D.7 - Attachment 7 PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

SUBJECT: Past Performance Questionnaire for Board Certified Emergency Medicine Physician Services.

FOR PROVIDERS OF PAST PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Network Contracting Office 23, Minneapolis, Minnesota, has issued a solicitation to provide Board Certified Emergency Medicine Physician Services.

Past performance information will be used to evaluate quotes received. Section A of the enclosed survey lists the contractor who has identified your office as a source to evaluate their past performance. Section A also authorizes release of this information to NCO23 Minneapolis, MN.

An individual knowledgeable of the contractor's quality of supplies and services rendered should complete the survey, providing comments wherever applicable. However, supplemental information from others in your organization is encouraged. If evaluating more than one contract for the same contractor, use a separate survey for each contract being evaluated.

Because this information is critical to the evaluation process, your time and effort in providing it is greatly appreciated. The survey should be completed as soon as possible but not later than 06/30/17. Send by mail to NCO 23 Contracting, attention: Daniel Vagts, 708 S Third Street, Suite 200E, Minneapolis, MN 55415 or electronically to daniel.vagts@va.gov.

PAST PERFORMANCE SURVEY

SECTION A: Contractor Information (to be completed by the contractor for who past performance information is being collected, prior to forwarding to respondent)

Prospective Government Contractor's Name and Address:
2. Contractor Point of Contact:
3. Phone number (with area code):
4. Contract number:
5. Description of Supplies provided under contract referenced in item 4:
6. Contract award date: Contract award amount:
7. Period of Performance or Delivery Date:
8. Authorization is hereby granted to provide the information requested in this survey to NCO23, Minneapolis, MN.
(Signature)
(Name and Title of Authorizing Official) (Date)

SECTION B: Respondent Information (to be co	ompleted by respondent)
(Signature)	(Date)
(Typed or Printed Name)	(Organization Name)
(Title)	
(Phone Number)	(Organization Address)
Respondent should complete survey and sub-	mit No later than: 06/30/2017
The following Rating Scale provides the definition be assessed:	itions for the Past Performance ratings to
SUBSTANTIAL CONFIDENCE: Based on the offeror's recent/relevant peforn high expectation that the offeror will succession	
SATISFACTORY CONFIDENCE: Based on the offeror's recent/relevant peforr reasonable expectation that the offeror will s	•
LIMITED CONFIDENCE: Based on the offeror's recent/relevant perfor reasonable expectation that the offeror will s	
NO CONFIDENCE: Based on the offeror's recent/relevant perfor no expectations that the offeror will be able to	

effort.

UNKNOWN CONFIDENCE (NEUTRAL):

No recent/relevant performance record is available or the offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned.

The questions on the survey shall be rated in accordance with the definitions provided in the Rating Scale. Any unsatisfactory or marginal rating shall be supplemented with an explanation in the space provided.

QUALITY OF SERVICE

1. Rate the contractor's compliance with contractual $\,$ E V S M U N requirements.

COMMENTS:

SCHEDULE

1. Delivery of service was within required time E V S M U N period specified by contract requirements.

2. Overall rating of contractor conformance to E V S M U N schedule.

COMMENTS:

BUSINESS RELATIONS

1. Rate the working relationship between contractor's management, your company and your designated representatives (to include inspection personnel).

EVSMUN

2. Rate the contractor's ability to submit reports and/or invoices. Are they complete and accurate?	Ε	V	S	M	U	N	
3. Rate the contractor's ability to submit required reports and/or invoices in a timely manner.	Ε	٧	S	M	U	N	
4. Rate the contractors responsiveness to customer complaint resolution.	Ε	٧	S	M	U	N	
5. Overall rating of contractor's business relations.	Ε	٧	S	Μ	U	N	
COMMENTS							
How would you feel about awarding another contract to this contractor?							
Would not hesitate to award another contract to this con	tra	cto	or.				
Would most likely award another contract to this contractor.							
Would think twice about awarding another contract to this contractor, but would do so if no better alternative existed.							
Do not wish to award another contract to this contractor.							
Would not award another contract to this contractor.							
COMMENTS:							