ATTACHMENT J-4-d

Mission Support Contract
FY 2013 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 INCENTIVES

This PEMP contains both objective and subjective performance incentives in order to maximize the efficacy of the Mission Support Contract. The completion criteria for objective incentives consist of the successful completion of specified activities. The completion criteria for subjective incentives are focused on the achievement of high-level strategies, outcomes, and envisioned end states. The evaluation of all incentives will include a subjective determination regarding quality and effectiveness.

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 the following strategic areas of the contract:

a. Effective Site Cleanup and Future Waste Treatment Plant Operations

Enable mission contractors to achieve their cleanup mission by providing site utilities, infrastructure, and services at the levels required. The key outcomes include:

- Enabling site contractors to achieve reduced cost of site cleanup
- Delivering timely service that supports customer key milestones and regulatory commitments

b. Efficient Site Cleanup and Future Waste Treatment Plant Operations

Realize efficiencies by consolidating, integrating, and centralizing sitewide service functions, safety and security programs, and business functions.

c. Site Stewardship

Provide sitewide, integrated stewardship for the Hanford Site.

The objective performance incentives are allocated 60 percent of the available fee and the remaining 40 percent is allocated to the subjective performance incentives.

3. PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE RATINGS

Payment of fee is subject to the fee reduction terms of this contract, and fee determining official approval that the contractor has achieved the stated outcome for the specific performance incentive. The criteria listed in Table 3.1, Performance Ratings and Definitions, will be used in the evaluation of any subjective elements of the objective incentives as well as for the subjective incentive 4.0, Comprehensive Performance.

Table 3.1, Performance Incentive Ratings and Definitions

Adjectival Rating	Definition	Percentage of Fee Earned
Excellent	Contractor has exceeded almost all of the significant award-fee criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the award-fee plan for the award-fee evaluation period. Contractor's work is highly professional. Contractor solves problems with very little, if any, Government involvement. Contractor is proactive and takes an aggressive approach in identifying problems and their resolution, including those identified in the risk management process, with a substantial emphasis on performing quality work in a safe manner within cost/schedule requirements. No significant re-work.	91% to 100%
Very Good	Contractor has exceeded many of the significant award-fee criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the award-fee plan for the award-fee evaluation period. Contractor solves problems with minimal Government involvement. Contractor is usually proactive and demonstrates an aggressive approach in identifying problems and their resolution, including those identified in the risk management process, with an emphasis on performing quality work in a safe manner within cost/schedule requirements. Problems are usually self-identified and resolution is self-initiated. Some limited, low-impact rework within normal expectations.	76% to 90%
Good	Contractor has exceeded some of the significant award-fee criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defied and measured against the award-fee plan for the award-fee evaluation period. Contractor is able to solve basic problems with adequate emphasis on performing quality work in a safe manner within cost/schedule objectives. The rating within this range will be determined by level of necessary Government involvement in problem resolution, including those problems identified in the risk management process, and extent to which the performance problem is self-identified vs. Government-identified. Some re-work required that unfavorably impacted cost and/or schedule.	51% to 75%
Satisfactory	Contractor has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the award-fee plan for the award-fee evaluation period. Contractor has some difficulty solving basic problems, and cost, schedule, safety, and technical performance needs improvement to avoid further performance risk. Government involvement in problem resolution, including those problems identified in the risk management process, is necessary. Some rework required that unfavorably impacted cost and/or schedule.	$\leq$ 50%
Unsatisfactory	Contractor has failed to meet overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured against the criteria in the award-fee plan for the award-fee evaluation period. Contractor does not demonstrate an emphasis on performing quality work in a safe manner within cost/schedule objectives. Contractor is unable to solve problems and Government involvement in problem resolution, including those problems identified in the risk management process, is necessary. Excessive rework required that had significant unfavorable impact on cost and/or schedule.	0%

4. PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE FEE CALCULATION METHODOLOGY

Table 4.1, Fee Calculation Methodology

Strategic Area	Performance Incentive	Allocated %
1.0: Effective Site Cleanup and Future Waste Treatment Plant Operations	1.1: Align infrastructure to deliver needed capabilities at the specific date and time required by the cleanup contractor to support their cleanup mission to include future WTP operations.	5%
	1.2: Operate infrastructure at the level of reliability necessary to support site cleanup and future WTP operations.	10%
	1.3: Deliver services as defined by service level agreements, forecast of services, and customer service metrics required by the cleanup contractor to support their cleanup mission to include future WTP operations.	18%
	1.4: Conduct portfolio analyses and integrated planning for the Hanford Site.	7%
2.0: Efficient Site Cleanup and Future Waste Treatment Plant Operations	2.1: Realize efficiencies through integration, consolidation, and standardization of sitewide service and business functions.	6%
	2.2: Realize efficiencies through integration, consolidation, and standardization of sitewide safety, security, and stewardship programs.	10%
3.0: Site Stewardship	3:1: Implement the Comprehensive Land Use Management Plan.	4%
Objective PI Fee Allocation: ($20,819,901 X 60% = $12,491,941)		
4.0: Comprehensive Performance		40%
Subjective PI Fee Allocation: ($20,819,901 X 40% = $8,327,960)		

5. PERFORMANCE INCENTIVES

Table 5.1, FY13 Performance Incentives

Fee determination and payment will be made in accordance with the Section B clause entitled Fee Determination and Payment. The completion criteria for objective incentives consist of the successful completion of specified activities. The completion criteria for subjective incentives are focused on the achievement of high-level strategies, outcomes, and envisioned end states. The evaluation of all incentives will include a subjective determination regarding quality and effectiveness.

STRATEGIC AREA 1.0: Effective Site Cleanup and Future Waste Treatment Plant Operations						
PERFORMANCE INCENTIVES		COMPLETION CRITERIA		DUE DATE	DOE LEAD	MSA LEAD
1.1	Align infrastructure to deliver needed capabilities at the specific date and time required by the cleanup contractor to support their cleanup mission to include future WTP operations.	1.1.1.a	Complete a self-assessment that evaluates MSA's planning approach to ensure their PMB and execution year IPL reflects key RL and ORP strategic cleanup strategies, priorities and plans (e.g., the RL Completion Framework, Comprehensive Land Use Plan, Ten-Year Site Plan, Infrastructure and Services Alignment Plan, etc.), and aligns the series of key underlying MSA plans and deliverables with RL and ORP strategies and plans.	12-1-12	Einan	McCutcheon Olsen
		1.1.1.b	Identify and brief RL/ORP on the results of the self-assessment and develop a schedule for executing these improvements with a defined implementation date for each of the necessary actions.	1-31-13		
		1.1.1.c	Identify, brief, and submit the revised planning approach process documentation.	3-3-13		
		1.1.1.d	Complete the remaining FY13 actions identified in the schedule.	9-30-13		
		1.1.2	Demonstrate completion of the approved FY13 reliability project activities within cost and schedule.	9-30-13		
		1.1.3	Develop planning packages for post-2015 infrastructure projects to include project prioritization, refined scope, and cost and schedule estimates for each project to support FY15 budget formulation. Project priorities shall reflect the site cleanup and WTP operations mission needs, risks, and impacts associated with delivery of these projects.	12-15-12	Qualheim	
1.2	Operate infrastructure at the level of reliability necessary to support site cleanup and future WTP operations.	1.2.1.a	Evaluate critical systems for mission-impacting vulnerabilities with a focus on water, electrical, and WSCF. Address any identified vulnerabilities/single points of failure. Provide a matrix that identifies the vulnerability, the corrective action, and the path forward for achieving the corrective action (estimated cost).	3-31-13	Dickinson	Wilson
		1.2.1.b	Develop and document through a maintenance program description an improved comprehensive maintenance management program that is aligned with CRD Paragraph 3, Sub-Paragraph 5 of DOE Order 430.1 Change 1 for RL approval. The maintenance	3-31-13		

