

ESCO Evaluation Sheet for an Energy Performance Contract

Firm _____ Rater _____ Date _____

1. Project Management and Coordination

Show the organization chart (by name as available) for implementing and managing the proposed project, including the responsibilities of each individual shown and the lines of authority within the overall organization. Identify portions of the effort, if any, that are proposed to be subcontracted and provide the same information for subcontractor organization and personnel. What is the current workload of the staff identified to work on this project? Can the firm meet the proposed project deadlines?

SCORE	CRITERIA
Poor	Organizational chart does not indicate primary management responsibilities or lines of authority for any individuals with the team. Requirement for subcontracted work is not explained. Management and coordination not explained. Ability to meet schedule not explained. High risk of failure.
Acceptable	Organizational chart lists main customer contract only or the line of authority does not extend to the potential field individuals. Requirement for subcontracted work briefly explained without any additional information (if applicable). Management and coordination barely explained or a standard response. Moderate risk of failure.
Good	Organizational chart lists all known tasks but not all team members identified. Management responsibilities and authority not complete. Subcontracted work identified without any personnel identified (as applicable). Management responsibilities were not explained or it was a standard response. Low risk of failure.
Superior	Organizational chart lists all known team members or identifies type of task members with clear lines of responsibilities and authority. All potential subcontracted work identified with personnel identified (as applicable). Management responsibilities are clearly explained. No risk of failure.
Score / Comments	

2. Appropriate Market Sector Experience/Expertise

Provide information that emphasizes ESCO's experience and expertise in a specific market sector.

SCORE	CRITERIA
Poor	Less than 3 years experience with specific market sector or with any EPC project in the state. High risk of failure.
Acceptable	3 to 5 years experience with specific market sector or with any EPC

	project in the state. Moderate risk of failure.
Good	5-8 years experience with specific market sector or with any EPC project in the state. Low risk of failure.
Superior	8 plus years experience with specific market sector or with any EPC project in the state. No risk of failure.
Score / Comments	

3. Project Personnel and Staffing

Identify each individual(s) who will have primary responsibility for the following tasks. Include the name, title, intended role and responsibilities for the duration of the contract, educational background, specific qualifications related to role and responsibilities, past relevant experience, number of years of relevant experience, supervisory responsibilities if relevant, list of projects individual was associated with during the last five years including type of project and project cost shall be included. Provide resumes for personnel proposed for work.

3a. **Qualifications and Experience of Personnel – Technical Analysis (audit)**

Do the individuals identified as the audit team have experience in the client's type of facilities, expertise with state design codes/requirements, and knowledge of the local construction industry? Is the audit process explained? Any identified energy conservation measures (ECMs)? Renewable energy discussed? How is the savings cash flow developed? Is the risk of savings cash flow explained (measurement and verification [M/V] education)? How is equipment selected? How is the initial construction cost estimates developed?

SCORE	CRITERIA
Poor	Less than 3 years experience with specific market sector or with any EPC project in the state. Team has little knowledge of or the development of ECMs. Savings methodology not explained. High risk of savings not being maintained over the life of the equipment. Equipment selection by ESCo. Construction cost estimate process not valid. High risk of failure.
Acceptable	3 to 5 years experience with specific market sector or with any EPC project in the state. Staff has basic knowledge of or the development of ECMs. Simple savings methodology. Acceptable risk of savings not being maintained over the life of the equipment. Equipment selected to meet savings only. Construction cost estimate by national cost only. Moderate risk of failure.
Good	5-8 years experience with specific market sector or with any EPC project in the state. Staff has good knowledge of or the development of

ESCO Evaluation Sheet for an Energy Performance Contract

Firm _____ Rater _____ Date _____

	ECMs. Savings methodology inputs explained. Low risk of savings not being maintained over the life of the equipment. Equipment selected with some client input. Construction cost estimate checked against firm's historical data. Low risk of failure.
Superior	8 plus years experience with specific market sector or with any EPC project in the state. Staff has extensive knowledge of or the development of ECMs. Savings methodology inputs explained and matches national M/V standard. No risk of savings not being maintained over the life of the equipment. Equipment selected with savings, O/M, and client considerations. Construction cost estimate check with local contractors. No risk of failure.
Score / Comments	

3b. Qualifications and Experience of Personnel – Engineering Design

Do the individuals identified as the design team have experience in the client's type of facilities, expertise with the state's design codes/requirements, and knowledge of the local construction industry? Explain what design is done in-house or contracted out and why? What are their relevant skills, availability, experience as a team? Is the design checked for saving requirements, completeness, constructability, and cost? Include a minimum of one professional engineer licensed in the state.

SCORE	CRITERIA
Poor	Less than 3 years experience with specific market sector or with any EPC project in the state. All design is subcontracted out. Design individuals have no working experience together. Design team not identified. Design team not available. No due diligence review on final design. High risk of failure.
Acceptable	3 to 5 years experience with specific market sector or with any EPC project in the state. Subcontracted design not explained. Some design individuals have worked together. Most design team members not identified. Not all members of the design team are available. Code review of final design only. Moderate risk of failure.
Good	5-8 years experience with specific market sector or with any EPC project in the state. Subcontracted design explained. Most design individuals have worked together. Most design team members are identified. Most members of the design team are available. Final design has code review and some client review. Low risk of failure.
Superior	8 plus years experience with specific market sector or with any EPC project in the state. Subcontracted design explained and local firms

	utilized. Design individuals have worked together. Design team members are identified. Design team is available. Final design has code review, extensive internal review, and client's review. No risk of failure.
Score / Comments	

3c. Qualifications and Experience of Personnel – Construction Management

Do the individuals identified as the Construction Management team have experience in the client's type of facilities, expertise with the state's design codes/requirements, and knowledge of the local construction industry? Explain what construction management is done in-house or contracted out and why? What are their relevant skills, availability, experience as a team? Experience with problem solving and communication with client. Experience with multiply contractor coordination.

SCORE	CRITERIA
Poor	Less than 3 years experience with specific market sector or with any EPC project in the state. Construction management team not identified. High risk of failure.
Acceptable	3 to 5 years experience with specific market sector or with any EPC project in the state. Construction team identified but has no experience with design team or no experience with potential ECMs. Construction team has weak communication skills. Moderate risk of failure.
Good	5-8 years experience with specific market sector or with any EPC project in the state. Construction team identified but has experience with design team and some experience with potential ECMs. Construction team has good communication skills. Low risk of failure.
Superior	8 plus years experience with specific market sector or with any EPC project in the state. Construction team identified but has extensive experience with design team and extensive experience with potential ECMs. Construction team has proven communication skills and problem solving skills. No risk of failure.
Score / Comments	

3d. Qualifications and Experience of Personnel – Construction

Identify each individual or company division who will have responsibility for any

ESCO Evaluation Sheet for an Energy Performance Contract

Firm _____ Rater _____ Date _____

in-house construction. Why in-house instead of subcontracted work? How is the in-house construction cost verified as reasonable? Any subcontractors identified for construction. Why these subcontractors? How are subcontractors selected? Any experience with local subcontractors? How is the warranty handled?

SCORE	CRITERIA
Poor	ESCO has no knowledge of local contractors and does none of the work in-house. In-house construction division utilized or a non-local subcontractor selected before a review of potential local contractors cost and availability. High risk of failure.
Acceptable	ESCO has some knowledge of local contractors and performs selected work in-house with qualified staff. ESCo prefers non-local subcontractors to local subcontractors because of previous projects with subcontractors and cost is not always a consideration. Moderate risk of failure.
Good	ESCO has worked in many locations in the state. ESCo has worked with some local contractors. Performs selected work in-house with qualified staff. ESCo works with client to select a subcontractor. Low risk of failure.
Superior	ESCO has worked in most of the state. ESCo has worked with many local contractors on similar projects. Performs work in-house with qualified staff when proven cost effective. ESCo works with client to select a subcontractor and subcontractor has previous EPC experience. No risk of failure.
Score / Comments	

3e. Qualifications and Experience of Personnel – Training

How is the training determined? Who does the training - the ESCo, the subcontractor, the equipment supplier, or a combination of all? Is the training recorded for future staff or for retraining existing staff? Where is the training site? What follow-up training is required or offered?

SCORE	CRITERIA
Poor	No training program discussed. Client is expected to provide all the training to their staff. High risk of failure.
Acceptable	No formal schedule training provided. Training is defined as the client participating in the start-up and testing of equipment. Training is general and not to the equipment installed. No recording of training. Moderate risk of failure.
Good	Training schedule is outlined only for some ECMs. Client participation in start-up and testing expected. Training is focused on operation and

	maintenance (O&M) only. Training is recorded. Low risk of failure.
Superior	Training requirement is outlined for each ECM with clients input. Training is focused on both long term O&M and maintenance of required energy savings. Training is on the actual equipment installed. Training is recorded. No risk of failure.
Score / Comments	

3f. Qualifications and Experience of Personnel – Measurement and Verification
 Did the ESCo explain how the International Performance Measurement and Verification Protocol (IPMVP) plan will be developed in conjunction with the technical energy audit? Is the client educated on the different M&V options, cost of each option, and the risk to the long-term energy saving of each option? Are the long-term M&V tasks explained to the client to help sustain the energy savings in the future?

SCORE	CRITERIA
Poor	IPMVP is not utilized or recognized. M&V plan is based upon ESCo goals. No education on M&V. High risk of failure.
Acceptable	ESCo recognizes the IPMVP. No discussion on how long-term energy savings is sustained. No discussion on how the client can verify savings. ESCo perform verification. Moderate risk of failure.
Good	ESCo recognizes the IPMVP. Client explained how M&V plan could help sustain long-term energy savings. ESCo perform verification with annual report. Some discussion on how the client can verify savings. Low risk of failure.
Superior	ESCo recognizes the IPMVP. IPMVP plan explained and risk assessment on savings explained. Client explained how M&V plan could help sustain long-term energy savings. ESCo performs verification of savings over the length of the loan payments. Client trained to perform saving verification. No risk of failure.
Score / Comments	

3g. Qualifications and Experience of Personnel – Post Construction Support
 What is the equipment warranty process? Do all warranty issues go to the ESCo, Construction Company, the nation equipment provider, or to the local equipment provider? How are warranty conflicts resolved?

ESCO Evaluation Sheet for an Energy Performance Contract

Firm _____ Rater _____ Date _____

SCORE	CRITERIA
Poor	National equipment company handles all warranty issues. ESCo not involved. High risk of failure.
Acceptable	Warranty issues handle by a mix of the contractors, local representatives or national firms. ESCo will provide support only in guarantee period if savings are at risk. Moderate risk of failure.
Good	Warranty issues handle by a mix of the contractors, local representatives or national firms. ESCo will provide support beyond guarantee period only if savings are at risk. Low risk of failure.
Superior	Warranty issues handle by a mix of the contractors, local representatives or national firms per client's direction. ESCo will provide support and work with local and national firms to find a solution. No risk of failure.
Score / Comments	

3h. Added Qualifications and Experience

From the table of individuals proposed for the project who is identified for the: technical analysis, engineering design, construction management, construction, training, post-construction measurement and verification, support, and other services. What is their level of expertise, years in industry or other important facts? Where are they located? Permanent office in the state? On assignment from other state? Out-of-state support?

SCORE	CRITERIA
Poor	Individuals not identified for the different roles. High risk of failure.
Acceptable	Individuals identified for some of the roles. Level of expertise low for the scope of anticipated work. On-site availability limited. Moderate risk of failure.
Good	Individuals identified for most of the roles. Level of expertise good for the scope of anticipated work. On-site availability explained. Low risk of failure.
Superior	Individuals identified for all of the roles. Level of expertise explained in detail and matches the scope of anticipated work. On-site availability explained. No risk of failure.
Score / Comments	

4. Cost and Pricing

Maximum rates were established for ESCOs participating in the state's energy performance contracting program. Review the rates proposed for this specific project.

