ATTACHMENT J-2

APPENDIX B

FY 2008
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND MEASUREMENT PLAN

Applicable to the Operation of
ERNEST ORLANDO LAWRENCE BERKELEY NATIONAL LABORATORY

CONTRACT NO. DE-AC02-05CH11231

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

This document, the Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan (PEMP), primarily serves as DOE's Quality Assurance/Surveillance Plan (QASP) for the evaluation of *The Regents of the University of California* (hereafter referred to as "the Contractor") performance regarding the management and operations of the *Lawrence Berkeley 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 performance-based fee earned by the Contractor as stipulated within the clauses entitled, "Standards of Contractor Performance Evaluation," "Conditional Payment of Fee, Profit, and Other Incentives," and "Total Available Fee: Base Fee Amount and Performance Fee Amount." Further, this document describes the basis for eligibility for the award term incentive outlined in the clause entitled "Award Term Incentive." In partnership with the Contractor and other key customers, the Department of Energy (DOE) Headquarters (HQ) and the Berkeley Site Office (BSO) 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 (hereafter referred to as Performance Measures) 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 BSO. 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 BSO 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, and how the performance-based incentive 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, the weightings assigned to each Goal and Objective, and a table for calculating the final score for each Goal.

I. DETERMINING THE CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE RATING, PERFORMANCE-BASED FEE AND AWARD TERM ELIGIBILITY

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. 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 overall numeric 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 numeric 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 composed of two or more weighted Objectives and each Objective may have a set of Performance Measures, which are identified to assist the reviewer in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each of the Performance Measures identifies significant activities, requirements, and/or milestones important to the success of the corresponding Objective and shall be utilized as the primary means of determining the Contractor's success in meeting the Objective. Although the Performance Measures are the primary means for determining performance, 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 an 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. The FY 2008 target stated at 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 these details have been included in the PEMP. However these should be considered as guidelines that do not restrict the evaluator from considering other factors that contribute to the evaluation.

Letter Grade	Numeric Score	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 Score	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 purposes of 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	Letter Grade	Numeric Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Total Score
1.0 Mission Accomplishment			TBD%		
2.0 Construction and Operations of User Research Facilities and Equipment			TBD%		
3.0 Science and Technology Research Project/Program Management			TBD%		

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:
Total available FY2008 fee is $4,500,000 (Base Fee: None Performance Fee: $4,500,000). 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 A1 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 Figure 1.	Percent S&T Fee Earned	M&O Fee Multiplier
4.3	100%	100%
4.2		
4.1		
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%
thru		
1.1		
1.0 – 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 Figure 3.	____%
M&O Fee Multiplier from Figure 3.	X ____%
Overall Earned Percentage of 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 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 the clauses entitled, "Standards of Contractor Performance Evaluation", "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 an 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 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.

Determining Award Term Eligibility. Pursuant to the clause entitled "Award Term Incentive" the contractor may also earn additional term by exceeding performance expectations. The contractor is eligible for award term in accordance with the clause when performance for the S&T and M&O components results in scores within the shaded areas of Table C, which would be scores of 3.5 or higher for S&T and 3.1 or higher for the M&O component. Notwithstanding the overall scores earned, if the contractor scores less than a 3.1 in any S&T goal or less than a 2.5 in any M&O goal the contractor will not be eligible for award term.

II. PERFORMANCE GOALS, OBJECTIVES & 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. 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 and targets for FY 2008. The weighting of Goals is provided in Table A, Section I and the weighting of

Objectives shall be shown in Tables at the end of each Goal. For convenience, the Program Offices stated goal and objective weightings are shown in Attachment I.

PART A – SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY COMPONENT

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 TBD%.

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 Table 1.1). Weightings for each Customer listed below are preliminary, based upon FY 2006 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) (89.5%)
- Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) (6.6%)
- Assistant Secretary for Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (RW) (2.4%)
- Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy (1.5%).

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.

Objectives:

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 by 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.

A to A+	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+	Impacts the community as expected. Strong peer review comments in all relevant areas.
B	Not strong peer review comments in at least one significant research area.
C	One research area just not working out. Peer review reveals that a program isn't going anywhere.
D	Failure of multiple program elements.
F	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 by 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 position in the scientific community; and
- Effectiveness in driving the direction and setting the priorities of the community in a research field.

A to A+	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$^+$	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	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.
C	Working on problems no longer at the forefront of science; stale research; evolutionary, not revolutionary.
D	Failure of multiple program elements.
F	Gross scientific incompetence and/or scientific fraud.

1.3 Provide and sustain Outputs that Advance Program Objectives and 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.

A to A+	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+	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	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.
C	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.
D	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.
F	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.

A to A+	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+	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	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.
C	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.
D	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.
F	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 overall program/project.

Science Program Office[1]	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research (ASCR)					
1.1 Impact			40%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			15%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
				Overall ASCR Total	
Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES)					
1.1 Impact			50%		
1.2 Leadership			20%		
1.3 Output			15%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
				Overall BES Total	
Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER)					
1.1 Impact			30%		
1.2 Leadership			20%		
1.3 Output			20%		
1.4 Delivery			30%		
				Overall BER Total	
Office of Fusion Energy Sciences (FES)					
1.1 Impact			30%		
1.2 Leadership			20%		
1.3 Output			25%		
1.4 Delivery			25%		
				Overall FES Total	
Office of High Energy Physics (HEP)					
1.1 Impact			30%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			30%		
1.4 Delivery			10%		
				Overall HEP Total	
Office of Nuclear Physics (NP)					
1.1 Impact			35%		
1.2 Leadership			25%		
1.3 Output			25%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
				Overall NP Total	

[1] A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the SC Programs is provided within Attachment I to this plan.

Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS)					
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**
Office of Advanced Scientific Research			23.2%		
Office of Basic Energy Sciences			32.2%		
Office of Biological and Environmental Research			22.8%		
Office of Fusion Energy Sciences			1.7%		
Office of High Energy Physics			14.2%		
Office of Nuclear Physics			5.7%		
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists			0.2%		
				Performance Goal 1.0 Total	

Table 1.2 – SC Program Office Overall Performance Goal Score Development[2]

HQ Program Office[3]	**Letter Grade**	**Numerical Score**	**Weight**	**Weighted Score**	**Overall Score**
Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE)					
1.1 Impact			35%		
1.2 Leadership			35%		
1.3 Output			15%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
				Overall EERE Total	
Office of Fossil Energy (FE)					
1.1 Impact			25%		
1.2 Leadership			25%		
1.3 Output			25%		
1.4 Delivery			25%		

[2] Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 1.2 are preliminary, based upon FY 2006 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.

[3] 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.

				Overall FE Total	
Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (RW)					
1.1 Impact			25%		
1.2 Leadership			25%		
1.3 Output			25%		
1.4 Delivery			25%		
				Overall RW Total	

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

HQ Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Science			89.5%		
Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy			6.6%		
Office of Fossil Energy			1.5%		
Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management			2.4%		
				Performance Goal 1.0 Total	

Table 1.4 – Overall Performance Goal Score Development[4]

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

[4] Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 1.4 are preliminary, based upon FY 2006 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 Operations 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 TBD%.

The Provide for Efficient and Effective Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operations of 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). Weightings for each Customer listed below are preliminary, based upon FY 2006 Budget Authority figures, and are provided here for informational purposes only. 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%)
  - Office of Advance Scientific Computing Research (ASCR) (23.6%)
  - Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES) (32.9%)
  - Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER) (23.2%)
  - Office of High Energy Physics (HEP) (14.5%)
  - Office of Nuclear Physics (NP) (5.8%)

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 (i.e., activities leading up to CD-2)

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by scientific/technical workshops developing pre-conceptual R&D, progress reports, Lehman reviews, 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 site;
- Delivery of accurate and timely information needed to carry out the critical decision and budget formulation process.; and
- Ability to meet the intent of DOE Order 413.3A, Program and Project Management for the Acquisition of Capital Assets.

A to	In addition to meeting all measures under B^+, the laboratory is recognized by the research

A+	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+	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 appraised 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	Fails to meet expectations in one of the areas listed under B+.
C	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.
D	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.
F	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 (execution phase, Post CD-2 to CD-4)

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

- Adherence to DOE Order 413.3A 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 the project(s).

A to A+	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+	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	The project fails to meet expectations in one of the areas listed under B+.
C	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.
D	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.
F	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 by progress reports, peer reviews, Program/Staff Office reviews/oversight, performance against benchmarks, Approved Financial Plans (AFPs), etc.:

- Availability, reliability, and efficiency of facility(ies);
- 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.

A to A+	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^+	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	The project fails to meet expectations in one of the areas listed under B+.
C	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, **or** the facility operates at steady state, but the associated schedule and costs exceed planned values. Commitment to ES&H is satisfactory.
D	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, **or** the facility operates at steady state, but the schedule and costs associated exceed planned values. Commitment to ES&H is satisfactory.
F	The facility fails to operate; the facility operates well below steady state **and/or** the reliability of the performance is well below planned values.

2.4 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 by 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.

A to A+	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$^+$	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	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 an/or reach out to external users.
C	Reviews state that the laboratory has made satisfactory use of the facility, but has not demonstrated much innovation.
D	Few facility users, with none using it in novel ways; research base is very thin.
F	Laboratory does not know how to operate/use its own facility adequately.

DOE HQ Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
SC Office of Advanced Scientific Computing (ASCR)					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			10%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components			10%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			70%		
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base and External User Community			10%		
SC Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES)					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			20%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient			15%		

DOE HQ Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components					
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			50%		
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base and External User Community			15%		
SC Office of Biological and Environmental Research (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			0%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			90%		
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base and External User Community			10%		
SC Office of High Energy Physics (HEP)					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			50%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components			50%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			0%		
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base and External User Community			0%		
SC Office of Nuclear Physics (NP)					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			0%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components			0%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			85%		
2.4 Effective Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base and External User Community			15%		

Table 2.1 –DOE Program Office Performance Goal 2.0 Score Development

DOE HQ Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score

SC Office of Advanced Scientific Computing (ASCR)			23.6%		
SC Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES)			32.9%		
SC Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER)			23.2%		
SC Office of High Energy Physics (HEP)			14.5%		
SC Office of Nuclear Physics (NP)			5.8%		
				Overall Program Office Total	

Table 2.2 – Overall Performance Goal 2.0 Score Development[5]

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 2.3 – Goal 2.0 Final Letter Grade

[5] Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 2.2 are preliminary, based upon FY 2006 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.

3.0 Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology 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 27%.

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). Weightings for each Customer listed below are preliminary, based upon FY 2006 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 provided by the Program Offices listed below.

- Office of Science (SC) (89.5%)
- Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) (6.6%)
- Assistant Secretary for Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (RW) (2.4%)
- Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy (1.5%).

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 by 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.

A to A+	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+	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	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.
C	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.
D	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.
F	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 by peer reviews, existence and quality of strategic plans as determined by SC and scientific community review, Program Office and scientific community review/oversight, etc.:

- Quality of R&D and/or 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.).

