

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN
(PEQAP)

“Training/Support Services for the
Office of Secure Transportation”
DE-RP04-02AL67577

26 July 2002

1. The Fee Determining Official (FDO) is the Director, Office of Secure Transportation (OST).
2. The Award Fee Board (AFB) consists of the following members:
 - a. Program Manager, Chairperson
 - b. At least three OST Program Specialist Members
 - c. Contracting Officer Representative, OST, Member
 - d. Contracting Officer, OCP, Member
3. In the event of the absence of the FDO, the individual acting in the same official capacity will assume the function of FDO. In the event of the absence of a board member, another person having similar qualifications may be substituted. Technical and functional experts, as required, may serve in an advisory capacity. These experts, if used, will not serve as voting members of the board.
4. The Performance Evaluation Quality Assurance Plan (PEQAP) may be unilaterally changed by Department of Energy pursuant to Clause H.23, entitled “Performance Evaluation QA Plan.” Changes will apply to subsequent award fee periods.
5. Formal evaluations will be made only at the end of award fee periods. Interim evaluations will not be used. This does not preclude normal contract monitoring activities and performance discussions with the contractor.
6. The award fee will be determined based on the contractor's evaluated performance during each award fee period. The first award fee period shall begin on contract award date and end six months later. Successive award fee periods shall follow in six-month increments in accordance with contract Clause H.22, entitled “Payment of Base and Award Fee,” until the end of the contract. The last award fee period shall be adjusted to coincide with the end of the contract.

COPY

7. The amount of award fee available for a given award fee period is as follows:

Maximum Award Fee:	TBD
<u>Evaluation Period-- Basic</u>	<u>\$ Amount</u>
1st Evaluation Period	TBD
2nd Evaluation Period	TBD
3rd Evaluation Period	TBD
4th Evaluation Period	TBD
5th Evaluation Period	TBD
6th Evaluation Period	TBD
<u>Evaluation Period—Option 1</u>	<u>\$ Amount</u>
7 th Evaluation Period	TBD
8 th Evaluation Period	TBD
<u>Evaluation Period—Option 2</u>	<u>\$ Amount</u>
9 th Evaluation Period	TBD
10 th Evaluation Period	TBD

Award fees available but not earned in one period will not be carried forward to subsequent award fee periods. The available award fee pool for the basic period is listed in Section B001 and the option periods in Section B002.

8. The following procedures will be used to determine the award fee earned:

- a. Within ten (10) calendar days after the end of each evaluation period, the contractor may provide to the AFB Chairperson a written self-assessment of performance during the period, and, at the FDO's request, the contractor will provide an oral briefing of the self-assessment. The self-assessment should discuss major accomplishments or progress made in any Subtask or Management Performance Categories/Items during the period. The self-assessment may also discuss other accomplishments deemed worthy of consideration during the performance period. The self-assessment should also include the contractor's self-assessment of its weaknesses and areas where improvement is needed.
- b. Within twenty (20) calendar days after the end of each evaluation period, the AFB shall meet to evaluate the contractor's performance during that period. The AFB shall use the criteria outlined in Attachment No. 1 and the contractor's self-assessment. The AFB shall evaluate the contractor's self-assessment and consider its realism as part of their evaluation of the contractor's performance. The thoroughness and candor of the report will be considered by the AFB and the FDO as an indicator of the degree to which the contractor seeks out problems and solutions, and as an indicator of the contractor's understanding of contract issues. The board may use any person it deems necessary as an advisor to assist in evaluating the contractor's performance. All data items submitted during and/or for an evaluation period will be used to evaluate the contractor's performance in that period. While it is recognized that the method of evaluation will be to

evaluate against the subtask performance criteria, the FDO may also consider any information available to him or her which relates to the contractor's performance of contract requirements.

- c. Within thirty (30) calendar days after the end of each evaluation period, the FDO shall:
 - (1) Unilaterally determine the percentage of available award fee earned; and
 - (2) Notify the contractor and the Contracting Officer (CO), in writing, of his decision along with an evaluation of the contractor's performance as measured against the award fee criteria. Interim evaluations will not be used.
 - d. Within thirty (30) calendar days after receiving written notification from the FDO, the CO will unilaterally amend the contract to authorize payment of any fee awarded by the FDO. Provisional payment of potential award fee will be made in accordance with Clause H.22, *PAYMENT OF BASE AND AWARD FEE*, of the contract. In the event that the FDO determines the contractor's performance to be unacceptable in any area of contract performance, as specified in the PEQAP, the FDO may at his/her discretion determine the contractor's overall performance to be unacceptable. Accordingly, the FDO may withhold the entire award fee for the evaluation period. The decision of the FDO shall be final.
- 9.
- a. Each subtask will be evaluated using the subtask performance criteria. The total of the Task Performance Categories A and B will account for 85 percent of the total award fee percentage and the total of Categories C for 15 percent of the total award fee percentage.
 - b. Fee will not be awarded on a Total Weight Rating below 71. The Range of Incentive Effectiveness is shown at the end of this plan in the Award Fee Application Chart depicting the percentages of available award fee against the total weighted score.

