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**PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT (PA) REVIEW CHECKLIST**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Name** |       |
| **Project Number** |       |
| **Agency** |       |
| **Evaluator** |       |
| **Date of Review** |       |

**PROJECT MANAGEMENT PLAN (to provide for efficient development of the proposal, IDIQ H.4.2.B.2.i.)**

[ ]  Organization chart showing key players, expertise, responsibilities, and the project organization needed to effectively develop and implement the proposal are identified and described

[ ]  Communication plan with government to collectively build project is described

☐ Project milestones for IGA and proposal development are realistic, reasonable and acceptable to the government

[ ]  Project Management Plan provides a framework for the efficient development of a proposal, implementation of the project, and long-term project support to meet the government’s objectives

Project Facilitator comments on this section:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**ENERGY (and water) CONSERVATION MEASURES (ECMs):**

[ ]  Existing equipment and systems and proposed measures are reasonably defined.

[ ]  The package of ECMs is as comprehensive as desired (encompasses a wide range of opportunities – energy, water, and O&M savings, renewable energy, site infrastructure needs, etc.)

[ ]  Each ECM is suitable for its intended purpose and consistent with government needs/requirements

[ ]  Bases for all savings streams are well described (energy, water, interactive effects, O&M, rate change...)

[ ]  Methods and analyses used to calculate baseline energy/water use and savings are sound

[ ]  Magnitude of baselines and energy savings for each ECM and for each form of energy are in line with expectations

[ ]  Operational conditions (set points, operating hours, foot-candles, etc.) described before and after upgrade.

[ ]  Operating hours and other assumptions are consistent with site operations and documented

[ ]  Projected O&M cost savings have been reviewed with the site and there is confidence in their accrual (refer to guidance: How to Determine and Verify Operations and Maintenance Savings in Energy Savings Performance Contracts)

[ ] Cost savings for each ECM and form of energy are consistent with energy savings and unit costs

[ ] ECM Lessons Learned for energy generation (PV, wind, CHP, biomass, etc.), power purchase agreement, and emerging technology ECMs have been reviewed and applied as appropriate for this project (see “ECM Lessons Learned - For Energy Generation, Power Purchase Agreement, and Emerging Technology ECMs”)

[ ]  “Potential ECMs” for further analysis are consistent with agency needs and are worthy of continued study (see IDIQ Section H.4.2.A)

Project Facilitator comments on this section:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**RISK, RESPONSIBILITY, and PERFORMANCE**

**Financial Factors: (construction costs, M&V confidence, energy-related savings, delays, facility changes, interest rates)**

[ ]  Risks for the financial components of the Risk, Responsibility, and Performance Matrix (RRPM) have been clearly described and allocated

[ ]  Potential shortfalls in any responsibility have been considered along with resolution strategies.

[ ]  Strategies for addressing each risk are effective and acceptable

**Operational Factors: (operating hours, loads, weather, user participation)**

[ ]  Risks for the operational components of the RRPM have been clearly described and allocated

[ ]  Potential shortfalls in any responsibility have been considered along with resolution strategies

[ ]  Strategies for addressing each risk are effective and acceptable

**Performance Factors** (the ESCO is ultimately responsible for performance**): (equipment performance, operations, maintenance, repair & replacement)**

[ ]  Risks for the performance components of the RRPM have been clearly allocated

Project Facilitator comments on this section:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**M&V APPROACH:**

[ ]  An M&V approach (e.g., A, B, C, D) is defined for each measure (consistent with FEMP M&V Guidelines)

[ ]  Witnessing approaches are proposed for each recommended ECM, consistent with guidance, and levels are appropriate (refer to witnessing guidance and FEMP M&V Guidelines)

[ ]  Is each ECM categorized as one of the 19 ECM categories per the IDIQ (and differences noted)

[ ]  M&V strategies manage risk well and are acceptable to agency

Project Facilitator comments on this section:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**PRICE:**

**☐** The PA assessed implementation price ranges “r*eflect”* a clear understanding of the recommended scope. ECM or overall pricing that is either to low or to high could indicate a disconnect between the ESCO and agency performance expectations.

☐ ECM prices (refer to Sch2a) are approximately in line with expectations (benchmarks, rules of thumb, history). A reasonableness check is suitable for the PA (project facilitators may have benchmark ranges for direct costs of common ECMs such as lighting, variable-speed drives, and chillers).

[ ]  Overall project development costs are reasonable (Sch2b; total project price and pricing components)

[ ] Contractor and performance period costs are within range of expectations and/or reasonable (Sch2a, Sch2b, Sch3)

[ ]  The Energy Escalation Rate Calculator was properly applied (where applicable) to forecast utility escalation rates and other proposed rates are reasonable. Note escalation rates are needed for both utilities and O&M costs.

☐ Delivery percentages (Schedules 2a, 2b, 3) and interest rate spread are within the ESCO’s IDIQ contract maximums

Project Facilitator comments on this section:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**SCHEDULES:**

[ ]  TO schedules in the PA are from eProject Builder (footnoted on each schedule)

[ ]  Sch1: All annual payments are less than guaranteed annual savings (required)

[ ]  Sch1: Guaranteed annual cost savings are within a reasonable level of estimated annual cost savings

☐ Summary: Contract term is reasonable and acceptable

Project Facilitator comments on this section:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**OVERALL:**

(Y/N) Does this project meet the majority of the agency needs and all requirements? Or can it be easily modified to meet the needs?

(Y/N) Is this an appropriate project to pursue under a performance contract?

(Y/N) Is this a reasonable technical and financial deal for the government?

(Y/N) Is this a contractor with whom you can have a good long-term working relationship?

(Y/N) Have agency risks been evaluated and minimized?

(Y/N) Are all buildings included in the scope appropriate given facility master plan?

(Y/N) Are the overall percentages of energy and cost savings from the project reasonable?

☐ Review comments from all reviewers (including SMEs) have been pulled together by the PF into a single document/package, provided to the Agency and contractor, and archived by the PF

Project Facilitator comments on this section:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_