PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE (L001)

INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFERORS SENDING REFERENCE QUESTIONNAIRE FORMS:

Section A (Part I and Part II) shall be completed by the Offeror (the firm requesting the reference) prior to issuing the questionnaires. The Offeror shall send the questionnaires for two (2) relevant projects that are referenced in its Technical Proposal that are in progress or completed in the past five (5) years to the individuals who will provide the reference. For Government contracts, send to the Contracting Officer (CO) or CO's Technical Representative. For commercial references, send to personnel with duties similar to those for Government contracts. It is the responsibility of the Offeror to follow-up and encourage references to submit the questionnaire. The completed questionnaire shall be submitted via e-mail directly from the person providing the reference. In addition, copies of all requested questionnaire forms by the Offeror to the Reference source must be included with the Offeror's proposal due 5PM EST, on **February 2, 2024**.

INSTRUCTIONS TO PERSON PROVIDING REFERENCE:

In order to assess potential vendors under SIR No. 693KA9-24-R-00006, the FAA contracting office is obtaining past performance information with respect to each Offeror. As a reference for work performed by the firm identified in Section A of this questionnaire, your candid response will assist in the evaluation process. Please complete Section B (Part I and Part II) of the questionnaire as thoroughly as possible and submit to anita.m.flack-colon@faa.gov no later than 5PM EST, on February 2, 2024. The subject line in the submission e-mail shall clearly indicate: SIR No. 693KA9-24-R-00006 Past Performance Questionnaire <a href="mailto:Submission for <Company Name">Submission for <Company Name and the message shall originate from the reference's government or commercial e-mail system.

In addition to this questionnaire, you may receive a follow-up phone call to confirm or clarify information. This is a major FAA acquisition and your input into this evaluation is greatly appreciated. If you have questions regarding this questionnaire or require assistance, please submit inquiries to: anita.m.flack-colon@faa.gov.

Anita Flack-Colon Contracting Officer, AAQ-420 Acquisition & Business Services

SECTION A TO BE COMPLETED BY OFFEROR (THE FIRM REQUESTING THE REFERENCE)
PART I: FAA WORKFORCE SCHEDULING TOOL PROGRAM OFFEROR INFORMATION
COMPANY NAME OF OFFEROR:
OFFEROR ADDRESS:
COMPANY NAME OF FAA AHR COMMERCIAL INFORMATION SERVICES PERFORMING TEAM MEMBER FOR THIS REFERENCE (IF APPLICABLE):
TEAM MEMBER ADDRESS:
PART II: PAST PERFORMANCE INFORMATION
TITLE OF PROJECT/CONTRACT NUMBER FOR WHICH REFERENCE IS REQUESTED:
AGENCY/CUSTOMER
CONTRACT/ORDER/SUBCONTRACT/OTHER:
CONTRACT TYPE: (Check all that apply)
☐ FP ☐ CPFF-Completion ☐ CPFF-Term ☐ CPIF ☐ CPAF ☐ IDIQ/Task Order
☐ Requirements ☐ Labor-Hour ☐ T&M ☐ CR ☐ Other (Specify)
DATE OF AWARD:
PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE (INCLUDING OPTIONS):
CONTRACT AMOUNT:
 INITIAL CONTRACT DOLLAR VALUE (W/OPTIONS): FINAL CONTRACT DOLLAR VALUE (W/OPTIONS):
ROLE ON PROJECT:
□ PRIME
☐ SUBCONTRACTOR (EXPLAIN TYPE AND EXTENT OF SUBCONTRACTING, IF APPLICABLE):
OTHER (EXPLAIN)

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF TYPE OF SERVICES/PRODUCTS REQUIRED UNDER THE CONTRACT:
DESCRIBE COMPLEXITY OF WORK:

SECTION B
TO BE COMPLETED BY EVALUATOR (PERSON PROVIDING REFERENCE)
PART I: REFERENCE INFORMATION
NAME & TITLE:
ORGANIZATION (INCLUDING AGENCY AND/OR COMPANY):
CONTRACT ROLE (e.g. CO, COTR):
ADDRESS:
PHONE NUMBER:
FAX NUMBER:
E-MAIL:

PART II: INFORMATION ABOUT PROJECT/CONTRACT FOR WHICH REFERENCE IS REQUESTED

Please identify and correct any information that is not accurate in Section A.

Please objectively assess the requesting firm in each performance element below by assigning an "X" to the most appropriate rating as described below:

Performance Element	Exceptional	Very Good	Satisfactory	Marginal	Unsatisfactory
1. Technical Performance / Quality of Service	Met all performance requirements / Exceeded 20 % or more Minor problems / Highly effective corrective actions / Improved performance/qual ity results	Met all performance requirements / Exceeded 5% or more Minor problems / Effective corrective actions	Met all performance requirements Minor problems / Satisfactory corrective actions Performance reflects serious problem / Ineffective corrective actions		Most performance requirements are not met Recovery not likely
Assessment (Check Box)					
2. Cost Control	Significant reductions while having met all contract requirements Use of value engineering or other innovative management techniques	Reduction in overall cost/price while having met all contract requirements Use of value engineering or other innovative management techniques	· Met overall cost/price estimates while having met all contract requirements	Do not meet cost/price estimates Inadequate corrective action plans / No innovative techniques to bring overall	Significant cost overruns Not likely to recovery cost control

	· Quickly resolved cost issues / Effective corrective actions facilitated cost reductions	· Quickly resolved cost/price issues / Effective corrective actions to facilitate overall cost/price reductions	expenditures within limits		
Assessment (Check Box)					
3. Schedule (Timeliness)	Significantly exceeded delivery requirements (All on-time with many early deliveries to the Government's benefit) Quickly resolved delivery issues / Highly effective corrective actions	On-Time deliveries / Some early deliveries to the Government's benefit Quickly resolved delivery issues / Effective corrective actions	On-time deliveries Minor problems / Did not effect delivery schedule	Some late deliveries No corrective actions	Many late deliveries Negative cost impact / Loss of capability for Government Ineffective corrective actions / Not likely to recover
Assessment (Check Box)					
4. Business Relations	Highly professional / Responsive / Proactive Significantly exceeded expectations High user satisfaction Significantly exceeded SB/SDB subcontractor goals Minor changes implemented without cost impact / Limited change proposals / Timely definitization of change proposals	Professional / Responsive Exceeded expectations User satisfaction Exceeded subcontractor goals Limited change proposals / Timely definitization of change proposals	 Professional / Reasonably responsive Met expectations Adequate user satisfaction Met subcontractor goals Reasonable change proposals / Reasonable definitization cycle 	Less Professionalism and Responsiveness Low user satisfaction / No attempts to improve relations Unsuccessful in meeting subcontractor goals Unnecessary change proposals / Untimely definitization of change proposals	Delinquent responses / Lack of cooperative spirit Unsatisfied user / Unable to improve relations Significantly under subcontractor goals Excessive unnecessary change proposals to correct poor management Significantly untimely definitization of change proposals

Assessment							
(Check Box)							
FOR #5, PLEASE ANSWER "Yes" or "No", as appropriate		No", as	YES		NO		
5. Given the choice, would you do business with this contractor again?							
6. Additional comments you would like to share		to share					
SIGNATURE				DATE:			