|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIORIBC ACQUISITION SERVICES |  |
| **EVALUATION REPORT ON** |
| **CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE** |
| **’’’’’’CPARS Compatible Format’’’’’’** |
| ***SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION*** |
| ***NOT FOR PUBLIC RELEASE (see FAR 3.104 & 42.1503)*** |
| **AGENCY / USER** |  | **CONTRACT NO.** |  |
| **ADDRESS** |  | **CONTRACTOR** |  |
| **CITY / STATE/ ZIP** |  | **PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE** | FROM | TO |
|  |  |
| **CONTRACT COR** |  | **LOCATION OF PERFORMANCE** |  |
| **PROGRAM TITLE** | **AIRCRAFT FLIGHT SERVICES**: [ ]  AIRPLANE [ ]  HELICOPTER [ ] AIR TANKER [ ]  OTHER – specify  |
| **AIRCRAFT TYPE** |  |  |
| CONTRACT EFFORT DESCRIPTION*(check all that apply)* | [ ]  EXCLUSIVE USE [ ]  CALL WHEN NEEDED [x]  ON CALL |
| [ ]  FIRE MANAGEMENT [ ]  RESOURCE [ ] MAINTENANCE |
| [ ]  OTHER MISSION – specify: |  |
| **INSTRUCTIONS:** This form can be completed on the computer or printed and completed by hand. Use the mouse to navigate. To check or uncheck a box, **'double click' the box**. If further direction is required on how to complete this evaluation or where to submit it, please contact your Contracting Officer. Comment boxes are formatted to automatically wrap the entered text. Check the box that best describes the level in which the Contractor supported the area described. Comments are essential and must substantiate your rating selection. N/A = not applicable. If additional space is required, use page 2 of the form or attach additional page(s).**SEE PAGE 4 FOR EVALUATION RATINGS DEFINITIONS** |
| **1. Quality. Contractor was professional and conformed to contract requirements. Was capable, efficient and effective in supporting the programs of this contract. Provided well maintained equipment and highly qualified personnel.** |
|  [ ]  N/A [ ]  Exceptional [ ]  Very Good [ ]  Satisfactory [ ]  Marginal [ ]  Unsatisfactory |
| COMMENTS:  |
|  |
| **2. Schedule. Contractor was prepared and available to begin work on contract start date and provided daily coverage during the contract period with little to no disruption or unavailability. Contractor kept COR informed of crew exchanges, maintenance issues, etc.** |
|  [ ]  N/A [ ]  Exceptional [ ]  Very Good [ ]  Satisfactory [ ]  Marginal [ ]  Unsatisfactory |
| COMMENTS:  |
|  |
| **3. Cost Control. How well does the contractor control operating costs? (Check N/A if this is a Firm Fixed price or Firm Fixed Price with Economic Price Adjustment contract)**  |
|  [ ]  N/A [ ]  Exceptional [ ]  Very Good [ ]  Satisfactory [ ]  Marginal [ ]  Unsatisfactory |
| COMMENTS:  |
|  |
| **4. Management. Contractor and on-site representatives were professional, well qualified, and committed to customer satisfaction and safety of operations. Contractor provided necessary support for key personnel and if applicable, took necessary action to correct or replace any personnel.** |
|  [ ]  N/A [ ]  Exceptional [ ]  Very Good [ ]  Satisfactory [ ]  Marginal [ ]  Unsatisfactory |
| COMMENTS:  |  |
|  |
| **5. Small Business. How does the contractor support small business? (Check N/A unless this is a large business and a subcontracting plan is required)** |
|  [ ]  N/A [ ]  Exceptional [ ]  Very Good [ ]  Satisfactory [ ]  Marginal [ ]  Unsatisfactory |
| COMMENTS:  |  |
|  |
| **6. Regulatory Compliance. How well does the contractor comply with governing regulations such as the Federal Aviation Regulation or others.** |
|  [ ]  N/A [ ]  Exceptional [ ]  Very Good [ ]  Satisfactory [ ]  Marginal [ ]  Unsatisfactory |
| COMMENTS:  |  |
|  |
| **7. Other – Safety. Contractor and on-site representatives attitude and efforts, as well as actual application, towards aircraft safety and general safety of operations?** [ ]  N/A [ ]  Exceptional [ ]  Very Good [ ]  Satisfactory [ ]  Marginal [ ]  Unsatisfactory |
| COMMENTS:  |
|  |
| **8. Customer Satisfaction. Identify to what level you were satisfied with the services provided under this contract. If given the opportunity, would you hire this contractor again to accomplish a similar project?** [ ]  yes [ ]  No |
|  [ ]  N/A [ ]  Exceptional [ ]  Very Good [ ]  Satisfactory [ ]  Marginal [ ]  UnsatisfactoryCOMMENTS:  |
|  |
| **9. Other Areas:** |
|  [ ]  N/A [ ]  Exceptional [ ]  Very Good [ ]  Satisfactory [ ]  Marginal [ ]  Unsatisfactory |
| **10. Other Areas:** |
|  [ ]  N/A [ ]  Exceptional [ ]  Very Good [ ]  Satisfactory [ ]  Marginal [ ]  Unsatisfactory |
| **11. Other Areas:** |
|  [ ]  N/A [ ]  Exceptional [ ]  Very Good [ ]  Satisfactory [ ]  Marginal [ ]  Unsatisfactory |
| **12. Other Areas:** |
|  [ ]  N/A [ ]  Exceptional [ ]  Very Good [ ]  Satisfactory [ ]  Marginal [ ]  Unsatisfactory |
|  |
| Additional comments to support your response to any item above or other items (will not be posted on CPARS website) |
|  |
| Name, Title of Individual Completing this Form ( include agency, phone and electronic address )  |
| Signature |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RATING** |  |  | **DEFINITION** |  |  |  |  | **NOTE** |  |  |  |
| Exceptional | Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds many to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the 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 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 being assessed 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. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Marginal |  | Performance does not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the 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 has 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. quality, schedule, business relations, management of key personnel, safety 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 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, etc.) |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |