Pacific Gas and Electric Company Independent Evaluator Re-Evaluation Questionnaire For 2010 Assessment

Name of	
Evaluator Name of IE	
Firm	
IE Engagements (e.g. "2007 RPS Solicitation"). Add more lines as necessary. (To Be Filled in by PG&I	Cost Per Engagement (To Be Filled in by PG&E)

Section I

٦

Assessment of Independent Evaluator – Specific Criteria

response or	circling your respo	onse. At t		ng an X to the left of your ia, you also have the ns to that criteria.
	ed impartiality in his	s or her as	Fairness ssessment of the RFO ncial interest in the po) or bilateral contracting otential bidders
Question 1	recommendations of	concernin _a	lity in his or her revie g the RFO process, R ugh the RFO or non-	RFO bid assessments, or
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral Opi	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree No
Question 2	outcome of an RF(demonstrate any fin) or bilate nancial in	ral negotiation or dia	at issue in an RFO or
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral Opi	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree No
Question 3			her reports or PRG p nst any party or intere	
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral Opi	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree No
Please add your a	additional commen	ts about t	he IE regarding fair	ness.

Criteria:	Thoroughness
Cincina.	Invivugnitos

The IE assessed all relevant information to provide a reliable and complete report.

Question 1			lusions in his or her ne or she considered	A	ovided
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral Opin	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No
Question 2	The IE provided cl	ear and wo	ell-supported conclus	sions.	
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral Opin	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No
Question 3	used the criteria se	t forth in t	te assessments of the he appropriate proto RFO or non-RFO b	cols or CPUC decis	
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral Opin	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No

Criteria: Availability

The IE was available or made him or herself available to discuss the RFO process, bids, contract negotiations, and PRG presentations.

<u> </u>	0		le himself or herself t G or PRG members)	o meet with the	
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral Opi	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No
Zuconon 2	The IE was respon questions on a time	-	uests for information	ı or in answering	
		ът. , т		0, 1 D'	
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral Opi	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No

The IE demo	nstrated and applied	d an in-de	Expertise pth knowledge of the ce a reliable report.	subject he or she	was
Question 1		strated tec	hnical expertise in h	is or her ability to	
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral Opi	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No
Question 2			luation and analytic uation in the RFO p	•	•
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral Opi	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No
Question 3		ed a firm ¿	grasp of both the qua al negotiation evalua	-	tative
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral Opin	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No
Please add your :	additional commen	ts about t	he IE regarding exp	ertise.	

	Criteria: Communications The IE was clear and complete with her or her comments.	
^ · · ·	The IE's reports or PRG presentations were clear and complete and addressed the concerns and interests of the PRG.	
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Strongly Disagree Dopinion	No
VIICALIUH 4	The IE's reports that were included in CPUC filings (i.e., advice letter applications, etc.) were clear and complete.	rs,
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Strongly Disagree Dopinion	No
Question 3	The IE was able to effectively communicate orally at PRG meetings.	
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree Neutral Somewhat Disagree Strongly Disagree Dopinion	No

	The II		a: Cost were reasonable.		
Question 1	The IE's hourly bil	lling rate	appeared to be reason	nable and appropri	ate.
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral Opi	Somewhat Disagree nion	Strongly Disagree	No
Question 2	The amount of time to be reasonable an	-	pent on specific tasks riate.	or assignments ap	peared
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral Opi	Somewhat Disagree nion	Strongly Disagree	No
Question 3	The costs included appeared to be reas		's bills (e.g., travel, co nd appropriate.	ppying costs, etc.)	
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral Opi	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No
Pleas	e add your additio	nal comm	ents about the IE re	garding Cost	

Criteria:	Added	Value
CINCIIA.	Auuuu	v aruc

The IE demonstrated that him or her added value to the procurement process or product (e.g. specific bilateral review).

Question 1	PG&E's procurem	-	ations to the PRG we ies.	ere helpful in revie	wing
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral Opi	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No
Question 2			Commission were use ng and the Commissi		partie
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral Opi	Somewhat Disagree nion	Strongly Disagree	No
Question 3	The IE provided he its procurement pro	10	ce or comments on h	ow PG&E could in	nprove
Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No

Section II Recommendation

Please provide any additional comments and your recommendation about retention of the IE in PG&E's IE Pool.

Reviewer's Name:

Representing:

Date of Review: