## ATTACHMENT 13 PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE OFFICE OF ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT

Contractor:
) Contract No.:
Type of Contract:
☐ Negotiated or ☐ Sealed Bid; ☐ Competitive or ☐ Non-Competitive ☐ Fixed Price; type: ☐ Cost; type: ☐ to ☐ Initial Contract Value: ☐ Final Contract Value: ☐ Enief Description of Requirement: ☐ Enief Descripti
Complexity of Effort (Check one): ☐ Difficult ☐ Routine
RATER INFORMATION provide the information requested below to assist the DoS in tracking responses and resolving conflicts. This ation will be kept confidential.  Name:
Telephone/FAX Nos.:/
Organization:
Mailing Address:
Position Title/Grade:
Length of Involvement in Contract:
Questionnaire Completion Date:
GENERAL INFORMATION
answer the questions below:  sets the Contractor even been given a cure notice, show cause notice, suspension of progress payments, ters of direction?  Yes No  yes, please explain:

(c)	Are there any partia	□ Default				☐ Yes		- nvenience	
	If yes, please explain	·							- 
. ,	If an award/incentive Contractor usually in Changes in contract		_						
	attributable, for the submitted by the Co actions. Please explain:	most part, to: □ Contractor, □ other co	ustom ustom	er-issue er actio	ed change ns, or □ o	orders, other Co	□ claims ontractor		_
4.	RATING PAST	PERFORMANCE							_
	INTEGRATION figuring, assembling, operational systems.								
	EXCELLENT	GOOD		FA	AIR		POOR		UNSATISFACTO RY
	All system performance requirements are enhanced or exceeded; all system operational requirements met or exceeded.  All system performance requirements are met; all system operational requirements are met.		per req mo req sor into	Most system performance requirements are met; most system operational requirements are met; some customer intervention required.			system mance ements are m system operatements are m ntial custome ention require	tional et; er ed	Nonconformances compromise the program severely despite substantive intervention by the customer.
	se rate the categories uss below. If a statem					arginal o	r unaccepta	able rati	ing is given, please
	Contractor's demi	-			-			_	mainframes,
RA	ΓING:		] G	□F	□Р	□U	□NA		
	Contractor's demo	-		in plar	nning, pı	ovidin	g, and co	ontroll	ing production
RA	ΓING:		G	□F	□Р	$\square$ U	□NA		
C.	Consistency, relia	bility, level of Co	ontrac	ctor's te	echnical	perfori	mance in	integr	rating systems.
RA	ΓING:		] G	□F	□Р	□U	□NA		
D.	Contractor's abilit	y and responsiver	ness i	in meet	ing quic	k turna	round re	quire	ments.
RA	ΓING:		G	$\Box$ F	□Р	□U	□NA		
	Effectiveness of Coroviding successf	•	izatic	onal str	ucture, s	span of	control,	and es	scalation procedures
RA'	ΓING:		G	□F	□Р	□ U	□NA		

