

EXHIBIT 14 – NNG14476256R

PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE INSTRUCTIONS (Updated September, 2010)

Sections I through III provide for contract-related descriptive information and identification of the evaluator.

Section IV lists the major work elements within our Statement of Work (SOW). Please provide your assessment of the “relevant experience” and “performance” associated with our SOW evidenced within the contract for which you are a reference. Your assessment of the relevancy should reflect the fact that the principal purpose of our contract is as follows:

The Earth Observing System Data and Information System is a major core capability within NASA's Earth Science Data Systems Program. EOSDIS ingests, processes, archives and distributes data from a large number of Earth observing satellites. EOSDIS consists of a set of processing facilities and Earth Science Data Centers distributed across the United States and serves hundreds of thousands of users around the world, providing hundreds of millions of data files each year covering many Earth science disciplines. The Earth Science Data and Information System (ESDIS) Project, Code 423, at the Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC) manages the EOSDIS on behalf of the Science Mission Directorate (SMD).

In the performance of this contract, the EED2 contractor is required to coordinate and integrate task related activities with the ESDIS Project, the Distributed Active Archive Centers (DAACs), other Earth science data centers, the science investigator teams, the user community, as well as other EOS contractors. The contractor's overall goal shall be to continuously improve the reliability, availability, functionality, operability, and performance of hardware and software systems within the EOSDIS while reducing operational and maintenance costs.

“**Significant Experience**” means that a full range of services was routinely performed by the contractor under the associated SOW element. “**Moderate Experience**” describes a contractor who has experience in several aspects of a work element even though the experience may not have been on a continuous basis or directly related to the purpose of our contract. “**Minimal Experience/Did not Perform**” means that, although at least some aspects of the work may have been performed, such performance was limited in scope or frequency, or the work element was not performed under the contract.

Section V evaluates the contractor's technical, schedule, and cost performance and management. (Additional pages may be used for comments if desired). It is very important to keep in mind that only performance in the **past 5 years** is relevant. If you cannot answer any questions, please circle “N/R” for Not Rated.

The following definitions are offered for your use in assigning a performance rating for each of the factors in Sections IV and V:

Very High (VH)	The Offeror's relevant past performance is of exceptional merit ; indicating exemplary performance in a timely, efficient, and economical manner; very minor (if any) problems with no adverse effect on overall performance.
High (H)	The Offeror's relevant past performance demonstrates 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.
Moderate (M)	The Offeror's relevant past performance demonstrates effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable problems, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance.
Low (L)	The Offeror's relevant past performance meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance.

EXHIBIT 14 – NNG14476256R

Very Low (VL)	The Offeror's relevant past performance 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.
N/R	Not Rated

Section VI provides for evaluation of the contractor's management of cost and award/incentive fee history.

RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE TO
BY **TWO WEEKS BEFORE PROPOSAL
DUE DATE.**

NASA Goddard Space Flight Center
Attn: Sherika D. Wilson, Code 210.6
Greenbelt, MD 20771
Phone: 301-286-0566 FAX: 301-286-0383
e-mail: Sherika.D.Wilson@nasa.gov

EXHIBIT 14 – NNG14476256R

PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

I. Contract Information

- A. Name of Company/Division Being Evaluated: _____
- B. Address: _____
- C. Contractor Cage Code and/or DUNS number: _____
- D. Contract Number: _____
- E. Contract Type: _____
- F. Period of Performance (including options): From: _____ To: _____
- G. Total Contract Value: _____
- H. Award Information: Competitive: Yes ___ No ___
Basis of Selection: Technical ___ Cost/Price ___
Other (specify) _____

II. Description of Contract

Briefly describe the services provided under this contract:

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

Prime Contractor ___ Significant Subcontractor ___ Team Member ___
Other (describe) _____

Does a corporate or business relationship exist between the firm being evaluated and your organization?

Yes ___ No ___. If yes, please describe: _____

III. Evaluator Information

Name: _____
Title: _____
Agency/Company: _____
Address: _____
Phone: _____ Date Questionnaire Completed: _____
Role in Program/Contract: _____
Length of Involvement in this Program/ Contract: _____

EXHIBIT 14 – NNG14476256R

PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

IV. SOW Survey: Relevant Experience and Performance Ratings: Please check the appropriate blocks for both Relevance (Significant, Moderate, Minimal/Did Not Perform) and the Performance (VH, H, M, L, VL, N/R) for each SOW Element Listed below (see page 1 definitions and instructions).

SOW ELEMENT	SIGNIFICANT	MODERATE	MINIMAL/ DID NOT PERFORM	PERFORMANCE RATING (Please circle)					
				VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
The contractor planned, developed, integrated, and executed program management activities to successfully execute the requirements of the contract.									
The contractor planned and executed a transition of hardware and software system responsibilities from a previous vendor to include facility planning, property management, personnel training and a capability demonstration.									
The contractor was able to perform design, development, test, and deployment activities for a large data system comprised of integrated COTS software and hardware and custom code.									
The contractor was able to perform hardware and software engineering maintenance for a large data system comprised of integrated COTS software and hardware and custom code.									
The contractor has been proactive in assessing projected lifecycles for COTS products (hardware and software), and replacing COTS products prior to obsolescence.									
The contractor was effective in assessing new technologies and replacing old technologies in the configured system.									
The contractor was effective in their use of analyses and trade studies to make recommendations for enhancements to meet growth projections and/or reduce costs.									

