

ATTACHMENT J-5: PERFORMANCE EVALUATION MANAGEMENT PLAN (PEMP)

FOR

PORTSMOUTH ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNICAL SERVICES II


EVALUATION PERIOD 3 – FISCAL YEAR 2016

October 1, 2015 to September 30, 2016

REVISION 0



CONCUR:



Joel B. Bradburne, Portsmouth Site Lead
Portsmouth/Paducah Project Office


6/24/15
Date



Vincent Adams, Portsmouth Site Director, Federal Project Director
Portsmouth/Paducah Project Office

7/10/15
Date

APPROVED:



William E. Murphy, Manager
Portsmouth/Paducah Project Office

7/15/15
Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	Introduction.....	3
2.0	Definition of Terms.....	3
3.0	Fee Structure.....	3
4.0	Organizational Structure.....	4
5.0	Responsibilities.....	4
6.0	Fee Overview Requirements and Periods.....	5
7.0	Performance Evaluation Process.....	6
8.0	Award Fee Terms.....	9

TABLES

1.	Award Fee by Fiscal Year.....	5
2.	Cost Overrun Table.....	9

EXHIBITS

1.	Performance Evaluation Board (PEB) Members and Advisors.....	11
2.	Performance Evaluation Rating Table.....	12
3.	Performance Evaluation Conversion Chart.....	13
4.	Performance Evaluation Management Plan (PEMP) Categories of Performance....	14
5.	Rating Criteria #1 - #4.....	15
6.	Rating Summary Tables.....	26
7.	Performance Evaluation Summary.....	31
8.	Performance Evaluation Process Flowchart.....	32

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Contract Number DE-EM0002639 is a Cost-Plus-Award Fee Contract. This Performance Evaluation Management Plan (PEMP) describes the plan for the evaluation and award of fee.

Contract Section B.4 describes the Award Fee terms. The purpose of this PEMP is to define the methodology and responsibilities associated with determining the fee to be awarded to the contractor. The plan outlines the organization, procedures, evaluation criteria and evaluation periods for implementing the award fee provisions of the contract. The objective of the PEMP is to motivate the contractor toward excellence and total contract performance and to emphasize key areas of performance without jeopardizing minimum acceptable performance in all other areas.

2.0 DEFINITION OF TERMS

- (a) **Contracting Officer (CO):** The individual authorized to commit and obligate the government through the life of the contract. The CO is an advisor to the Performance Evaluation Board (PEB).
- (b) **Fee Determining Official (FDO):** The individual who makes the final determination of the amount of fee to be awarded to the contractor.
- (c) **Performance Evaluation Board (PEB):** The group of individuals who review the contractor's performance and recommend an adjective rating to the FDO. The PEB chairperson is the DOE Portsmouth Site Director. Members of and advisors to the PEB are indicated in Exhibit 1.
- (d) **Project Team Evaluators (PTE):** The individual(s) assigned to monitor and evaluate the contractor's performance on a continuing basis. This surveillance will include, but will not be limited to, the routine interface and oversight of the contractor and the review of the provided services and work products submitted to DOE by the contractor. The PTE's evaluation is the primary point of reference in determining the recommended award fee, especially the technical support area of performance. The PTEs are responsible for providing their input, as requested, to the Technical Lead. The PTEs are advisor(s) to the PEB through the Technical Lead.
- (e) **Technical Lead:** The individual who is most directly responsible for the satisfactory performance of the Portsmouth Environmental Technical Services Project. The Technical Lead manages the evaluation process, coordinates the development of the PEMP and subsequent revisions, and also serves as the recorder, who is responsible for insuring the PEB is properly convened, which includes meeting place, time, advising all PEB members, preparing the agenda, and taking minutes. The Technical Lead is an advisor to the PEB.

3.0 FEE STRUCTURE

The total available award fee for the base and option period can be earned through subjective fee components, termed categories of performance, consisting of the four (4) performance evaluation criteria defined herein. Fee is earned through the PEMP as there is no base fee

for this contract. The final amount of the annual award fee shall be unilaterally determined by the Fee Determining Official (FDO). The rating definitions, termed adjectival ratings, are included in Exhibit 2, Performance Evaluation Rating Table and the Category of Performance criteria (1-4) are included in Exhibit 3, Rating Criteria.

4.0 ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

- (a) The Manager, PPPO, will serve as the FDO and will establish a PEB. The PEB will assist the FDO in the award fee determination by recommending an award fee for the contractor's performance. If the FDO is absent, the Deputy Manager, PPPO, will serve as the FDO. If a PEB member is absent, the FDO will approve substitute(s) with similar qualifications. Technical and functional experts, as required, may serve in an advisory (non-voting) capacity to the PEB. See Exhibit 1 for members and potential advisors.
- (b) A copy of the PEMP shall be provided to the contractor prior to the start of the evaluation period. Changes within the period which do not impact the performance evaluation criteria or process, such as editorial, personnel changes or changes made by contract modification may be made and unilaterally by the CO and implemented by notice to the contractor; however, any significant change required after the start of the evaluation period, shall be authorized by bilateral agreement.

