

Past Performance Check:

Offeror:

Reference:

Date:

Reference POC:

CO:

Signature:

Project:
Period of Performance –
Contract Number –

Ratings: Exceptional; Very Good; Satisfactory; Marginal; Unsatisfactory; and N/A

The following responses are provided:

- | | | |
|----|----------------------------|----------|
| 1. | Quality of Product/Service | Rating – |
| 2. | Timeliness of Performance | Rating – |
| 3. | Price/Cost Control | Rating – |
| 4. | Customer Satisfaction | Rating – |
| 5. | Additional Comments | |

Exceptional

Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds many to the Governments 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 were highly effective.

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 were effective.

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.

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.

Unsatisfactory

Performance does not meet most contractual requirements. Recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains serious problem(s) for which the contractor's corrective actions appear or were ineffective.

N.A. Not applicable or do not know.

NOTE:

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.

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.

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.

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).

Attachment 3
QSU TSBQ202300001
TSB – Range Cleaning Services

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).

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