

ATTACHMENT J-4

Mission Support Contract Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

The Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan (PEMP) details the administration of performance incentives and allocation of total available fee as defined in Section B, Supplies or Services and Prices/Costs.

1. PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Each performance measure will set forth the specific requirements, criteria and/or specifications for acceptable performance of an outcome and the amount of fee assigned to the individual performance measure.

2. ALLOCATION OF AVAILABLE FEE

Because the services to be determined under this contract directly support the mission contractors and because such services are integral to the environmental cleanup mission at Hanford, DOE will heavily weight the assignment of fee toward efficient and effective provision of Hanford Site services and infrastructure; right-sizing to meet the mission needs over the life cycle of Hanford cleanup; and sustained excellence and enhanced effectiveness of integrated safety, security, health, and environmental protection.

3. PERFORMANCE MEASURE FEE STRUCTURE METHODS

Each performance measure may have a distinct fee structure to incentivize maximum performance and resource utilization by the contractor. Individual performance measures may require the contractor to exceed approved baseline performance to earn 100 percent (%) of the fee allocated to that performance measure. DOE is not limited to the following list of fee structure methods and may combine elements of multiple fee structures. Regardless of the fee structure method used, payment of fee is subject to the fee reduction terms of this contract, and fee determining official (FDO) approval that the contractor has achieved the stated outcome for the specific performance measure.

- (a) Straight-line Method: This method provides a 100% incremental fee for completion of the performance measure prior to the expiration of the contract period.
- (b) Declining Method: This method provides 100% incremental fee for completion of the performance measure by a specific date and/or milestone, but the percentage is reduced incrementally beyond that event. The specific percentage of reduction and corresponding time or specific milestones triggering the reductions are defined within the performance measure.
- (c) Terminal Method: This method provides 100% incremental fee for completion of the performance measure prior to a specific date and/or milestone; however, the contractor will forfeit 100% of the fee allocated to the performance measure for completion of the performance measure after the passing of the specific date and/or milestone as defined within the performance measure.

- (d) Performance Measure Provisional Dependent Method: This method provides the contractor the opportunity to earn only provisional fee until completion of a specific milestone, a separate performance measure or multiple performance measures, upon which the fee becomes progress or final. For example, the contractor may complete performance measure 1, earn 90% of the fee as provisional, then complete performance measure 2 and earn the associated fee for performance measure 2, as well as convert the provisional fee earned for performance measure 1 to an incremental fee.
 - (e) Subjective Method: This method provides the contractor the opportunity to earn up to 100% fee for performance of contract requirements based on subjective criteria as determined by DOE.
 - (f) Target Method: This method provides for the initially negotiated fee to be adjusted later by a formula based on the relationship of performance measures against the baseline. This method specifies a target baseline performance, a target fee, minimum and maximum fees, and a fee adjustment formula. After performance, the fee payable is determined in accordance with the formula. The formula provides, within limits, for increases in fee above target fee when baseline performance is exceeded, and decreases in fee below target fee when baseline performance is not achieved. This increase or decrease is intended to provide an incentive for the contractor to manage the contract effectively.
4. The following tables summarize the contract work requirements that may become fee-bearing via performance measures.

Table 4.1, Fee Distribution Table

Performance Incentive			Maximum Available Fee Percentage
1.0	Meet First-Year Performance Commitments (20%)		
	1.1	Complete Commitments by September 2010	
	1.1a	Portfolio Analysis Center	4%
	1.1b	Redundant MSA IT Systems	4%
	1.1c	WiMax	4%
	1.1d	Emergency Telecommunications	4%
	1.1e	Protective Strategy for Interim Storage Area	4%
2.0	Productivity Improvement and Reinvestment (20%)		
	2.1	FY 2010 Savings Wedge	10%
	2.2	Multiyear Project Delivery	
	2.2a	Supporting the 2015 Vision	2%
	2.2b	Green Energy	2%
	2.2c	Hanford Road System	2%
	2.2d	Crane and Rigging	2%
	2.2e	HAMMER Training and Education Center	2%
3.0	Infrastructure Services and Alignment Plan (15%)		
	3.1	Infrastructure Services and Alignment Plan	15%
4.0	Sustain Performance Excellence (30%)		
	4.1	Sustain Performance Excellence	
	4.1a	Performance Excellence	15%
	4.1b	Portfolio Management	2.5%
	4.1c	Unclassified Cyber Security	1%
	4.1d	Contract Modification Proposals	1.5%
	4.2	Safe Operations	
	4.2a	EMS	1%
	4.2b	ISM	5%
	4.2c	Common Safety Processes	3%
	4.2d	Site-wide Programs	.5

Performance Incentive				Maximum Available Fee Percentage
		4.2e	Hanford Site Chronic Beryllium Disease Prevention Program	.5
5.0	Establish and Meet Service Level Requirements (15%)			
	5.1	Service Delivery Bases		
		5.1a	Service Delivery Plans Alignment	5%
		5.1b	Service Level Agreements Performance	10%

Table 4.2, Fee-Bearing Performance Measures

OBJECTIVE	OUTCOMES	PERFORMANCE MEASURES	INTERIM MILESTONES (No fee will be paid for achievement of interim milestones; fee is dependent upon completion and acceptance criteria)	COMPLETION CRITERIA	ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA/ EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS	TOTAL AVAILABLE FEE
<p><i>Fee determination and payment will be made in accordance with the Section B clause entitled Fee Determination and Payment. The completion criteria for objective measures consist of the completion of specified activities. The completion criteria for subjective measures are focused on the achievement of high-level strategies, outcomes, and envisioned end states. The evaluation of all measures will include a subjective determination regarding quality and effectiveness.</i></p>						
<p>1.0: Meet FY 2010 Performance Initiatives</p>	<p>Complete FY 2010 performance initiatives¹ selected by DOE in accordance with Section B, Supplies or Services and Prices/Costs, or as directed by the contracting officer.</p>	<p>Performance Measure 1.1: Evaluation Criteria, Complete Initiatives by September 2010 [no individual weighting]</p>				<p>20%</p>
		<p>a. Stand up a portfolio analysis center and implement the OMEGA framework, tools, and methods to assist in Hanford sitewide strategic planning and performance documentation through visualization that demonstrates actual completed work, progress milestones, issues and risk management, and regulatory progress.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete development of the Integrated Hanford Life Cycle Cleanup Plan (utilizing the OMEGA framework) and installation of a portfolio analysis center by April 15, 2010. • Utilize the plan and a portfolio analysis center to support federal performance analysis and sitewide budget simulation process to visualize actual work completed, milestones achieved, issue resolution, risk management, and regulatory progress from April 15, 2010 to September 30, 2010. • Utilize Hanford Life Cycle Cleanup Plan tools to perform strategic planning for scope, schedule, and cost optimization using phased approach from October 15, 2009 to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated complete operational capabilities of a portfolio analysis center by September 30, 2010. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stood up a portfolio analysis center that supported the development of each of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ An Integrated Hanford Life Cycle Cleanup Plan. ○ A mission needs analysis that identified strategic or project integration gaps in mission execution capabilities. ○ A sitewide budget simulation process that analyzes the impact of changes in scope and budget. ○ Sitewide presentations and reports for RL, ORP, HQ, and the public. ○ Documents that require regulatory and stakeholder approval. ○ Tools and techniques for performing simulations, optimization, and visualization to support life cycle baseline planning that enables DOE to respond to dynamic and frequent changes in scope, schedule, cost, budget, contractor performance, technical direction, and regulatory requirements. 	

¹ A number of the performance initiatives were derived from MSA's final proposal received on May 12, 2008.

OBJECTIVE	OUTCOMES	PERFORMANCE MEASURES	INTERIM MILESTONES (No fee will be paid for achievement of interim milestones; fee is dependent upon completion and acceptance criteria)	COMPLETION CRITERIA	ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA/ EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS	TOTAL AVAILABLE FEE
			September 30, 2010. • Provide monthly status progress.			
		b. Identify and eliminate 20% of redundant MSA IT systems in the first year based on the Hanford Information System inventory; migrate data from Hanford Document Control System, Engineering Drawing Maintenance System, data tracking and accountability, and site drawing file to the new Document Management and Control System (DMCS) application, and configure DMCS to transmit engineering drawings to Integrated Document Management System (IDMS) for retention as the electronic records copy.	• Provide quarterly reports on the progress of the system elimination and the DMCS project status by January 15, April 15, July 15, and October 15, 2010.	• Reported the 20% reduction of redundant systems. • Demonstrated operations of the DMCS application. • Demonstrated operations of the IDMS-hosted engineering drawings system by September 30, 2010.	• Eliminated 20% of the redundant MSA IT systems. • Eliminated all data systems referenced in the performance measure through implementation of the DMCS. • Validated that all site drawing files were migrated to the new DMCS application, and that the DMCS was configured to transmit engineering drawings to IDMS.	
		c. Extend the WiMax capabilities to implement a scalable and distributed wireless phone/computer network system with coverage in the Central Plateau.	• Prepare and provide a WiMax implementation plan by December 31, 2009. Provide progress reports by January 15, April 15, July 15, and October 15, 2010.	• Demonstrated that there is extended WiMax coverage in the Central Plateau by September 30, 2010.	• Implemented the WiMax schedule implementation plan in the Central Plateau. • Provided 95% HLAN accessibility in the Central Plateau. • Validated the extent of WiMax coverage through propagation mapping and RL field strength testing.	

OBJECTIVE	OUTCOMES	PERFORMANCE MEASURES	INTERIM MILESTONES (No fee will be paid for achievement of interim milestones; fee is dependent upon completion and acceptance criteria)	COMPLETION CRITERIA	ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA/ EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS	TOTAL AVAILABLE FEE
		d. Implement fully redundant emergency telecommunications to the Patrol Operations Center 911, federal telephone system, and the local telephone companies to mitigate the risk identified in the telecommunications service section of the Documented Residual Risk and Plan of Action and Milestone Report, Attachment 6, Common Control System Security Plan for Richland Hanford HLAN Richland, WA.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide quarterly reports on the project progress by January 15, April 15, July 15, and October 15, 2010. • Document project completion and provide a full report against the Residual Risk Plan, Attachment 6, Common Control System Security Plan. • Complete a readiness review on the redundant emergency telecommunications system, identify and disposition operational issues by September 15, 2010. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implemented a fully redundant emergency telecommunications system that is operational by September 30, 2010. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designed, fabricated, and tested a fully redundant emergency telecommunications system. • Completed a successful readiness review on the redundant emergency telecommunications system. • Identified and corrected all operational issues. • Commenced operation by the end of the fiscal year. 	
		e. Deploy and demonstrate a compliant and effective protective strategy for the Interim Storage Area (ISA).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transmittal of the management self-assessment of safeguards and security readiness to assume operations at the ISA by September 17, 2009. • Receipt from DOE prior to September 30, 2009, approval of the ISA as a protected area. • Transmittal to DOE by May 30, 2010, of the ISA vulnerability assessment that documents the protection effectiveness offered to significant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed vulnerability assessment (including JCATS and force-on-force results) and effective protection strategy for the ISA by September 30, 2010. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided a vulnerability assessment on the ISA that validates that the protection effectiveness is at the high category and demonstrates compliance and effectiveness as required in DOE O 470.3B and DOE M 470.4-1 Change 1, Section C. 	

OBJECTIVE	OUTCOMES	PERFORMANCE MEASURES	INTERIM MILESTONES (No fee will be paid for achievement of interim milestones; fee is dependent upon completion and acceptance criteria)	COMPLETION CRITERIA	ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA/ EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS	TOTAL AVAILABLE FEE																									
			security interest located at the ISA. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a schedule documenting the preparation of the ISA vulnerability assessment will be provided to DOE SES monthly status. The vulnerability assessment will be provided upon completion of the action. 																												
2.0: Productivity Improvement and Reinvestment	Implement productivity improvements to create a savings wedge to fund additional project deliveries.	Performance Measure 2.1: Evaluation Criteria, FY 2010 Savings Wedge [no individual weighting]				20%																									
		Reduce MSC's total cost by \$9M during FY 2010. By implementing productivity improvements in key service areas, utilizing the contract as awarded as a base, MSA will create a savings wedge to perform additional site infrastructure and services projects per the infrastructure reliability priority project list (IRPPL) that are key to the cleanup mission while meeting requirements of Objective 5.0. MSA is responsible for total performance of Objective 2.0, including selecting the specific approaches and methods to perform these cost savings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify top service area projects that will undergo Lean Six Sigma productivity improvement processes or other cost savings initiatives that reduce FY 2010 costs by \$9M for approval by DOE by December 31, 2009. Provide status reports on progress of project improvements and cost savings on a quarterly basis. Report will include documentation of Lean Six Sigma process improvement analysis, implementation plan of suggested projects, results of projects implemented and analysis of actual costs savings by January 15, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implemented cost reduction/Lean Six Sigma productivity projects to reduce total cost by \$9M by September 30, 2010. Provided documentation demonstrating total cost reduction of \$9M that is easily validated by DOE audit personnel. Provided documentation demonstrating that cost savings have been made available to site infrastructure and services projects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identified projects and initiatives supporting cost reduction and provided documentation showing total cost reduction of \$9M that was readily and successfully validated by DOE personnel. <p>Note: Percentage of fee earned is based on amount of cost savings achieved:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1516 1029 1852 1419"> <thead> <tr> <th>Cost Savings</th> <th>Percent of Fee</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>\$9M</td><td>10%</td></tr> <tr><td>\$8.5M</td><td>9%</td></tr> <tr><td>\$8M</td><td>8%</td></tr> <tr><td>\$7.5M</td><td>7%</td></tr> <tr><td>\$7M</td><td>6%</td></tr> <tr><td>\$6.5M</td><td>5%</td></tr> <tr><td>\$6M</td><td>4%</td></tr> <tr><td>\$5.5M</td><td>3%</td></tr> <tr><td>\$5M</td><td>2.5%</td></tr> <tr><td>\$4.5M</td><td>2%</td></tr> <tr><td>\$4M</td><td>1.5%</td></tr> <tr><td>\$3.5M</td><td>1%</td></tr> <tr><td>\$3M</td><td>.5%</td></tr> </tbody> </table>		Cost Savings	Percent of Fee	\$9M	10%	\$8.5M	9%	\$8M	8%	\$7.5M	7%	\$7M	6%	\$6.5M	5%	\$6M	4%	\$5.5M	3%	\$5M	2.5%	\$4.5M	2%	\$4M	1.5%	\$3.5M
Cost Savings	Percent of Fee																														
\$9M	10%																														
\$8.5M	9%																														
\$8M	8%																														
\$7.5M	7%																														
\$7M	6%																														
\$6.5M	5%																														
\$6M	4%																														
\$5.5M	3%																														
\$5M	2.5%																														
\$4.5M	2%																														
\$4M	1.5%																														
\$3.5M	1%																														
\$3M	.5%																														

