AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE	OF	PAGES
	1		1

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICAITON NO.	3. EFFECTIVE DATE	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.	5. PROJECT NO. (If applicble)
M049	October 1, 2007		

6. ISSUED BY	CODE	7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6)	CODE
U.S. Department of Energy TJNAF Site Office 12000 Jefferson Avenue Newport News, Virginia 23606			

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, county, State and ZIP Code)	(X)	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICIATION NO.
Jefferson Science Associates, LLC 12000 Jefferson Avenue Newport News, Virginia 23606		9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11)
		10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO. DE-AC05-06OR23177
	X	10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) April 14, 2006
CODE / FACILITY CODE		

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

☐ The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers ☐ is extended, ☐ is not extended.

Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods:

(a)By completing items 8 and 15, and returning _____ copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment your desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPIRATION DATA (If required)

N/A

13. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO MODIFICATION OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

CHECK ONE	
	A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.
	B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).
	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:
X	IAW Clause H.11 entitled "Standards of Contractor Performance Evaluation."
	D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor ☐ is not, ☒ is required to sign this document and return 2 copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)

1. The purpose of this modification is to incorporate the revised FY 2008 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan dated April 21, 2008 in Appendix B of the contract.

2. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)		16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)	
		James A. Turi, Administrative Contracting Officer	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR (Signature of person authorized to sign)	15C. DATE SIGNED 4/28/08	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (Signature of Contracting Officer)	16C. DATE SIGNED 5/2/08

April 21, 2008

October 1, 2007 – September 30, 2008

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND MEASUREMENT PLAN

Management and Operations of the Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility (TJNAF)

U.S. Department of Energy

and

Jefferson Science Associates, LLC

Contract No. DE-AC05-06OR623177

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

The overall performance against each Objective of this performance plan, to include the evaluation of Performance Measures identified for each Objective, shall be evaluated jointly by the HQ office or major customer and the TJSO. This cooperative review methodology will ensure that the overall evaluation of the Contractor results in a consolidated DOE position taking into account specific Performance Measures as well as all additional information not otherwise identified via specific Performance Measures. The TJSO 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 below 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 Performance Measures of performance identified, along with the weightings assigned to each Goal and Objective and a table for calculating the final score for each Goal.

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

The FY 2008 Contractor performance grades for each Goal will be determined based on the weighted sum of the individual scores earned for each of the Objectives described within this document for Science and Technology and for Management and Operations. No overall rollup grade will be provided. The rollup of the performance of each Goal will then be utilized to determine the Contractor performance score for Science and Technology and Management and Operations (see Table A below). The total overall score

derived for Science and Technology will be utilized to determine the amount of available fee that may be earned (see Table C). The overall score derived for Management and Operations will be utilized to determine the multiplier to be applied (see Table C) to the Science and Technology fee earned to determine the final amount of fee earned for FY2008. Each Goal is composed of two or more weighted Objectives and each Objective has a set of Performance Measures, which are identified to assist the reviewer in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each of the Performance Measures identifies significant activities, requirements, and/or milestones important to the success of the corresponding Objective and shall be utilized as the primary means of determining the Contractor's success in meeting the Objective. Although the Performance Measures are the primary means for determining performance, other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources to include, but not limited to, the Contractor's self-evaluation report, operational awareness (daily oversight) activities; "For Cause" reviews (if any); other outside agency reviews (OIG, GAO, DCAA, etc.) and the annual two week review (if needed), may be utilized in determining the Contractor's overall success in meeting an Objective. The following describes the methodology for determining the Contractor's grade for each Goal:

Performance Evaluation Methodology:

The purpose of this section is to establish a methodology to develop scoring at the Objective level. Each Objective within a Goal shall be assigned a numerical score, per Figure I-1 below, by the evaluating office. Each evaluation will measure the degree of effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in meeting the Objective and shall be based on the Contractor's success in meeting the set of Performance Measures identified for each Objective as well as other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources as identified above.

The set of Performance Measures identified for each Objective represent the set of significant indicators that if fully met, collectively places performance for the Objectives in the "B+" grade range. For some targets, it serves the evaluator to provide additional grading details (for example at the A, C+, and D levels) and in those cases details have been included in the PEMP. However, these should be considered as guidelines that do not restrict the evaluator from considering other factors that contribute to the evaluation.

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

Letter Grade	Numeric Grade	Definition
B+	3.4 – 3.1	Meets expectations of performance as set by the performance measures identified for each Objective with no notable areas of increased or diminished performance identified. Deficiencies identified are offset by positive performance and have little to no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
B	3.0 – 2.8	Most expectations of performance as set by the performance measures identified for each Objective are met and/or other minor deficiencies are identified. Performance measures or other minor deficiencies identified are offset by positive performance within the purview of the Objective and have little to no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
B-	2.7 – 2.5	One or two expectations of performance set by the performance measures are not met and/or other deficiencies are identified and although they may be offset by other positive performance, they may have the potential to negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
C+	2.4 – 2.1	Some expectations of performance set by the performance measures are not met and/or other minor deficiencies are identified and although they may be offset by other positive performance, they may have the potential to negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
C	2.0 – 1.8	A number of expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or a number of other deficiencies are identified and although they may be somewhat offset by other positive performance, they have the potential to negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
C-	1.7 – 1.1	Most expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or other major deficiencies are identified which have or will negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment if not immediately corrected.
D	1.0 – 0.8	Most or all expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or other significant deficiencies are identified which have negatively impacted the Objective and/or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
F	0.7 – 0	All expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or other significant deficiencies are identified which have significantly impacted both the Objective and the accomplishment of the Laboratory mission.

