

## **ATTACHMENT J-2**

### **APPENDIX B**

#### **FY 2007 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 ..... J-B-4**
- I. DETERMINING THE CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE RATING, PERFORMANCE-BASED FEE AND AWARD TERM ELIGIBILITY ..... J-B-4**
- II. PERFORMANCE GOALS, OBJECTIVES & MEASURES ..... J-B-9**
- BACKGROUND ..... J-B-9**
- PERFORMANCE GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES ..... J-B-9**
- PART A – SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY COMPONENT ..... J-B-10**
- 1.0 PROVIDE FOR EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE MISSION ACCOMPLISHMENT ..... J-B-10**
  - 1.1 SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY RESULTS PROVIDE MEANINGFUL IMPACT ON THE FIELD .... J-B-10**
  - 1.2 PROVIDE QUALITY LEADERSHIP IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ..... J-B-11**
  - 1.3 PROVIDE AND SUSTAIN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY OUTPUTS THAT ADVANCE PROGRAM OBJECTIVES AND GOALS ..... J-B-11**
  - 1.4 PROVIDE FOR EFFECTIVE DELIVERY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ..... J-B-12**
- 2.0 PROVIDE FOR EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE DESIGN, FABRICATION, CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATIONS OF RESEARCH FACILITIES ..... J-B-16**
  - 2.1 PROVIDE EFFECTIVE FACILITY DESIGN(S) AS REQUIRED TO SUPPORT LABORATORY PROGRAMS (I.E., ACTIVITIES LEADING UP TO CD-2) ..... J-B-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) ..... J-B-17**
  - 2.3 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE OPERATION OF FACILITIES ..... J-B-18**
  - 2.4 EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF FACILITY(IES) TO GROW AND SUPPORT THE LABORATORY’S RESEARCH BASE AND EXTERNAL USER COMMUNITY ..... J-B-19**
- 3.0 PROVIDE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM MANAGEMENT ..... J-B-22**
  - 3.1 PROVIDE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT STEWARDSHIP OF SCIENTIFIC CAPABILITIES AND PROGRAM VISION ..... J-B-22**
  - 3.2 PROVIDE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROJECT/PROGRAM PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT ..... J-B-23**
  - 3.3 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATIONS AND RESPONSIVENESS TO CUSTOMER NEEDS ..... J-B-23**
- PART B – MANAGEMENT & OPERATIONS COMPONENT ..... J-B-28**
- 4.0 PROVIDE SOUND AND COMPETENT LEADERSHIP AND STEWARDSHIP OF THE LABORATORY ..... J-B-28**
  - 4.1 PROVIDE A DISTINCTIVE VISION FOR THE LABORATORY AND EFFECTIVE PLANS FOR ACCOMPLISHMENT OF THE VISION TO INCLUDE STRONG PARTNERSHIPS REQUIRED TO CARRY OUT THOSE PLANS ..... J-B-28**
  - 4.2 PROVIDE FOR RESPONSIVE AND ACCOUNTABLE LEADERSHIP THROUGHOUT THE ORGANIZATION ..... J-B-30**
  - 4.3 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE CORPORATE OFFICE SUPPORT AS APPROPRIATE .... J-B-31**
- 5.0 SUSTAIN EXCELLENCE AND ENHANCE EFFECTIVENESS OF INTEGRATED SAFETY, HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ..... J-B-32**
  - 5.1 PROVIDE A WORK ENVIRONMENT THAT PROTECTS WORKERS AND THE ENVIRONMENT.. J-B-32**

**5.2 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF INTEGRATED SAFETY, HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT ..... J-B-33**

**5.3 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT, MINIMIZATION, AND POLLUTION PREVENTION ..... J-B-35**

**6.0 DELIVER EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE BUSINESS SYSTEMS AND RESOURCES THAT ENABLE THE SUCCESSFUL ACHIEVEMENT OF THE LABORATORY MISSION(S) ..... J-B-37**

**6.1 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM ..... J-B-37**

**6.2 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE ACQUISITION AND PROPERTY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM(S) ..... J-B-37**

**6.3 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AND DIVERSITY PROGRAM..... J-B-39**

**6.4 PROVIDE EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS FOR INTERNAL AUDIT AND OVERSIGHT;; QUALITY; INFORMATION MANAGEMENT; AND OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES AS APPROPRIATE..... J-B-40**

**6.5 DEMONSTRATE EFFECTIVE TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY AND COMMERCIALIZATION OF INTELLECTUAL ASSETS ..... J-B-43**

**7.0 SUSTAIN EXCELLENCE IN OPERATING, MAINTAINING, AND RENEWING THE FACILITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE PORTFOLIO TO MEET LABORATORY NEEDS. .... J-B-44**

**7.1 MANAGE FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE IN AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE MANNER THAT OPTIMIZES USAGE AND MINIMIZES LIFE CYCLE COSTS ..... J-B-44**

**7.2 PROVIDE PLANNING FOR AND ACQUIRE THE FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIRED TO SUPPORT FUTURE LABORATORY PROGRAMS. .... J-B-45**

**8.0 SUSTAIN AND ENHANCE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY MANAGEMENT (ISSM) AND THE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM.. .... J-B-46**

**8.1 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM ..... J-B-47**

**8.2 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE SYSTEM FOR CYBER-SECURITY ..... J-B-48**

**8.3 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE SYSTEM FOR THE PROTECTION OF SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIALS, CLASSIFIED MATTER, AND PROPERTY ..... J-B-50**

**8.4 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE SYSTEM FOR THE PROTECTION OF CLASSIFIED AND SENSITIVE INFORMATION ..... J-B-51**

**ATTACHMENT I - LBNL S&T APPRAISAL WEIGHT SHEET ..... J-B-52**

## INTRODUCTION

This document, the Performance Evaluation Measurement Plan (PEMP), primarily serves as DOE's Quality Assurance/Surveillance Plan (QASP) for the evaluation of *The Regents of the University of California* (hereafter referred to as "the Contractor") performance regarding the management and operations of the *Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory* (hereafter referred to as "the Laboratory") for the evaluation period from October 1, 2006, through September 30, 2007. The performance evaluation provides a standard by which to determine whether the Contractor is managerially and operationally in control of the Laboratory and is meeting the mission requirements and performance expectations/objectives of the Department as stipulated within this contract.

