

## **ATTACHMENT J-2**

### **APPENDIX B**

#### **FY 2006 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 .....4**
- I. DETERMINING THE CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE RATING, PERFORMANCE-BASED FEE AND AWARD TERM ELIGIBILITY .....5**
- II. PERFORMANCE GOALS, OBJECTIVES & MEASURES .....10**
- BACKGROUND .....10**
- PERFORMANCE GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES .....10**
- PART A – SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY COMPONENT .....11**
- 1 PROVIDE FOR EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE MISSION ACCOMPLISHMENT .....11**
  - 1.1 SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY RESULTS PROVIDE MEANINGFUL IMPACT ON THE FIELD .....12**
  - 1.2 PROVIDE QUALITY LEADERSHIP IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY .....12**
  - 1.3 PROVIDE AND SUSTAIN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY OUTPUTS THAT ADVANCE PROGRAM OBJECTIVES AND GOALS .....13**
  - 1.4 PROVIDE FOR EFFECTIVE DELIVERY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY .....13**
- 2 PROVIDE FOR EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE DESIGN, FABRICATION, CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATIONS OF RESEARCH FACILITIES .....16**
  - 2.1 PROVIDE EFFECTIVE FACILITY DESIGN(S) AS REQUIRED TO SUPPORT LABORATORY PROGRAMS (I.E., ACTIVITIES LEADING UP TO CD-2) .....16**
  - 2.2 PROVIDE FOR THE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES AND/OR FABRICATION OF COMPONENTS (EXECUTION PHASE, POST CD-2 TO CD-4) .....17**
  - 2.3 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE OPERATION OF FACILITIES .....18**
  - 2.4 EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF FACILITY(IES) TO GROW AND SUPPORT THE LABORATORY’S RESEARCH BASE .....18**
- 3 PROVIDE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM MANAGEMENT .....22**
  - 3.1 PROVIDE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT STEWARDSHIP OF SCIENTIFIC CAPABILITIES AND PROGRAM VISION .....22**
  - 3.2 PROVIDE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROJECT/PROGRAM PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT .....23**
  - 3.3 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATIONS AND RESPONSIVENESS TO CUSTOMER NEEDS .....24**
- PART B – MANAGEMENT & OPERATIONS COMPONENT .....27**
- 4 PROVIDE SOUND AND COMPETENT LEADERSHIP AND STEWARDSHIP OF THE LABORATORY .....27**
  - 4.1 PROVIDE A DISTINCTIVE VISION FOR THE LABORATORY AND AN EFFECTIVE PLAN FOR ACCOMPLISHMENT OF THE VISION TO INCLUDE STRONG PARTNERSHIPS REQUIRED TO CARRY OUT THOSE PLANS .....27**
  - 4.2 PROVIDE FOR RESPONSIVE AND ACCOUNTABLE LEADERSHIP THROUGHOUT THE ORGANIZATION .....29**
  - 4.3 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE CORPORATE SUPPORT AS APPROPRIATE .....29**
- 5 SUSTAIN EXCELLENCE AND ENHANCE EFFECTIVENESS OF INTEGRATED SAFETY, HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION .....31**
  - 5.1 PROVIDE A WORK ENVIRONMENT THE PROTECTS WORKERS AND THE ENVIRONMENT .....31**

**5.2 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF INTEGRATED SAFETY, HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT .....31**

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

**6 DELIVER EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE BUSINESS SYSTEMS AND RESOURCES THAT ENABLE THE SUCCESSFUL ACHIEVEMENT OF THE LABORATORY MISSION(S) .....34**

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

**6.2 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE ACQUISITION AND PROPERTY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM(S) .....34**

**6.3 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT SYSTEM.....34**

**6.4 PROVIDE EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS FOR INTERNAL AUDIT AND OVERSIGHT;; QUALITY; INFORMATION MANAGEMENT; AND OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES AS APPROPRIATE. ....35**

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

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

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

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

**8 SUSTAIN AND ENHANCE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY MANAGEMENT (ISSM) AND THE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM 41**

**8.1 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM .....41**

**8.2 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE SYSTEM FOR CYBER-SECURITY .....41**

**8.3 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE SYSTEM FOR THE PROTECTION OF SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIALS, CLASSIFIED MATTER, AND PROPERTY .....42**

**8.4 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE SYSTEM FOR THE PROTECTION OF CLASSIFIED AND SENSITIVE INFORMATION .....43**

**ATTACHMENT 1 - LBNL OFFICE OF SCIENCE S&T APPRAISAL WEIGHT SHEET.....44**

**INTRODUCTION**

This document describes the primary measurement basis for 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, 2005, through September 30, 2006. 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 and performance expectations/objectives of the Department as stipulated within this contract.

This document also describes 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. In cases where there is no agreement on the measure and/or the target to be achieved the Contracting Officer will make the final determination as to the measure and target that will be used to determine the contractor’s performance.

A four level description of performance expectations will be utilized. Table I-1 depicts the paragraph numbering methodology to be employed and the definition for each performance (measurement) level.