5.0 RESPONSIBILITIES

- (a) The PTE(s) will monitor and evaluate the contractor's performance. The PTE(s) will work closely with the CO and Technical Lead in performing PEMP surveillance duties. PTE(s) will use Exhibit 2, Performance Evaluation Rating Table, numerical rating portion only, and Exhibit 3, Rating Criteria or Categories of Performance (#1-4), in monitoring and evaluating contractor's performance.
- (b) The Technical Lead will use the Performance Evaluation Rating Table, Exhibit 2 to determine the adjective ratings to be reported to the PEB. The Technical Lead will be thoroughly familiar with current award fee policy, guidance, regulations, and correspondence pertinent to the award fee process. The Technical Lead will coordinate administrative actions required by the PTE(s), the PEB, and the FDO. Administrative actions include receiving, processing, and distributing performance evaluation inputs, drafting the performance evaluation report, as well as scheduling and assisting with internal milestones (i.e., PEB briefings, and other actions as required for the smooth operation of the performance evaluation process).
- (c) The PEB members will review the PTE's evaluation reports and the Technical Lead's recommended adjectival rating, consider information from other pertinent sources, and develop a recommendation. The PEB chairperson will give the recommendation to the FDO.
- (d) The FDO will review the PEB's recommendations, consider all appropriate data, and notify the CO in writing of the final fee determination after receiving Head of Contracting Activity (HCA) coordination. The CO will prepare a letter for FDO signature notifying the contractor of the award fee amount. The CO will modify the contract to reflect the earned

award fee for the performance evaluation period.

6.0 FEE OVERVIEW REQUIREMENTS AND PERIODS

- (a) The total award fee available is \$1,935,836. An annual amount will be available for each fiscal year subject to contract adjustments through modification of the contract. Fee evaluation will be conducted annually by fiscal year. The first period, and all periods thereafter, shall begin on October 1 of each year (fiscal year). The contract transition period completed on September 30, 2013. No fee is payable for the contract transition period.
- (b) Following are the amounts currently available for each annual evaluation period:

TABLE 1 AWARD FEE BY FY

CLIN 0002 by FY	Period	Fee Available	Fee Earned	Fee Unavailable
FY14	1	\$389,929	\$358,735	\$31,194
FY15	2	\$385,418		
FY16	3	\$380,800		
Total		\$1,156,147		
CLIN 0003 by FY	Period	Fee Available		
FY17	4	\$380,808		
FY18	5	\$398,881		
Total		\$779,689		

- (c) The available fee identified in each evaluation period is the maximum amount that may be earned during that particular period unless the fee is increased by contract modification. In accordance with the Contract Clause B.4, Award Fee, a "provisional payment of a proportional quarterly amount equivalent to 75% of the available award fee for the period will be allowed."

If the CO reduces fee in accordance with the Contract Section I clause, entitled "DEAR 952.223.76 Conditional Payment of Fee or Profit – Safeguarding Restricted Data and Other Classified Information and Protection of Worker, Safety and Health (DEC 2010)", or other terms of the contract, the award fee available in the evaluation period shall be unilaterally decreased by the equivalent amount.
- (d) The Government may unilaterally revise the distribution of the award fee available in any subsequent evaluation periods. The CO will notify the contractor in writing of such changes in distribution before the relevant evaluation period begins and the PEMP will be modified accordingly. After an evaluation period has begun, significant changes may only be made by mutual agreement of the parties. While the Government may unilaterally change the award fee amounts for each period or each rated criteria area

prior to the start of each award fee period, the total amount of award fee available may not be unilaterally changed, other than as documented in (d) above, once established at the beginning of each evaluation period. In no event shall any unearned fee (fee unavailable) be available in a subsequent period of performance. Fee unearned in any period is no longer available to be earned.

7.0 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROCESS (See Exhibit 6, Performance Evaluation Process Flowchart)

(a) PTE Actions

- (1) PTE(s) will continually monitor and evaluate the contractor's performance and using the criteria contained in Exhibit 3, Rating Criteria (#1-4), provide semi-annual and annual strengths and weaknesses to the Technical Lead and annual numerical ratings of performance using Exhibit 4, Rating Summary Table.
- (2) The Rating Criteria, Exhibit 3, categories of performance #1-4 will be assessed using the adjectival rating, Performance Evaluation Rating Table, Exhibit 2, on an annual basis while only strengths and weaknesses related to the PEMP Categories of Performance will be presented to the contractor at the six (6) month interval in the period. The PTE will use the appropriate numerical rating criteria (0-25 Evaluation Points) to document the contractor's performance. The PTE will review and numerically evaluate each Category of Performance criteria (#1-4) to determine the performance level after also identifying strengths and weaknesses of the contractor. A weakness for any Category of Performance may be defined as any failure, or potential failure to meet the Category of Performance criteria herein. If a weakness appears in any way to negatively impact Environmental Safety and Health (ES&H)/Quality Assurance (QA) performance or the safeguarding of restricted data pursuant to the contract, the PTE shall notify the Portsmouth Site Director and the CO. The PTE will maintain all documentation for contract file maintenance. The PTE will use the documentation to ensure contractor has established adequate procedures to prevent recurrence of weaknesses.

At the end of the six month period and the end of the annual period, each PTE member will submit to the Technical Lead written strengths and weaknesses using, Exhibit 3, for all Category of Performance Items (#1-4). Based on the above evaluation results, the PTE will provide the written notes on the strengths and weaknesses of the contractor and also annually provide the numerical rating for each Category of Performance to report to the Technical Lead, Exhibit 4.

(b) Technical Lead's Actions

- (1) The Technical Lead will collect performance input from the PTE, semi-annually and annually. Annually, the Technical Lead will select an adjective rating for each of the Category of Performance (#1-4) items based on his/her personal observations of performance during the period and numerical ratings presented by the PTE.

