

DIRECTIVES CONTROL FORM - ORO O FINAL DIRECTIVE

PART A (To be completed by the Division of Primary Interest (DPI))

1. NUMBER AND TITLE OF DIRECTIVE: ORO M 220, Rev. 1, OAK RIDGE OPERATIONS APPRAISAL MANUAL

2. PURPOSE OF TRANSMITTAL: New Directive Revised Directive Page Change

3. THIS DOCUMENT MAY AFFECT THE WORK PERFORMED BY THE FOLLOWING CONTRACTORS: (Check appropriate boxes)

No (all contractors)

Yes If yes, whom? LMES LMER ORAU SURA
 Bechtel Jacobs Company

Other contractors (list by type)



Many ORO contractors have approved S/RIDs or WSS sets that may affect applicability of contractor requirements from this directive. Applicability of contractor requirements must take into account the approved standards set for each particular contract.

4. SIGNIFICANT PROVISIONS: Are there any significant changes or impact?

No Yes If yes, describe: This ORO Manual is part of the ORO sunset review process. It was previously Attachment 1 of ORO O 220, Chapter V, but has now been modified into a separate document. Changes to this Manual include editorial revisions to (1) retitle Section 2, (2) delete the word "report" in paragraphs 2.4.4 and 3.3.4, (3) add additional information in paragraph 3.3.3, and (4) modify (and reformat to enhance readability) Appendix 3 to reflect current policy.

5. CONTACT POINT: Sheria Allen Financial Evaluation and Accountability Division, FM-73 576-0008
Name Organization Telephone

PART B (To be completed by the Directives Management Group (DMG)):

6. FILING INSTRUCTIONS:

<u>Remove</u>	<u>Dated</u>	<u>Insert</u>	<u>Dated</u>
ORO O 220, Chapter V, Attachment 1, ORO M 220 Pages i through 3-13	09/30/1996	ORO O Control Form ORO M 220, Rev. 1 Pages i through 3-13	06/18/1999 06/18/1999

ORO Orders are available on the ORO Directives Management Home Page [http://www.ornl.gov/doe_oro_dmg/orchklst.htm] within 5-10 working days after receipt of this Control Form. The ORO Orders will no longer be mailed in printed copy unless you do not have Internet capabilities.

7. APPROVED FOR DISTRIBUTION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE OFFICIAL DIRECTIVES DISTRIBUTION LIST:

Sheria Allen AD-440
Signature Management Analyst, AD-440

6/18/1999
Date

INSTRUCTIONS TO ADDRESSEES: THIS FORM IS TO BE FILED WITH THE DIRECTIVE AND RETAINED
Rev. 08/04/1998

OAK
RIDGE
OPERATIONS
MANUAL

ORO M 220
Rev. 1

**OAK RIDGE OPERATIONS
APPRAISAL MANUAL**

June 1999

Department of Energy
Directives Management Group

**OAK RIDGE OPERATIONS (ORO)
APPRAISAL MANUAL**

Table of Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Purpose	1-1
1.2 Scope	1-1
2. ORO EVALUATION PROGRAM	
2.1 Introduction	2-1
2.2 Program Objectives	2-1
2.3 Purpose	2-2
2.4 Types of Evaluations	2-2
2.4.1 COR CPFF Summary Appraisals	2-2
2.4.2 Functional Appraisals	2-2
2.4.3 Business Management Reviews	2-3
2.4.4 Contractor Past Performance	2-3
3. APPRAISAL METHODOLOGY	
3.1 Introduction	3-1
3.2 Multidisciplinary Approach	3-1
3.3 Conducting Reviews	3-1
3.3.1 Functional Appraisals - On-site Review	3-1
a. Preparation for On-Site Review	3-1
b. Execution of On-site Review	3-2
c. Reporting	3-3
d. Follow-up	3-4
3.3.2 COR CPFF Summary Appraisals	3-5
3.3.3 Business Management Reviews	3-5
3.3.4 Contractor Past Performance	3-7
4. APPENDICES	
Appendix 1 - Report Format for COR CPFF Summary Appraisals	3-8
Appendix 2 - Report Format for Functional Appraisal Reports	3-10
Appendix 3 - Rating Guidelines	3-11

ORO APPRAISAL MANUAL

1. INTRODUCTION.

1.1 Purpose.

This Manual complements ORO O 220, Chapter V, APPRAISAL OF DOE CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE. It was developed to assist ORO employees in understanding the ORO Appraisal Program and in evaluating contractor performance.

