

NATIONAL & CWN MOBILE FOOD SERVICES PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Contractor Name	Unit Number:	Contract/BPA No.	
		Incident Name	
		Incident No.	
		Inclusive Dates	
<p>Ratings: Summarize Contractor performance and check the descriptive rating corresponding to each rating category. (Rating definitions are on page two of this form.) The rating official must provide specific details and comments supporting each rating assigned.</p>			
Quality of Services/ Equipment	Comments:		Exceptional
			Very Good
			Satisfactory
			Marginal
			Unsatisfactory
Schedule: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Timeliness of Performance	Comments:		Exceptional
			Very Good
			Satisfactory
			Marginal
			Unsatisfactory
Management/ Business Relations: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Working with Government & Other Contractors	Comments:		Exceptional
			Very Good
			Satisfactory
			Marginal
			Unsatisfactory
Additional Comments: Outstanding Workers and/or Individuals / Areas needing Improvement			
Rating Official Name/Title	Rating Official Signature	Rating Official Phone No.	Date
		Rating Official E-Mail:	
Contractor Representative Name/Title	Contractor Representative Signature. This rating has been discussed with me.	Contractor Rep Phone No.	Date
		Contractor Rep E-Mail (Optional)	

Any Contractor comments regarding this performance evaluation must be submitted, in writing, to the Contracting Officer within 30 days of receipt by the Contractor's Representative.

Original—CONTRACTING OFFICER; 1st Copy—KITCHEN/CONTRACTOR; 2nd Copy—FDUL; 3rd Copy—USING AGENCY

EVALUATION RATING DEFINITIONS (Reference Table 42-1 FAR 42.1503)

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 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.
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.
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.
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).
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).

Note 1: It is expected that an "Exceptional" rating will be used in those RARE circumstances where contractor performance clearly exceeds the performance levels described as "Very Good".

Note 2: Plus or minus signs may be used to indicate an improving (+) or worsening (-) trend insufficient to change the evaluation status.

Note 3: N/A (not applicable) should be used if the ratings are not going to be applied to a particular area for evaluation.

Original—CONTRACTING OFFICER; 1st Copy—KITCHEN/CONTRACTOR; 2nd Copy—FDUL; 3rd Copy—USING AGENCY