- (2) The Technical Lead will solicit input from the contractor for both the semi-annual presentation and the annual evaluation. The Technical Lead will use Exhibit 4, Rating Summary Table, to record the PTE's numerical ratings for the period. On a semi-annual basis, the Technical Lead will report to the contractor, the strengths and weaknesses without documenting numerical or adjectival ratings. Annually, the Technical Lead will assess and report the PTE's strengths and weaknesses, collect numerical ratings and annotate his/her rationale for selecting a particular adjective rating. The Technical Lead is not permitted to change the PTE's numerical ratings, but the Technical Lead's adjectival rating may differ from the PTE's average numerical ratings.
 - (3) The Technical Lead will use Exhibit 5, Performance Evaluation Summary, to document the presentation of semi-annual strengths and weaknesses and recommended adjectival ratings.
 - (4) The Technical Lead will complete and submit Exhibit 4, Rating Summary Table, for presentation to the PEB.
 - (5) The Technical Lead notifies the PEB members and advisors of the date and time of the annual PEB meeting in accordance with the schedule established by the PEB chairperson. Additionally, the Technical Lead notifies the contractor of the meeting date and time, as determined by the PEB chairperson, and advises the contractor of when and how (written, oral, or both) he/she will be permitted to address the PEB. Generally, the contractor will be provided the opportunity to provide a self-assessment including written materials (limited to no more than 20 pages) and an oral presentation of up to 30 minutes to the PEB. The presentation shall be provided by the contractor to the Technical Lead in advance and should be in the form of a self-assessment measured against each performance evaluation criteria section. Prior to the PEB meeting, the Technical Lead will provide the PEB members with a page-numbered binder to include, at a minimum, the input for the fiscal year from the PTE members, the forms required to be filled out during the evaluation meeting, and the contractor's performance evaluation presentation.
 - (6) The Technical Lead prepares functional area evaluation reports in a briefing format as determined by the PEB chairperson. The area report briefing should include a mix of specific and global evaluation comments so the PEB can get a holistic assessment of the contractor's performance. The Technical Lead will draft the performance evaluation report for the PEB; however the report may be revised as a result of the PEB review.
- (c) PEB Actions
- (1) The Portsmouth Site Director will chair the PEB. The FDO may approve the PEB members recommended by the chairperson. The PEB chairperson will establish dates, times, and places for the PEB meeting and notify the Technical Lead for appropriate notification to members, advisors, and the contractor. The chairperson will schedule the PEB meeting to ensure the PEB's recommended

adjectival rating is presented to the FDO within 30 days following the close of the evaluation period.

- (2) PEB members will consider all information from the following sources in determining its award fee recommendation to the FDO:
 - (a) Evaluations submitted by the PTEs and Technical Lead. The Chairperson may require oral briefings by the functional area personnel.
 - (b) Information submitted by other sources as considered appropriate by the PEB.
 - (c) Contractor's written or oral (or both as determined by chairperson) self-assessment of performance.
 - (3) Using Exhibit 4, Rating Summary Table, and each PEB member will document their adjective rating using the definitions in Exhibit 2, Performance Evaluation Rating Table, and provide their rationale by attaching notes to Exhibit 4, as required, for their selection.
 - (4) The chairperson will collect PEB members' Rating Summary Table, Exhibit 4, and review them. If any PEB member's adjective rating is below "Satisfactory" or if the rating is lower than the PTE(s) numerical rating for that same area, appropriate discussions should be conducted to determine the PEB member's rationale. Lowering the adjective rating requires specific reasons, since the contractor will be aware of the identified weaknesses from the semi-annual review. Once the chairperson is satisfied with the PEB's rating, the chairperson will pass the rating sheets to the Technical Lead.
 - (5) The Technical Lead summarizes adjective ratings for the rating criteria using Exhibit 4, Rating Summary Table and provides a summary adjective rating to the PEB to ensure PEB consensus with the resulting overall rating. The PEB will strive to gain consensus on the summary recommendation to the FDO.
 - (6) The chairperson will prepare or will have the Technical Lead prepare a cover letter to transmit Exhibits 3, 4 and 5, and final performance evaluation report which summarizes the PEB's Adjectival Rating, to the FDO.
 - (7) Upon request, the PEB Chair may meet with the contractor's manager to further discuss documented strengths and weaknesses. This provides the contractor an opportunity to take corrective actions prior to the annual meeting and evaluation.
- (d) FDO's Actions
- (1) The FDO determines the final fee based upon all the information furnished and assigns a final percent of award fee earned for the evaluation period using the Exhibit 2, Performance Evaluation Conversion Chart.
 - (2) The FDO obtains HCA coordination and notifies the CO in writing or via electronic correspondence of his/her final determination of award fee.

(e) CO's Actions

- (1) The CO will prepare a letter for the FDO's signature notifying the contractor of the award fee earned for the annual period. Additionally, the letter will identify any specific areas of strengths and weaknesses in the contractor's performance.
- (2) The CO will unilaterally modify the contract to reflect the FDO's final determination of award fee, notifying the contractor to either invoice the remaining fee or reimburse DOE the difference from the 75% provisional billing in accordance with B.4, Award Fee and B.5, Final Fee Determination. This modification will unilaterally decrease the total value of the contract commensurate with the amount of the fee unearned, if any. The modification will be issued to the contractor within 14 days after the CO receives the FDO's decision.