OBJECTIVE	OUTCOMES	PERFORMANCE MEASURES	INTERIM MILESTONES (No fee will be paid for achievement of interim milestones; fee is dependent upon completion and acceptance criteria)	COMPLETION CRITERIA	ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA/ EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS	TOTAL AVAILABLE FEE
			April 15, July 15, and October 15, 2010.			
Performance Measure 2.2: Evaluation Criteria, Multiyear Project Delivery [no individual weighting]						
		a. Develop feasible infrastructure and information technology (IT) projects from the IRPPL that support the 2015 Hanford Site cleanup vision and mission support risk-based strategic plans, and deliver these projects to optimize portfolio life cycle costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By December 31, 2009, identify FY 2010 prioritized infrastructure and IT projects from the IRPPL that are commensurate with the ISAP. Create a draft list of prioritized projects for FY 2011 to FY 2015, aligned with the ISAP by July 1, 2010. Provide quarterly status reports on progress of prioritized projects by January 15, April 15, July 15, and October 15, 2010. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delivered infrastructure and IT projects that support the 2015 Hanford Site cleanup vision by September 30, 2010. Apply reinvestment savings to IRPPL ready-to-implement projects within 30 calendar days of when savings are realized and reported in the quarterly status report. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completed infrastructure and IT projects from the IRPPL that supported the Hanford 2015 cleanup vision for the Central Plateau and River Corridor within schedule and cost. 	
		b. Develop viable green energy, energy management projects, and other initiatives in response to the Secretary's initiatives and Executive Order 13423, Strengthening Federal Environmental, Energy, and Transportation Management, and deliver these projects to optimize portfolio energy use.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify FY 2010 prioritized energy management projects and initiatives by December 31, 2009. Identify a list of prioritized energy management projects/Initiatives for FY11 to FY15 by July 1, 2010. Provide quarterly status reports on progress of prioritized projects by January 15, April 15, July 15, and October 15, 2010. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implemented FY 2010 identified energy management projects and initiatives by September 30, 2010. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completed FY 2010 projects and initiatives that met one or more of the goals delineated in EO 13423, Section 2, Goals for Agencies, paragraphs (a) through (h). Completed FY 2010 identified energy management projects and initiatives per project schedules and costs. 	

OBJECTIVE	OUTCOMES	PERFORMANCE MEASURES	INTERIM MILESTONES (No fee will be paid for achievement of interim milestones; fee is dependent upon completion and acceptance criteria)	COMPLETION CRITERIA	ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA/ EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS	TOTAL AVAILABLE FEE
		c. Configure and align the Hanford road system for successful completion of 2015 Hanford Site cleanup activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submit a Hanford roads project package consisting of preliminary design, project number(s), schedule, and ROM estimates in a risk-based, prioritized spreadsheet demonstrating above- and below-the-line funding allocations by March 18, 2010. • Provide quarterly Hanford roads project status reports by April 15, July 15, and October 15, 2010. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed approved FY 2010 road system projects by September 30, 2010. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided road system configuration decision information by March 18 that supports 2015 cleanup activities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Developed, coordinated, and reviewed project list with other site contractors. ○ Provided a schedule and ROM estimates for the listed projects. ○ Prioritized the project list and delineated above-the-line projects. • Designed, constructed, and completed above-the-line projects as reflected in the March 18 project schedule on schedule and within cost. • Incorporated road system configuration into the ISAP. 	
		d. Demonstrate improved performance of crane and rigging service delivery,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submit quarterly reports by January 15, April 15, July 15, and October 15, 2010. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated improvements in crane system and crew availability by September 30, 2010. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achieved 80% crane system and crew availability. 	
		e. Operate the Volpentest HAMMER Training and Education Center to support training requirements for completion of ARRA work and the 2015 Hanford Site cleanup activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The facilities, equipment, instructors, and training programs for required standardized training as defined in the J-3 table, are in place to provide 98% of the scheduled training sessions. • Submit quarterly reports by January 15, April 15, July 15, and October 15, 2010, documenting the status of the metric. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated with a statistical basis that the facility, equipment, instructors, and training programs for required standardized training, as defined in the J-3 table, are in place to provide 98% of the scheduled training sessions, excluding unforeseen weather impacts, utility and infrastructure outages, medical emergencies, cancellations due to low enrollment, or other exigent circumstances. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executed 98% of standardized scheduled training as defined in the J-3 table. 	