1.2 Scope.

The Manual addresses the design and operation of the ORO Appraisal Program and the methodology used in evaluating contractor performance.

2. ORO EVALUATION PROGRAM.

2.1 Introduction.

ORO's prime responsibility is the management of contracts under which government programs are executed and facilities are operated. ORO's role is to define the mission, authorize and direct the work, and evaluate performance. The contractor's role is to bring its unique abilities and management systems to bear on the execution of assigned work, as well as the day-to-day operation of government facilities. ORO is responsible not only for ensuring that major missions such as meeting production quotas within acceptable cost, schedule, and quality parameters are accomplished, but also is responsible for ensuring that facilities are operated and programs are carried out in a lawful, economical, efficient, safe, and secure manner. The evaluation process has three purposes: (1) to provide information relating to the effectiveness and innovativeness of contractor performance within available resources, (2) to assist management in making award fee and contract extend/compete decisions, and (3) to provide information concerning operational deficiencies and areas of vulnerability and associated risks to assist management in taking mitigation actions.

Viewed from this perspective, appraisal of contractor performance must be seen as an integral part of ORO's contract administration function. Therefore, the importance of having an effective evaluation program cannot be overemphasized.

An effective evaluation program requires a sense of mission and responsibility on the part of all employees involved in appraising contractor performance. ORO is committed to maintaining an effective contractor evaluation program that provides responsible officials with current information as to what is going on, progress or achievements, and where management action is needed. Such information in the hands of management officials is a fundamental basis for management control.

2.2 Program Objectives.

The objectives of the ORO Evaluation Program are to:

- a. Evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency with which ORO contractors achieve established programmatic and administrative goals;
- b. Identify those areas where improvements in contractor performance are required and ensure that the improvements are made;
- c. Identify vulnerabilities and associated risks and ensure that appropriate corrective actions are taken;
- d. Provide a systematic source of information upon which to make contract extend/compete, fee negotiation, and award fee decisions; and

- e. Ensure compliance with DOE Orders and regulations.

2.3 Purpose.

The ORO Evaluation Program is essentially a decision-support system. As previously stated, evaluations are conducted to provide information to ORO management to be used in making award fee, contract extend/compete, and operational decisions. To facilitate operations decisions, the scope of each evaluation should include the identification of vulnerabilities and associated risks and the determination of underlying causes without regard to whether casual factors are under the contractor's control. Effective identification of vulnerabilities and risks must, of necessity, be a cooperative effort between ORO and contractor personnel. Contractors should be encouraged to voluntarily report areas of vulnerability, along with corrective actions taken, planned, or proposed.

To be useful to management, information provided must be timely, relevant, complete, and accurate. Timeliness is ensured by proper scheduling; relevancy and completeness are ensured by the application of appropriate performance objectives and criteria; and accuracy is ensured by collecting sufficient data and information to support appraisal findings and recommendations.

2.4 Types of Evaluations.

The evaluation process produces Contracting Officer's Representatives (COR) cost-plus-fixed-fee (CPFF) summary appraisals, Principal Staff's functional appraisals, Business Management Reviews, and Contractor Past Performance.

2.4.1 COR CPFF Summary Appraisals. COR summary appraisals apply to CPFF contracts and are conducted annually by the COR. Summary appraisal reports will contain adjective ratings reflecting the overall level of contractor performance as well as the level of performance in functional areas. The required format for these reports is shown in Appendix 1 of this Manual. These appraisals are required for contracts with a value greater than \$10 million and for contracts that are not covered under the following reviews: Business Management, Environmental, Safety, and Health Review, and Technical Programs. It also excludes the following types of contracts: Architect/Engineering, Auditing Services, Construction, Lease/Rental, Legal/Litigation, and Gas/Utilities.

NOTE: Principal Staff is responsible for providing to the COR input of CPFF contractors' performance in their areas of responsibility. No specific format is required; however, an adjective rating is to be assigned.

2.4.2 Functional Appraisals. Functional appraisals are conducted by the Principal Staff in support of the COR. Functional appraisal reports are used as "feeder" reports to the COR summary appraisal reports. These reports are not required to contain performance ratings. The format to be used and minimum requirements are specified in Appendix 2.

- 2.4.3 Business Management Reviews. A review of business management activities to validate and verify the effectiveness and efficiency of the contractor's assessment of compliance with its contract and its performance against agreed-to performance objectives, measures, and expectations. These reviews are conducted annually over a 2-week period.
- 2.4.4 Contractor Past Performance. The development of the performance report is a combined responsibility of the COR and Contracting Officer (CO). After discussions with the CO, the COR will prepare performance reports on contractors at the time the work under the contract is completed and interim evaluations each year on contracts with periods of performance, including options, that exceed 1 year for contracts that have been in place for at least 3 months. The COR will use all pertinent information available in judging contractor performance (i.e., CO and Headquarters input, the use of questionnaires, etc.). The COR will submit the completed and signed performance reports to the cognizant CO for review and signature. The report rating guidelines are specified in Appendix 3.

3. APPRAISAL METHODOLOGY.

3.1 Introduction.

An effective contractor appraisal program must be based on rigorous planning that results in a consistent and focused approach and discourages a fire-fighting mentality. Therefore, the first step in the appraisal process is the identification of all the program elements or activities that are to be reviewed. For example, the COR would identify emergency preparedness, health physics, and fire protection, among others, as program elements to be appraised.

An appraisal of contractor performance should utilize information generated over the entire review period. This information is derived from routine operational and financial reports, audit and inspection reports, vulnerability assessments and management control reviews, correspondence, day-to-day contacts, on-site visits made for the explicit purpose of evaluating performance. Performance information, regardless of how it is obtained, should be evaluated against established objectives and criteria.

3.2 Multidisciplinary Approach.

The COR, in coordination with the Principal Staff, will establish multidisciplinary teams to appraise one or more areas of contractor performance when appropriate. This approach will allow the synthesis of appraisal information from various disciplines into a broader view of contractor performance and enable CORs to manage a network of interrelated issues. The COR, in coordination with the Principal Staff, should determine, prior to the beginning of each fiscal year, multidisciplinary appraisals to be conducted. The Principal Staff can then develop their appraisal schedules accordingly. The COR are not precluded, however, from requesting a multidisciplinary appraisal of any time circumstances warrant.

3.3 Conducting Reviews.

An on-site appraisal consists of four distinct phases: (1) preparation for on-site review; (2) execution of on-site review; (3) reporting; and (4) follow-up.

3.3.1 Functional Appraisals - On-site Review.

a. Preparation for On-site Review.

- (1) At least 30 days prior to a scheduled on-site review, the cognizant COR, in coordination with the Principal Staff, should:
 - (a) Establish the purpose and scope of the review.
 - (b) Designate a review team and assigned functional areas to team members. One member should be designated as team leader.

- (c) Establish, informally, mutually acceptable dates for the on-site review and arrange for an opening meeting with the contractor.
- (d) Prepare a notice of the planned review for transmittal to the contractor with a copy to the Director, Financial Evaluation and Accountability Division (FEAD).

NOTE: The COR is not precluded from requesting an unannounced appraisal when appropriate.

- (2) After assignments have been made, each team member should:
 - (a) Review prior appraisal reports related to the areas to be appraised.
 - (b) Review the contractor performance objectives and criteria.
 - (c) Review pertinent public laws, DOE Orders, ORO Orders, and contractor procedures.
 - (d) Review related operational and financial reports, audit and inspection reports, management control reviews, correspondence issued during the appraisal cycle.
 - (e) Review the contractor organization chart.

The purpose of these reviews is to enable each team member to prepare an appraisal checklist to be used in collecting information during the on-site review. Checklist questions should be assigned to test critical points, in particular management control systems, and should enable the appraiser to determine whether established objectives and performance criteria are being met. While responses elicited by checklist questions will, of necessity, be qualitative as well as quantitative, questions should be framed so that all responses can be independently verified.

b. Execution of On-site Review.

(1) Entrance Briefing.

The entrance briefing should communicate the objectives of the appraisal and areas of concentration to the contractor. The team leader has the primary responsibility for the conduct and format of the meeting. The tone of the meeting should be established so that the contractor perceives the appraisal team as being fair and objective. The basic philosophic viewpoint to be communicated is that the appraisal is intended to assist the contractor in attaining the mutual goal of

performance recognition and improvement. Emphasis should be placed on the mutual identification of vulnerabilities and associated risks.