This document also describes the distribution of the total available performance based fee and the methodology for determining the amount of performance-based fee earned by the Contractor as stipulated within the clauses entitled, "Standards of Contractor Performance Evaluation," "Conditional Payment of Fee, Profit, and Other Incentives," and "Total Available Fee: Base Fee Amount and Performance Fee Amount." Further, this document describes the basis for eligibility for the award term incentive outlined in the clause entitled "Award Term Incentive." In partnership with the Contractor and other key customers, the Department of Energy (DOE) Headquarters (HQ) and the Berkeley Site Office (BSO) have defined the measurement basis that serves as the Contractor's performance-based evaluation and fee determination.

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

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

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

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

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

The FY 2007 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. Performance evaluations will be rolled up for an overall grade for Science and Technology and for Management and Operations. The rollup of the performance of each Goal will then be utilized to determine the overall Contractor performance grade for Science and Technology and Management and Operations. The overall

numeric score derived for Science and Technology will be utilized to determine the amount of available fee that may be earned (see Table C).

The overall numeric score derived for Management and Operations will be utilized to determine the multiplier to be applied (see Table C) to the Science and Technology fee earned to determine the final amount of fee earned for FY 2007. Each Goal is composed of two or more weighted Objectives and each Objective may have a set of Performance Measures, which are identified to assist the reviewer in determining the Contractor’s overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each of the Performance Measures identifies significant activities, requirements, and/or milestones important to the success of the corresponding Objective and shall be utilized as the primary means of determining the Contractor’s success in meeting the Objective. Although the Performance Measures are the primary means for determining performance, other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources to include, but not limited to, the Contractor’s self-evaluation report, operational awareness (daily oversight) activities; “For Cause” reviews (if any); other outside agency reviews (OIG, GAO, DCAA, etc.), and an annual 2-week review (if needed), may be utilized in determining the Contractor’s overall success in meeting an Objective. The following describes the methodology for determining the Contractor’s grade for each Goal:

Performance Evaluation Methodology:

The purpose of this section is to establish a methodology to develop scoring at the Objective Level. Each Objective within a Goal shall be assigned a numerical score, per Figure I-1 below, by the evaluating office. Each evaluation will measure the degree of effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in meeting the Objective and shall be based on the Contractor’s success in meeting the set of Performance Measures identified for each Objective as well as other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources as identified above. The set of Performance Measures identified for each Objective represent the set of significant indicators that if fully met, collectively places performance for the Objective in the “B+” grade range. The FY 2007 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.

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

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

Calculating Individual Goal Scores and Letter Grade:

Each Objective is assigned the earned numerical score by the evaluating office as stated above. The Goal rating is then computed by multiplying the numerical score by the weight of each Objective within a Goal. These values are then added together to develop an overall score for each Goal. A set of tables is provided at the end of each Performance Goal section of this document to assist in the calculation of Objective scores to the Goal score. Utilizing Table A, below, the scores for each of the Science and Technology (S&T) Goals and Management and Operations (M&O) Goals are then multiplied by the weight assigned and these are summed to provide an overall score for each. The 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 2007.

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 and for utilization in determining fee as indicated in Table C. A standard rounding convention of x.44 and less rounds down to the nearest tenth (here, x.4), while x.45 and greater rounds up to the nearest tenth (here, x.50).

S&T Performance Goal	Letter Grade	Numeric Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Total Score
1.0 Mission Accomplishment	J-B-6		50%		
2.0 Construction and Operations of User Research Facilities and Equipment			23%		

**Table A. FY 2007 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 2007 Contractor Letter Grade Scale**

Determining the Amount of Performance-Based Fee Earned:

Total available FY2007 fee is \$4,500,000 (Base Fee: None Performance Fee: \$4,500,000). The percentage of the available performance-based fee that may be earned by the Contractor shall be determined based on the overall weighted score for the S&T Goals (see Table A above) and then compared to Table C below. The overall numerical score of the M&O Goals from Table A1 above shall then be utilized to determine the final fee multiplier (see Table C), which shall be utilized to determine the overall amount of performance-based fee earned for FY 2007 as calculated within Table D .

Overall Weighted Score from Figure 1.	Percent S&T Fee Earned	M&O Fee Multiplier
4.3	100%	100%
4.2		
4.1		
4.0	97%	100%
3.9		
3.8		
3.7	94%	100%
3.6		
3.5		
3.4	91%	100%
3.3		
3.2		
3.1		
3.0	88%	95%
2.9		
2.8		
2.7	85%	90%
2.6		
2.5		
2.4	75%	85%
2.3		
2.2		
2.1		
2.0	50%	75%
1.9		
1.8		
1.7	0%	60%
thru		
1.1		
1.0 – 0.8	0%	0%
0.7 to 0.0	0%	0%

Table C. - Performance-Based Fee Earned Scale

Overall Fee Determination	
Percent S&T Fee Earned from Figure 3.	____%
M&O Fee Multiplier from Figure 3.	X ____%
Overall Earned Percentage of Performance-Based Fee	____%

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

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

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



based on performance against any contract requirement, specific note should be made to contract clauses which address reduction of fee including the clauses entitled, “Standards of Contractor Performance Evaluation”, “Total Available Fee: Base Fee Amount and Performance Fee Amount”, and “Conditional Payment of Fee, Profit, and Other Incentives – Facility Management Contracts.” Data to support rating and/or fee adjustments may be derived from other sources to include, but not limited to, operational awareness (daily oversight) activities; “For Cause” reviews (if any); other outside agency reviews (OIG, GAO, DCAA, etc.), and an annual 2-week review (if needed).

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

The final Contractor performance-based 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 2007. The weighting of Goals is provided in Table A, Section I and the weighting of Objectives shall be shown in Tables at the end of each Goal. For convenience, the Program Offices stated goal and

objective weightings are shown in Attachment I. Should an Objective contain multiple Performance Measures they are assumed to be of equal value unless otherwise stated.

## **PART A – SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY COMPONENT**

### **1.0 Provide for Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment**

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

The weight of this goal is 50%.

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

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers as identified below. The overall Goal score from each HQ Program Office and/or customer is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 1.1). Weightings for each Customer listed below are preliminary, based upon FY 2006 Budget Authority figures, and are provided here for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2007.

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

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned by each of the offices identified above by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 1.4 below). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 1.5 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as viewed by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers for which the Laboratory conducts work.