Paragraph Numbering	Performance Level and Definition
X	<u>Performance Goal</u> : A general overarching statement of the desired outcome for each major performance area that will be scored and reported annually under the appraisal process.
X.X	<u>Performance Objective</u> : A statement of desired results for an organization or activity. Note: The set of Performance Measures identified should be the primary means for determining the Contractor's performance in meeting the Performance Objective; however, other performance information available to the evaluator from other sources may be utilized in determining the overall performance rating of a Performance Objective.
X.X.X	<u>Performance Measure</u> : A quantitative or qualitative method for characterizing performance to assist the reviewer in assessing achievement of the corresponding Performance Objective (i.e., what you would measure).
To be nested within Performance Measure paragraph.	<u>Performance Target</u> : The desired condition, milestone, or target level of achievement for each Performance Measure (objective or subjective as appropriate), established at an appropriately detailed level that can be tracked and used for a judgment or decision on performance assessment.

**Table I-1. Four Level Performance Measurement Methodology**  
In this table “X” = a number

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 fee earned (if any) will be determined and how award term eligibility will be determined.

Section II provides the detailed information concerning each Goal, the 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 2006 Contractor performance grades will be determined based on the weighted sum of the individual scores earned for each of the Goals described within this document for Science and Technology and for Management and Operations (see Table A below). No overall rollup grade will be provided. Performance evaluations shall be measured and graded at the Objective level, which rollup to provide the performance evaluation determination for each Goal. The overall numeric score derived for Science and Technology will be utilized to determine the amount of available fee that may be earned (see Table B).

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 2006. 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 letter and numeric grade for each Goal:

### Performance Evaluation Methodology:

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 2006 target if not a pass/fail measure is stated at the B+ grade

range. If the target is for a pass/fail measure then a pass = 4.3 and a fail = 0.7. 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.
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

Letter Grade	Numeric Score	Definition
		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 Crosswalk and Definitions**

Calculating Individual Goal Scores and Letter Grade:

Science and Technology (S&T)

Each Program Office establishes its own weight for the Goals and the Objectives under those goals. The Objective scores for each program area will be weighted based on the program office’s stated weight to create a weighted score at the Goal level for the program area. The Goal scores and the Goal weights for each program area will then be weighted based on the percentage created by dividing the program area funds by all program area funds being evaluated. The sum of all the weighted program area Goals and weighted program area weights will create the overall Goal score and Goal weighting (Goal weighting is currently represented by XX in Table A). . (The Table A weightings for S&T Goals 1-3 are composites based on the summation of program office assigned Goal and Objective weightings for LBNL, and FY05 funding. They will be updated using FY06 year-end Budget Authority (BA)).

Management and Operations (M&O)

Each Objective is assigned the earned numerical score by the evaluating office. The Goal rating is then computed by multiplying the numerical score by the weight of each Objective within the Goal. The sum of 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 total score for Science and Technology and Management and Operations is compared to the letter grade scale found in Table B, below, to determine the overall S&T and M&O grades for FY 2006.

The raw score (rounded to the nearest hundredth) 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 identifying the overall letter grade as indicated in Table B.

S&T Performance Goal	Letter Grade	Numeric Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Total Score
1 Mission Accomplishment			50%		
2 Construction and Operations of User Research Facilities and Equipment			23%		
3 Science and Technology Research Project/Program Management			27%		
<b>Total Score</b>					
M&O Performance Goal	Letter Grade	Numeric Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Total Score

**Table A. FY 2006 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 2006 Contractor Letter Grade/Numeric Score Scale**

Determining the Amount of Performance-Based Fee Earned:

Total available FY06 fee is \$4,500,000 (Base Fee: None Performance Fee: \$4,500,000). Goals one through three comprise the goals for the S&T rating. The S&T score is used to establish the gateway for the maximum percentage of performance fee that may be earned by the contractor by referring to Table C. The percentage of performance fee that is possible is then multiplied by the percentage multiplier in Table C that corresponds to the score for Goals four through eight which comprise the M&O component of the evaluation. The overall numerical score of the M&O Goals from Table A. above shall then be utilized to determine the final fee multiplier (see Table C.), which shall be utilized to determine the overall amount of performance-based fee earned for FY 2006 as calculated within Table D.



Overall Weighted Score from Table A.	Percent S&T Fee Earned	M&O Fee Multiplier
4.3	100%	100%
4.2		
4.1		
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 Table C.	____%
M&O Fee Multiplier from Table C.	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 clauses entitled “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 as set forth by the policies described in Acquisition Regulation; Conditional Payment of Fee, Profit, and Other Incentives interim final rule published in 68 Fed. Reg. 68771, Dec. 10, 2003. The final Contractor performance-based rating 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 2006. 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 1. Should an Objective contain multiple Performance Measures they are assumed to be of equal value unless otherwise stated.

## PART A – SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY COMPONENT

### 1 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 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 2005 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 2006.

- Office of Science (SC) (90.3%)
  - Office of Advance Scientific Computing Research (ASCR) (21.0%)
  - Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES) (29.3%)
  - Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER) (21.0%)
  - Office of Fusion Energy Sciences (FES) (1.8%)
  - Office of High Energy Physics (HEP) (12.2%)
  - Office of Nuclear Physics (NP) (5.4%)
  - Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS) (0.2%)
- Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) (7.3%)
- Assistant Secretary for Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (RW) (1.8%)

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 1.2 below). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 1.3 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 weightings for the remaining HQ Program Offices shall be recalculated based on their percentage of the total Budget Authority (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.

