

**ENERGY SYSTEM ACQUISITION ADVISORY BOARD
(ESAAB)**

STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURE (SOP)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY (DOE)

**OFFICE OF ACQUISITION AND PROJECT
MANAGEMENT (OAPM)**

July 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | <i>i</i> |
| LIST OF APPENDICES | <i>i</i> |
| 1.0 INTRODUCTION | <i>1</i> |
| 2.0 ESAAB PURPOSE | <i>1</i> |
| 3.0 ESAAB MEMBERSHIP AND RESPONSIBILITIES | <i>2</i> |
| 4.0 ESAAB PROCEDURES | <i>Error! Bookmark not defined.</i> |
| 5.0 “PAPER” ESAAB | <i>4</i> |
| 6.0 ESAAB-EQUIVALENT MEETINGS | <i>4</i> |

LIST OF APPENDICES

| | |
|---|-----|
| APPENDIX A: ESAAB ACTIVITIES TIMELINE | A-1 |
| APPENDIX B: PRESENTATION OUTLINE FOR THE ESAAB MEETING | B-1 |
| APPENDIX C: EXAMPLES OF THE ESAAB DECISION MEMORANDUM | C-1 |
| APPENDIX D: EXAMPLE OF THE ESAAB STAFF MEMORANDUM | D-1 |

1.0 Introduction

This Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) discusses all elements of an Energy System Acquisition Advisory Board (ESAAB) to include membership, member roles and responsibilities, scheduling, procedures, and products. This SOP also assists those responsible in preparation for ESAAB meetings, particularly the Office of Acquisition and Project Management (OAPM), Programs, and Project Teams.

- 1.1 Background.** Department of Energy Order 413.3 (DOE O 413.3B), hereafter referred to as the Order, was updated on November 29, 2011, to enhance DOE program and project management direction for the acquisition of capital assets with the goal of delivering projects within the original performance baseline (PB), cost and schedule, and fully capable of meeting mission performance, safeguards and security, and environmental, safety, and health requirements unless impacted by a directed change. ESAAB membership and responsibilities are spelled out in the Order. The Order can be found at and downloaded from <https://www.directives.doe.gov/directives>.

1.2 SOP Objectives

- 1.2.1 To establish consistent ESAAB processes and procedures to facilitate informed, objective, and documented strategic and major system critical decisions and baseline change proposals for all new missions.
- 1.2.2 To assist Programs and Project Teams in scheduling and preparing for ESAAB meetings.

1.3 Applicability

- 1.3.1 This SOP should be used when scheduling and preparing for a Secretarial Acquisition Executive (SAE) ESAAB to facilitate the ESAAB decision-making process. This SOP also outlines when to consider using a streamlined ESAAB process.
- 1.3.2 Similar decision procedures may be applied to non-Major System Projects. These procedures should be individually tailored by the designated Acquisition Executive (AE) to the size and complexity of the project.
- 1.3.3 This SOP does NOT impose new requirements or constitute Department policy. Nor is this SOP intended to modify the ESAAB process delineated in DOE Orders or policy memorandums.

2.0 ESAAB Purpose

The purpose of the ESAAB is to assist the SAE in the decision-making process on critical decision (CD) milestones, baseline change proposals (BCPs), and site selections for Major System Projects. The description and/or definitions of CDs, BCPs, and Major System Project are provided in the Order. A call for a special ESAAB can also be made when an unforeseen review of a Major System Project is required. The ESAAB provides

a formal, documented, and auditable management process for making decisions that affect major system acquisitions and Major System Projects.

3.0 ESAAB Membership and Responsibilities

ESAAB membership and responsibilities are delineated in the Order. A current list (office symbol, name, phone #) of ESAAB, “As-Needed” ESAAB, and Pre-ESAAB members is available at <http://www.energy.gov/management/downloads/energy-systems-acquisition-advisory-board-esaab-members-july-2014>.