#### 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

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

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

<b>Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS)</b>					
1.1 Impact			25%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			30%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
Overall WDTS Total					

**Table 1.1 – 1.0 SC Program Office Performance Goal Score Development**

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Research			23.2%		
Office of Basic Energy Sciences			32.2%		
Office of Biological and Environmental Research			22.8%		
Office of Fusion Energy Sciences			1.7%		
Office of High Energy Physics			14.2%		
Office of Nuclear Physics			5.7%		
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists			0.2%		
Performance Goal 1.0 Total					

**Table 1.2 – SC Program Office Overall Performance Goal Score Development<sup>2</sup>**

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

<sup>2</sup> Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 1.2 are preliminary, based upon FY 2006 Budget Authority figures, and are provided for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2007.

<sup>3</sup> A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the other Programs and other customers is provided within Attachment I to this plan.

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

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

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

**Table 1.4 – Overall Performance Goal Score Development<sup>4</sup>**

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

**Table 1.5 – 1.0 Goal Final Letter Grade**

<sup>4</sup> Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 1.2 are preliminary, based upon FY 2006 Budget Authority figures, and are provided for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2007.

**2.0 Provide for Efficient and Effective Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operations of Research Facilities**

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

The weight of this goal is 23%.

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

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers as identified below. The overall Goal score from each SC Program Office is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 2.1). Weightings for each Customer listed below are preliminary, based upon FY 2006 Budget Authority figures, and are provided here for informational purposes only. Final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2007.

- Office of Science (SC) (100%)
  - Office of Advance Scientific Computing Research (ASCR) (23.6%)
  - Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES) (32.9%)
  - Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER) (23.2%)
  - Office of High Energy Physics (HEP) (14.5%)
  - Office of Nuclear Physics (NP) (5.8%)

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

Objectives:

**2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s) as Required to Support Laboratory Programs (i.e., activities leading up to CD-2)**

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by scientific/technical workshops developing pre-conceptual R&D, progress reports, Lehman reviews, Program/Staff Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

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

<b>A to A+</b>	In addition to meeting all measures under B <sup>+</sup> , the laboratory is recognized by the research community as the leader for making the science case for the acquisition; Takes the initiative to demonstrate the potential for revolutionary scientific advancement. Identifies,
----------------	--



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

**2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components (execution phase, Post CD-2 to CD-4)**

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

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

<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. The facility operates at steady state, on cost and on schedule, but the reliability of performance is somewhat below planned values, <b>or</b> the facility operates at steady state, but the associated schedule and costs exceed planned values. Commitment to ES&H is satisfactory.
<b>D</b>	Performance of the facility fails to meet expectations in many of the areas listed under B+; for example, the cost of operations is unexpectedly high and availability of the facility is unexpectedly low. The facility operates somewhat below steady state, on cost and on schedule, and the reliability performance is somewhat below planned values, <b>or</b> the facility operates at steady state, but the schedule and costs associated exceed planned values. Commitment to ES&H is satisfactory.
<b>F</b>	The facility fails to operate; the facility operates well below steady state <b>and/or</b> the reliability of the performance is well below planned values.

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

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

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

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

<b>DOE HQ Program Office</b>	<b>Letter Grade</b>	<b>Numerical Score</b>	<b>Objective Weight <sup>1</sup></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)			10%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components			10%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			70%		
2.4 Effective Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base and External User Community			10%		
<hr/>					
<b>SC Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES)</b>					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			20%		
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			45%		
2.4 Effective Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base and External User Community			15%		
<hr/>					
<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 and External User Community			10%		
<hr/>					
<b>SC Office of 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 and External User Community			0%		
<hr/>					
<b>SC Office of 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 <sup>1</sup>	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 and External User Community			15%		

**Table 2.1 –DOE Program Office Performance Goal 2.0 Score Development**

DOE HQ Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
SC Office of Advanced Scientific Computing (ASCR)			23.6% <sup>5</sup>		
SC Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES)			32.9%		
SC Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER)			23.2%		
SC Office of High Energy Physics (HEP)			14.5%		
SC Office of Nuclear Physics (NP)			5.8%		
<b>Overall Program Office Total</b>					

**Table 2.2 – Overall Performance Goal 2.0 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 2.0 Final Letter Grade**

<sup>5</sup> S&T Goal and Objective weightings indicated for each program are preliminary. They are carried forward from FY06. Final Goal and Objective weightings will be incorporated, as appropriate, once they are determined by the HQ Program Offices and provided to the BSO. Should a Program Office fail to provide final S&T Goal and Objective weightings before the end of the first quarter FY 2007, the preliminary weightings provided shall become final.

**3.0 Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Program Management**

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

The weight of this goal is 27%.

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

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers as identified below. The overall Goal score from each HQ Program Office and/or customer is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 3.1). Weightings for each Customer listed below are preliminary, based upon FY 2006 Budget Authority figures, and are provided here for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2007 provided by the Program Offices listed below.

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

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned by each of the offices identified above by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 3.4 below). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 3.5 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. The Contractor’s success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor’s performance as viewed by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers for which the Laboratory conducts work.

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>Science Program Office<sup>6</sup></b>	<b>Letter Grade</b>	<b>Numerical Score</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Weighted Score</b>	<b>Overall Score</b>
<b>Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research (ASCR)</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			30%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			30%		
<b>Overall ASCR Total</b>					
<b>Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES)</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			30%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			30%		
<b>Overall BES Total</b>					
<b>Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER)</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			20%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			30%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			50%		
<b>Overall BER Total</b>					
<b>Office of Fusion Energy Sciences (FES)</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			35%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			30%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			35%		
<b>Overall FES Total</b>					
<b>Office of High Energy Physics (HEP)</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			20%		
<b>Overall HEP Total</b>					
<b>Office of Nuclear Physics (NP)</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			20%		
<b>Overall NP Total</b>					
<b>Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS)</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			20%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			40%		
<b>Overall WDTS Total</b>					

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

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

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

**Table 3.2 – SC Program Office Overall Performance Goal Score Development<sup>7</sup>**

HQ Program Office <sup>8</sup>	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE)					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			50%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			25%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			25%		
Overall EERE Total					

<b>Office of Fossil Energy (FE)</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			30%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			30%		
Overall FE Total					
<b>Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (RW)</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			TBD%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			TBD%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			TBD%		
Overall OE Total					

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

<sup>7</sup> Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 3.2 are preliminary, based upon FY 2006 Budget Authority figures, and are provided for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2007.

