

**AWARD FEE PLAN**

**FOR**

**Facility Support Services Contract (Wastren-EnergX Mission Support, LLC)**

**DE-CI0000004**

**REVISION 2**

**Period of Performance FY 12**

APPROVED:



**William E. Murphie, Manager  
Portsmouth/Paducah Project Office**

CONCURRENCE:



**Damon Detillion,  
WEMS Project Manager**

**AWARD FEE PLAN  
FOR  
Facility Support Services Contract(Wastren-EnergX Mission Support, LLC)**

**CONTENTS**

|                                  | <b><u>PAGE</u></b> |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1. INTRODUCTION                  | 1                  |
| 2. DEFINITION OF TERMS           | 1                  |
| 3. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE      | 1                  |
| 4. RESPONSIBILITIES              | 2                  |
| 5. AWARD FEE AMOUNTS AND PERIODS | 2                  |
| 6. AWARD FEE PROCESS             | 3                  |
| 7. TERMINATION FOR CONVENIENCE   | 6                  |
| 8. TERMINATION FOR DEFAULT       | 6                  |
| 9. FEE PLAN CHANGE PROCEDURE     | 7                  |

**EXHIBITS**

1. Performance Evaluation Board (PEB) Members and Advisors (1 page)
2. Award Fee Rating Table, Award Fee Conversion Chart and Award Fee Calculations (3 pages)
3. Rating Criteria (3 pages)
4. Rating Summary Tables (2 pages)
5. Award Fee Process Flowchart (2 pages)
6. Wastren-EnergX Mission Support, LLC Performance Metrics (10 pages)

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

The purpose of this award fee plan is to define the methodology and responsibilities associated with determining the fee to be awarded to Wastren-EnergX Mission Support, LLC (WEMS) (hereafter referred to as the contractor). The plan outlines the organization, procedures, and evaluation periods for implementing the award fee provisions of the contract. The objective of the award fee is to motivate the contractor to substantially exceed standards and to emphasize key areas of performance and concern without jeopardizing minimum acceptable performance in all other areas.

## **2. 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 award fee to the FDO. The PEB chairperson is the 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. The PTE's evaluation is the primary point of reference in determining the recommended award fee, especially the technical support area of performance. The PTE is an advisor(s) to the PEB.
- e. **Infrastructure Project Manager:** The individual who is most directly responsible for the performance of the Facility Support Services contract oversight. The Infrastructure Project Manager also serves as the recorder, who is responsible for ensuring the PEB is properly convened, which includes meeting place, time, advising all PEB members, preparing agenda, and taking minutes. The Infrastructure Project Manager is an advisor to the PEB.

## **3. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE**

- a. The Manager, Portsmouth/Paducah Project Office (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 Award Fee Plan shall be provided to the contractor 30 days before the start of the first evaluation period. Changes that do not impact the award fee criteria or process, such as editorial or personnel changes may be made and implemented without being provided to the contractor 30 days before the start of the evaluation period.

#### **4. RESPONSIBILITIES**

a. The Contractor has developed performance metrics in coordination with the Infrastructure Project Manager and CO to assess the quality of support services provided, (i.e., IT services, records management, training, grounds and facility maintenance, etc.). These metrics have been reviewed and accepted by DOE PTE (see Exhibit 6). Additionally, each of these metrics is applicable to services provided directly by WEMS and in direct support to the Decontamination and Decommissioning (D&D) contractor. The contractor will self-report the results of these metrics on a quarterly basis and DOE will consider the results as part of the Award Fee Recommendation. The contractor will provide quarterly self-assessments. As part of its self-assessment, the contractor will conduct surveys on an annual basis of other contract customers. Results of surveys and performance reporting will be provided to the PTE, PEB, and FDO.

b. The PTE(s) will monitor and evaluate the contractor's performance. The PTE(s) will work closely with the CO and Infrastructure Project Manager in performing surveillance duties.

c. The Infrastructure Project Manager will use the Award Fee Rating Table in Exhibit 2 to determine the adjective ratings to be reported to the PEB. The Infrastructure Project Manager will be thoroughly familiar with current award fee policy, guidance, regulations, and correspondence pertinent to the award fee process. The Infrastructure Project Manager will coordinate administrative actions required by the PTE(s), the PEB, and the FDO. Administrative actions include receiving, processing, and distributing performance evaluation inputs, scheduling and assisting with internal milestones, (i.e., PEB briefings, and other actions as required for the smooth operation of the award fee process). The Infrastructure Project Manager will receive input quarterly on contractor performance from the PTE, D&D contractor, and Environmental Technical Services contractor. Input will be gathered through interview, survey, or written evaluation using Exhibits 2 and 3 as guides.

d. The PEB members will review the PTE's evaluation reports and the Infrastructure Project Manager's recommended adjective rating, consider information from other pertinent sources, and develop a fee recommendation. The PEB chairperson will give the fee recommendation to the FDO.

e. The FDO will review the PEB's recommendations, consider all appropriate data, and notify the CO in writing of the final fee determination. 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 award fee for the performance evaluation period.

**5. AWARD FEE AMOUNTS AND PERIODS**

- a. The total award fee available is \$2,628,354. An annual amount will be available for each fiscal year subject to contract adjustments through modification of the contract.
- b. The following are the amounts available for each annual evaluation period:

| <u>Evaluation Period</u> | <u>Amount Available</u> | <u>Award Received</u> |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| 03/16/10-09/30/10        | \$259,040.70            | \$196,408.22          |
| 10/01/10-09/30/11        | \$525,597.92            | \$336,203.60          |
| 10/01/11-09/30/12        | \$526,656.60            | TBD                   |
| 10/01/12-09/30/13        | \$526,656.60            | TBD                   |
| 10/01/13-09/30/14        | \$526,656.60            | TBD                   |
| 10/01/14-07/25/15        | \$263,745.58            | TBD                   |

c. The amount corresponding to each evaluation period is the maximum amount that may be earned during that particular period unless the amount is changed by contract modification. Should the anticipated scope per fiscal year increase or decrease by an estimated 10% or greater from the scope as priced in the contract for that year, the contractor and government will enter into good faith negotiations to adjust the fee pool for that year and subsequent years as may be appropriate accordingly. Any portion of award fee not awarded for an evaluation period may not be transferred to another evaluation period. In accordance with the Contract Clause B.2(d), a “provisional payment of a proportional quarterly amount up to 75% of the available award fee for the period will be permitted.”

d. In accordance with the Contract Clause B.2 Estimated Cost, Base, and Award Fee, if significant changes to the work scope occur, the contractor and CO will enter into good faith negotiations to revise the fee pool.

e. The government may unilaterally revise the distribution of the award fee, as indicated in paragraph 5b above, 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 award fee plan will be modified accordingly. After an evaluation period has begun, 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 once established at the beginning of the contract.

**6. AWARD FEE PROCESS (See Exhibit 5, Award Fee Process Flowchart)**

**a. Contractor Actions**

The contractor will present a briefing to the PTE and PEB summarizing performance for the previous period within 30 days of the end of the performance period. This performance

summary will include self-certified documentation of all performance, including the metrics listed in Exhibit 6. The contractor will present objective evidence of performance (see 4.a) and customer service ratings from supported contractors.

b. **PTE Actions**

(1) PTE(s) will continually monitor and evaluate the contractor's performance using Exhibit 3, Rating Criteria as a guide.

(2) For the Category of Performance (CP) items, the PTE will evaluate these items on a quarterly basis. The PTE will use the appropriate CP rating criteria in Exhibit 3 to evaluate the CP item for the purpose of evaluating the contractor. The PTE will notify the contractor of any weaknesses via electronic correspondence, copying the Site Lead, CO and the Infrastructure Project Manager. If the weakness appears in any way to negatively impact Environmental Safety & Health (ES&H) performance, or the safeguarding of restricted data pursuant to Clause I.101 DEAR 952.223-76 Conditional Payment of Fee or Profit - safeguarding restricted data and other classified information and protection of worker safety and health, the PTE shall notify the Site Lead and the CO with the details via electronic correspondence. A weakness for any Category of Performance is defined as any failure to meet CP evaluation criteria. The contractor shall comply within the allowable time identified in the electronic correspondence to correct or provide an acceptable resolution to the weaknesses. Time sensitive requirements cannot be re-performed. The PTE will maintain all documentation for file maintenance. The PTE will use the documentation to ensure the contractor has established adequate procedures to prevent recurrence of weaknesses.

(3) Within 30 days of the end of each quarter, the PTE will submit to the Infrastructure Project Manager the rating criteria, using Exhibit 3 as a guide, for all Category of Performance items. Based on the above evaluation results, the PTE will select the appropriate adjective rating with written notes on the strengths and weaknesses of the contractor to report to the Infrastructure Project Manager.

c. **Infrastructure Project Manager's Actions**

(1) The Infrastructure Project Manager will select an adjective rating for each of the CP items based on his/her personal observations of performance and the adjective rating reported by the PTE. Besides reporting the PTE's notes on the strengths and weaknesses of the contractor, the Infrastructure Project Manager will annotate his/her rationale for selecting a particular adjective rating.

(2) The Infrastructure Project Manager will use Exhibit 4, Adjective Rating Summary Table, to summarize the PTE's adjective rating for the quarter and the Infrastructure Project Manager's adjective rating. Also, written notes of the Infrastructure Project Manager's rationale for selecting a particular adjective rating will be indicated on the table.

(3) The Infrastructure Project Manager will use Exhibit 4, Annual Adjective Rating, to compute the annual adjective rating average for the award fee.

(4) The Infrastructure Project Manager will submit a completed Exhibit 4, Annual Adjective Rating, for presentation to the PEB.

(5) The Infrastructure Project Manager notifies PEB members and any advisors of the date and time of PEB meeting in accordance with the schedule established by the PEB chairperson. Additionally, the Infrastructure Project Manager notifies the contractor of the date and time of PEB meeting and advises the contractor of when and how (written, oral, or both) he/she will be permitted to address the PEB as determined by the PEB chairperson. Generally, the contractor will be provided the opportunity to provide written materials and an oral presentation. The presentation should be provided in advance and should be in the form of a self-assessment measured against each award fee criteria section. The presentation should be limited to approximately one hour. Before the PEB meeting, the Infrastructure Project Manager will provide the PEB members with a page-numbered binder to include, at a minimum, the input for the fiscal year (or evaluation period) from the PTE members, the forms required to be filled out during the evaluation meeting, and the contractor's award fee self-assessment and presentation.

(6) The Infrastructure Project Manager 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.

d. **PEB Actions**

(1) Site Director, Portsmouth will chair the PEB. The Site Director will form the PEB and receive FDO concurrence on the membership. The PEB chairperson will establish dates, times, and places for the PEB meeting and notify the Infrastructure Project Manager for appropriate notification to members, advisors, and the contractor. The FDO will be invited to attend the PEB meeting. The chairperson will schedule the PEB meeting to ensure the PEB's recommended fee is presented to the FDO within 60 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 PTE's and Infrastructure Project Manager. 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 presentations (or both as determined by chairperson) and the contractor self-assessment (quarterly and annual) of performance for that period.

(3) Using Exhibit 3, PEB Member's Rating, each member will select an adjective rating from Exhibit 2, Award Fee Rating Table, and provide their rationale in the Notes section of Exhibit 4, Annual Adjective Rating Table, for their selection.

(4) The chairperson will collect members' Annual Adjective Rating Table, Exhibit 4, and review them. If any member's adjective rating is "unsatisfactory" and this rating is lower than a PTE(s) adjective rating for that same area, appropriate discussions with that member(s) should be conducted to determine the member's rationale. Lowering the adjective rating requires specific

reasons because the contractor will be aware of all weaknesses from the PTE's quarterly evaluation. Once the chairperson is satisfied with the PEB's rating results, the chairperson will pass the individual member's rating sheets to the Infrastructure Project Manager.

(5) The Infrastructure Project Manager summarizes individual member's adjective ratings for the rating criteria using Exhibit 4, Summary of PEB's rating.

