

1

ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

Contractors in Rulemaking

Committee on Rulemaking

Proposed Recommendation for Committee | March 24, 2022

Note for Committee: The draft recommendation does not include a Preamble, which will

2	be supplied prior to the next meeting. Here is a summary of the major points that staff anticipates
3	will appear in the draft preamble.
4	1. Agencies rely on contractors to perform a wide variety of functions associated with
5	rulemaking at various stages in the process. They include planning regulatory timelines
6	and strategies, conducting research undergirding a rule, convening meetings of interested
7	parties, monitoring and processing comments, and even drafting the initial text of a
8	proposed rule.
9	2. Among the factors agencies consider in deciding whether to contract out specific
10	rulemaking functions are the following:
11	Reasons to use a contractor may include:
12	• Increased staffing flexibility to ease workloads;
13	• The ability for contractors to provide a particular service at a lower cost;
14	• Topic-specific expertise that is not present among existing agency staff;
15	• Access to technology that the agency does not possess internally; and
16	• Contractors' ability to provide an alternative perspective on a particular issue.
17	Challenges presented by the use of contractors in rulemaking may include:
18	Management challenges associated with supervising a workforce that includes
19	both federal employees and contractors;
20	• A lack of familiarity with internal agency protocols among contractors; and

Commented [KN1]: For Committee: The Preamble will identify concerns that may be implicated with the use of contractors in rulemaking.

Commented [KN2]: For Committee: The Preamble will identify particular concerns regarding the use of contractors in rulemaking.

1



21		• A possible increased potential for ethics violations, especially in the domains of
22		organizational and personal conflicts of interest and misuse of confidential
23		information.
24	3.	Agencies must also take into account legal considerations that apply to the use of
25		contractors. When considering what functions to contract out, agencies must be cognizant
26		of what functions might constitute an inherently governmental function (IGF). The Office
27		of Management and Budget (OMB) has provided guidance in its Circular A-76 that
28		describes IGFs and which functions might be closely associated with IGFs. ¹ The Office
29		of Federal Procurement Policy (OFPP) issued a final policy letter in 2011 providing
30		clarification on what types of functions might venture into IGF territory. ² Generally,
31		contractor functions should be limited to those that provide support for the agency's
32		rulemaking activities and do not supplant the agency's decision-making or policy-making
33		functions. Principles of administrative justice or good agency practice might also mitigate
34		against outsourcing certain functions, whether or not they qualify as IGFs or are
35		classified as being closely associated with IGFs.
36	4.	Although contractors are, with a few exceptions, not subject to the ethics laws governing
37		federal employees, there are nevertheless potential ethics-related risks against which
38		agencies must protect. The risks of conflicts of interest (both organizational and personal)
39		and misuse of confidential information are especially salient when contractors support a
40		policymaking function such as rulemaking (see ACUS Recommendation 2011-3,
41		Compliance Standards for Government Contractor Employees – Personal Conflicts of
42		Interest and Use of Certain Non-Public Information ³).

2

Commented [KN3]: For Committee: FAR 3.1106 provides model contract clauses to use in connection with contracts for services that are closely associated with inherently governmental functions and that involve potential personal conflicts of interest. This provision has only limited applicability to contracts for acquisition-related activities. The final Preamble will cite this FAR rule and note the extent of its applicability.

The FAR Council also proposed a rule titled *Federal Acquisition Regulation; Organizational Conflicts of Interest* (OCI), 76 Fed. Reg. 23236 (Apr. 26, 2011), in 2011 but withdrew it in 2021. This rule would have updated FAR 9.5, specifically by providing guidance for the detection and mitigation of actual and potential OCIs and by adding model contract clauses. The Preamble will also mention this proposed rule and what the scope of its coverage would have been.

¹ OFF. OF MGMT. & BUDGET, EXEC. OFF. OF THE PRESIDENT, OMB CIRCULAR A-76 (REVISED), PERFORMANCE OF COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES (2003), *available at* https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/legacy_drupal_files/omb/circulars/A76/a76_incl_tech_correction.pdf.

² Publication of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy (OFPP) Policy Letter 11-01, Performance of Inherently Governmental and Critical Functions, 76 Fed. Reg. 56227 (Oct. 12, 2011).

³ 76 Fed. Reg. 48792 (Aug. 9, 2011).



RECOMMENDATION

General Considerations Relating to Use of Contractors

43	1.	When	considering whether to use a contractor to perform a function in furtherance of
44		agency	rulemaking, agencies should weigh the potential benefits and potential drawbacks
45		of doin	ng so. Before retaining a contractor to perform a specific rulemaking-related
46		function	on, agencies should consider whether the contractor offers some comparative
47		advant	age that the agency does not otherwise possess. Possible reasons to hire a
48		contra	ctor include enhancing efficiency, acquiring access to knowledge or technology
49		that th	e agency does not otherwise possess, and acquiring an alternative perspective on a
50		particu	ılar problem.
51	2.	In add	ition to considering contractors to perform a function in furtherance of agency
52		rulema	king, agencies should also consider alternative methods to expand internal
53		capaci	ty. These might include:
54		a.	Considering whether existing processes for performing rulemaking-related
55			functions can be made more efficient;
56		b.	Temporarily reallocating agency staff from another component to assist with a
57			rulemaking;
58		c.	Offering employees overtime or compensatory time;
59		d.	Hiring more full-time staff;
60		e.	Hiring short-term employees;
61		f.	Using executive branch rotations, fellowship programs, or the Intergovernmental
62			Personnel Act (IPA);
63		g.	Rehiring retired employees; or
64		h.	Using Federally Funded Research and Development Centers (FFRDCs).
	Inhero	ently G	overnmental Functions

Agencies should adopt and disseminate policies to ensure that agency personnel do
not contract out inherently governmental functions (IGFs) and ensure increased

3



67		scrutiny when contracting out functions that are closely related to IGFs. In applying
68		policies from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the Office of Federal
69		Procurement Policy (OFPP) to the rulemaking context, agencies should design their
70		policies to protect against the risk of contracting out activities involving discretion of
71		the sort likely to influence policy choices that they make.
72	4.	The OFPP, OMB, and Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs should assess
73		whether current agency practices align with broader procurement best practices and
74		consider providing guidance on contractor-performed functions associated with
75		rulemaking processes. Among other things, this guidance might provide specific
76		examples of rulemaking-related functions that qualify as IGFs and should not be
77		contracted out or that are sufficiently close to IGFs so that agencies should exercise
78		heightened caution when contracting out such functions.