<sup>8</sup> A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the other Programs and other customers is provided within Attachment I to this plan.

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

**Table 3.4 – Overall Performance Goal Score Development<sup>9</sup>**

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

**Table 3.5 – 3.0 Goal Final Letter Grade**

<sup>9</sup> Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 3.4 are preliminary, based upon FY 2006 Budget Authority figures, and are provided for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2007.

## PART B – MANAGEMENT & OPERATIONS COMPONENT

### Evaluating Management and Operations Goals/Objectives

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

Targets are written at the meets expectation grade level of B+ (3.1 – 3.4). For some targets, it serves the evaluator to provide additional grading details (for example at the A, C+ and D levels) and in those cases these details have been included in the PEMP. However these should be considered as guidelines that do not restrict the evaluator from considering other factors that contribute to the evaluation.

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

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

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

The weight of the Goal is 25%.

This Goal shall measure the Contractor's capabilities in leading the direction of the overall Laboratory. It also measures the responsiveness of the Contractor to issues and opportunities for continuous improvement and contractor office involvement/commitment to the overall success of the Laboratory.

#### Objectives:

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

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

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

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

The overall performance (outcomes/results) of the following set of performance measures (tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones) shall be utilized by evaluators as the primary measure of the Contractor's success in meeting this Objective and for determining the numerical score awarded. The evaluation of this Objective may also consider other tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones not otherwise identified below but that provide evidence to the effectiveness/performance of the Contractor in meeting this Objective.

Measures:

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

FY 2007 Target: The Business Plan or updated Institutional Plan will be a quality document consistent with DOE schedule and guidance. Should DOE elect to not issue guidance, the Laboratory will prepare an Integrated Strategic Plan that addresses scientific and operational goals and strategies.

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

FY 2007 Target: Continue to demonstrate growth and progress in the development of quality research partnerships and collaborations, for example at the Molecular Foundry and for progress on a 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 2007 Target: Based on the Work For Others Program Plan, demonstrate continued progress in implementing and improving the WFO information system and reporting protocol for the management and oversight of the WFO portfolio.

- 4.1.4 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 2007 Target: Demonstrate work environment improvement planning, at a minimum, by continuing strong workforce diversity planning in each division; and by follow-up on the Workforce Climate Survey, implementing targeted recommendations for improvement to the work environment based on survey results; and developing a Laboratory strategic diversity plan complementing division plans consistent with Contract Appendix M.

- 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 2007 Targets: Expand tools for outreach, including an enhanced Public Affairs website, in community relations and communications. As a special emphasis, proactively disseminate information in support of a rollout of the Lab's Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) through community meetings, publications, and web based information. Deliver on science education outreach activities that utilize the

resources of Berkeley Lab to enhance and improve science teaching and learning in local school districts, as well as continued efforts to leverage and attract resources for science lessons in local schools.

#### 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 2007 Target: UC's LBNL Contract Assurance Council operates effectively with a regular schedule of meetings which allow for review of significant, self-identified issues or potential concerns that the Council and Laboratory management address collaboratively to provide assurance that the performance of work is accomplished in a manner that meets the terms and conditions of the contract. UC's Vice President for Laboratory Management provides a timely and comprehensive annual assurance letter attesting to the adequacy and functionality of management controls for LBNL activities.

- 4.2.2 Leadership maintains an effective assurance function with cognizance of robust feedback and improvement.

FY 2007 Targets: LBNL's Institutional Assurance Office is staffed and operating effectively. A comprehensive inventory of existing operations assurance systems is developed and a gap analysis is performed to determine opportunities for improved assurance systems.

- 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 2007 Target: A cross-discipline lessons learned and best practices database is developed and implemented. The system will serve as a repository of lessons learned and send emails to subscribers when new lessons are entered.

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

FY 2007 Target: During FY 2007, Laboratory management will schedule a validation review of the September 2006 ISM Review. The review will validate that corrective actions resulting from the September 2006 review are effective and LBNL is improving the safety culture.

- 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 2007 Target: Efficiency improvement targets for 2007 include three areas: (A) supply chain management, (B) information technology, and (C) facilities condition assessment. In these target areas, significant progress should be demonstrated in efficiency improvements and/or savings as appropriate

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

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

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

Measures:

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

FY 2007 Target: UC's LBNL Advisory Board meets twice yearly with an agenda that is balanced between selected scientific and operational topics. The Board provides a timely written report and recommendations to the President of the University concerning the management of the Laboratory and the quality of UC support and oversight, including the effectiveness of the LBNL and UC contract assurance functions. UC and the Lab will follow-up on recommended improvements.

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

FY 2007 Target: New UC joint appointments in the area of nanoscience and solar to chemical energy research.

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

FY 2007 Targets: LBNL and UCOP leadership actively work to achieve alternative financing for important new buildings such as a User Guest House, a Computational Research and Theory Building, and a Helios Research Facility. Demonstrated progress is achieved on the conceptual design of these facilities.

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

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

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

Table 4.2 – Goal 4.0 Final Letter Grade

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

The weight of this goal is 22%.

Objectives:

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

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

- The success in meeting ES&H goals.

Measures:

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

FY 2007 Target: DART rate is 0.25

Gradient:

A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F
<0.15	0.15-0.19	0.2-0.24	0.25	0.26-0.5	0.51-0.55	0.56-0.6	0.61-0.65	0.66-0.7	0.71-0.75	>0.75

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 2007 Target: TRC rate is 0.65

Gradient:

A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F
<0.31	0.31-0.47	0.48-0.64	0.65	0.66-1.17	1.18-1.22	1.23-1.27	1.28-1.32	1.33-1.37	1.38-1.42	> 1.42

5.1.3 The scoring for environmental non-compliance issues relative to an internal control number.

FY 2007 Target: The scoring for 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 environmental incident depending on severity, magnitude, and proactive nature of the work that may have resulted in the issue in accordance with the document “Weighting Factors for Environmental Incidents at LBNL”. Severe incidents (for example, a penalty from an enforcement action in excess of \$100K) will result in the application of a weighting factor of 5, which results in a maximum letter grade of a "C" for the performance year.