(6) The chairperson will prepare or will have the Infrastructure Project Manager prepare a cover letter to transmit Exhibit 3, PEB Member's Rating, and Exhibit 4, Summary of PEB's Rating, to the FDO.

**e. 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 Award Fee Conversion Chart.

(2) The FDO will notify the CO in writing, by electronic correspondence, or in briefing with CO and PEB chair of his/her final determination of award fee.

**f. CO's Actions**

(1) The CO will prepare a letter for the FDO's signature notifying the contractor of the amount of award fee earned for the evaluation 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, if needed. The modification will reflect award fee and will be issued to the contractor within 14 days after the CO receives the FDO's decision.

**7. TERMINATION FOR CONVENIENCE**

In the event that the contract is terminated for the convenience of the government, the remaining award fee payable for the current period will be a matter of settlement in accordance with the termination clause of the contract (Clause I. 86). The remaining fee for all periods after the termination shall not be considered earned and therefore shall not be paid.

**8. TERMINATION FOR DEFAULT**

In the event that the contract is terminated for default, the remaining award fee payable for the current period shall not be considered earned and therefore shall not be paid. The remaining fee for all periods after the termination shall not be considered earned and therefore shall not be paid.

## **9. FEE PLAN CHANGE PROCEDURE**

All significant changes are approved by the FDO; the PEB Chairperson approves other changes. Examples of significant changes include changing evaluation criteria, adjusting weights to redirect contractor's emphasis to areas needing improvement, and revising the distribution of fee dollars. The CO will provide a notice of changes to the contractor, 30 days prior to making changes. Changes that do not impact the award fee criteria or process, such as editorial clarifications, personnel changes or other insignificant changes may be made and implemented within the period without providing the 30 day advance notice to the contractor. The contractor may recommend changes to the CO no later than 60 days prior to the beginning of the new evaluation period. After approval, the CO shall notify the contractor in writing of any change(s). Unilateral changes may be made to the fee plan if the contractor is provided written notification by the CO before the start of the upcoming evaluation period or as provided in B.5, Base and Award Fee of the contract. Contract modifications effecting estimated cost and available fee, may require a change to the Award Fee Plan. Such changes shall be incorporated in accordance with clause B.5 and DOE Acquisition Guide, Chapter 16.2 (July 2012) and may be incorporated by attaching an approved amendment to the Award Fee Plan.

**PERFORMANCE EVALUATION BOARD MEMBERS AND ADVISORS**

Following are suggested members and advisors:

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Site Director, Portsmouth (Chairperson)    | Vincent Adams   |
| Site Lead, Portsmouth                      | Joel Bradburne  |
| Deputy Manager, PPPO Lexington (Alternate) | TBD (Rachel Blumenfeld, Acting)   |
| Lead Contracting Officer, PPPO Lexington   | Pam Thompson  |
| *Contracting Officer                       | David Senderling  |
| *Infrastructure Project Manager            | Matt Vick   |
| *Project Team Evaluators                   | PPPO Portsmouth Staff; and, Russ McCallister, Quality Assurance; Tom Hines, Safety; Mark Allen, Security; James Woods, Information Technology |
| *Contracts Lawyer                          | Bert Gawthorp   |
| *Advisors Only - Non-Voting Participants   |   |

**AWARD FEE RATING TABLE**

| <b>ADJECTIVE RATING</b> | <b>DEFINITION</b>   |
|-------------------------|---|
| <b>EXCELLENT</b>        | Contractor has exceeded all or almost all of the significant award-fee criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract as defined and measured against the criteria in the contract and the award fee plan for the award fee evaluation period. |
| <b>VERY GOOD</b>        | Contractor has exceeded many of the significant award fee criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract as defined and measured against the criteria in the contract and the award fee plan for the award fee evaluation period.              |
| <b>GOOD</b>             | Contractor has exceeded some of the significant award fee criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract as defined and measured against the criteria in the contract and the award fee plan for the award fee evaluation period.              |
| <b>SATISFACTORY</b>     | Contractor has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract as defined and measured against the criteria in the contract and the award fee plan for the award fee evaluation period.  |
| <b>UNSATISFACTORY</b>   | Contractor has failed to meet overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract as defined and measured against the criteria in the contract and the award-fee plan for the award-fee evaluation period.   |

| <b>AWARD FEE CONVERSION CHART</b> |  |                                       |
|-----------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| <b>ADJECTIVE RATING</b>           | <b>EVALUATION POINTS (OVERALL WEIGHTED RESULT)</b> | <b>PERCENTAGE OF AWARD FEE EARNED</b> |
| EXCELLENT                         | 23-25  | 91 to 100%                            |
| VERY GOOD                         | 20-22  | 76 to 90%                             |
| GOOD                              | 12-19  | 51 to 75%                             |
| SATISFACTORY                      | 6-11   | No Greater than 50%                   |
| UNSATISFACTORY                    | Less than 5  | 0%                                    |

| <b>CATEGORY OF PERFORMANCE (CP)</b>   | <b>Weightings</b> |
|---|-------------------|
| 1. Quality and Effectiveness of the Mission Support Services<br>Sections: C.2.5 Computer Services, C.2.7 Training, C.2.10.2 Records Management, C.2.10.4 Property, C.2.10.1 Mail Services, C.2.10.3 Fleet Management, C.2.10.6 Shipping and Receiving | 35%               |
| 2. Quality and Effectiveness of Maintenance Services<br>Sections: C.2.2 Grounds Maintenance, C.2.3 Roads Maintenance, C.2.4 Janitorial, C.2.9 Facility Maintenance  | 25%               |
| 3. Quality and Effectiveness of the Security Programs<br>Sections: C.2.5.2 Cyber Security and C.2.6 Security  | 25%               |
| 4. Effectiveness of Cost Savings Initiatives  | 10%               |
| 5. Quality and Timeliness of Contract deliverables (Emphasis on invoicing, response to special requests and data calls)   | 5%                |
|   |                   |

Project Management; Environmental, Safety and Health; and Quality programs will be evaluated and assessed as related to the individual categories of performance.

**Award Fee Calculation Methodology:**

1. PTE assigns rating (0-25) for each Category of Performance (CP)
2. Multiply weighting percentage to each CP to arrive at weighted result.
3. Add weighted results together to arrive at overall weighted result.

