



Contractor Past Performance Evaluation Form

(This process is governed by [FAR 42.15](#) and the Contractor Performance and Assessment Reporting System ([CPARS](#)))

Part I – to be completed by CGM, Contracting Officer

Contract Number	MCC-12-00XX-CON-01	Award Date	Date
Order Number ¹	Not applicable	Expiration Date	Date
Contractor	Insert Name	Contract Value ²	\$ Cumulative
COR	Insert name	Project Monitor (PM)	Insert name or enter "N/A"

Part II – to be completed by COR/PM (collaborate as needed and return one form to CGM)

Program Title [Insert title here](#)

Contract Effort Description [Describe effort here](#)

Directions: Select appropriate rating and enter substantiating comments for contractor performance. The definitions of the evaluation ratings are described on the following page(s).

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Quality of Product or Service | Chose from list
Insert comments here |
| 2. Schedule | Chose from list
Insert comments here |
| 3. Cost Control ³ | Chose from list
Insert comments here |
| 4. Business Relations | Chose from list
Insert comments here |
| 5. Management of Key Personnel ⁴ | Chose from list
Insert comments here |
| 6. Small Business Subcontracting Plan ⁵ | Chose from list |
| 7. Recommendation | If I had a choice, and given what I know today about the Contractor's ability to execute what it promised in its proposal, I choose from list recommend award to them again today. |

¹ Evaluations at the order level are only required if that information would be more useful than at the contract level (see [FAR 42.1502](#) for more information)

² Contracts with a cumulative value exceeding \$150,000 require an annual evaluation.

³ For fixed price contracts, enter "Not applicable."

⁴ For PSC contracts, enter "Not applicable."

⁵ Typically applies when contract value exceeds \$650,000. For PSC contracts enter "Not applicable."

Procurement-Sensitive Information

Definitions for Performance Evaluation Ratings

Rating	Definition	Note
Exceptional	Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds many to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor was highly effective.	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.
Very Good	Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds some to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor was effective.	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.
Satisfactory	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.	To justify a Satisfactory rating, there should have been only minor problems , or major problems the contractor recovered from without impact to the contract. There should have been no significant weaknesses identified. A fundamental principle of assigning ratings is that contractors will not be assessed a rating lower than Satisfactory solely for not performing beyond the requirements of the contract.
Marginal	Performance does not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed 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.	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).
Unsatisfactory	Performance does not meet most contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains a serious problem(s) for which the contractor's corrective actions appear or were ineffective.	To justify an Unsatisfactory rating, identify multiple significant events in each category that the contractor had trouble overcoming and state how it impacted the Government. A singular problem, however, could be of such serious magnitude that it alone constitutes an unsatisfactory rating. An Unsatisfactory rating should be supported by referencing the management tools used to notify the contractor of the contractual deficiencies (e.g., management, quality, safety, or environmental deficiency reports, or letters).

Procurement-Sensitive Information