Gradient:

A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F
0	1	2	3	3.5	4	4.5	5	5.5	6	> 6

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

FY 2007 Target: The scoring for radiological incidents is at or below 3. Laboratory and DOE will apply a weighting factor to each radiological incident depending on severity, magnitude, and proactive nature of the work that may have resulted in the incident in accordance with the document “Weighting Factors for Radiological Incidents at LBNL”. Due to the severity, a reportable occurrence categorized as a category 1 under Group 6 of the Occurrence Reporting and Processing System (ORPS) will be weighted 5.0, which results in a maximum letter grade of a "C" for the performance year.

Gradient:

A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F
0	1	2	3	3.5	4	4.5	5	5.5	6	> 6

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

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

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

Measures:

5.2.1 Complete required safety-related training per JHQ.

FY 2007 Target: 90% by 9/30/07.

Gradient:

A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F
98 - 100	95 - 97	91 - 94	90	85 - 89	80 - 84	75 - 79	70 - 74	65 - 69	60 - 64	< 60

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

FY 2007 Target: Manage AHDs using the electronic AHD Management system. Complete established milestones on schedule.

Milestones:

1. Modify PUB-3000 to reflect that the electronic AHD management system is the location of record for active AHDs, and that all new AHDs and authorizations of existing AHDs must be processed through this system. Target date: October 30, 2006.
2. 10% of active AHDs are approved by all signatories through the electronic AHD management system. Target date: December 31, 2006.

3. 20% of active AHDs are approved by all signatories through the electronic AHD management system. Target date: March 31, 2007.
4. 50% of active AHDs are approved by all signatories through the electronic AHD management system. Target date: June 30, 2007.
5. 85% of active AHDs are approved by all signatories through the electronic AHD management system. Target date: September 30, 2007.

Protocol: For calculations, percent complete is the number of active AHDs authorized through the AHD database divided by the total number of active AHDs multiplied by 100. The total number of active AHDs is the sum of the active AHDs authorized through the AHD database and the number of active AHDs that exist as a “hard copy” or as a Word version that have not yet been migrated over to the new system. Closed, Expired and Draft AHDs are not included in the calculations.

Gradient:

A range	B+	C range	D range	F
5 milestones	4 milestones	3 milestones	2 milestones	1 milestone

5.2.3 Improvement of line management accountability for enforcement of safety practices and procedures.

FY 2007 Target: Define safety management responsibilities for PIs, postdocs, and graduate students. Develop training to perform these responsibilities. Complete established milestones on schedule.

Milestones:

1. Define line safety management roles and responsibilities and submit the definitions for approval to Human Resources and the Safety Review Committee.  
Target Date: November 30, 2006.
2. Establish the need, scope, requirements of line manager safety oversight training.  
Target Date: February 28, 2007
3. Complete the development of training.  
Target Date: June 30, 2007
4. Begin training.  
Target Date: August 31, 2007

Gradient:

A range	B+	C range	D range	F
4 milestones	3 milestones	2 milestones	1 milestones	0 milestone

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

FY 2007 Target: Leadership is further strengthening LBNL’s safety program through comprehensive implementation of the Corrective Action Plan for ISMS. All major activities scheduled for FY 07 will be completed, integral with a strategy of continuous improvement.

90% (B+) completion of major activities scheduled to be completed by 9/30/07 in Integrated Safety Management System (ISMS) Evaluation Corrective Action Plan.

Gradient:

A	B+	B	C	D	F
100 – 91	90	89-80	79-70	69-60	≤59

Protocol:

1. BSO will verify implementation and appropriateness of major activities.

2. LBNL will provide monthly status report of major activities completion to BSO.
3. BSO will provide feedback to LBNL within 60 days of LBNL notification of closure.
4. BSO will review Baseline Change Proposals for concurrence when changes:
  - a. Extend the Completion Date greater than 30 days beyond the established date; or,
  - b. Postpone the Completion Date until FY08.

**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

Measures:

5.3.1 75 % of milestones to develop, implement, and maintain certification equivalence of an LBNL Performance-based Environmental Management System are achieved.

FY 2007 Target milestones:

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

Gradient:

A	B+	C	D
Meet 4 target milestones	Meet 3 target milestones	Meet 2 target milestones	Meet 1 target milestones

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

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

FY 2007 Target: LBNL will select, evaluate, and implement two waste minimization, emission reduction, and/ or resource conservation projects.

Protocol:

By March 31, 2007, LBNL and BSO will jointly agree on the potential candidate projects and their respective potential point values with the understanding that several small projects may be grouped together and counted as one implemented project. Additional projects may be identified after March 31, 2007, and used for this performance measure. The examples of projects to be considered include: LEED building design and certification, sealing of ventilation ducts, cooling tower water treatment, procurement of environmentally friendly products, and reducing LBNL commute traffic. The number of implemented projects will determine the grade for this performance measure; however, evaluations completed during the performance year, but not implemented, may be used to achieve a higher score within the grade range.

Gradient:

A Range	B+	C Range	D Range	F
Implement more than two projects	Implement two projects	Implement one project	Initiate project implementation	No project Implemented

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Weighted Score	Total Points
<b>5.0 Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health and Environmental Protection</b>					
5.1 Provide a Work Environment that Protects Workers and the Environment.			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 5.0 Total</b>					

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

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

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

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

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

The weight of this goal is 25%.

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

Objectives:

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

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

Measure:

- 6.1.1 The Laboratory will present data and analysis demonstrating 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 2007 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 2007 Target: Achieve a score of 86.8% or better on the Balanced Scorecard Model Index.

Acquisition  
Measurement

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

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

- LBNL, BSO, and UCLMO will determine an equitable way of adjusting the assigned points, or zero points will be earned if an activity is not performed during the fiscal year.
- If, through no fault of Procurement, an activity is not performed, the points will be redistributed to another measure or measures, as negotiated among the parties (LBNL, BSO, and UCLMO).

**Scoring**

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

<b>PERSPECTIVE</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
Customer	15
Internal Business Processes	55
Learning and Growth	25
Managing Financial Aspects	5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>

Property

Measurement

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

Target

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

Point Value

LBNL, DOE, and UCLMO established a consensually acceptable point value for each measure. The range in point value is from 0 to 12 per measure. Points are converted to percentage on a one for one basis, (e.g. 90 points = 90%), 100 points are available to Property. The points are distributed to the following perspectives:

<b>PERSPECTIVE</b>	<b>POINTS</b>
Customer	20
Internal Business	46
Learning and Growth	10
Financial	24
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>

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

#### Overall Scoring

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

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

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

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

(Note: Diversity is a vital Laboratory management responsibility. Therefore, diversity is evaluated in the Laboratory Leadership section, measure 4.1.4.)