COPY

**CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION QUALITY ASSURANCE REPORT
SERVICE/SUB-SERVICE AREA PERFORMANCE CATEGORIES**

Ratings
 Outstanding (96 - 100)
 Good (86 - 95)
 Satisfactory (80 - 85)
 Marginal (71 - 79)
 Unsatisfactory (0 - 70)

Date _____
 Contract No. _____
 Contractor _____

CATEGORY	CRITERIA	RATING POINTS	WEIGHTING FACTOR	WEIGHTED POINTS
A	QUALITY OF WORK			
	A1 Thoroughness and Accuracy of Work	_____	X .15	_____
	A2 Technical Competence	_____	X .15	_____
	A3 Independence and Initiative	_____	X .15	_____
	A4 Liaison Effectiveness	_____	X .15	_____
B	TIME OF DELIVERY			
	B1 Adherence to Plan Schedule	_____	X .25	_____
C	COST EFFICIENCY			
	C1 Utilization of Resources	_____	X .15	_____

TOTAL WEIGHTED RATING _____

Rated by: _____

Signature: _____

Note: Provide supporting data and/or justification for below satisfactory or outstanding item ratings. (All ratings initially start at SATISFACTORY)

COPY

A: QUALITY OF WORK	Unsatisfactory (0-70)	Marginal (71-79)	Satisfactory (80-85)	Good (86-95)	Outstanding (96-100)	Reference to PWS
(A-1) Thoroughness and Accuracy of Work	Work (i.e., Training Program Support activities, the property management program, and logistical support), is incomplete, inaccurate according to guidance, difficult to understand and does not meet minimum requirements as outlined in the PWS.	Work (i.e., Training Program Support activities, the property management program, and logistical support), is complete and is adherent to guidance; however, further discussions and revisions are necessary to clarify work and to meet minimum requirements as outlined in the PWS.	Work (i.e., Training Program Support activities, the property management program, and logistical support), is complete, and meets minimum requirements as outlined in the PWS.	Work (i.e., Training Program Support activities, the property management program, and logistical support), is well organized, is complete and in accordance with guidance and requirements as outlined in the PWS.	Work (i.e., Training Program Support activities, the property management program, and logistical support), is consistently exceptionally organized and understandable, incorporates data/analyses and related activities/issues outlined in the PWS.	4.2 4.3 5.1 5.1.2 5.2.1 5.2.2 5.2.3 5.2.4 5.3

COPY

A: QUALITY OF WORK	Unsatisfactory (0-70)	Marginal (71-79)	Satisfactory (80-85)	Good (86-95)	Outstanding (96-100)	Reference to PWS
(A-2) Technical Competence	Technical performance (i.e., analysis, design, development, implementation & evaluation of training programs, logistics, shipping, receiving, storage, equipment operators, armorers, quality assurance) shows no initiative. Technical effort is fragmented with little attempt to coordinate activities.	Technical performance (i.e., analysis, design, development, implementation & evaluation of training programs, logistics, shipping, receiving, storage, equipment operators, armorers, quality assurance) of the contractor indicates non-cognizance of program requirements. Frequent review of technical performance, surveillance of processes, and revisions to work products by DOE are required.	Technical performance (i.e., analysis, design, development, implementation & evaluation of training programs, logistics, shipping, receiving, storage, equipment operators, armorers, quality assurance) of the contractor indicates cognizance and adherence to program requirements and subtasks. Problems and resolution are promptly identified.	The technical performance (i.e., analysis, design, development, implementation & evaluation of training programs, logistics, shipping, receiving, storage, equipment operators, armorers, quality assurance) activities are well structured and coordinated work is highly professional and outputs are accurate and require little change or explanation.	The overall quality of performance and competence (i.e., analysis, design, development, implementation & evaluation of training programs, logistics, shipping, receiving, storage, equipment operators, armorers, quality assurance) is of high caliber and consistently exceeds the requirements of the PWS. The contractor identifies and recommends solutions independent of DOE assistance.	4.2 4.3 5.1 5.1.2 5.2.1 5.2.2 5.2.3 5.2.4 5.3

