

CLIENT AUTHORIZATION LETTER

INSERT DATE HERE

Dear Client:

We are currently responding to the NASA Ames Research Center Request for Proposal (RFP) for the Logistics Management Services (LMS) procurement. This procurement is a follow-on requirement at NASA Ames Research Center for LMS Services providing:

- Supply Management
- Equipment Management
- Property Disposal
- Janitorial
- Refuse and Recyclable Materials Collection, Remove, and Disposal
- Shipping
- Receiving
- Mail Service Center
- Warehousing and Re-distribution
- Fleet Management
- Industrial Property Management
- Documentation Services
- Conference Center Support

NASA Ames Research Center is continuing to place increased emphasis on past performance as a source selection factor. As such, a requirement of their solicitation is that past clients of ours be identified and participate in the evaluation process. You are hereby authorized to respond to this and other inquiries.

We have identified _____ of your organization as the point of contact based on his/her knowledge concerning our work.

Please complete the enclosed Past Performance Questionnaire and forward it directly to NASA Ames Research Center, Attn: William E. Hale, Code JAC:241-1, Moffett Field, CA 94035-0001, telephone 650-604-2849. Facsimile responses are acceptable, Attn: William E. Hale, fax 650-604-0912. E-mail responses may be sent to: William.Hale@nasa.gov.

A response to this questionnaire is requested to the above address no later than _____.

Your cooperation is appreciated. Any questions may be directed to the undersigned.

Sincerely,

Enclosure

SPECIFIC

The Past Performance evaluation assesses the contractor's performance under previously awarded contracts for the same, or similar requirements. The past performance evaluation is an assessment of the Government's level of confidence in the Offeror's ability to perform the solicitation requirements as described in the Statement of Work. The past performance evaluation shall be in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(2) and NFS 1815.305(a)(2).

Use the following adjectival ratings to respond to the questions below. Please select one rating per statement, using the following definitions and provide additional remarks to further explain any Excellent, Very Good and Poor rating as well as in response to the more detailed questions.

Definition of Ratings

Excellent (E)	Consistent record of exceptional past performance by the offeror and any proposed major subcontractors on work identical or very similar to the work requirements of the proposed contract; indicating exemplary performance in a timely, efficient, and economical manner; very minor (if any) problems with no adverse effect on overall performance.
Very Good (VG)	Consistent record of successful past performance by the offeror and any proposed major subcontractors on work identical or very similar to the work requirements of the proposed contract; demonstrating very effective performance that would be fully responsive to contract requirements with contract requirements accomplished in a timely, efficient, and economical manner for the most part with only minor problems with little identifiable effect on overall performance.
Good (G)	Successful past performance by the offeror and any proposed major subcontractors on work similar to the work requirements of the proposed contract; and it demonstrates effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable problems, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance.
Neutral (N)	Neutral score. Assigned to offerors without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available
Satisfactory (S)	Successful past performance by the offeror and any proposed major subcontractors on work similar to the work requirements of the proposed contract and may be limited in terms of the size, scope and complexity when compared to this contract; demonstrates meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance.
Poor (P)	The Offeror's relevant past performance demonstrates performance that does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas, which adversely affect overall performance.

a. RELEVANT TECHNICAL PERFORMANCE

(Include comments for Excellent, Very Good and Poor ratings.)

1. Rate the contractor's flexibility and effectiveness in dealing with unexpected changes to technical requirements.

E VG G N S P

2. Rate the contractor's quality, accuracy, and completeness of technical documentation.

E VG G N S P

3. Rate the contractor's ability to resolve unexpected problems in a timely, effective manner.

E VG G N S P

b. CONTRACT MANAGEMENT

(Include comments for Excellent, Very Good and Poor ratings)

1. Rate the contractor's safety record, including ability to protect the environment and employees during performance of contract requirements.

E VG G N S P _____

2. Rate the contractor's qualifications and effectiveness of on-site contract management and the level of autonomy the on-site manager has to manage the contract.

E VG G N S P _____

3. Rate the contractor's ability to manage a large number of varied task, and experience for responding to short-term high demand requirements.

E VG G N S P

4. Rate the contractor's record in conformance with contract terms and conditions, including delivery of products, services, and reports.

E VG G N S P

5. Rate the contractor's record in retaining qualified employees to address contract requirements.

E VG G N S P

6. Rate the contractor's record in effectively managing subcontractors.

E VG G N S P

7. Rate the contractor's record in handling labor, including union, related issues, and the history of handling claims or disputes over the last five (5) years, and their resolution(s).

E VG G N S P

8. Rate the contractor's management of the phase-in period to ensure efficient continuation of services, in cases where the offeror was not the incumbent.

E VG G N S P

9. Rate the Contractor's handling of Government sensitive and third party proprietary data issues, including export control.

E VG G N S P

10. Rate the Contractor's processes for negotiating and implementing contract changes.

E VG G N S P

11. Rate the Contractor's response to work (or task orders) as assigned and the completion of work plans.

E VG G N S P

12. Rate the Contractor's experience in dealing with increased workload or contract de-scoping.

E VG G N S P

13. Rate the Contractor's ability to fill vacant key position(s) appropriately and in a timely manner.

E VG G N S P

c. CORPORATE MANAGEMENT RESPONSIVENESS

1. Rate the contractor's availability of corporate resources.

E VG G N S P

2. Rate the responsiveness of contractor's corporate management to contract issues.

E VG G N S P

3. Rate the impact of contractor's changes to lines of authority that were made during the contract.

E VG G N S P

4. Rate the Contractor's ability to operate free from organizational conflict of interest.

E VG G N S P

d. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

1. Did the Contractor provide the key personnel proposed?

Yes No

If no, please explain _____

2. If hiring was required at any time after the start of the contract, did the contractor identify appropriate vacancy skill sets and fill those vacancies with the appropriate skills and expertise in a timely manner?

Yes No N/A

If no, please explain _____

3. Did any regulatory violations occur because of Contractor's actions?

Yes

No

If yes, please explain _____

Submitted By (Signature) _____

Date: _____

Name (printed) _____

Phone, Commercial: _____ FAX _____

Position/Title: _____