F. Contractor's ability to manage and resolve integration problems.

4.2 SYSTEM RELIABILITY EXPERIENCE Assuring stable, reliable systems at high levels of availability. The definitions for the adjectival rating provided below:	g catagories are							
Assuring stable, reliable systems at high levels of availability. The definitions for the adjectival rating	a categories are							
	g categories are							
EXCELLENT GOOD FAIR POOR UN Y	SATIFACTOR							
requirements are met or exceeded; problems expediently resolved.  requirements are met; problems resolved with expediently resolved.  requirements are met; problems resolved with expediently resolved.  requirements not met; problems resolved with some customer  requirements not met; problems resolved with some customer  substantial customer substantial customer	nconformances repromise the program erely despite stantive intervention he customer.							
Please rate the categories below as they relate to this subfactor. If a marginal or unacceptable rating is given, please discuss below. If a statement is not applicable, indicate 'NA'.								
A. Contractor's demonstrated performance in meeting system uptime requirements	S.							
RATING: $\Box$ E $\Box$ G $\Box$ F $\Box$ P $\Box$ U $\Box$ NA								
B. Contractor's ability to resolve problems that impact system availability.								
RATING: $\Box$ E $\Box$ G $\Box$ F $\Box$ P $\Box$ U $\Box$ NA								
C. Contractor's demonstrated performance in planning for configuration changes the system availability.	hat may impact							
RATING: $\Box$ E $\Box$ G $\Box$ F $\Box$ P $\Box$ U $\Box$ NA								
D. Contractor's ability to coordinate the efforts of subcontractors and customer persuailability problems.	sonnel to resolve							
RATING: DE DG DF DP DU DNA								
E. Contractor's understanding of negative effects of system downtime on customers applications.	s and							
RATING: $\Box$ E $\Box$ G $\Box$ F $\Box$ P $\Box$ U $\Box$ NA								
4.3 MAINTENANCE EXPERIENCE Providing resources (personnel and components) to maintain hardware and software from multiple vendors. The definitions for the adjectival rating categories are provided below:								
EXCELLENT GOOD FAIR POOR UN Y	SATIFACTOR							
requirements are enhanced or exceeded.  requirements are met.  requirements are met;  some customer intervention required.  requirements are met;  some customer intervention required.  requirements are met;  substantial customer intervention required.	nconformances promise the program erely despite stantive intervention he customer.							
Please rate the categories below as they relate to this subfactor. If a marginal or unacceptable rating is given, please discuss below. If a statement is not applicable, indicate 'N/A'.								
Please rate the categories below as they relate to this subfactor. If a marginal or unacceptable rating is discuss below. If a statement is not applicable, indicate 'N/A'.	, r							

B. Contractor's demonstrated performance in managing third parties associated with hardware and software maintenance.									
RATING:	□Е		G □F	□Р	□U	□NA			
	C. Contractor's demonstrated performance in maintaining hardware and software and in meeting response times and effecting on-site remedial repairs.								
RATING:	□Е		G 🗆 F	□Р	□U	□NA			
D. Contractor's demonstrated performance in obtaining spare parts and in providing replacement components on a timely basis.									
RATING:	□Е		G □ F	□Р	□U	□NA			
E. Contractor's demonstrated ability to provide qualified personnel for hardware and software.									
RATING:	□Е		G □ F	□Р	□ U	□NA			
F. Contractor's abilit	y and responsi	vene	ess in meeti	ng quick	turna:	ound require	ments.		
RATING:	□Е		G □F	□Р	□U	□NA			
G. Effectiveness of Contractor's organizational structure, span of control, and escalation procedures in providing successful performance.									
RATING:	□Е		G □ F	□Р	□U	□ NA			
H. Contractor's abili	ty to manage a	nd re	esolve prob	lems.					
RATING:	□Е		G □ F	□Р	□U	□NA			
<b>4.4 SUPPORT SER</b> Provisioning as-needed teadjectival rating categorie		ch as		rmance ev	aluation	and tuning. Th	e definitions for the		
EXCELLENT	GOOD		FAI	IR .		POOR	UNSATIFACTOR Y		
All contractual requirements are enhanced or exceeded; resources provided for all services required are excellent.	All contractual requirements are me resources provided (all services required good.	or	Most contractual requirements are met; resources provided for most services required are satisfactory.		Most contractual requirements are not met; resources provided for most services required are unsatisfactory.		Nonconformances compromise the program severely despite substantive intervention by the customer.		
Please rate the categories below as they relate to this subfactor. If a marginal or unacceptable rating is given, please discuss below. If a statement is not applicable, indicate 'NA'.									
A. Contractor's demonstrated experience in providing support services such as system performance evaluation and tuning as well as site surveys, configuration management, and expert software support.									
RATING:	□Е		G DF	□ P	□ U	□NA			
B. Effectiveness and	reliability of C	Contr		nnel.					
RATING:	□E		G 🗆 F	□Р	□U	□NA			