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

**1.2 Provide Quality Leadership in Science and Technology**

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured 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.

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

### 1.3 Provide and sustain Science and Technology Outputs that Advance Program Objectives and Goals

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

- The number of publications in peer-reviewed journals;
- The quantity of output from experimental and theoretical research; and
- Demonstrated progress against peer reviewed recommendations, headquarters guidance, etc.

<b>Pass</b>	Not failing; see below.
<b>Fail</b>	Peer reviewers not satisfied; output not meeting general scientific standards; minimal progress against FWPs.

Note: The numerical grade for “Pass” is 4.3 and for “Fail” it is 0.7

### 1.4 Provide for Effective Delivery of 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, Field Work Proposals (FWPs), Approved Financial Plans (AFPs), Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

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

<b>Pass</b>	Not failing; (see numerical grades)
<b>Fail</b>	Peer reviewers not satisfied; significant number of milestones not met, results not delivered to community while it matters..

Note: The numerical grade for “Pass” is 4.3 and for “Fail” it is 0.7

<b>DOE HQ Program Office</b>	<b>Letter Grade</b>	<b>Numerical Score</b>	<b>Objective Weight</b>	<b>Weighted Score</b>	<b>Overall Score</b>
SC Office of Advanced Scientific Computing (ASCR)					
1.1 Output			40%		
1.2 Impact			30%		
1.3 Leadership			15%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
ASCR Subtotal					
SC Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES)					
1.1 Output			50%		
1.2 Impact			20%		
1.3 Leadership			15%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
BES Subtotal					
SC Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER)					
1.1 Output			30%		
1.2 Impact			20%		
1.3 Leadership			20%		
1.4 Delivery			30%		
BER Subtotal					
SC Office of Fusion Energy Sciences (FES)					
1.1 Output			30%		
1.2 Impact			30%		
1.3 Leadership			20%		
1.4 Delivery			20%		
FES Subtotal					
SC High Energy Physics (HEP)					
1.1 Output			30%		
1.2 Impact			30%		
1.3 Leadership			30%		
1.4 Delivery			10%		
HEP Subtotal					
SC Nuclear Physics (NP)					
1.1 Output			40%		
1.2 Impact			30%		
1.3 Leadership			15%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
NP Subtotal					
SC Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS)					
1.1 Output			25%		
1.2 Impact			30%		
1.3 Leadership			30%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
WDTS Subtotal					

DOE HQ Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) <sup>1</sup>					
1.1 Output			35%		
1.2 Impact			35%		
1.3 Leadership			15%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
Overall EERE Total					
Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (RW) <sup>1</sup>					
1.1 Output			25%		
1.2 Impact			25%		
1.3 Leadership			25%		
1.4 Delivery			25%		
Overall RW Total					

**Table 1.1 – DOE Program Office Performance Goal 1 Score Development**

DOE HQ Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
SC Office of Advanced Scientific Computing (ASCR)			XX%		
SC Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES)			XX%		
SC Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER)			XX%		
SC Office of Fusion Energy Sciences (FES)			XX%		
SC High Energy Physics (HEP)			XX%		
SC Nuclear Physics (NP)			XX%		
SC Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS)			XX%		
Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE)			XX%		
Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (RW)			XX%		
Overall DOE Program Office Total					

**Table 1.2 – Overall Performance Goal 1 Score Development**

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

**Table 1.3 – Goal 1 Final Letter Grade**

<sup>1</sup> Goal and Objective weightings indicated for EE and RW have been set by the BSO and are preliminary. Final Goal and Objective weightings will be incorporated, as appropriate, once they are determined by the HQ Program Office and provided to the BSO. Should a Program Office fail to provide final Goal and Objective weightings before the end of the first quarter FY 2006 the preliminary weightings provided shall become final.

**2 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 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 2005 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 2006.

- Office of Science (SC) (100%)
  - Office of Advance Scientific Computing Research (ASCR) (23.7%)
  - Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES) (33.0%)
  - Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER) (23.7%)
  - Office of High Energy Physics (HEP) (13.7%)
  - Office of Nuclear Physics (NP) (6.0%)

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. Should one or more of the HQ Program Offices choose not to provide an evaluation for this Goal and its corresponding Objectives, the weightings for the remaining HQ Program Offices shall be recalculated based on their percentage of the total Budget Authority (BA) for those remaining HQ Program Offices.

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 413.3, Program and Project Management for the Acquisition of Capital Assets.

<b>A to</b>	In addition to meeting all measures under B <sup>+</sup> , the laboratory is recognized by the research
<b>A+</b>	community as the leader for making the science case for the acquisition; Takes the



	initiative to demonstrate the potential for revolutionary scientific advancement. Identifies, analyzes and champions novel approaches for acquiring the new capability, including leveraging or extending the capability of existing facilities and financing. Proposed approaches are widely regarded as innovative, novel, comprehensive, and potentially cost-effective. Reviews repeatedly confirm potential for scientific discovery in areas that support the Department’s mission, and potential to change a discipline or research area’s direction.
<b>B+</b>	Provides the overall vision for the acquisition. Displays leadership and commitment to achieving the vision within preliminary estimates that are defensible and credible in terms of cost, schedule and performance; develops quality analyses, preliminary designs, and related documentation to support the approval of the mission need (CD-0), the alternative selection and cost range (CD-1) and the performance baseline (CD-2). Solves problems and addresses issues. Keeps DOE apprised of the status, near-term plans and the resolution of problems on a regular basis. Anticipates emerging issues that could impact plans and takes the initiative to inform DOE of possible consequences.
<b>B</b>	Fails to meet expectations in one of the areas listed under B+.
<b>C</b>	The laboratory team develops the required analyses and documentation in a timely manner. However, inputs are mundane and lack innovation and commitment to the vision of the acquisition.
<b>D</b>	The potential exists for credible science and business cases to be made for the acquisition, but the laboratory fails to take advantage of the opportunity.
<b>F</b>	Proposed approaches are based on fraudulent assumptions; the science case is weak to non-existent, the business case is seriously flawed.