**Example:**

PTE Ratings: Quality and Effectiveness of Mission Support Services – 24  
 Quality and Effectiveness of Maintenance Services – 23  
 Quality and Effectiveness of Security Programs – 22  
 Effectiveness of Cost Savings Initiatives – 20  
 Quality and Timeliness of contract deliverables– 23

Weighted Result:  $(24 \times 35\%) + (23 \times 25\%) + (22 \times 25\%) + (20 \times 10\%) + (23 \times 5\%) = 22.8$

Overall Weighted Result: 22.8; round up to 23.

Adjective rating (Award Fee Conversion Chart): EXCELLENT.

Potential Percentage of Award Fee Earned (as determined by the FDO): 91% to 100%.

**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 Award Fee Conversion Chart does not remove the element of judgment from the award-fee process.

| <b>RATING CRITERIA</b>   |                                    |                     |             |                      |                  |
|--|------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------|----------------------|------------------|
| <i>(IDENTIFY QUARTER)</i>  |                                    |                     |             |                      |                  |
| <b>RATING (Check Appropriate Box)</b>  |                                    |                     |             |                      |                  |
| <b>CATEGORY OF PERFORMANCE<br/>(EVALUATION WEIGHTING)</b>  | <b>UN-<br/>SATISFACTORY</b>        | <b>SATISFACTORY</b> | <b>GOOD</b> | <b>VERY<br/>GOOD</b> | <b>EXCELLENT</b> |
| <b>QUALITY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF<br/>MISSION SUPPORT SERVICES (35%)</b>   |                                    |                     |             |                      |                  |
| EVALUATION POINTS:   | 0-5                                | 6 - 11              | 12 - 19     | 20 - 22              | 23 - 25          |
| EVALUATION CRITERIA:   | NOTES ON STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES: |                     |             |                      |                  |
| Perform support service activities defined in Section C, Sections: C.2.5 Computer Services, C.2.7 Training, C.2.10.2 Records Management, C.2.10.4 Property, C.2.10.1 Mail Services, C.2.10.3 Fleet Management, C.2.10.6 Shipping and Receiving |                                    |                     |             |                      |                  |

| <b>RATING CRITERIA</b>   |                                    |                     |             |                      |                  |
|--|------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------|----------------------|------------------|
| <i>(IDENTIFY QUARTER)</i>  |                                    |                     |             |                      |                  |
| <b>RATING (Check Appropriate Box)</b>  |                                    |                     |             |                      |                  |
| <b>CATEGORY OF PERFORMANCE<br/>(EVALUATION WEIGHTING)</b>  | <b>UN-<br/>SATISFACTORY</b>        | <b>SATISFACTORY</b> | <b>GOOD</b> | <b>VERY<br/>GOOD</b> | <b>EXCELLENT</b> |
| <b>QUALITY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF<br/>MAINTENANCE SERVICES (25%)</b>   |                                    |                     |             |                      |                  |
| EVALUATION POINTS:   | 0-5                                | 6 - 11              | 12 - 19     | 20 - 22              | 23 - 25          |
| EVALUATION CRITERIA:   | NOTES ON STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES: |                     |             |                      |                  |
| Perform facility support service activities defined in Section C, Sections: C.2.2 Grounds Maintenance, C.2.3 Roads Maintenance, C.2.4 Janitorial, C.2.9 Facility Maintenance |                                    |                     |             |                      |                  |

| <b>RATING CRITERIA</b>  |                                    |                     |             |                      |                  |
|---|------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------|----------------------|------------------|
| <b>(IDENTIFY QUARTER)</b>   |                                    |                     |             |                      |                  |
| <b>RATING (Check Appropriate Box)</b>   |                                    |                     |             |                      |                  |
| <b>CATEGORY OF PERFORMANCE<br/>(EVALUATION WEIGHTING)</b>   | <b>UN-<br/>SATISFACTORY</b>        | <b>SATISFACTORY</b> | <b>GOOD</b> | <b>VERY<br/>GOOD</b> | <b>EXCELLENT</b> |
| <b>QUALITY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF<br/>SECURITY PROGRAMS (25%)</b>   |                                    |                     |             |                      |                  |
| EVALUATION POINTS:  | 0-5                                | 6 - 11              | 12 - 19     | 20 - 22              | 23 - 25          |
| EVALUATION CRITERIA:  | NOTES ON STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES: |                     |             |                      |                  |
| Perform security support service activities defined in Section C, C.2.5.2 Cyber Security and C.2.6 Security |                                    |                     |             |                      |                  |

| <b>RATING CRITERIA</b>  |                                    |                     |             |                      |                  |
|---|------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------|----------------------|------------------|
| <b>(IDENTIFY QUARTER)</b>   |                                    |                     |             |                      |                  |
| <b>RATING (Check Appropriate Box)</b>   |                                    |                     |             |                      |                  |
| <b>CATEGORY OF PERFORMANCE<br/>(EVALUATION WEIGHTING)</b>                                       | <b>UN-<br/>SATISFACTORY</b>        | <b>SATISFACTORY</b> | <b>GOOD</b> | <b>VERY<br/>GOOD</b> | <b>EXCELLENT</b> |
| <b>EFFECTIVENESS OF COST SAVINGS<br/>INITIATIVES (10%)</b>                                      |                                    |                     |             |                      |                  |
| EVALUATION POINTS:  | 0-5                                | 6 - 11              | 12 - 19     | 20 - 22              | 23 - 25          |
| EVALUATION CRITERIA:  | NOTES ON STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES: |                     |             |                      |                  |
| Presents initiatives that will result in tangible savings to DOE (cost, schedule, and/or risk), |                                    |                     |             |                      |                  |
| Performs site tasks/activities in most cost effective manner consistent with approved baselines |                                    |                     |             |                      |                  |