(2) Team Meetings.

Team meetings should be conducted periodically during the execution phase of the on-site review. These meetings should be coordinated by the team leader. The sharing of facts and tentative conclusions enriches the appraisal process. Talking over what has been learned allows for team corroboration of facts and observations. The questions and discussions should bring into sharper focus tentative findings; that is, the evidence should be organized to support findings. Draft findings may be modified, incorporated with others, or discarded. Where pieces of evidence are either insufficient or completely missing, provisions may then be made to gather additional information. The result from this sharing should be replanning or redirection of the appraisal. Basically, replanning is a repeat of the preparation phase, based upon the information now available. The following issues should be addressed specifically:

- Are the results of the interviews and evidence gathered sufficient to reach conclusions?
- Should there be additional interviews, checklist questions, or evidence?
- Does the review seem to be accomplishing its objectives?

c. Reporting.

(1) Exit Conference with Contractor.

An exit meeting should be held with the contractor's management staff. The team leader has the responsibility for coordinating and conducting the exit meeting. Since this meeting is essentially an oral presentation of findings, it is properly considered as part of the reporting phase.

The main purposes of the exit meeting are to (1) discuss findings so the formal report will not be a surprise, (2) allow for factual corrections and explanations, (3) allow the contractor the opportunity to propose corrective actions.

Preparation for the exit meeting should begin with the findings-of-fact generated during the execution phase. The detailed findings should be organized in some logical fashion determined by the purpose and scope of the review. Negative findings that will result in recommendations for corrective action should be supported by factual evidence that can be independently verified. Each team member should be prepared to make an oral presentation on contractor

performance in assigned areas. Here, as in the opening meeting, the review team should establish a positive atmosphere in keeping with the principle that the end objective of the appraisal is to improve performance.

(2) Exit Meeting with COR.

After the exit meeting with the contractor, a similar meeting should be held with the COR. The COR should be informed of the results of the on-site review. A written summary of findings, areas of vulnerabilities and associated risks, constraints outside of the contractor's control, tentative recommendations, and contractor comments should be provided to the COR. Team members should make oral presentations on contractor performance in assigned areas.

The main purposes of the exit meeting are to (1) discuss findings so that the COR can take immediate action, if appropriate, (2) allow the factual corrections and explanations, and (3) allow the COR the opportunity to propose corrective actions.

(3) Formal Report.

Review team members are responsible for drafting those sections of the formal appraisal report applicable to their respective assigned areas. The team leader has the responsibility for coordinating the drafting effort and for consolidating the drafted sections into a finished report. Appendix 2 of this Manual provides guidelines for preparing final appraisal reports.

The final report should be transmitted by memorandum from the appropriate Division Director or review team leader to the COR, with a copy to FEAD, within 30 days of completion of the on-site review. The COR is responsible for reviewing the report and directing the contractor to take appropriate action based on report findings and recommendations. As a general rule, the COR should forward a copy of the appraisal report to the contractor and to FEAD with appropriate implementing instructions within 10 days of receipt.

d. Follow-up.

The COR should direct the contractor to respond to implementing instructions within 30 days of receipt. The COR should ensure that a written reply is received, evaluate adequacy of the response, verify that corrective action is accomplished, and document closeout of open items.

Appraisal team members' advice should be sought concerning the adequacy of the contractor's response to their respective recommendations. Copies of all correspondence relating to appraisal activities should be provided to FEAD.

In evaluating the contractor's response, two major problems are often encountered: (1) the response is a defense of the status quo, or (2) the response "fixes" specific deficiencies without addressing underlying causes. Both problems can be minimized by good reviewing and reporting; however, some responses will ultimately be judged inadequate. As a first step toward a solution, the COR and appraisal team members should inform the contractor that they are willing to discuss proposed replies and corrective actions both prior to and after their incorporation into a format response.