**2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components (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 413.3 Project Management for the Acquisition of Capital Assets;
- Successful fabrication of facility components
- Effectiveness in meeting construction schedule and budget; and
- Quality of key staff overseeing the project(s).

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

	Laboratory commitment to environment, safety and health issues is inadequate; reports to DOE are largely incomplete; laboratory commitment to the project has subsided.
<b>F</b>	Laboratory falsifies data during project execution phase; shows disdain for executing the project within minimal standards for environment, safety or health, fails to keep DOE informed of project status; reviews regularly indicate that the project is expected to breach its cost/schedule performance baseline.

**2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities**

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured 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.

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

**2.4 Effective Utilization of Facility(ies) to Grow and Support the Laboratory’s Research Base**

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.:

- Contractor’s efforts to take full advantage of the facility to strengthen the Laboratory’s research base; and
- 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 using the facility.

<b>A to A+</b>	Reviews document how multiple disciplines are using the facility in new and novel ways and reviews document that full advantage has been taken of the facility to strengthen the laboratory’s research base.
<b>B+</b>	Reviews state strong and effective team approach exists toward establishing an internal user community; laboratory is capitalizing on existence of facility to grow internal capabilities.
<b>B</b>	Reviews state that lab is establishing an internal user community, but laboratory is still not capitalizing fully on existence of facility to grow internal capabilities.
<b>C</b>	Reviews state that the laboratory has made satisfactory use of the facility, but has not demonstrated much innovation.
<b>D</b>	Few indigenous staff use the facility, with none using it in novel ways; research base is very thin.
<b>F</b>	Laboratory does not know how to operate/use its own facility adequately.

<b>DOE HQ Program Office</b>	<b>Letter Grade</b>	<b>Numerical Score</b>	<b>Objective Weight</b>	<b>Weighted Score</b>	<b>Overall Score</b>
<b>SC Office of Advanced Scientific Computing (ASCR)</b>					
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 Effective Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base			10%		
<b>SC Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES)</b>					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			10%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components			30%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			45%		
2.4 Effective Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base			15%		
<b>SC Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER)</b>					
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 Effective Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base			10%		
<b>SC High Energy Physics (HEP)</b>					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			80%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components			20%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			0%		
2.4 Effective Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base			0%		
<b>SC Nuclear Physics (NP)</b>					
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%		

DOE HQ Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
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			15%		

**Table 2.1 –DOE Program Office Performance Goal 2 Score Development**

DOE HQ Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
SC Office of Advanced Scientific Computing (ASCR)					
SC Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES)					
SC Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER)					
SC High Energy Physics (HEP)					
SC Nuclear Physics (NP)					
<b>Overall Program Office Total</b>					

**Table 2.2 – Overall Performance Goal 2 Score Development**

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

**Table 2.3 – Goal 2 Final Letter Grade**

### **3 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 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 2005 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 2006 provided by the Program Offices listed below.

- Office of Science (SC) (90.3%)
  - Office of Advance Scientific Computing Research (ASCR) (21.0%)
  - Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES) (29.3%)
  - Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER) (21.0%)
  - Office of Fusion Energy Sciences (FES) (1.8%)
  - Office of High Energy Physics (HEP) (12.2%)
  - Office of Nuclear Physics (NP) (5.4%)
  - Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS) (0.2%)
- Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) (7.3%)
- Assistant Secretary for Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (RW) (1.8%)

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 3.2 below). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 3.3 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 weightings for the remaining HQ Program Offices shall be recalculated based on their percentage of the total Budget Authority (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.

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

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

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured 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.).

<b>A to A+</b>	Research plans are proactive, not reactive, as evidenced by making hard decisions and taking strong actions; plans are robust against budget fluctuations – multiple contingencies planned for; new initiatives are proposed and funded through reallocation of resources from less effective programs; plans are updated regularly to reflect changing scientific and fiscal conditions; plans include ways to reduce risk, duration of programs.
<b>B+</b>	Plans are reviewed by experts outside of lab management and/or include broadly-based input from within the laboratory; research plans exist for all program areas; plans are consistent with known budgets and well-aligned with DOE interests; work follows the plan.
<b>B</b>	Research plans exist for all program areas; work follows the plan.
<b>C</b>	Research plans exist for most program areas; work does not always follow the plan.

<b>D</b>	Plans do not exist for a significant fraction of the lab’s program areas, or significant work is conducted outside those plans.
<b>F</b>	No planning is done.

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

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured 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).