| <b>RATING CRITERIA</b>  |   |                     |             |                      |                  |
|---|---|---------------------|-------------|----------------------|------------------|
| <b>(IDENTIFY QUARTER)</b>                                       |   |                     |             |                      |                  |
| <b>RATING (Check Appropriate Box)</b>                           |   |                     |             |                      |                  |
| <b>CATEGORY OF PERFORMANCE<br/>(EVALUATION WEIGHTING)</b>       | <b>UN-<br/>SATISFACTORY</b>               | <b>SATISFACTORY</b> | <b>GOOD</b> | <b>VERY<br/>GOOD</b> | <b>EXCELLENT</b> |
| <b>Quality and Timeliness of Contract Deliverables<br/>(5%)</b> |   |                     |             |                      |                  |
| <b>EVALUATION POINTS:</b>                                       | 0-5                                       | 6 - 11              | 12 - 19     | 20 - 22              | 23 - 25          |
| <b>EVALUATION CRITERIA:</b>                                     | <b>NOTES ON STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES:</b> |                     |             |                      |                  |
| Quality and timeliness of contract deliverables                 |   |                     |             |                      |                  |
| Quality and timeliness of invoicing and related reporting       |   |                     |             |                      |                  |
| Responsiveness to special requests and data calls               |   |                     |             |                      |                  |

**Adjective Rating Summary Table – Infrastructure Project Manager**

| <b>CATEGORY OF PERFORMANCE</b>                               | <b>ADJECTIVE. RATING</b> |
|--|--------------------------|
| 1. Quality and Effectiveness of the Mission Support Services |                          |
| 2. Quality and Effectiveness of Maintenance Services         |                          |
| 3. Quality and Effectiveness of Security Program             |                          |
| 4. Effectiveness of Cost Savings Initiatives                 |                          |
| 5. Quality and Timeliness of Contract deliverables           |                          |

**Annual Adjective Rating Table – Project Team Evaluators**

| <b>ANNUAL ADJECTIVE RATING</b>                           |                                   |                                   |                                   |                                   |   |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| <i>(IDENTIFY ANNUAL PERIOD)</i>                          |                                   |                                   |                                   |                                   |   |
| <b>CATEGORY OF PERFORMANCE</b>                           | <b>ADJECTIVE RATING</b>           |                                   |                                   |                                   |   |
|  | <b>1<sup>st</sup><br/>Quarter</b> | <b>2<sup>nd</sup><br/>Quarter</b> | <b>3<sup>rd</sup><br/>Quarter</b> | <b>4<sup>th</sup><br/>Quarter</b> | <b>Evaluation<br/>Period<br/>Rating</b> |
| 1. Quality and Effectiveness of Mission Support Services |                                   |                                   |                                   |                                   |   |
| 2. Quality and Effectiveness of Maintenance Services     |                                   |                                   |                                   |                                   |   |
| 3. Quality and Effectiveness of Security Program         |                                   |                                   |                                   |                                   |   |
| 4. Effectiveness of Cost Savings Initiatives             |                                   |                                   |                                   |                                   |   |
| 5. Quality and Timeliness of Contract deliverables       |                                   |                                   |                                   |                                   |   |

**Summary of PEB's Rating**

| <b>SUMMARY OF PEB'S RATING<br/>(IDENTIFY ANNUAL PERIOD)</b> |   |                                       |                                    |   |                                       |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| <b>Member</b>   | <b>Mission Support Services<br/>(35%)</b> | <b>Maintenance Services<br/>(25%)</b> | <b>Security Programs<br/>(25%)</b> | <b>Cost Savings Initiatives<br/>(10%)</b> | <b>Contract Deliverables<br/>(5%)</b> |
| <i>Insert Name of Voter</i>                                 |   |                                       |                                    |   |                                       |
| <i>Insert Name of Voter</i>                                 |   |                                       |                                    |   |                                       |
| <i>Insert Name of Voter</i>                                 |   |                                       |                                    |   |                                       |
| <i>Insert Name of Voter</i>                                 |   |                                       |                                    |   |                                       |
| <b>TOTALS</b>   |   |                                       |                                    |   |                                       |

**AWARD FEE PROCESS**



**INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT  
MANAGER SUMMARIZES  
INDIVIDUAL PEB MEMBER'S  
RATING**



**PEB CHAIRPERSON OR  
INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT  
MANAGER PREPARES COVER  
LETTER  
TRANSMITTING SUMMARY  
RATING  
TO FDO**



**FDO MAKES FINAL FEE  
DETERMINATION  
AND NOTIFIES CO**



**CO PREPARES LETTER FOR FDO  
SIGNATURE NOTIFYING AWARD  
FEE AMOUNT TO CONTRACTOR;  
CO MODIFIES CONTRACT  
REFLECTING FDO'S  
DETERMINATION**

## Performance Metrics

| <b>1. Mission Support</b>                                  |                     |  |  |  |
|--|---------------------|--|--|--|
| <b>C.2.5 M FSF.25.01.03.05.05 Computer Services</b>        |                     |  |  |  |
| <b>L1</b>  | <b>L 2</b>          | <b>Definition</b>  | <b>Goal and Scoring</b>  | <b>Measure</b>   |
| A. Service Provision                                       | I. Network Services | The number of times in each quarter that network service fails or must be have unscheduled maintenance. Scheduled down time will not be counted unless the operation causes the service to be unavailable beyond the pre-defined maintenance window. | All services will be available according to the Service Level Agreement for the service. Most of the services will have a 24X7 operation expectation. Some services will have to be taken off line for maintenance, application of software patches or upgrades. Measure is number of occurrences per quarter. | Excellent 0-1<br>Very good =2-3<br>Good = 4-5<br>Satisfactory = 6-7<br>Unsatisfactory = > 7                |
| <b>C.2.7 M FSF.25.01.03.05.07 Training</b>                 |                     |  |  |  |
| <b>L1</b>  | <b>L 2</b>          | <b>Definition</b>  | <b>Goal and Scoring</b>  | <b>Measure</b>   |
| A. Course Completion Percentage                            |                     | Course Completion Percentage   | Measured in pass fail rate for those who attend training. NOT measured in course attendance.   | Excellent ≥ 96%<br>Very Good = 95%-90%<br>Good = 89%-76%<br>Satisfactory = 75%-51%<br>Unsatisfactory ≤50%  |
| B. Customer Feedback Implementation                        |                     | Customer Feedback Implementation   | Measured in percentage of student feedback implemented into training program or addressed back to customer as to why feedback not implemented.   | Excellent ≥ 96%<br>Very Good = 95%-90%<br>Good = 89%-76%<br>Satisfactory = 75%-51%<br>Unsatisfactory ≤ 50% |
| C. Current Completions                                     |                     | Learning Management System report on Maintenance of Current Completions  | Time. Measured in hours, to update LMS for training completions.   | Excellent < 48<br>Very Good = 48-54<br>Good =55-61<br>Satisfactory = 60-72<br>Unsatisfactory > 72          |
| <b>C.2.10.2 M FSF.25.01.03.05.10.02 Records Management</b> |                     |  |  |  |

