District of Columbia
Office of the Chief Financial Officer
Office of Contracts

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM
(Check appropriate box)

Performance Elements	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Poor	Unacceptable
Quality of Services/ Work		x			
Timeliness of Performance		x			
Cost Control		x			
Business Relations		x			
Customer Satisfaction		x			

1. NAME & TITLE OF EVALUATOR /(COTR): James Snight, Director DSC
2. SIGNATURE OF EVALUATOR/(COTR): Signature Below DATE: 10/31/2023 | 7:26 PM EDT
3. NAME OF AGENCY: Office of the Chief Information Officer
4. TELEPHONE NUMBER OF EVALUATOR/(COTR): 202.442.6345
5. NAME OF FIRM BEING EVALUATED Deloitte Consulting LLP
6. Type of service received: DIFS Implementation Services
7. Contract Number, Amount and period of Performance CFOPD-19-C-001;$19,802,717,00; 03-JUN-22 - 02-JUN-23

8. Remarks on Excellent Performance: Provide data supporting this observation.
(Continue on separate sheet if needed)

9. Remarks on Unacceptable Performance: Provide data supporting this observation.
(Continue on separate sheet if needed)

DocuSigned by:
Jim Snight
94F6FF9A74FA420...

DocuSign Envelope ID: 061A1F03-E680-43D9-B3D3-230640E9D6EF

RATING GUIDELINES

Summarize Contractor performance in each of the rating areas. Assign each area a rating of 0 (Unacceptable), 1 (Poor), 2 (Acceptable), 3 (Good), 4(Excellent), or ++ (Plus). Use the following instructions as guidance in making these evaluations.

	Quality Product/Service	**Cost Control**	**Timeliness of Performance**	**Business Relations**
	-Compliance with contract requirements -Accuracy of reports -Appropriateness of personnel -Technical excellence	-Within budget (over/ under target costs) -Current, accurate, and complete billings -Relationship of negated costs to actual -Cost efficiencies -Change order issue	-Meet interim milestones -Reliable -Responsive to technical directions -Completed on time, including wrap-up and contract administration -No liquidated damages assessed	-Effective management -Business-like correspondence -Responsive to contract requirements -Prompt notification of contract problems -Reasonable/cooperative -Flexible -Pro-active -Effective contractor recommended solutions -Effective small/small disadvantaged business Subcontracting program
0. Zero	Nonconformances are compromising the achievement of contract requirements, despite use of Agency resources.	Cost issues are compromising performance of contract requirements.	Delays are compromising the achievement of contract requirements, despite use of Agency resources.	Response to inquiries, technical/service /administrative issues is not effective and responsive.
1. Unacceptable	Nonconformances require major agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.	Cost issues require major agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.	Delays require major agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.	Response to inquiries, technical/service /administrative issues is marginally effective and responsive.
2. Poor	Nonconformances require minor agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.	Cost issues require minor agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.	Delays require minor agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.	Response to inquiries, technical/service /administrative issues is somewhat effective and responsive.
3. Acceptable	Nonconformances do not impact the achievement of contract requirements.	Cost issues do not impact achievement of contract requirements.	Delays do not impact the achievement of contract requirements.	Response to inquiries, technical/service /administrative issues is usually effective and responsive.
4. Good	There are no quality problems.	There are no cost issues.	There are no delays.	Responses to inquiries, technical/service/ administrative issues is effective and responsive.
5. Excellent	The contractor has demonstrated an exceptional performance level in some or all of the above categories.			