3.3.2 COR CPFF Summary Appraisals.

These appraisals are conducted annually by the COR of CPFF contractors' performance. Summary appraisal reports contain adjective ratings reflecting the overall level of contractor performance as well as the level of performance in functional areas (see Appendix 1 of this Manual). These reports should address the effectiveness and efficiency with which established programmatic and administrative objectives were met, and the most important achievements and deficiencies that impacted the performance rating. Vulnerabilities and associated risks that were not previously reported in functional appraisals or other reports should be identified, including factors outside the contractor's control contributing to performance deficiencies. Recognition should be given where a major problem was resolved during the performance period. Data and information included should fully and clearly support the performance rating assigned.

The Principal Staff provides annual input to the COR to be used in preparing annual CPFF summary appraisal reports. In addition, the Principal Staff prepares and provides to the cognizant COR appraisal objectives and performance criteria for CPFF contracts to be used in appraising contractor performance for the next fiscal year. Copies of all correspondence relative to COR appraisals should be provided to the Chief, FEAD.

3.3.3 Business Management Reviews. Reviews of business management activities are conducted to validate and verify the effectiveness and efficiency of the contractor's assessment of compliance with its contract and its performance against agreed-to performance objectives, measures, and expectations. These reviews are conducted annually over a 2-week period.

The BMR primarily assesses or verifies a contractor self-assessment. The foundation of the contractor self-assessment and the BMR are performance objectives, measures, and expectations agreed to by the contractor and DOE. Oversight will be conducted on a performance basis and rely substantially, but not exclusively, on contractor self assessments. ORO and the Contractor will agree upon the functional areas to be included in the review. These areas are the level at which performance objectives, measures, and expectations are developed for the contractor self-assessment. The following areas could be considered in the annual Business Management Review:

- A. LEGAL/PATENT SERVICES
- B. INFORMATION RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

1. AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING
2. RECORDS MANAGEMENT
3. TELECOMMUNICATIONS (including TEMPEST and COMSEC)
4. UNCLASSIFIED COMPUTER SECURITY
5. ARCHIVES
6. LIBRARY SERVICES
7. MAIL HANDLING
- C. PROCUREMENT
- D. PERSONNEL
 1. SALARY ADMINISTRATION
 2. TRAINING
 3. POSITION CLASSIFICATION
 4. RECRUITMENT
 5. LABOR RELATIONS
- E. PROPERTY
- F. SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION MANAGEMENT
- G. FINANCE AND BUDGET
- H. INSTITUTIONAL PROJECT AND FACILITIES MANAGEMENT
- I. WORK FOR OTHER ADMINISTRATION
- J. LAB DIRECTED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION AND GENERAL OVERSIGHT
- K. SECURITY OVERSIGHT (including NATO reviews)
- L. DIVERSITY
 1. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY
 2. AFFIRMATIVE ACTION/EEO
- M. TECHNOLOGY PARTNERSHIPS ADMINISTRATION
- N. TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION
- O. TRAVEL - FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC
- P. REVIEW OF FOREIGN VISITS AND ASSIGNMENTS
- Q. PUBLIC AFFAIRS
- R. TRAVEL - FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC
- S. ANY OTHER AREAS AGREED UPON BETWEEN THE OPERATIONS OFFICE MANAGER AND THE CONTRACTOR IN COORDINATION WITH SECRETARIAL OFFICERS.

The review will rely substantially on the Contractor's Self-Assessment. An ongoing contractor assessment of performance compared to mutually agreed-upon (by the contractor and DOE) performance objectives, measures, and expectations. In addition the daily Operation Awareness of the Contractor's activities will be assessed. Continuous management of those activities which enable the government to determine how well the contractor is performing to meet the requirements of the contract. Potentially, it encompasses all dealings between the government and the contractor from the time the contract is awarded until work has been completed and accepted or the contract terminated, payment has been made, and disputes resolved. Factors influencing the degree of ongoing operational awareness include the nature of the work, the type of contract, and

the past performance of the contractor. Specific activities which constitute the ongoing operational awareness process should be defined and understood by Operations Office Managers and the Contractor.

Additional reviews of contractor operations or performance which are required as a result of the identification of significant areas for improvement or trends which indicate the potential for improvement and require DOE follow up to protect the Government's interest will be For Cause Reviews. They may also arise from implementation of new requirements on the contractor or new contractor systems which require validation.

3.3.4 Contractor Past Performance.

An annual report is prepared jointly by the COR and CO of relevant information regarding a contractor's actions and performance under previous award contracts (see Appendix 3 of this Manual for Ratings Guidelines). These reports are prepared for contracts with a value greater than \$100K.

