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**INVESTMENT-GRADE AUDIT/PROPOSAL: REVIEW CHECKLIST**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Name** |  |
| **FEMP ID#** |  |
| **Agency** |  |
| **Project Facilitator** |  |
| **Date of Review** |  |

**Overall**

IGA content consistent with Agency requirements

All buildings included in the scope are appropriate given facility master plan

Overall percentage energy and cost savings are reasonable

Rebates and incentives were adequately pursued by ESCO

Risks of emerging/underutilized technologies properly identified and brought to Agency’s attention as necessary

Where Agency accepting O&M responsibilities, reviewer has assessed the likelihood of problems and their potential impacts, and has brought these to the Agency’s attention

ESCO is responsible for O&M of equipment installed (required by 2017 IDIQ; Section C.8)

Risk, Responsibility, and Performance Matrix consistent with Agency expectations

M&V strategies and costs provide good balance between cost and Agency risk

Reviewer has assessed the overall reliance on Option A methods to ensure appropriate, given risks

Reviewer has examined percentage of project savings from electricity, gas, other fuels, water, and O&M, to identify where more extensive M&V should be emphasized

☐ 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

Analyses, notes, and other work done to support the PF’s comments have been archived

**For each form of energy and water (duplicate for each type of energy):**

Energy type:

Baseline unit rate adequately documented.

If blended rates are used, the methodology for calculating them is valid.

Escalation rates adequately documented and consistent with FEMP recommendations (latest version of EERC tool utilized).

**For each ECM (duplicate for each ECM):**

Technical Category:

ECM Name:

FPE notified of need for technology expert review, if necessary

ECM suitable for intended purpose and consistent with agency requirements

Construction cost consistent with similar ECMs in recent projects

Proposed construction schedule reasonable and consistent with previous projects

Commissioning plan is adequate

Methodology used to calculate baseline energy use adequate and supported by the included measured data

Operating hour and other assumptions are reasonable and well-documented

Energy savings estimate consistent with similar ECMs in recent projects, and is adequately documented

Interactive effects with other ECMs considered in the calculations

Assessed the need for expert review of building models (DOE-2, EnergyPlus, etc.) and obtained secondary reviews as necessary

Simulation models adequately calibrated

Sampling of equipment to calculate baseline performed correctly

Energy cost savings calculation consistent with energy savings estimate and baseline energy unit prices.

Energy-related O&M cost savings reasonable, well-documented and consistent with FEMP guidance, and supported by customer evaluation

Added O&M costs for additional equipment adequately documented, and included in cash flow

For ECMs with expected useful life less than project term, replacement plan is documented and budgeted in project

Post-installation M&V activities appropriate and adequate to determine potential to provide savings

Annual M&V activities adequate and consistent with current FEMP guidance (reference latest version of M&V Guidelines: Measurement and Verification for Performance-Based Contracts)

The IGA M&V plan includes a schedule indicating M&V activities, a recommended level of government witnessing for each ECM, and post-award M&V reporting milestones for each ECM (reference IDIQ Sec. C.4.2.B and Guide to Government Witnessing and Review of Measurement and Verification Activities)

Planned measurements during post-acceptance M&V confirm performance as opposed to confirming intent (e.g., confirming that space temperatures actually change in the case of setbacks or an actuator moves versus confirming they are programmed to occur)

Any sampling performed during M&V is adequate and consistent with FEMP guidelines (reference latest version of M&V Guidelines: Measurement and Verification for Performance-Based Contracts)

Where M&V method depends on customer-maintained equipment like a BAS/EMCS, reviewer comments address the potential risks and/or recommend backup plan

Where ECMs or M&V depend on connection to military LAN, reviewer comments address potential connection challenges and risks

ECM lessons learned for energy generation (PV, wind, CHP, biomass, etc.), power purchase agreement, and emerging technology ECMs was reviewed and applied as appropriate for this project (lessons learned document available from <https://energy.gov/eere/femp/resources-implementing-federal-energy-savings-performance-contracts>)

**TO Schedules**

TO schedules in proposal/IGA match those in eProject Builder

**TO-1**

Implementation period savings and payments consistent with Agency expectations and FEMP guidance

Estimated annual cost savings traceable to and consistent with ECM-level calculations

Guaranteed cost savings consistent with estimated annual cost savings

Annual contractor payments consistent with guaranteed cost savings, and are less than guaranteed savings in each contract year

**TO-2a**

Components of the implementation price (columns a, b, and c) for each ECM are traceable to costs detailed in the proposal/IGA

Activities that make up the M&V expense for each ECM are adequately described in the proposal/IGA and reasonable (for both M&V equipment installed at construction and post- installation M&V activities – see TO-2b parts b and j)

**TO-2b**

M&V costs in parts b and j sum to the M&V expense total in TO-2a

**TO-3**

Performance period service expenses adequately documented and consistent with previous projects of this size

Interest payments for each year consistent with project interest rate and loan balance

Loan balance correct for each year

**TO-4**

Energy baseline and savings for each ECM and each form of energy consistent with calculations provided in the IGA

Energy cost savings for each ECM and each form of energy consistent with energy savings and energy unit costs

Other energy-related O&M costs for each ECM consistent with documentation in IGA

M&V expense represents a reasonable balance of cost versus savings risk (one-time M&V expenses/costs on TO-2a and TO-2b may need to be considered in this assessment)

**TO-5**

Cancellation ceiling for each year is consistent with remaining principle per Schedule TO-3 and agreed-upon cancellation penalty ceiling

**Summary of Key Issues/Findings** (List main areas of concern identified in review)

|  |
| --- |
|  |