| L1   | L 2  | Definition  | Goal and Scoring  | Measure  |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| A. Intake Boxes Scanned  |  | There are about 800 ft <sup>3</sup> of Active Records and 1,600 ft <sup>3</sup> of Inactive records in the Backlog. This process takes prepped boxes and scans them in accordance with FSS-1300, Record Life Cycle and Retrieval. | 6,000 documents per year: based on percentage processed to date / 1,500 per quarter.  | Excellent ≥ 96%<br>Very Good = 95%-90%<br>Good = 89%-76%<br>Satisfactory = 75%-51%<br>Unsatisfactory ≤ 50% |
| <b>C.2.10.4 O FSF.25.01.03.05.10.04 Real and Personal Property</b> |  |   |   |  |
| L1   | L 2  | Definition  | Goal and Scoring  | Measure  |
| A. Personal property   | 1. Inventory and Excessing personal property | Personal property inventory is measured by the ability to identify missing items. The capability to excess property measures distribution performance.  | Missing items Identified/dispositioned items appropriately excessed.  | Excellent ≥ 96%<br>Very Good = 95%-90%<br>Good = 89%-76%<br>Satisfactory = 75%-51%<br>Unsatisfactory ≤ 50% |
| <b>C.2.10.1 M FSF.25.01.03.05.10.01 Mail Services</b>              |  |   |   |  |
| L1   | L 2  | Definition  | Goal and Scoring  | Measure  |
| A. Number of Mail Runs   |  | The number of mail runs performed by the RMDC to insure timely pick up and delivery of mail. Includes schedule runs to and from the USPS in Piketon and identified plant site locations.  | Percentage of scheduled, on time runs.  | Excellent ≥ 96%<br>Very Good = 95%-90%<br>Good = 89%-76%<br>Satisfactory = 75%-51%<br>Unsatisfactory ≤ 50% |
| <b>C.2.10.3 O FSF.25.01.03.05.10.03 Fleet Management</b>           |  |   |   |  |
| L1   | L 2  | Definition  | Goal and Scoring  | Measure  |
| A. Fleet Management  |  | GSA Fleet vehicles maintained at appropriate intervals.   | GSA vehicle maintenance schedules must be met at regular intervals for service. These services will be measured for timeliness based on the due dates of required service. Days past the due date will be measured for effectiveness. | Excellent < 1%<br>Very Good = 1%-2%<br>Good = 3% - 5%<br>Satisfactory = 6%-10%<br>Unsatisfactory > 10%     |

|  |            |  |  |  |
|--|------------|--|--|--|
| B. Reporting   |            | Monthly Fuel Reports.  | The Fleet Manager must report fuel consumption on a monthly basis. This metric measures on time delivery of the report.  | Excellent = On Time<br>Very Good = 1 Late<br>Good = 2 Late<br>Satisfactory = 3 Late<br>Unsatisfactory = 4 Late |
| <b>C.2.10.6</b> o FSF.25.01.03.05.10.6 <b>Shipping and Receiving</b> |            |  |  |  |
| <b>L1</b>  | <b>L 2</b> | <b>Definition</b>  | <b>Goal and Scoring</b>  | <b>Measure</b>   |
| A. On-Time Material Delivery   |            | Measures customer support responsiveness.  | Identify the number of deliveries over each month that were not made within 2 days of receipt or date requested from storage and calculate average occurrence per month. | Excellent < 3<br>Very Good = 3-5<br>Good = 6-10<br>Satisfactory = 11-15<br>Unsatisfactory > 15                 |
| <b>2. Maintenance Support</b>  |            |  |  |  |
| <b>C.2.2</b> o FSF.25.01.03.05.02 <b>Grounds Maintenance</b>         |            |  |  |  |
| <b>L1</b>  | <b>L 2</b> | <b>Definition</b>  | <b>Goal and Scoring</b>  | <b>Measure</b>   |
| A. Mowing Schedule Performance                                       |            | Measures actual completion of grass/vegetation cutting with respect to mowing plan schedule. | Divide the number of equivalent areas completed by the number of areas scheduled to complete.  | Excellent ≥ 96%<br>Very Good = 95%-90%<br>Good = 89%-76%<br>Satisfactory = 75%-51%<br>Unsatisfactory ≤ 50%     |
| B. Snow Removal  |            | Measures level of response to surface areas requiring removal.                               | Divide the number of areas by the total number of areas requiring removal.   | Excellent = 100%<br>Very Good = 96%-99%<br>Good = 90%-95%<br>Satisfactory = 80-89%<br>Unsatisfactory < 80%     |

