SELF-GOVERNANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST

## Self-Governance Purpose, Goals, Objectives, and Benefits

The purpose of Self-Governance is to codify the self-governance arrangement for contractor’s Earned Value Management System (EVMS) implementation, maintenance and data sharing in contractor’s EVM System Description or Self-Governance Charter/Plan. The goal is for contractor to develop, implement and maintain an EIA 748 complaint EVMS via self-governance. Effective contractor self-governance through implementation of a visible, structured, and management endorsed process minimizes the requirement for government oversight while ensuring contractual requirements are met in the provision of timely, accurate, reliable and auditable information available for informed contract and project management decision making. This approach is intended to engender a more transparent and collaborative environment.

Self-Governance benefits all parties in the effective and efficient use of the contractor’s EVMS for managing the design and construction delivery process of all projects subject to DOE O 413.3B. It provides contractor the opportunity to plan and schedule internal compliance reviews without disrupting work scope performance; affords contractor the opportunity to self-disclose EVMS related issues and implement corrective actions without disrupting work scope performance; allows contractor to plan and schedule peer or joint reviews with other contractors or DOE without further stressing limited resources; allows DOE/NNSA Program Office and DOE Office of Project Management (PM) to act in a true oversight role, resulting in less intrusive government oversight; and voids the need for future on-site DOE PM-30 EVMS surveillance reviews, assuming submittal of EVMS data and information in PARS, inclusive of quarterly EVMS ribbon runs, remain within acceptable compliance thresholds, and absent DOE/NNSA Program Office or DOE/NNSA Site Office/Project Team request.

## Self-Governance Review Checklist Questions

Based on the features and attributes of a contractor’s Self-Governance Plan, the following checklist provides a series of questions to assess incorporation of concepts in their procedures. Record the results of each question immediately following the question.

* Does the contractoruse the PM-30 Compliance Review Checklist (CRC) matrix during development and maintenance of the EVM System Description and associated procedures in order to address all compliance areas?
* Does the contractor submit, via the Contracting Officer for PM-30 review, all changes to the approved EVM System Description and associated procedures prior to implementation?
* Does the contractor prepare EVMS surveillance plans annually based on risk factors, to include program/project health, past performance and other factors?
* Does the contractor prepare and deliver periodic reports (at least quarterly) that detail EVMS surveillance findings?
* Does the contractor conduct periodic evaluations following a data driven approach to ensure compliance with the accepted EVM System Description and the integrity of the EVMS is maintained, and inform DOE/NNSA Project Office, DOE/NNSA Site Office/Project Team. and PM-30 of deficiencies that affect overall acceptability?
* Does the contractor have established procedures, metrics and corrective action plans that document and resolve documented EVMS deficiencies affecting the validity of the program/project’s reported performance information?
* Does the contractor have procedures to immediately notify and collaboratively work with DOE/NNSA Project Office, DOE/NNSA Site Office/Project Team, and PM-30 on EVMS interpretative differences? Has that happened? If so, ask for example.
* Does the contractorpartner with DOE/NNSA Project Office, DOE/NNSA Site Office/Project Team, and PM-30 to interface with internal and external stakeholders to communicate EVMS lessons learned)?
* Does the Contractor partner with DOE/NNSA Project Office, DOE/NNSA Site Office/Project Team, and PM-30 to develop and promote EVMS compliance, refine EVMS compliance testing protocols and action thresholds, automate EVMS compliance tests to the extent possible, and participate in the development and testing of automated data analytic tools and PARS?
* Are the Contractor’s Contract Requirements Document (CRD) requirements, inclusive of Contractor Project Performance (CPP) Upload Requirements, in accord with DOE O 413.3B?
* Does the Contractor submit all data electronically to DOE via PARS?
* Do the contractor’s procedures state that the data must be submitted using the current Access file, and when available, the CSV flat file template such that the required project performance data is at the lowest element of cost level in the specified format which has been developed to support both the DOE PM-30 EVMS Compliance Review Standard Operating Procedure (ECRSOP) and ongoing Contractor EVMS Self-Governance?
* How does the Contractor ensure the quality of the electronic data transfer to PARS and confirm it is consistent with the data in their EVMS cost and schedule systems?
* To ensure effective self-governance, does the Contractorprovide additional specific detailed information as an attachment in PARS Document Management System (DMS) for those projects with a TPC of $100M or more on at least a quarterly basis, including
* Baseline and forecast/status schedule files in native formats (e.g., .xer)?
* Internally generated test ribbons and drill-down results?
* Trend log and change control logs for contingency, CBB, MR, UB, and PMB?
* Other EVMS artifacts (e.g., WADs, BCPs, etc.), when requested?
* Does the contractor assess the ongoing compliance of their EVMS by accessing the PARS compliance test results?