CONTRACTOR PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Contractor Name and Address: (Identify Division)	2. Contract Number: _____ 3. Contract Value (Base Plus Options): _____ 4. Contract Award Date: _____ Comp Date: _____

5. Type of Contract: (Check all that apply) --
{ } FP { } FPI { } FP-EPA { } Award Fee { } CPFF-Completion { } T&M
{ } CPFF-Term { } CPIF { } CPAF { } Requirements { } ID/IQ { } BOA
{ } SBA 8(a) { } SBIR { } Negotiated { } Competitive { } Non-Competitive { } Labor Hour

6. Description of Requirements:

7. Ratings. Summarize contractor performance and circle in the column on the right the number which corresponds to the performance rating for each rating category. Please see page three for explanation of rating scale.

Quality of IRM Support Service	Comments	0 1 2 3 4
Cost Control	Comments	0 1 2 3 4
Timeliness of Performance	Comments	0 1 2 3 4
Business Relations	Comments	0 1 2 3 4
Customer Satisfaction	Comments	0 1 2 3 4

8. Would you select this firm again? Please explain.	
9. Program Officer: Phone/Fax/Internet Address:	Signature and Date:
10. Contract Officer: Phone/Fax/Internet Address:	Signature and Date:

CONTRACTOR PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE INSTRUCTIONS

Block 1: Contractor Name and Address. Identify the specific division being evaluated if there is more than one.

Block 2: Contract number of contract being evaluated.

Block 3: Contract value shall include base plus options. If funding was increased or decreased during the evaluation period. the value in this block should indicate the change.

Block 4: Contract award date and anticipated or anticipated contract completion date.

Block 5: Type of contract: Check all that apply.

Block 6: Provide a brief description of the work being done under the contract and identify the key performance indicators.

Block 7: Circle the rating in far right column and provide brief narrative for each of the categories rated. Indicate the contract requirements that were exceeded or were not met by the contractor and by how much.

Block 8: If given a choice, please explain why you would or would not select the contractor for this contract again.

Block 9: The program office person most familiar with the contractor's performance would sign this block. The rating is a combined program office, contracting officer decision.

Block 10: The contracting officer's signature certifies concurrence with this rating.

LAN & HELP DESK SUPPORT RATING GUIDELINES PAST PERFORMANCE

Summarize contractor performance in each of the rating areas. Assign each area a rating of 0 (Unsatisfactory), 1 (Poor), 2 (Fair), 3 (Good), 4 (Excellent), 5 (Outstanding). Use the following instructions as guidance in making these evaluations.

	Quality of IRM Support Service	**Cost Control**	**Timeliness of Performance**	**Business Relations**	**Customer Satisfaction**
	- Compliance with contract requirements - Accuracy of reports - Appropriateness of personnel - Excellent technical support - Resolves problems quickly - Replacement of personnel	- Within budget (over/under target costs) - Current, accurate, and complete billings - Relationship of negotiated costs to actuals - Cost efficiencies - Change order issues - High performance under Award Fee type contract(s)	- Met interim milestones - Reliable Support - Responsible to technical direction - Completed on time, including wrap up and contract administration - No liquidated damages assessed - Provides timely response to user requests for assistance	- Effective management - Businesslike correspondence - Responsive to contract requirements - Prompt notification of problems - Reasonable/cooperative - Flexible - Pro-active -Effective contractor-recommended solutions - Effective program for handling emergency service requirements. - Control of subcontractors	- Satisfaction of end users with the contractor's service.
0. Unsatisfactory	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 the use of agency resources.	Response to inquiries, technical/service/administrative issues is not effective and responsive.	End users consistently felt the service did not meet the Agency's expectations causing irreparable impacts to achievement of contract requirements.
1. Poor	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.	End users overall felt the service barely met the Agency's expectations but was often poor causing major impacts to achievement of contract objectives.
2. Fair	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.	End users overall felt the service met the Agency's expectations but was frequently poor causing minor impacts to achievement of contract requirements.
3. Good	Nonconformances do not impact achievement of contract requirements.	Cost issues do not impact achievement of contract requirements.	Delays do not impact achievement of contract requirements.	Response to inquiries, technical/service/administrative issues is usually effective and responsive.	End users overall felt the service met the Agency's expectations, however, containing instances of poor services which did not impact achievement of contract objectives.
4. Excellent	There are no quality problems.	There are no cost issues.	There are no delays.	Response to inquiries, technical/service/administrative issues is effective and responsive.	Ninety (90) percent or more of end users surveyed rated the service as excellent or better