8.0 AWARD FEE TERMS

(a) Conditional Requirement for Cost Control

- (1) If the final cost of performance is equal to or greater than 10% over the estimated cost for the contract scope (\$9,636,947.59 for FY16), as defined by the June 2015 RSI contract performance baseline report as modified through contract modification 20, **and as updated by all subsequent contract modifications through the end of FY 16**, the following Cost Control Table, Table 2 will be applied to the fee identified by FY in Table 1, Award Fee by FY.
- (2) Fee reduced for cost control, shall not be available in this or any other award fee period. The estimated costs defined in this Award Fee Plan for remaining contract scope will be amended by DOE to incorporate contract modifications and corresponding changes to the contract performance baseline as required.

Table 2 - COST OVERRUN TABLE

Cost Overrun (%)	Available Fee Reduction (%)
0-10.00%	0%
10.01-11%	1%
11.01-12%	2%
12.01-13%	3%
13.01-14%	4%
14.01-15%	5%
15.01-16%	7%
16.01-17%	9%
17.01-18%	11%
18.01-19%	13%
19.01-20%	15%
> 20%	15%

b) Termination

- (1) In the event that the contract is terminated in accordance with FAR 52.249-6, Termination (Cost Reimbursement) (MAY 2000), award fee available in the current period may be negotiated in any request for equitable adjustment, documented in accordance with the termination clause of the contract. The remaining fee for all periods after the termination shall not be considered earned and therefore shall not be paid or be available in any other period.

EXHIBIT 1: PERFORMANCE EVALUATION BOARD MEMBERS AND ADVISORS

Fee Determining Official:

Manager, PPPO Lexington William E. Murphie

Following are PEB members and PEB advisors:

Portsmouth Site Director (Chairperson) Dr. Vincent Adams

Deputy Manager, PPPO Lexington Robert E. Edwards

Lead Procurement Official, PPPO Lexington Robert Swett

*Contracting Officer Daniel Burke
*Contracting Officer Marcella Wolfe
*Attorney Advisor Jason Sherman
* Technical Lead (Site Lead) Joel B. Bradburne

Project Team Evaluators¹

M. Judson Lilly
Cidney Voth
Kristi Wiehle
Amy Lawson
Matt Vick
Richard Mayer
Greg Simonton
Johnny Reising
Tom Hines
Dewintus Powell
Tony Takacs
Gary Bumgardner
Mark Allen
James Woods
Russell McCallister

*PEB Advisors Only - Non-Voting Participants

¹The PEB Chair may add, remove or replace additional PTEs throughout the contract period of performance, as appropriate.

EXHIBIT 2: PERFORMANCE EVALUATION RATING TABLE		
ADJECTIVE RATING		DEFINITION
EXCELLENT	91%- 100%	Contractor has exceeded almost all of the significant award-fee criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract for the evaluation period. Contractor's work is highly professional. Contractor solves problems with very little, if any, Government involvement. Contractor is proactive and takes an aggressive approach in identifying problems and their resolution with a substantial emphasis on performing quality work in a safe manner within cost/schedule requirements.
VERY GOOD	76%-90%	Contractor has exceeded many of the significant award-fee criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract for the evaluation period. Contractor solves problems with minimal Government involvement. Contractor is usually proactive and demonstrates an aggressive approach in identifying problems and their resolution, including those identified in the risk management process, with an emphasis on performing quality work in a safe manner within cost/schedule requirements. Problems are usually self-identified and resolution is self-initiated.
GOOD	51%-75%	Contractor has exceeded some of the significant award-fee criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract for the evaluation period. Contractor is able to solve basic problems with adequate emphasis on performing quality work in a safe manner within cost/schedule objectives. The rating within this range will be determined by the level of necessary Government involvement in problem resolution including the extent to which the problem and resolution is self-identified vs. Government-identified.
SATISFACTORY	No Greater Than 50%	Contractor has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract for the evaluation period. Contractor has some difficulty solving basic problems, and cost, schedule, safety, and technical performance needs improvement to avoid further performance risk. Government involvement in problem resolution is necessary.
UNSATISFACTORY	0%	Contractor has failed to meet overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract for the evaluation period. Contractor does not demonstrate an emphasis on performing quality work in a safe manner within cost/schedule objectives. Contractor is unable to solve problems and Government involvement in problem resolution is necessary.*

*NOTE: For those Category of Performance elements receiving a score of 50% or below, no fee will be earned. Any unearned fee will be forfeited and not available in subsequent evaluation periods.

EXHIBIT 3: PERFORMANCE EVALUATION CONVERSION CHART		
ADJECTIVE RATING	EVALUATION POINTS (OVERALL WEIGHTED RESULT)	PERCENTAGE OF AWARD FEE EARNED
EXCELLENT	23-25	91 to 100%
VERY GOOD	19-22	76 to 90%
GOOD	14-18	51 to 75%
SATISFACTORY	8-13	No Greater Than 50%
UNSATISFACTORY	0-7	0%

	EXHIBIT 4: PEMP CATEGORIES OF PERFORMANCE SUMMARY	Total CP Weighting	Points Recommended	Weighted Point Total
1	Quality and Effectiveness of Performing Administrative Support (C.3.11)	20%		
2	Quality and Effectiveness of Performing Environmental, Safety & Health (ES&H); Quality Assurance (QA) and Field Support (C.3.4)	20%		
3	Quality and Effectiveness of Performing Project Support (C.3.3, C.3.5, C.3.6, C.3.7, C.3.8, C.3.9, C.3.10)	30%		
4	Quality and Effectiveness in Managing the Program (C.3.2, C.4, C.5, C.6, C.7, C.8, C.9, C.11)	30%		

Award Fee Calculation Methodology:

1. PTE assigns numerical rating (0-25) on this page based on each Category of Performance and use Exhibit 3, Rating Sheet to document strengths and weaknesses.
2. Multiply weighting percentage to each CP to arrive at weighted result and provide overall weighted result and to apply the related adjectival rating.

*Rounding Rule: 5 and above is rounded up to the next whole number.

FDO Decision:

The earned award-fee amount indicated by the use of a conversion table or graph is a guide to the FDO. Use of the Performance Evaluation Conversion Chart does not remove the element of judgment from the award fee process.

EXHIBIT 5: RATING CRITERIA #1					
PEMP Category of Performance (Quality Evaluation Factors)					
(IDENTIFY PERIOD)	RATING (Document strengths/weaknesses)				
CATEGORY OF PERFORMANCE (EVALUATION WEIGHTING)	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	SATISFACTORY	UNSATISFACTORY
Quality and Effectiveness of Performing Administrative Support and Oversight (20%)					
- Complete inventory & disposition 25% of documents in library					
EVALUATION POINTS:	23-25	19-22	14-18	8-13	0-7
QUALITY EVALUATION FACTORS:	NOTES ON STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES				
<p>In this category, the contractor will be evaluated on its overall demonstrated ability to support DOE in managing and integrating all DOE site contracts and performance of the wide range of technical and administrative requirements of the site (PWS paragraph C.3.11, Technical & Administrative Services). This category of performance covers the majority of office-type support requirements as described in the PWS paragraphs.</p> <p>Methods of Surveillance/ Assessment:</p> <p>1. Contractor shall submit a self-assessment within 15 calendar days after the end of the 6-month interval and annual evaluation periods. This self-assessment shall address both the strengths and weaknesses of the Contractor's performance during the evaluation period. Where deficiencies in performance are noted, the Contractor shall describe the actions planned or taken to correct such deficiencies and avoid their recurrence.</p> <p>2. PTE(s) continuous monitoring and evaluation of performance</p>					

EXHIBIT 5: RATING CRITERIA #1					
PEMP Category of Performance (Quality Evaluation Factors)					
(IDENTIFY PERIOD)	RATING (Document strengths/weaknesses)				
CATEGORY OF PERFORMANCE (EVALUATION WEIGHTING)	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	SATISFACTORY	UNSATISFACTORY
<p>including, but will not be limited to, the routine interface and oversight of the contractor and the review of the provided services and work products submitted to DOE by the contractor.</p> <p>3. Any applicable stakeholder feedback (Non-DOE).</p> <p>Success Criteria include performance of activities in the defined PWS paragraphs as well as the following.</p> <p>DOE's evaluation of the quality and effectiveness of the delivered products and services will include, but will not be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Whether products/services delivered comply with contract requirements, DOE and federal orders, directives, regulations, and statutes, as well as management instructions; b) Whether products/services demonstrate an appropriate level of professional due diligence, accuracy, clarity, and mission focus; c) The overall timeliness (i.e. IAW the established due dates) of the Contractor's deliverable work products as well as site contractual requirements, DOE directives and/or orders; d) The extent and accuracy of any documentation, references, and background material accompanying a finished deliverable product; and e) The appropriateness of the format and clarity of written products, considering the intended audience for the deliverable product. 					

EXHIBIT 5: RATING CRITERIA #2					
PEMP Category of Performance (Quality Evaluation Factors)					
(IDENTIFY PERIOD)	RATING (Documents strengths/weaknesses)				
CATEGORY OF PERFORMANCE (EVALUATION WEIGHTING)	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	SATISFACTORY	UNSATISFACTORY
Quality and Effectiveness of Performing and Oversight of Environment, Safety & Health (ES&H); Quality Assurance (QA) and Field Support (20%)					
- Complete all scheduled assessments in the approved assessment plan					
EVALUATION POINTS:	23-25	19-22	14-18	8-13	0-7
EVALUATION CRITERIA:	NOTES ON STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES				
In this category, the contractor will be evaluated on its ability to demonstrate excellence in the performance and oversight of activities which promote the safety culture in a compliant manner to ensure all workers, the public and environment are protected from adverse consequences. The contractor will be evaluated on its demonstrated ability to effectively manage the ES&H, QA and Field support service requirements as identified in PWS paragraph C.3.4, Environmental Safety and Health (ES&H), Quality Assurance (QA) and Field Services. The ES&H, QA and Field support will include, but will not be limited to, document reviews, reporting, investigations of accidents, trending of findings and observations, reviewing and analyzing corrective action plans and providing recommendations and follow up to ensure compliance.					