#### Measures:

- 6.3.1 The Laboratory will participate in the HR Accreditation Pilot Self-Assessment Process in order to demonstrate its success in achieving an effective Human Resources Management System.

The self-assessment will occur in the six following areas:

1. HR Strategic Management
2. HR Operations and Program Assurance
3. Employment and Talent Management
4. Total Compensation and Benefits
5. Training and Development
6. Work Environment and Employee/Labor Relations

The preliminary self-assessment has three primary purposes:

1. Test the validity of the proposed standards and the practicality of the self-assessment process.
2. Compare current HR operations with the proposed standards and to identify functional areas needing improvement to bring operations in line with the standards.
3. Identify data gaps and other information shortcomings which limit or preclude required assessment.

FY 2007 Target: Achievement of the following will demonstrate “B+” level of performance:

The following tasks will be conducted for the preliminary self-assessment by 01/31/2007:

1. A plan will be developed for conducting the assessment, including data to be gathered, persons to be interviewed, and the assessment timetable.
2. The assessment team will be identified.

3. The assessment team will use the Assessor Guide to gather information necessary to reach conclusions regarding compliance with the Accreditation Standards.
4. The assessment team will analyze the available data and reach conclusions. The team will identify areas where conclusions cannot be reached.
5. The team will summarize its findings, suggest revisions to the proposed standards, the assessor guide, and the self-assessment process.
6. The team will recommend follow-up actions needed to bring us into compliance with the standards.

The following tasks will be conducted for the formal self-assessment by 09/30/2007:

1. A plan will be developed for conducting the assessment, including data to be gathered, persons to be interviewed, and the assessment timetable.
2. The assessment team will be identified.
3. The assessment team will use the Assessor Guide to gather information necessary to reach conclusions regarding compliance with the Accreditation Standards.
4. The assessment team will analyze the available data and reach conclusions. The team will identify areas where conclusions cannot be reached.
5. The team will summarize its findings, suggest revisions to the proposed standards, the assessor guide, and the self-assessment process.
6. The team will recommend follow-up actions needed to bring us into compliance with the standards. If necessary, action plans will be developed.

The performance level is determined by the number of areas having completed certain tasks. The table below details the grading approach.

Range of Targets, from “A” to “F”\*:

Performance Level	Preliminary	Formal		
	Tasks 1-6	Tasks 1-4	Task 5	Task 6
“A”	6 of 6 areas	5 of 6 areas	3 of 6 areas	1 of 6 areas
“B+”	<b>6 of 6 areas</b>	<b>3 of 6 areas</b>	<b>2 of 6 areas</b>	<b>0 of 6 areas</b>
“C”	5 of 6 areas	2 of 6 areas	1 of 6 areas	0 of 6 areas
“D”	4 of 6 areas	1 of 6 areas	0 of 6 areas	0 of 6 areas
“F”	3 of 6 areas	0 of 6 areas	0 of 6 areas	0 of 6 areas

\*Qualifiers of “+” and “-“ will be assigned as needed at evaluation to further distinguish performance.

Assumptions:

1. This measure supports a multi-year effort of LBNL to achieve accreditation of the Human Resources program.
2. A certified HR management system will include the following elements:
  - i. Requirements will be based on the US Department of Energy (DOE) Office of Science (Card) principles of Line Management Accountability, National Standards, Oversight, Contractor Accountability, Vision, and Incentives.
  - ii. Components of the certified system will consist of standards, self-assessment against the standards, certification, and peer review.

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



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

**Scoring**

Internal Audit Services will use a balanced scorecard approach for assessing achievement of individual measures. Each measure will be scored on an A+ or A to F scale. Scoring gradients/scales for individual measures are detailed below.

**Measures:**

6.4.1 - Customer Perspective: Internal Audit will be measured on the deployment of an efficient and effective process for obtaining customer feedback and development of baselines for measuring customer satisfaction improvement in future years.

FY 2007 Target: Internal Audit will deploy customer satisfaction surveys for both internal and external customers. IAS will develop a methodology for scoring customer feedback, and determine baselines for development of scoring gradients for use in FY 2008.

**Gradient/Scoring**

Score	Achievement
A+	Meet A/A- target, and in addition analyze feedback to identify potential process improvements
A/A-	Meet B+ target, and in addition deploy surveys within a week of issuing report and follow up on customer feedback
B+	Deploy surveys (external and internal) following each audit and appropriate advisory services, develop scoring methodology and baselines
B	Deploy surveys following each audit and appropriate advisory services, develop scoring methodology
C	Deploy survey with majority of audits and appropriate advisory services
D	Deploy survey with several audits and advisory services
F	Deploy surveys with only a minority of audits

6.4.2 - Internal Business Processes:

A. Internal Audit will plan for and conduct audits of core business functions as approved by the LBNL Audit Committee, DOE, and UCOP Audit Management.

FY2007 Target: Internal Audit will complete more than 95% to 100% of LBNL Audit Committee, DOE, and UCOP audit management expectations

To remain consistent with University of California audit guidelines, audits will be considered complete when a final draft is issued to management.

**Gradient/Scoring**

Score	Achievement (percentage of plan completed)
A+	>105% of expectations
A/A-	> 100 to 105% of expectations

B+	> 95 to 100 % of expectations
B	> 90 to 95% of expectations
C	> 85 to 90% of expectations
D	> 80 to 85% of expectations
F	Less than 80%

B. Internal Audit will incorporate efficiency and/or effectiveness recommendations into audits where appropriate.

FY2007 Target: IAS will issue at least three recommendations for improving the efficiency of Laboratory operations.

Score	Achievement (number of efficiency recommendations issued)
A+	5
A/A-	4
B+	3
C	2
D	1
F	none

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

FY2007 Target: Internal Audit will report quarterly on direct and indirect hours spent by Internal Audit Staff. The percentage of direct hours will be no more than 5 percentage points below the percentage included on the approved annual audit plan, averaged over the course of the fiscal year.

Hours are calculated by taking the number of employee hours available per quarter, with sick, vacation, holiday and other leave hours excluded from that total. Direct hours include hours spent on audits, advisory services, investigations, external audit coordination, quality assurance, and system-wide development projects. Indirect hours include time spent on administration, professional development, staff meetings, etc.