Ethics

79	5.	When selecting contractors for rulemaking-related functions, agencies should
80		consider whether any contractor may have an actual or perceived organizational
81		conflict of interest in connection with any assigned task or function. If a potential
82		organizational conflict exists, agencies should either select another contractor or put
83		in place appropriate protections to ensure that the contractor's outside interests do not
84		undermine its ability to perform its assigned functions in a way that does not create an
85		actual or perceived conflict of interest.
86	6.	When contracting out rulemaking functions for which there is a risk of a personal
87		conflict of interest, agencies should consider including a clause in the contract
88		providing that the contractor will not assign functions or tasks under the contract to
89		any employee who has an actual or perceived conflict of interest and, as appropriate,
90		provide employee training on recognizing and disclosing personal conflicts. The
91		clause should also provide that, in the event that an employee improperly performs a
92		function despite the existence of a personal conflict of interest, the contractor will
93		disclose the conflict to the agency and undertake appropriate remedial action.

Commented [KN4]: For Committee: The preamble will address that this risk may be especially heightened when the contractor is drafting the regulatory text or preamble language, performing analyses or presenting strategy options to be used by agency personnel in the rulemaking context, or when agencies enter into contracts that enser which a users and agree multiple avalence ing that span multiple years and cover multiple rulemaking functions, for example.

Commented [KN5]: For Committee: Should this recommendation identify specific examples of rulemaking-related functions that qualify as IGFs and should not be contracted out?



94	7.	When contracting out rulemaking-related functions for which there is a risk of misuse
95		of confidential information, agencies should consider including a clause in the
96		contract providing that the contractor will ensure that any employee handling such
97		information has been appropriately trained on the necessary safeguards. The clause
98		should also provide that the contractor will disclose any breach of this obligation to
99		the agency and undertake appropriate remedial actions.

Internal Management

100	8.	Agencies should adopt and disseminate written policies relating to the use of
101		contractors to perform rulemaking-related functions and covering matters such as:
102		a. The types of rulemaking functions that should be reserved for federal employees;
103		b. The extent of contributions in the rulemaking context that could be handled by
104		contractors;
105		c. Management controls, such as those in Paragraphs 9-11, the agency has adopted
106		to ensure that agency personnel do not contract out IGFs and to ensure increased
107		scrutiny when contracting out functions that are closely related to IGFs;
108		d. Any other oversight policies related to contractors performing rulemaking-
109		specific functions and steps the agency has adopted to ensure adequate internal
110		disclosure concerning what functions contractors undertake;
111		e. Ethical rules applicable to government contractors;
112		f. Applicability of policies on ex parte communications to communications
113		involving contractors;
114		g. Considerations to help agency personnel determine the likely benefits or
115		challenges of contracting out certain rulemaking-related functions; or
116		h. Possible alternatives to contracting out certain rulemaking-related functions,
117		including those listed in Paragraph 2.
118	9.	To ensure effective management of contractors, agencies should consider adopting
119		the following practices:



120	a. Providing rulemaking-specific training for managers on IGFs, activities closely
121	associated with IGFs, and ethical restrictions applicable to contractors; and
122	b. Designating an agency office or officer who can answer questions about the use
123	of contractors to perform rulemaking-related functions and is responsible for
124	deciding whether an activity is an IGF.
125	10. When agencies contract out a rulemaking-related function, they should ensure that
126	agency employees can identify contractors and are aware of contractors' assigned
127	duties. Agencies should also clarify to what extent contractors should be integrated
128	into the workplace. For example, agencies may need to address whether contractors
129	work in the same space as agency employees, participate in meetings with agency
130	leadership or other meetings at which substantive policy is decided, and have agency
131	email addresses.
132	11. Agencies should consider ways to share information about contractors in rulemaking
133	within and across agencies. This might include using existing contracting databases or
134	schedules to encourage greater coordination and efficiency about existing rulemaking
135	contracts, as well as informal sharing of practices for managing contractors.

Transparency

136	12. Agencies should describe in an appropriate place on their websites the types of
137	rulemaking-related functions they assign to contractors.
138	13. Agencies should adopt a policy that explains when they will note in a notice of
139	proposed rulemaking or final rule that a contractor performed a rulemaking-related
140	function and, if legally permissible, identify the contractor that performed it.
141	14. If an agency relies upon materials prepared by a contractor, those materials should be
142	included in the public rulemaking docket with an indication of the contractor that
143	prepared them. Although agencies must ensure that any contractor confidential
144	business information (CBI) is protected when doing so, they should consider whether
145	such restrictions allow them to achieve an appropriate level of transparency in
146	connection with their rulemaking activities when deciding whether or not to use

6



147	contractors. Agencies should also ensure their agreements with contractors will allow
148	for the disclosure of any information that may be needed on judicial review of an
149	agency rule.
150	15. In instances in which a contractor undertaking a rulemaking-related function
151	communicates with the public on behalf of the agency, the agency should consider
152	whether to direct the contractor to identify its status as a non-federal employee in any
153	such communications.