**PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE**

**RFQ SP0604-22-Q-0404**

Our firm is currently in the process of preparing a proposal for the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) Energy Sustainment Restoration & Modernization (SRM) Support Services effort, RFQ number SP0604-22-Q-0404. As part of our proposal, we have listed you as a reference on our performance for this type of service with your agency under the previous/current contract listed below. Your input on our performance is therefore requested.

This questionnaire is due to DLA Energy no later than **May 23, 2022, 12:00 p.m. EST.**

The questionnaire must be submitted directly via e-mail to CSTeam@dla.mil. The email subject line should be ATTN: PPQ, RFQ SP0604-22-Q-0404, (*Company Name*).

If you will not be available for verification of this past performance evaluation May 23, 2022 through June 06, 2022, please designate an alternate POC for the DLA Contracting Officer to contact.

Thank you.

**NAME OF OFFEROR:** Syms Strategic Group, LLC

**Phone:** (801) 510-5235

**E-mail:** ESyms@symssg.com

**I. Current or Historical Contract Information**

**CONTRACT REFERENCED:** Benefits Appeals and Memorials (BAM) Program Management Office (PMO) and Technical Management Support

1. **Contract or Identifying Number:**

**Subcontract Number:** 2017-016-T4NG-SC**, PO:** VAT4NG-018-009

1. **Contract Value:** $1,011,343
2. **Period of Performance:** 06/09/2017 – 06/08/2020
3. **Brief description of items provided:** SSG provided project/program management support and sustainment activities for the BAM Portfolio, which is comprised of approximately 50 development programs and projects and sustainment activities across four work streams. We provided daily support to each BAM Team to include the analysis of business, functional, and technical reports. Our team members worked with BAM to strategize and document process improvements for various functions within BAM. In addition, we assisted the government with establishing a unified governance for all development and sustainment projects that fell within the BAM Portfolio, specifically in the areas of financial management, Veteran-Focused Integration Process (VIP) compliance, and communications.

**Task 1 – Provide Program, Budget, and Process Support**

In collaboration with the BAM Portfolio Team and stakeholders, SSG supported timely and accurate financial management and reporting activities to ensure the integration of project and program budgets. SSG prepared and reviewed planning and expenditure data related to Operational Management Review (OMR), Internal Process Review (IPR), Program Management Review (PMR), VIP and Enterprise Project Structure. On a day-to-day basis, we tracked the execution year funding and assisted in the development and update of budget execution artifacts.

**Task 2 – Strategic Program Support**

SSG reviewed forward-looking strategies to develop and document alternatives to address technical and schedule challenges. Our team conducted research regarding various aspects of proposed strategies and alternatives and provided summaries of findings. We identified and applied a variety of process analysis approaches to determine the impact of complex issues. SSG provided a composite list of all alternative strategies and approaches and considered a detailed summary of cost, schedule, and performance risks and benefits of each.

**Task 3 – Provide PMD Program Database Maintenance Support**

SSG created and maintained a Risk Register that was updated on a weekly basis and was the central repository for all risks identified within the BAM Portfolio list of program/projects. Each risk had a unique identifier and included information such as source, project, trigger, description, impact, impact severity, probability of occurrence, mitigation strategy, risk category, response strategy, and dependencies. The risk register contained all project and program issues and information such as description, project name, source, impact, and resolution.

1. **Name of Person Completing Questionnaire:** Ben Lin

**Agency/Company:** Favor TechConsulting, LLC (FTC)

**Title:** Chief Operating Officer (COO) **Phone:** (202) 255-9635

**E-mail:** blin@ftc-llc.com

**Alternate POC name:**

**Alternate POC Phone Number:**

**Alternate POC e-mail address:**

**II. EVALUATION. Please rate the Contractor utilizing the guide below. Explanatory narratives for as many responses as possible would be appreciated. These narratives need not be lengthy, just detailed. Attach additional pages if more space is needed.**

**Evaluation Definitions –**

The following definitions should be used in the assessment of Contractor performance.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| EXCEPTIONAL | Performance EXCEEDS MOST contractual requirements. The performance of areas being assessed was accomplished with few minor issues or concerns. |
| VERY GOOD | Performance EXCEEDS SOME contractual requirements. The performance of areas being assessed was accomplished with few minor issues or concerns, for which the Contractor’s corrective actions were highly effective. |
| SATISFACTORY | Performance MEETS contractual requirements. The performance of the areas being assessed contains minor issues or concerns, for which corrective actions taken by the Contractor were effective. |
| MARGINAL | Performance MEETS SOME contractual requirements. The performance of the areas being assessed includes significant problems, issues, or concerns for which corrective actions taken by the Contractor were only somewhat effective. |
| UNSATISFACTORY | Performance DOES NOT MEET contractual requirements. The performance of the areas being assessed includes serious problems, issues, or concerns for which the Contractor’s corrective actions were ineffective. |
| NOT APPLICABLE (N/A) | Performance information not recent or relevant as defined in the Solicitation. Unable to provide assessment. |

**Past Performance Evaluation**

**Question 1. Performance**

What is your assessment of the Contractor’s ability to meet your requirements?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Exceptional | Very Good | Satisfactory | Marginal | Unsatisfactory | N/A |
| **Performance** | X |  |  |  |  |  |

*Comments, if any.*

|  |
| --- |
| SSG exhibited exceptional ability to meet every one of our requirements. |
|  |
|  |
|  |

**Question 2. Timeliness**

What is your assessment of the Contractor’s ability to provide products in a timely manner?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Exceptional | Very Good | Satisfactory | Marginal | Unsatisfactory | N/A |
| **Timeliness** | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Ability to Resolve Timeliness Problems** | X |  |  |  |  |  |

*Comments, if any.*

|  |
| --- |
| SSG provided products in a very timely manner and there were very few problems with their product service delivery. If any issues arose, SSG solved the issue immediately. |
|  |
|  |
|  |

**Question 3. Quality of Workload Management**

What is your assessment of the Contractor’s ability to manage workload, produce quality deliverables and coordinate with subcontractors (if any) to meet requirements of the applicable performance work statement?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Exceptional | Very Good | Satisfactory | Marginal | Unsatisfactory | N/A |
| **Quality of Management** | X |  |  |  |  |  |

*Comments, if any.*

|  |
| --- |
| SSG expertly managed its workload and produced quality deliverables. |
|  |
|  |
|  |

**Question 4. Overall Rating of Contractor’s Performance**

What is your overall rating of Contractor’s performance (requirements, schedule) on contract being assessed?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Exceptional | Very Good | Satisfactory | Marginal | Unsatisfactory |
| X |  |  |  |  |

**General Comments:**

|  |
| --- |
| SSG did an excellent job adhering to the project requirements and to the schedule. I would strongly recommend them for similar future projects. |
|  |
|  |
|  |