Figure I-1. Letter Grade and Numerical Score Definitions

Calculating Individual Goal Scores and Letter Grades:

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

The raw score from each calculation shall be carried through to the next stage of the calculation process. The raw score for Science and Technology and Management and Operations will be rounded to the nearest tenth of a point for purposes of determining fee as indicated in Table C. A standard rounding

convention of x .44 and less rounds down to the nearest tenth (here, x.4), while x.45 and greater rounds up to the nearest tenth (here, x.50).

S&T Performance Goal	Numerical Score	Letter Grade	Weight[1]	Weighted Score	Total Score
1.0 Mission Accomplishment			40%		
2.0 Construction and Operations of User Research Facilities and Equipment			40%		
3.0 Science and Technology Research Project/Program Management			20%		
				Total Score	
M&O Performance Goal	**Numerical Score**	**Letter Grade**	**Weight**	**Weighted Score**	**Total Score**
4.0 Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory			20%		
5.0 Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection			30%		
6.0 Business Systems			20%		
7.0 Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio			15%		
8.0 Integrated Safeguards and Security Management and Emergency Management Systems			15%		
				Total Score	

Table A. FY 2008 Contractor Evaluation Score Calculation

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

Table B. FY 2008 Contractor Letter Grade Scale

[1] Weightings for Goals 1, 2 and 3 are preliminary, based upon FY2007 Budget Authority figures, and are provided here for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for calculating weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2008.

Determining the Amount of Performance-Based Fee Earned:
The total available FY08 performance fee is $3,100,000.00. The percentage of the available performance-based fee that may be earned by the Contractor shall be determined based on the overall weighted score for the S&T Goals (see Table A. above) and then compared to Table C. below. The overall numerical score of the M&O Goals from Table A. above shall then be utilized to determine the final fee multiplier (see Table C.), which shall be utilized to determine the overall amount of performance-based fee earned for FY2008 as calculated within Table D.

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

Table C. Performance-Based Fee Earned Scale

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

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

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

The lack of performance objectives and measures in this plan does 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 two 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 relating to safeguarding of classified information and to adequate protection of the 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 Science and Technology and Management and Operations components results in scores within the shaded areas of Table C, which would be scores of 3.5 or higher for Science and Technology and 3.1 or higher for the Management and Operations component. Not withstanding the overall scores earned, if the Contractor scores less than a 3.1 in any Science and Technology Goal or less than 2.5 in any Management and Operations Goal, the Contractor will not be eligible for award term.

II. PERFORMANCE GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Background

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

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

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

Performance Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures

The following sections describe the Performance Goals, their supporting Objectives, and associated performance measures for FY2008.

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 40%.

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 Program Office as identified below. The overall Goal score from each HQ Program Office is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table

1.1). Weightings for each office listed below are preliminary, based upon FY 2007 Budget Authority figures, and are provided here for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2008.

- Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research (ASCR) (<1%)
- Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER) (<1%)
- Office of Science - Nuclear Physics (NP) (99%)
- Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS) (<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 1.2 below). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 1.3 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. Individual Program Office weightings for each of the Objectives identified below are provided within Table 1.1. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as viewed by the Office of Science Program Offices for which the Laboratory conducts work. Should one or more of the HQ Program Offices choose not to provide an evaluation for this Goal and its corresponding Objectives the weighting for the remaining HQ Program Offices shall be recalculated based on their percentage of BA for FY 2008 as compared to the total BA for those remaining HQ Program Offices.

Objectives:

1.1 Science and Technology Results Provide Meaningful Impact on the Field

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

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

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

1.2 Provide Quality Leadership in Science and Technology

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

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

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

1.3 Provide and Sustain Outputs that Advance Program Objectives and Goals

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

Science Program Office[2]	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research					
1.1 Impact			40%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			15%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
				Overall ASCR 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 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			25%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			30%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
				Overall WDTS Total	

Table 1.1 - 1.0 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 1 to this plan.

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research			<1%		
Office of Biological and Environmental Research			<1%		
Office of Nuclear Physics			99%		
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists			<1%		
				Performance Goal 1.0 Total	

Table 1.2 – Overall Performance Goal Score Development[3]

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

Table 1.3 – 1.0 Goal Final Letter Grade

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

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

The weight of this goal is 40%.

The Provide for Efficient and Effective Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operations of 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 Program Office as identified below. The overall Goal score from each SC Program Office is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 2.1). Weightings for each office listed below are preliminary, based upon FY 2007 Budget Authority figures, and are provided here for informational purposed only. Final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2008.