EXHIBIT 5: RATING CRITERIA #2					
PEMP Category of Performance (Quality Evaluation Factors)					
(IDENTIFY PERIOD)	RATING (Documents strengths/weaknesses)				
CATEGORY OF PERFORMANCE (EVALUATION WEIGHTING)	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	SATISFACTORY	UNSATISFACTORY
<p>Methods of Surveillance/Assessment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Contractor shall submit a self-assessment within 15 calendar days after the end of the 6-month interval and annual evaluation periods. This self-assessment shall address both the strengths and weaknesses of the Contractor's performance during the evaluation period. Where deficiencies in performance are noted, the Contractor shall describe the actions planned or taken to correct such deficiencies and avoid their recurrence. PTE(s) continuous monitoring and evaluation of performance including, but will not be limited to, the routine interface and oversight of the contractor and the review of the provided services and work products submitted to DOE by the contractor. Any applicable stakeholder feedback (non-DOE). <p>Success Criteria include performance of activities in the defined PWS paragraphs as well as the following. DOE's evaluation of the quality and effectiveness of performing and oversight of ES&H, QA and Field support activities will include, but will not be limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the Contractor provides thorough evaluations & oversight of site contractor's safety programs including adherence to DOE policies, procedures & orders Whether the contractor execution of direct field observation and surveillance activities results in: 					

EXHIBIT 5: RATING CRITERIA #2					
PEMP Category of Performance (Quality Evaluation Factors)					
(IDENTIFY PERIOD)	RATING (Documents strengths/weaknesses)				
CATEGORY OF PERFORMANCE (EVALUATION WEIGHTING)	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	SATISFACTORY	UNSATISFACTORY
i. No employee exposures to work place hazards above the applicable exposure limits; ii. No incidents where either a failure to follow a prescribed hazardous energy control process or miss-located hazardous energy source results in a person contacting hazardous energy (e.g., burn, shock) including prevention of re-occurring electrical safety incidents or events; iii. Maintaining reduced loss of work time to include but not be limited to the standard Days Away, Restricted, or Transferred (DART) Rates; and iv. Timely occurrence reporting, corrective action recommendations, and causal analyses, as required.					

EXHIBIT 5: RATING CRITERIA #3					
PEMP Category of Performance (Quality Evaluation Factors)					
(IDENTIFY PERIOD)	RATING (Documents strengths/weaknesses)				
CATEGORY OF PERFORMANCE (EVALUATION WEIGHTING)	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	SATISFACTORY	UNSATISFACTORY
Quality and Effectiveness of Performing Project Support (30%)					
- Maintain RSI invoice backlog to ≤ 35 invoices in process					
- Provide monthly updates for site-wide spend plan					
- Maintain Portsmouth D&D Life Cycle Baseline with semi-annual BCP updates submitted to DOE					
- Analyze and prepare contractor monthly performance feedback standardized reports for DOE					
- Complete contract change order cost proposal technical evaluations within approved scheduled date depending on work scope priorities					
EVALUATION POINTS:	23-25	19-22	14-18	8-13	0-7
EVALUATION CRITERIA	NOTES ON STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES				
In this category, the contractor will be evaluated on its ability to demonstrate excellence in Project Support related to performance in the following functional areas of the PWS: C.3.3, Planning and Integration; C.3.5, Waste Management; C.3.6, Regulatory Support; C.3.7, Investment Recovery; C.3.8, Nuclear Material Management/Disposition and D&D Safety Basis; C.3.9 Environmental Restoration and Regulatory Compliance; and C.3.10 D&D Oversight and Infrastructure Support. Methods of Surveillance/Assessment: 1. Contractor shall submit a self-assessment within 15 calendar days after the end of the 6-month interval and annual					

EXHIBIT 5: RATING CRITERIA #3					
PEMP Category of Performance (Quality Evaluation Factors)					
(IDENTIFY PERIOD)	RATING (Documents strengths/weaknesses)				
CATEGORY OF PERFORMANCE (EVALUATION WEIGHTING)	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	SATISFACTORY	UNSATISFACTORY
<p>evaluation periods. This self-assessment shall address both the strengths and weaknesses of the Contractor's performance during the evaluation period. Where deficiencies in performance are noted, the Contractor shall describe the actions planned or taken to correct such deficiencies and avoid their recurrence.</p> <p>2. PTE(s) continuous monitoring and evaluation of performance including, but will not be limited to, the routine interface and oversight of the contractor and the review of the provided services and work products submitted to DOE by the contractor.</p> <p>3. Any applicable stakeholder feedback (Non-DOE).</p> <p>Success Criteria include performance of activities in the defined PWS paragraphs as well as the following. DOE's evaluation of the quality and effectiveness of Project Support will include, but will not be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Effectiveness of the Contractor's internal controls to assure proper supervision of the work force and economical completion of assigned tasks. b) Effectiveness of Contractor's integration of technical support, including innovativeness and creativity in technical recommendations. c) Effectiveness of the coordination and cooperation with cognizant DOE officials and site contractor's to resolve problems that may arise in communications, planning, scheduling or other related areas while maintaining a business-like concern for DOE's interests. 					

EXHIBIT 5: RATING CRITERIA #3					
PEMP Category of Performance (Quality Evaluation Factors)					
<i>(IDENTIFY PERIOD)</i>		RATING (Documents strengths/weaknesses)			
CATEGORY OF PERFORMANCE (EVALUATION WEIGHTING)	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	SATISFACTORY	UNSATISFACTORY
d) Successful completion of requirements for the On-Site Waste Disposal Facility (OSWDF) including but not limited to regulatory and capital asset requirements. e) Consideration will be given to the expeditious review and finalization of regulatory requirements f) Consideration will be given to the expeditious development and successful disposition of waste; implementation of investment recovery, and disposition/management of Nuclear material; g) Performing observations utilizing the site D&D safety basis documents.					

