

CPPRS Evaluation Form

CPPRS EVALUATION FORM

Final Interim – Period Report: From _____ to _____

Note: CONTINUATION SHEETS MAY BE USED IF MORE SPACE IS REQUIRED
 (See Rating Guidelines & Block-by-block Instructions below)

1. Contractor Name and Address: _____ _____ _____ _____ 1a. Country Location _____	2. Contract Number: _____ 3. Contract Value (Base plus Options): _____ 4. Contract Award Date: _____ 5. Contract Completion Date: _____
6. Category of Procurement: (Check all that apply) Goods <input type="checkbox"/> Works <input type="checkbox"/> Consulting Services <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Consulting Services <input type="checkbox"/> 6a. Subcontract(s)? yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> If yes, name of 1 st Tier Sub _____	
6b. Consortium? yes <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> If yes, name of other members: _____	
7. Description and Location of Requirement: 	
8. Ratings. Summarize contractor performance and circle in the column on the right the number which corresponds to the performance rating for each rating category. Please see below for an explanation of rating scale.	
A. Quality	Comments:
B. Cost Control (<i>Cost Reimbursement only</i>)	Comments:
C. Timeliness of Performance	Comments:

0
1
2
3
4
5

0
1
2
3
4
5

0
1

		2 3 4 5
D. Business Relations	Comments:	0 1 2 3 4 5
E. Performance of Key Personnel:		
Name _____ Employment Dates _____ Title _____ Employment Dates _____ Comments/Rating: _____ _____ _____		0 1 2 3 4 5
Name _____ Employment Dates _____ Title _____ Employment Dates _____ Comments/Rating: _____ _____ _____		0 1 2 3 4 5
Name _____ Employment Dates _____ Title _____ Employment Dates _____ Comments/Rating: _____ _____ _____		0 1 2 3 4 5
AVERAGE SCORE FOR 8E		
9. AVG. Score: (Add the ratings of 8A-8E and divide by 5 or number of areas rated if less than 5)		
10. Would you select this firm again? Please explain.		

11. MCA Entity Project Director Name: _____ Phone/FAX/Internet Address: _____	Signature: _____ Date: _____	
11A. Approval by the Procurement Director : <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____		
12. Contractor's Review. Were comments or additional information provided? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No. If yes, please attach. Number of Pages of Attachment ____		
13. Contractor Name: _____ Phone/FAX/Internet Address: _____	Signature: _____ Date: _____	
14. MCA Entity Review. Were contractor's comments reviewed by the director general or chief executive officer of the MCA Entity? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No. If yes, please attach comments of MCA Director General/CEO . Number of Pages of comments ____		
15. Final Ratings. Reassess the Block 8 ratings based on contractor's comments and MCA Director General/CEO review. Revise block 8 rating, if appropriate and indicate the new scores in areas A-E.		
A. Quality _____	B. Cost Control _____	C. Timeliness _____ D. Business Relations _____ E. Performance of Key Personnel _____
16. Final AVG. Score (Add the ratings of 15A-15E and divide by 5 or number of areas rated if less than 5). _____		
17. MCA Director General/CEO Name: _____ Phone/FAX/Internet Address: _____	Signature: _____ Date: _____	
END OF FORM		

CPRS Evaluation Form: Rating Guidelines

Quality of Product or Service

0 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Poor 2 = Fair 3 = Good 4 = Excellent 5 = Outstanding

Unsatisfactory	Non-conformances are jeopardizing the achievement of contract requirements, despite use of MCA Entity resources. Recovery is not likely. If performance cannot be substantially corrected, it constitutes a significant impediment in consideration for future awards containing similar requirements.
Poor	Overall compliance requires significant MCA Entity resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.
Fair	Overall compliance requires minor MCA Entity resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.
Good	There are no, or very minimal, quality problems, and the Contractor has met the contract requirements.
Excellent	There are no quality issues, and the Contractor has substantially exceeded the contract performance requirements without commensurate additional costs to the MCA Entity.
Outstanding	The contractor has demonstrated an outstanding performance level that was significantly in excess of anticipated achievements and is commendable as an example for others, so that it justifies adding a point to the score. It is expected that this rating will be used in those rare circumstances where contractor performance clearly exceeds the performance levels described as "Excellent".

Cost Control (Cost Reimbursement only)

0 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Poor 2 = Fair 3 = Good 4 = Excellent 5 = Outstanding

Unsatisfactory	Ability to manage cost issues is jeopardizing performance of contract requirements, despite use of MCA Entity resources. Recovery is not likely. If performance cannot be substantially corrected, this level of ability to manage cost issues constitutes a significant impediment in consideration for future awards.
Poor	Ability to manage cost issues requires significant MCA Entity resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.
Fair	Ability to control cost issues requires minor MCA Entity resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.
Good	There are no, or very minimal, cost management issues and the Contractor has met the contract requirements.
Excellent	There are no cost management issues and the Contractor has exceeded the contract requirements, achieving cost savings to the MCA Entity.
Outstanding	The contractor has demonstrated an outstanding performance level that justifies adding a point to the score. It is expected that this rating will be used in those rare circumstances where the contractor achieved cost savings and performance clearly exceeds the performance levels described as "Excellent".

Timeliness of Performance

0 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Poor 2 = Fair 3 = Good 4 = Excellent 5 = Outstanding

Unsatisfactory	Delays are jeopardizing the achievement of contract requirements, despite use of MCA Entity resources. Recovery is not likely. If performance cannot be substantially corrected, it constitutes a significant impediment in consideration for future awards.
Poor	Delays require significant MCA Entity resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.
Fair	Delays require minor MCA Entity resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.
Good	There are no, or minimal, delays that impact achievement of contract requirements.
Excellent	There are no delays and the contractor has exceeded the agreed upon time schedule.

Outstanding The contractor has demonstrated an outstanding performance level that justifies adding a point to the score. It is expected that this rating will be used in those rare circumstances where contractor performance clearly exceeds the performance levels described as "Excellent".

Business Relations

0 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Poor 2 = Fair 3 = Good 4 = Excellent 5 = Outstanding

Unsatisfactory Response to inquiries and/or technical, service, administrative issues is not effective. If not substantially mitigated or corrected it should constitute a significant impediment in considerations for future awards.

Poor Response to inquiries and/or technical, service, administrative issues is marginally effective.

Fair Response to inquiries and/or technical, service, administrative issues is somewhat effective.

Good Response to inquiries and/or technical, service, administrative issues is consistently effective.

Excellent Response to inquiries and/or technical, service, administrative issues exceeds Government expectation.

Outstanding The contractor has demonstrated an outstanding performance level that justifies adding a point to the score. It is expected that this rating will be used in those rare circumstances where contractor performance clearly exceeds the performance levels described as "Excellent".

CPRS Evaluation Form: Rating Guidelines

Key Personnel

0 = Unsatisfactory 1 = Poor 2 = Fair 3 = Good 4 = Excellent 5 = Outstanding

Unsatisfactory	Personnel listed as Key were ineffective in the key position to which they were assigned. They were not effective or efficient in managing the project(s) under contract. Their qualifications were overstated for the effort we received in their critical area. They were consistently inaccessible to address critical issues. Deliverables were consistently late or unsatisfactory and did not meet the MCA Entity's needs.
Poor	Personnel listed as Key were usually not effective in the key position to which they were assigned. There were many issues concerning the project(s) under their cognizance that were not addressed to the MCA Entity's satisfaction. They were often inaccessible to address critical issues in a timely manner. Deliverables were often late, of poor quality and/or not helpful towards the MCA Entity's needs.
Fair	Personnel listed as Key were marginally effective in the key position to which they were assigned. They provided minimal effort required under the contract. They were inaccessible on occasion when critical issues arose and provided minimal support in addressing the issues. Deliverables were sometimes late or of mediocre quality and inconsistent in terms of whether they were helpful given the MCA Entity's needs.
Good	Personnel listed as Key were effective in the key position to which they were assigned. They were effective and efficient in managing the project(s) under contract as stated. They were accessible at key times to address critical issues. Deliverables were on-time, of adequate quality and met the MCA Entity's needs.
Excellent	Personnel listed as Key were highly effective and efficient in the key position to which they were assigned. They did an excellent job in managing the project(s) under contract. They were always accessible to address and aid in solving critical issues that arose under the contract. Deliverables were consistently on time, of high quality and always met the MCA Entity's expectations.
Outstanding	Personnel listed as Key were extremely efficient and effective in the key position to which they were assigned and went over and above to help in other areas as well. They did an outstanding job in managing the project(s) under contract. They were always accessible to address and aid in solving critical issues that arose under the contract. Deliverables were consistently on time, of high quality and always met the MCA Entity's expectations.

