

ATTACHMENT J-2

APPENDIX B

**FY 2010
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND MEASUREMENT PLAN**

Applicable to the Operation of
**ERNEST ORLANDO LAWRENCE BERKELEY NATIONAL
LABORATORY**

CONTRACT NO. DE-AC02-05CH11231

Table of Contents

- I. DETERMINING THE CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE RATING, PERFORMANCE-BASED FEE AND AWARD TERM ELIGIBILITY J-B-4**
 - PERFORMANCE EVALUATION METHODOLOGY..... J-B-5**
 - CALCULATING INDIVIDUAL GOAL SCORES AND LETTER GRADES J-B-7**
 - DETERMINING THE AMOUNT OF PERFORMANCE-BASED FEE EARNED J-B-8**
 - ADJUSTMENT TO THE LETTER GRADE AND/OR PERFORMANCE-BASED FEE DETERMINATION... J-B-9**
 - DETERMINING AWARD TERM ELIGIBILITY J-B-9**
 - BACKGROUND..... J-B-9**
- PERFORMANCE GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND NOTABLE OUTCOMES J-B-10**
- 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-11**
 - 1.2 PROVIDE QUALITY LEADERSHIP IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY..... J-B-11**
 - 1.3 PROVIDE AND SUSTAIN OUTPUTS THAT ADVANCE PROGRAM OBJECTIVES & GOALS J-B-12**
 - 1.4 PROVIDE FOR EFFECTIVE DELIVERY OF PRODUCTS..... J-B-12**
 - OFFICE OF SCIENCE PROGRAM OFFICE NOTABLE OUTCOMES J-B-13**
 - 2.0 PROVIDE FOR EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE DESIGN, FABRICATION, CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATIONS OF RESEARCH FACILITIES..... J-B-17**
 - 2.1 PROVIDE EFFECTIVE FACILITY DESIGN(S) AS REQUIRED TO SUPPORT LABORATORY PROGRAMS (I.E., ACTIVITIES LEADING UP TO CD-2)..... J-B-17**
 - 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-18**
 - 2.3 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE OPERATION OF FACILITIES J-B-19**
 - 2.4 UTILIZATION OF FACILITY TO GROW AND SUPPORT LAB'S RESEARCH BASE AND EXTERNAL USER COMMUNITY J-B-19**
 - OFFICE OF SCIENCE PROGRAM OFFICE NOTABLE OUTCOMES:..... J-B-20**
 - 3.0 PROVIDE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM MANAGEMENT J-B-23**
 - 3.1 PROVIDE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT STEWARDSHIP OF SCIENTIFIC CAPABILITIES AND PROGRAM VISION..... J-B-23**
 - 3.2 PROVIDE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROJECT/PROGRAM PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT J-B-24**
 - 3.3 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATIONS AND RESPONSIVENESS TO CUSTOMER NEEDS J-B-25**
 - OFFICE OF SCIENCE PROGRAM OFFICE NOTABLE OUTCOMES:..... J-B-25**
- PART B – MANAGEMENT & OPERATIONS COMPONENT..... J-B-29**
 - 4.0 PROVIDE SOUND AND COMPETENT LEADERSHIP AND STEWARDSHIP OF THE LABORATORY..... J-B-29**
 - 4.1 LEADERSHIP AND STEWARDSHIP OF THE LABORATORY (PROVIDE A DISTINCTIVE VISION FOR THE LABORATORY AND AN EFFECTIVE PLAN FOR ACCOMPLISHMENT OF THE VISION TO INCLUDE STRONG PARTNERSHIPS REQUIRED TO CARRY OUT THOSE PLANS)..... J-B-29**
 - 4.2 MANAGEMENT AND OPERATION OF THE LABORATORY (PROVIDE FOR RESPONSIVE AND ACCOUNTABLE LEADERSHIP THROUGHOUT THE ORGANIZATION) J-B-29**
 - 4.3 CONTRACTOR VALUE-ADDED (PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE CORPORATE OFFICE SUPPORT AS APPROPRIATE) J-B-29**

- 5.0 SUSTAIN EXCELLENCE AND ENHANCE EFFECTIVENESS OF INTEGRATED SAFETY, HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION..... J-B-30**
 - 5.1 PROVIDE A WORK ENVIRONMENT THAT PROTECTS WORKERS AND THE ENVIRONMENT. J-B-30**
 - 5.2 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF INTEGRATED SAFETY, HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT J-B-30**
 - 5.3 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT, MINIMIZATION, AND POLLUTION PREVENTION J-B-30**

- 6.0 DELIVER EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE BUSINESS SYSTEMS AND RESOURCES THAT ENABLE THE SUCCESSFUL ACHIEVEMENT OF THE LABORATORY MISSION(S) J-B-31**
 - 6.1 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM(S)... J-B-32**
 - 6.2 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM..... J-B-32**
 - 6.3 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE PROPERTY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM..... J-B-32**
 - 6.4 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AND DIVERSITY PROGRAM J-B-32**
 - 6.5 PROVIDE EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS FOR INTERNAL AUDIT AND OVERSIGHT; QUALITY; INFORMATION MANAGEMENT; AND OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES AS APPROPRIATE J-B-32**
 - 6.6 DEMONSTRATE EFFECTIVE TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY AND COMMERCIALIZATION OF INTELLECTUAL ASSETS J-B-32**

- 7.0 SUSTAIN EXCELLENCE IN OPERATING, MAINTAINING, AND RENEWING THE FACILITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE PORTFOLIO TO MEET LABORATORY NEEDS..... J-B-33**
 - 7.1 MANAGE FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE IN AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE MANNER THAT OPTIMIZES USAGE, MINIMIZES LIFE CYCLE COSTS, AND ENSURES SITE CAPABILITY TO MEET MISSION NEEDS J-B-34**
 - 7.2 PROVIDE PLANNING FOR AND ACQUIRE THE FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIRED TO SUPPORT THE CONTINUATION AND GROWTH OF LABORATORY MISSIONS AND PROGRAMS..... J-B-34**

- 8.0 SUSTAIN AND ENHANCE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY MANAGEMENT (ISSM) AND THE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM..... J-B-35**
 - 8.1 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM J-B-35**
 - 8.2 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE SYSTEM FOR CYBER-SECURITY J-B-35**
 - 8.3 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE SYSTEM FOR THE PROTECTION OF SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIALS, CLASSIFIED MATTER, AND PROPERTY J-B-35**
 - 8.4 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE SYSTEM FOR THE PROTECTION OF CLASSIFIED AND SENSITIVE INFORMATION..... J-B-35**

INTRODUCTION

This document, the Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan (PEMP), primarily serves as DOE's Quality Assurance/Surveillance Plan (QASP) for the evaluation of The Regents of the University of California (hereafter referred to as "the Contractor") performance regarding the management and operations of the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (hereafter referred to as "the Laboratory") for the evaluation period from October 1, 2009, through September 30, 2010. 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 requirement and performance expectations/objectives of the Department as stipulated within this contract.

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

The Performance Goals (hereafter referred to as Goals), Performance Objectives (hereafter referred to as Objectives) and set of Notable Outcomes (Performance Measures/Targets) discussed herein were developed in accordance with contract expectations set forth within the contract. The Notable Outcomes 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 Notable Outcomes, shall be evaluated jointly by the appropriate HQ office, major customer and/or the Site Office as appropriate. This cooperative review methodology will ensure that the overall evaluation of the Contractor results in a consolidated DOE position taking into account specific Notable Outcomes as well as all additional information available to the evaluating office. The Site Office shall work closely with each HQ program office or major customer throughout the year in evaluating the Contractor's performance and will provide observations regarding programs and projects as well as other management and operation activities conducted by the Contractor throughout the year.

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

Section II provides the detailed information concerning each Goal, their corresponding Objectives, and Notable Outcomes identified, along with the weightings assigned to each Goal and Objective and a table for calculating the final grade for each Goal.

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

The FY 2010 Contractor performance grades for each Goal will be determined based on the weighted sum of the individual scores earned for each of the Objectives described within this document for Science and Technology and for Management and Operations. No overall rollup grade will be provided. The rollup of the performance of each Goal will then be utilized to determine the Contractor numerical grade for Science and Technology and Management and Operations (see Table A below). The total overall numerical grade derived for Science and Technology will be utilized to determine the amount of available fee that may be earned (see Table C). The overall numerical grade 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 2010. Each Goal is composed of two or more weighted

Objectives and each Objective has set definitions and/or Notable Outcomes, which are linked to an Objective or set of Objectives to assist the reviewer in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting an Objective(s). Where utilized each of the Notable Outcomes highlight key aspects/areas of performance deserving special attention for the upcoming fiscal year and are utilized as a means of determining the Contractor's success in meeting the Objective along with other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources to include, but not limited to, operational awareness (daily oversight) activities; "For Cause" reviews (if any); other outside agency reviews (OIG, GAO, DCAA, etc.), and the annual 2-week review (if needed). The 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 grading at the Objective Level. Each Objective within a Goal shall be assigned a grade and corresponding numerical grade by the evaluating office. Each evaluation will measure the degree of effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in meeting the corresponding Objectives based on all performance information available to the evaluating office.

It is the DOE's expectation that the Contractor provides for and maintains management and operational (M&O) systems that efficiently and effectively support the current mission(s) of the Laboratory and assure the Laboratory's ability to deliver against DOE's future needs. In evaluating the Contractor's performance DOE shall assess the degree of effectiveness and performance in meeting each of the Objectives provided under each of the Goals. For the five M&O Goals DOE will rely on a combination of the information through the Contractor's own assurance systems, the ability of the Contractor to demonstrate the validity of this information, and DOE's own independent assessment of the Contractor's performance across the spectrum of its responsibilities. The latter might include, but is not limited to operational awareness (daily oversight) activities; formal assessments conducted; "For Cause" reviews (if any); and other outside agency reviews (OIG, GAO, DCAA, etc.).

The mission of the Laboratory is to deliver the science and technology needed to support Departmental missions and other sponsor's needs. Operational performance at the Laboratory meets DOE's expectations (defined as the grade of B+) for each Objective if the Contractor is performing at a level that fully supports the Laboratory's current and future science and technology mission(s). Performance that has, or has the potential to, 1) adversely impact the delivery of the current and/or future DOE/Laboratory mission(s), 2) adversely impact the DOE and or the Laboratory's reputation, or 3) does not provide the competent people, necessary facilities and robust systems necessary to ensure sustainable performance, shall be graded below expectations as defined in Figure I-1 below.

The Department sets our expectations high, and expects performance at that level to optimize the efficient and effective operation of the Laboratory. Thus, the Department does not expect routine Contractor performance above expectations against the M&O Goals (4.0 – 8.0). Performance that might merit grades above B+ would need to reflect a Contractor's unexpectedly strong improvement in a particular area, significant contributions to the management and operations at the system of Laboratories, or recognition by external, independent entities as exemplary performance.