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



<b>DOE HQ Program Office</b>	<b>Letter Grade</b>	<b>Numerical Score</b>	<b>Objective Weight</b>	<b>Weighted Score</b>	<b>Overall Score</b>
SC Office of Advanced Scientific Computing (ASCR)					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			35%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Ongoing Management			35%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			30%		
<b>SC Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES)</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Ongoing Management			30%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			30%		
<b>SC Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER)</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			20%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Ongoing Management			30%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			50%		
<b>SC Office of Fusion Energy Sciences (FES)</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			35%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Ongoing Management			35%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			30%		
<b>SC High Energy Physics (HEP)</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Ongoing Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			20%		
<b>SC Nuclear Physics (NP)</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Ongoing Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			20%		
<b>SC Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS)</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			20%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Ongoing Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			40%		

Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) <sup>2</sup>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			50%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Ongoing Management			25%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			25%		
<b>Overall EERE Total</b>					
Assistant Secretary for Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (RW) <sup>2</sup>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Ongoing Management			20%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			40%		
<b>Overall FE Total</b>					

**Table 3.1 – DOE Program Office Performance Goal 3 Score Development**

DOE HQ Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
SC Office of Advanced Scientific Computing (ASCR)					
SC Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES)					
SC Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER)					
SC Office of Fusion Energy Sciences (FES)					
SC High Energy Physics (HEP)					
SC Nuclear Physics (NP)					
SC Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS)					
Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE)			XX%		
Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (RW)			XX%		
<b>Overall DOE Program Office Total</b>					

**Table 3.2 – Overall Performance Goal 3 Score Development**

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

**Table 3.3 – Goal 3 Final Letter Grade**

<sup>2</sup> Goal and Objective weightings indicated for EE and RW have been set by the BSO and are preliminary. Final Goal and Objective weightings will be incorporated, as appropriate, once they are determined by the HQ Program Office and provided to the BSO. Should a Program Office fail to provide final Goal and Objective weightings before the end of the first quarter FY 2006 the preliminary weightings provided shall become final.

**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 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 corporate office leadership provides appropriate levels of resources and support for the overall success of the Laboratory.**

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 an Effective Plan for Accomplishment of the Vision to Include Strong Partnerships Required to Carry Out those Plans**

In measuring the performance of this Objective, 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 2006 Target: Final Business Plan or updated FY 2007-2011 Institutional Plan, will be a quality document consistent with DOE schedule and guidance and will include a distinguishing mission statement.

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

FY 2006 Target: Demonstrate growth and progress in the development of quality research partnerships and collaborations, for example at the new Molecular Foundry and for progress on the Joint Dark Energy Mission.

- 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 2006 Target: Demonstrate effective progress in defining, and implementing an improved WFO information system and reporting protocol for the management and oversight of the WFO portfolio.

- 4.1.4 Laboratory Leadership strives to improve diversity of the workforce and the quality of the working environment and requires Workforce Diversity Planning by all Divisions.

FY 2006 Target: Demonstrate work environment improvement planning, at a minimum, by conducting workforce diversity planning in each division; and by developing and implementing a quality workforce climate survey, completing an analysis, and preparing recommendations for improvement to the work environment based on survey results.

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

FY 2006 Targets: Develop and implement a community outreach program in CY 2006 for the Laboratory's 75<sup>th</sup> Anniversary celebrations. Develop an effective initial student pipeline tracking system to assess science education program successes and impacts.

#### **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 Level of Corporate and Institutional Leadership oversight and response to Laboratory issues and opportunities is commensurate with the level of significance or severity.

FY 2006 Target: UC's LBNL Contract Assurance Council is established, staffed, and operating effectively.

- 4.2.2 Leadership maintains an effective assurance function with cognizance of corrective action plans and insures their timely closure.

FY 2006 Targets: LBNL's Institutional Assurance Office is established, staffed, and operating effectively. A consolidated corrective action tracking system is implemented.

- 4.2.3 Level of Corporate Leadership involvement in assessing best practices management approaches and systems utilized at the Laboratory to ensure they are comprehensive and sufficient to address risks attendant to Laboratory operations and strategic mission accomplishment.

FY 2006 Target: A "Best Practices" Standards Tailoring/Replacement Process is initiated with BSO.

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

FY 2006 Target: Leadership is further strengthening the accident prevention program, including implementing a leadership program for accident reduction involving safety performance recognition, supervisor training, leadership walk-throughs, safety agenda topics at executive meetings, and a formal safety awareness and communications program.

- 4.2.5 Leadership undertakes continuous operational improvement and achieves progress on management efficiency initiatives. The efficiencies should streamline, and where appropriate automate processes, standardize and institutionalize practices, and improve the management of resources.

FY 2006 Target: Efficiency improvement targets for 2006 include three areas: (A) supply chain management, (B) information technology, and (C) facilities condition assessment. Significant progress in defining, developing, implementing, and measuring savings in these target areas should be demonstrated.

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

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

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

FY 2006 Target: UC’s LBNL Advisory Board is established, staffed, and operating effectively.

4.3.2 The demonstrated accomplishment of the Contractor to enter into effective joint appointments when appropriate.

FY 2006 Target: New UC joint appointments in the area of nanoscience.

4.3.3 Effectiveness of supporting the construction of new Laboratory facilities through alternative financing.

FY 2006 Targets: Develop project business plans, including financial plans, for a User Guest House and a Computational Research and Theory Building.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Weighted Score	Total Points
<b>4 Effectiveness and Efficiency of Contractor Leadership and Stewardship</b>					
4.1 Provide a Distinctive Vision for the Laboratory and an Effective Plan for Accomplishment of the Vision to Include Strong Partnerships Required to Carry Out those Plans			40%		
4.2 Provide for Responsive and Accountable Leadership throughout the Organization			30%		
4.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Corporate Support as Appropriate			30%		
<b>Performance Goal 4 Total</b>					

**Table 4.1 – Goal 4 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 Final Letter Grade**

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

**The Contractor sustains and enhances the effectiveness of integrated safety, health and environmental protection through a strong and well deployed system.**

This goal shall measure the Contractor's overall success in preventing worker injury and illness; implement Integrated Safety Management across the organization; and providing effective and efficient environmental protection.

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 degree of success in meeting the following:

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 2006 Target: DART rate is 0.5

5.1.2 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 2006 Target: TRC rate is 1.17

5.1.3 The number of environmental non-compliance issues is below internal control number.

FY 2006 Target: The number of environmental incidents (Notices of Violations and environmental releases exceeding regulatory reportable quantities) is at or below 3. Laboratory and DOE will apply a weighting factor to each ORPS, depending on severity and magnitude.

5.1.4 The number of radiological incidents relative to an internal control number.

FY 2006 Target: : The number of radiological incidents is at or below 3. Radiological incidents are:

- Reportable occurrences categorized as significance category 1, 2, 3, or 4 (Personnel Contamination only) under Group 6 of the Occurrence Reporting and Processing System (ORPS).
- Items requiring entry in the Price-Anderson Amendments Act Non-Compliance Tracking System (PAAA NTS).

Non-compliances that are reportable under ORPS and entered into PAAA NTS will only count as one issue. ORPS category 4 (Personnel Contamination) occurrences are weighted 0.5.

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

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

- The commitment of leadership to strong ES&H performance is appropriately demonstrated;

- 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 bench level.

Measures:

5.2.1 Complete required safety-related training per JHQ.

FY 2006 Target: 90% by 9/30/06.

5.2.2 Effectiveness of the process to identify, analyze, and categorize hazards associated with all work.

FY 2006 Target: Divisions have an effective process to identify and analyze hazards. Performance will be determined through the LBNL FY06 ES&H division Self-Assessment reporting and validation process. For each division and directorate, a green rating receives three points, a yellow rating receives two points, and a red rating receives one point. Total Laboratory score will be 43 points or higher out of 48 total possible points.

5.2.3 Effectiveness of ES&H communication between management and staff.

FY 2006 Target: Divisions have ongoing and systematic ES&H communication between management and staff. Performance will be determined through the LBNL FY06 ES&H Division Self-Assessment reporting and validation process. For each division and directorate, a green rating receives three points, a yellow rating receives two points, and a red rating receives one point. Total Laboratory score will be 43 points or higher out of 48 total possible points.

5.2.4 Involvement of managers and staff in ES&H feedback and improvement activities.

FY 2006 Target: Division managers and staff are regularly involved in ES&H feedback and improvements. Performance will be determined through the LBNL FY06 ES&H Division Self-Assessment reporting and validation process. For each division and directorate, a green rating receives three points, a yellow rating receives two points, and a red rating receives one point. Total Laboratory score will be 43 points or higher out of 48 total possible points.

### **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 80% of milestones to development, implement, and maintain certification equivalence of an LBNL Performance-based Environmental Management System are achieved.

FY 2006 Target:

- 1) Complete external triennial audit
- 2) External audit validates effective implementation of EMS
- 3) Analyze environmental aspects/ impacts
- 4) Implement Environmental Management Programs to improve environmental performance
- 5) Complete internal annual assessment



5.3.2 For designated projects, identification and implementation of waste minimization, emission reduction, and/or resource conservation opportunities.

FY 2006 Target: LBNL will select evaluate, and implement two waste minimization, emission reduction, and/or resource conservation projects.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Weighted Score	Total Points
<b>5 Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health and Environmental Protection</b>					
5.1 Provide a Work Environment that Protects Workers and the Environment.			35%		
5.2 Provide Efficient and Effective Implementation of Integrated Safety, Health and Environmental Management			35%		
5.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Waste Management, Minimization, and Pollution Prevention.			30%		
<b>Performance Goal 5 Total</b>					

**Table 5.1 – Goal 5 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 Final Letter Grade**

**6 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 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 the Laboratory's success in meeting Financial Management goals and expectations using the Laboratory's Balanced Scorecard Model Index approved by the DOE BSO.

FY 2006 Target: Achieve a score of 86.8 or better on the Balanced Scorecard Model Index.

**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 2006 Target: Achieve a score of 86.8% or better on the Balanced Scorecard Model Index.

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

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.

Measure:

- 6.3.1 The Laboratory will analyze its Balanced Scorecard activities in order to demonstrate its success in achieving an effective Human Resources Management System.

FY 2006 Target: Best practices or national standards have been reviewed and/or developed, and a gap analysis completed for 11 balanced scorecard activities; in addition, transition plans responsive to the gap analyses have been developed for 6 balanced scorecard activities, and implemented for 2 balanced scorecard activities. For activities not requiring a gap analysis, responsive action has been identified and initiated.

**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.

Measures:

- 6.4.1 Customer Perspective - Internal Audit will be measured on the degree to which an effective and efficient process for obtaining internal and external customer feedback has been developed and is ready for deployment.

FY 2006 Target: Internal Audit will have an effective and efficient process for obtaining customer feedback ready for deployment.

- 6.4.2 Internal Business Processes - Internal Audit will plan for and conduct audits of core business functions as approved by the LBNL Audit Committee and UCOP Audit Management.

FY 2006 Target: Internal audit will complete 80% of the annual audit plan or equivalent as approved by the LBNL Audit Committee and UCOP Audit Management.

- 6.4.3 Financial Perspective - Internal Audit staff will maintain an appropriate level of hours spent directly on audits, advisory services and investigations in accordance with standards developed by UCOP Audit Management and approved by the LBNL Audit Committee.

FY 2006 Target: Internal Audit will report quarterly on direct and indirect hours. Direct hours will account for at least 85% averaged over the course of the year.

- 6.4.4 Learning and Growth Perspective – Internal Audit will be assessed on the percentage of professional staff that complete the training hours required to maintain credentials/certification.

FY 2006 Target: 85% (6 out of 7) of professional staff complete hours to maintain certifications.

- 6.4.5 Information Management. LBNL will baseline existing governance and project management activities surrounding applications development. The Laboratory will develop and implement a process that would create past performance data for an out year metric.

FY 2006 Target: Document and confirm that a process for tracking Enterprise Computing Steering Committee (ECSC) projects to cost and schedule is in place to develop performance numbers for out years.

**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 disclose all new inventions made under the contract to DOE in a timely fashion.

FY 2006 Target: The Contractor shall disclose at least 88% of new inventions within two months of disclosure receipt.

- 6.5.2 The Contractor will deploy its intellectual property through licenses, options, bailments, and similar technology transfer instruments. It will seek to obtain a fair return on these technologies to use as inventor incentives and for use per the Contract. A measure of market impact is indicated by the income received by the Contractor for use of the technologies.

FY 2006 Target: The contractor shall obtain at least \$1,200 K income.

<b>ELEMENT</b>	<b>Letter Grade</b>	<b>Numerical Score</b>	<b>Objective Weight</b>	<b>Weighted Score</b>	<b>Total Points</b>
<b>6 Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission(s)</b>					
6.1 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Financial Management System(s).			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			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%		
<b>Performance Goal 6 Total</b>					

**Table 6.1 – Goal 6 Performance Rating Development**

<b>Final Grade</b>	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F
<b>Total Score</b>	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 Final Letter Grade**

**7 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.**

Goal 7 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.

Measures:

7.1.1 Maintenance and Utility Reliability - Effectiveness and efficiency of maintenance activities to maximize the operational life of facility systems, structures, and components

FY 2006 Target: LBNL achieves 3.1 – 3.4 score based on the Facilities and Infrastructure Performance Assessment Model (PAM). Calculation of the score is defined in the PAM. The PAM will be developed by 30 September 2005. The PAM milestones include: unplanned power outages, Maintenance Investment Index (MII), deferred maintenance, and condition assessments.

7.1.2 Energy Management - Effective execution of the goals within the Energy Performance Management Agreement.

FY 2006 Target: LBNL achieves 3.1 – 3.4 score based on the FY 06 Energy Performance Management Agreement which will be developed in accordance with forthcoming DOE Headquarters' guidance.

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 2006 Target: LBNL achieves 3.1 – 3.4 score based on the Facilities and Infrastructure Performance Assessment Model (PAM). Calculation of the score is defined in the PAM. The PAM will be developed by 30 September 2005. The PAM milestones include:

calculation of the Asset Utilization Index (AUI), FIMS accuracy/completeness, and Space Banking.

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

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

- Integration and alignment of the Ten Year Site Plan to the Laboratory's comprehensive strategic plan;
- The facility planning, forecasting, and acquisition for effective translation of business needs into comprehensive and integrated facility site plans;
- The effectiveness in producing quality site and facility planning documents as required;
- The involvement of relevant stakeholders in all appropriate aspects of facility planning and preparation of required documentation;
- Overall responsiveness to customer mission needs; and
- Efficiency in meeting Cost and Schedule Performance Index for construction projects (when appropriate).

### 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.

FY 2006 Target: LBNL achieves 3.1 – 3.4 score based on the Facilities and Infrastructure Performance Assessment Model (PAM). Calculation of the score is defined in the PAM. The PAM will be developed by 30 September 2005. The PAM milestones include: 10 year site plan update.

- 7.2.2 Construction/Project Management - Activities and requirements related to Line Item, SLI, GPP, and Non-Cap projects are accomplished.

FY 2006 Target: LBNL achieves 3.1 – 3.4 score based on the Facilities and Infrastructure Performance Assessment Model (PAM). Calculation of the score is defined in the PAM. The PAM will be developed by 30 September 2005. The PAM milestones include: the Molecular Foundry, Bevatron D&D, and B77 Phase II Rehabilitation.

- 7.2.3 Seismic Safety Planning - Activities and requirements related to Seismic Safety are accomplished.