The COR and CO will jointly carry out the requirements in FASA and the FAR and thereby ensure that the Department's future source selection decisions reflect informed judgments as to an offeror's potential to provide quality products or services. To this end, it is necessary to ensure that contracting activities systematically collect, maintain, and utilize information on contractors' past performance.

Acquisition Letter 95-08, dated October 2, 1995, sets forth detailed responsibilities and authorities necessary to carry out the contractor past performance program within Federal agencies.

APPENDIX 1

REPORT FORMAT FOR COR CPFF SUMMARY APPRAISALS

The following is a required format for preparing COR CPFF summary appraisal reports:

1. Introduction. Purpose and scope of appraisal, and period covered.
2. Summary and Conclusions. State overall adjective rating reflecting the contractor's performance (see Page 3-9 of this Manual). Provide brief comments regarding the effectiveness and efficiency with which established programmatic and administrative objectives were met. Briefly describe the most important achievements and deficiencies that affected the performance rating. Identify vulnerabilities and associated risks that have not previously been reported in functional appraisals or other reports. Identify factors outside the contractor's control contributing to performance deficiencies. Recognition should be given where a major problem was resolved during the performance period. Isolated examples of satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance should not be allowed to materially influence overall evaluation of a contractor's performance. Conclusions should be supported in the commentary.
3. Commentary. Address programmatic and administrative areas and provide an adjective rating for performance in each area. Provide detailed comments on the contractor's significant achievements in each area, as well as deficiencies and current or anticipated problems, vulnerabilities, and risks. Factors outside the contractor's control contributing to deficiencies and vulnerabilities should be candidly reported. Data and information included should fully and clearly support the performance ratings assigned.

APPENDIX 1

PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE

Adjective Rating	Definition
Outstanding	Performance substantially exceeds expected levels of performance. Several significant ¹ or notable ² achievements exist. No significant deficiencies in performance.
Good	Performance exceeds expected levels and some notable achievements exist. Although some notable deficiencies may exist, no significant deficiencies exist.
Satisfactory	Performance meets expected levels. Minimum standards are exceeded and "good practices" are evident in contract operations. Notable achievements or notable deficiencies may or may not exist.
Marginal	Performance is less than expected. No notable achievements exist; however, some notable deficiencies exist or any notable achievements that exist are more than offset by significant or notable deficiencies.
Unsatisfactory	Performance is below minimum acceptable levels. Significant deficiencies causing severe impacts on mission capabilities exist.

¹Significant: This term indicates a major event or sustained level of performance that, due to its importance, has a substantial positive or negative impact on the contractor's ability to carry out its mission.

²Notable: This term indicates an event or sustained level of performance that is of lesser importance than a "significant" event, but nonetheless deserves positive or negative recognition.

APPENDIX 2

REPORT FORMAT FOR FUNCTIONAL APPRAISAL REPORTS

Functional appraisal reports should be tailored to include the following headings and elements:

1. INTRODUCTION.

- a. A description of the purpose and scope of the appraisal.
- b. Period covered.
- c. Requirements for the appraisal (applicable Orders, criteria, and requirements referenced).

2. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.

- a. Brief comments regarding the effectiveness and efficiency with which established objectives were met.
- b. A brief description of deficiencies, material weaknesses, or vulnerabilities and associated risks.
- c. Factors outside the contractor's control contributing to performance deficiencies and vulnerabilities.

3. COMMENTARY.

- a. Detailed comments regarding the adequacy of contractors' performance in relation to established performance objectives and criteria.
- b. A description of deficiencies, material weaknesses, or vulnerabilities and associated risks and underlying causes.
- c. Pertinent comments of responsible contractor officials.
- d. A description of noteworthy achievements.
- e. Any issues or questions needing further study and consideration.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS.

- a. Recommendations for actions to improve problem areas identified and to improve operations whether or not casual factors are within the contractor's control.
- b. A description of actions taken on open recommendations from prior appraisal reports and status or prior recommendations.

APPENDIX 3

Rating Guidelines

Summarize contractor performance in each of the rating areas. Assign each area a rating of 0 (Unsatisfactory), 1 (Poor), 2 (Fair), 3 (Good), 4 (Excellent), or 5 (Exceptional). Use the following instructions as guidance in making these evaluations. Ensure that this assessment is consistent with any other Agency assessments made (i.e., for payment of fee purposes).

1. Quality of Product/Service. This includes: Compliance with contract requirements; Accuracy of reports; Appropriateness of personnel; and Technical excellence.

0	Unsatisfactory	Nonconformances are compromising the achievement of contract requirements, despite use of Agency resources.
1	Poor	Nonconformances require major Agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.
2	Fair	Nonconformances require minor Agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.
3	Good	Nonconformances do not impact achievement of contract requirements.
4	Excellent	There are no quality problems.
5	Exceptional	The contractor has demonstrated an exceptional performance level in any of the above four categories that justifies using this additional score. It is expected that this rating will be used in those rare circumstances when contractor performance clearly exceeds the performance level described as "Excellent."

2. Cost Control. This includes: Within budget (over/under target costs); Current, accurate, and complete billings; Relationship of negotiated costs to actuals; Cost efficiencies; and Change Orders issues.

0	Unsatisfactory	Cost issues are compromising performance of contract requirements.
1	Poor	Cost issues require major Agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.
2	Fair	Cost issues require minor Agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.
3	Good	Cost issues do not impact achievement of contract requirements.

- | | | |
|---|-------------|---|
| 4 | Excellent | There are no cost issues. |
| 5 | Exceptional | The contractor has demonstrated an exceptional performance level in any of the above four categories that justifies using this additional score. It is expected that this rating will be used in those rare circumstances when contractor performance clearly exceeds the performance level described as "Excellent." |
3. Timeliness of Performance. This includes: Meeting interim milestones; Reliability; Responsiveness to Technical Direction; Completion on time, including wrap-up and contract administration; and No liquidated damages being assessed.
- | | | |
|---|----------------|---|
| 0 | Unsatisfactory | Delays are compromising the achievement of contract requirements, despite use of Agency resources. |
| 1 | Poor | Delays require major Agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements. |
| 2 | Fair | Delays require minor Agency resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements. |
| 3 | Good | Delays do not impact achievement of contract requirements. |
| 4 | Excellent | There are no delays. |
| 5 | Exceptional | The contractor has demonstrated an exceptional performance level in any of the above four categories that justifies using this additional score. It is expected that this rating will be used in those rare circumstances when contractor performance clearly exceeds the performance level described as "Excellent." |
4. Business Relations. This includes: Effective management; Businesslike correspondence; Responsiveness to contract requirements; Prompt notification of problems; Reasonable/cooperative, flexible, and pro-active attitudes; Effective contractor-recommended solutions; Effective small/small disadvantaged business subcontracting program; and Effective diversity program.
- | | | |
|---|----------------|--|
| 0 | Unsatisfactory | Response to inquiries or technical/service/administrative issues is not effective and responsive. |
| 1 | Poor | Response to inquiries or technical/service/administrative issues is marginally effective and responsive. |

- 2 Fair Response to inquiries or technical/service/administrative issues is somewhat effective and responsive.
- 3 Good Response to inquiries or technical/service/administrative issues is usually effective and responsive.
- 4 Excellent Response to inquiries or technical/service/administrative issues is consistently effective and responsive.
- 5 Exceptional The contractor has demonstrated an exceptional performance level in any of the above four categories that justifies using this additional score. It is expected that this rating will be used in those rare circumstances when contractor performance clearly exceeds the performance level described as "Excellent."

5. Customer Satisfaction. This includes: Ability to solve contract problems; Display of initiative; Effectively assesses impact of changes; and Organizational support structure.

- 0 Unsatisfactory Response to contract problems and changes, and organizational support provided is not effective and responsive.
- 1 Poor Response to contract problems and changes, and organizational support provided is marginally effective and responsive.
- 2 Fair Response to contract problems and changes, and organizational support provided is somewhat effective and responsive.
- 3 Good Response to contract problems and changes, and organizational support provided is usually effective and responsive.
- 4 Excellent Response to contract problems and changes, and organizational support provided is consistently effective and responsive.
- 5 Exceptional The contractor has demonstrated an exceptional performance level in any of the above four categories that justifies using this additional score. It is expected that this rating will be used in those rare circumstances when contractor performance clearly exceeds the performance level described as "Excellent."