OBJECTIVE	OUTCOMES	PERFORMANCE MEASURES	INTERIM MILESTONES (No fee will be paid for achievement of interim milestones; fee is dependent upon completion and acceptance criteria)	COMPLETION CRITERIA	ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA/ EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS	TOTAL AVAILABLE FEE
3.0: Infrastructure Services and Alignment Plan	Deliver an Infrastructure Services and Alignment Plan (ISAP) that provides for a convincing and credible roadmap to achieve transformational change, and net annual and life cycle cost reductions, in performing contract requirements.	Performance Measure 3.1: Evaluation Criteria, Infrastructure Services and Alignment Plan [no individual weighting]				10%
		Deliver an ISAP that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishes a framework for management, operational, technical, and safety excellence • Identifies gaps in current and future infrastructure needs and develops solutions to close these gaps, including implementation plans. • Identifies innovations to deliver on proposal and meets Statement of Work requirements with a credible schedule for successful implementation and demonstration. • Creates a forward-thinking business model for operating, maintaining, and investing that meets contract requirements and enables cost savings and reinvestments. • Implements a service delivery model that creates a scalable approach to operate and optimize infrastructure and service delivery, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft framework developed and reviewed with DOE by October 29, 2009. • Identify solutions to address service level gaps by December 15, 2009. • Submit final framework to DOE by December 15, 2009. • Identify technological and performance innovations that right-size the infrastructure and services with an activity-based, logic-linked schedule for implementation by January 7, 2010. • Develop draft business model and review with DOE by January 15, 2010. • Develop required implementation plan(s) to close gaps, including opportunities for Lean Six Sigma evaluations by January 29, 2010. • Draft ISAP developed and reviewed with DOE by January 29, 2010. • Update service delivery documents (SDDs) (as required) to further define J-3 services by May 13, 2010. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitted ISAP to DOE by March 1, 2010, that included the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Identified gaps in current and projected future infrastructure needs including strategies to close these gaps with implementation plans. ○ Innovations. ○ Business model. ○ Service delivery model. • Implemented service delivery model by September 30, 2010. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed, maintained, and updated a master ISAP that incorporates the Hanford Site strategic vision and describes the activities necessary to integrate MSC responsibilities with those of other Hanford Site (mission) contractors, to right-size the infrastructure and services, and to maintain the capacity of infrastructure systems provided for the Hanford Site over its life cycle. • Provided tactical-level information to successfully achieve MSC outcomes while minimizing the Hanford Site's life cycle costs. • Included an approach for taking advantage of new technologies and business practices that make good business sense from a safety, compliance, cost-effectiveness and energy-efficiency perspective. • Incorporated the annual forecast of services and infrastructures of needed utilities, services and infrastructure from other site contractors. • Developed and submitted to DOE-RL a 300 Area facility disposition business case analysis for the most effective means to transfer functions and evacuate buildings 3790, 339A, 3220, 3507, 3506C, 3709A, 3709B, and three emergency sirens. • Submitted an IR/CM infrastructure scalability solution and implementation plan for DOE approval that complied with the Clinger-Cohen Act, OMB A-11, A-300 and all applicable Federal IT requirements, and was aligned with the annual Capital Investment Plan. • Identified a schedule for implementing all innovations that identifies logic-linked activities, basis of estimate-derived durations, is 	

OBJECTIVE	OUTCOMES	PERFORMANCE MEASURES	INTERIM MILESTONES (No fee will be paid for achievement of interim milestones; fee is dependent upon completion and acceptance criteria)	COMPLETION CRITERIA	ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA/ EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS	TOTAL AVAILABLE FEE
		including rapid realignment to right-size infrastructure and services.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop required service level agreements by July 30, 2010. Develop metrics to assess service delivery performance by August 27, 2010. 		resource-loaded, with risks identified, and associated contingencies. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provided cost-benefit analysis for innovations. Provided a business model. Completed all signed SDDs for J-3 services, including all aspects stated in the Interface Management Plan, in particular, scalable service delivery, SLAs, and capability to readily right-size infrastructure and services. Identified and documented gaps between November 5, 2009, performance measurement baseline (PMB) and ISAP and developed a path forward strategy to bridge the gaps. 	
4.0: Sustain Performance Excellence	Demonstrate management, operational, technical, and safety excellence and continuous improvement through effective planning, organization, leadership, coordination, integration, and control of the required resources, activities, and interfaces.	Performance Measure 4.1: Evaluation Criteria, Sustain Performance Excellence [no individual weighting]				30%
		a. Demonstrate performance excellence through service delivery by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developing solutions that provide for optimal delivery of services across the Hanford Site. Coordinating and integrate resources, activities, and interfaces to maximize benefit to the Hanford Site. Controlling scope, schedule, cost, quality, and risk to manage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review and provide updated performance metrics/service levels in each of the five (5) functional areas used to evaluate performance of services delivered and the physical condition of infrastructure and utilities, including systems and equipment necessary for the life cycle of Hanford cleanup by April 15, 2010.² Develop the MSA parent organization customer survey that addresses each component of 4.1a-d as it relates to the desired outcomes by January 31, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developed updated performance metrics by April 15, 2010. Met 95% of established performance goals from MSA parent organization survey improvement plan on time by September 30, 2010. Passed an RL independent review by October 15, 2010. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developed updated performance metrics/service levels in each of the five functional areas and the mission support general performance requirements used to evaluate performance of services delivered and the physical condition of infrastructure and utilities, including systems and equipment necessary for the life cycle of Hanford cleanup. These metrics addressed requirements necessary for safe, compliant, cost-effective, and energy-efficient operations. Passed an RL independent assessment to determine the sufficiency of MSA parent survey and MSA performance metrics. The RL assessment was conducted to verify the extent to which MSA accomplished the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documented the performance measurement system (e.g., performance metrics, service level metrics, and safety 	

² Initial set of metrics was provided in a letter from MSA dated October 15, 2009.

OBJECTIVE	OUTCOMES	PERFORMANCE MEASURES	INTERIM MILESTONES (No fee will be paid for achievement of interim milestones; fee is dependent upon completion and acceptance criteria)	COMPLETION CRITERIA	ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA/ EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS	TOTAL AVAILABLE FEE
		infrastructure and service delivery. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintaining relationships with DOE, customers, and stakeholders based on open, honest, and effective communication. 	2010. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document, analyze, and publish the results of the MSA parent organization survey; develop an improvement plan for areas of lower than desired response; and establish performance goals by April 15, 2010. Measure against performance goals and report on a quarterly basis by July 15 and October 15, 2010. Submit a quarterly report that details the Lean Six Sigma quality events, training and staff improvement measures, outreach and communications efforts, service delivery aspects, and coordination activities by January 15, April 15, July 15, and October 15, 2010. 		metrics), baseline performance data, and operational performance that demonstrated management, operational, technical, and safety excellence. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reported an analysis of performance, improvement targets, and strategies. Reported performance trend data. Documented achievement of performance metrics along with associated performance goals. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrated effective communications through DOE customer feedback of DOE, customers, and stakeholders. 	
		b. Provide timely and quality products to DOE under Portfolio Management.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop performance metrics and establish performance goals for Portfolio Management by December 31, 2009. Review Portfolio Management performance monthly with DOE. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met requirements of task orders from December 31, 2009 to September 30, 2010. Met established performance goals by September 30, 2010. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provided timely and quality products per task order in areas such as value engineering studies, project management, project controls, cost estimating and scheduling, ESH&Q compliance, verification of cleanup and radiological clearance, and conducted independent analysis and generated technical assessment reports. Met 95% of performance goals established between DOE and MSA in Portfolio Management. 	

OBJECTIVE	OUTCOMES	PERFORMANCE MEASURES	INTERIM MILESTONES (No fee will be paid for achievement of interim milestones; fee is dependent upon completion and acceptance criteria)	COMPLETION CRITERIA	ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA/ EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS	TOTAL AVAILABLE FEE
		c. Evaluate and affirm effective unclassified cyber security performance metrics.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outline the key cyber security metrics for FY 2010 by December 15, 2009. Conduct management self-assessment to ensure cyber security metrics are effective and meet requirements by February 28, 2010. Provided a briefing on the results of the management self-assessment and improvement actions by March 15, 2010. Provide quarterly reports against FY 2010 cyber security metrics by April 15, July 15, and October 15, 2010. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Established effective cyber security performance metrics. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Established key cyber security metrics. Provided briefing and documentation of improvement actions. Provided quarterly reports including trend data, demonstrating performance against the established metrics. Developed performance metrics that reflected the requirements of the Program Cyber Security Plan. 	
		d. Develop the internal capability to deliver future contract modification proposals within the agreed upon contract modification schedule.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provided a logic linked schedule by August 15, 2010 that was reviewed and accepted by DOE that provides for submission of all currently identified contract modifications/proposals by July 31, 2011. By September 30, 2010, all contract modification proposals due in FY2010 have been delivered and met quality standards identified in the contract and FAR. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrated success in delivering FY2010 contract modification proposals on schedule and in accordance with the contract and FAR requirements. Demonstrated success in developing the internal capability to deliver the currently identified contract modification proposals within the agreed upon schedule. Provided a logic linked schedule that was reviewed and accepted by DOE based on a review of MSA's internal procedures, personnel, training and systems to be a realistic and achievable approach for completing all identified contract modification proposals by July 2011. 	

OBJECTIVE	OUTCOMES	PERFORMANCE MEASURES	INTERIM MILESTONES (No fee will be paid for achievement of interim milestones; fee is dependent upon completion and acceptance criteria)	COMPLETION CRITERIA	ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA/ EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS	TOTAL AVAILABLE FEE	
		Performance Measure 4.2: Evaluation Criteria, Safe Operations [individual weighting]					
		a. Accelerate the development of the MSA Environmental Management System (EMS) with external audit and conformance declaration in accordance with DOE O 450.1A.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct external audit by December 15, 2009. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provided MSA EMS conformance declaration to RL by December 31, 2009. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provided accelerated declaration that provided evidence of compliance with DOE O 450.1A. Successfully passed independent verification of MSA EMS compliance with DOE Order. 		
		b. Declare Phase I/Phase II readiness leading to DOE approval of MSA's ISM system. Note: Fee will be considered provisional fee that is paid contingently and may be determined to be earned fee upon DOE's final verification of Phase II of MSA's ISM system. Determination of earned fee will be completed by December 15, 2010.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete corporate review of Phase I readiness by February 6, 2010. Complete corporate review of Phase I/Phase II readiness by July 31, 2010. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Declared Phase I/Phase II ISMS readiness by September 30, 2010, leading to successful verification of MSA's ISM system. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provided timely declaration that demonstrated evidence of successful independent verification of MSA's ISM system in accordance DOE M 450.4-1. Successfully passed DOE's final verification of MSA ISM system. 		
		c. Develop 13 of the 14 required standardized training and/or common safety processes established in Section C, Table C.2.1.2-1 and described in Section C, C.2.1.5 by September	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a strategy to accelerate the standardized training and common safety processes by December 15, 2009. Track and report progress and status monthly. In collaboration with other 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developed 13 of the 14 or all 14 required standardized training and common safety processes in Section C, Table C.2.1.2-1: Stop Work, Excavation, CDBPP, Respiratory Protection, Fall Protection, IH Database, Hazard 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developed 13 of the 14 or all 14 required standardized training and/or common safety processes consistent with applicable DOE orders, regulations, and site-driven requirements. Completed development of training materials for those processes in Section C, Table C.2.1.2-1 that required standardized training. 		

OBJECTIVE	OUTCOMES	PERFORMANCE MEASURES	INTERIM MILESTONES (No fee will be paid for achievement of interim milestones; fee is dependent upon completion and acceptance criteria)	COMPLETION CRITERIA	ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA/ EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS	TOTAL AVAILABLE FEE
		30, 2010. Note: Can earn 1% fee based on developing 13 of the standardized training and common safety processes and additional 2% fee for developing all 14 standardized safety processes for a maximum of 3% fee.	Hanford contractors, propose the next standardized sitewide safety processes by March 31, 2010.	Chemical Reporting, Electrical Safety, Confined Space Entry, Hoisting and Rigging, and Lock Out/Tag Out. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completed development of training materials, and made training available for the following: CDBPP, Respiratory Protection, Fall Protection, Electrical Safety, Confined Space Entry, Hoisting and Rigging, Lock Out/Tag Out, HAZWOPER, Rad Safety, and HGET 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Made training available to site contractors for those processes in Section C, Table C.2.1.2-1 that required standardized training. 	
		d. Develop an integrated master schedule for multiple site-wide programs implementation with the other Hanford site contractors. Revise the Site Wide Safety Program Plan (MSC-MP-41080) to include a section on implementation that will describe the process and activities used to develop individual integrated safety program implementation plans within 30 days of receipt of individual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Produce an Integrated Master Schedule by August 15, 2010 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submit to DOE a completed Integrated Master Schedule by August 15, 2010. Submit the contractor-approved revised Site Wide Safety Program Plan (MSC-MP-41080) to DOE by September 30, 2010. Provide to DOE the Milestone Tracking Process and format that will be used to status DOE and the SMT on program implementation on a monthly basis, by September 30, 2010. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Included the first issuance of the master schedule with the following Site Wide Programs: fall protection, electrical, respiratory protection, IH exposure records, hazardous chemicals, and confined space. Obtained approvals of the affected Hanford contractors for the revised Site Wide Safety Program Plan. 	

