

Annual Performance Evaluation of Qualified Persons (QP) / Mining Plan Preparing Agencies (MPPAs) by Coal Controller Organization

1. Performance evaluation of all QPs/MPPAs will be done annually (for year 2024-25 onwards) by Coal Controller Organization (CCO). The Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and various factors to be considered for addition/subtraction of points during the evaluation process have been given in self-explanatory table (refer **Annexure-I**).
 2. Based on the score obtained, QPs/MPPAs will be categorized under three categories viz. "Very Good", "Good" and "Poor" (**refer Annexure-II**). A yearly assessed category will be communicated to the QP/MPPA.
 3. Those evaluated under "Poor" category are expected to improve their performance to avoid any further action by the competent authority. Their poor performance will be communicated to the competent authority/ QCI/NABET. 30 points will be deducted from the score obtained during performance evaluation in the subsequent year.
 4. In case a number of mining plans, prepared by a QP/MPPA, have been approved in a year, the average score will be considered.
5. Explanations of certain terms used in the table given in Annexure-I
- a. **Suppression of facts/objectionable omissions:**
 - (i) The facts mentioned insidiously in one section of the mining plan, clearly indicating that the QP/MPPA is aware of the fact, but not elaborated at relevant places in the mining plan or not discussing during the presentations/discussions with Internal Committee.
 - (ii) Omissions of observations made by Internal Committee.
 - (iii) Omissions/additions of certain facts from the mining plan during subsequent uploading of mining plans without approval/information of the Internal Committee
 - (iv) Other cases of similar nature.
 - b. **Technical Inconsistency:**
 - (i) Inefficiency/lack of knowledge of QPs/MPPAs, regarding statute/guidelines/plan preparation/use of software/ other planning concepts/calculations/etc., is grossly evident.
 - (ii) Other cases of similar nature.

c. Rejections directly attributed to QP/MPPA:

- i. Case comes to the notice that due to inaccurate planning, the project cannot be executed (at any stage).
- ii. Rejection was due to the fact that proper advice, regarding documents to be used for mine planning, boundary certification etc., was not given by the QP/MPPA.

(ii) Other cases of similar nature.

5. No deductions will be made due to any delays/ rejections not directly attributed to the QP/MPPA.

Annexure-I

Table 1: Key Performance Indicators for annual performance evaluation of QPs/MPPAs

No. of meetings		Time for approval by the Internal Committee		Suppression of facts/ Objectionable Omissions	Technical inconsistency	False reports related with Minor changes	Rejections directly attributed to MPPA	Addition al Points given by IC members of CCO for complex projects and technical excellence	Carry over points for previous year performance
No. of meetings	Score	Time (days)	Score						
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2	100	Less than 75	100	-15 points per mining plan	-15 points per mining plan	-10 points per instance	-50 points per mining plan	+50 points per mining plan	-30 points for Poor Grade categorization in the previous year
3	90	Less than 105	80						
4	80	Less than 135	60						

5	70	Less than 165	40						
6	60	Less than 195	20						
7	50	Less than 225	10						
8	40	Greater than 225	0						
9	30								
10	20								
11	10								

Annexure-II

Table2: Categorization based on score obtained as per Table 1 above

Total Score	Category
170- 200	Very Good
101-169	Good
0-100	Poor