4.0 ESAAB Procedures

- 4.1 Scheduling an ESAAB.** The steps outlined in Appendix A of this SOP provide the framework, normal working times and responsibilities for the activities prior to and immediately following the ESAAB. This includes the steps to convene an ESAAB and schedule pre-ESAAB meetings and ESAAB reviews. It also lists the appropriate responsible office for each activity.
- 4.2 Staff Support.** OAPM normally provides staff support to the SAE and board members for ESAAB presentations (e.g., schedules, agenda, pre-briefing and presentation requirements).
- 4.3 Preparing for an ESAAB.** Appendix B provides the presentation outline/templates to prepare ESAAB briefing materials. It is essential that the presenters brief the significant issues and any problems associated with the project. These issues should be fully coordinated in advance with cognizant staff and program officials. Also, the SAE and the sponsoring Program Secretarial Officer (PSO) should receive concise pre-briefings to ensure that an informed decision or review will occur.
- 4.4 Inspector General (IG) / Government Accountability Office (GAO) / Congressional Report Check.** The Program should identify, review and summarize recent IG, GAO, and Congressional audit activity, reviews, reports, or other related information pertinent to the project for the SAE during an ESAAB. This action should be completed and reviewed at the pre-ESAAB meeting.
- 4.5 Project Briefing Material and Supporting Documentation.** At least 20 calendar days prior to the Pre-ESAAB meeting, a draft of the project briefing material and supporting documentation should be provided to OAPM and Pre-ESAAB member representatives by the cognizant PSO. The draft briefing will be reviewed for conformance to Departmental orders and policies and to identify any remaining issues for discussion at the Pre-ESAAB meeting.
- 4.6 Pre-ESAAB Meeting.** The program and project managers should schedule and conduct a “dry-run” of the presentation for the sponsoring PSO for review and resolution of issues prior to the ESAAB meeting. The Pre-ESAAB members should be invited to:

- Review the proposed agenda items;
- Participate in a final exchange of ideas;
- Assure compliance with Departmental policy and procedures;
- Discuss and resolve outstanding issues;
- Determine the status of any independent project review (e.g., EIR or IPR) issues;
- Cover the status of administrative actions;
- Review pertinent Inspector General (IG), Government Accountability Office (GAO), and Congressional reports and other documentation as necessary related to the project under review; and
- Set a schedule for remaining actions.

At the conclusion of the “dry-run,” a recommendation should be made by OAPM to the PSO on the readiness of the project to proceed with the scheduled ESAAB meeting based on the completeness of material and administrative actions presented at the Pre-ESAAB Meeting.

4.7 SAE Pre-Brief Meeting. OAPM will conduct a pre-briefing for the SAE to assist in their preparation for the board meeting. The objectives of this pre-brief are to:

- Acquaint the SAE with the background and description of the project, and the purpose of the ESAAB;
- Provide an independent assessment of the project;
- Provide an independent assessment of remaining issues/problems to be presented with recommended solutions;
- Clarify any technical and management items; and
- Provide a final status on administrative actions so as not to consume too much time during the formal meeting.

4.8 ESAAB Staff Memorandum

4.8.1 The Secretariat should prepare a staff decision memorandum (approval or disapproval) summarizing the results of the meeting and documenting decisions made by the SAE (see Appendix C for example memorandums).

4.8.2 The staff memorandum should specify SAE decisions reached, actions assigned, results of special studies and assessments, limitations associated with approvals, resource levels which may be used for budgetary and organizational planning, constraints on systems development and definition, and schedules for accomplishing action items. A summary of the approved cost, schedule, and technical baselines should be annotated within the meeting minutes. The ESAAB meeting minutes (see Appendix D) will be attached to the memorandum.

4.8.3 The Secretariat should coordinate the staff memorandum with the appropriate board members and advisors prior to forwarding it to the SAE. Dissenting views will be included in the package. Non-concurrence on a coordinated document (e.g., Paper ESAAB) by a member shall not require resolution prior to forwarding the request to the SAE for a decision. Coordination from applicable board members should be obtained on the final document.

5.0 “PAPER” ESAAB

5.1 **General.** In circumstances where the acquisition action (i.e., baseline deviation or critical decision approvals) is of relatively low monetary value, low risk, and requires non-controversial decisions, a streamlined ESAAB achieves the required staff coordination and approval without convening a formal meeting of the Deputy Secretary and all ESAAB members.

5.2 **“Paper” ESAAB (Streamlined ESAAB) Process.** The Program Office can request that OAPM consider a streamlined ESAAB process in lieu of convening a formal meeting. The Office of Management determines: (1) if a streamline ESAAB is appropriate; and (2) level of inter-office coordination required.

5.3 **Streamlined ESAAB Coordination.** At a minimum, all streamlined ESAABs will be coordinated with OAPM, the Chief Financial Officer, and the Office of the General Counsel with the expectation of expeditious concurrences. However, non-concurrence on a coordinated document by a member shall not require resolution prior to forwarding the request to the SAE for a decision.

6.0 ESAAB-Equivalent Meetings

6.1 **AE Meetings.** The Programs are authorized to make changes to projects that are smaller than the SAE approval limits (see authority levels identified in the current version of the Order). The Programs should create an ESAAB-equivalent entity to facilitate decision making by the AE.

6.2 ESAAB-Equivalent Procedures

6.2.1 The designated AE should:

- Appoint and chair acquisition advisory boards to provide advice and recommendations on key project decisions.
- Be delegated to a level commensurate with the size and complexity of the project and in accordance with Departmental policies and orders.
- Operate within the specific limits of their delegated authority.

6.2.2 The advisory board should replicate functions performed by the ESAAB.

- 6.2.3 Members may be selected from within the AE's organization; however, at least one member not under the AE should be designated as a contributing member.
- 6.2.4 OAPM will provide a representative to each advisory board for projects with a TPC greater than or equal to \$100M.
- 6.2.5 OAPM may be invited to attend advisory boards for projects with a TPC less than \$100M, but are not normally a board member.
- 6.2.6 The implementing documentation and composition of each advisory board along with meeting agendas and minutes should be provided to OAPM.

APPENDIX A
ESAAB ACTIVITIES TIMELINE

The steps outlined below provide the framework and normal working times and responsibilities for the activities prior to and immediately following the ESAAB:

| Activity | Responsible Office | Calendar Days Relative to Meeting |
|---|---------------------------|--|
| Submit written request to Secretariat for ESAAB review | PSO | 25 days |
| Schedule pre-ESAAB meeting | PSO | 25 days |
| Prepare draft briefing material and supporting documentation and distribute briefing material for pre-ESAAB meeting | PSO | 20 days |
| Conduct pre-ESAAB meeting | PSO | 18 days |
| Comment on pre-ESAAB presentation | ESAAB Members | 16 days |
| Confirm proposed ESAAB date with SAE | ESAAB Secretariat | 14 days |
| Submit ESAAB meeting request to include 30 minute pre-brief for SAE | ESAAB Secretariat | 14 Days |
| Finalize briefing material and supporting documentation | PSO | 5 days |
| Distribute final briefing material to ESAAB members | ESAAB Secretariat | 5 days |
| Conduct ESAAB meeting | SAE | 0 days |
| Prepare staff memorandum of decision with actions and provide required project documentation (updated by PSO) reflecting ESAAB decisions and submit for SAE approval and issuance | ESAAB Secretariat | +15 days |

APPENDIX B
PRESENTATION OUTLINE FOR THE ESAAB MEETING

1. **GENERAL.** These guidelines have been prepared to aid program and project managers in their preparation of presentation materials for ESAAB meetings.
2. **COMPOSITION.** Each presentation will be slightly different given the decision (e.g., baseline change proposal) required of the SAE. The following outline is a guide to assist in compiling the ESAAB presentation. Additionally, an ESAAB briefing template (PowerPoint) can be found at <http://energy.gov/management/office-management/operational-management/project-management/documents-and-publications>.
 - a. CD-0, Approve Mission Need
 - Title Page
 - Mission / Objectives – Summarize the capability gap. Describe why the facilities, equipment, or services currently existing are not sufficient to address the gap. Explain the internal or external drivers (e.g., statute, regulation, legal agreement, earmark, or Presidential directive).
 - Alternative Strategies – Identify high-level strategies/alternatives considered or to be analyzed to meet the mission need.
 - Conceptual Scope
 - Conceptual Schedule and Cost Range
 - Readiness to Proceed
 - Assumptions and Constraints
 - Risk Management
 - Mission Validation Independent Review – Summarize the issues, their resolution, and subsequent recommendations.
 - Summary and Recommendation
 - b. CD-1, Approve Alternative Selection and Cost Range
 - Title Page
 - Mission / Objectives
 - Alternatives: (Discuss sorting, grading, and selecting criteria.)
 - Strategies
 - Technologies
 - Locations
 - Acquisition Strategies (e.g., design-build) and Plan (e.g., M&O)
 - Life Cycle Cost and Schedule
 - Preferred Alternative
 - Project Technical Scope/Process
 - Conceptual Schedule and Cost Range
 - Readiness to Proceed
 - Assumptions and Constraints
 - Risk Management
 - Integrated Project Team
 - Long Lead Procurements

- Summary and Recommendation
- c. CD-2, Approve Performance Baseline, or BCP (see Section 3 below).
 - d. CD-3, Approve Start of Construction (see Section 3 below). Although using the same set of slides as in CD-2, the Program should discuss the differences or what has changed since CD-2 with the ESAAB members.
3. **PRESENTATION FORMAT.** The outline that follows describes the information that should be considered for inclusion on the presentation charts for a CD-2, CD-3, or BCP approval request. The presentation may be augmented by additional charts that the Programs need to illustrate project systems, problems, issues, or other pertinent factors. However, presentation materials should be minimized to the extent possible. Templates for ESAAB briefings (PowerPoint) can be found at <http://energy.gov/management/office-management/operational-management/project-management/documents-and-publications>.
- a. **Title Page.** Indicate the official name of the project, the name and organization of the acquisition proponent, and the name of the presenters. State the ESAAB decision that will be requested at the meeting.
 - b. **Mission / Objectives.** Indicate the original mission need statement. If the Program has identified a credible performance gap between its current capabilities and stated goals, then indicate the updates to the mission-related need. Also, state the key program and project objectives. The relationship between the program and project objectives should be clear.
 - c. **Project Technical Scope / Process.** Show a recent photograph or artist's conception of the project. Use a technical process flow chart or similar graphic to summarize how the facility or machine is expected to function. Identify key requirements (or KPPs). Show the basic technical baseline requirements for the project. A history of project related events and a detailed technical description should be avoided due to time constraints. The ESAAB members and advisors should be briefed by their respective staffs or may request a briefing by the respective Program.
 - d. **Baseline Project Summary Schedule.** Provide an overview of project activity; display the baseline schedule for the life of the project. Include all Acquisition Executive decision points, other critical decisions and events, major milestones including ES&H milestones that may impact the project's critical path, and critical path for project implementation. Also, state the tailoring strategy for adapting critical decision requirements, if any.
 - e. **Baseline Resource Plan.** Show the funding authority profile available and anticipated. Show both cumulative obligations and costs planned by fiscal year over the life of the project. Actual costs and obligations to date shall be shown against these plans. All costs and obligations shall be denoted in current-year dollars for the year of expenditure. Address the basis of the cost/schedule estimate to include methodology and confidence levels. Also, show the total estimated cost for design, construction, and startup to include contingency, management reserve, fees, and ODCs. If a BCP, the Program must show

how much funding is required and where the funding is coming from in the Program.

- f. **Readiness to Proceed.** In a very brief, bullet style manner, summarize the status of each critical decision prerequisite. Succinctly state the problem, issue, or item of concern, list the corrective actions taken, the additional corrective actions required (with dates), and an assessment of the impact on the project. Prepare a separate chart for each topic to be discussed with whatever illustrative material is appropriate to present the problem, issue, or item of concern in a fully informative manner. [Highlight the major system critical decision prerequisites (as prescribed in DOE O 413.3A) needed to bring a project to the next major milestone in the acquisition phase.]
- g. **Assumptions and Constraints.** Identify the assumptions and constraints related to the project life cycle to include phases of design, construction, commissioning and operations.
- h. **Risk Management.** Summarize the key risks resulting from assumptions, requirements, technology readiness, staffing and the like. Include your mitigation plans as well as the likelihood of occurrence and consequence of impact.
- i. **Project Contract Status.** Review or update the project's acquisition plan and the contractor's performance to date.
- j. **Integrated Project Team.** Show the participating organizations and their responsibilities in the form of an organization chart. This is the opportunity to depict the manner in which the project is being managed. Laboratory/contractor/partner responsibilities should be included. Also show, in a separate box, a summary of the DOE staffing, both on-board and planned.
- k. **ICE, EIR, and EVMS Summary.** Summarize the resolution of ICE, major EIR findings, and the status of EVMS certification.
- l. **Summary and Recommendation.** Highlight the key points from the presentation, restate the decision requested, and identify the next actions planned following the requested decision by the Acquisition Executive.

APPENDIX C
EXAMPLE OF AN SAE ESAAB DECISION MEMORANDUM (BCP)

MEMORANDUM FOR THE DEPUTY SECRETARY

FROM: INGRID KOLB
DIRECTOR
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT

SUBJECT: ACTION: Approve the K-25 D&D Project Baseline Change Proposal

ISSUE: Approval of K-25 Baseline Change Proposal

BACKGROUND: On August 1, 2011, the Deputy Secretary, as the Secretarial Acquisition Executive (SAE), chaired an ESAAB meeting to discuss a Baseline Change Proposal (BCP) for the K-25 D&D project at the East Tennessee Technology Park, Oak Ridge, TN. A follow-on meeting to address questions raised during the ESAAB was held on September 7, 2011. The presentations from both meetings are attached for reference.

The BCP increases the Total Project Cost (TPC) by \$517M to \$1.397B and establishes a scheduled completion date (CD-4) of December 31, 2015. The Key Performance Parameters (KPP) have been clarified and simplified to state "demolish the K-25 Building to slab in accordance with CERCLA and the National Historic Preservation Act." In addition, the Program is requesting the delegation of authority to the Acting Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management to approve the revised Project Execution Plan.

The Office of Engineering and Construction Management validated the revised TPC of \$1.397B contingent upon the Program fully funding the project in accordance with the funding profile presented during the External Independent Review (EIR) and detailed in the ESAAB brief.

The approval of the BCP is contingent upon Mr. Kopotic attaining Level 4 FPD certification within six months of the BCP's approval and the Program fully funding the project in accordance with the funding profile detailed in the ESAAB brief. Any changes to this funding profile must be endorsed by the SAE.

OPTIONS: None.

RECOMMENDATION: Approve the K-25 Baseline Change Proposal

APPROVE: _____ DISAPPROVE: _____ DATE: _____

CONCURRENCES: GC/
CF/
EM/

EXAMPLE OF AN SAE ESAAB DECISION MEMORANDUM (CD)

MEMORANDUM FOR THE DEPUTY SECRETARY

FROM: INGRID KOLB
DIRECTOR
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT

SUBJECT: ACTION: Approve the National Synchrotron Light Source-IT Facility
Project Energy Systems Acquisition Advisory Board (ESAAB) Record of
Decision

ISSUE: The Office of Science (SC) requested approval to start construction on the National Synchrotron Light Source-II (NSLS-11) project at Brookhaven National Laboratory in Upton, New York.

BACKGROUND: On December 9, 2008, you chaired a meeting of the Energy Systems Acquisition Advisory Board (ESAAB) to discuss Critical Decision-3 (CD-3), Approve Start of Construction, for the NSLS-11 project.

The Critical Decision-3, Start of Construction approval is for an advanced National Synchrotron Light Source II facility that consists of the following:

- Key Performance Parameters:
 - Accelerator facilities that will operate at an electron energy of 3.0 giga-electron volts (GeV) and a stored current of 25 milli-amperes (mA).
 - Six beamlines ready for commissioning with X-ray beam.
 - Minimum, 340,000 gross square feet of conventional facilities.
- Total Project Cost (TPC)- \$912M;
- Project Completion Date (CD-4)- June 2015.

OPTIONS: None.

RECOMMENDATION: Approve Critical Decision-3, Start of Construction, for the National Synchrotron Light Source-IT Facility Project

APPROVE: _____ DISAPPROVE: _____ DATE: _____

CONCURRENCES: GC/
CF/
EM/

APPENDIX D
EXAMPLE OF ESAAB STAFF MEMORANDUM (MEETING MINUTES)

MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION

FROM: PAUL BOSCO
DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF ENGINEERING AND
CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT

SUBJECT: Energy Systems Acquisition Advisory Board meeting held August 1, 2011, for
K-25 D&D Project

Attached for your use and information are the minutes of the subject meeting held on August 1, 2011.

Please feel free to contact me or Darren Morton of my staff at (202) 287-1784 if you have any questions or comments.

Distribution

Deputy Secretary

Acting Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, EM-1

Director, Office of Management, MA-1

Acting Director, Office of Procurement and Assistance Management, MA-60

Acting Chief Financial Officer, CF-1

Deputy General Counsel for Environment and Nuclear Programs, GC-50

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Project Management, EM-10

Assistant Manager, Environmental Management, OR

Federal Project Director, K-25

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Meeting Minutes, Energy Systems Acquisition Advisory Board (ESAAB) Meeting to Discuss Baseline Change Proposal for the K-25 Decontamination and Decommissioning (D&D) Project at the East Tennessee Technology Park, Oak Ridge, TN

ISSUE: Information within this memorandum records the minutes from the ESAAB for the subject K-25 D&D project.