| <b>C.2.3 o FSF.25.01.03.05.03 Roads Maintenance</b>       |            |   |   |   |
|---|------------|---|---|---|
| <b>L1</b>   | <b>L 2</b> | <b>Definition</b>   | <b>Goal and Scoring</b>   | <b>Measure</b>  |
| A. Backlog Management                                     |            | Measures growth in backlog.   | Divide the number of open work orders associated with roadways & parking lots at the end of month by the number of open work orders at the end of the previous month.   | Excellent = 0% Increase<br>Very Good = 1%-5% Increase<br>Good = 5%-10% Increase<br>Satisfactory = 11%-20% Increase<br>Unsatisfactory > 20% Increase |
| <b>C.2.4 o FSF.25.01.03.05.04 Janitorial Services</b>     |            |   |   |   |
| <b>L1</b>   | <b>L 2</b> | <b>Definition</b>   | <b>Goal and Scoring</b>   | <b>Measure</b>  |
| A. Quality of Janitorial Services                         |            | Measures the quality level of janitorial services being provided.   | Perform periodic inspections of area conditions, score each major attribute, total scores for each inspection, and average the total scores for all inspections during the period. The results of the inspections shall be documented. Unacceptable is defined as not meeting the term "appropriate condition" taken from the contract section C.2.4. | Excellent ≥ 96%<br>Very Good = 95%-90%<br>Good = 89%-76%<br>Satisfactory = 75%-51%<br>Unsatisfactory ≤ 0%   |
| <b>C.2.9 o FSF.25.01.03.05.09.01 Facility Maintenance</b> |            |   |   |   |
| <b>L1</b>   | <b>L 2</b> | <b>Definition</b>   | <b>Goal and Scoring</b>   | <b>Measure</b>  |
| A. Corrective Maintenance Work Requests Completed         |            | Measures the work-off rate of corrective maintenance (CM). Excludes work associated with Preventive Maintenance, Plant Modifications, and Operations. | Divide the number of CM work requests completed by number of CM work requests initiated.  | Excellent = 0% Increase<br>Very Good = 1%-5% Increase<br>Good = 5%-10% Increase<br>Satisfactory = 11%-20% Increase<br>Unsatisfactory > 20% Increase |

|  |           |  |  |   |
|--|-----------|--|--|---|
| B. Percentage of Preventative Maintenance            |           | Measures the effectiveness of the Preventive Maintenance (PM) tasks by determining the percentage of Work Orders that are PMs, and comparing to industry target standard of 80% PM & 20% CM. | Divide the number of Facility Maintenance CM + PM work orders by number of PM work orders, and divide result by 0.8. | Excellent ≥ 96%<br>Very Good = 95%-90%<br>Good = 89%-76%<br>Satisfactory = 75%-51%<br>Unsatisfactory ≤ 50%              |
| <b>3. Security</b>                                   |           |  |  |   |
| <b>C.2.5.2 Cyber Security</b>                        |           |  |  |   |
| <b>L1</b>  | <b>L2</b> | <b>Definition</b>  | <b>Goal and Scoring</b>  | <b>Measure</b>  |
| A. Compliance  |           | Cyber Security requirements are specified in DOE O 205.1A, the PCSP, and PSP.  | Incident response time as specified.   | Excellent = 100%<br>Very Good = 98%-99%<br>Good = 95%-97%<br>Satisfactory = 90%-94%<br>Unsatisfactory < 90%             |
| <b>C.2.6 M FSF.25.02.01.01.02 Personnel Security</b> |           |  |  |   |
| <b>L1</b>  | <b>L2</b> | <b>Definition</b>  | <b>Goal and Scoring</b>  | <b>Measure</b>  |
| A. HSPD Credentials                                  |           | Provide for site contractors, including ACP.   | Measure is hours to complete based on receipt of the request.  | Excellent = 40 hours<br>Very Good = 56 hours<br>Good = 72 hours<br>Satisfactory = 80 hours<br>Unsatisfactory > 80 hours |
| B. Issuance of Property Passes                       |           | The response time for the issuance of property passes.   | Response time measured in hours.   | Excellent ≤ 4 Hrs.<br>Very Good = 5-6 Hrs<br>Good = 7-8 Hrs.<br>Satisfactory = 9-12 Hrs.<br>Unsatisfactory > 12 Hrs.    |
| C. Incident Response                                 |           | The time required to respond to Incidents.   | Response time measured in hours.   | Excellent = 1<br>Very Good = 2<br>Good = 3-4<br>Satisfactory = 5-8<br>Unsatisfactory > 8                                |

|   |                                     |   |   |   |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| D. Visitor Control                                  | 1. Un-Authorized Visitor Processing | The processing of a visitor, on site, who is not on the visitor list according to procedure FSS-4201. | The number of personnel for which requests were properly submitted to visitor control for inclusion and were not included on the visitors list.                                       | Excellent = 10<br>Very Good = 12<br>Good = 14<br>Satisfactory = 16<br>Unsatisfactory < 16   |
| E. FOCI   |                                     | The ability to process and maintain current FOCI contracts.   | Processing FOCI contracts along with procurement or contracting officer to ensure all identified FOCI contracts are maintained or new contracts are in place day one of D&D contract. | Excellent = 100%<br>Very Good = 98%-99%<br>Good = 95%-97%<br>Satisfactory = 90%-94%<br>Unsatisfactory < 90%   |
| <b>C.2.6 M FSF.25.02.01.01.03 Physical Security</b> |                                     |   |   |   |
| <b>L1</b>   | <b>L 2</b>                          | <b>Definition</b>   | <b>Goal and Scoring</b>   | <b>Measure</b>  |
| A. Locksmith  |                                     | The response time to provide lock and key service.  | Response time measure in terms of SLA. Forty-eight (48) hours is the standard response time. Measure is number of requests LONGER than the SLA.                                       | Excellent ≤ 6 Hrs.<br>Very Good = 6-8 Hrs.<br>Good = 9-15 Hrs.<br>Satisfactory = 16-21 Hrs.<br>Unsatisfactory >21 Hrs.                              |
| <b>4. Cost Savings</b>                              |                                     |   |   |   |
| <b>L1</b>   | <b>L 2</b>                          | <b>Definition</b>   | <b>Goal and Scoring</b>   | <b>Measure</b>  |
| A. Cost Savings                                     |                                     | WEMS will save \$30,000 per quarter.  | Cost savings in dollar amounts.   | Excellent ≥ \$30,000<br>Very Good = \$29,999 - \$25,000<br>Good = \$24,999 -20,000<br>Satisfactory = \$19,999 - 10,000<br>Unsatisfactory < \$10,000 |

|                |  |   |  |  |
|----------------|--|---|--|--|
| B. Initiatives |  | WEMS will submit new initiatives, with ROM savings projections. | Number of initiatives submitted per quarter. | Excellent = 5<br>Very Good = 4<br>Good = 3<br>Satisfactory = 2<br>Unsatisfactory < 2 |
|----------------|--|---|--|--|

