

**ATTACHMENT 05**

**PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE**

**MARCORSYSCOM**

Marine Corps Systems Command (MARCORSYSCOM) is conducting a source selection evaluation in support of the Enhanced Flame Resistant Combat Ensemble (EFRCE) procurement. As part of the source selection process, potential contractors' past performance is being evaluated. As such, each Offeror is required to provide past performance information as part of their proposal.

To this end, THE OFFEROR has chosen you as a reference, and, by providing you this questionnaire, has asked that you fill out the related information and submit **BACK TO THE RESPECTIVE OFFEROR** in a timely manner. Once received, the **OFFEROR** shall submit this questionnaire as part of a solicitation package to the Government for consideration in support of the Enhanced Flame Resistant Combat Ensemble (EFRCE) procurement.

Of note, Marine Corps Systems Command personnel may contact you to verify and/or discuss your answers to the below questions.

The Marine Corps Systems Command greatly appreciates your time and effort in completing the attached questionnaire. Your care on this questionnaire is a small but important part of the process that ultimately determines the quality and effectiveness of the equipment your Marines will rely upon when going into harm's way.

Thank you for your support in this endeavor!

**Contracting Office  
Product Manager – Infantry Combat Equipment  
Program Manager Marine - 113  
Marine Corps Systems Command  
Quantico, Virginia**

**INSTRUCTIONS:**

**1. Please provide your contact information.**

(a) Name of Questionnaire Participant: \_\_\_\_\_

(b) Company Represented: \_\_\_\_\_

(c) Physical Company Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Downloaded from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2346127> on Tue, 20 Jun 2016 12:02:05 UTC  
All use subject to [JSTOR Terms and Conditions](#)

(d) Email Address of Questionnaire Participant: \_\_\_\_\_

(e) Phone Number of Questionnaire Participant: \_\_\_\_\_

**2. What is the contract number in question by which work was performed?**

[illegible]

**3. What was the nature of the contract in terms of scope? At a minimum, please briefly address the “who,” “what,” “when,” “where,” “why,” and “how much” questions when discussing scope of the respective contract being commented on in this survey.**

---

---

© 2006 Pearson Education, Inc. All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America. This publication is protected by copyright. Any unauthorized reproduction or distribution of this work without written permission from Pearson Education, Inc., may result in legal action.

---

---

[illegible]

**Figure 1**

Figure 1. Schematic representation of the experimental design. The subjects were divided into two groups: the control group (n = 10) and the experimental group (n = 10). The control group received a standard training protocol, while the experimental group received a modified training protocol. The subjects were then subjected to a series of tests to evaluate their performance. The results of the tests are presented in the following table.

\_\_\_\_\_

---

1112

**5. What was the total dollar amount associated with the contract?**

\_\_\_\_\_

6. Please refer to the appendix attached to this Past Performance Questionnaire for definitions regard the following ratings to complete the Past Performance Questionnaire. Please provide a rating for each category. Also, if you wish, please comment freely in the spaces provided. Both favorable and unfavorable comments are welcome. If you wish to attach an addendum page(s) for comments, please feel free to do so.

Quality of Products		
	N/A	Comments:
	Exceptional	
	Very Good	
	Satisfactory	
	Marginal	
	Unsatisfactory	

Schedule		
	N/A	Comments:
	Exceptional	
	Very Good	
	Satisfactory	
	Marginal	
	Unsatisfactory	

Cost Controls		
	N/A	Comments:
	Exceptional	
	Very Good	
	Satisfactory	
	Marginal	
	Unsatisfactory	

Business Relations		
	N/A	Comments:
	Exceptional	
	Very Good	
	Satisfactory	
	Marginal	
	Unsatisfactory	

Management of Key Personnel		
	N/A	Comments:
	Exceptional	
	Very Good	
	Satisfactory	
	Marginal	
	Unsatisfactory	

Small Business Involvement		
	N/A	<b>Not applicable to this past performance survey and the EFRCE procurement, per Federal Acquisition Regulation 19.1202-2.</b>
	Exceptional	
	Very Good	
	Satisfactory	
	Marginal	
	Unsatisfactory	

Other/General		
	N/A	Comments:
	Exceptional	
	Very Good	
	Satisfactory	
	Marginal	
	Unsatisfactory	

# **EFRCE Past Performance Questionnaire Appendix**

## **Definitions of Evaluator Ratings**

**Evaluation Ratings Definitions (Excluding Utilization of Small Business)**

Rating	Definition	Note
<b>Exceptional</b>	Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds many to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor was highly effective.	To justify an Exceptional rating, identify multiple significant events and state how they were of benefit to the Government. A singular benefit, however, could be of such magnitude that it alone constitutes an Exceptional rating. Also, there should have been NO significant weaknesses identified.
<b>Very Good</b>	Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds some to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor was effective.	To justify a Very Good rating, identify a significant event and state how it was a benefit to the Government. There should have been no significant weaknesses identified.
<b>Satisfactory</b>	Performance meets contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor appear or were satisfactory.	To justify a Satisfactory rating, there should have been only minor problems, or major problems the contractor recovered from without impact to the contract. There should have been NO significant weaknesses identified. A fundamental principle of assigning ratings is that contractors will not be assessed a rating lower than Satisfactory solely for not performing beyond the requirements of the contract.
<b>Marginal</b>	Performance does not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed reflects a serious problem for which the contractor has not yet identified corrective actions. The contractor's proposed actions appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented.	To justify Marginal performance, identify a significant event in each category that the contractor had trouble overcoming and state how it impacted the Government. A Marginal rating should be supported by referencing the management tool that notified the contractor of the contractual deficiency (e.g., management, quality, safety, or environmental deficiency report or letter).
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	Performance does not meet most contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains a serious problem(s) for which the contractor's corrective actions appear or were ineffective.	To justify an Unsatisfactory rating, identify multiple significant events in each category that the contractor had trouble overcoming and state how it impacted the Government. A singular problem, however, could be of such serious magnitude that it alone constitutes an unsatisfactory rating. An Unsatisfactory rating should be supported by referencing the management tools used to notify the contractor of the contractual deficiencies (e.g., management, quality, safety, or environmental deficiency reports, or letters).

NOTE 1: Plus or minus signs may be used to indicate an improving (+) or worsening (-) trend insufficient to change the assessment status.

NOTE 2: N/A (not applicable) should be used if the ratings are not going to be applied to a particular area for evaluation.