

10 Jun 11



**DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY**  
U.S. ARMY SPACE AND MISSILE DEFENSE COMMAND/  
ARMY FORCES STRATEGIC COMMAND  
POST OFFICE BOX 1500  
HUNTSVILLE, ALABAMA 35807-3801

REPLY TO  
ATTENTION OF

SMDC-RDC-BA

10 June 2011

SUBJECT: Past Performance Questionnaire; Request for Proposal (RFP) W9113M-11-R-0003, SYSTEMS ENGINEERING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CONTRACT (SETAC) 2010

Dear Sir or Madam:

You are requested to complete the enclosed Past Performance Questionnaire in response to a solicitation issued by the U.S. Army Space & Missile Defense Command/Army Forces Strategic Command (USASMDC/ARSTRAT), Redstone Arsenal, Alabama. It is stressed that this questionnaire must be filled out by the addressee and not the offeror, and that the information is then forward to the individual identified below. The addressee is requested to sign the questionnaire as a validation of your assessment. **DO NOT RETURN YOUR RESPONSE TO THE CONTRACTOR THAT FORWARDED THIS QUESTIONNAIRE TO YOU.**

This letter, as well as the attached questionnaire, have been forwarded to you by \_\_\_\_\_ (insert name of firm). This firm intends to submit a proposal as either a prime contractor or a major subcontractor in response to the subject solicitation. This company has been instructed to forward this correspondence to you no later than fifteen (15) calendar days prior to the proposal due date of \_\_\_\_\_ (insert date). You are requested to complete the questionnaire and forward it either by e-mail or by facsimile to the following:

E-MAIL: [Elbert.Clarke@smdc.army.mil](mailto:Elbert.Clarke@smdc.army.mil)

FACSIMILE: 256-955-4240

Attention: Mr. Elbert Clarke  
U.S. Army SMDC/ARSTRAT  
ATTN: SMDC-RDC-BA  
P.O. Box 1500  
Huntsville, AL 35807-3801

A member of our Performance Risk Assessment Group may be in contact with you regarding your response should it become necessary. In the event that your response contains derogatory or superlatively positive responses/comments regarding the contractor's performance, you are requested to submit available documentation supporting these assessments. Your submittal of such documentation will hopefully eliminate post-response inquiries.

If you have any questions about this form or the overall past performance process, please contact Mr. Elbert Clarke at [Elbert.Clarke@smdc.army.mil](mailto:Elbert.Clarke@smdc.army.mil) or (256) 955-3420.

Sincerely,

//s//

STEPHEN W. HAYES  
Contracting Officer

**“Distribution A. Approved for Public Release: Distribution Unlimited.”**

SETAC 2010

**ATTACHMENT 09  
PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE**

W9113M-11-R-0003

**SECTION 1 – CONTRACT IDENTIFICATION (To be completed by Offeror)**

**CONTRACTOR NAME:** \_\_\_\_\_.

**CONTRACT NO:** \_\_\_\_\_ **TASK/DELIVERY ORDER NO. (if applicable):** \_\_\_\_\_.

**CONTRACTOR STATUS:**  Prime Contractor  Prime Contractor JV Participant  Subcontractor

Prime Contractor Name: \_\_\_\_\_ JV (Joint Venture) Name: \_\_\_\_\_

**CONTRACT TYPE:**  FFP  CFFF  CPAF  Labor Hour  T&M  SAIDIQ\*  MAIDIQ\*\*  
 Other Cost Reimbursement (explain below)  Other Type (explain below)

\*Single Award Indefinite-Quantity/Indefinite-Delivery \*\* Multiple Award Indefinite-Quantity/Indefinite-Delivery

**Contract Type Explanation:** *(If contract example is for entire SAIDIQ or MAIDIQ, specify all task order types)*

**CONTRACT AWARD BASIS:**  Competitive  Non-Competitive

**TOTAL POTENTIAL PERFORMANCE PERIOD:** From \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_.  
*(Including all options)*

**AWARDED TOTAL POTENTIAL CONTRACT VALUE:** \$ \_\_\_\_\_.  
*(Including all options)*

**CURRENT TOTAL POTENTIAL CONTRACT VALUE:** \$ \_\_\_\_\_.  
*(Including all options)*

**Explanation for difference between awarded and current contract values:** (e.g., Gov’t directed change in scope, schedule extension, cost overrun, etc.)

**COR/COTR:** *(name/organization/phone/email address)* \_\_\_\_\_

**PCO:** *(name/organization/phone/email address)* \_\_\_\_\_

**ACO:** *(name/organization/phone/email address)* \_\_\_\_\_

**TITLE AND DESCRIPTION OF CONTRACT EFFORT:** *(Attach additional pages if necessary)*

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**SECTION 2 – PERFORMANCE QUESTIONS (To be completed by Government POC)**

*The Government POC/addressee is requested to answer the following questions by placing a check mark in the box (i.e., double-click on) that best describes the quality of the contractor’s performance in relation to the question being asked. For any assigned descriptions of “considerably surpassed” or “did not meet/less than minimum”, please provide additional comments supporting these assessments. For any assessment of a “did not meet/less than minimum”, please indicate in the comments whether or not the contractor has been previously advised that his performance had not met minimum requirements. If so, please attach the substantiating documentation.*

**SECTION 2A – QUALITY OF PRODUCTS/SERVICES**

1. To what extent does/did the contractor meet the technical objectives/requirements of the contract/task order?

- Considerably surpassed minimum technical objectives/requirements
- Generally exceeded minimum technical objectives/requirements
- Met minimum technical objectives/requirements
- Did not meet minimum technical objectives/requirements

Comments:

2. How responsive is/was the contractor in responding to changes in technical direction and/or in the technical environment in which the effort was performed?