**5. Contract Deliverables**

| L1                                 | L 2 | Definition  | Goal and Scoring   | Measure  |
|------------------------------------|-----|---|--|--|
| A. Timeliness of Deliverables      |     | Deliverables from Table C.3-1, Section C of the contract will be made on time.  | Percentage of deliverables on time.  | Excellent = 100%<br>Very Good = 96%-99%<br>Good = 90%-95%<br>Satisfactory = 80-89%<br>Unsatisfactory < 80% |
| B. Approvals                       |     | Quality of deliverables for approval.   | Measure will be first submittal approval percentage.                                 | Excellent ≥ 96%<br>Very Good = 95%-90%<br>Good = 89%-76%<br>Satisfactory = 75%-51%<br>Unsatisfactory ≤ 50% |
| C. Special Requests and data calls |     | Special requests will be handled on time  | Percentage of special requests completed on time.                                    | Excellent ≥ 96%<br>Very Good = 95%-90%<br>Good = 89%-76%<br>Satisfactory = 75%-51%<br>Unsatisfactory ≤ 50% |
| D. Books Closed                    |     | Previous month books closed accurately by the 10th of the following month. This will allow information to flow to project controls that will in turn be able to disseminate information for its monthly deliverables. | Measured in the number of days used to close the books each month, measured in days. | Excellent < 10 Days<br>Good = 10 Days<br>Unsatisfactory > 10 Days  |

**6. Quality and Timeliness of D&D Contractor Transition Support**

| L1          | L 2 | Definition                        | Goal and Scoring                                      | Measure                                       |
|-------------|-----|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| A. Desktops |     | Desktops established for D&D Team | Desktop will be deployed according to SLA - installed | Excellent ≤ 48 Hrs.<br>Very Good = 49-55 Hrs. |

|                         |  |  |  |   |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|---|
|                         |  |  | within 48 hours of request.<br>(Measured in hours).  | Good = 56-60 Hrs.<br>Satisfactory = 61-75 Hrs.<br>Unsatisfactory > 75 Hrs.                                  |
| B. Documentum           |  | Uptime/downtime of the Documentum system.  | The number of instances in a quarter that Documentum is not available or off line measured in unscheduled instances. | Excellent = 2<br>Very Good = 3<br>Good = 4<br>Satisfactory = 5<br>Unsatisfactory > 5                        |
| C. Clearance Processing |  | The ability to process and obtain all clearances granted prior to the effective date of the D&D contract work. | All identified clearances will be in an active status with the new D&D contractor on day one of the contract.        | Excellent = 100%<br>Very Good = 98%-99%<br>Good = 95%-97%<br>Satisfactory = 90%-94%<br>Unsatisfactory < 90% |

**7. Environmental Safety, Health, and Quality (ESH&Q) (All Performance Categories)**

| L1   | L 2 | Definition  | Goal and Scoring   | Measure  |
|--|-----|---|--|--|
| A. OSHA Total Recordable Case (TRC)                  |     | The number of OSHA Total Recordable Cases.                | This is Zero tolerance measure. A single violation will result in unsatisfactory scoring.                              | Excellent<br>Unsatisfactory  |
| B. Days Away Cases, Restricted or Transferred (DART) |     | The number of Days Away Cases, Restricted or Transferred. | This is Zero tolerance measure. A single violation will result in unsatisfactory scoring.                              | Excellent<br>Unsatisfactory  |
| C. Fleet Safety Events                               |     | The number of fleet safety events, Property Damage Only.  | One event per year.  | Excellent = 1<br>Very Good = 2<br>Good = 3<br>Satisfactory = 4<br>Unsatisfactory = 5 |
| D. ISMS  |     | Effective ISMS Implementation.                            | Measure is effectiveness of work control process and application of Lessons Learned as evaluated in DOE Surveillances. | Excellent<br>Very Good<br>Good<br>Satisfactory<br>Unsatisfactory                     |

|                         |  |  |   |   |
|-------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| E. DOE Oversight        |  | Responsiveness to DOE and other stakeholder feedback to issues identified. | Timely response and closure of items identified in DOE Surveillances.   | Excellent = 100%<br>Very Good = 98%-99%<br>Good = 95%-97%<br>Satisfactory = 90%-94%<br>Unsatisfactory < 90% |
| F. Contractor Oversight |  | Implementation of a contractor oversight program.                          | Measure is effectiveness of self identification/correction of issues, managing safety management challenges, and QA programs to prevent recurrences evaluated in DOE Surveillances. | Excellent<br>Very Good<br>Good<br>Satisfactory<br>Unsatisfactory  |
|                         |  |  |   |   |
|                         |  |  |   |   |

**FSF.25.01.03.05.11.01 Project Management**

| L1                    | L 2 | Definition  | Goal and Scoring  | Measure   |
|-----------------------|-----|---|---|---|
| A. Schedule Adherence |     | Percentage of projects that are executed in the planned time-frame based on its baseline. | Performance measure is the projects completed in its planned time frame.  | Excellent = 100%<br>Very Good = 96%-99%<br>Good = 90%-95%<br>Satisfactory = 80%-89%<br>Unsatisfactory < 80% |
| B. Cost               |     | Percentage of projects that are executed in the planned budget based on its baseline.     | Performance measure is the projects completed in its planned time budget. | Excellent = 100%<br>Very Good = 96%-99%<br>Good = 90%-95%<br>Satisfactory = 80%-89%<br>Unsatisfactory < 80% |
| C. Milestones         |     | Percent of milestones completed on time.  | Performance measure is the milestones completed on time.                  | Excellent = 100%<br>Very Good = 96%-99%<br>Good = 90%-95%<br>Satisfactory = 80%-89%<br>Unsatisfactory < 80% |

|                          |  |   |   |   |
|--------------------------|--|---|---|---|
|                          |  |   |   |   |
| D. Customer Satisfaction |  | Percent of projects meeting stakeholder expectations. | Performance measure is the number of projects meeting stakeholder expectations. | Excellent = 100%<br>Very Good = 96%-99%<br>Good = 90%-95%<br>Satisfactory = 80%-89%<br>Unsatisfactory < 80% |