

**APPENDIX E**  
**STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE-BASED FEE**

**FY 2008**  
**BATTELLE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND MEASUREMENT PLAN**  
**for**  
**Management and Operations of the**  
**Pacific Northwest National Laboratory**

**APPENDIX E**  
**STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE-BASED FEE**

**FY 2008**  
**BATTELLE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND MEASUREMENT PLAN**  
**FOR**  
**MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS OF THE**  
**PACIFIC NORTHWEST NATIONAL LABORATORY**



---

**Michael J Weis, Manager**  
**Pacific Northwest Site Office**

10/10/07  
Date

**Table of Contents**

**INTRODUCTION ..... 5**

**II. PERFORMANCE GOALS, OBJECTIVES & PERFORMANCE MEASURES..... 10**

**BACKGROUND ..... 10**

**PERFORMANCE GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES ..... 10**

**1.0 PROVIDE FOR EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE MISSION ACCOMPLISHMENT ..... 11**

**1.1 SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY RESULTS PROVIDE MEANINGFUL IMPACT ON THE FIELD..... 11**

**1.2 PROVIDE QUALITY LEADERSHIP IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY..... 12**

**2.0 PROVIDE FOR EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE DESIGN, FABRICATION, CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF RESEARCH FACILITIES..... 18**

**2.1 PROVIDE EFFECTIVE FACILITY DESIGN(S) AS REQUIRED TO SUPPORT LABORATORY PROGRAMS. 18**

**2.2 PROVIDE FOR THE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES AND/OR FABRICATION OF COMPONENTS ..... 19**

**2.3 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE OPERATION OF FACILITIES ..... 19**

**2.4 EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF FACILITY(IES) TO GROW AND SUPPORT THE LABORATORY’S RESEARCH BASE AND EXTERNAL USER COMMUNITY ..... 20**

**3.0 PROVIDE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH PROJECT/PROGRAM MANAGEMENT ..... 22**

**3.1 PROVIDE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT STEWARDSHIP OF SCIENTIFIC CAPABILITIES AND PROGRAM VISION..... 22**

**3.2 PROVIDE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROJECT/PROGRAM PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT ..... 23**

**3.3 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATIONS AND RESPONSIVENESS TO CUSTOMER NEEDS ..... 24**

**4.0 PROVIDE SOUND AND COMPETENT LEADERSHIP AND STEWARDSHIP OF THE LABORATORY..... 28**

**4.1 PROVIDE A DISTINCTIVE VISION FOR THE LABORATORY AND AN EFFECTIVE PLAN FOR ACCOMPLISHMENT OF THE VISION TO INCLUDE STRONG PARTNERSHIPS REQUIRED TO CARRY OUT THOSE PLANS ..... 28**

**4.2 PROVIDE FOR RESPONSIVE AND ACCOUNTABLE LEADERSHIP THROUGHOUT THE ORGANIZATION 29**

**4.3 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE CORPORATE OFFICE SUPPORT AS APPROPRIATE..... 29**

**5.0 SUSTAIN EXCELLENCE AND ENHANCE EFFECTIVENESS OF INTEGRATED SAFETY, HEALTH, AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION..... 31**

**5.1 PROVIDE A WORK ENVIRONMENT THAT PROTECTS WORKERS AND THE ENVIRONMENT. .... 31**

**5.2 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF INTEGRATED SAFETY, HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT ..... 32**

**5.3 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT, MINIMIZATION, AND POLLUTION PREVENTION ..... 32**

**6.0 DELIVER EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE BUSINESS SYSTEMS AND RESOURCES THAT ENABLE THE SUCCESSFUL ACHIEVEMENT OF THE LABORATORY MISSION(S) THE CONTRACTOR SUSTAINS AND ENHANCES CORE BUSINESS SYSTEMS THAT PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE SUPPORT TO LABORATORY PROGRAMS AND ITS MISSION(S)..... 34**

**6.1 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM(S) ..... 34**

**6.2 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE ACQUISITION AND PROPERTY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM(S) ..... 35**

**6.3 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AND DIVERSITY PROGRAM..... 35**

**6.4 PROVIDE EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS FOR INTERNAL AUDIT AND OVERSIGHT; QUALITY; INFORMATION MANAGEMENT; AND OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES AS APPROPRIATE ..... 36**

**6.5 DEMONSTRATE EFFECTIVE TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY AND COMMERCIALIZATION OF INTELLECTUAL ASSETS ..... 36**

**7.0 SUSTAIN EXCELLENCE IN OPERATING, MAINTAINING, AND RENEWING THE FACILITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE PORTFOLIO TO MEET LABORATORY NEEDS ..... 38**

**7.1 MANAGE FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE IN AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE MANNER THAT OPTIMIZES USAGE AND MINIMIZES LIFE CYCLE COSTS..... 38**

**7.2 PROVIDE PLANNING FOR AND ACQUIRE THE FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIRED TO SUPPORT FUTURE LABORATORY PROGRAMS..... 39**

<b>8.0 SUSTAIN AND ENHANCE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY MANAGEMENT (ISSM) AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS .....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>8.1 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM .....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>8.2 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE SYSTEM FOR CYBER-SECURITY .....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>8.3 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE SYSTEM FOR THE PROTECTION OF SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIALS, CLASSIFIED MATTER, AND PROPERTY .....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>8.4 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE SYSTEM FOR THE PROTECTION OF CLASSIFIED AND SENSITIVE INFORMATION.....</b>	<b>43</b>

## INTRODUCTION

This document, the Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan (PEMP), primarily serves as DOE's Quality Assurance/Surveillance Plan (QASP) for the evaluation of Battelle's (hereafter referred to as "the Contractor") performance regarding the management and operations of the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (hereafter referred to as "the Laboratory") for the evaluation period from October 1, 2007, through September 30, 2008. The performance evaluation provides a standard by which to determine whether the Contractor is managerially and operationally in control of the Laboratory and is meeting the mission requirements and performance expectations/objectives of the Department as stipulated within this contract.

This document also describes the distribution of the total available performance-based fee and the methodology for determining the amount of fee earned by the Contractor as stipulated within the clauses entitled, "Determining Total Available Performance Fee and Fee Earned," "Conditional Payment of Fee, Profit, or Incentives," and "Total Available Fee: Base Fee Amount and Performance Fee Amount." In partnership with the Contractor and other key customers, the Department of Energy (DOE) Headquarters (HQ) and the Site Office have defined the measurement basis that serves as the Contractor's performance-based evaluation and fee determination.

The Performance Goals (hereafter referred to as Goals), Performance Objectives (hereafter referred to as Objectives) and set of Performance Measures and Targets (hereafter referred to as Performance Measures/Targets) for each Objective discussed herein were developed in accordance with contract expectations set forth within the contract. The Performance Measures for meeting the Objectives set forth within this plan have been developed in coordination with HQ program offices as appropriate. Except as otherwise provided for within the contract, the evaluation and fee determination will rest solely on the Contractor's performance within the Performance Goals and Objectives set forth within this plan.

The overall performance against each Objective of this performance plan, to include the evaluation of Performance Measures identified for each Objective, shall be evaluated jointly by the appropriate HQ office or major customer and the Site Office. This cooperative review methodology will ensure that the overall evaluation of the Contractor results in a consolidated DOE position taking into account specific Performance Measures as well as all additional information not otherwise identified via specific Performance Measures. The Site Office shall work closely with each HQ program office or major customer throughout the year in evaluating the Contractor's performance and will provide observations regarding programs and projects as well as other management and operation activities conducted by the Contractor throughout the year.

Section I provides information on how the performance rating (grade) for the Contractor, as well as how the performance-based fee earned (if any) will be determined. As applicable, also provides information on the award term eligibility requirements.

Section II provides the detailed information concerning each Goal, their corresponding Objectives, and Performance Measures of performance identified, along with the weightings assigned to each Goal and Objective and a table for calculating the final score for each Goal.

In accordance with the Contract Clause entitled "Determining Total Available Performance Fee and Fee Earned", the annual total available performance fees for FY 2008 shall be \$8,600,000.

### I. DETERMINING THE CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE RATING AND PERFORMANCE-BASED FEE AWARD TERM ELIGIBILITY (as applicable)

The FY 2008 Contractor performance grades for each goal will be determined based on the weighted sum of the individual scores earned for each of the Objectives described within this document for Science and Technology and for Management and Operations. No overall rollup grade will be provided. Performance evaluations shall be measured and graded at the Objective level, which rollup to provide the performance evaluation

determination for each Goal. The rollup of the performance of each Goal will then be utilized to determine the Contractor performance score for Science and Technology and Management and Operations (See Table A below). The total overall score derived for Science and Technology will be utilized to determine the amount of available fee that may be earned (see Table C). The overall score derived for Management and Operations will be utilized to determine the multiplier to be applied (see Table C) to the Science and Technology fee earned to determine the final amount of fee earned for FY 2008. Each Goal is comprised of two or more weighted Objectives, each Objective has one or more performance measures/targets, the outcomes of which collectively assist the evaluating office in determining the Contractor’s overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each management system should demonstrate effective and efficient implementation and execution across the laboratory to demonstrate the measurement of assurance. This also includes the analysis and use of performance data to identify improvement opportunities. Each of the performance measures/targets identifies significant tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones for which the outcomes/results of are important to the success of the corresponding Objective. Other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources to include, but not limited to, the Contractor’s self-evaluation report, operational awareness (daily oversight) activities; “For Cause” reviews (if any); other outside agency reviews (OIG, GAO, DCAA, etc.), and the annual 2-week review (if needed), may be utilized in determining the Contractor’s overall success in meeting an Objective. The following describes the methodology for determining the Contractor’s grade for each Goal:

**Performance Evaluation Methodology:**

The purpose of this section is to establish a methodology to develop scoring at the Objective Level. Each Objective within a Goal shall be assigned a numerical score, per Figure I-1 below, by the evaluating office. Each evaluation will measure the degree of effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in meeting the Objective and shall be based on the Contractor’s success in meeting the set of Performance Measures identified for each Objective as well as other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources as identified above. The set of Performance Measures identified for each Objective represent the set of significant indicators that if fully met, collectively places performance for the Objective in the “B+” grade range. For some targets, it serves the evaluator to provide additional grading details (for example at the A, C+, and D levels) and in those cases details have been included in the PEMP. However, these should be considered as guidelines that do not restrict the evaluation from considering other factors that contribute to the evaluation.

Letter Grade	Numeric Grade	Definition
A+	4.3 – 4.1	Significantly exceeds expectations of performance as set within performance measures identified for each Objective or within other areas within the purview of the Objective. Areas of notable performance have or have the potential to significantly improve the overall mission of the Laboratory. No specific deficiency noted within the purview of the overall Objective being evaluated.
A	4.0 – 3.8	Notably exceeds expectations of performance as set within performance measures identified for each Objective or within other areas within the purview of the Objective. Areas of notable performance either have or have the potential to improve the overall mission of the Laboratory. Minor deficiencies noted are more than offset by the positive performance within the purview of the overall Objective being evaluated and have no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
A-	3.7 – 3.5	Meets expectations of performance as set within performance measures identified for each Objective with some notable areas of increased performance identified. Deficiencies noted are offset by the positive performance within the purview of the overall Objective being evaluated with little or no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
B+	3.4 – 3.1	Meets expectations of performance as set by the performance measures identified for each Objective with no notable areas of increased or diminished performance identified. Deficiencies identified are offset by positive performance and have little to no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.

Letter Grade	Numeric Grade	Definition
B	3.0 – 2.8	Most expectations of performance as set by the performance measures identified for each Objective are met and/or other minor deficiencies are identified. Performance measures or other minor deficiencies identified are offset by positive performance within the purview of the Objective and have little to no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
B-	2.7 – 2.5	One or two expectations of performance set by the performance measures are not met and/or other deficiencies are identified and although they may be offset by other positive performance, they may have the potential to negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
C+	2.4 – 2.1	Some expectations of performance set by the performance measures are not met and/or other minor deficiencies are identified and although they may be offset by other positive performance, they may have the potential to negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
C	2.0 – 1.8	A number of expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or a number of other deficiencies are identified and although they may be somewhat offset by other positive performance, they have the potential to negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
C-	1.7 – 1.1	Most expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or other major deficiencies are identified which have or will negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment if not immediately corrected.
D	1.0 – 0.8	Most or all expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or other significant deficiencies are identified which have negatively impacted the Objective and/or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
F	0.7 – 0	All expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or other significant deficiencies are identified which have significantly impacted both the Objective and the accomplishment of the Laboratory mission.

**Figure I-1. Letter Grade and Numerical Score Definitions**

Calculating Individual Goal Scores and Letter Grade:

Each Objective is assigned the earned numerical score by the evaluating office as stated above. The Goal rating is then computed by multiplying the numerical score by the weight of each Objective within a Goal. These values are then added together to develop an overall score for each Goal. A set of tables is provided at the end of each Performance Goal section of this document to assist in the calculation of Objective scores to the Goal score. Utilizing Table A, below, the scores for each of the Science and Technology (S&T) Goals and Management and Operations (M&O) Goals are then multiplied by the weight assigned and these are summed to provide an overall score for each.

The raw score from each calculation shall be carried through to the next stage of the calculation process. The raw score for Science and Technology and Management and Operations will be rounded to the nearest tenth of a point for determining fee as indicated in Table C. A standard rounding convention of x.44 and less rounds down to the nearest tenth (here, x.4), while x.45 and greater rounds up to the nearest tenth (here, x.50).

S&T Performance Goal	Numerical Score	Letter Grade	Weight	Weighted Score	Total Score
1.0 Mission Accomplishment			55%		
2.0 Construction and Operations of User Research Facilities and Equipment			10%		
3.0 Science and Technology Research Project/Program Management			35%		
<b>Total Score</b>					
M&O Performance Goal	Numerical Score	Letter Grade	Weight	Weighted Score	Total Score
4.0 Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory			20%		
5.0 Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection			20%		
6.0 Business Systems			20%		
7.0 Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio			20%		
8.0 Integrated Safeguards and Security Management and Emergency Management Systems			20%		
<b>Total Score</b>					

**Table A. FY 2008 Contractor Evaluation Score Calculation**

Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F
Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-0.8	0.7-0

**Table B. FY 2008 Contractor Letter Grade Scale**

Determining the Amount of Performance-Based Fee Earned:

The percentage of the available performance-based fee that may be earned by the Contractor shall be determined based on the overall weighted score for the S&T Goals (see Table A. above) and then compared to Table C. below. The overall numerical score of the M&O Goals from Table A. above shall then be utilized to determine the final fee multiplier (see Table C.), which shall be utilized to determine the overall amount of performance-based fee earned for FY 2008 as calculated within Table D.

Overall Weighted Score from Table A.	Percent S&T Fee Earned	M&O Fee Multiplier
4.3	100%	100%
4.2		
4.1		

<sup>1</sup> Weightings for Goals 1, 2, and 3 are preliminary, based upon FY 2007 Budget Authority figures, and are provided here for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for calculating weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2008.

Overall Weighted Score from Table A.	Percent S&T Fee Earned	M&O Fee Multiplier
4.0	97%	100%
3.9		
3.8		
3.7	94%	100%
3.6		
3.5		
3.4	91%	100%
3.3		
3.2		
3.1		
3.0	88%	95%
2.9		
2.8		
2.7	85%	90%
2.6		
2.5		
2.4	75%	85%
2.3		
2.2		
2.1		
2.0	50%	75%
1.9		
1.8		
1.7	0%	60%
1.6		
1.5		
1.4		
1.3		
1.2		
1.1		
1.0 to 0.8	0%	0%
0.7 to 0.0	0%	0%

**Table C. - Performance-Based Fee Earned Scale**

Overall Fee Determination	
Percent S&T Fee Earned from Table C.	
M&O Fee Multiplier from Table C.	X
Overall Earned Performance-Based Fee	

**Table D. – Final Percentage of Performance-Based Fee Earned Determination**

Adjustment to the Letter Grade and/or Performance-Based Fee Determination:

The lack of performance objectives and measures in this plan do not diminish the need to comply with minimum contractual requirements. Although the performance-based Goals and their corresponding Objectives shall be the primary means utilized in determining the Contractor’s performance grade and/or amount of performance-based fee earned, the Contracting Officer may unilaterally adjust the rating and/or reduce the

otherwise earned fee based on the Contractor's performance against all contract requirements as set forth in the Prime Contract. While reductions may be based on performance against any contract requirement, specific note should be made to contract clauses which address reduction of fee including, Standards of Contractor Performance Evaluation, DEAR 970.5215-1 – Total Available Fee: Base Fee Amount and Performance Fee Amount, and Conditional Payment of Fee, Profit, and Other Incentives – Facility Management Contracts. Data to support rating and/or fee adjustments may be derived from other sources to include, but not limited to, operational awareness (daily oversight) activities; "For Cause" reviews (if any); other outside agency reviews (OIG, GAO, DCAA, etc.), and the annual 2-week review (if needed).

The adjustment of a grade and/or reduction of otherwise earned fee will be determined by the severity of the performance failure and consideration of mitigating factors. DEAR 970.5215-3 Conditional Payment of Fee, Profit, and Other Incentives – Facility Management Contracts is the mechanism used for reduction of fee as it relates to performance failures related to safeguarding of classified information and to adequate protection of environment, health and safety. Its guidance can also serve as an example for reduction of fee in other areas.

The final Contractor performance-based grades for each goal and fee earned determination will be contained within a year-end report, documenting the results from the DOE review. The report will identify areas where performance improvement is necessary and, if required, provide the basis for any performance-based rating and/or fee adjustments made from the otherwise earned rating/fee based on Performance Goal achievements.

## **II. PERFORMANCE GOALS, OBJECTIVES & PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

### **Background**

The current performance-based management approach to oversight within DOE has established a new culture within the Department with emphasis on the customer-supplier partnership between DOE and the laboratory contractors. It has also placed a greater focus on mission performance, best business practices, cost management, and improved contractor accountability. Under the performance-based management system the DOE provides clear direction to the laboratories and develops annual performance plans (such as this one) to assess the contractors performance in meeting that direction in accordance with contract requirements. The DOE policy for implementing performance-based management includes the following guiding principles:

- Performance objectives are established in partnership with affected organizations and are directly aligned to the DOE strategic goals;
- Resource decisions and budget requests are tied to results; and
- Results are used for management information, establishing accountability, and driving long-term improvements.

The performance-based approach focuses the evaluation of the Contractor's performance against these Performance Goals. Progress against these Goals is measured through the use of a set of Objectives. The success of each Objective will be measured based on a set of Performance Measures, both objective and subjective, that are to focus primarily on end-results or impact and not on processes or activities. As well as management system performance, this also includes the analysis and use of performance data to identify improvement opportunities and other information that may be gathered as operational oversight. Measures provide specific evidence of performance, and collectively, they provide the body of evidence that indicates performance relative to the corresponding Objectives. On occasion however, it may be necessary to include a process/activity-oriented measure when there is a need for the Contractor to develop a system or process that does not currently exist but will be of significant importance to the DOE and the Laboratory when completed or that lead to the desired outcome/result.

### **Performance Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures**

The following sections describe the Performance Goals, their supporting Objectives, and associated performance measures for FY 2008.

## 1.0 Provide for Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment

**The Contractor produces high-quality, original, and creative results that advance science and technology; demonstrates sustained scientific progress and impact; receives appropriate external recognition of accomplishments; and contributes to overall research and development goals of the Department and its customers.**

The weight of this Goal is 55%.

The Provide for Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment Goal measures the overall effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in delivering science and technology results which contribute to and enhance the DOE's mission of protecting our national and economic security by providing world-class scientific research capacity and advancing scientific knowledge by supporting world-class, peer-reviewed scientific results, which are recognized by others.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers as identified below. The overall Goal score from each HQ Program Office and/or customer is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Tables 1.1, 1.2, & 1.3). Weightings for each Customer listed below are preliminary, based upon FY 2007 Budget Authority figures, and are provided here for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2008.

- Office of Science (SC) (25%)
- Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation (DNN) (23%)
- Department of Homeland Security (DHS) (31%)
- Office of Environmental Management (EM) (12 %)
- Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) (5%)
- Office of Fossil Energy (FE) (2%)
- Office of Intelligence and Counterintelligence (IN) (2%)

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned by each of the offices identified above by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 1.4 below). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 1.5 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as viewed by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers for which the Laboratory conducts work. Should one or more of the HQ Program Offices choose not to provide an evaluation for this Goal and its corresponding Objectives the weighting for the remaining HQ Program Offices shall be recalculated based on their percentage of BA for FY 2008 as compared to the total BA for those remaining HQ Program Offices.

### 1.1 Science and Technology Results Provide Meaningful Impact on the Field

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured through progress reports, peer reviews, Field Work Proposals (FWPs), Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- The impact of publications on the field;
- Publication in journals outside the field indicating broad impact;
- Impact on DOE or other customer mission(s);
- Successful stewardship of mission-relevant research areas;
- Significant awards (R&D 100, FLC, Nobel Prizes, etc.);
- Invited talks, citations, making high-quality data available to the scientific community; and

- Development of tools and techniques that become standards or widely-used in the scientific community.

<b>A to A+</b>	Changes the way the research community thinks about a particular field; resolves critical questions and thus moves research areas forward; results generate huge interest/enthusiasm in the field.
<b>B+</b>	Impacts the community as expected. Strong peer review comments in all relevant areas.
<b>B</b>	Not strong peer review comments in at least one significant research area.
<b>C</b>	One research area just not working out. Peer review reveals that a program isn't going anywhere.
<b>D</b>	Failure of multiple program elements.
<b>F</b>	Gross scientific incompetence and/or scientific fraud.

### 1.2 Provide Quality Leadership in Science and Technology

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured through progress reports, peer reviews, Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Willingness to pursue novel approaches and/or demonstration of innovative solutions to problems;
- Willingness to take on high-risk/high payoff/long-term research problems, evidence that the Contractor “guessed right” in that previous risky decisions proved to be correct and are paying off;
- The uniqueness and challenge of science pursued, recognition for doing the best work in the field;
- Extent of collaborative efforts, quality of the scientists attracted and maintained at the Laboratory;
- Staff members visible in leadership positions in the scientific community; and
- Effectiveness in driving the direction and setting the priorities of the community in a research field.

<b>A to A+</b>	Laboratory staff lead Academy or equivalent panels; laboratory's work changes the direction of research fields; world-class scientists are attracted to the laboratory, lab is trend-setter in a field.
<b>B+</b>	Strong research performer in most areas; staff asked to speak to Academy or equivalent panels to discuss further research directions; lab is center for high-quality research and attracts full cadre of researchers; some aspects of programs are world-class.
<b>B</b>	Strong research performer in many areas; staff asked to speak to Academy or equivalent panels to discuss further research directions; few aspects of programs are world-class.
<b>C</b>	Working on problems no longer at the forefront of science; stale research; evolutionary, not revolutionary.
<b>D</b>	Failure of multiple program elements.
<b>F</b>	Gross scientific incompetence and/or scientific fraud.

### 1.3 Provide and sustain Outputs that Advance Program Objectives & Goals

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measures through defined project products, progress reports, statements of work, program management plans, Program Office and/or other reviews/oversight, etc.:

- The quantity and quality of program/project (e.g., technical reports, policy papers, prototype demonstrations, tasks, etc.) output(s) be it policy, R&D, or implementation programs;
- The number of publications in peer-reviewed journals; and
- Demonstrated progress against peer-reviewed recommendations, headquarters guidance, etc.

<b>A to A+</b>	Program offices, clients, end-users, independent experts and/or peers laud work results; output(s) exceeds the amount and/or quality typically expected for an excellent body of
----------------	--

	work.
<b>B<sup>+</sup></b>	Program office, client, end-user, independent expert and/or peer reviews are universally positive; output(s) meet the amount and/or quality typically expected for the body of work; work demonstrates progress against review recommendations and/or headquarters guidance.
<b>B</b>	Program office, client, end-user, independent expert and/or peer reviews are largely positive, with only a few minor deficiencies and/or slightly negative responses noted; minor deficiencies and/or negative responses have little to no potential to adversely impact the overall program/project.
<b>C</b>	A number of outputs have not met the amount and/or quality typically expected for the body of work; program office, client, end-user, independent expert and/or peer reviews identify a number of deficiencies and although they may be somewhat offset by other positive performance, they have the potential to negatively impact the overall program/project if not corrected.
<b>D</b>	Most outputs have not met the amount and/or quality typically expected for the body of work; program office, client, end-user, independent expert and/or peer reviews identify significant deficiencies which have negatively impacted the overall program/project.
<b>F</b>	All outputs have not met the amount and/or quality typically expected for the body of work; program office, client, end-user, independent expert and/or peer reviews identify significant deficiencies which have significantly impacted and/or damaged the overall program/project.

**1.4 Provide for Effective Delivery of Products** In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measures through progress reports, peer-reviews; Field Work Proposals (FWPs), Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Efficiency and effectiveness in meeting goals/milestones documented within FWPs and/or other such documents;
- Efficiency and effectiveness in delivering on promises and/or getting instruments to work as promised; and
- Efficiency and effectiveness in transmitting results to the community and/or responding to DOE or other customer guidance.

<b>A to A+</b>	Program/project goals and/or milestones are met well ahead of schedule and/or well under budget; program/project and/or mission objective(s) are fully meet and results anticipate HQ guidance.
<b>B<sup>+</sup></b>	Program/project goals and/or milestones are primarily met on schedule and within budget; program/project and/or mission objective(s) are fully meet and are fully responsive to HQ guidance.
<b>B</b>	Most program/project goals and/or milestones are met on schedule and within budget; overall program/project and/or mission objective(s) are meet; minor delays, overruns, and/or deficiencies are minimized and/or have little to no adverse impact the overall program/project.
<b>C</b>	A number of and/or key program/project goals and/or milestones are not met within the scheduled timeframe(s) (e.g less than 6 months behind) and/or within the agreed upon budget (e.g., less than 15% over); overall program/project and/or mission objective(s) have not been met or have the potential to be missed; delays, overruns, and/or deficiencies are identified which have the potential to adversely impact the overall program/project is not corrected.
<b>D</b>	Most of and/or key program/project goals and/or milestones are not met within the scheduled timeframe(s) (e.g more than 6 months behind) and/or within the agreed upon budget (e.g., less than 25% over); overall program/project and/or mission objective(s) have not been met or have the potential to be missed; sizeable delays, overruns, and/or deficiencies are identified which have negatively impacted the overall program/project

<b>F</b>	All and/or key program/project goals and/or milestones are not met within the scheduled timeframe(s) (e.g more than 9 months behind) and/or within the agreed upon budget (e.g., greater than 25% over); overall program/project and/or mission objective(s) have not been met; significant delays, overruns, and/or deficiencies are identified which have negatively impacted the overall program/project.
----------	--

Science Program Office <sup>2</sup>	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
<b>Office of Advanced Scientific Research</b>					
1.1 Impact			40%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			15%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
Overall ASCR Total					
<b>Office of Basic Energy Sciences</b>					
1.1 Impact			50%		
1.2 Leadership			20%		
1.3 Output			15%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
Overall BES Total					
<b>Office of Biological and Environmental Research</b>					
1.1 Impact			30%		
1.2 Leadership			20%		
1.3 Output			20%		
1.4 Delivery			30%		
Overall BER Total					
<b>Office of Fusion Energy Sciences</b>					
1.1 Impact			25%		
1.2 Leadership			25%		
1.3 Output			25%		
1.4 Delivery			25%		
Overall FES Total					
<b>Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists</b>					
1.1 Impact			25%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			30%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
Overall WDTS Total					

Table 1.1 – 1.0 SC Program Office Performance Goal Score Development

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
<b>Office of Advanced Scientific Research</b>			7%		
<b>Office of Basic Energy Sciences</b>			15%		
<b>Office of Biological and Environmental Research</b>			76%		
<b>Office of Fusion Energy Sciences</b>			1%		
<b>Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists</b>			1%		
Performance Goal 1.0 Total					

Table 1.2 – SC Program Office Overall Performance Goal Score Development<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the SC Programs is provided within Attachment I to this plan.

<sup>3</sup> Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 1.2 are preliminary, based upon FY 2007 Budget Authority figures, and are provided for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2008.

HQ Program Office <sup>4</sup>	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
<b>Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation</b>					
1.1 Impact			25%		
1.2 Leadership			15%		
1.3 Output			30%		
1.4 Delivery			30%		
Overall DNN Total					
<b>Department of Homeland Security</b>					
1.1 Impact			40%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			0%		
1.4 Delivery			30%		
Overall DHS Total					
<b>Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy</b>					
1.1 Impact			30%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			20%		
1.4 Delivery			20%		
Overall EERE Total					
<b>Office of Environmental Management</b>					
1.1 Impact			50%		
1.2 Leadership			20%		
1.3 Output			0%		
1.4 Delivery			30%		
Overall EM Total					
<b>Office of Fossil Energy</b>					
1.1 Impact			30%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			20%		
1.4 Delivery			20%		
Overall FE Total					
<b>Office of Intelligence and Counterintelligence</b>					
1.1 Impact			30%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			20%		
1.4 Delivery			20%		
Overall IN Total					

**Table 1.3 – 1.0 Other Program Office & Customer Performance Goal Score Development**

<sup>4</sup> A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the other Programs and other customers is provided within Attachment I to this plan. Goal and Objective weightings indicated for non-science customers are reflective of FY 2007 weightings and will be updated as those customers provide their weightings. Final Goal and Objective weightings will be incorporated, as appropriate, once they are determined by each HQ Program Office and provided to PNSO. Should a HQ Program Office fail to provide final Goal and Objective weightings before the end of the first quarter FY 2008 the preliminary weightings provided shall become final.

HQ Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Science			25%		
Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation			23%		
Department of Homeland Security			31%		
Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy			5%		
Office of Environmental Management			12%		
Office of Fossil Energy			2%		
Office of Intelligence and Counterintelligence			2%		
Performance Goal 1.0 Total					

Table 1.4 – Overall Performance Goal Score Development<sup>5</sup>

Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-0.8	0.7-0
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

Table 1.5 – 1.0 Goal Final Letter Grade

<sup>5</sup> Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 1.4 are preliminary, based upon FY 2007 Budget Authority figures, and are provided for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2008.

## 2.0 Provide for Efficient and Effective Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operation of Research Facilities

**The Contractor provides effective and efficient strategic planning; fabrication, construction and/or operations of Laboratory facilities; and is responsive to the user community.**

The weight of this Goal is 10%.

The Provide for Efficient and Effective Design, Fabrication, Construction and/or Operation of Laboratory Research Facilities Goal shall measure the overall effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in planning for and delivering leading-edge specialty research and/or user facilities to ensure the required capabilities are present to meet today's and tomorrow's complex challenges. It also measures the Contractor's innovative operational and programmatic means for implementation of systems that ensures the availability, reliability, and efficiency of these facilities; and the appropriate balance between R&D and user support.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers as identified below. The overall Goal score from each SC Program Office is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 2.1). Final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2008.

- Office of Science (SC) (100%)

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned to each of the objectives by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 2.1 below). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 2.2 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as viewed by SC.

### Objectives:

#### 2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s) as Required to Support Laboratory Programs

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured through progress reports, Program/Staff Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Effectiveness of planning of preconceptual R&D and design for life-cycle efficiency;
- Leverage of existing facilities at the Laboratory;
- Delivery of accurate and timely information required to carry out the critical decision and budget formulation process; and
- Ability to meet the intent of DOE Order 413.3, Program and Project Management for the Acquisition of Capital Assets.

<b>A to A+</b>	In addition to meeting all measures under B <sup>+</sup> , the laboratory is recognized by the research community as the leader for making the science case for the acquisition; Takes the initiative to demonstrate the potential for revolutionary scientific advancement. Identifies, analyzes and champions novel approaches for acquiring the new capability, including leveraging or extending the capability of existing facilities and financing. Proposed approaches are widely regarded as innovative, novel, comprehensive, and potentially cost-effective. Reviews repeatedly confirm potential for scientific discovery in areas that support the Department's mission, and potential to change a discipline or research area's direction.
----------------	---

<b>B+</b>	Provides the overall vision for the acquisition. Displays leadership and commitment to achieving the vision within preliminary estimates that are defensible and credible in terms of cost, schedule and performance; develops quality analyses, preliminary designs, and related documentation to support the approval of the mission need (CD-0), the alternative selection and cost range (CD-1) and the performance baseline (CD-2). Solves problems and addresses issues. Keeps DOE apprised of the status, near-term plans and the resolution of problems on a regular basis. Anticipates emerging issues that could impact plans and takes the initiative to inform DOE of possible consequences.
<b>B</b>	Fails to meet expectations in one of the areas listed under B+.
<b>C</b>	The laboratory team develops the required analyses and documentation in a timely manner. However, inputs are mundane and lack innovation and commitment to the vision of the acquisition.
<b>D</b>	The potential exists for credible science and business cases to be made for the acquisition, but the laboratory fails to take advantage of the opportunity.
<b>F</b>	Proposed approaches are based on fraudulent assumptions; the science case is weak to non-existent, the business case is seriously flawed.

## 2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured through progress reports, Lehman reviews, Program/Staff Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Adherence to DOE Order 413.3 Project Management for the Acquisition of Capital Assets;
- Successful fabrication of facility components;
- Effectiveness in meeting construction schedule and budget; and
- Quality of key staff overseeing projects.

<b>A to A+</b>	Laboratory has identified and implemented practices that would allow the project scope to be increased if such were desirable, without impact on baseline cost or schedule; Laboratory always provides exemplary project status reports on time to DOE and takes the initiative to communicate emerging problems or issues. There is high confidence throughout the execution phase that the project will meet its cost/schedule performance baseline; Reviews identify environment, safety and health practices to be exemplary.
<b>B+</b>	The project meets CD-2 performance measures; the laboratory provides sustained leadership and commitment to environment, safety and health; reviews regularly recognize the laboratory for being proactive in the management of the execution phase of the project; to a large extent, problems are identified and corrected by the laboratory with little, or no impact on scope, cost or schedule; DOE is kept informed of project status on a regular basis; reviews regularly indicate project is expected to meet its cost/schedule performance baseline.
<b>B</b>	The project fails to meet expectations in one of the areas listed under B+.
<b>C</b>	Reviews indicate project remains at risk of breaching its cost/schedule performance baseline; Laboratory commitment to environment, safety and health issues is adequate; Reports to DOE can vary in degree of completeness; Laboratory commitment to the project appears to be subsiding.
<b>D</b>	Reviews indicate project is likely to breach its cost/schedule performance baseline; and/or Laboratory commitment to environment, safety and health issues is inadequate; reports to DOE are largely incomplete; laboratory commitment to the project has subsided.
<b>F</b>	Laboratory falsifies data during project execution phase; shows disdain for executing the project within minimal standards for environment, safety or health, fails to keep DOE informed of project status; reviews regularly indicate that the project is expected to breach its cost/schedule performance baseline.

## 2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured through progress reports, peer reviews, Program/Staff Office reviews/oversight, performance against benchmarks, Approved Financial Plan (AFP), etc.:

- Availability, reliability, and efficiency of facilities;
- Degree the facility is optimally arranged to support community;
- Whether R&D is conducted to develop/expand the capabilities of the facility(ies);
- Effectiveness in balancing resources between facility R&D and user support; and
- Quality of the process used to allocate facility time to users.

<b>A to A+</b>	Performance of the facility exceeds expectations as defined before the start of the year in any of these categories: cost of operations, users served, availability, beam delivery, or luminosity, and this performance can be directly attributed to the efforts of the laboratory; and /or: the schedule and the costs associated with the ramp-up to steady state operations are less than planned and are acknowledged to be ‘leadership caliber’ by reviews; Data on ES&H continues to be exemplary and widely regarded as among the ‘best in class’.
<b>B<sup>+</sup></b>	Performance of the facility meets expectations as defined before the start of the year in all of these categories: cost of operations, users served, availability, beam delivery, or luminosity, and this performance can be directly attributed to the efforts of the laboratory; and /or: the schedule and the costs associated with the ramp-up to steady state operations occur as planned; Data on ES&H continues to be very good as compared with other projects in the DOE.
<b>B</b>	The project fails to meet expectations in one of the areas listed under B+.
<b>C</b>	Performance of the facility fails to meet expectations in several of the areas listed under B+; for example, the cost of operations is unexpectedly high and availability of the facility is unexpectedly low, the number of users is unexpectedly low, beam delivery or luminosity is well below expectations. The Facility operates at steady state, on cost and on schedule, but the reliability of performance is somewhat below planned values, <b>or</b> the facility operates at steady state, but the associated schedule and costs exceed planned values. Commitment to ES&H is satisfactory.
<b>D</b>	Performance of the facility fails to meet expectations in many of the areas listed under B+; for example, the cost of operations is unexpectedly high and availability of the facility is unexpectedly low. The Facility operates somewhat below steady state, on cost and on schedule, and the reliability performance is somewhat below planned values, <b>or</b> the facility operates at steady state, but the schedule and costs associated exceed planned values. Commitment to ES&H is satisfactory.
<b>F</b>	The facility fails to operate; the facility operates well below steady state <b>and/or</b> the reliability of the performance is well below planned values.

#### 2.4 Effective Utilization of Facility(ies) to Grow and Support the Laboratory’s Research Base and External User Community

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured through peer reviews, participation in international design teams, Program/Staff Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- The facility is being used to perform influential science;
- Contractor’s efforts to take full advantage of the facility to strengthen the Laboratory’s research base;
- Conversely the facility is strengthened by a resident research community that pushes the envelope of what the facility can do and/or are among the scientific leaders of the community;
- Contractor’s ability to appropriately balance access by internal and external user communities; and
- There is a healthy program of outreach to the scientific community.

<b>A to A+</b>	Reviews document that multiple disciplines are using the facility in new and novel ways, that the facility is being used to pursue influential science, that full advantage has been taken of the facility to enhance external user access, and strengthen the laboratory's research base. A healthy outreach program is in place.
<b>B+</b>	Reviews state strong and effective approach exists toward establishing a large external and internal user community; that the facility is being used for influential science; the laboratory is capitalizing on existence of facility to grow internal scientific capabilities. A healthy outreach program is in place.
<b>B</b>	Reviews state that lab is establishing an external and internal user community, but laboratory is still not capitalizing fully on existence of the facility to grow internal capabilities and/or reach out to external users.
<b>C</b>	Reviews state that the laboratory has made satisfactory use of the facility, but has not demonstrated much innovation.
<b>D</b>	Few facility users, with none using it in novel ways; research base is very thin.
<b>F</b>	Laboratory does not know how to operate/use its own facility adequately.

HQ Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Science (BER)					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			0%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components			15%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			75%		
2.4 Effective Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base and External User Community			10%		
Overall SC Total					

Table 2.1 – 2.0 Program Office Performance Goal Score Development<sup>6</sup>

Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-0.8	0.7-0
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

Table 2.2 – 2.0 Goal Final Letter Grade

<sup>6</sup> A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the SC Programs and other Lab Customers is provided within Attachment I to this plan.

### **3.0 Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Research Project/Program Management**

**The Contractor provides effective program vision and leadership; strategic planning and development of initiatives; recruits and retains a quality scientific workforce; and provides outstanding research processes, which improve research productivity.**

The weight of this Goal is 35%.

The Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Program Management Goal shall measure the Contractor's overall management in executing S&T programs. Dimensions of program management covered include: 1) providing key competencies to support research programs to include key staffing requirements; 2) providing quality research plans that take into account technical risks, identify actions to mitigate risks; and 3) maintaining effective communications with customers to include providing quality responses to customer needs.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers as identified below. The overall Goal score from each HQ Program Office and/or customer is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 3.1, 3.2, & 3.3). Weightings for each Customer listed below are preliminary, based upon FY 2007 Budget Authority figures, and are provided here for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2008.

- Office of Science (SC) (25%)
- Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation (DNN) (23%)
- Department of Homeland Security (DHS) (31%)
- Office of Environmental Management (EM) (12 %)
- Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) (5%)
- Office of Fossil Energy (FE) (2%)
- Office of Intelligence and Counterintelligence (IN) (2%)

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned by each of the offices identified above by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 3.4 below). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 3.5 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as viewed by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers for which the Laboratory conducts work. Should one or more of the HQ Program Offices choose not to provide an evaluation for this Goal and its corresponding Objectives the weighting for the remaining HQ Program Offices shall be recalculated based on their percentage of BA for FY 2008 as compared to the total BA for those remaining HQ Program Offices.

#### Objectives:

### **3.1 Provide Effective and Efficient Stewardship of Scientific Capabilities and Program Vision**

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured through peer reviews, existence and quality of strategic plans as determined by SC and scientific community review, Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Efficiency and effectiveness of joint planning (e.g., workshops) with outside community;
- Articulation of scientific vision;
  
- Development of core competencies, ideas for new facilities and research programs; and
- Ability to attract and retain highly qualified staff.

<b>A to A+</b>	Providing strong programmatic vision that extends past the laboratory and for which the lab is a recognized leader within SC and in the broader research communities; development and maintenance of outstanding core competencies, including achieving superior scientific excellence in both exploratory, high-risk research and research that is vital to the DOE/SC missions; attraction and retention of world-leading scientists; recognition within the community as a world leader in the field.
<b>B+</b>	Coherent programmatic vision within the laboratory with input from and output to external research communities; development and maintenance of strong core competencies that are cognizant of the need for both high-risk research and stewardship for mission-critical research; attracting and retaining scientific staff who are very talented in all programs.
<b>B</b>	Programmatic vision that is only partially coherent and not entirely well connected with external communities; development and maintenance of some, but not all core competencies with attention to, but not always the correct balance between, high-risk and mission-critical research; attraction and retention of scientific staff who talented in most programs.
<b>C</b>	Failure to achieve a coherent programmatic vision with little or no connection with external communities; partial development and maintenance of core competencies (i.e., some are neglected) with imbalance between high-risk and mission-critical research; attracting only mediocre scientists while losing the most talented ones.
<b>D</b>	Minimal attempt to achieve programmatic vision; little ability to develop any core competencies with a complete lack of high-risk research and ignorance of mission-critical areas; minimal success in attracting even reasonably talented scientists.
<b>F</b>	No attempt made to achieve programmatic vision; no demonstrated ability to develop any core competencies with a complete lack of high-risk research and ignorance of mission-critical areas; failure to attract even reasonably talented scientists.

### 3.2 Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Project/Program Planning and Management

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured through peer reviews, existence and quality of strategic plans as determined by SC and scientific community review, Program Office and scientific community review, etc.:

- Quality of R&D and user facility strategic plans
- Adequacy in considering technical risks;
- Success in identifying/avoiding technical problems;
- Effectiveness in leveraging (synergy with) other areas of research; and
- Demonstration of willingness to make tough decisions (i.e., cut programs with sub-critical mass of expertise, divert resources to more promising areas, etc.).

<b>A to A+</b>	Research plans are proactive, not reactive, as evidenced by making hard decisions and taking strong actions; plans are robust against budget fluctuations – multiple contingencies planned for; new initiatives are proposed and funded through reallocation of resources from less effective programs; plans are updated regularly to reflect changing scientific and fiscal conditions; plans include ways to reduce risk, duration of programs.
<b>B+</b>	Plans are reviewed by experts outside of lab management and/or include broadly-based input from within the laboratory; research plans exist for all program areas; plans are consistent with known budgets and well-aligned with DOE interests; work follows the plan.
<b>B</b>	Research plans exist for all program areas; work follows the plan.
<b>C</b>	Research plans exist for most program areas; work does not always follow the plan.
<b>D</b>	Plans do not exist for a significant fraction of the lab’s program areas, or significant work is conducted outside those plans.
<b>F</b>	No planning is done.

**3.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Communications and Responsiveness to Customer Needs**

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured through Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- The quality, accuracy and timeliness of response to customer requests for information;
- The extent to which the Contractor keeps the customer informed of both positive and negative events at the Laboratory and conversely the number of times the customer is surprised – either positively or negatively; and
- The ease of determining the appropriate contact (who is on-point) within the Laboratory for particular issues/incidents.

<b>A to A+</b>	Communication channels are well-defined and information is effectively conveyed; important or critical information is delivered in real-time; responses to HQ requests for information from laboratory representatives are prompt, thorough, correct and succinct; laboratory representatives <i>always</i> initiate a communication with HQ on emerging issues there are no surprises.
<b>B+</b>	Good communication is valued by all staff throughout the contractor organization; responses to requests for information are thorough and are provided in a timely manner; the integrity of the information provided is never in doubt
<b>B</b>	Evidence of good communications is noted throughout the contractor organization and responses to requests for information provide the minimum requirements to meet HQ needs; with the exception of a few minor instances HQ is alerted to emerging issues.
<b>C</b>	Laboratory representatives recognize the value of sound communication with HQ to the mission of the laboratory. However, laboratory management fails to demonstrate that its employees are held accountable for ensuring effective communication and responsiveness; laboratory representatives do not take the initiative to alert HQ to emerging issues.
<b>D</b>	Communications from the laboratory are well-intentioned but generally incompetent; the laboratory management does not understand the importance of effective communication and responsiveness to the mission of the laboratory.
<b>F</b>	Contractor representatives are openly hostile and/or non-responsive – emails and phone calls are consistently ignored; communications typically do not address the request; information provided can be incorrect, inaccurate or fraudulent – information is not organized, is incomplete, or is fabricated.

Science Program Office <sup>7</sup>	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
<b>Office of Advanced Scientific Research</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			30%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			30%		
Overall ASCR Total					
<b>Office of Basic Energy Sciences</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			30%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			30%		
Overall BES Total					
<b>Office of Biological and Environmental Research</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			20%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			30%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			50%		
Overall BER Total					
<b>Office of Fusion Energy Sciences</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			30%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			35%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			35%		
Overall FES Total					
<b>Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			20%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			40%		
Overall WDTS Total					

**Table 3.1 – 3.0 SC Program Office Performance Goal Score Development**

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
<b>Office of Advanced Scientific Research</b>			7%		
<b>Office of Basic Energy Sciences</b>			15%		
<b>Office of Biological and Environmental Research</b>			76%		
<b>Office of Fusion Energy Sciences</b>			1%		
<b>Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists</b>			1%		
Performance Goal 3.0 Total					

**Table 3.2 – SC Program Office Overall Performance Goal Score Development<sup>8</sup>**

<sup>7</sup> A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the SC Programs is provided within Attachment I to this plan.

<sup>8</sup> Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 3.2 are preliminary, based upon FY 2007 Budget Authority figures, and are provided for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2008.

HQ Program Office <sup>9</sup>	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
<b>Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			20%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			20%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			60%		
Overall DNN Total					
<b>Department of Homeland Security</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			50%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			25%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			25%		
Overall DHS Total					
<b>Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			30%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			35%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			35%		
Overall EERE Total					
<b>Office of Environmental Management</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			25%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			25%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			50%		
Overall EM Total					
<b>Office of Fossil Energy</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			30%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			30%		
Overall FE Total					
<b>Office of Intelligence and Counterintelligence</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			30%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			30%		
Overall IN Total					

**Table 3.3 – 3.0 Other Program Office & Customer Performance Goal Score Development**

<sup>9</sup> A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the other Programs and other customers is provided within Attachment I to this plan. Goal and Objective weightings indicated for non-science customers are reflective of FY 2007 weightings and will be updated as those customers provide their weightings. Final Goal and Objective weightings will be incorporated, as appropriate, once they are determined by each HQ Program Office and provided to PNSO. Should a HQ Program Office fail to provide final Goal and Objective weightings before the end of the first quarter FY 2008 the preliminary weightings provided shall become final.

HQ Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Science			25%		
Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation			23%		
Department of Homeland Security			31%		
Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy			5%		
Office of Environmental Management			12%		
Office of Fossil Energy			2%		
Office of Intelligence and Counterintelligence			2%		
Performance Goal 3.0 Total					

Table 3.4 – Overall Performance Goal Score Development<sup>10</sup>

Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-0.8	0.7-0
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

Table 3.5 – 3.0 Goal Final Letter Grade

<sup>10</sup> Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 3.4 are preliminary, based upon FY 2007 Budget Authority figures, and are provided for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2008.

#### **4.0 Provide Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory**

**The Contractor's Leadership provides effective and efficient direction in strategic planning to meet the mission and vision of the overall Laboratory is accountable and responsive to specific issues and needs when required; and corporate office leadership provides appropriate levels of resources and support for the overall success of the Laboratory.**

The weight of this Goal is 20%.

The Provide Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory Goal shall measure the Contractor's Leadership capabilities in leading the direction of the overall Laboratory. It also measures the responsiveness of the Contractor to issues and opportunities for continuous improvement and corporate office involvement/commitment to the overall success of the Laboratory.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the evaluating office as described within Section I of this document. Each Objective has one or more performance measures/targets, the outcomes of which collectively assist the evaluating office in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each management system should demonstrate effective and efficient implementation and execution across the laboratory to demonstrate the measurement of assurance. This also includes the analysis and use of performance data to identify improvement opportunities. Each of the performance measures/targets identifies significant tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones for which the outcomes/results of are important to the success of the corresponding Objective. Other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources may be used as well. The overall Goal score is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 4.1 at the end of this section). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 4.2 to determine the overall Goal letter grade.

Objectives:

#### **4.1 Provide a Distinctive Vision for the Laboratory and an Effective Plan for Accomplishment of the Vision to Include Strong Partnerships Required to Carry Out those Plans**

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Quality of the Vision developed for the Laboratory and effectiveness in identifying its distinctive characteristics;
- Quality of Strategic/Work Plan for achieving the approved Laboratory vision;
- Quality of required Laboratory Business Plan;
- Ability to establish and maintain long-term partnerships/relationships that advance/expand ongoing Laboratory missions and/or provide new opportunities/capabilities; and
- Effectiveness in developing and implementing commercial research and development opportunities that leverage accomplishment of DOE goals and projects with other federal agencies that advances the utilization of Laboratory technologies and capabilities.

The evaluation of this Objective may also consider other tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones not otherwise identified below but that provide evidence to the effectiveness/performance of the Contractor in meeting this Objective. The weight of this Objective is 30%.

- 4.1.1 Development of credible planning documents (e.g., Work Plan) to achieve the vision for the future that are realistic and aligned with DOE priorities, and provide a clear measurement basis for determining performance.
- 4.1.2 Demonstrate alignment and advancement in DOE and Laboratory missions through strategic partnerships with other Laboratories, academia and private industry.

4.1.3 Measure: Develop a baseline for understanding and trending the cost of doing business.

Target: Identify and bin major laboratory costs identifying direct and indirect labor FTEs and costs as well as various operating costs, such as utilities, by November 30, 2007. The cost structure and associated baseline cost of doing business is sufficiently detailed (i.e., including all funding and costs, both direct and indirect with associated FTEs) so the laboratory and site office have a common understanding of how the money is spent and the various cost drivers that effect the laboratory's cost of doing business.

#### 4.2 Provide for Responsive and Accountable Leadership throughout the Organization

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Leadership's, to include Corporate Office Leadership's, ability to instill responsibility and accountability down and through the entire organization; and
- The effectiveness and efficiency of Leadership, to include Corporate Office Leadership, in identifying and/or responding to Laboratory issues or opportunities for continuous improvement.

The evaluation of this Objective may also consider other tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones not otherwise identified below but that provide evidence to the effectiveness/performance of the Contractor in meeting this Objective. The weight of this Objective is 40%.

4.2.1 Demonstrate ability to understand and act upon laboratory performance information utilizing a systematic process, (e.g. managing the organization, managing resources, realization of mission, measurement analysis and improvement etc.) in executing contract expectations

4.2.2 Perform Lab-level corrective action management that demonstrates understanding of Lab-wide issues and accomplishes integrated and cross-cutting solutions.

#### 4.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Corporate Office Support as Appropriate

In measuring the performance of this Objective, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider Corporate Office engagement as follows:

- Advancing excellence in science and technology. Examples include facilitating strategic relationships with industry, academia, and/or other laboratories, to include international entities as appropriate; providing strategic investments, in-kind matches, or otherwise leveraging federal and private resources to advance the R&D life cycle from discovery research through technology maturation and deployment;
- Advancing excellence in operations. Examples include the introduction and sharing of best practices; conducting special oversight or assessment projects; enabling strategic hires; and/or providing innovative approaches for facility, equipment and infrastructure needs whether for maintenance, upgrade, replacement, or additions;
- Advancing excellence in stakeholder relations. Examples include maintaining good corporate citizenship in the community; leveraging the national laboratory as a regional resource at the state(s) level; and maintaining effective communication with elected federal officials and their staff.

The evaluation of this Objective may also consider other tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones not otherwise identified below but that provide evidence to the effectiveness/performance of the Contractor in meeting this Objective. The weight of this Objective is 30%.

4.3.1 Demonstrate that the Corporate Office effectively utilizes the approved assurance process to monitor the overall strategy and each strategic outcome.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
<b>4.0 Effectiveness and Efficiency of Contractor Leadership and Stewardship</b>					
4.1 Provide a Distinctive Vision for the Laboratory and an Effective Plan for Accomplishment of the Vision to Include Strong Partnerships Required to Carry Out those Plans			30%		
4.2 Provide for Responsive and Accountable Leadership throughout the Organization			40%		
4.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Corporate Office Support as Appropriate			30%		
<b>Performance Goal 4.0 Total</b>					

**Table 4.1 – 4.0 Goal Performance Rating Development**

Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-0.8	0.7-0
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

**Table 4.2 – 4.0 Goal Final Letter Grade**

## **5.0 Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection.**

The weight of this Goal is 20%.

The Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection Systems that Efficiently and Effectively Support the Overall Mission of the Laboratory Goal shall measure the Contractor's overall success in deploying, implementing, and improving integrated ES&H systems that efficiently and effectively support the mission(s) of the Laboratory.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the evaluating office as described within Section I of this document. Each Objective has one or more performance measures/targets, the outcomes of which collectively assist the evaluating office in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each management system should demonstrate effective and efficient implementation and execution across the laboratory to demonstrate the measurement of assurance. This also includes the analysis and use of performance data to identify improvement opportunities. Each of the performance measures/targets identifies significant tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones for which the outcomes/results of are important to the success of the corresponding Objective. Other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources may be used as well. The overall Goal score is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 5.1 at the end of this section). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 5.2 to determine the overall Goal letter grade.

Objectives:

### **5.1 Provide a Work Environment that Protects Workers and the Environment.**

In measuring the performance of this Objective, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider performance trends that reflect positive outcomes and show continuous improvement in protecting workers and the environment. While an aspect of achieving good results for this objective is minimizing the occurrence of environment, safety and health (ESH) incidents, positive outcomes can be demonstrated if community health or perceptions of risk to members of the public are not adversely affected when environmental and work related releases result in spreads of contamination.

The evaluation of this Objective may also consider other tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones not otherwise identified below but that provide evidence to the effectiveness/performance of the Contractor in meeting this Objective. The weight of this Objective is 40%.

- 5.1.1 Days away, restricted or transferred (DART) case rate is within the range of normal process variation based on recent Laboratory performance (which meets the SC goal case rate of 0.25). The Laboratory is to maintain an arithmetic average (i.e., mean) that is at or below the SC goal. Determination of the average and management actions to address trends should be based on accepted control chart methodology (using "U" type control chart).
- 5.1.2 Total reportable case rate (TRCR) is within the range of normal process variation based on recent Laboratory performance (which meets the SC goal case rate of 0.65). The Laboratory is to maintain an arithmetic average (i.e., mean) that is at or below the SC goal. Determination of the average and management actions to address trends should be based on accepted control chart methodology (using "U" type control chart).
- 5.1.3 Demonstrate performance trends that reflect positive outcomes and show continuous improvement in protecting workers, the public and the environment. Positive trends would include, but not be limited to: non-compliances to federal ES&H-related regulations (e.g., 10 CFR 851 or 10 CFR 835) that are proactively identified and addressed, and do not result in Notices of Violation or

Penalty; frequency of safety and health occurrences; frequency of first aid cases; distribution and frequency of accidents by type, etc.

## **5.2 Provide Efficient and Effective Implementation of Integrated Safety, Health and Environment Management**

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Ability to achieve desired results (i.e., effectiveness) while minimizing necessary resources to achieve desired results (i.e., efficiency)
- Use of a systematic performance measurement process for the Integrated Safety Management (ISM) system that measures indicators of effectiveness relative to the Core Functions and Guiding Principles of ISM and addresses efficiency with respect to the performance of the ISM program at the Laboratory.
- Results of independent and external indicators reflecting performance of the IESH Management System.

The evaluation of this Objective may also consider other tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones not otherwise identified below but that provide evidence to the effectiveness/performance of the Contractor in meeting this Objective. The weight of this Objective is 30%.

- 5.2.1 Demonstrate implementation and execution of ISM in Laboratory operations through effective and efficient accomplishment of ISM objectives for the three major Laboratory activities (i.e., R&D, Facility and Craft Work, and Construction).
- 5.2.2 Achieve continuous improvement in effectiveness and efficiency of ISM processes as demonstrated by: a systematic performance measurement process; effective analysis and use of performance data streams; and, independent external validation and/or certification (including ISO 14001, EPA Performance Track, VPP STAR status, and WS&H program [10CFR851] and ISM program acceptance by DOE.

## **5.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Waste Management, Minimization, and Pollution Prevention**

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Effective implementation of the Start Clean Stay Clean program across the Laboratory
- Effective implementation of a PNNL waste management strategy - cradle to grave management of waste at PNNL .
- Successfully complete 2008 EPA Performance Track, and Pollution Prevention goals.
- Demonstration of cost effective, efficient waste management processes

The evaluation of this Objective may also consider other tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones not otherwise identified below but that provide evidence to the effectiveness/performance of the Contractor in meeting this Objective. The weight of this Objective is 30%

- 5.3.1 Demonstrate integration with life-cycle management process to effectively manage acquisitions. Successful integration will reflect full understanding of life-cycle management process and ability to affect resulting waste generation. Continuous improvement will be demonstrated through positive trends in process management. There will be no missed milestones under Start Clean Stay Clean or Unneeded Materials and Chemicals. For waste generation rates a rebaselining effort will be accomplished this fiscal year.  
\*Acquisitions excludes purchase of services.
- 5.3.2 Demonstrate substantial progress in achieving future waste management requirements necessary to support the PNNL mission by completing the value mapping effort associated with Waste

Management and then by developing a Waste Management Strategy by December 31, 2007, that encompasses the following aspects:

- a) Based on PNNL contract mission scope and strategic outcomes
- b) Clearly defined current vs. estimated future state
- c) Include strategies for promoting efficiency
- d) Sound measurement basis for determining successful implementation.

- 5.3.3 Demonstrate effective pollution prevention, waste minimization, and resource conservation processes through meeting all of the goals.
- a) Consistent with Departmental goals on environment, energy, and transportation management.
  - b) Include sustainable environmental practices, including acquisition of biobased, environmentally preferable, energy-efficient, water-efficient, and recycled-content products
  - c) EPA Performance Track goals, are complete, on track and performance is acceptable to EPA
  - d) Pollution Prevention actions are taken by Management (e.g., PPOAs)

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
<b>5.0 Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection</b>					
5.1 Provide a Work Environment that Protects Workers and the Environment			40%		
5.2 Provide Efficient and Effective Implementation of Integrated Safety, Health and Environment Management			30%		
5.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Waste Management, Minimization, and Pollution Prevention			30%		
<b>Performance Goal 5.0 Total</b>					

**Table 5.1 – 5.0 Goal Performance Rating Development**

Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-0.8	0.7-0
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

**Table 5.2 – 5.0 Goal Final Letter Grade**

## **6.0 Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission(s)**

**The Contractor sustains and enhances core business systems that provide efficient and effective support to Laboratory programs and its mission(s).**

**The weight of this Goal is 20%.**

Deliver Efficient, Effective and Responsive Business Systems that enable the successful achievement of the Laboratory Mission(s) shall measure the Contractor's overall success in deploying, implementing, and improving integrated business systems that efficiently and effectively support the mission(s) of the Laboratory.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the evaluating office as described within Section I of this document. Each Objective has one or more performance measures/targets, the outcomes of which collectively assist the evaluating office in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each management system should demonstrate effective and efficient implementation and execution across the laboratory to demonstrate the measurement of assurance. This also includes the analysis and use of performance data to identify improvement opportunities. Each of the performance measures/targets identifies significant tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones for which the outcomes/results are important to the success of the corresponding Objective. Other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources may be used as well. The overall Goal score is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 6.1 at the end of this section). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 6.2 to determine the overall Goal letter grade.

Objectives:

### **6.1 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Financial Management System(s)**

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- The demonstration of efficient and effective financial management system(s) support;
- The effectiveness of the financial management system(s) as validated by internal and external audits and reviews;
- The continual improvement of financial management system(s) through the use of results of audits, review, and other information; and
- The degree of knowledge and appropriate utilization of established system processes/procedures by Contractor management and staff.

The evaluation of this Objective will consider other tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones not otherwise identified below but that provide evidence to the effectiveness/performance of the Contractor in meeting this Objective. The weight of this Objective is 20%.

- 6.1.1 Accurate, timely, and complete financial reports/submissions are provided to DOE in accordance with Departmental/PNSO requirements for all activities/deliverables.
- 6.1.2 Cost and commitments do not exceed the available funding in the contract at the cost level of the budget and reporting code (9-digit B&R) in the financial plan at any point during the fiscal year.
- 6.1.3 Demonstrate responsible cost management performance through the management of the following metrics 1) core composite rate without third party costs, target 55% 2) core composite rate with third party costs, target=33%, 3) Percentage of direct FTE's as a percentage of the total laboratory

FTE's, target=52%, and 4) cost per FTE-1830 year-to-date cost divided by 1830 year-to-date FTE's (1830 only), target = \$190K/FTE

- 6.1.4 Validate financial management through independent assessment, internal audits, and external audits. Assessments results and other audits or reviews reflect a robust internal control system for the Financial Management System. In addition, there are no repeat audit findings identified in any internal/external reviews where the Contractor received notification of the finding and had a reasonable opportunity to implement corrective actions.
- 6.1.5 Timely completion of all corrective actions identified in internal/external assessments (including critiques, management system assessments, internal audits, DCAA audits etc.) in accordance with SBMS requirements. In addition, all assessments performed will be entered into the assessment tracking system (ATS).

## **6.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition and Property Management System(s)**

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Demonstration of efficient and effective acquisition and property management system(s) support;
- The effectiveness of the acquisition and property management system(s) as validated by internal and external audits and reviews;
- The continual improvement of acquisition and property management system(s) through the use of results of audits, review, and other information; and
- The degree of knowledge and appropriate utilization of established system processes/procedures by Contractor management and staff.

The evaluation of this Objective may also consider other tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones not otherwise identified below but that provide evidence to the effectiveness/performance of the Contractor in meeting this Objective. The weight of this Objective is 20%.

- 6.2.1 Demonstrate an efficient acquisition management system through:
  - use of rapid purchasing techniques, (85% of transactions)
  - use of alternative acquisition mechanisms, (85% of transactions)
  - use of e-commerce, (12% of transactions)
  - cycle time, (11 days for overall cycle time)
  - cost to spend ratio, (4%)
- 6.2.2 Demonstrate an effective Acquisition Management System through review, implementation and compliance with Acquisition Guidelines (AG's), SBMS and through compliance with PAAA, P-Cards, Competition Requirements, Cost/Price Analysis, with no significant findings or multiple failures to meet balanced scorecard targets.
- 6.2.3 Demonstrate an efficient and effective Property Management System through meeting Property Management Self Assessment and Balanced Scorecard Programs targets which include assets located during inventories (98%), cost per property record ( $\leq$ \$2.35), customer satisfaction (80%), data accuracy (98%), timely excess of property (80%), fleet utilization ( $>$ 94%), and continued training and education for qualified property management professionals (93%).

## **6.3 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Human Resources Management System and Diversity Program**

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Demonstration of efficient and effective human resources management system support;
- The effectiveness of the human resources management system as validated by internal and external audits and reviews;

- The continual improvement of the human resources management system through the use of results of audits, review, and other information; and
- The degree of knowledge and appropriate utilization of established system processes/procedures by Contractor management and staff.

The evaluation of this Objective may also consider other tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones not otherwise identified below but that provide evidence to the effectiveness/performance of the Contractor in meeting this Objective. The weight of this Objective is 20%.

- 6.3.1 Demonstrate efficient and effective human resource management system through external reviews, surveys and inspections (to include Compensation and Benefits measures which demonstrate efficient management of cost) with no significant findings.
- 6.3.2 Demonstrate employee and Management awareness of human resource management processes and procedures. Target: Management System maturity rating of at least 2 (substantially mature).
- 6.3.3 Increase woman and minority representation within the EEO groups that are currently below availability. Target = 50% of the categories in which placement goals exist.

#### **6.4 Provide Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Management Systems for Internal Audit and Oversight; Quality; Information Management; and Other Administrative Support Services as Appropriate**

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Demonstration of efficient and effective management systems support;
- The effectiveness of the management systems as validated by internal and external audits and reviews;
- The continual improvement of management systems through the use of results of audits, reviews, and other information;
- The integration of lab-level system performance metrics and trends;
- The degree of knowledge and appropriate utilization of established system processes/procedures by Contractor management and staff; and
- The comparison (benchmark) of Information Technology cost performance with like industry and government entities,

The evaluation of this Objective may also consider other tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones not otherwise identified below but that provide evidence to the effectiveness/performance of the Contractor in meeting this Objective. The weight of this Objective is 30%.

- 6.4.1 Demonstration of the efficiency and effectiveness of the Planning and Assessment including (IA and IO), Quality, Project Management, and Information Resource Management Systems, and others as appropriate using the results of internal and external assessments relative to system metrics, performance targets and trends.
- 6.4.2 Demonstration of continual process improvement through performance data and feedback from all sources to drive improved performance in the Planning and Assessment (including IA and IO), Quality, Project Management, and Information Resource Management Systems, focusing on significance performance trends

#### **6.5 Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Technology and Commercialization of Intellectual Assets**

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- The skillful stewardship of the pipeline of innovations and resulting intellectual assets at the laboratory; and
- The market impacts and returns to the laboratory created/generated as a result of technology transfer and intellectual asset deployment activities;

The evaluation of this Objective may also consider other tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones not otherwise identified below but that provide evidence to the effectiveness/performance of the Contractor in meeting this Objective. The weight of this Objective is 10%.

- 6.5.1 Number of invention disclosures. Target = 225
- 6.5.2 Total consideration (license revenue and non-cash returns from licensing of Laboratory derived IP, as well as new R&D projects where IP is optioned, licensed, or otherwise used) to the Laboratory from the deployment of intellectual assets. Target = \$30M

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
<b>6.0 Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission(s)</b>					
6.1 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Financial Management System(s)			20%		
6.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition and Property Management System(s)			20%		
6.3 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Human Resources Management System and Diversity Program			20%		
6.4 Provide Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Management Systems for Internal Audit and Oversight; Quality; Information Management; and Other Administrative Support Services as Appropriate			30%		
6.5 Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Technology and Commercialization of Intellectual Assets			10%		
<b>Performance Goal 6.0 Total</b>					

**Table 6.1 – 6.0 Goal Performance Rating Development**

Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-0.8	0.7-0
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

**Table 6.2 – 6.0 Goal Final Letter Grade**

## **7.0 Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs**

**The Contractor provides appropriate planning for, construction and management of Laboratory facilities and infrastructures required to efficiently and effectively carry out current and future S&T programs.**

The weight of this Goal is 20%.

The Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs Goal shall measure the overall effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in planning for, delivering, and operations of Laboratory facilities and equipment needed to ensure required capabilities are present to meet today's and tomorrow's complex challenges.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the evaluating office as described within Section I of this document. Each Objective has one or more performance measures/targets, the outcomes of which collectively assist the evaluating office in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each management system should demonstrate effective and efficient implementation and execution across the laboratory to demonstrate the measurement of assurance. This also includes the analysis and use of performance data to identify improvement opportunities. Each of the performance measures/targets identifies significant tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones for which the outcomes/results of are important to the success of the corresponding Objective. Other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources may be used as well. The overall Goal score is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 7.1 at the end of this section). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 7.2 to determine the overall Goal letter grade.

Objectives:

### **7.1 Manage Facilities and Infrastructure in an Efficient and Effective Manner that Optimizes Usage and Minimizes Life Cycle Costs**

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- The management of real property assets to maintain effective operational safety, worker health, environmental protection and compliance, property preservation, and cost effectiveness while meeting program missions, through effective facility utilization, maintenance and budget execution;
- The day-to-day management and utilization of space in the active portfolio;
- The maintenance and renewal of building systems, structures and components associated with the Laboratory's facility and land assets; and
- The management of energy use and conservation practices.

The evaluation of this Objective may also consider other tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones not otherwise identified below but that provide evidence to the effectiveness/performance of the Contractor in meeting this Objective. The weight of this Objective is **50%**.

- 7.1.1 Maintenance and Renewal – Maintenance and renewal of Office of Science facilities which maximizes the operational life of systems, structures, and components, as defined by Facilities Asset Condition Index (ACI) with ACI of .98, minimum MII of 2%, and Integrated Facility and Infrastructure (IFI) Crosscut Budget execution consistent with quarterly expenditure rates provided to the Office of Science per DOE O 430.1B.
- 7.1.2 An update to the Ten Year Site Plan is developed and approved by DOE that adequately addresses the site's contribution to meeting the Agency wide goals of the Secretarial Transformational Energy Action Management (TEAM) initiative and the goals set forth in Executive Order 13423.

Target: September 30, 2008.)

- 7.1.3 Asset Utilization – Demonstrated effectiveness and efficiency in utilizing Office of Science space holdings as defined by Facilities Asset Utilization Index (AUI), DOE O 430.1B, and demonstrate effectiveness and efficiency in utilizing total space holdings with an AUI of 0.98
- 7.1.4 Facility Reliability – Enabling the Laboratory mission through high facility reliability as defined by the Laboratory Facility Reliability Index with a total financial impact >\$50K to <\$100K during the fiscal year.
- 7.1.5 Operational Performance – Effective management of facility operating boundaries, protecting staff, public and the environment, enabling mission execution, and preventing creation of unplanned future facility legacies or liabilities as measured through the effective implementation of the Laboratory Facility Use Agreements for existing and future facilities with 2 instances (annual cumulative) where operational boundary Lab policies are not followed.

## **7.2 Provide Planning for and Acquire the Facilities and Infrastructure Required to support Future Laboratory Programs**

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Integration and alignment of the Ten Year Site Plan to the Laboratory’s comprehensive strategic plan;
- The facility planning, forecasting, and acquisition for effective translation of business needs into comprehensive and integrated facility site plans;
- The effectiveness in producing quality site and facility planning documents as required;
- The involvement of relevant stakeholders in all appropriate aspects of facility planning and preparation of required documentation;
- Overall responsiveness to customer mission needs; and
- Efficiency in meeting Cost and Schedule Performance Index for construction projects (when appropriate);
- Adherence to DOE O 413.3 Project Management for the Acquisition of Capital Assets;
- Quality of key staff overseeing projects;
- Effectiveness of planning of pre-conceptual R&D and design for life-cycle efficiency.
- Leverage of existing facilities at the laboratory;
- Delivery of accurate and timely information required to carry out the critical decision and budget formulation process.

The evaluation of this Objective may also consider other tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones not otherwise identified below but that provide evidence to the effectiveness/performance of the Contractor in meeting this Objective. The weight of this Objective is 50%.

- 7.2.1 PNNL TYSP: Execution of the Ten Year Site Plan (TYSP) as reported quarterly and documented in a self assessment report at the end of the fiscal year. At least 80% of FY08 actions are implemented.
- 7.2.2 PNNL Small Capital and Facility Projects: The delivery of the following types of projects within expected range of performance: GPP, IGPP, and expense/programmatic funded construction projects with a total of estimated cost (TEC) >\$100K: At least 90% of these projects have Cost Performance Index (CPI) and Schedule Performance Index (SPI) within the range of 0.9 and 1.15 by the end of FY08.
- 7.2.3 PNNL CRL Project – PSF Project (Line-Item): The PSF Project is charged with delivering the Horn Rapids Triangle facility complex and the 325 Building life extension in accordance with the performance baseline approved at CD-2 on June 22, 2007. PNNL executes the PSF Project in accordance with the performance baseline in the approved PEP and achieves a CPI within the range of 0.9 and 1.15 by the end of FY08

- 7.2.4 PNNL Transition Project: The PNNL Transition Project is charged with relocating PNNL capabilities and turning over 300 Area facilities that will not be retained, ensuring the PNNL operating model can effectively and efficiently support startup and operation of the new and upgraded facilities, and taking the necessary actions to provide continuity of 300 Area operations during transition. PNNL executes the Transition Project in accordance with the performance baseline in the approved PEP and achieves a CPI within the range of 0.9 and 1.15 by the end of FY08
- 7.2.5 Measure: Develop a strategy for increasing investment in infrastructure which minimizes increases to the cost of doing business .

Target: Develop strategy by September 30, 2008.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
<b>7.0 Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs</b>					
7.1 Manage Facilities and Infrastructure in an Efficient and Effective Manner that Optimizes Usage and Minimizes Life Cycle Costs			50%		
7.2 Provide Planning for and Acquire the Facilities and Infrastructure Required to support Future Laboratory Programs			50%		
<b>Performance Goal 7.0 Total</b>					

**Table 7.1 – 7.0 Goal Performance Rating Development**

<b>Total Score</b>	<b>4.3-4.1</b>	<b>4.0-3.8</b>	<b>3.7-3.5</b>	<b>3.4-3.1</b>	<b>3.0-2.8</b>	<b>2.7-2.5</b>	<b>2.4-2.1</b>	<b>2.0-1.8</b>	<b>1.7-1.1</b>	<b>1.0-0.8</b>	<b>0.7-0</b>
<b>Final Grade</b>	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

**Table 7.2 – 7.0 Goal Final Letter Grade**

**8.0 Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM) and Emergency Management Systems**

**The Contractor sustains and enhances the effectiveness of integrated safeguards and security and emergency management through a strong and well deployed system.**

The weight of this Goal is 20%.

The Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM) and Emergency Management Systems Goal shall measure the Contractor’s overall success in safeguarding and securing Laboratory assets that supports the mission(s) of the Laboratory in an efficient and effective manner and provides an effective emergency management program.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the evaluating office as described within Section I of this document. Each Objective has one or more performance measures/targets, the outcomes of which collectively assist the evaluating office in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each management system should demonstrate effective and efficient implementation and execution across the laboratory to demonstrate the measurement of assurance. This also includes the analysis and use of performance data to identify improvement opportunities. Each of the performance measures/targets identifies significant tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones for which the outcomes/results of are important to the success of the corresponding Objective. Other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources may be used as well. The overall Goal score is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 8.1 at the end of this section). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 8.2 to determine the overall Goal letter grade.

Objectives:

### **8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System**

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- The commitment of leadership to a strong Emergency Management System is demonstrated;
- The maintenance and appropriate utilization of Emergency Management procedures and processes are effectively demonstrated;
- Emergency management events are reported and mitigated as necessary;
- Results of external reviews, surveys and inspections demonstrate Emergency Management systems are effective; and
- Employee and management awareness of Emergency Management responsibilities.

The evaluation of this Objective may also consider other tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones not otherwise identified below but that provide evidence to the effectiveness/performance of the Contractor in meeting this Objective. The weight of this Objective is 25%

- 8.1.1 Emergency Management systems are routinely validated, integrated and working appropriately on an ongoing basis reflecting that standards of performance are high, efficient, and minimum requirements are met and in some areas exceeded. Response organizations and staff are prepared to respond to and handle emergencies and events where the management support group is activated, or demonstrated through satisfactory completion of drills. Lessons learned are prepared and implemented and corrective actions are developed and completed as necessary. Average drill and event grade of 3.25 to 4.25
- 8.1.2 Employee and management awareness of responsibilities are maintained and validated with  $\geq 90\%$  of the facility staff interviewed receiving a passing score and  $\geq 88\%$  of the questions asked in the unannounced interviews correctly answered.
- 8.1.3 Results of external and internal reviews, surveys, and inspections include a rating of Satisfactory demonstrating compliant program elements. Effective implementation of corrective actions to mitigate and/or resolve the deficiencies result in no repetitive deficiencies.
- 8.1.4 PNNL campus, PNNL Site, and applicable Hanford Site facilities are fully compliant with the PNNL Emergency Management Plan. This includes completing all actions necessary to achieve compliance and integration with processes associated with the Capability Replacement Laboratory Project, local municipalities as well as other contractors, as applicable. Minimum of 1 PNNL EP Drill conducted with local municipalities; 100% of all items required to achieve compliance with the PNNL Emergency Management Plan are completed in accordance with an established schedule (for any new facility brought on line as well as existing facilities).

## **8.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for Cyber-Security**

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- The commitment of leadership to a strong Cyber-Security performance is appropriately demonstrated;
- Integration of Cyber-Security into the culture of the organization for effective deployment of the system is demonstrated;
- The maintenance and appropriate utilization of Cyber-Security risk identification, prevention, and control processes/activities;
- Cyber-Security events are reported and mitigated as necessary;
- Results of external reviews, surveys and inspections demonstrate Cyber-Security systems are effective; and
- Employee and management awareness of Cyber-Security responsibilities.

The evaluation of this Objective may also consider other tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones not otherwise identified below but that provide evidence to the effectiveness/performance of the Contractor in meeting this Objective. The weight of this Objective is 25%.

- 8.2.1 Results of external reviews, surveys and inspections demonstrate compliant unclassified cyber security program elements through receipt of satisfactory ratings. Effective implementation of corrective actions to mitigate and/or resolve the deficiencies is achieved and reflected by zero repetitive findings.
- 8.2.2 Limit the potential compromise of electronic information stored or managed in [unclassified] laboratory databases, networked or stand-alone systems by achieving a rolling six month average Cyber Security Incident Score of less than or equal to 0.75.

## **8.3 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Special Nuclear Materials, Classified Matter, and Property**

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- The commitment of leadership to strong Safeguards performance is appropriately demonstrated;
- Integration of Safeguards into the culture of the organization for effective deployment of the system is demonstrated;
- The maintenance and appropriate utilization of Safeguards risk identification, prevention, and control processes/activities;
- Safeguards events are reported and mitigated as necessary;
- Demonstrate an effective safeguards system through external reviews, surveys and inspections; and
- Management and employee awareness of Safeguards responsibilities.

The evaluation of this Objective may also consider other tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones not otherwise identified below but that provide evidence to the effectiveness/performance of the Contractor in meeting this Objective. The weight of this Objective is 25%.

- 8.3.1 Results of external reviews, surveys and inspections demonstrate compliant Safeguards and Physical Security program elements through satisfactory ratings with no sub-elements rated less than Satisfactory and effective implementation of corrective actions to mitigate and/or resolve the deficiencies with no repetitive findings.
- 8.3.2 Coordinate with Capability Replacement Laboratory (CRL) staff to establish a short-duration holding account (material balance area-MBA) for nuclear material determined to be excess to programmatic need. Provide quarterly reporting to CRL and Transition Program management on the stewardship status of the nuclear material inventory so as to provide visibility to material

utilization. 85% of all Nuclear Material not being used on an actively funded project or program will be placed in an MBA segregated from the active inventory

**8.4 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Classified and Sensitive Information**

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- The commitment of leadership to strong protection of classified and sensitive information performance is appropriately demonstrated;
- Integration of protection of classified and sensitive information into the culture of the organization for effective deployment of the system is demonstrated; and
- The maintenance and appropriate utilization of protection of classified and sensitive information risk identification, prevention, and control processes/activities;
- Protection of classified and sensitive information events are reported and mitigated as necessary;
- Demonstrate an effective Security system through external reviews, surveys and inspections; and
- Management and employee awareness of responsibilities for the protection of classified and sensitive information.

The evaluation of this Objective may also consider other tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones not otherwise identified below but that provide evidence to the effectiveness/performance of the Contractor in meeting this Objective. The weight of this Objective is 25%.

- 8.4.1 90% to 96% of Line management and staff demonstrate their commitment to SAS through timely completion of required reoccurring Safeguards and Security (SAS) courses to promote continuing awareness of safeguards and security practices. The reoccurring courses include #912 (annual refresher for cleared staff) and #1350 (annual refresher for uncleared staff).
- 8.4.2 Report and mitigate security events as necessary within required reporting timeframes with the normalized number of incidents occurring at or below the rate of four per two hundred thousand hours charged to classified projects (moving 12mo averages) AND the Severity Index Measure (SIM) is below a composite score of 3 per month.
- 8.4.3 Results of external reviews, surveys and inspections demonstrate compliant Information Security program elements through satisfactory ratings with no sub-elements rated less than Satisfactory and effective implementation of corrective actions to mitigate and/or resolve the deficiencies with no repetitive findings.
- 8.4.4 Demonstrate reduced risk exposure to classified cyber systems by supporting the Department Diskless Workstation Task Force (DWTF) and completing actions to reduce the amount of CREM by transferring an additional 90% of the total number of qualifying classified standalone systems to the Pacific Northwest Classified Network (PNCN).

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
<b>8.0 Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM)</b>					
8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System			25%		
8.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective			25%		

<b>ELEMENT</b>	<b>Letter Grade</b>	<b>Numerical Score</b>	<b>Objective Weight</b>	<b>Total Points</b>	<b>Total Points</b>
System for Cyber-Security					
8.3 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Special Nuclear Materials, Classified Matter, and Property			25%		
8.4 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Classified and Sensitive Information			25%		
<b>Performance Goal 8.0 Total</b>					

**Table 8.1 – 8.0 Goal Performance Rating Development**

<b>Total Score</b>	<b>4.3-4.1</b>	<b>4.0-3.8</b>	<b>3.7-3.5</b>	<b>3.4-3.1</b>	<b>3.0-2.8</b>	<b>2.7-2.5</b>	<b>2.4-2.1</b>	<b>2.0-1.8</b>	<b>1.7-1.1</b>	<b>1.0-0.8</b>	<b>0.7-0</b>
<b>Final Grade</b>	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

**Table 8.2 – 8.0 Goal Final Letter Grade**

**Attachment 1**

**Program Office Goal & Objective Weightings for FY 2008**

Office of Science

	ASCR Weight	BES Weight	BER Weight	FES Weight	WDTS Weight
<b>Goal #1 Mission Accomplishment</b>					
Goal's weight	<b>80</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>65</b>
1a. Impact (significance)	40	50	30	25	25
1b. Leadership (recognition of S&T accomplishments)	30	20	20	25	30
1c. Output (productivity)	15	15	20	25	30
1d. Delivery	15	15	30	25	15
<b>Goal #2 Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operation of Facilities</b>					
Goal's weight	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
2a. Design of Facility (the initiation phase and the definition phase, i.e. activities leading up to CD-2)			0		
2b. Construction of Facility/Fabrication of Components (execution phase, Post CD-2 to CD-4)			15		
2c. Operation of Facility			75		
2d. Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Lab's Research Base			10		
<b>Goal #3 Program Management</b>					
Goal's weight	<b>20</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>35</b>
3a. Stewardship of Scientific Capabilities and Programmatic Vision	30	40	20	30	20
3b. Program Planning and Management	40	30	30	35	40
3.c Program Management-Communication & Responsiveness (to HQ)	30	30	50	35	40

## Attachment 1 Program Office Goal & Objective Weightings for FY 2008

All other Customers<sup>11</sup>

	DNN	DHS	EM	EERE	FE	IN
	Weight	Weight	Weight	Weight	Weight	Weight
<b>Goal #1 Mission Accomplishment</b>						
Goal's weight	65	60	60	60	60	60
1a. Impact (significance)	25	40	50	30	30	30
1b. Leadership (recognition of S&T accomplishments)	15	30	20	30	30	30
1c. Output (productivity)	30	0	0	20	20	20
1d. Delivery	30	30	30	20	20	20
<b>Goal #2 Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operation of Facilities</b>						
Goal's weight	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2a. Design of Facility (the initiation phase and the definition phase, i.e. activities leading up to CD-2)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2b. Construction of Facility/Fabrication of Components (execution phase, Post CD-2 to CD-4)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2c. Operation of Facility	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2d. Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Lab's Research Base	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Goal #3 Program Management</b>						
Goal's weight	35	40	40	40	40	40
3a. Stewardship of Scientific Capabilities and Programmatic Vision	20	50	30	25	40	40
3b. Program Planning and Management	20	25	35	25	30	30
3.c Program Management-Communication & Responsiveness (to HQ)	60	25	35	50	30	30

<sup>11</sup> Goal and Objective weightings indicated for non-science customers are reflective of FY 2007 weightings and will be updated as those customers provide their weightings. Final Goal and Objective weightings will be incorporated, as appropriate, once they are determined by each HQ Program Office and provided to PNSO. Should a HQ Program Office fail to provide final Goal and Objective weightings before the end of the first quarter FY 2008 the preliminary weightings provided shall become final.