- Considerably surpassed Government expectations
- Generally exceeded Government expectations
- Met Government expectations
- Did not meet Government expectations

Comments:

3. To what extent does/did the contractor identify and proactively mitigate technical risks associated with the required effort without Government intervention?

- Considerably surpassed Government expectations
- Generally exceeded Government expectations
- Met Government expectations
- Did not meet Government expectations

Comments:

**“Distribution A. Approved for Public Release: Distribution Unlimited.”**

SETAC 2010

**ATTACHMENT 09  
PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE**

W9113M-11-R-0003

4. How effective was the contractor in the timely resolution of technical problems without Government intervention?

- Considerably surpassed Government expectations
- Generally exceeded Government expectations
- Met Government expectations
- Did not meet Government expectations

Comments:

5. What is/was the level of the contractor’s technical personnel qualifications in relation to the minimum qualification requirements of the contract/task order? If minimum qualifications were not required, what is/was the level of qualifications in relation to that which would be expected to successfully achieve technical objectives?

- Considerably surpassed minimum/expected qualifications
- Generally exceeded minimum/expected qualifications
- Met minimum/expected qualifications
- Less than minimum/expected qualifications

Comments:

**SECTION 2B – SCHEDULE ADHERENCE**

1. To what extent does/did the contractor adhere to original contract/task order delivery schedules, to include the delivery of products/services as well as deliverable reports?

- Considerably surpassed required delivery schedules (routinely delivered ahead of schedule)
- Generally exceeded required delivery schedules (occasionally delivered ahead of schedule)
- Met delivery schedules
- Did not meet required delivery schedules

Comments:

2. To what extent does/did the contractor identify and proactively mitigate schedule risks associated with the required effort without Government intervention?

- Considerably surpassed Government expectations
- Generally exceeded Government expectations

**PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE**

- Met Government expectations
- Did not meet Government expectations

Comments:

**SECTION 2C – CONDUCT OF BUSINESS RELATIONS**

1. How responsive is/was the contractor’s managerial personnel in responding to Government queries and requests?

- Considerably surpassed Government expectations
- Generally exceeded Government expectations
- Met Government expectations
- Did not meet Government expectations

Comments:

2. How effective is/was the contractor’s managerial personnel in communicating/interfaces with Government personnel?

- Considerably surpassed Government expectations
- Generally exceeded Government expectations
- Met Government expectations
- Did not meet Government expectations

Comments:

3. To what extent does/did the contractor demonstrate initiative in teaming and/or collaborating with the Government customer, other contractors, or similar entities to promote synergy and innovation?

- Considerably surpassed Government expectations
- Generally exceeded Government expectations
- Met Government expectations
- Did not meet Government expectations

Comments:

**SECTION 2D – EFFECTIVENESS OF COST/PRICE AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**

1. How effective is/was the contractor in accurately forecasting and allocating sufficient resources, including the appropriate types and numbers of qualified personnel, to successfully meet the technical objectives of the contract/task order in a timely manner?

- Considerably surpassed Government expectations; personnel retention rates were maintained at 95% or better.
- Generally exceeded Government expectations; personnel retention rates were maintained at 90% or better.
- Met Government expectations; personnel retention rates were maintained at 80% or better.
- Did not meet Government expectations; personnel retention rates were maintained at less than 80% (see Section 2E, Question 1 below)

Comments:

2. How effective is/was the contractor in adhering to original cost/price and other resource estimates during the course of contract/task order performance?

- Considerably surpassed Government expectations. For cost-reimbursement type contracts, actual cost of performance was maintained within original cost estimates.
- Generally exceeded Government expectations. For cost-reimbursement type contracts, actual cost of performance was maintained within 105% of original cost estimates.
- Met Government expectations. For cost-reimbursement type contracts, actual cost of task order performance was maintained within 110% of original cost estimates.
- Did not meet Government expectations. For cost-reimbursement type contracts, actual cost of task order performance exceeded 110% of original cost estimate. (see Section 2E, Question 1 below)

Comments:

3. How effective is/was the contractor in meeting cost/performance reporting requirements in terms of accuracy and content?

- Considerably surpassed Government expectations
- Generally exceeded Government expectations
- Met Government expectations
- Did not meet Government expectations

Comments:

**“Distribution A. Approved for Public Release: Distribution Unlimited.”**

SETAC 2010

**ATTACHMENT 09  
PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE**

W9113M-11-R-0003

**SECTION 2E – ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

1. If the contractor experienced cost overruns under this contract/task order, or required scope and/or ceiling increases as a result of a failure to adequately manage the effort, provide additional information below:
  
2. Has this contract been partially or completely terminated for default or convenience?  Yes  No
  - a. If yes, termination was for:  Default  Convenience
  - b. If yes, explain basis for default:
  
3. Are there any pending terminations?  Yes  No  
If yes, explain and indicate the status.:
  
4. Identify the contractor’s overall strengths and weaknesses:
  
5. Additional information not included above (attach additional page if necessary):

**SECTION 3 – RESPONDENT INFORMATION (To be completed by Government POC)**

**EVALUATED BY:**

Name and Title: \_\_\_\_\_.

Organization: \_\_\_\_\_.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_.