OBJECTIVE	OUTCOMES	PERFORMANCE MEASURES	INTERIM MILESTONES (No fee will be paid for achievement of interim milestones; fee is dependent upon completion and acceptance criteria)	COMPLETION CRITERIA	ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA/ EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS	TOTAL AVAILABLE FEE
		contractors' implementation plans. Obtain the approval of the OHC on the revised plan. Establish a milestone tracking system for each individual safety program plan and obtain and provide monthly updates of each contractor's status and assist DOE in implementation solutions. Within 45 days of the development of each individual integrated safety program plan, begin reporting the status of each contractor's milestones to DOE and the SMT				
		e. Implementation plan and procedures supporting Federal oversight and health advocate functions, and an integrated Corrective Action Plan (CAP) and tracking system of the Hanford Site Chronic			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Successfully passed an MSA readiness review with oversight by DOE to implement the beryllium oversight and health advocate functions. 	

OBJECTIVE	OUTCOMES	PERFORMANCE MEASURES	INTERIM MILESTONES (No fee will be paid for achievement of interim milestones; fee is dependent upon completion and acceptance criteria)	COMPLETION CRITERIA	ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA/ EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS	TOTAL AVAILABLE FEE
		Beryllium Disease Prevention Program (CBDPP).				
5.0: Establish and Meet Service Level Requirements	Develop and implement an approach that proactively identifies customer service delivery needs and delivers the right service to the right place at the right time, avoiding costs to the customer due to inadequate service delivery and demonstrates customer satisfaction.	Performance Measure 5.1: Evaluation Criteria, Service Delivery Bases [no individual weighting]				20%
		a. Align MSA service delivery to customer key milestones.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide quarterly reports on the progress of this incentive by January 15, April 15, July 15, and October 15, 2010. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implemented an approach that proactively identified customer key milestones and requirements by December 15, 2009. Reported issues, process improvements and lessons learned for activities through September 30, 2010. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provided documentation quarterly that service delivery supported customer key milestones. Provided documentation for issue resolutions and process improvements. 	
		b. Complete all service level agreements (SLAs) identified in the service delivery documents (SDDs) and provide excellent customer satisfaction, and update the Hanford Site Services Requirements Matrix (J-3) with written concurrence of all prime contractors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document historical service level performance for all service level delivery where data exists by March 31, 2010. Develop a draft survey to assess the MSA service delivery model and review with DOE by December 15, 2009. Develop a final customer satisfaction survey and process by January 1, 2010. Establish a customer satisfaction baseline for evaluating and measuring survey baseline results by April 15, 2010. Provide quarterly reports against service level metrics, SLAs, and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provided historical service level performance for all service level delivery and completed all SLAs by May 31, 2010, and achieved SLA performance criteria on all SLAs by September 30, 2010. Provided a signed Hanford Site Services Requirements Matrix in accordance with Clause H.44(h) by February 28, 2010. Conducted surveys and demonstrated improvement over the customer satisfaction baseline by September 30, 2010. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documented timely completion of SLAs. Demonstrated effectiveness of the SLAs as validated by Hanford Site customers and alignment of SLAs to customers' changing needs over time. Achieved all SLA performance criteria as documented in periodic reports and validated by Hanford Site customers. Updated J-3 matrix supported by rationale for changes, reflecting concurrence of all prime contractors. Measured customer satisfaction of Hanford clients, documented analysis of customer satisfaction, identified opportunities for improvement, and achieved improvements in customer satisfaction. 	

OBJECTIVE	OUTCOMES	PERFORMANCE MEASURES	INTERIM MILESTONES (No fee will be paid for achievement of interim milestones; fee is dependent upon completion and acceptance criteria)	COMPLETION CRITERIA	ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA/ EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS	TOTAL AVAILABLE FEE																
			customer surveys by April 15, July 15, and October 15, 2010.		Note: The table below shows the desired improvements relative to the baseline rating. <table border="1" data-bbox="1476 488 1896 703"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Customer Survey Improvement Goals</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Baseline Rating</th> <th>Improvement Goal</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>< 2.0</td> <td>Improve by 25%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.0 – 2.5</td> <td>Improve by 20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.51 – 3.0</td> <td>Improve by 15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3.01 – 3.5</td> <td>Improve by 10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3.51 – 4.0</td> <td>Improve by 5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4.01 – 4.5</td> <td>Maintain rating</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Customer Survey Improvement Goals		Baseline Rating	Improvement Goal	< 2.0	Improve by 25%	2.0 – 2.5	Improve by 20%	2.51 – 3.0	Improve by 15%	3.01 – 3.5	Improve by 10%	3.51 – 4.0	Improve by 5%	4.01 – 4.5	Maintain rating	
Customer Survey Improvement Goals																						
Baseline Rating	Improvement Goal																					
< 2.0	Improve by 25%																					
2.0 – 2.5	Improve by 20%																					
2.51 – 3.0	Improve by 15%																					
3.01 – 3.5	Improve by 10%																					
3.51 – 4.0	Improve by 5%																					
4.01 – 4.5	Maintain rating																					