This year, a set of Notable Outcomes have been identified under each Goal to highlight the Contractor key aspects/areas of performance deserving special attention for the upcoming fiscal year. Each Notable Outcome is linked to one or more Objectives, and failure to meet expectations against any Notable Outcome will result in a grade less than B+ for that Objective(s). Performance above expectations against a Notable Outcome will be considered in the context of the Contractor's entire performance with respect to the relevant Objective.

Definitions for the grading scale for the Goal 4.0 – 8.0 Objectives are provided in Figure I-1, below:

Letter Grade	Numerical Grade	Definition
A+	4.3-4.1	Significantly exceeds expectations of performance against all aspects of the Objective in question. The Contractor’s systems function at a level that fully supports the Laboratory’s current and future science and technology mission(s). Performance is notable for its significant contributions to the management and operations across the SC system of laboratories, and/or has been recognized by external, independent entities as exemplary.
A	4.0-3.8	Notably exceeds expectations of performance against all aspects of the Objective in question. The Contractor’s systems function at a level that fully supports the Laboratory’s current and future science and technology mission(s). Performance is notable for its contributions to the management and operations across the SC system of laboratories, and/or as been recognized by external, independent entities as exemplary.
A-	3.7-3.5	Exceeds expectations of performance against all aspects of the Objective in question. The Contractor’s systems function at a level that fully supports the Laboratory’s current and future science and technology mission(s).
B+	3.4-3.1	Meets expectations of performance against all aspects of the Objective in question. The Contractor’s systems function at a level that fully supports the Laboratory’s current and future science and technology mission(s). No performance has, or has the potential to, adversely impact 1) the delivery of the current and/or future DOE/Laboratory mission(s), 2) the DOE and/or the Laboratory’s reputation, or does not 3) provide a sustainable performance platform.
B	3.0 -2.8	Just misses meeting expectations of performance against a few aspects of the Objective in question. In a few minor instances, the Contractor’s systems function at a level that does not fully support the Laboratory’s current and future science and technology mission, or provide a sustainable performance platform.
B-	2.7-2.5	Misses meeting expectations of performance against several aspects of the Objective in question. In several areas, the Contractor’s systems function at a level that does not fully support the Laboratory’s current and future science and technology mission, or provide a sustainable performance platform.
C+	2.4-2.1	Misses meeting expectations of performance against many aspects of the Objective in question. In several notable areas, the Contractor’s systems function at a level that does not fully support the Laboratory’s current and future science and technology mission or provide a sustainable performance platform, and/or have affected the reputation of the Laboratory or DOE.
C	2.0-1.8	Significantly misses meeting expectations of performance against many aspects of the Objective in question. In many notable areas, the Contractor’s systems do not support the Laboratory’s current and future science and technology mission, nor provide a sustainable performance platform and may affect the reputation of the Laboratory or DOE.
C-	1.7- 1.1	Significantly misses meeting expectations of performance against most aspects of the Objective in question. In many notable areas, the Contractor’s systems demonstrably hinder the Laboratory’s ability to deliver on current and future science and technology mission, and have harmed the reputation of the Laboratory or DOE.
D	1.0-0.8	Most or all expectations of performance against the Objective in question are missed. Performance failures in this area have affected all parts of the Laboratory; DOE leadership engagement is required to deal with the situation and help the Contractor.
F	0.7-0	All expectations of performance against the Objective in question are missed. Performance failures in this area are not recoverable by the Contractor or DOE.

Figure I-1. Letter Grade and Numerical Grade Definitions

Calculating Individual Goal Scores and Letter Grades:

Each Objective is assigned the earned numerical grade by the evaluating office as stated above. The Goal rating is then computed by multiplying the numerical grade by the weight of each Objective within a Goal. These values are then added together to develop an overall numerical grade for each Goal. For the purpose of determining the final Goal grade, the raw numerical grade for each Goal will be rounded to the nearest tenth of a point utilizing the standard rounding convention discussed below and then compared to Table B. A set of tables is provided at the end of each Performance Goal section of this document to assist in the calculation of Objective numerical grades to the Goal grade. Utilizing the raw numerical grade for each Goal within Table A, below, the grades 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 raw numerical grade for each.

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

S&T Performance Goal	Numerical Grade	Letter Grade	Weight ¹	Weighted Score	Total Score
1.0 Mission Accomplishment			35.4%		
2.0 Construction and Operations of User Research Facilities and Equipment			40.7%		
3.0 Science and Technology Research Project/Program Management			23.9%		
Total Score					
M&O Performance Goal	Numerical Grade	Letter Grade	Weight	Weighted Score	Total Score
4.0 Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory			25%		
5.0 Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection			27%		
6.0 Business Systems			20%		
7.0 Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio			20%		
8.0 Integrated Safeguards and Security Management and Emergency Management Systems			8%		
Total Score					

Table A. FY 2010 Contractor Evaluation Numerical Grade Calculation

Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F
-------------	----	---	----	----	---	----	----	---	----	---	---

Any weightings provided for each S&T Goal listed within Table A are preliminary, based upon FY 2008 Budget Authority figures, and are shown for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining the overall S&T score will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2010.

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 2010 Contractor Letter Grade Scale

Determining the Amount of Performance-Based Fee Earned:

Total available FY 2010 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 numerical grade for the S&T Goals (see Table A. above) and then compared to Table C. below. The overall numerical grade of the M&O Goals from Table A. above shall then be utilized to determine the final fee multiplier (see Table C.), which shall be utilized to determine the overall amount of performance-based fee earned for FY 2010 as calculated within Table D.

Overall Weighted Score from Table A.	Percent S&T Fee Earned	M&O Fee Multiplier
4.3	100%	100%
4.2		
4.1		
4.0	97%	100%
3.9		
3.8		
3.7	94%	100%
3.6		
3.5		
3.4	91%	100%
3.3		
3.2		
3.1		
3.0	88%	95%
2.9		
2.8		
2.7	85%	90%
2.6		
2.5		
2.4	75%	85%
2.3		
2.2		
2.1		
2.0	50%	75%
1.9		
1.8		
1.7	0%	60%
1.6		
1.5		
1.4		
1.3		
1.2		
1.1		
1.0 to 0.8	0%	0%
0.7 to 0.0	0%	0%

Table C. - Performance-Based Fee Earned Scale

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

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

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

The lack of performance objectives and notable outcomes in this plan do not diminish the need to comply with minimum contractual requirements. Although the performance-based Goals and their corresponding Objectives shall be the primary means utilized in determining the Contractor’s performance grade and/or amount of performance-based fee earned, the Contracting Officer may unilaterally adjust the rating and/or reduce the otherwise earned fee based on the Contractor’s performance against all contract requirements as set forth in the Prime Contract. While reductions may be based on performance against any contract requirement, specific note should be made to contract clauses which address reduction of fee including, Standards of Contractor Performance Evaluation, DEAR 970.5215-1 – Total Available Fee: Base Fee Amount and Performance Fee Amount, and Conditional Payment of Fee, Profit, and Other Incentives – Facility Management Contracts. Data to support rating and/or fee adjustments may be derived from other sources to include, but not limited to, operational awareness (daily oversight) activities; “For Cause” reviews (if any); other outside agency reviews (OIG, GAO, DCAA, etc.), and the annual 2-week review (if needed).

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

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

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 & PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Background

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

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

The performance-based approach focuses the evaluation of the Contractor's performance against these Performance Goals. Progress against these Goals is measured through the use of a set of Objectives. The success of each Objective will be measured based on a set of Notable Outcomes, both objective and subjective, that are to focus primarily on end-results or impact and not on processes or activities. Notable Outcomes 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 Notable Outcomes

The following sections describe the Performance Goals, their supporting Objectives, and associated Notable Outcomes for FY 2010.

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 35.4%.

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

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers as identified below. The overall Goal score from each HQ Program Office and/or customer is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Tables 1.1, 1.2, & 1.3). Weightings for each Customer listed below are preliminary, based upon FY 2008 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 2010.

- Office of Science (SC) (87.2%)
- Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) (9.4%)
- Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy (FE) (3.4%)

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

cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers for which the Laboratory conducts work. Should one or more of the HQ Program Offices choose not to provide an evaluation for this Goal and its corresponding Objectives the weighting for the remaining HQ Program Offices shall be recalculated based on their percentage of BA for FY 2010 as compared to the total BA for those remaining HQ Program Offices.

Objectives:

1.1 Science and Technology Results Provide Meaningful Impact on the Field

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

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

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

1.2 Provide Quality Leadership in Science and Technology

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

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

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

F	Gross scientific incompetence and/or scientific fraud.
----------	--

1.3 Provide and sustain Outputs that Advance Program Objectives & Goals

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

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

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

1.4 Provide for Effective Delivery of Products

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

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

A to A+	Program/project goals and/or milestones are met well ahead of schedule and/or well under budget; program/project and/or mission objective(s) are fully meet and results anticipate HQ guidance.
B⁺	Program/project goals and/or milestones are primarily met on schedule and within budget;

	program/project and/or mission objective(s) are fully meet and are fully responsive to HQ guidance.
B	Most program/project goals and/or milestones are met on schedule and within budget; overall program/project and/or mission objective(s) are meet; minor delays, overruns, and/or deficiencies are minimized and/or have little to no adverse impact the overall program/project.
C	A number of and/or key program/project goals and/or milestones are not met within the scheduled timeframe(s) (e.g less than 6 months behind) and/or within the agreed upon budget (e.g., less than 15% over); overall program/project and/or mission objective(s) have not been met or have the potential to be missed; delays, overruns, and/or deficiencies are identified which have the potential to adversely impact the overall program/project is not corrected.
D	Most of and/or key program/project goals and/or milestones are not met within the scheduled timeframe(s) (e.g more than 6 months behind) and/or within the agreed upon budget (e.g., less than 25% over); overall program/project and/or mission objective(s) have not been met or have the potential to be missed; sizeable delays, overruns, and/or deficiencies are identified which have negatively impacted the overall program/project.
F	All and/or key program/project goals and/or milestones are not met within the scheduled timeframe(s) (e.g more than 9 months behind) and/or within the agreed upon budget (e.g., greater than 25% over); overall program/project and/or mission objective(s) have not been met; significant delays, overruns, and/or deficiencies are identified which have negatively impacted the overall program/project.

Office of Science Program Office Notable Outcomes

- ASCR: Emphasis in FY 2010 should be on the timely completion of ARRA milestones for the Magellan and Advanced Networking Initiative projects. (Objectives 1.1, 1.4)

Science Program Office²	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Research					
1.1 Impact			40%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			15%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
Overall ASCR Total					
Office of Basic Energy Sciences					
1.1 Impact			45%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			15%		
1.4 Delivery			10%		
Overall BES Total					
Office of Biological and Environmental Research					
1.1 Impact			30%		
1.2 Leadership			20%		
1.3 Output			20%		
1.4 Delivery			30%		
Overall BER Total					
Office of Fusion Energy Sciences					
1.1 Impact			30%		
1.2 Leadership			20%		
1.3 Output			25%		
1.4 Delivery			25%		
Overall FES Total					
Office of High Energy Physics					
1.1 Impact			30%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			20%		
1.4 Delivery			20%		
Overall HEP Total					
Office of Nuclear Physics					
1.1 Impact			35%		
1.2 Leadership			25%		
1.3 Output			25%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
Overall NP Total					
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists					
1.1 Impact			TBD%		
1.2 Leadership			TBD%		
1.3 Output			TBD%		
1.4 Delivery			TBD%		
Overall WDTS Total					

Table 1.1 – 1.0 SC Program Office Performance Goal Score Development

² 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			24.9%		
Office of Basic Energy Sciences			24.2%		
Office of Biological and Environmental Research			17.0%		
Office of Fusion Energy Sciences			1.6%		
Office of High Energy Physics			13.1%		
Office of Nuclear Physics			6.1%		
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists			0.3%		
Performance Goal 1.0 Total					

Table 1.2 – SC Program Office Overall Performance Goal Score Development³

HQ Program Office ⁴	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy					
1.1 Impact			TBD%		
1.2 Leadership			TBD%		
1.3 Output			TBD%		
1.4 Delivery			TBD%		
Overall EERE Total					
Office of Fossil Energy					
1.1 Impact			TBD%		
1.2 Leadership			TBD%		
1.3 Output			TBD%		
1.4 Delivery			TBD%		
Overall FE 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			87.2%		
Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy			9.4%		
Office of Fossil Energy			3.4%		
Performance Goal 1.0 Total					

Table 1.4 – Overall Performance Goal Score Development⁵

³ Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 1.2 are preliminary, based upon FY 2008 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 2010.

⁴ 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.

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

⁵ Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 1.2 are preliminary, based upon FY 2008 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 2010.

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 research facilities; and are responsive to the user community.

The weight of this Goal is 40.7%.

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). Final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2006.

- Office of Science (SC) (100%)

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

A to A+	In addition to meeting all measures under B ⁺ , 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+	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	Fails to meet expectations in one of the areas listed under B+.
C	The laboratory team develops the required analyses and documentation in a timely manner. However, inputs are mundane and lack innovation and commitment to the vision of the acquisition.
D	The potential exists for credible science and business cases to be made for the acquisition, but the laboratory fails to take advantage of the opportunity.
F	Proposed approaches are based on fraudulent assumptions; the science case is weak to non-existent, the business case is seriously flawed.

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

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

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

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

2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities

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

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

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

2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Lab's Research Base and External User Community

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

- The facility is being used to perform influential science;
- Contractor’s efforts to take full advantage of the facility to strengthen the Laboratory’s research base;
- Conversely the facility is strengthened by a resident research community that pushes the envelope of what the facility can do and/or are among the scientific leaders of the community;

- Contractor’s ability to appropriately balance access by internal and external user communities; and
- There is a healthy program of outreach to the scientific community.

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

Office of Science Program Office Notable Outcomes:

- BES: Provide management leadership in planning for future light source. (Objective 2.1)
- FES: Complete the conceptual designs of the NDCX-II project in FY-10 to enable construction of the device towards facilitating experimentation by FY-12. (Objective 2.1)
- HEP: The lab will make significant contributions towards development of the conceptual mission design for the Joint Dark Energy Mission. (Objective 2.1)
- ASCR: If not accomplished by September 30, 2009, deliver to ASCR a plan, with options, for meeting mid-term and long-term NERSC infrastructure needs. (Objective 2.3)
- BER: Emphasis in FY 2010 should be on the timely completion of ARRA milestones for the JGI (Objective 2.3)

DOE HQ Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
SC Office of Advanced Scientific Computing (ASCR)					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			10%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components			10%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			70%		
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base and External User Community			10%		
<hr/>					
SC Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES)					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			20%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components			15%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			50%		
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base and External User Community			15%		
<hr/>					
SC Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER)					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			0%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components			0%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			90%		
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base and External User Community			10%		
<hr/>					
SC Office of Fusion Energy Science (FES)					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			45%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components			55%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			0%		
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base and External User Community			0%		
<hr/>					
SC Office of High Energy Physics (HEP)					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			40%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication			60%		

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

Table 2.1 –DOE Program Office Performance Goal 2.0 Score Development

DOE HQ Program Office ⁶	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
SC Office of Advanced Scientific Computing (ASCR)			22.8%		
SC Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES)			34.4%		
SC Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER)			22.7%		
SC Office of High Energy Physics (HEP)			14.1%		
SC Office of Nuclear Physics (NP)			6.0%		
Overall Program Office Total					

Table 2.2 – Overall Performance Goal 2.0 Score Development⁷

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

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

⁷ Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 2.2 are preliminary, based upon FY 2008 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 2010.

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 23.9%.

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

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers as identified below. The overall Goal score from each HQ Program Office and/or customer is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 3.1, 3.2, & 3.3). Weightings for each Customer listed below are preliminary, based upon FY 2008 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 2010 provided by the Program Offices listed below.

- Office of Science (SC) (90.9%)
- Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) (6.9%)
- Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy (FE) (2.1%)

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned by each of the offices identified above by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 3.4 below). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 3.5 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as viewed by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers for which the Laboratory conducts work. Should one or more of the HQ Program Offices choose not to provide an evaluation for this Goal and its corresponding Objectives the weighting for the remaining HQ Program Offices shall be recalculated based on their percentage of BA for FY 2010 as compared to the total BA for those remaining HQ Program Offices.

Objectives:

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

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

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

A to	Providing strong programmatic vision that extends past the laboratory and for which the lab
A+	is a recognized leader within SC and in the broader research communities; development

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

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

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

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

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

3.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Communications and Responsiveness to Customer Needs

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

- The quality, accuracy and timeliness of response to customer requests for information;
- The extent to which the Contractor keeps the customer informed of both positive and negative events at the Laboratory so that the customer can deal effectively with both internal and external constituencies; and
- The ease of determining the appropriate contact (who is on-point for what).

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

Office of Science Program Office Notable Outcomes:

- BER: Emphasis in FY 2010 should be on the timely completion of ARRA milestones for JBEI. (Objective 3.2)
- BES: Provide effective oversight of the management and initial operations of the Energy Frontier Research Center: “Center for Nanoscale Control of Geologic CO₂.” (Objective 3.2)
- BES: Provide effective scientific leadership and management for the Solar Energy Research Center. (Objective 3.2)
- NP: Provide increased management oversight for the CUORE project. (Objective 3.2)

Science Program Office⁸	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Research					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			30%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			30%		
Overall ASCR Total					
Office of Basic Energy Sciences					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			30%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			40%		
Overall BES Total					
Office of Biological and Environmental Research					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			20%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			30%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			50%		
Overall BER Total					
Office of Fusion Energy Sciences					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			35%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			30%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			35%		
Overall FES Total					
Office of High Energy Physics					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			20%		
Overall HEP Total					
Office of Nuclear Physics					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			35%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			25%		
Overall NP Total					
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			20%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			40%		
Overall WDTS Total					

Table 3.1 – 3.0 SC Program Office Performance Goal Score Development

⁸ 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			18.4%		
Office of Basic Energy Sciences			23.9%		
Office of Biological and Environmental Research			25.1%		
Office of Fusion Energy Sciences			2.0%		
Office of High Energy Physics			14.5%		
Office of Nuclear Physics			6.7%		
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists			0.2%		
Performance Goal 1.0 Total					

Table 3.2 – SC Program Office Overall Performance Goal Score Development⁹

HQ Program Office ¹⁰	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			TBD%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			TBD%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			TBD%		
Overall EERE Total					
Office of Fossil Energy					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			TBD%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			TBD%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			TBD%		
Overall FE Total					

Table 3.3 – 3.0 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			90.9%		
Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy			6.9%		
Office of Fossil Energy			2.1%		
Performance Goal 1.0 Total					

Table 3.4 – Overall Performance Goal Score Development¹¹

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
--------------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	--------------

⁹ Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 3.2 are preliminary, based upon FY 2008 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 2010.

¹⁰ 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.

¹¹ Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 3.4 are preliminary, based upon FY 2008 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 2010.

Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F
-------------	----	---	----	----	---	----	----	---	----	---	---

Table 3.5 – 3.0 Goal Final Letter Grade

PART B – MANAGEMENT & OPERATIONS COMPONENT

4.0 Provide Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory

The weight of the Goal is 25%.

This Goal evaluates the Contractor's Leadership capabilities in leading the direction of the overall Laboratory, the responsiveness of the Contractor to issues and opportunities for continuous improvement, and corporate office involvement/commitment to the overall success of the Laboratory.

4.1 Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory (Provide a Distinctive Vision for the Laboratory and an Effective Plan for Accomplishment of the Vision to Include Strong Partnerships Required to Carry Out those Plans)

4.2 Management and Operation of the Laboratory (Provide for Responsive and Accountable Leadership throughout the Organization)

4.3 Contractor Value-added (Provide Efficient and Effective Corporate Office Support as Appropriate)

In measuring the performance of the above Objectives, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider performance trends, outcomes and continuous improvement in overall Contractor Leadership's planning for, integration of, responsiveness to and support for the overall success of the Laboratory. This may include, but is not limited to, the quality of Laboratory Vision/Mission strategic planning documentation and progress in realizing the Laboratory vision/mission; the ability to establish and maintain long-term partnerships/relationships with the scientific and local communities as well as private industry that advance, expand, and benefit the ongoing Laboratory mission(s) and/or provide new opportunities/capabilities; implementation of a robust assurance system; Laboratory and Corporate Office Leadership's ability to instill responsibility and accountability down and through the entire organization; overall effectiveness of communications with DOE; understanding, management and allocation of the costs of doing business at the Laboratory commensurate with associated risks and benefits; utilization of corporate resources to establish joint appointments or other programs/projects/activities to strengthen the Laboratory; and advancing excellence in stakeholder relations to include good corporate citizenship within the local community.

Notable Outcome: Laboratory leadership will develop a strategic plan for the future scientific and technical activities of the Laboratory, which aligns with Office of Science and Department goals, and a detailed strategy for executing the plan during the next 2-5 years. (Objective 4.1)

Notable Outcome: Laboratory leadership will provide a strategy for its Work for Others (WFO) program; the WFO program should align with and support Office of Science, Department, and Laboratory goals. (Objective 4.1)

Notable Outcome: Laboratory leadership will make significant progress in defining and implementing its contractor assurance system. It is expected that a collaborative and uniform approach to this issue among all contractors will be evident. (Objective 4.2)

Notable Outcome: Laboratory leadership demonstrates dramatic progress toward creating and implementing an effective integrated safety management system at LBNL. (Objective 4.2)

Notable Outcome: Laboratory leadership develops a more comprehensive infrastructure strategy that is more tightly integrated with the Laboratory's scientific vision, and which is explicit about the future of both on and off-campus infrastructure needs (including, explicitly, Old Town). (Objective 4.2)

Notable Outcome: The contractor will fill all key leadership positions at the Laboratory in a timely manner. (Objective 4.3)

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Weighted Score	Total Points
4.0 Provide Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory					
4.1 Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory			33%		
4.2 Management and Operation of the Laboratory			33%		
4.3 Contractor Value-added			34%		
Performance Goal 4.0 Total					

Table 4.1 – Goal 4.0 Performance Rating Development

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

Table 4.2 – Goal 4.0 Final Letter Grade

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

The weight of this goal is 27%.

This Goal evaluates the Contractor’s overall success in deploying, implementing, and improving integrated ES&H systems that efficiently and effectively support the mission(s) of the Laboratory.

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

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

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

In measuring the performance of the above Objectives, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider performance trends, outcomes and continuous improvement in protecting workers, the public and the environment. This may include, but is not limited to, minimizing the occurrence of environment, safety and health (ESH) incidents; effectiveness of the Integrated Safety Management (ISM) system relative to the Core Functions and Guiding Principles of ISM and addresses efficiency with respect to the performance of the ISM program at the Laboratory; the effectiveness of work planning, feedback, and improvement processes; the strength of the safety culture throughout the Laboratory; the effective development, implementation and maintenance of an efficient and effective Environmental Management system covering cradle to grave Laboratory level management of waste, pollution prevention and regulatory compliance; and the effectiveness of responses to identified hazards and/or incidents.

Notable Outcome: LBNL will continue improvement of an institutionally integrated ES&H program. Improvements will be demonstrated by successful completion of corrective actions documented in the ISM Improvement Project Plan. 90% of corrective actions scheduled for completion during FY10 will be completed.(Objective 5.1)

Notable Outcome: LBNL will maintain an effective ISM program. LBNL will demonstrate self-identification and reporting, thorough analysis, comprehensive development of corrective actions, timely implementation of corrective actions, and effective communication to DOE-BSO of other EHS-related issues and events.(Objective 5.2)

Notable Outcome: LBNL will develop, implement, and maintain an Environmental Management System (EMS) that reflects the EMS elements and framework found in the International Organization for Standardization’s (ISO) 14001:2004 (E) International Standard or equivalent. LBNL will meet the minimum requirements for green rating on the DOE EMS Annual Report Scorecard, based on guidance developed for federal agencies to comply with the EMS reporting requirements of Executive Order 13423 *Strengthening Federal Environmental, Energy, and Transportation Management*.(Objective 5.3)

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

Table 5.1 – Goal 5.0 Performance Rating Development

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

Table 5.2 – Goal 5.0 Final Letter Grade

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

The weight of this goal is 20%.

This Goal evaluates the Contractor’s overall success in deploying, implementing, and improving integrated business systems that efficiently and effectively support the mission(s) of the Laboratory.

- 6.1 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Financial Management System(s)**
- 6.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition Management System**
- 6.3 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Property Management System**
- 6.4 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Human Resources Management System and Diversity Program**
- 6.5 Provide Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Management Systems for Internal Audit and Oversight; Quality; Information Management; and Other Administrative Support Services as Appropriate**
- 6.6 Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Technology and Commercialization of Intellectual Assets**

In measuring the performance of the above Objectives, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider performance trends, outcomes and continuous improvement in the development, deployment and integration of foundational program (e.g., Quality, Financial Management, Acquisition Management, Requirements Management, and Human Resource Management) systems across the Laboratory. This may include, but is not limited to, minimizing the occurrence of management systems support issues; quality of work products; continual improvement and improvement driven by the results of audits, reviews, and other performance information; the integration of system performance metrics and trends; the degree of knowledge and appropriate utilization of established system processes/procedures by Contractor management and staff; benchmarking and performance trending analysis. The DOE evaluator(s) shall also consider the stewardship of the pipeline of innovations and resulting intellectual assets at the Laboratory along with impacts and returns created/generated as a result of technology transfer and intellectual asset deployment activities.

Notable Outcome: LBNL will implement a comprehensive institutional program for managing ARRA funds received by the Laboratory. LBNL will demonstrate funds were satisfactorily managed in accordance with ARRA requirements through internal and external audits. (Objective 6.1)

Notable Outcome: LBNL will continue improvement of its Human Resources program. LBNL will satisfactorily complete an outside Peer Review of the Human Resources Department and Diversity Program focusing on the HR Strategy, Structure, Operations, and Funding Model supporting the mission of the Laboratory with appropriate HR practices. (Objective 6.4)

Notable Outcome: LBNL will maintain an efficient, effective, and responsive Internal Audit function. LBNL will complete 90% of the Audit Committee and DOE-approved annual audit plan, including completion of the "Transparency and Oversight over the American Recovery & Reinvestment Act Funds" audit during the performance period.(Objective 6.5)

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Weighted Score	Total Points
6.0 Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission(s)					
6.1 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Financial Management System(s).			30%		
6.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition Management System(s)			20%		
6.3 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Property Management System			15%		
6.4 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Human Resources Management System and Diversity Program			15%		
6.5 Provide efficient, effective, and Responsive Management Systems for Internal Audit and Oversight, Quality; Information Management; and Other Administrative Support Services as Appropriate			10%		
6.6 Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Technology and Commercialization of Intellectual Assets			10%		
Performance Goal 6.0 Total					

Table 6.1 – Goal 6.0 Performance Rating Development

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

Table 6.2 – Goal 6.0 Final Letter Grade

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

The weight of this goal is 20%.

This Goal evaluates 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 mission(s) and complex challenges.

7.1 Manage Facilities and Infrastructure in an Efficient and Effective Manner that Optimizes Usage, Minimizes Life Cycle Costs, and Ensures Site Capability to Meet Mission Needs

7.2 Provide Planning for and Acquire the Facilities and Infrastructure Required to support the Continuation and Growth of Laboratory Missions and Programs

In measuring the performance of the above Objectives, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider performance trends, outcomes and continuous improvement in facility and infrastructure programs. This may include, but is not limited to, the management of real property assets to maintain effective operational safety, worker health, environmental protection and compliance, property preservation, and cost effectiveness; effective facility utilization, maintenance and budget execution; day-to-day management and utilization of space in the active portfolio; maintenance and renewal of building systems, structures and components associated with the Laboratory’s facility and land assets; management of energy use and conservation practices; the integration and alignment of the Laboratory’s comprehensive strategic plan with capabilities; facility planning, forecasting, and acquisition; the delivery of accurate and timely information required to carry out the critical decision and budget formulation process; quality of site and facility planning documents; and Cost and Schedule Performance Index performance for construction projects.

Notable Outcome: LBNL will demonstrate satisfactory progress towards a robust institutional maintenance program by implementing a documented set of processes for planning, budgeting and implementation according to a Maintenance Improvement Project Plan. (Objective 7.1)

Notable Outcome: Utilizing the Mission Readiness process, LBNL will develop a multi-year investment strategy aligned with the Laboratory’s scientific vision to address identified mission needs.(Objectives 7.1 and 7.2)

Notable Outcome: LBNL will execute SLI Line Item and ARRA funded GPP Projects during FY10 on cost and schedule.(Objective 7.2)

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

Table 7.1 –Goal 7.0 Performance Rating Development

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

Table 7.2 – Goal 7.0 Final Letter Grade

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

The weight of this goal is 8%.

This Goal evaluates 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.

8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System

8.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for Cyber-Security

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

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

In measuring the performance of the above Objectives, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider performance trends, outcomes and continuous improvement in the safeguards and security, cyber security and emergency management program systems. This may include, but is not limited to, the commitment of leadership to strong safeguards and security, cyber security and emergency management systems; the integration of these systems into the culture of the Laboratory; the degree of knowledge and appropriate utilization of established system processes/procedures by Contractor management and staff; maintenance and the appropriate utilization of Safeguards, Security, and Cyber risk identification, prevention, and control processes/activities; and the prevention and management controls and prompt reporting and mitigation of events as necessary.

Notable Outcome: LBNL will demonstrate improvements in the emergency management program. LBNL will complete performance-year deliverables for the emergency management program as documented in the DOE-approved action plan. (Objective 8.1)

Notable Outcome: LBNL's cyber security program provides cost-effective, mission-friendly protection of its scientific and operational computing assets. No reasonably preventable cyber security incidents significantly interfere with scientific or operational work, as measured by the incident review process.(Objective 8.2)

Notable Outcome: LBNL demonstrates implementation of a comprehensive institutional program for managing Laboratory-owned and utilized special nuclear materials. Assessment demonstrating consistent and effective implementation is completed by September 30, 2010. (Objective 8.3)

Notable Outcome: LBNL will implement a physical security program consistent with the approved Site Security Plan.(Objective 8.3)

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

Table 8.1 – Goal 8.0 Performance Rating Development

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

Table 8.2 – Goal 8.0 Final Letter Grade

Attachment I – Program Office Goal & Objective Weightings

Office of Science

		ASCR	BES	BER	FES	HEP	NP	WDTS
		Wt	Wt	Wt	Wt	Wt	Wt	Wt
Goal #1 Mission Accomplishment								
	Goal's weight	40	30	25	30	35	40	65
1.1 Impact (significance)		40	45	30	30	30	35	25
1.2 Leadership		30	30	20	20	30	25	30
1.3 Output (productivity)		15	15	20	25	20	25	30
1.4 Delivery		15	10	30	25	20	15	15
Goal #2 Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operation of Facilities								
	Goal's weight	40	50	50	40	35	30	0
2.1 Design of Facility (the initiation phase and the definition phase, i.e. activities leading up to CD-2)		10	20	0	55	40	0	0
2.2 Construction of Facility/Fabrication of Components (execution phase, Post CD-2 to CD-4)		10	15	0	45	60	0	0
2.3 Operation of Facility		70	50	90	0	0	85	0
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Lab's Research Base		10	15	10	0	0	15	0
Goal #3 Program Management								
	Goal's weight	20	20	25	30	30	30	35
3.1 Stewardship of Scientific Capabilities and Programmatic Vision		30	40	20	35	40	40	20
3.2 Program Planning and Management		40	30	30	30	40	35	40
3.3 Program Management-Communication & Responsiveness (to HQ)		30	30	50	35	20	25	40

All Other Customers¹²

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

¹² Goal and Objective weightings indicated for non-science customers are reflective of FY 2009 weightings and will be updated as those customers provide their weightings. Final Goal and Objective weightings will be incorporated, as appropriate, once they are determined by each HQ Program Office and provided to the Site Office. Should a HQ Program Office fail to provide final Goal and Objective weightings before the end of the first quarter FY 2009 the preliminary weightings provided shall become final.