COPY

A: QUALITY OF WORK	Unsatisfactory (0-70)	Marginal (71-79)	Satisfactory (80-85)	Good (86-95)	Outstanding (96-100)	Reference - Para. # to SOW
(A-3) Independence and Initiative	Contractor requires constant monitoring and surveillance in order to maintain project schedules of all tasks and programs. There is no initiative to independently resolve issues and expects DOE to establish priorities to satisfy program needs.	The contractor requires occasional prompting to maintain project schedules of tasks and programs. There is some initiative to independently resolve issues and there is some expectation for DOE resolution of most problems.	The contractor displays interest and desire to maintain project schedules, maintain consistency and integrity of tasks and programs. There is initiative to independently resolve issues to satisfy programs needs with assistance and direction of DOE.	The contractor independently maintains schedules, maintains consistency and integrity of all programs when completing tasks and projects, with minimal direction by DOE. Work demonstrates creativity and initiative to accomplish project goals.	The contractor independently develops and maintains schedules, which are consistent with program responsibilities. The contractor develops lessons learned to identify problem areas and resolves issues independently of DOE. Highly creative in meeting project goals.	4.2 4.3 5.1 5.1.2 5.2.1 5.2.2 5.2.3 5.2.4 5.3
(A-4) Liaison Effectiveness (Customer Interface)	Displays indifference to liaison requirements relative to all program responsibilities (i.e, coordinating with federal, state, and local agencies, other contractors, etc). There is no evidence of customer or coordination interface activities to meet program requirements.	Satisfactory interface (i.e, coordinating with federal, state, local agencies, other contractors etc.) is dependent on DOE to force resolution of problems. Contractor provides no constructive recommendation(s) to subcontractors, vendors, or federal, state, and local agencies, etc.	Maintains interface (i.e, coordinating with federal, state, local agencies, other contractors, etc) relative to all program responsibilities. Contractor is dependent on DOE for resolving some problems, however, provides recommendation(s).	Maintains independent contract & customer interface (i.e, coordinating with federal, state, local agencies, other contractors, etc.) relative to all program responsibilities. The contractor provides timely communications. Provides constructive recommendation(s) to problems with minimal assistance from DOE.	Maintains exceptional interface (i.e, coordinating with federal, state, local agencies, other contractors, etc), relative to all program areas. The contractor independently develops new communication avenues and consistently keeps all contacts informed of program relative activities. The contractor ensures all liaison activities are coordinated timely, and independently provides constructive recommendation(s) to resolve problems and issues.	4.2 4.3 5.1 5.1.2 5.2.1 5.2.2 5.2.3 5.2.4 5.3

COPY

B: TIME OF DELIVERY	Unsatisfactory (0-70)	Marginal (71-79)	Satisfactory (80-85)	Good (86-95)	Outstanding (96-100)	Reference - Para. # to SOW
(B-1) Adherence to Plan Schedule	Contractor consistently provides late deliverables, which significantly impact all program requirements. No efforts are made to resolve schedule maintenance problems.	Late deliverables require DOE participation to minimize impact on program requirements. The contractor is not proactive to resolve lack of maintaining schedules and commitments.	Meets planned schedules and commitments with negotiated delays, which have no impact on the overall program requirements. The contractor resolves schedule maintenance issues as they arise and which may affect future activities.	Meets originally planned schedules without any negotiated delays, meets all tasks and program requirements.	Accurate and complete quality products and support are provided ahead of schedule, thereby exceeding program requirements.	4.3 5.1 5.2 5.3

COPY

C: COST EFFICIENCY	Unsatisfactory (0-70)	Marginal (71-79)	Satisfactory (80-85)	Good (86-95)	Outstanding (96-100)	Reference - Para. # to SOW
(C-1) Utilization of Resources	Staffing types and levels, and overall cost control activities are not managed to meet required support activities efficiently.	Staffing types and levels appear appropriate and overall cost controls seem evident, but no resource management processes are in implemented to actively manage and meet activities efficiently.	Staffing types and levels, and funds management processes are performed, and provided to DOE/AL Project Manager to ensure effective utilization of resources, while not affecting the accomplishment of required support activities.	Staffing types and levels, and funds management programs identifies milestones for periodic reviews of staffing levels and costs. Resource management activities ensure accomplishment of minimum project and support activities.	The resource management program resulted in cost savings, identifies milestones for periodic reviews of staffing levels and costs, and ensures the effective and efficient utilization of resources, while meeting or exceeding program requirements.	Overall PWS

COPY

AWARD FEE APPLICATION CHART

Score RATING		% of Award Fee Pool
100	Outstanding	100
99	Outstanding	99
98	Outstanding	98
97	Outstanding	97
96	Outstanding	96
95	Good	94
94	Good	92
93	Good	90
92	Good	88
91	Good	86
90	Good	84
89	Good	82
88	Good	80
87	Good	78
86	Good	76
85	Satisfactory	72
84	Satisfactory	68
83	Satisfactory	64
82	Satisfactory	60
81	Satisfactory	55
80	Satisfactory	50
79	Marginal	45
78	Marginal	40
77	Marginal	35
76	Marginal	30
75	Marginal	25
74	Marginal	20
73	Marginal	15
72	Marginal	10
71	Marginal	5
70	Unsatisfactory	0
0		

COPY