A to A+	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^{+}	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	Research plans exist for all program areas; work follows the plan.
C	Research plans exist for most program areas; work does not always follow the plan.
D	Plans do not exist for a significant fraction of the lab's program areas, or significant work is conducted outside those plans.
F	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 by 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 so that the customer can deal effectively with both internal and external constituencies; and
- The ease of determining the appropriate contact (who is on-point for what).

A to A+	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 *always* initiate a communication with HQ on emerging issues there are no surprises.
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	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.
C	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.
D	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.
F	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[6]	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research (ASCR)					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			30%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			30%		
				Overall ASCR Total	
Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES)					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			30%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			30%		
				Overall BES Total	
Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER)					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			20%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			30%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			50%		
				Overall BER Total	
Office of Fusion Energy Sciences (FES)					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			35%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			30%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			35%		
				Overall FES Total	
Office of High Energy Physics (HEP)					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			20%		
				Overall HEP Total	
Office of Nuclear Physics (NP)					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			20%		
				Overall NP Total	
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS)					
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

[6] A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the SC Programs is provided within Attachment I to this plan.

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Research			23.2%		
Office of Basic Energy Sciences			32.2%		
Office of Biological and Environmental Research			22.8%		
Office of Fusion Energy Sciences			1.7%		
Office of High Energy Physics			14.2%		
Office of Nuclear Physics			5.7%		
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists			0.2%		
				Performance Goal 3.0 Total	

Table 3.2 – SC Program Office Overall Performance Goal Score Development[7]

HQ Program Office[8]	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE)					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			50%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			25%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			25%		
				Overall EERE Total	
Office of Fossil Energy (FE)					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			30%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			30%		
				Overall FE Total	
Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (RW)					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			20%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			40%		
				Overall OE Total	

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

[7] Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 3.2 are preliminary, based upon FY 2006 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.

[8] 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.

HQ Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Science			89.5%		
Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy			6.6%		
Office of Fossil Energy			1.5%		
Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management			2.4%		
				Performance Goal 3.0 Total	

Table 3.4 – Overall Performance Goal Score Development[9]

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

[9] Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 3.4 are preliminary, based upon FY 2006 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.

PART B – MANAGEMENT & OPERATIONS COMPONENT

Evaluating Management and Operations Goals/Objectives

Each Objective within the Management and Operations Goals (Goals 4 – 8) 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, the outcomes of which collectively assist the evaluating office in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each of the performance measures identifies significant tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones for which the outcomes/results are important to the success of the corresponding Objective. Although other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources may be used, the outcomes of performance measures identified for each Objective shall be the primary means of determining the Contractor's success in meeting an Objective.

Targets are written at the meets expectation grade level of B+ (3.1 – 3.4). 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 these details have been included in the PEMP. However these should be considered as guidelines that do not restrict the evaluator from considering other factors that contribute to the evaluation.

The overall Goal score is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table X.1 at the end of each goal which provides the objective weighting). The overall score earned is then compared to Table X.2 to determine the overall Goal letter grade.

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 of the overall Laboratory; is accountable and responsive to specific issues and needs as required; and contractor office leadership provides appropriate levels of resources and support for the overall success of the Laboratory.

The weight of the Goal is 25%.

This Goal shall measure the Contractor's 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 contractor office involvement/commitment to the overall success of the Laboratory.

Objectives:

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

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

- Quality of required Laboratory Business Plan or Institutional Plan; including the quality of the mission developed for the Laboratory and effectiveness in identifying its distinctive characteristics;

- Ability to establish and maintain long-term partnerships/relationships that advance/expand ongoing Laboratory missions and/or provide new opportunities/capabilities;
- Effectiveness in Work for Others planning and management, and
- Effectiveness in developing and implementing research and development opportunities that leverage accomplishment of DOE goals and projects with other federal agencies, states, universities, and industry to advance the utilization of Laboratory technologies and capabilities.

The overall performance (outcomes/results) of the following set of performance measures (tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones) shall be utilized by evaluators as the primary measure of the Contractor's success in meeting this Objective and for determining the numerical score awarded. 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.

Measures:

4.1.1 The Laboratory Business Plan or Institutional Plan provides all required data in a clear and concise manner and is completed within established guidelines and schedules. The Laboratory Mission included in the plan provides a clear understanding of the distinctive characteristics of the Laboratory.

FY 2008 Target: The Business Plan or/and other SC defined institutional planning documents will be quality document(s) consistent with DOE schedule and guidance. Should DOE elect to not issue guidance, the Laboratory will prepare an Integrated Strategic Plan that addresses scientific and operational goals and strategies.

4.1.2 Strategic partnerships are developed that demonstrate the Laboratory's leadership, leverage DOE resources, and support collaborative programs with other DOE laboratories and academic, and industry groups.

FY 2008 Target: Continue to demonstrate growth and progress in the development of quality research partnerships and collaborations, in particular for support of the Joint BioEnergy Institute (JBEI), the Deep Underground Science and Engineering Laboratory (DUSEL), and Molecular Foundry user program.

4.1.3 Effectiveness of the Work-for-Others (WFO) planning, management, and reporting system that serves the needs of both LBNL and DOE, and facilitates the project approval process.

FY 2008 Target: Based on the Work For Others Program Plan, demonstrate continued progress in implementing and improving the WFO information system and reporting protocol for the management and oversight of the WFO portfolio.

4.1.4 Effectiveness in maintaining appropriate relations with the community to include providing for science education opportunities, outreach, and open and honest communications.

FY 2008 Targets: With UC Berkeley and other partners, coordinate and implement communications outreach activities for publicly informed development of the DOE Joint Bioenergy Institute (JBEI). Continue to deliver on science education outreach activities in the local school districts, expanding the efforts when resources are available. Develop and implement coordination efforts with science education activities throughout the laboratory. Continue the Center for Science & Engineering Education student tracking.

4.1.5 Valued partnership in supporting the local counterintelligence office (CI) in implementing and maintaining successful CI plans and programs at the Lab through leadership and management effectiveness.

FY 2008 Target: Continue to provide the local CI office the necessary space, staff, and access to other Lab resources for a successful CI Awareness Program and Site-Specific CI Support Plans.

4.1.6 Develop a baseline for understanding and trending the cost of doing business.

FY 2008 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 December 31, 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 institutional assurance system, to include Corporate Office Leadership's role, ability to instill responsibility and accountability down and through the entire organization; and
- The effectiveness and efficiency of the Institutional Assurance System, to include Corporate Office Assurance, in identifying and/or responding to Laboratory issues or opportunities for continuous improvement.

Measures:

4.2.1 Leadership maintains an effective assurance function with cognizance of robust feedback and improvement. Laboratory risks are managed commensurate with the level of significance and severity.

FY 2008 Target: The Issues Management Program is implemented in all divisions. Issues and associated corrective actions are identified, managed and tracked to completion, issues are monitored and analyzed, and lessons learned and best practices are developed and disseminated as appropriate.

4.2.2 Leadership is committed to a pervasive safety culture, and strives for continuous safety performance improvement.

FY 2008 Target: The Laboratory provides the leadership and organizational resources to implement a strategy of continuous improvement, to be documented with specific and representative leadership actions. Leadership is further strengthening LBNL's safety program through comprehensive implementation of the Integrated Safety Management Corrective Action Plan. Leadership communicates the importance of the ISM improvements, and provides the resources to facilitate successful implementation.

4.2.3 The Contractor will demonstrate that its Senior Managers are kept informed about evolving cyber security risks and threats.

FY08 Target**:** The Computer Protection Program Manager or CIO will provide cyber security risk and threat updates to Division Directors and Senior Management three times during the performance period.

4.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Corporate Office Support as Appropriate

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

- University involvement in and support of business and other infrastructure process and procedure improvements;
- The willingness to enter into and effectiveness of joint appointments when appropriate; and
- Where appropriate, the willingness to develop and work with the Department in implementing facility financing agreements and/or provide investments into the Laboratory.

Measures:

4.3.1 University support of programs, business and other operations, including administration, finance, human resources, and facilities, and process and procedure improvements.

FY 2008 Target: Demonstrate tangible UC support that contribute to the intellectual and organizational assets available to LBNL to advance its national missions and goals. Examples include leadership development for staff , business systems policy support, and corporate encouragement of the use of University research resources.

4.3.2 The demonstrated accomplishment of the Contractor to conduct appropriate corporate oversight and assurance.

FY 2008 Target: : Maintain, improve, or add systems, policies, and actions that demonstrate proactive corporate responsibility. Examples include continued function of UC's LBNL Advisory Board and the Contract Assurance Council. The University will provide an Assurance Letter to DOE that documents responsible and effective management control systems.

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

Table 4.1 – Goal 4.0 Performance Rating Development

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 4.2 – Goal 4.0 Final Letter Grade

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

The weight of this goal is 22%.

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 the following:

- The success in meeting ES&H goals.

Measures:

5.1.1 The Contractor's progress in achieving and maintaining "best-in-class" ES&H program performance, as measured by the days away, restricted or transferred (DART) case rate.

FY 2008 Target: DART rate is a 30% improvement over final FY 07 performance.

5.1.2 The Contractor shall control work activities in a manner that protects the health of the workers, public, and environment.

FY 2008 Target: Score is between 2 □ and 3 points. Points are allocated by applying agreed upon weighting factors to each environmental incident in accordance with the document "Weighting Factors for Environmental Incidents at LBNL." Severity levels are as follows:

- Minor non-compliance (for example, an undated hazardous waste container) receives the least weighting.
- Moderate non-compliance (for example, a leaking hazardous waste container resulting in a Notice of Violation).
- Significant non-compliance (for example, a treatment unit that releases effluent above permitted limits to the sanitary sewer resulting in a Notice of Violation).
- Severe non-compliance (for example, a penalty from an enforcement action in excess of $100K) will result in a weighting factor of 5.

5.1.3 The scoring for radiological incidents relative to an internal control number.

FY 2008 Target: The scoring for radiological incidents is at or below 3. Laboratory and DOE will apply a weighting factor to each radiological incident depending on severity, magnitude, and proactive nature of the work that may have resulted in the issue in accordance with the document "Weighting Factors for Radiological Incidents at LBNL". Minor incidents [for example, Occurrence Reporting and Processing System (ORPS) category 4 Personnel Contamination occurrences] receive the least weighting. Due to the severity, a reportable occurrence categorized as a category 1 under Group 6 of the ORPS will be weighted 5.0, which results in a maximum letter grade of a "C" for the performance year.

5.1.4 The Contractor's progress in achieving and maintaining "best-in-class" ES&H program performance, as measured by the days away, restricted or transferred (DART) case rate.

FY 2008 Target: DART rate is 0.25

5.1.5 The Contractor's progress in achieving and maintaining "best-in-class" ES&H program performance, as measured by the total recordable case rate (TRC).

FY 2008 Target: TRC rate is 0.65

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:

- Demonstration of the commitment of leadership to strong ES&H performance
- The maintenance and appropriate utilization of hazard identification, prevention, and control processes/ activities; and
- The degree to which scientist and workers are involved and engaged in the ES&H program at the working level.

Measures:

5.2.1 Complete required safety-related training per Job Hazards Questionnaire.

FY 2008 Target: 90% by 9/30/08.