CPRS Evaluation Form: Rating Guidelines

Block 1: Contractor name and address. Identify the specific division of the company being evaluated if there is more than one.

Block 1a: Identify the country location where work is being performed.

Block 2: Contract number of contract being evaluated.

Block 3: Contract dollar value shall include base period plus all options. If funding is increased, or decreased during the evaluation period, it should be reflected in the overall value.

Block 4: Contract award date.

Block 5: Contract completion date.

Block 6: Category of Procurement: Check all that apply.

Block 6a: List the name of the 1st tier subcontractor, if applicable.

Block 6b: List the members of the consortium, if applicable.

Block 7: Provide a brief description and location of the procurement.

Block 8: Circle rating in far right columns and provide a very brief narrative summarizing performance for the category being rated. Use the rating guidelines included herein.

List the names and employment dates of the contractor's key personnel. This provides a record of how long these managers worked on the contract. If there were many management changes, a second page may be necessary. On the comment/rating line, briefly describe and rate the overall performance of the Key personnel. Average the score for all key personnel and place in the space provided at 8E.

Block 9: Calculate the average score for 8A-E and enter under item 9.

Block 10: If given a choice, please explain why you would or would not select the contractor to perform work on behalf of the MCA Entity again.

Block 11: Within the MCA Entity, it is intended that the Project Director has completed blocks 1 through 10 and should sign this block.

Block 11A: Within the MCA Entity, it is intended that the Procurement Director shall endorse this block, indicating that he/she has reviewed the initial report and rating and is in supports the report.

Block 12-13: **Contractor's Review:** The contractor should be provided an opportunity to review and endorse the past performance report. Forward the completed report (through block 11A to the Contractor) and instruct them to review and sign the document on block 12 within not later than 15 calendar days of the date of your instruction to indicate receipt of the rating. If comments are unfavorable, the contractor **must** be afforded an opportunity to comment. More time may be granted, as reasonable, but should not extend beyond a maximum of 30 calendar days from the date of your instructions. Signature by the Contractor does not necessarily indicate agreement. If concern or disagreement is received from the contractor, additional MCA Entity review at a level higher than the MCA Project Director/Procurement Director is required.

Block 14: **MCA Entity Review:** This is the review by the Director General/CEO of the MCA Entity. Review cannot be delegated. Comments should be provided, as necessary. Attach additional pages as needed.

Block 15: After the MCA Entity review, the Director General/CEO computes a final rating, if necessary based on Contractor comments, and enters the final rating. The final rating may remain unchanged from the original rating of item 9, or it may be revised. Either way, a final rating is required to be entered here by the Director General/CEO.

Block 16: Calculate the average score for 15A-15E and enter in this block.

Block 17: The Director General/CEO's signature certifies that they have reviewed the entire file and have either concurred with the original rating or established a different final rating.

Once complete with this process, the record contains the original report and rating signed by the Project Director, endorsed by the Procurement Director, with a signature reflecting review, and comment if necessary, by the contractor, as well as, a final rating and signature of a Director General/CEO with comments, as necessary. This entire package should be e-mailed to mcccprps@mcc.gov.