C. Contractor's demonstrated ability to provide qualified personnel for support services.									
RATING:	□Е	$\Box$ G	□F	□Р	□U	□NA			
D. Contractor's abilit	y and responsi	veness	in meet	ing quic	k turna	round require	ments.		
RATING:	□Е	$\Box$ G	□F	□Р	□U	□NA			
E. Contractor's ability to satisfy security requirements and to obtain clearances for personnel in a prompt fashion.									
RATING:	□Е	$\Box$ G	□F	□Р	□U	□NA			
F. Performance in pl	anning, schedu	ıling, c	ontrollir	ng, moni	toring,	and reporting	on deliverables.		
RATING:	□Е	$\Box$ G	□F	□Р	□U	□ NA			
G. Effectiveness of C in providing successf	-		ional str	ucture, s	span of	control, and $\epsilon$	escalation procedures		
RATING:	□Е	□G	□F	□Р	□U	□NA			
H. Contractor's abilit	y to manage ar	nd reso	olve prob	olems.					
RATING:	□Е	$\Box$ G	□F	□Р	ПU	□NA			
Providing training and traidefinitions for the adjective EXCELLENT	ining materials, in		rovided be		ıtilizing <sub>l</sub>	POOR	UNSATIFACTOR		
All training objectives are enhanced or exceeded; resources provided for training are excellent.	Most training object are met; resources provided for training good.	g are	Met some tra objectives; re provided for atisfactory.	sources	are not provide	raining objectives met; resources ed for training are factory.	Training ineffective and compromises the program severely despite substantive intervention by the customer.		
Please rate the categories discuss below. If a statem					rginal or	unacceptable ra	ting is given, please		
A. Quality and thorou	ighness of Cor	ıtracto	r's traini	ng mate	rials.				
RATING:	□Е	$\Box$ G	□F	□ P	□ U	□NA			
B. Competency and e	effectiveness of	f Cont	actor's i	nstructo	rs.				
RATING:	□Е	$\Box$ G	□F	□Р	□U	□NA			
	C. Contractor's demonstrated performance in providing training tailored for different skill levels, e.g., novice, experienced, advanced.								
RATING:	□Е	$\Box$ G	□F	□ P	□U	□NA			
D. Contractor's demonstrated performance in providing training for different levels of understanding, e.g., conceptual versus practical.									
	-		-	riding tra	aining f	or different le	evels of		

E. Contractor's ability to provide training specific to the needs of the students.									
RA	ATING:	□Е		G □ F	□Р	□U	□NA		
	Contractor's demonds-on training.	onstrated perfor	rmar	ice in mak	ing use	of prod	uction and su	pport equipment for	•
RA	ATING:	□Е		G □ F	□ P	□U	□NA		
					ffective re	esources.	The definitions	for the adjectival rating	
	EXCELLENT	GOOD		FA	AIR		POOR	UNSATIFACTOR Y	
	Cost estimates are accurate; exceeds the norm on price issues; keeps costs down; proposals are well documented.	No cost/price issues, issues do not impact program.		Cost/price iss minor with lit on program; s customer inte required.	ttle impact some rvention	progra custon require		Cost/price issues compromise the program severely despite substantive intervention by the customer.	
	ease rate the categories cuss below. If a statem					rginal or	unacceptable ra	ting is given, please	
A.	Contractor's demo	onstrated perfo	rmaı	nce in mak	king bes	t use of	`available fun	ids.	
RA	ATING:	□Е		G □ F	□Р	□U	□NA		
В.	Contractor's effect	etiveness in see	king	alternativ	es when	obtain	ing needed re	esources.	
RA	ATING:	□Е		G □ F	□Р	□U	□NA		
C.	Contractor's abili	ty to communic	cate	the cost-ef	fectiver	ness of	various altern	atives.	
RA	ATING:	□Е		G □ F	□Р	□U	□NA		
D.	Contractor's demo	onstrated perfo	rmai	nce in acci	urately e	estimati	ng costs.		
RA	ATING:	□Е		G 🗆 F	□Р	□U	□NA		
E.	Contractor's demo	onstrated perform	rmar	nce in repo	orting bo	th item	ized and sum	marized costs.	
RA	ATING:	□Е		G 🗆 F	□Р	□U	□NA		
			all D		l, and Wo	man-Ow	ned Businesses.	The definitions for the	_
	EXCELLENT	GOOD		FA	AIR		POOR	UNSATIFACTOR Y	
	Exceeded goals; excellent performance by subcontractors, payments always timely to subcontractors.	Met or exceeded goog good performance b subcontractors, payments timely to subcontractors.		Met some gor satisfactory p by subcontrac payments tim subcontractor	erformance ctors, some ely to	satisfa by sub timely subcor	goals not met; ctory performance contractors and payments to ntractors requires ntervention by the ner.	Subcontracting program ineffective and compromises the program severely despite substantive intervention by the customer.	