5.2.2 Authorize work using the Job Hazards Analysis (JHA).

FY 2008 Target: 75% of affected LBNL employees have authorized JHA by 9/30/08.

Protocol: The value is calculated as follows:

- "Authorized JHA" means that the final individual baseline JHA has been signed by the Worker and the Work Lead and that the work has been authorized. Signing of the JHA is sufficient to meet this requirement; completion of specified training is not required. This information can be obtained from the JHA data management system.
- "Affected LBNL employees" are LBNL employees who work at LBNL or at offsite locations considered to be LBNL spaces (for example, Donner and Calvin Laboratories, Berkeley West Biocenter) who have been onsite for greater than 30 days. This information is also available from the JHA data management system as well as HRIS.

5.2.3 Leadership is committed to a pervasive safety culture, and strives for continuous safety performance improvement.

FY 2008 Target: Leadership is further strengthening LBNL's safety program through comprehensive implementation of the Corrective Action Plan for ISMS. All 17 major activities scheduled for FY 08 will be completed, integral with a strategy of continuous improvement.

90% (B+) completion of major activities scheduled to be completed by 6/30/08 in Integrated Safety Management System (ISMS) Evaluation Corrective Action Plan.

Protocol:

1. BSO will verify implementation and appropriateness of major activities.
2. LBNL will provide monthly status report of major activities completion to BSO.
3. BSO will provide feedback to LBNL within 60 days of LBNL notification of closure.
4. BSO will review Baseline Change Proposals for concurrence when changes extend the completion date greater than 30 days beyond the established date.

5.2.4 The contractor will initiate steps to apply for and receive DOE VPP STAR status under the DOE Voluntary Protection Program.

FY 2008 Target: The contractor will conduct a gap analysis of their safety program against the VPP criteria and deliver a report to BSO that presents the gaps and an Improvement Plan to address the gaps. The gap analysis and improvement plan are due by 9/30/08.

Protocol:

Implementation with no milestones in FY08 qualifies for a B+ range.

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:

- Environmental Management System implementation
- Success in waste minimization (low level, mixed low level, hazardous, and/ or sanitary waste), emission reduction, and/or resource conservation

Measures:

5.3.1 The Contractor shall develop, implement, and maintain certification equivalence of an LBNL Performance-based Environmental Management System.

FY 2008 Target: Complete all 4 EMS core program milestones.

EMS Core Program Milestones:

1. Review environmental aspects and impacts.
2. Determine the set of significant environmental aspects.
3. Revise existing Environmental Management Programs as needed, or develop new ones.
4. Complete annual internal assessment.

EMS Program Additional Milestones

5. Assess effectiveness of operational controls implemented.
6. Enhance communications on EMS. Examples include an article in *Today at Berkeley Lab* or *The View*.

5.3.2 The Contractor shall complete the EMS Projects.

FY 2008 Target: Complete the equivalent of two projects from the jointly agreed to list of potential projects.

Protocol:

By March 31, 2008 LBNL and BSO will jointly agree on the potential candidate projects and their respective potential point values with the understanding that several small projects may be grouped together and counted as one project. Additional projects may be identified after March 31, 2008, and used for this performance measure. The examples of projects to be considered include: LEED building design and certification, sealing of ventilation ducts, cooling tower water treatment, procurement of environmentally friendly products, and reducing LBNL commute traffic. The number of points earned will determine the grade for this performance measure.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Weighted Score	Total Points
5.0 Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health and Environmental Protection					
5.1 Provide a Work Environment that Protects Workers and the Environment.			20%		
5.2 Provide Efficient and Effective Implementation of Integrated Safety, Health and Environmental Management			50%		
5.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Waste Management, Minimization, and Pollution Prevention.			30%		
				Performance Goal 5.0 Total	

Table 5.1 – Goal 5.0 Performance Rating Development

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 5.2 – Goal 5.0 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 25%.

The contractor provides business systems that efficiently and effectively support the overall mission of the Laboratory. The goal shall measure the Contractor's overall success in deploying, implementing, and improving integrated business system that efficiently and effectively support the mission(s) of the Laboratory.

Objectives:

6.1 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Financial Management System

The Laboratory shall maintain and administer a Financial Management system that is suitable to provide proper accounting in accordance with DOE and Prime Contract requirements. The Laboratory will provide support to this Objective through accountability, internal controls, and competent staffing.

Measure:

6.1.1 The Laboratory will present data and analysis demonstrating theLaboratory's success in meeting Financial Management goals and expectations using the Laboratory's Balanced Scorecard Model Index approved by the DOE BSO.

FY 2008 Target: Achieve a score of 86.8% or better on the Balanced Scorecard Model Index consisting of the following performance targets:

- At least 91% of active balance sheet accounts receive timely accurate and complete reconciliations.
- At least 91% of audit generated corrective actions scheduled to be closed are closed.
- At least 91% of policies scheduled for review for compliance with contract requirements are reviewed.
- All internal control self-assessments will be accomplished in accordance with the DOE approved schedule.
- At least 91% of budget and financial reports are submitted timely, complete and accurate.
- The sum of DOE direct-funded costs and commitments do not exceed available funds at the B&R OCL at year-end.
- The Office of the CFO (OCFO) demonstrates systematic financial controls to mitigate inappropriate financial transactions that may result in funding issues.
- The OCFO reduces the frequency of significant unallowable costs (>$2.5K) to no more than 3 incidents due to cost overruns at the 9 digit B&R caused by inadequacies in systems or procedures.
- Meet all deadlines and deliverables satisfactorily for A-123 Appendix A control requirements.

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:

The Laboratory's approved Acquisition and Property Management systems ensure that these business operations are performed effectively, efficiently, and in accordance with Prime Contract requirements and with policies and procedures approved by DOE. In support of these systems, the Laboratory solicits customer feedback, provides a sound management system for ensuring personal property accountability for government property from acquisition to disposition, manages costs and performance and tracks trends, and ensures staff has the tools and training necessary to perform their responsibilities and to support this objective.

Measure:

6.2.1 The Laboratory will present data and analysis demonstrating their success in meeting Acquisition and Property Management objectives and expectations using the Laboratory's Balanced Scorecard Model Index approved by the DOE BSO.

FY 2008 Target: Achieve a score of 86.8% or better on the Balanced Scorecard Model Index.

Acquistion
Measurement

LBNL, BSO, and UCLMO have mutually agreed upon the acceptable level of performance and corresponding targets/gradients for each activity. For activities occurring only once a year, the score shall be entered based on the final result at the end of the designated timeframe. All other results shall be reported quarterly and scored at fiscal year-end based upon the annual cumulative result.

If Procurement fails to perform an activity, the scoring will be handled by either of the following two methods:

- LBNL, BSO, and UCLMO will determine an equitable way of adjusting the assigned points, or zero points will be earned if an activity is not performed during the fiscal year.

- If, through no fault of Procurement, an activity is not performed, the points will be redistributed to another measure or measures, as negotiated among the parties (LBNL, BSO, and UCLMO).

Scoring
The total earned points for each Performance Measure/Activity are combined to arrive at the overall fiscal year-end score for the Procurement Department. Points are converted to percentage on a one for one basis, 100 points are available to Procurement. The points are distributed to the following perspectives:

PERSPECTIVE	POINTS
Customer	15
Internal Business Processes	55
Learning and Growth	25
Managing Financial Aspects	5
TOTAL	**100**

Property
Measurement
Methods of measurement for the core elements were determined based on a cost/benefit analysis. Statistical sampling will be employed where it will provide a cost benefit, while assuring accuracy and precision of results commensurate with the specific measure.

Target
DOE Headquarters has identified national targets for the balanced scorecard measures. Gradients have been established for each BSC Model Index measure based on these targets and the Laboratory's historical performance.

Point Value
LBNL, DOE, and UCLMO established a consensually acceptable point value for each measure. The range in point value is from 0 to 10 per measure. Points are converted to percentage on a one for one basis, (e.g. 90 points = 90%), 100 points are available to Property. The points are distributed to the following perspectives:

PERSPECTIVE	POINTS
Customer	20
Internal Business	54
Learning and Growth	6
Financial	20
TOTAL	**100**

If the Laboratory fails to perform an activity during the fiscal year and LBNL, DOE, and UCLMO agree in advance that the activity will not be performed, the three parties will determine an equitable way of distributing the assigned points.

Overall Scoring
The total earned points/percentage for each core element for both acquisition and property are added together to arrive at the overall score for the organization. The overall score for acquisition and property is then divided by two to convert the total points achieved to a PEMP Score.

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.

Measures:

6.3.1 Implement FY08 actions that will move the Laboratory forward in pursuing National Academy of Public Administrators (NAPA) certification in the following three standards: HR Strategic Management, Employment and Talent Management, and Training and Development

FY 2008 Target: By 9/30/08, complete 4 out of 6 tasks that will move the Laboratory forward in pursuing NAPA certification in HR Strategic Management, Employment and Talent Management and Training and Development.

6.3.2 Diversity: Develop and implement the FY06-07 Workplace Climate Survey action items for job and career advancement, quality of supervision, communication between management and staff, and work-life balance by 9/30/08.

FY 2008 Target: Complete 5 of the 7 tasks to develop and implement the FY06-07 Workplace Climate Survey action items by 9/30/08.

Background for 6.3.2: The FY06-07 Workplace Climate Survey was launched by the laboratory's workforce diversity office, following Director Chu's endorsement of the laboratory's diversity best practices council recommendation.

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

The Laboratory will demonstrate efficient, effective, and responsive management systems for Internal Audit and Information Management by presenting data and analysis demonstrating the Lab's success in meeting the performance objective for Internal Audit. The Laboratory will utilize a balanced scorecard approach to measure Internal Audit performance.

Scoring
Internal Audit Services and Information Technology will use a balanced scorecard approach for assessing achievement.

Measures:

6.4.1 The Laboratory will present data and analysis demonstrating the Laboratory's success in meeting Internal Audit goals and expectations using the Laboratory's Balanced Scorecard Model Index.

FY 2008 Target: Achieve a score of 86 or better on the Balanced Scorecard Model Index consisting of the following performance targets:

- Issue surveys to internal and external customers within one week of audit issuance or advisory service completion.
- Internal Audit will complete 95% of LBNL Audit Committee, DOE, and UCOP audit management expectations.
- Internal Audit Services will issue at least four recommendations for improving the efficiency of laboratory operations.

- At least 95% of direct hours included in the approved audit plan will be actually expended as direct hours over the course of the year.
- No more than one of the professional staff will not complete the required continuing professional education (CPE) hours to maintain at least one professional credential/certification.

6.4.2 Information Management: The Laboratory will achieve a score of 85 points or above on the IT Scorecard which includes measures of customer service, system availability, network availability, and efficiency.

FY 2008 Target: The Laboratory will achieve a score of 85 points or above on the IT Scorecard which is based on the following performance targets representing the maximum points to be assigned each scorecard measure:

- Telephony cost per service call is more than 1% below FY07.
- Network availability for science exceeds 99.99%.
- Network availability for business exceeds 99.9%.
- Overall satisfaction with Helpdesk assigned tickets exceeds 9.5 on 10 point scale

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 proper stewardship of intellectual assets and Laboratory owned or originated technology;
- The market impacts created/generated as a result of technology transfer and deployment activities; and
- Communication products contributing to the transfer of Laboratory originated knowledge and technology.

Measures:

6.5.1 The Contractor will write non-confidential descriptions of Laboratory inventions and post them on the Contractor's Technology Transfer website.

FY 2008 Target: The Contractor will write and post on the web at least 20-24 Technology Announcements (i.e. non-confidential descriptions).

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Weighted Score	Total Points
6.0 Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission(s)					
6.1 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Financial Management System(s).			30%		
6.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition and Property Management System(s)			30%		
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			10%		
6.5 Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Technology and Commercialization of Intellectual Assets			10%		
				Performance Goal 6.0 Total	

Table 6.1 – Goal 6.0 Performance Rating Development

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 6.2 – Goal 6.0 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%.

Goal 7.0 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.

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.
- Specific tasks associated with each Measure is documented in the UC/LBNL/BSO FY08 Facilities and Infrastructure Performance Assessment Model (PAM).

Measures:

7.1.1 Maintenance and Utility Reliability- Effectiveness and efficiency of maintenance activities to maximize the operational life of facility systems, structure and Components.

FY 2008 Target: LBNL achieves the following milestones based on the Facilities and Infrastructure Performance Assessment Model (PAM). The PAM milestones are:

- Maintenance Investment Index (MII) equal to 2% of Replacement Plant Value;
- Asset Condition Index (ACI) reflecting deferred maintenance reduction of $6.06M or a revised figure mutually agreed between DOE and LBNL by March 31, 2008; and,
- Completion of RPAM activities as follow: FY08 Condition Assessment Summary Report; FY07 Actual Maintenance Report; FY08 Required Maintenance Report; and, review and update the LBNL Maintenance Plan.

7.1.2 Energy and Utility Management initiatives are managed through the FY 2008 LBNL Comprehensive Energy Management Plan (CEMP).

FY 2008 Target: LBNL meets expectations for all five Comprehensive Energy Management Plan required objectives. The objectives are:

- 1) complete requirements identified in the LBNL CEMP;
- 2) energy use per gross square foot is 2 percent less than the previous year;
- 3) green MWH purchased is equal to or greater than 3 percent of total MWH purchased.;
- 4) new buildings are designed to use 30 percent less energy; and
- 5) "29" electricity usage meters are installed.

7.1.3 Real Property Management Space/Facility Utilization - Effectively managed consistent with mission, requirements, and DOE direction. Intent is to measure the effectiveness, completeness, and timeliness of implementation of Real Property management using Facilities Information Management System (FIMS) office space utilization, facilities asset and utilization index (AUI), and real property leases.

FY 2008 Target**:** LBNL achieves 5 of the 6 milestones based on the Facilities and infrastructure Performance Assessment Model (PAM) The PAM milestones include:

- Populate FIMS with Executive Order 13327 required data elements;
- Document underutilized or unsuitable excess space and AUI, and recommend its inclusion in FIMS and the Ten-Year Site Plan
- Timely acquisition of lease space. Complete B937 move plan (Q1 FY08). Complete FY08 portion of approved B937 plan by Q4 FY08.

- Ensure FIMS consistency with other DOE databases. Produce documentation that shows quarterly reconciliation between FIMS and Management and Analysis Reporting System (MARS).
- Ensure FIMS supports Space Banking Reporting. Prepare annual memo to DOE regarding Space Banking, reflecting FIMS archived square footage, facilities flagged as excess and excess years.
- Complete Internal FIMS Data Validation per DOE requirements.

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 alignment and effectiveness 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;
- Effectiveness in meeting project performance baselines for scope, schedule and cost;
- Overall responsiveness to customer mission needs; and
- Efficiency in meeting Cost and Schedule Performance Index for construction projects (when appropriate).

Measures:

7.2.1 Integrated Site Planning - The Laboratory develops, documents, and maintains an integrated site planning process that is aligned with DOE mission needs and the Laboratory strategic/business plan. Intent is to measure the effectiveness of integrated site planning activities using any related site development planning documents. Each task is assessed individually.

FY 2008 Target: LBNL meets expectations for three tasks based on the Facilities and Infrastructure Performance Assessment Model (PAM) The three tasks to be performed are:

- Prepare and ensure DOE Planning Documents such as the TYSP addresses LBNL strategic goals, SC's guidance and BSO Comments.
- Review selected proposals for NEPA/CEQA compliance. Review and process research, construction, maintenance, and operations proposals for NEPA/CEQA compliance.
- ASCE-31 Seismic evaluations: Complete 100% of trailer and unoccupied building inventory.

7.2.2 Construction/Project Management - Activities and requirements related to Line Item projects are complete within preliminary performance baselines for scope, schedule and cost (established at CD-1) or performance baselines (established at CD-2). Each task is assessed individually.

FY 2008 Target: LBNL adheres to the performance baseline for selected projects and manages GPP priority list and associated cost and schedule based on the Facilities and Infrastructure Performance Assessment Model (PAM). The rated projects/programs are:

- Demolition of B51 and the Bevatron;
- B77 Phase II Rehabilitation;
- User Support Building;
- General Plant Project (GPP) Program; and,
- Seismic Phase I and Seismic Phase 2.

7.2.3 Develop a strategy for increasing investment in infrastructure which minimizes increases to the cost of doing business.

