

**PAST PERFORMANCE FORM LETTER/EMAIL EXAMPLE FOR  
OFFEROR'S TO USE AS A COVER FOR QUESTIONNAIRE**

*(Date of Letter)*

*(Name and Address of proposed offeror's customer)*

Attention: *(Name and Designation of Customer's Contract Manager or Appropriate Contact)*

Subject: NASA Langley Research Center Request for Proposal (RFP) Flight Critical Systems Research (NNL13451174R)

Dear *(Contact Name)*:

We are currently responding to a NASA Langley Research Center (LaRC) solicitation for Flight Critical Systems Research. We have identified our work for your agency as a past performance reference. The Government requested, when possible, to have the evaluation jointly completed by the Technical Customer (e.g. PM/COR/QAE) and Contracting Officer. Per the solicitation instruction, please complete the enclosed Past Performance Questionnaire and return the signed, completed document to the NASA Contracting Office listed below No Later Than 1:00 p.m. February 19, 2013.

Preferable Method of Transmission is via email to the Contract Specialist, Bobbi Forbes, by Adobe PDF file to: [bobbi.forbes@nasa.gov](mailto:bobbi.forbes@nasa.gov)

\*Due to the importance of this questionnaire to the source selection process, please verify that the Contract Specialist received the completed questionnaire. They can be reached by email or phone at [bobbi.forbes@nasa.gov](mailto:bobbi.forbes@nasa.gov), (757)864-1770 respectively.

In the event you are contacted for information on work we have performed either on this effort or other efforts, you are hereby authorized to respond to those inquires. Your cooperation with this effort is greatly appreciated. Please direct any questions to *(Name and Phone Number of Offeror's Point-of-Contact)*.

In order to maintain the integrity of this process, please **DO NOT** return the questionnaire to us. Return it to NASA LaRC at the address listed above.

Sincerely,  
*(Name of Signer)*  
*(Designation of Signer)*

cc:

**PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE AND INSTRUCTIONS**

Responses to following questionnaire will be used to evaluate the past performance of Offerors responding to solicitation number NNL13451174R for NASA Langley Research Center Flight Critical Systems Research requirement. Section IV below provides the scope of research and development being procured at NASA LaRC. You are requested to rate the offerors performance in each area.

Please complete this questionnaire and return to the email address, secure fax, or mail address listed below.

1. Email – [bobbi.forbes@nasa.gov](mailto:bobbi.forbes@nasa.gov)
2. Secure FAX – (757)864-7898  
ATTN: Bobbi Forbes
3. Regular Mail  
NASA LANGLEY RESEARCH CENTER  
ATTN: BOBBI FORBES  
TO BE OPENED BY ADDRESSEE ONLY  
Mail Stop 12  
5A LANGLEY BOULEVARD  
HAMPTON, VA 23681-2199  
TELEPHONE: (757) 864-1770

***This form contains Source Selection Information when completed.  
See FAR 3.104.***

**I. CONTRACT INFORMATION**

1. Name of Company Being Evaluated: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Address: \_\_\_\_\_
3. Contract Number: \_\_\_\_\_
4. Contract Type: \_\_\_\_\_
5. Contract Value:
  - a. Awarded Value: \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Current or Final Value: \_\_\_\_\_
6. Period of Performance: From: \_\_\_\_\_ To: \_\_\_\_\_

**II. DESCRIPTION OF CONTRACT**

During the contract performance being evaluated, this firm was the:

- Prime Contractor
- Subcontractor
- Other:

---

**III. EVALUATOR**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Organization: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

E-mail address: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone #: \_\_\_\_\_

**RATINGS: Using the definitions below, please rate the company's performance in Section IV below, from Exceptional to Does Not Meet. If you have previously rated the contractor's performance using an existing rating scale (e.g., CPARS), a cross-reference rating table is also provided below so that you can translate your ratings into the scale used for this RFP. If the company has not performed a particular task, please mark "Not Applicable (N/A)".**

<b>EXCEPTIONAL</b>	Of exceptional merit; exemplary performance in a timely, efficient, and economical manner; very minor (if any) weaknesses with no adverse effect on overall performance.
<b>VERY EFFECTIVE</b>	Very effective performance, fully responsive to contract requirements accomplished in a timely, efficient, and economical manner for the most part; only minor weaknesses.
<b>EFFECTIVE</b>	Effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable weaknesses, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance.
<b>MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE</b>	Meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable weaknesses with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance.
<b>DOES NOT MEET</b>	Does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; deficiencies in one or more areas which adversely affect overall performance.
<b>NOT APPLICABLE (N/A)</b>	Performance information not recent or relevant as defined in the Solicitation. Unable to provide assessment.

RFP PERFORMANCE ADJECTIVES	Equivalent Ratings From Other Federal Government Performance Rating Scales			
From NASA Past Performance "Levels of Confidence"	CPARS (current)	CPARS (old)	FAR Award Fee (16.401, Table 16-1)	Old NASA Award Fee and PPDB (1680)
<b>Exceptional</b> (from Very High Level of Confidence)	Excellent	Outstanding	Excellent	Excellent
<b>Very Effective</b> (from High Level of Confidence)	Very Good	Above Average	Very Good	Very Good
<b>Effective</b> (from Moderate Level of Confidence)	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Good
<b>Minimum Acceptable</b> (from Low Level of Confidence)	Marginal	Marginal	Satisfactory	Fair
<b>Does Not Meet</b> (from Very Low Level of Confidence)	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Poor/ Unsatisfactory

**PLEASE RATE THE FOLLOWING CATEGORIES:**

CREW SYSTEMS AND AVIATION OPERATIONS						
IV. TECHNICAL TASKS	Exceptional	Very Effective	Effective	Minimum Acceptable	Does Not Meet	N/A
<b>1. Situation Awareness – Flight Crew</b>						
Contractor's ability to investigate and develop technologies, methods and procedures to improve flight crew situation awareness for Next Generation Air transportation system (NextGen) operations						
(a) Real-time information electronically: (check all that apply) <input type="checkbox"/> four-dimensional position <input type="checkbox"/> traffic, terrain, obstacle, and hazardous weather locations <input type="checkbox"/> flight path and surface route <input type="checkbox"/> air traffic control instructions <input type="checkbox"/> alerts of hazardous situations <input type="checkbox"/> other _____						

CREW SYSTEMS AND AVIATION OPERATIONS (CONTINUED)						
IV. TECHNICAL TASKS	Exceptional	Very Effective	Effective	Minimum Acceptable	Does Not Meet	N/A
<b>(b) Flight Deck Displays and Interface Concepts:</b> (check all that apply) <input type="checkbox"/> synthetic vision <input type="checkbox"/> human machine interface <input type="checkbox"/> human centered design						
<b>(c) Communication, navigation, and surveillance infrastructure technologies</b>						
<b>(d) Human-in-the-loop experimentation:</b> (check all that apply) <input type="checkbox"/> simulation <input type="checkbox"/> flight testing						
<b>Rationale for Assigned Rating:</b>						
<b>2. Situation Awareness – Air Traffic Control (ATC)</b>						
Contractor's ability to investigate and develop technologies and methods to increase air traffic control situation awareness: (check all that apply) <input type="checkbox"/> strategic and tactical collaborative decision making <input type="checkbox"/> seamless surveillance <input type="checkbox"/> controller-pilot data link communications (CPDLC) <input type="checkbox"/> alerting of flight crew path/route deviations <input type="checkbox"/> other _____						
<b>Rationale for Assigned Rating:</b>						

SAFETY-CRITICAL AVIATION SYSTEMS						
IV. TECHNICAL TASKS	Exceptional	Very Effective	Effective	Minimum Acceptable	Does Not Meet	N/A
<b>1. Design Integrity</b>						
Contractor's capability and experience in conducting research in Formal Methods: (check all that apply) <input type="checkbox"/> mechanical theorem proving <input type="checkbox"/> model checking <input type="checkbox"/> static analysis <input type="checkbox"/> other _____						
Contractor's capability and experience in conducting research in the safety assurance of complex systems						
Contractor's capability and experience in conducting research in design and assessment methods and techniques for the Validation & Verification of complex systems: (check all that apply) <input type="checkbox"/> composable verification <input type="checkbox"/> static analysis methods <input type="checkbox"/> model-based development <input type="checkbox"/> other _____						
<b>Rationale for Assigned Rating:</b>						
<b>2. System Safety Assurance</b>						
Contractor's capability and experience in conducting research in software assurance and certification						
Contractor's capability and experience in conducting research in airworthiness and systems safety						
<b>Rationale for Assigned Rating:</b>						

SAFETY-CRITICAL AVIATION SYSTEMS (CONTINUED)						
IV. TECHNICAL TASKS	Exceptional	Very Effective	Effective	Minimum Acceptable	Does Not Meet	N/A
<b>3. Operational Integrity</b>						
Contractor's capability and experience in conducting research in architectural principles for redundancy management and fault-tolerance						
Contractor's capability and experience in conducting research in the modeling of faults, failures, disturbances, and degradation						
Contractor's capability and experience in conducting research in integrated systems health management						
Contractor's ability to conduct systems engineering in support of novel flight critical systems analysis and development from research concept through simulation and test to flight experiment: (check all that apply) <input type="checkbox"/> requirements analysis <input type="checkbox"/> complex system functional decomposition <input type="checkbox"/> experimental system specification <input type="checkbox"/> experimental system design <input type="checkbox"/> system verification and validation <input type="checkbox"/> cost-benefit studies <input type="checkbox"/> modeling and simulation <input type="checkbox"/> configuration management <input type="checkbox"/> systems integration <input type="checkbox"/> systems assurance						
Contractor's experience participating in national and international working groups and standards setting committees for purposes of developing consensus-based recommendations for flight critical systems						
<b>Rationale for Assigned Rating:</b>						

WORKING GROUPS AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES						
IV. TASK	Exceptional	Very Effective	Effective	Minimum Acceptable	Does Not Meet	N/A
How effective was contractor's experience providing technical interchange in working groups and special committees?						
<b>Rationale for Assigned Rating:</b>						
BUSINESS MANAGEMENT						
IV. TASKS	Exceptional	Very Effective	Effective	Minimum Acceptable	Does Not Meet	N/A
<b>Schedule:</b> How effective was contractor in completing all PWS/SOW requirements within the time specified?						
<b>Cost:</b> How effective was contractor in estimating and controlling costs?						
<b>Management of Personnel:</b> How effective was contractor in recruiting skilled personnel, either through direct hire or subcontract?						
<b>Subcontracting:</b> How effective was contractor in meeting contractual subcontract goals?						
<b>Rationale for Assigned Rating:</b>						

Additional Comments:

---



---



---



---



---

**V. CONCLUSIONS**

Would you recommend this Contractor for another contract? Why? Please add any comments you feel pertinent.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---