Please rate the categories below as t discuss below. If a statement is not				. If a mar	ginal or u	inacceptable rating is given, please		
A. Contractor's effectiveness as prime contractor in establishing separate percentage goals for use of small, small disadvantaged, and women-owned small businesses and in achieving those goals.								
RATING:	□Е	$\Box$ G	$\Box$ F	□Р	ПU	□NA		
B. Contractor's effectiveness in monitoring and controlling the performance of subcontractors and in improving the level of their overall performance.								
RATING:	□E	$\Box$ G	□F	□Р	□U	□NA		
C. Contractor's effectiveness in using source lists, such as the SBA's Procurement Automated Source System database, and other means to locate small, small disadvantaged, and women-owned small businesses and in establishing its own system of records to demonstrate plan compliance.								
RATING:	□Е	$\Box$ G	□F	□Р	□U	□NA		
D. Contractor's promptness in making payments to subcontractors.								
RATING:	□Е	$\Box$ G	□F	□Р	□U	□NA		
E. Contractor's effectiveness in maintaining contact with subcontractors and in managing and resolving problems.								
RATING:	□Е	$\Box$ G	□F	□Р	ПU	□NA		
F. Contractor's effectiveness in choosing capable subcontractors and teaming partners and in maintaining good business relationships with them.								
RATING:	□Е	$\Box$ G	□F	□Р	□U	□NA		
G. Contractor's effectivenss from customer personnel.	in solvi	ng cont	tract per	forman	ce prob	lems without extensive guidance		
RATING:	ПЕ	ПС	ПЕ	ПР	Пυ	П NA		

## 4.8 CUSTOMER SATISFACTION AND BUSINESS RELATIONS EXPERIENCE:

Establishing productive working relationships between customers and contractor, subcontractor, and vendor personnel. The definitions for the adjectival rating categories are provided below:

EXCELLENT	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	UNSATIFACTOR Y
Responses to questions/technical/service/administrative issues exceed the norm; displays ingenuity; relationships with other than prime contractor are seamless.	Responses to questions/technical/ service/administrative issues are effective; contractors work effectively as a team.	Responses to questions/technical/service/administrative issues are usually effective; contractors work as a team requiring some customer intervention.	Responses to questions/technical/ service/administrative issues are marginally effective; issues arise between contractors requiring substantial customer intervention.	Responses to questions/technical/ service/administrative issues are ineffective; friction between contractors compromises the program severely despite substantive intervention by the customer.

Please rate the categories below as they relate to this subfactor. If a marginal or unacceptable rating is given, please discuss below. If a statement is not applicable, indicate 'NA'.

A. Contractor's demonstrate questions/technical/service/a				onding	to			
RATING:	□Е	□G	□F	□Р	□U	□NA		
B. Contractor's demonstrate and affect their applications.	-	rmance	in reso	lving pr	oblems	that arise which involve customers		
RATING:	□Е	$\Box$ G	$\Box$ F	□Р	□U	□NA		
C. Contractor's ability to coccustomer problems.	ordinate	e the eff	forts of	subcon	ractors	and customer personnel to resolve		
RATING:	□Е	$\Box$ G	□F	□ P	□U	□NA		
D. Contractor's ability to co	D. Contractor's ability to communicate about the status of customer-related issues.							
RATING:	□Е	$\Box$ G	□F	□ P	□U	□NA		
E. Contractor's understanding	ng of th	e impor	tance of	f custor	ner-rela	ted issues.		
RATING:	□E	□G	□F	□ P	□ U	□ NA		
	5. CONCLUSION  Based on this Contractor's overall performance, would you award them another contract?   Yes  No  If no, please explain. Please discuss any marginal or acceptable rating from Section 4:							
The undersigned hereby confirms that the information provided in this document is correct as written. Should any corrections be required, the undersigned shall contact the Contracting Officer not later than 7 calendar days after the date of the signature below. This confirmation shall allow the Department of State to use the information contained herein as source selection information.								
Signature						Date		