BACKGROUND: On August 1, 2011, the Deputy Secretary, as the Secretarial Acquisition Executive (SAE), chaired an ESAAB meeting to consider the Baseline Change Proposal request for the K-25 D&D Project at the East Tennessee Technology Park (ETTP) site. ESAAB members or alternates in attendance were:

- Daniel Poneman, Deputy Secretary of Energy
- Mel Williams, Associate Deputy Secretary of Energy
- Steve Meador, for the Under Secretary of Science
- Gena Cadieux, for the General Counsel
- Owen Barwell, Acting Chief Financial Officer
- Ingrid Kolb, Director, Office of Management
- David Huizenga, Acting Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management
- Glenn Podonsky, Chief Health, Safety and Security Officer
- Chip Lagdon, Chief of Nuclear Safety
- Paul Bosco, Director, Office of Engineering and Construction Management
- Patrick Ferraro, Acting Director, Office of Procurement and Assistance Management
- Michael Thompson, for Deputy Administrator, Office of Defense Programs

DISCUSSION: The following paragraphs cover the topics discussed at the ESAAB.

Changes to the Performance Baseline

The ESAAB discussed the proposed changes to the Performance Baseline, specifically increasing the Total Project Cost from \$880M to \$1.397B and the establishment of a project completion date (Critical Decision – 4) of December 31, 2015. No change in scope was requested; however, the key performance parameters will be simplified under this request. Under the proposed funding profile, the project would be fully funded through 2015. Additionally, the Program Office requested delegation of authority to the Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management (EM-1) to approve the revised Project Execution Plan.

Project History

The history of the K-25 D&D project was discussed, including its inclusion in Project Baseline Summary (PBS) OR-0040 and the work completed to date. The contract for this work was originally awarded to Bechtel Jacobs (BJC) in 1997 and the contract was renegotiated in 2003 to provide for the closure of ETTP by 2008. However, due to cost overruns and poor performance, the Program Office made the decision in the fall of 2009 to accelerate the BJC performance period, and to replace BJC by, June 2011. The ESAAB discussed lessons learned during the BJC contract period and requested

additional information on the BJC contract structure: how the contractor was able to “mask” poor performance, and insight into the lack of Federal oversight which allowed such significant cost overruns.

Changes in the Project Management Approach

The FPD described changes in performance subsequent to the decision to replace the BJC in the fall of 2009. The Federal Project Director and BJC’s contract management team were replaced and contractor oversight was improved. An interim performance baseline was developed for the remainder of the BJC performance period and performance against this baseline has been positive. An independent government estimate was developed for all work remaining and is incorporated in this Baseline Change Proposal.

New Contract

A new contract for the K-25 D&D work was awarded to URS/CH2M Hill Oak Ridge (UCOR) in April 2011. Contract transition is complete and UCOR assumed responsibility for the K-25 project effective August 1, 2011. The ESAAB discussed the structure of the UCOR contract and inquired if lessons learned from the BJC contract, as well as other projects within the EM portfolio, were applied in developing the acquisition strategy and structuring the contract. The funding profile and the robustness of the available contingency were discussed in light of tight budgets and competing priorities.

Risks

The ESAAB discussed the remaining project risks including specific risk examples that could affect the Total Project Cost, such as Tc-99 decontamination and disposal. The ESAAB questioned the major findings of the February 2011 External Independent Review and requested additional detail regarding the risks associated with these findings.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS AND QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED:

1. Understand the history of the original PBS-0040 contract with BJC and subsequent restructuring. How did this happen?
 - a. How was the contract structured that allowed the cost overruns and poor performance to continue?
 - b. How did the contractor take advantage of the contract structure?
 - c. How did the Federal oversight fail?
2. Understand the contract structure of the new contract with UCOR. What protections do we have?
 - a. How is the contract structured? Need a better understanding of the award fee and incentive provisions.
 - b. How is the contractor held accountable in the contract?
 - c. How has Federal oversight improved? What lessons learned from other contracts (Salt Waste, etc.) were incorporated?
3. Need to understand the contingency portion of the \$517M with some precision. Balance confidence level against how the funds could be used for other priorities.
4. Need to understand the impact of the funding profile on the whole EM portfolio. What are the tradeoffs and priorities?

5. Provide more detail on the major findings in the February 2011 EIR. How did these findings affect the Federal baseline?
6. What is the enrichment level of uranium deposits remaining in the building?
7. Disaggregate the original \$1.7B PBS-0040. What buildings are included? What's left to be done? Is there a potential for further overruns in non-K-25 work?

Decisions

The Deputy Secretary deferred the approval decision of the BCP pending receipt of the Program Office's responses to the questions above. The Program Office committed to providing responses to the Deputy Secretary by August 10, 2011.