**Gradient/Scoring**

Score	Achievement (percentage of direct hours)
A+	Plan % or higher
A/A-	No more than 3 percentage points less than Plan %
B+	No more than 5 percentage points less than Plan %
B	No more than 7 percentage points less than Plan %
C	No more than 9 percentage points less than Plan %
D	No more than 11 percentage points less than Plan %
F	More than 11 percentage points below Plan%

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.

FY2007 Target: No more than one of the professional staff will not complete the required continuing professional education (CPE) hours to maintain at least one professional credential/certification.

Final certification determinations are made by the certifying agency. If any staff member is not recertified by the appropriate agency, no partial credit will be given for training hours completed.

**Gradient/Scoring**

Score	Achievement (number of professional staff with sufficient CPEs to maintain at least one certification/credential)
A	All
B+	All but one
C	All but two
D	All but three
F	All but four

6.4.5 LBNL utilizes IT to provide an efficient and productive environment for science and operations, including records management, report coordination, collaboration services, network operations, workstation management, plant operations, business applications, and general and scientific-support IT operations.

FY 2007 Target: LBNL operates an IT environment that enables productive science and operations.

**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 2007 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 2007 Target: The contractor shall obtain at least \$1,200 K income.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Weighted Score	Total Points
<b>6.0 Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission(s)</b>					
6.1 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Financial Management System(s).			30%		
6.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition and Property			30%		

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Weighted Score	Total Points
Management System(s)					
6.3 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Human Resources Management System and Diversity Program			20%		
6.4 Provide efficient, effective, and Responsive Management Systems for Internal Audit and Oversight, Quality; Information Management; and Other Administrative Support Services as Appropriate			10%		
6.5 Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Technology and Commercialization of Intellectual Assets			10%		
<b>Performance Goal 6.0 Total</b>					

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

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

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

**7.0 Sustain excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs.**

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

The weight of this goal is 20%.

Goal 7.0 shall measure the overall effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in planning for, delivering, and operations of Laboratory facilities and equipment needed to ensure required capabilities are present to meet today’s and tomorrow’s complex challenges.

Objectives:

**7.1 Manage Facilities and Infrastructure in an efficient and Effective manner that optimizes usage and minimizes Life Cycle costs**

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

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

- The management of energy use and conservation practices.

Measures:

- 7.1.1 Maintenance and Utility Reliability- Effectiveness and efficiency of maintenance activities to maximize the operational life of facility systems, structure and Components.
- FY 2007 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 milestones include: Maintenance Investment Index (MII), Asset Condition Index (ACI), and RPAM reports.
- 7.1.2 Energy Management – Effective execution of goals within the Energy Performance Management Agreement.
- FY 2007 Target: LBNL achieves 3.1 – 3.4 score based on initiatives managed through the Energy Performance Management Agreement.
- 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 2007 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 milestones include: calculation of the facilities asset and 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 alignment and effectiveness of the Ten Year Site Plan to the Laboratory's comprehensive strategic plan;
- The facility planning, forecasting, and acquisition for effective translation of business needs into comprehensive and integrated facility site plans;
- Effectiveness in meeting project performance baselines for scope, schedule and cost;
- Overall responsiveness to customer mission needs; and
- Efficiency in meeting Cost and Schedule Performance Index for construction projects (when appropriate).

Measures:

- 7.2.1 Integrated Site Planning - The Laboratory develops, documents, and maintains an integrated site planning process that is aligned with DOE mission needs and the Laboratory strategic/business plan. Intent is to measure the effectiveness of integrated site planning activities using any related site development planning documents. Each task is assessed individually.
- FY 2007 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 milestones include: 10 year site plan update, NEPA/CEQA compliance, and seismic evaluations.

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

FY 2007 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 milestones include: the Molecular Foundry, B77 Phase II Rehabilitation, the User Support Building, General Plant Project (GPP) Program and Seismic Phase I.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The weight of this goal is 8%.

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

Objectives:

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

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

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

Measures:

8.1.1 The Contractor will demonstrate Emergency Management success through accurate and timely DOE and LBNL reporting requirements.

FY 2007 Target: 86% (6/7) of emergency management reporting completed on schedule; one annual DOE report (Emergency Readiness Assurance Plans), four DOE quarterly reports (Emergency Management Program Metrics Report), and one annual and mid-year LBNL reports (Emergency Management Readiness Report)

**GRADIENT**

A	B+	C	D
100% (7/7) of emergency management reports (annual and quarterly) completed on schedule.	86% (6/7) of emergency management reports (annual and quarterly) completed on schedule.	72% (5/7) of emergency management reports (annual and quarterly) completed on schedule.	57% (4/7) of emergency management reports (annual and quarterly) completed on schedule.

8.1.2 The Contractor will demonstrate its commitment of leadership to emergency management by assuring adequate resources are provided.

FY 2007 Target: 90% (11/12) primary members of the Emergency Operations Center to complete two emergency management training classes by the end of the FY.

**GRADIENT**

A	B+	C	D
100% (12/12) of the primary members of the Emergency Response Organization to attend two training class by 9/30/07	90% (11/12) of the primary members of the Emergency Response Organization to attend two training class by 9/30/07	70% (8/12) of the primary members of the Emergency Response Organization to attend two training class by 9/30/07	40% (5/12 or less) of the primary members of the Emergency Response Organization to attend two training class by 9/30/07

8.1.3 The Contractor will demonstrate its commitment of leadership to emergency management by assuring adequate resources are provided.

FY 2007 Target: Fire alarm backbone (Install 9 nodes) for fire alarm monitoring network completed and communications link with monitoring station at LLNL established by the end of FY. (Note: Connection of nodes to fire alarm panels within Lab buildings not included in this phase)

**GRADIENT**

A	B+	C	D
Complete backbone for fire alarm monitoring system and establish communications with LLNL by 6/30/07.	Complete backbone for fire alarm monitoring system and establish communications with LLNL by 9/30/07.	Complete backbone for fire alarm monitoring system by and communications with LLNL incomplete by 9/30/07	Little or no progress made on installing backbone or in establishing communications link with LLNL by 9/30/07.

8.1 4 The Contractor demonstrates effective utilization of emergency management procedures and processes through exercises.

FY 2007 Target: 90% (11/12) of the primary members of the Emergency Operations Center to participate in two exercises by the end of the FY.

**GRADIENT**

A	B+	C	D
100% (12/12) of the primary members of the Emergency Response Organization to participate in two exercises by 9/30/07	90% (11/12) of the primary members of the Emergency Response Organization to participate in two exercises by 9/30/07	70% (8/12) of the primary members of the Emergency Response Organization to participate in two exercises by 9/30/07	40% (5/12 or less) of the primary members of the Emergency Response Organization to participate in one exercises by 9/30/07

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

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

- The Contractor’s success in meeting Cyber-Security goals and expectations;
- The commitment of leadership to a strong Cyber-Security performance is appropriately demonstrated
- Integration of Cyber-Security into the culture of the organization for effective deployment of the system is demonstrated; and
- The maintenance and appropriate utilization of Cyber-Security risk identification, prevention, and control processes/activities.

Measures:

8.2.1 The Contractor will Demonstrate Commitment to Improvement through the conduct of internal and external reviews and the timely completion of approved corrected action plans.

FY 2007 Target: One Plan of Actions and Milestones (POA&M) overdue and 2 assessments performed by end of FY.

**GRADIENT**

A	B+	C	D
0 POA&Ms overdue to target and >2 assessments performed.	1 POA&M overdue to target and 2 assessments performed annually.	2 POA&Ms overdue to target and 0 assessments performed.	>2 POA&Ms overdue to target and 0 assessments.



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

FY2007 Target: Updated Computer Security Training Program in place and 80% of employees trained by end of FY.

**GRADIENT**

A	B+	C	D
Updated Computer Security Training Program in place and greater than 80% of Laboratory trained and/or additional forms of training created and distributed.	Updated Computer Security Training Program in place and 80% of employees trained in Laboratory.	Updated Computer Security Training Program in place, but fewer than 80% of employees trained in Laboratory	Updated Computer Security Training Program not in place.

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

FY 2007 Target: All but one enclave risk assessed, risk agreement in place, and POA&Ms created for mitigation by end of FY.

**GRADIENT**

A	B+	C	D
All enclaves risk assessed, risk agreement in place, and POA&Ms in place for mitigations.	All but one enclave with risk assessments completed. Residual risk agreement in place and POA&Ms created for mitigation activities.	Half of enclaves risk assessed with POA&Ms created for mitigation activities.	Fewer then half of enclaves risk assessed with POA&Ms created for mitigation activities.

8.2.4 The Contractor will demonstrate its commitment to continuous improvement by testing and deploying new Management, Operational, and Technical Controls.

FY 2007 Target: At least two new or improved management, operational, and technical controls in place by end of FY.

**GRADIENT**

A	B+	C	D
> 2 new or substantially improved management, operational, or technical controls by end of FY.	Two new or substantially improved management, operational, or technical controls by end of FY.	One new or substantially improved, management, operational, or technical control in place by end of FY.	No new or modified controls.

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

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

- The Contractor’s success in meeting Safeguard goals and expectations
- The commitment of leadership to strong Safeguards performance is appropriately demonstrated
- Integration of Safeguards into the culture of the organization for effective deployment of the system is demonstrated
- The maintenance and appropriate utilization of Safeguards risk identification, prevention, and control processes/activities

Measures:

8.3.1 The Contractor will ensure on-going compliance with internal procedures to implement DOE Manual 470.4-6 in a graded approach.

FY 2007 Target: Schedules and conducts peer review of LBNL EHS Procedure 740, Nuclear Material Accountability program by 05/31/07.

**GRADIENT**

A	B+	C	D
Schedules and conducts peer review of EH&S Procedure 740 Nuclear Materials Accountability program 03/31/07	Schedules and conducts peer review of EH&S Procedure 740 Nuclear Materials Accountability program 05/31/07	Schedules and conducts peer review of EH&S Procedure 740 Nuclear Materials Accountability program 07/31/07	Schedules and conducts peer review of EH&S Procedure 740 Nuclear Materials Accountability program 09/30/07

8.3.2 The Contractor will develop corrective actions addressing peer review findings and submit to BSO for approval.

FY 2007 Target: Develops and submits peer review Corrective Action Plan to BSO by 07/31/07.

**GRADIENT**

A	B+	C	D
Develops and submits peer review Corrective Action Plan to BSO by 5/31/07, or peer review identifies no findings	Develops and submits peer review Corrective Action Plan to BSO by 07/31/07	Develops and submits peer review Corrective Action Plan to BSO by 09/30/07	Develops and submits peer review Corrective Action Plan not submitted to BSO by 9/30/07

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

FY 2007 Target: 86% (6/7) of safeguards process and activities (4 inventories, 3 inventory/transaction reports) completed on schedule. Authorization renewals completed as required – number varies.

**GRADIENT**

A	B+	C	D
100% (7/7) of safeguards process and activities (inventory,	86% (6/7) of safeguards process and activities (inventory, reporting)	71% (5/7) of safeguards process and activities (inventory, reporting)	71% (5) of safeguards process and activities (inventory, reporting)

reporting) and all authorization renewals) completed on schedule.	and 85% authorization renewals completed on schedule.	and 75% authorization renewals completed on schedule.	and 65% renewals completed on schedule.
---	---	---	---

**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>8.0 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 8.0 Total</b>					

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

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

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

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

		ASCR	BES	BER	FES	HEP	NP	WDTS	EERE	FE	RW
		Wt	Wt	Wt	Wt	Wt	Wt	Wt	Wt	Wt	Wt
<b>Goal #1 Mission Accomplishment</b>											
	<b>Goal's weight</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>40</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	20	30	30	30	35		25
1c. Output (productivity) (pass/fail)		15	15	25	25	30	15	30	15		25
1d. Delivery (pass/fail)		15	15	25	25	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>30</b>	<b>0</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)		10	20	0		80	0				
2b. Construction of Facility/Fabrication of Components (execution phase, Post CD-2 to CD-4)		10	20	0		20	0				
2c. Operation of Facility		70	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	0
<b>Goal #3 Program Management</b>											
	<b>Goal's weight</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>30</b>		<b>30</b>
3a. Stewardship of Scientific Capabilities and Programmatic Vision		30	40	20	35	40	40	20	50		40
3b. Program Planning and Management		40	30	30	30	40	40	40	25		20
3.c Program Management-Communication & Responsiveness (to HQ)		30	30	50	35	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	100