FY 2008 Target: Develop strategy by September 30, 2008.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Weighted Score	Total Points
7.0 Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs					
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%		
Performance Goal 7.0 Total					

Table 7.1 –Goal 7.0 Performance Rating Development

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 7.2 – Goal 7.0 Final Letter Grade

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

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 8%.

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.

Objectives:

8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System

To measure the performance of this objective, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- The Contractor's success in meeting Emergency Management goals and expectations.
- The commitment of leadership to a strong Emergency Management performance is appropriately demonstrated
- The maintenance and appropriate utilization of Emergency Management procedures and processes are effectively demonstrated

Measures:

8.1.1 The Contractor will demonstrate Emergency Management commitment through developing a long term Emergency Operations Center (EOC) project plan for the improvement of emergency operations.

FY 2008 Target**:** Complete assessment of the existing Emergency Operations Center and related training activities, which results in a graded EOC improvement plan approved for funding by September 30, 2008.

8.1.2 The Contractor will demonstrate Emergency Management commitment through making short term EOC functional improvements.

FY 2008 Target: Complete short term functional improvements by September 30, 2008.

8.1 3 The Contractor will demonstrate compliance with DOE 151.1C in a graded approach by conducting a hazards survey and developing an implementation plan.

FY 2008 Target: Complete hazards survey in accordance with 151.1C and develop an implementation plan, if necessary, by September 30, 2008.

8.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for Cyber-Security

To measure the performance of this objective, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- The Contractor's success in meeting Cyber-Security goals and expectations;
- 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; and
- The maintenance and appropriate utilization of Cyber-Security risk identification, prevention, and control processes/activities.

Measures:

8.2.1 The contractor will demonstrate commitment to cyber security and continuous improvement across a group of performance metrics which include training performance, corrective action management, certification and accreditation, risk assessment, and self assessment with stretch goals for new initiatives in training.

FY 2008 Target: Score of 85 or above on Cyber Security 2008 Scorecard, which is based on the following performance targets:

- Laboratory conducts internal and external reviews of security program;
- Corrective actions from Plans of Actions and Milestones (POA&Ms) completed on target;
- Risk assessment conducted for enclaves;
- New or improved management, operational, and technical controls in place;

- Cyber training of employees;
- Cyber training of guests;
- Personal Identifying Information (PII) training developed, and delivery to applicable individuals; and,
- Pursuit of system certification.

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

To measure the performance of this objective, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- The Contractor's success in meeting Safeguard goals and expectations
- 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

Measures:

8.3.1 The Contractor will ensure on-going compliance with internal procedures to implement DOE Manual 470.4-6 in a graded approach. The Contractor will develop corrective actions addressing peer review findings and submit to BSO for approval.

FY 2008 Target: Schedules and conducts peer review of LBNL MC&A Plan by 05/31/08. The contractor will develop and submit peer review Corrective Action Plan, if required, to BSO by 07/31/08.

8.3.2 The Contractor will control and maintain Nuclear Material in accordance with safeguard processes and activities.

FY 2008 Target: 86% (6/7) of safeguards process and activities (4 inventories, 3 inventory/transaction reports) completed on schedule. 85% Authorization renewals completed on schedule – number varies.

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

8.4.1 The Contractor will assure that classified and sensitive information are handled in an efficient and effective manner.

FY 2008 Target: Develop guidance on the protection of classified and sensitive information and make available on the Laboratory's security website by March 31, 2008.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Weighted Score	Total Points
8.0 Sustain and Enhance the effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM) and the Emergency Management System					
8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System			20%		
8.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for Cyber-Security			65%		
8.3 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Special Nuclear Materials, Classified Matter, and Property			10%		
8.4 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Classified and Sensitive Information			5%		
Performance Goal 8.0 Total					

Table 8.1 – Goal 8.0 Performance Rating Development

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 8.2 – Goal 8.0 Final Letter Grade

Attachment I - LBNL S&T Appraisal Weight Sheet

		ASCR	BES	BER	FES	HEP	NP	WDTS	EERE	FE	RW
		Wt	Wt	Wt	Wt	Wt	Wt	Wt	Wt	Wt	Wt
Goal #1 Mission Accomplishment											
	Goal's weight	**40**	**30**	**25**	**55**	**40**	**40**	**65**	**70**		**70**
1a. Impact (significance)		40	50	30	30	30	35	25	35	25	25
1b. Leadership (recognition of S&T accomplishments)		30	20	20	20	30	25	30	35	25	25
1c. Output (productivity) (pass/fail)		15	15	20	25	30	25	30	15	25	25
1d. Delivery (pass/fail)		15	15	30	25	10	15	15	15	25	25
	check sum	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Goal #2 Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operation of Facilities											
	Goal's weight	**40**	**50**	**50**	**0**	**30**	**30**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
2a. Design of Facility (the initiation phase and the definition phase, i.e. activities leading up to CD-2)		10	20	0		50	0				
2b. Construction of Facility/Fabrication of Components (execution phase, Post CD-2 to CD-4)		10	15	0		50	0				
2c. Operation of Facility		70	50	90		0	85				
2d. Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Lab's Research Base		10	15	10		0	15				
	check sum	100	100	100	0	100	100	0	0	0	0
Goal #3 Program Management											
	Goal's weight	**20**	**20**	**25**	**45**	**30**	**30**	**35**	**30**		**30**
3a. Stewardship of Scientific Capabilities and Programmatic Vision		30	40	20	35	40	40	20	50	40	40
3b. Program Planning and Management		40	30	30	30	40	40	40	25	30	20
3.c Program Management-Communication & Responsiveness (to HQ)		30	30	50	35	20	20	40	25	30	40
	check sum	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
	goal check sum	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100