> Construction Documents Phase Evaluator: Name: Title: Construction Administration Phase Repo</enter>			§ P	to	G	E	

Quality review of contract documents (i.e. shop drawings, reports, minutes, etc.)							
Quality of inspections							
Constructability of contract documents						Ħ	I
Quality of supplemental documents (i.e. design modes, RFIs)					Ħ	Ħ	
Cost Control							
Accuracy of final estimate with actual bid							
Review of change orders	Ħ	Ħ	TH	11	H	H	H
Compliance with Performance Schedules			1 1			ш_	
Timeliness of performance							
Responsiveness to review comments	H	H	+=	+#-	├ ├	-	
Effectiveness of Management and Business Practices	ш					Щ_	ш.
Key personnel effectiveness							
Coordination, responsiveness and cooperation	H-	H	+ =	+=	-	+-	\vdash
Documentation procedures	H-	H	+ 1	++	 	-	+#-
Security		ш		_لـار			
Compliance with security classification and handling							
compliance with security classification and handling					Ш	Ш	
<enter (2000="" character="" comments="" government="" maximum)=""> Construction Administration Phase Evaluator:</enter>							
Name: Title:							
Overall Ratings (on Final evaluation report ONLY)							
U = Unsatisfactory P = Poor F = Fair G = Good E = Excellent O =	Outst	andin	g				
79	N/A	U	Р	F	G	E	0
Overall Quality of Product or Service		П		1	H		
Overall Budget and Cost Control	-	H	H	++	H	H	H
Overall Compliance with Performance Schedules	H	H	H	H	H	H	\vdash
Overall Effectiveness of Management and Business Practices		+	+=	+=	++	H	닏
Overall Compliance with Security Requirements	-	 	+#-	12	H	H	닏
Overall Compliance with Occurry Requirements			ليا.	با		<u> </u>	<u> []</u>
Government Comments for Overall Ratings							
<enter (2000="" character="" comments="" government="" maximum)=""></enter>							
Enter Gordminent Gomments (2000 Gharacter maximum)							
Subcontracts							
Are subcontracts involved?							
Government Comments for Comment on Subcontracts							
<enter (2000="" character="" comments="" government="" maximum)=""></enter>							
						•••	
Small Business Subcontracting Plan							
Did the contractor make a good faith effort to comply with the Subcontracting Plar reporting and other commitments negotiated in the Subcontracting Plan?	ninar S 🔲 I	manne No [er cons	sistent <i>(fina</i>	with the state of	ne goa t only	ils,

Government Comments Addressing Both Questions for Small Business Subcontracting Plan (final report only)
Government Comments Addressing Both Questions for Small Business Subcontracting Plan (final report only)
<enter (2000="" characters="" comments="" government="" maximum)=""></enter>
Small Business Participation in Bundled Contracts
The state of the s
Did the contractor meet the objectives set forth in this bundled contract for small business participation? (final report only) Yes No NA
Government Comments for Small Business Participation in Bundled Contracts
<enter (2000="" characters="" comments="" government="" maximum)=""></enter>
Small Disadvantaged Business Participation Plan (SDB Plan)
Did the contractor make a good faith effort to comply with the SDB Plan in a manner consistent with the goals, reporting and other commitments negotiated in the SDB Plan? Yes No NA (final report only)
Did the contractor achieve negotiated goals and objectives? Tyes No No N/A (final report only)
Government Comments Addressing Both Questions for Small Disadvantaged Business Participation Plan
<enter (2000="" character="" comments="" government="" maximum)=""></enter>
Customer Satisfaction
Is/was the contractor committed to customer satisfaction? Yes No No N/A (final report only)
Would you recommend the selection of this firm again?
Government Comments for Customer Satisfaction
<enter (2000="" character="" comments="" government="" maximum)=""></enter>
Contractor Key Personnel
Contractor Rey Fersonner
Contractor Manger/Principal Investigator Name:
Government Comments for Contractor Manager/Principal Investigator <enter (2000="" character="" comments="" government="" maximum)=""></enter>

Contractor Key Person Name:

A&E Performance Evaluation (Prototype Form) Page 5 of 7

Government Comments for Contractor Key Person	
<enter (2000="" character="" comments="" government="" maximum)=""></enter>	
Project Officer/COTR	
Name:	
Phone: Ext: Fax:	
Email Address:	
Contractor Representative	
Name:	
Phone: Ext: Fax:	
Email Address:	
Contracting Officer	
Name:	
Phone: Ext: Fax:	
Email Address:	
CONTRACTOR COMMENTS	_
Contractor Comments for Pre-Design/Planning	
<enter (2000="" character="" comments="" contractor="" maximum)=""></enter>	
Contractor Comments for Concept	
<enter (2000="" character="" comments="" contractor="" maximum)=""></enter>	
Contractor Comments for Design Development <enter (2000="" character="" comments="" contractor="" maximum)=""></enter>	
Contractor Comments for Construction	
Contractor Comments for Construction Documents <enter (2000="" character="" comments="" contractor="" maximum)=""></enter>	\neg
\cdot	
Contractor Comments for Construction Administration	
Contractor Comments for Construction Administration <enter (2000="" character="" comments="" contractor="" maximum)=""></enter>	

Contractor Comments for Overall Ratings
<enter (2000="" character="" comments="" contractor="" maximum)=""></enter>
•
Contractor Comments for Comment on Subcontracts
<enter (2000="" character="" comments="" contractor="" maximum)=""></enter>
Contractor Comments for Small Business Subcontracting Plan (final report only)
<enter (2000="" character="" comments="" contractor="" maximum)=""></enter>
series communic (2000 enalidate maximum):
Contractor Comments for Small Business Participation in Bundled Contracts (final report only)
<enter (2000="" character="" comments="" contractor="" maximum)=""></enter>
•
Contractor Comments for Small Disadvantaged Business Participation Plan (final report only)
<enter (2000="" character="" comments="" contractor="" maximum)=""></enter>
Contractor Comments for Customer Satisfaction (final report only)
<enter (2000="" character="" comments="" contractor="" maximum)=""></enter>
-Emer Contractor Commonie (2000 Grandotor maximum)-
Contractor Comments for Contractor Manager/Principal Investigator
<enter (2000="" character="" comments="" contractor="" maximum)=""></enter>
Contractor Comments for Contractor Key Person
E
<enter (2000="" character="" comments="" contractor="" maximum)=""></enter>

OMB CLEARANCE NO. XXXX-XXXX

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION/CONFIDENTIAL



OCT 17 2001

CIVILIAN AGENCY ACQUISITION COUNCIL LETTER 2001-03

MEMORANDUM FOR CIVILIAN AGENCIES OTHER THAN NASA

FROM:

AL MATERA

CHAIRMAN

CIVILIAN AGENCY ACQUISITION COUNCIL (CAAC)

SUBJECT:

Advance Consultation: Class Deviation from the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 36.201, 36.604, 53.236-1(b) and 53.236-2(d), when using the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Contractor Performance System (CPS).

This letter serves as evidence of consultation with the Chairman of the Civilian Agency Acquisition Council, as provided in 1.404, should agencies chose to deviate from FAR Subpart 36.201 and FAR Subpart 36.604.

Subpart 36.201 requires the use of Standard Form 1420, Performance Evaluation (Construction) when evaluating a contractor's performance under a construction contract. Subpart 36.604 requires the use of Standard Form 1421, Performance Evaluation (Architect-Engineer), when evaluating a contractor's performance under an architect-engineer contract.

NIH offers a CPS and several agencies subscribe to this system. This system provides a Contractor Performance Insert Form (evaluation form) for both construction and architect-engineer contracts; therefore, the agencies that use this system it is not necessary to complete SF's 1420 and 1421. These Contractor Performance Insert Forms include all of the data elements required by SFs 1420 and 1421 and offers several additional advantages.

On September 22, 1999, the CAAC met to discuss a request from NIH asking for a deviation from using the SF 1420, Performance Evaluation (Construction). The CAAC stated they saw no significant issues and concurred in the deviation. However, I have since received requests for deviations for Architect-Engineer contracts, which is why we are including Subpart 36.604 as part of this advance consultation.

A new FAR case will be started to change the FAR language to allow agencies to use the NIH CPS Contractor Performance Insert Forms instead of the SFs 1420 and 1421. Not all agencies are using the NIH CPS; therefore, the revised

language will allow the use of either without having to request a deviation to the FAR when the standard forms are not used.

Accordingly, if desired, civilian agencies may authorize a class deviation in accordance with FAR 1.404 from the requirements FAR 36.201, 36.604, 53.236-1(b) and 53.236-2(d). Class deviations may remain in effect until issuance of an appropriate FAR change.