

PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

The Regional Contracting Office (RCO) – Bogota is currently evaluating competitive offers for the services described herein. You have been named as a point of contact for services previously provided by the contractor cited herein. Please provide the information requested in the questionnaire. The information you provide will become part of the source selection documentation, however your name will not be released to any of the parties. Should you have any questions concerning this request, please contact Annabelle F. Miller at Tel 57-1-383-4227 or 57-1-320-859-6933 or E-mail at annabelle.miller@tcsc.southcom.mil or annabelle.miller@us.army.mil

SOLICITATION: W913FT-11-R-0011 – Dispatch, Driver and Administrative Support Services

Brief Summary of the Requirements/Statement of Work in the current RFP being evaluated.

This Performance Work Statement (PWS) identifies driver and dispatch and administrative support services required by the USMILGP-CO. The Contractor shall provide all resources necessary to provide dispatch and driver and administrative services required by the USMILGP-Colombia. The Contractor shall provide fully qualified personnel who possess the training, skills, and experience to satisfactorily perform the required services. The Contractor shall plan, schedule, coordinate and ensure effective and economical completion of all work and services specified in this contract.

Contractor Being Evaluated:

Address:

(To be completed by person to whom questionnaire is addressed):

SECTION 1 Reference/Evaluator Information:

a. Name of person completing this questionnaire and position:

Name: _____

Tel No.: _____

Fax No: _____

E-mail: _____

Address: _____

b. Contract No: _____

c. Description of service: _____

d. Period of Performance (all years): _____

e. Total value of the contract (all years): _____

SECTION 2 Contractor's Past Performance

1. In your opinion, is the work performed under your contract “same or similar” in scope, size and complexity as the work described above?

Please circle one rating – Yes or No:

RATING		
Prime	Sub	Role of Contractor
Yes	No	Was this a competitive contract?
Yes	No	Same or Similar in Scope
Yes	No	Same or Similar in Size
Yes	No	Same or Similar in Complexity

Comments:

The definitions for “same”, “similar”, “different”, “scope”, “size” and “complexity” are as follows:

Same: For past performance to be considered “same” the contractor must have performed services, which were identical or greater in scope, size, or complexity to that of the RFP.

Similar: For past performance to be considered “similar” the contractor must have performed services which were comparable to the required services in scope, size, or complexity to that of the RFP.

Different: For past performance to be considered “different” the contractor did not provide services which were identical, greater or comparable in scope, size, or complexity to that of the RFP.

Scope: Range of operations covered

Size: Dollar value

Complexity: Degree of difficulty.

2. Please circle a rating in answer to each of the following questions and provide comments as appropriate.

(1) Quality of Service: A pattern of successful completion of tasks of good quality

(2) Schedule/Timeliness of Performance: A pattern of submitting deliverables/completing tasks that are timely

(3) Business Relations: A pattern of cooperativeness and teamwork with the Government at all levels (task managers, contracting officers, auditors, etc.)

(4) Management of Personnel: A pattern of effective hiring and retention practices

(5) A respect of stewardship of Government funds

ADJECTIVAL RATINGS/DEFINITIONS FOR OVERALL PAST PERFORMANCE INFORMATION FACTOR	
RATING	DEFINITION
E (Excellent)	Essentially <i>no doubt</i> exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort based on their performance record. Risk Level: Very Low
G (Good)	<i>Little doubt</i> exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort based on their performance record. Risk Level: Low
S (Satisfactory)	<i>Some doubt</i> exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort based on their performance record. Risk Level: Moderate
M Marginal	<i>Significant doubt</i> exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort based on their performance record. Risk Level: High
P (Poor)	It is <i>extremely doubtful</i> that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort based on their performance record. Risk Level: Very High
NR (No Rating)	The offeror has little/no relevant past performance upon which to base a meaningful performance risk prediction. Risk Level: Unknown

PLEASE CIRCLE THE ADJECTIVAL RATING WHICH BEST REFLECTS YOUR EVALUATION OF THE CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE.						
SEE BELOW FOR DEFINITIONS OF THE ADJECTIVAL RATING						
QUALITY OF SERVICE	RATING					
1. Effectiveness of overall contract management (including ability to effectively lead, manage and control the program).	E	G	S	M	P	N
2. Effectiveness of on-site management, including management of subcontractors	E	G	S	M	P	N
3. Ability to meet quality standards specified for technical performance.	E	G	S	M	P	N
4. Quality/integrity of technical data/report preparation efforts.	E	G	S	M	P	N
5. Adequacy/effectiveness of quality control program and adherence to contract quality assurance requirements.	E	G	S	M	P	N

PLEASE CIRCLE THE ADJECTIVAL RATING WHICH BEST REFLECTS YOUR EVALUATION OF THE CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE.						
SEE BELOW FOR DEFINITIONS OF THE ADJECTIVAL RATING						
6. Effectiveness of material management.	E	G	S	M	P	N
7. Effectiveness of acquisition management.	E	G	S	M	P	N
8. Contractor safety record.	E	G	S	M	P	N
9. If this is/was a Government contract, has/was this contract been partially or completely terminated for default or convenience or are there any pending terminations? Indicate if show cause or cure notices were issued, or any default action in comment section below.	E	G	S	M	P	N
SCHEDULE/TIMELINESS OF PERFORMANCE						
10. Compliance with contractual delivery terms and conditions	E	G	S	M	P	N
11. Timeliness/effectiveness of contract problem resolution without extensive customer guidance.	E	G	S	M	P	N
12. Ability to successfully respond to emergency and/or surge situations.	E	G	S	M	P	N
13. Responsiveness regarding safety issues.	E	G	S	M	P	N
BUSINESS RELATIONS						
14. Contractor was reasonable and cooperative in dealing with your staff (including the ability to successfully resolve disagreements/disputes; responsiveness to administrative reports).	E	G	S	M	P	N
MANAGEMENT OF PERSONNEL						
15. Ability to hire/apply a qualified workforce to this effort.	E	G	S	M	P	N
16. Ability to retain a qualified workforce on this effort	E	G	S	M	P	N
STEWARDSHIP OF GOVERNMENT FUNDS						
17. Contractor proposed innovative alternative methods/processes that reduced cost, improved maintainability or other factors that benefited the client.	E	G	S	M	P	N
18. If this is/was a Government cost type contract, the Contractor's timeliness in submitting monthly invoices with appropriate back-up documentation and monthly status reports/budget variance reports.	E	G	S	M	P	N
19. If this is/was a Government cost type contract, the Contractor's accuracy regarding monthly invoices with appropriate back-up documentation and monthly status reports/budget variance reports.	E	G	S	M	P	N
OVERALL RATING						
In summary, provide an overall rating for the work performed by this contractor.	E	G	S	M	P	N

