



GUIDELINES

CONTRACT TIERS AND RISK FACTORS

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Note: Tier assignment is determined by matching categorical elements, not the Aggregate Value. (i.e., if a contract matches several elements appearing in the Tier 3 column then the contract is rated as a Tier 3 Risk Level). | | |
| TIER ONE (Low Risk) | TIER TWO (Medium Risk) | TIER THREE (High Risk) |
| Annual Review | Semi-Annual Review | Quarterly Review |
| Aggregate Value: <100K | Aggregate Value: 100K < 1M | Aggregate Value: >1M+ |
| Contracted Supplies or Services are not essential to User Department's Operations | Contracted Supplies or Services are moderately essential to User Department's Operations | Contracted Supplies or Services are critical to User Department's Operations and require increased oversight by the City |
| Past performance by Contractor met or exceeded User Department expectations | User Department has not previously worked with Contractor | Past performance by Contractor did not meet User Department Expectations |
| User Department Contract Monitor has extensive experience with contract type/subject matter | User Department Contract Monitor has limited experience with contract type/subject matter | User Department Contract Monitor has no experience with the contract type/subject matter |
| Contract does NOT involve intellectual property licensing | Contract involves intellectual property licensing | Contract involves intellectual property licensing and has specific requirements, such as number of user seats or instances; term limitations; or impact to other City Systems |
| No Public Impact | | PHX Residents / Public Impact |
| Inter-agency agreements or other agreements between state agencies | | Citywide Agreements |
| No personal data or sensitive data is being shared with outside entities | | Involves creating, receiving, storing, or transmitting confidential or sensitive personal information |
| Certain Compliance (Firm Fixed Pricing and delivery) of Materials, goods, and service | | Uncertain Compliance: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Cost PlusDiscountsPunchout Catalog |
| Contract is NOT for provision of healthcare or administrative services or any service/activity that requires receipt, transmission, use or disclosure of Protected Health Information (PHI) | | Contract is for provision of healthcare or administrative services or any service/activity that requires receipt, transmission, use or disclosure of Protected Health Information (PHI) |
| | | Maintenance Repair & Operation (MRO) /Maintenance Repair Replacement & Alteration (MRR) |
| | | Lengthy Contract Lifecycle |
| | | Inconsistent Standards |
| TIER ONE (Low Risk) | TIER TWO (Medium Risk) | TIER THREE (High Risk) |
| Annual Review | Semi-Annual Review | Quarterly Review |
| Aggregate Value: <100K | Aggregate Value: 100K < 1M | Aggregate Value: >1M+ |
| | | Services where Contracts brings equipment requiring cranes, rigging, scaffolding, and /or erection equipment on City premises |
| | | Hauling of Hazardous Materials /Waste including chemicals, gas, or liquids. Products that can be considered hazardous, dangerous, or high risk of causing bodily injury or damage to property. This could include pacemakers, surgical robots, explosive chemicals, biologicals, lasers, etc. |
| | | Janitorial services performed on City Premises |
| | | Unaccompanied facility access |
| | | Access to vulnerable populations |
| | | Subject to political scrutiny |
| | | Technology Procurement |
| | | Access to CJIS |



City of Phoenix

FINANCE DEPARTMENT • PROCUREMENT DIVISION

CONTRACT PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

The purpose of this form is to evaluate the Contractor's service in relation to their contract with the City. This form is to be completed thoroughly and without bias.

Documents or written correspondence between the Department and the Contractor related to their performance should be provided with the completed evaluation.

The information provided in this evaluation may affect current and future contract business.

Contractor and Contract Details

City Clerk No. / SRM Contract No.

Solicitation No.

Contract Evaluation No.

Risk Level:

Contractor:

Contract Title:

Department(s):

Purpose of Evaluation:

Contract Officer:

DEFINITIONS

| Unsatisfactory Performance | Satisfactory Performance | Exceptional Performance | Not Applicable |
|--|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance <u>does not meet</u> contractual requirements and resolution did not occur in a timely or cost-effective manner. Serious problems existed and corrective actions have been ineffective. Major, extensive, and/or recurring non-compliance issues or problems. Performance indicates very little, or no effort extended to satisfy the minimum contract requirements. <p><i>(To justify an “Unsatisfactory” rating, the Evaluator should identify significant event(s) that the Contractor had trouble overcoming and state how it impacted the City. A singular problem, however, could be of such serious magnitude that it alone constitutes an “Unsatisfactory” rating. An “Unsatisfactory” should also be supported by referencing the management tool that notified the Contractor of the contractual deficiency (e.g., management, quality, safety, or deficiency reports, etc.)</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance meets contractual requirements. May have had some minor problems; however, satisfactory corrective actions taken by the Contractor were highly effective. Problems were not repetitive. <p><i>(To justify a “Successful” rating, there should have been NO significant weaknesses identified. A fundamental principle of assigning ratings is that the Contractor will not be evaluated with a rating lower than “Successful” solely for not performing beyond the requirements of the contract.)</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance <u>exceeds</u> contract requirements to the City’s benefit. Exceptional performance may reflect some of the following achievements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identified cost-savings, innovative options, or efficiencies. Demonstrated excellence in quality of work and service delivery. Added value, and/or went above and beyond City expectations. Consistently exceeded expectations <p><i>(To justify an “Exceptional” rating, the Evaluator should identify significant events and state how they were of benefit to the City. A singular benefit could be of such magnitude that it alone constitutes an “Exceptional” rating. Also, there should have been NO significant weaknesses identified.)</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This category is not applicable to the current Contractor. |

Performance Rating

- 1 Contract Compliance with SOW, Terms and Conditions and any Regulatory Requirements
- 2 Customer Service
 - Timeliness in delivery of goods and services
- 3 Customer Service
 - Communication and Responsiveness
- 4 Quality (Service and Commodities)
- 5 Invoicing and Payments

Department Comments

Is a supporting documentation and/or correspondence attached? Yes No Not Available N/A

Department Representative Name

Department Representative Signature

Date

CONTRACTOR USE ONLY

This section is to be completed by the Contractor, and reviewed by the Contract Officer

1. Is your Supplier Portal Profile current? YES NO

NOTE: If "No" go to: www.phoenix.gov/procure to update your profile.

Contractor's comments or response to items listed above (as applicable):

Contractor Representative Name

Contractor Representative Signature

Date



City of Phoenix
FINANCE DEPARTMENT ♦ PROCUREMENT DIVISION

FORM

INCIDENT REPORT

Date

| | | | |
|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|
| Department Name | Requestor's Name | | |
| City Clerk No. / SRM Contract No. | Contractor Name | | |
| Contract Title | | | |
| Provide details of the non-compliant action(s) taken by the Contractor. Attach previous correspondence and relevant information. | | | |
| Procurement Action (To be completed by the CPD Contract Officer. Refer to [4030] Remedy of Non-Performance SOP) | | | |
| Risk Level | Performance Score | Is this a reoccurring issue? | |
| Reference Contract Section | | | |
| Contract Officer Comments / Action Item | | | |
| Further Action Required? | Contract Officer Name | Signature | Date |