FY 2006 Target: LBNL achieves 3.1 – 3.4 score based on the Facilities and Infrastructure Performance Assessment Model (PAM). Calculation of the score is defined in the PAM. The PAM will be developed by 30 September 2005. The PAM milestones include: building evaluations and seismic correction projects.

<b>ELEMENT</b>	<b>Letter Grade</b>	<b>Numerical Score</b>	<b>Objective Weight</b>	<b>Weighted Score</b>	<b>Total Points</b>
<b>7 Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs</b>					
7.1 Manage Facilities and Infrastructure in an Efficient and Effective Manner that Optimizes Usage and Minimizes Life Cycle Costs			50%		
7.2 Provide Planning for and Acquire the Facilities and Infrastructure Required to support Future Laboratory Programs			50%		
<b>Performance Goal 7 Total</b>					

**Table 7.1 –Goal 7 Performance Rating Development**

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

**Table 7.2 – Goal 7 Final Letter Grade**



**8 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 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 demonstrates Emergency Management success through EMAP Program Accreditation or NFPA 1600 compliance.

FY 2006 Target: Conduct and complete an EMAP or NFPA 1600 compliance survey and corrective actions achieving compliance by 9/30/06.

8.1.2 The Contractor demonstrates their commitments of leadership to emergency management by assuring adequate resources are provided.

FY 2006 Targets:

1. 90% (11/12) of the primary members of the Emergency Response Organization to attend one training class by 9/30/06
2. Upgrade site-wide fire alarm communication system by installing end-of-line monitoring system by 9/30/06.

8.1.3 The Contractor demonstrates effective utilization of emergency management procedures and processes through exercises.

FY 2006 Target: 90% (11/12) of the primary members of the Emergency Response Organization to participate in one exercise by 9/30/06.

**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 Demonstrates Commitment to Improvement through the conduct of internal and external reviews and the timely completion of approved corrected action plans.

FY 2006 Targets: One POA&M overdue to target and two assessments performed annually.

Note: The two measures were combined because they both address management responsibilities. Language was added to the measure to explain the how it can be accomplished. Demonstrating commitment will require management to provide necessary resources to conduct audits and address findings. Audits findings will result in goals and objectives.

8.2.2 The Contractor integrates security practices into the culture of the organization by training employees on their security responsibilities.

FY 2006 Target: Improved Computer Security Training Program in place and 80% of employees trained in targeted organizations.

8.2.3 The Contractor Demonstrates its commitment to risk management by conducting risk assessments and mitigating unacceptable risks.

FY 2006 Targets: All but one enclave with risk assessments completed. Residual risk agreement in place and POA&Ms created for mitigation activities.

**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 Complete the development and implementation of internal procedures to implement DOE Manual 474.1-2A in a graded approach.

FY 2006 Target: Develops and implements EH&S Procedure 740 Nuclear Materials Accountability by 5/31/06

8.3.2 Demonstrate an effective Safeguards system through an external review..

FY 2006 Target: Schedules and conducts peer review of its safeguards program and procedures by 7/31/06.

8.3.3 Develop corrective actions for review findings in accordance with an approved Corrective Action Plan

FY 2006 Target: Develop and submit peer review Corrective Action Plan to BSO by 9/30/06.

8.3.4 Special Nuclear Material controlled and maintained in accordance with safeguard processes and activities.

FY 2006 Target: 85% (14/17) of safeguards process and activities (inventory, reporting, and authorization renewals) completed on schedule.

Note: Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory does not have classified matter or property.

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

Note: Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory does not have classified or sensitive information therefore this Objective will not be measured.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Weighted Score	Total Points
<b>8 Sustain and Enhance the effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM) and the Emergency Management System</b>					
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			15%		
8.4 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Classified and Sensitive Information			0%		
<b>Performance Goal 8 Total</b>					

**Table 8.1 – Goal 8 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 Final Letter Grade**

**Attachment 1 - LBNL S&T Appraisal Weight Sheet**

		ASCR	BES	BER	FES	HEP	NP	WDTS	EERE	RW
		Wt	Wt	Wt	Wt	Wt	Wt	Wt	Wt	Wt
<b>Goal #1 Mission Accomplishment</b>										
	<b>Goal's weight</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>70</b>
1a. Impact (significance)		40	50	30	30	30	40	25	35	25
1b. Leadership (recognition of S&T accomplishments)		30	20	20	30	30	30	30	35	25
1c. Output (productivity) (pass/fail)		15	15	20	20	30	15	30	15	25
1d. Delivery (pass/fail)		15	15	30	20	10	15	15	15	25
check sum		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
<b>Goal #2 Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operation of Facilities</b>										
	<b>Goal's weight</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
2a. Design of Facility (the initiation phase and the definition phase, i.e. activities leading up to CD-2)		0	10	0		80	0			
2b. Construction of Facility/Fabrication of Components (execution phase, Post CD-2 to CD-4)		0	30	0		20	0			
2c. Operation of Facility		90	45	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
<b>Goal #3 Program Management</b>										
	<b>Goal's weight</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>30</b>
3a. Stewardship of Scientific Capabilities and Programmatic Vision		35	40	20	35	40	40	20	50	40
3b. Program Planning and Management		35	30	30	35	40	40	40	25	20
3.c Program Management-Communication & Responsiveness (to HQ)		30	30	50	30	20	20	40	25	40
check sum		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
goal check sum		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100