EXHIBIT 5: RATING CRITERIA #4					
PEMP Category of Performance (Quality Evaluation Factors)					
(IDENTIFY PERIOD)	RATING (Documents strengths/weaknesses)				
CATEGORY OF PERFORMANCE (EVALUATION WEIGHTING)	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	SATISFACTORY	UNSATISFACTORY
Control of Quality and Effectiveness in Managing the Program (30%)					
EVALUATION POINTS:	23-25	19-22	14-18	8-13	0-7
EVALUATION CRITERIA	NOTES ON STRENGTH AND WEAKNESS ES				
In this category, the contractor will be evaluated on its ability to demonstrate excellence in Program Management activities related to performance in the following functional areas of the PWS. This is evaluating the contractor's ability to excel in providing support to their own staff as well as providing and maintaining skilled staff: C.3.2, Program Management; C.4, Contractor Access to Gov't Facilities; C.5, Security; C.6 Reporting Requirements; C.7, Contractor Identification while on DOE Installation; C.8 Contractor Employee Training; C.9, Deliverables and Reports Methods of Surveillance/Assessment:					

EXHIBIT 5: RATING CRITERIA #4					
PEMP Category of Performance (Quality Evaluation Factors)					
(IDENTIFY PERIOD)	RATING (Documents strengths/weaknesses)				
CATEGORY OF PERFORMANCE (EVALUATION WEIGHTING)	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	SATISFACTORY	UNSATISFACTORY
<p>1. Contractor shall submit a self-assessment within 15 calendar days after the end of the 6-month interval and annual evaluation periods. This self-assessment shall address both the strengths and weaknesses of the Contractor's performance during the evaluation period. Where deficiencies in performance are noted, the Contractor shall describe the actions planned or taken to correct such deficiencies and avoid their recurrence.</p> <p>2. PTE(s) continuous monitoring and evaluation of performance including, but will not be limited to, the routine interface and oversight of the contractor and the review of the provided services and work products submitted to DOE by the contractor.</p> <p>3. Any applicable stakeholder feedback (Non-DOE).</p> <p>Success Criteria include performance of activities in the defined PWS paragraphs as well as the following. DOE's evaluation of the quality and effectiveness of this category of performance will include, but will not be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Clarity of and ability to trace cost relative to contract performance work scope b) Effectiveness of planning, submission of reasonably priced change proposals, providing current, accurate and complete billing information; c) Maintaining a skilled, trained and quality work force; 					

EXHIBIT 5: RATING CRITERIA #4					
PEMP Category of Performance (Quality Evaluation Factors)					
(IDENTIFY PERIOD)	RATING (Documents strengths/weaknesses)				
CATEGORY OF PERFORMANCE (EVALUATION WEIGHTING)	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	SATISFACTORY	UNSATISFACTORY
d) Overall effective use of available resources, dependability and general coordination with the program office, including response to emerging and dynamic/urgent requirements; e) Ensure work force adhere to all security requirements; f) Exhibits reasonable and cooperative behavior with the site technical representatives and CO, including flexibility and responsiveness to inquiries; g) Status reports are to be submitted in accordance with contract reporting requirements, meeting all contract requirements; are timely and accurate in terms of technical, cost, and schedule.					

EXHIBIT 6: RATING SUMMARY TABLE (IDENTIFY PERIOD)					
PTE'S CATEGORY OF PERFORMANCE RATING <i>Instructions: Each PTE Member enters the total points (0-25 evaluation points) from Exhibit 3 Summary for the applicable Category of Performance in the spaces below and the Technical Lead selects the Adjective Rating.</i> <i>PTE members are not obligated to score/rate each category. PTE members may designate a category as *N/A if any category is not in their experience for the period.</i>	#1 Quality and Effectiveness of Performing Administrative Support <i>C.3.11</i>	#2 Quality and Effectiveness of Performing Environmental, Safety & Health (ES&H); Quality Assurance (QA) and Field Support <i>PWS paragraph C.3.4</i>	#3 Quality and Effectiveness of Performing Project Support <i>PWS paragraphs C3.3, C.3.5, C.3.6, C.3.7, C.3.8, C.3.9, C.3.10</i>	#4 Control of Contract Costs and Quality and Effectiveness in Managing the Program <i>PWS paragraphs C.3.2, C.4, C.5, C.6, C.7, C.8, C.9</i>	Comments
Signature of PTE (Date)					
Signature of PTE (Date)					
Signature of PTE (Date)					
Signature of PTE (Date)					
Signature of PTE (Date)					

EXHIBIT 6: RATING SUMMARY TABLE
 (IDENTIFY PERIOD)

PTE'S CATEGORY OF PERFORMANCE RATING <i>Instructions: Each PTE Member enters the total points (0-25 evaluation points) from Exhibit 3 Summary for the applicable Category of Performance in the spaces below and the Technical Lead selects the Adjective Rating.</i> <i>PTE members are not obligated to score/rate each category. PTE members may designate a category as *N/A if any category is not in their experience for the period.</i>	#1 Quality and Effectiveness of Performing Administrative Support <i>C.3.11</i>	#2 Quality and Effectiveness of Performing Environmental, Safety & Health (ES&H); Quality Assurance (QA) and Field Support <i>PWS paragraph C.3.4</i>	#3 Quality and Effectiveness of Performing Project Support <i>PWS paragraphs C.3.3, C.3.5, C.3.6, C.3.7, C.3.8, C.3.9, C.3.10</i>	#4 Control of Contract Costs and Quality and Effectiveness in Managing the Program <i>PWS paragraphs C.3.2, C.4, C.5, C.6, C.7, C.8, C.9</i>	Comments
Signature of PTE (Date)					
Signature of PTE (Date)					
Signature of PTE (Date)					
Signature of PTE (Date)					
Signature of PTE (Date)					

EXHIBIT 6: RATING SUMMARY TABLE
 (IDENTIFY PERIOD)

PTE'S CATEGORY OF PERFORMANCE RATING <i>Instructions: Each PTE Member enters the total points (0-25 evaluation points) from Exhibit 3 Summary for the applicable Category of Performance in the spaces below and the Technical Lead selects the Adjective Rating.</i> <i>PTE members are not obligated to score/rate each category. PTE members may designate a category as *N/A if any category is not in their experience for the period.</i>	#1 Quality and Effectiveness of Performing Administrative Support <i>C.3.11</i>	#2 Quality and Effectiveness of Performing Environmental, Safety & Health (ES&H); Quality Assurance (QA) and Field Support <i>PWS paragraph C.3.4</i>	#3 Quality and Effectiveness of Performing Project Support <i>PWS paragraphs C.3.3, C.3.5, C.3.6, C.3.7, C.3.8, C.3.9, C.3.10</i>	#4 Control of Contract Costs and Quality and Effectiveness in Managing the Program <i>PWS paragraphs C.3.2, C.4, C.5, C.6, C.7, C.8, C.9</i>	Comments
Signature of PTE (Date)					
Signature of PTE (Date)					
Signature of PTE (Date)					
Signature of PTE (Date)					
Signature of PTE (Date)					

EXHIBIT 6: RATING SUMMARY TABLE (IDENTIFY PERIOD)					
PTE'S CATEGORY OF PERFORMANCE RATING <i>Instructions: Each PTE Member enters the total points (0-25 evaluation points) from Exhibit 3 Summary for the applicable Category of Performance in the spaces below and the Technical Lead selects the Adjective Rating.</i> <i>PTE members are not obligated to score/rate each category. PTE members may designate a category as *N/A if any category is not in their experience for the period.</i>	#1 Quality and Effectiveness of Performing Administrative Support <i>C.3.11</i>	#2 Quality and Effectiveness of Performing Environmental, Safety & Health (ES&H); Quality Assurance (QA) and Field Support <i>PWS paragraph C.3.4</i>	#3 Quality and Effectiveness of Performing Project Support <i>PWS paragraphs C.3.3, C.3.5, C.3.6, C.3.7, C.3.8, C.3.9, C.3.10</i>	#4 Control of Contract Costs and Quality and Effectiveness in Managing the Program <i>PWS paragraphs C.3.2, C.4, C.5, C.6, C.7, C.8, C.9</i>	Comments
WEIGHTED RESULTS					
Signature of Site Lead: _____ Date					
Technical Lead compiles & tabulates PTE's ratings in the weighted results above and then provides his/her own overall evaluation here for presentation to PEB					
Comments:					

EXHIBIT 6: RATING SUMMARY TABLE
 (IDENTIFY PERIOD)

<i>PEB Member Selects Adjective Rating</i>	#1 Quality and Effectiveness of Performing Administrative Support (15%) <i>PWS paragraph C.3.11</i>	#2 Quality and Effectiveness of Performing Environment, Safety & Health (ES&H); Quality Assurance (QA) and Field Support (20%) <i>PWS paragraph C.3.4</i>	#3 Quality and Effectiveness of Performing Project Support (25%) <i>PWS paragraphs C.3.3, C.3.5, C.3.6, C.3.7, C.3.8, C.3.9, C.3.10</i>	#4 Control of Contract Costs and Quality and Effectiveness in Managing the Program (40%) <i>PWS paragraphs C.3.2, C.4, C.5, C.6, C.7, C.8, C.9</i>	Comments
Signature of PEB: _____ Date					
Signature of PEB: _____ Date					
Signature of PEB: _____ Date					
<i>Technical Lead Summarizes -</i>					
Chairperson Review & PEB Recommendations			Comments		
Signature of PEB Chairperson: _____ Date: _____					

EXHIBIT 7: PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SUMMARY ANNUAL AND SEMI-ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SUMMARY		
(IDENTIFY ANNUAL PERIOD)		ADJECTIVE RATING
CATEGORY OF PERFORMANCE	Semi-Annual Review (identify strengths and weaknesses only)	Recommended Adjective Annual Rating for the Period
#1 – Quality and Effectiveness of Performing Administrative Support (20%) PWS paragraph C.3.11		
#2 – Quality and Effectiveness of Performing Environment, Safety & Health (ES&H); Quality Assurance (QA) and Field Support (20%) PWS paragraph C.3.4		
#3 – Quality and Effectiveness of Performing Project Support (20%) PWS paragraphs C3.3, C.3.5, C.3.6, C.3.7, C.3.8, C.3.9, C.3.10		
#4 – Control of Contract Costs and Quality & Effectiveness in Managing the Program (30%) PWS paragraphs C.3.2, C.4, C.5, C.6, C.7, C.8, C.9		
Summary or Comments:		

EXHIBIT 8: PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROCESS FLOWCHART