4a. **Markups**

Markups shall be calculated as a percentage added to the base cost for the project. The use of margins in lieu of markups is not acceptable. Ranges for markups are not acceptable. Review the mark-up categories for total potential cost for the project. Overhead and profit (O&P) could be low, but mark-ups on the other categories could be high. Compare amount of design work done in-house verse subcontracted work to determine potential fees.

SCORE	CRITERIA
Poor	Mark-ups for overhead and profit high for the anticipated scope of work. Mark-ups on equipment and materials purchased are high. Mark-ups on subcontracted work are high. Overall, mark-ups are high or hard to understand. High potential cost.
Acceptable	Mark-ups for overhead and profit acceptable for the anticipated scope of work. Mark-ups on equipment and materials purchased are acceptable. Mark-ups on subcontracted work are acceptable. Overall, mark-ups are acceptable. Moderate potential cost.
Good	Mark-ups for overhead and profit good for the anticipated scope of work. Mark-ups on equipment and materials purchased are good. Mark-ups on subcontracted work are good. Overall, mark-ups are good and understandable. Low potential cost.
Superior	Mark-ups for overhead and profit low for the anticipated scope of work. Mark-ups on equipment and materials purchased are low. Mark-ups on subcontracted work are low. Overall mark-ups are low and very understandable. Superior potential cost.
Score / Comments	

4b. **Fees**

Use only the categories shown. Ranges for fees are not acceptable. Review the audit cost against industry range, anticipated scope of work, contingency requirement, expected length of audit schedule, accuracy of saving calculation, and method of construction cost estimating. What fees are one-time? What fees are annual? Are mark-ups applied to every category?

SCORE	CRITERIA
Poor	Cost of energy audit is either above or below industry range. Audit cost does not match anticipated scope of work. One-time verse annual fees

ESCO Evaluation Sheet for an Energy Performance Contract

Firm _____ Rater _____ Date _____

High	not reasonable and high. Mark-ups applied to every category. High potential cost.
Acceptable	Cost of energy audit is just above or below industry range. Audit cost does not match anticipated scope of work. One-time versus annual fees not reasonable but within an acceptable range. Mark-ups applied to most categories. Moderate potential cost.
Good	Cost of energy audit is within the industry range. Audit process explained in previous sections to match audit cost, but the explanation is not sufficient. One-time versus annual fees reasonable. Mark-ups applied to appropriate categories, but high. Low potential cost.
Superior	Cost of energy audit is within industry range. Audit process explained in previous sections to match audit cost. One-time versus annual fees reasonable. Mark-ups applied to appropriate categories. Superior potential cost.
Score / Comments	

4c. Best Value

Is the company's approach to performance contracting the best value for the investment? Does the ESCo describe or provide examples of any utility rebates or other financial incentives or grants it can potentially provide and/or facilitate? Does the cost of their work match the level of expertise identified for the project and the complexity of the project? Does the ESCo explain the cost for their work matches the value they deliver?

SCORE	CRITERIA
Poor	Price proposal indicates that the vendor does not understand the scope of work, complexity of project, or other critical details and that the proposed price is clearly not consistent with the overall project goals. Mark-ups, fees, and services provided are distinctly low or high based on the reader's perception. High potential cost.
Acceptable	Price proposal demonstrates that the vendor understands the scope, complexity, and other critical details, and that the price is reasonable for the project. Moderate potential cost.
Good	Price proposal provides solid detail relative to the successful accomplishment of each detail. The vendor demonstrates that they understand the scope, the complexity and other critical details. Low potential cost.
Superior	Price proposal provides strong detail relative to the successful accomplishment of each detail. The vendor demonstrates that they understand the scope, the complexity, other critical details and in particular the ability to absorb reasonable changes due to the variety of

	client buildings, weather, client issues, and other specifics Superior potential cost.
Score / Comments	