

## CPARS Assessing Official Rep. Performance Data

**Award #:**

**Dates being assessed:**

**Vendor/Contractor Name:**

**Assessing Official:**

**Assessing Official Representative (POC/COR):**

1. Location of Contract Performance
2. Key Subcontractors and Effort(s) Performed if applicable.
3. Program Title:
4. Contract Effort Description:
5. For the following select a rating and provide a narrative for each

Ratings: *For ratings above Satisfactory contractor has to exceed contract requirements with benefits to the government over and above the contract requirements.*

*Please rate each applicable area (a-g) below and include descriptive narrative descriptions of work performed. Further descriptions of ratings from the FAR are included below.*

a. Quality:

Exceptional, Very Good, Satisfactory, Marginal, Unsatisfactory,  
Narrative:

b. Schedule:

Exceptional, Very Good, Satisfactory, Marginal, Unsatisfactory,  
Narrative:

c. Cost Control (*not required for Firm Fixed Price contracts*)

Exceptional, Very Good, Satisfactory, Marginal, Unsatisfactory,  
Narrative:

d. Management - Exceptional, Very Good, Satisfactory, Marginal, Unsatisfactory,  
Narrative:

1. Overall Management
2. Management Responsiveness
3. Subcontract Management

e. Utilization of Small Business (*not required unless contract includes a subcontracting plan*) Exceptional, Very Good, Satisfactory, Marginal, Unsatisfactory,

Narrative:

f. Regulatory Compliance:  
 Exceptional, Very Good, Satisfactory, Marginal, Unsatisfactory,  
 Narrative:

g. Other Areas: Exceptional, Very Good, Satisfactory, Marginal, Unsatisfactory,  
 Narrative:

6. Any additional narrative

Table 42-1—Evaluation Ratings Definitions

Rating	Definition	Note
(a) Exceptional . . . . .	Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds many to the Government’s benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being evaluated was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were 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.
(b) Very Good . . . . .	Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds some to the Government’s benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being evaluated was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were 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.
(c) 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/order. There should have been NO significant weaknesses identified. A fundamental principle of assigning ratings is that contractors will not be evaluated with a rating lower than Satisfactory solely for not performing beyond the requirements of the contract/order.
(d) Marginal . . . . .	Performance does not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being evaluated 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).
(e) 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).