EXHIBIT 14 – NNG14476256R

The contractor was effective in supporting a science-oriented community to maximize the community's understanding and use of the data system.				VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
The contractor was effective in providing operations support to the deployed sites to include system operations, system administration, training, on-site metrics collection, problem diagnoses and problem resolution.				VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
The contractor performed studies and fielded prototypes as a way to research possible enhancements to the data system.				VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
The contractor successfully performed major operating system upgrades, Database Management System (DBMS) updates, and other COTS software updates to the system without adversely impacting operations.				VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
The contractor demonstrated good performance in meeting system availability requirements.				VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
The contractor demonstrated that systems they built or maintained could interface with external systems.				VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
The contractor was effective in understanding and applying geospatial and earth science disciplines, techniques, and standards in the development, maintenance and enhancement of large scale hardware and software systems and associated processes.				VH	H	M	L	VL	NR

EXHIBIT 14 – NNG14476256R

PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

V. General Performance Survey

NO	PERFORMANCE QUESTIONS	PERFORMANCE RATING (Please Circle)					
		VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
1.	Overall performance in planning and controlling the program	VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
2.	Quality of services and support provided	VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
3.	Compliance with technical requirements and performance standards	VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
4.	Content, accuracy, quality, and timeliness of technical reports and deliverables	VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
5.	The contractor's training materials are thorough and of high quality.	VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
6.	Ability to design and/or deliver a product that meets or exceeds performance requirements within costs and schedule	VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
7.	Timely identification and mitigation of risks	VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
8.	Ability to balance labor resources across maintenance and development tasks, consistent with customer priorities.	VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
9.	Contractor's ability to identify and correct performance deficiencies in a timely manner	VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
10.	Compliance with technical process and control requirements (quality assurance, configuration management, etc.)	VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
11.	Metrics are used to enforce, monitor and control development processes.	VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
12.	Ability to make changes to processes or work instructions resulting in cost reductions in labor or materials costs.	VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
13.	Ability to proactively look to reduce operations costs.						
14.	Ability to recruit and retain highly skilled personnel, including ability to fill key vacancies in a timely manner.	VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
15.	Ability to incorporate labor-saving new technologies, commercial or open-source, into existing processes.	VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
16.	The delivered system has proven to be scalable in meeting growth in performance and capacity requirements.	VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
17.	Ability to handle fluctuating workloads	VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
18.	Adherence to safety and health procedures	VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
19.	Overall Safety and Health injury/illness record	VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
20.	Demonstrated understanding and compliance with mission safety requirements	VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
21.	Communicating and interfacing with Government	VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
22.	Ability to effectively manage subcontractor performance	VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
23.	Ability to build effective working relationships with associate contractors, subcontractors and the Government in a team environment.	VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
24.	Timeliness, quality, and accuracy of schedule reporting	VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
25.	Adequacy of Contractor's system(s) for processing task orders and/or changes.	VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
26.	Overall responsiveness to Government requests	VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
27.	Ability to establish realistic cost estimates	VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
28.	Ability to establish realistic schedule estimates	VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
29.	If performance based, how successful was the Contractor	VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R

EXHIBIT 14 – NNG14476256R

	in meeting the contract metrics?						
30.	Adherence to estimated costs and contract cost targets	VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
31.	Ability to anticipate, identify and control cost growth.	VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
32.	Ability to meet Small Business Subcontracting Plan Goals	VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
33.	Timeliness, quality, and accuracy of Small Business Subcontracting Plan reporting	VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
34.	Ability to meet Small Disadvantaged Business Participation targets	VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
35.	Timeliness, quality, and accuracy of financial reporting	VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R
36.	Overall evaluation of cost performance	VH	H	M	L	VL	N/R

EXHIBIT 14 – NNG14476256R

PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

Section VI:

What is the Contract Value:

	Initial Value	Current Value
Estimated Cost:	\$ _____	\$ _____
Fee:	\$ _____	\$ _____
Total Value:	\$ _____	\$ _____

Briefly describe any change(s) from original contract value:

What are the total contract expenditures to date (cost/fees to date based on invoices, reports, etc)?

What is the **Annual** Contract Value to Date (The current contract expenditures to date divided by the number of years of performance to date)?

Was there a cost overrun? () Yes () No
If yes, please explain:

If this was an award fee contract, what are the individual and/or average ratings of performance by your organization? Please attach any available award fee letters or database entries

Please comment on particularly strong/weak points of Contractor's performance (technical, schedule, and/or cost).

Overall Contract Performance Rating (circle one)

Very High High Moderate Low Very Low

Would you select this Contractor Again? () Yes () No

Please add any other comments you may feel are pertinent.

Rater's Signature

Date