STRATEGIC AREA 1.0: Effective Site Cleanup and Future Waste Treatment Plant Operations						
PERFORMANCE INCENTIVES		COMPLETION CRITERIA		DUE DATE	DOE LEAD	MSA LEAD
			program shall address key attributes, demonstrate a graded approach for application, and describe the management approach that includes staffing, labor, budgeting, and parts and equipment. The maintenance program description will include a crosswalk to the 430.1B requirements. The maintenance program description shall include a high-level implementation schedule for implementation of the improved maintenance program across MSA maintenance activities. The program shall reflect system availability impacts to other Hanford contractors.			
		1.2.1.c	Begin implementation of the maintenance program in water and electrical by developing a schedule detailing implementation, follow-on to current priorities and demonstrates integration with WTP and Central Plateau strategies. Complete FY13 activities in accordance with the implementation schedule.	9-30-13		
		1.2.2	Develop and deliver an Electrical Master Plan that documents a strategy for managing repairs, life extensions, replacements, and deactivations for the electrical transmission and distribution system over a 10-year planning horizon.	7-1-13		
		1.2.3	Develop a long-term strategy for the effective maintenance and operation of the Hanford Radiological Site Services that identifies and evaluates the viability and cost-effectiveness of potential process/operational improvements. Work with DOE and other Hanford contractors to facilitate implementation of feasible process improvements at the start of FY14 and for future years.	7-31-13	Corey Frey	Fritz
1.3	Deliver services as defined by service level agreements, forecast of services, and customer service metrics required by the cleanup contractor to support their cleanup mission to include future WTP operations.	1.3.1	Receive an overall satisfaction rating of 4.3 or higher out of 5.0 on overall customer satisfaction ratings based on service catalog requests.	9-30-13	Bird	McCutcheon Sours
		1.3.2	Meet or exceed the performance target contained in each service level agreement (SLA) on an average annual basis.	9-30-13		
		1.3.3	Develop and implement improvements in the site ESH&Q and related safety initiatives (i.e., safety culture, worker involvement, benchmarking and performance measurement, hazard identification and communication tools, lessons learned, etc.).	9-30-13	Corey Frey	Kruger
1.4	Conduct portfolio analyses and integrated planning for the Hanford Site.	1.4.1.a	Provide for DOE approval a process improvement plan that incorporates the five recommendations contained in the Integrated Technical Data Mart (ITD) Technical Project Self-Assessment Rev. 0, issued May 2012. The process improvement plan shall also identify and implement process improvements that facilitate data import and export from the	12-1-12	Pak	Young

STRATEGIC AREA 1.0: Effective Site Cleanup and Future Waste Treatment Plant Operations						
PERFORMANCE INCENTIVES		COMPLETION CRITERIA		DUE DATE	DOE LEAD	MSA LEAD
			ITD to elements within the Portfolio Management Strategic Toolbox (BASS, Life Cycle Model [LCM], GeoVis, dashboards, and/or What If Analyzer).			
		1.4.1.b	Implement the DOE-approved process improvement plan actions that incorporate the five recommendations contained in the ITD Technical Project Self-Assessment.	5-1-13		
		1.4.2.a	Deliver an FY15 budget formulation planning case using RL's development guidelines. Deliver a Hanford Site Integrated Priority List (IPL) and other data deliverables as defined by DOE-HQ budget guidance call and the FY14 lessons learned implementation plan.	3-15-13		
		1.4.2.b	Deliver a Life Cycle Report planning case using RL's development guidelines that meets TPA requirements, and submit the final 2013 Life Cycle Report to DOE.	12-31-12		
		1.4.2.c	Deliver a Life Cycle Report planning case using RL's development guidelines that meets TPA requirements and submit the draft 2014 Life Cycle Report to DOE.	8-31-13		
		1.4.2.d	Utilizing the LCM as the analytical tool and RL's development guidelines, deliver four planning cases. The results shall be reported in BASS, made accessible in Project Data Management System (PDMS) with a ledger of all planning cases prepared, and include data by PBS and WBS as follows: LCM files, a summary of the planning case basis, assumptions, data sources, identification of changes, results - including analysis of schedule float and affected TPA milestones, QA process, point of contact, client, and notifications to DOE RL-affected organizations.	9-30-13		

STRATEGIC AREA 2.0: Efficient Site Cleanup and Future Waste Treatment Plant Operations						
PERFORMANCE INCENTIVES		COMPLETION CRITERIA		DUE DATE	DOE LEAD	MSA LEAD
2.1	Realize efficiencies through integration, consolidation, and standardization of sitewide service and business functions.	2.1.1.a	Identify, brief, and submit for RL approval Information Management cost and performance efficiencies, such as consolidation of like data systems, subcontracts and billing systems, and extension of sitewide Thin Client Implementation Plan, with a proposed schedule for implementation.	1-15-13	Dickinson	Eckman
		2.1.1.b	Implement RL-approved FY13 Information Management cost and performance efficiencies per approved schedule.	9-30-13		
		2.1.2.a	Submit a schedule for RL approval and ORP concurrence for the joint development of business case analyses in conjunction with other Hanford contractors (CHPRC, WRPS, and WCH, as appropriate) for the following FY13 service areas: 100K and 400 Area water treatment plants, 400 Area sewer, fire protection engineering, facilities maintenance, and site training.	11-30-12	Dickinson Hathaway Hastings	McCutcheon
		2.1.2.b	For those service areas warranted, complete a business case analyses consistent with the RL-approved schedule, and jointly present results, recommendations, and a proposed implementation schedule, as applicable, to DOE (RL and ORP) for approval.	7-31-13		
		2.1.2.c	Complete the approved FY13 implementation activities.	9-30-13		
		2.1.3.a	Identify the top cost contributors to MSC operations, identifying the corresponding requirements driving these costs, and challenging the assumptions upon which the requirements are based to determine which ones are valid given current site conditions and risks.	12-31-12	Bird	Olsen
		2.1.3.b	Where appropriate to reduce or eliminate requirements, provide the technical justifications in support of the proposed reductions.	9-30-13		
2.2	Realize efficiencies through integration, consolidation, and standardization of sitewide safety, security, and stewardship programs.	2.2.1.a	Identify and submit for RL approval Protective Force Program performance enhancements and efficiencies with a proposed schedule for implementation.	6-28-13	Loiacono	Hafner
		2.2.1.b	Implement the RL-approved Protective Force Program performance enhancements and efficiencies per the approved schedule.	9-30-13		
		2.2.2.a	Conduct an analysis with recommendations to enhance performance and efficiency of the Hanford Emergency Operations Center, with a proposed schedule for implementation.	4-30-13		

STRATEGIC AREA 2.0: Efficient Site Cleanup and Future Waste Treatment Plant Operations						
PERFORMANCE INCENTIVES		COMPLETION CRITERIA		DUE DATE	DOE LEAD	MSA LEAD
		2.2.2.b	Implement RL-approved FY13 Hanford Emergency Operations Center performance enhancements and efficiencies per approved schedule.	9-30-13		
		2.2.3.a	Submit for RL approval options to optimize site access.	4-30-13	Hastings	McCutcheon Wilson Fritz Hafner
		2.2.3.b	Implement RL-approved FY13 actions to optimize site access.	9-30-13		
		2.2.4	Provide site coordination role for the implementation of process improvements and for the effective maintenance and updates of the sitewide safety (SWS) standards and programs, including ongoing efforts to improve the Hanford Site Chronic Beryllium Disease Prevention Program (CBDPP). Support development and implementation of FY12 SWS program as approved by DOE and the SWS senior management team. Complete MSA implementation of Hanford Site Respiratory Program, EJTA SWS, and Electrical SWS.	9-30-13	Corey Frey	Kruger
		2.2.5	Expand HAMMER's customer base by implementing the recommendations of Appendix A of the strategy paper dated January 31, 2012; and support DOE-RL on all Washington State National Guard and National Guard Bureau activities associated with utilizing Hanford assets for future use.	9-30-13	Hastings	Kruger

STRATEGIC AREA 3.0: Site Stewardship						
PERFORMANCE INCENTIVES		COMPLETION CRITERIA		DUE DATE	DOE LEAD	MSA LEAD
3.1	Implement the Comprehensive Land Use Management Plan	3.1.1	Implement a comprehensive Hanford Site Borrow Pit management program in accordance with available NEPA and other applicable environmental requirements and sustainability goals.	8-31-13	Hathaway	Wilson
		3.1.2	Successfully submit the draft transition turnover package (TTP) for the first reactor parcel to DOE within 75 days of receipt of the WCH TTP.	TTP + 75 days		
		3.1.3	Implement Phase 2 of the Hanford Integrated Land Management Program, to include design and implementation of a web-based automated process, mapping data, IT info to facilitate application reviews, design standards, zoning map, education/training program, and lessons learned, including utilizing the planning committee under the CIB for sitewide integration.	8-31-13		
		3.1.4	Provide radiological release, environmental, cultural, and real estate due diligence to support the integrated project schedule for RL's response to the land transfer request from TRIDEC.	9-30-13		
		3.1.5.a	Facilitate sitewide integration and participation by Hanford contractors for sustainability activities and implement FY13 Hanford Site Sustainability Program activities/actions necessary to meet DOE's sustainability goals and metrics toward reducing greenhouse gas emissions, waste generation, energy consumption, and water use.	9-30-13		Fritz
		3.1.5.b	Provide a briefing on potential Hanford Site energy conservation measures (ECMs) projects with recommended funding sources and contracting methods (e.g. third-party financing, Congressional appropriations, energy savings performance contracts, utility energy service contracts, etc.).	4-30-13		
		3.1.5.c	For the RL-approved ECMs, prioritize, develop, and submit the project proposals along with a proposed implementation schedule.	6-30-13		

STRATEGIC AREA 4.0: Comprehensive Performance				
	SUBJECTIVE PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE	DUE DATE	DOE LEAD	MSA LEAD
4.1	• Provide site services to other Hanford contractors so that Hanford cleanup is done safely, cost effectively, and on schedule, in order for those contractors to meet their cleanup commitments. • Operate in a manner conducive to excellence and quality by delivering services across the Hanford Site; coordinating and integrating resources, activities, and interfaces; and maintaining relationships with DOE, customers, and stakeholders based on open, honest, and effective communication. • Work with DOE in a spirit of cooperation during the negotiation process, including timely submission of requests for additional data, timely counteroffers, and conveying a positive and professional attitude to achieve fair and timely settlement of change order proposals or requests for equitable adjustment. • Demonstrate operational excellence in business and financial management by fulfilling contractual obligations in a fiscally responsible manner to include, but not limited to, the use of approved purchasing, estimating, accounting, property, budget, planning, billing, labor, and accounting systems; and the contractor's management of government property. • Provide leadership to improve management effectiveness, collaborate and participate proactively with customers, value workers, and provide a supportive environment. • Measure overall performance under the contract via the use of a comprehensive performance measurement system. • Integrate and coordinate all activities required to execute the contract with other Hanford contractors, specifically the timeliness, completeness, and quality of problem identification; and corrective action plans. • Submit timely, accurate, and complete change order proposals, requests for equitable adjustment proposals, and/or cost growth proposals, that meet all FAR requirements, including compliance with the formatting requirements in FAR 15.408, Table 15-2. • Comply with federal and departmental acquisition regulations, procedures, and guidance (including contract change proposal timeliness and quality pursuant to DOE Policy Flash 2008-39, dated April 25, 2008). • Comply with contract requirements not covered by other performance incentives. • Demonstrate continuous improvement in the safety culture and perform work safely and in a compliant manner that assures the workers, public, and environment are protected from adverse consequences.	9-30-13	Branch	Olsen