- Office of Science - Nuclear Physics (NP) (100%)

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

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 2.2 below). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 2.3 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. Individual Program Office weightings for each of the Objectives identified below are provided within Table 2.1. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as viewed by the Office of Nuclear Physics.

Objectives:

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

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

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

A to 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 appraised of the status, near-term plans and the resolution of problems on a regular basis. Anticipates emerging issues that could impact plans and takes the initiative to inform DOE of possible consequences.
B	Fails to meet expectations in one of the areas listed under B+.
C	The laboratory team develops the required analyses and documentation in a timely manner. However, inputs are mundane and lack innovation and commitment to the vision of the acquisition.
D	The potential exists for credible science and business cases to be made for the acquisition, but the laboratory fails to take advantage of the opportunity.
F	Proposed approaches are based on fraudulent assumptions; the science case is weak to non-existent, the business case is seriously flawed.

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

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

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

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

2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities

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

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

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

2.4 Utilization of Facility 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 laboratory is establishing an external and internal user community, but laboratory is still not capitalizing fully on existence of the facility to grow internal capabilities an/or reach out to external users.
C	Reviews state that the laboratory has made satisfactory use of the facility, but has not demonstrated much innovation.
D	Few facility users, with none using it in novel ways; research base is very thin.
F	Laboratory does not know how to operate/use its own facility adequately.

Science Program Office[4]	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Nuclear Physics					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			0%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components			25%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			60%		
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base and External User Community			15%		
				Overall NP Total	

Table 2.1 – 2.0 Program Office Performance Goal Score Development

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Nuclear Physics			100%		
				Overall Program Office Total	

Table 2.2 – Overall Performance Goal Score Development[5]

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

[5] Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 2.2 are preliminary, based upon FY 2007Budget Authority figures, and are provided for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for

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 – 2.0 Goal Final Letter Grade

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 20%.

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 Program Office as identified below. The overall Goal score from each Program Office is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 3.1). Weightings for each Customer listed below are preliminary, based upon FY 2007 Budget Authority figures, and are provided here for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2008.

- Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research (ASCR) (<1%)
- Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER) (<1%)
- Office of Science - Nuclear Physics (NP) (99%)
- Office of Science - Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS) (<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 3.2 below). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 3.3 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. Individual Program Office weightings for each of the Objectives identified below are provided within Table 3.1. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as viewed by the Office of Science Program Offices for which the Laboratory conducts work. Should one or more of the HQ Program Offices choose not to provide an evaluation for this Goal and its corresponding Objectives the weighting for the remaining HQ Program Offices shall be recalculated based on their percentage of BA for FY 2008 as compared to the total BA for those remaining HQ Program Offices.

---

determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2008.

Objectives:

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

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

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

A to A+	Providing strong programmatic vision that extends past the laboratory and for which the laboratory 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 are 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.).

Grade	Performance
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 laboratory 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 laboratory'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).

Grade	Performance
A to A+	Communication channels are well-defined and information is effectively conveyed; important or critical information is delivered in real time; responses to HQ requests for information from laboratory representatives are prompt, thorough, correct and succinct; laboratory representatives *always* initiate a communication with HQ on emerging issues.
B+	Good communication is valued by all staff throughout the contractor organization; responses to requests for information are thorough and are provided in a timely manner; the integrity of the information provided is never in doubt.
B	Evidence of good communications is noted throughout the contractor organization and responses to requests for information provide the minimum requirements to meet HQ needs; with the exception of a few minor instances HQ is alerted to emerging issues.
C	Laboratory representatives recognize the value of sound communication with HQ to the mission of the laboratory. However, laboratory management fails to demonstrate that its employees are held accountable for ensuring effective communication and responsiveness; laboratory representatives do not take the initiative to alert HQ to emerging issues.
D	Communications from the laboratory are well-intentioned but generally incompetent; the laboratory management does not understand the importance of effective communication and responsiveness to the mission of the laboratory.
F	Contractor representatives are openly hostile and/or non-responsive – emails and phone calls

	are consistently ignored; communications typically do not address the request; information provided can be incorrect, inaccurate or fraudulent – information is not organized, is incomplete, or is fabricated.

Science Program Office[6]	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research					
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 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 Nuclear Physics					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			20%		
				Overall NP Total	
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists					
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 Program Office Performance Goal Score Development

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

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research			<1%		
Office of Biological and Environmental Research			<1%		
Office of Nuclear Physics			99%		
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists			<1%		
				Performance Goal 1.0 Total	

Table 3.2 – Overall Performance Goal Score Development[7]

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

Table 3.3 - 3.0 Goal Final Letter Grade

[7] Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 3.1 and Table 3.2 are preliminary, based upon FY 2007 Budget Authority figures, and are provided for informational purposes only. Final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2008.

Attachment 1

Office of Science Program Office Goal & Objective Weightings

SC Program Offices	ASCR	BER	NP	WDTS
	Weight	Weight	Weight	Weight
Goal 1.0 Mission Accomplishment				
Goal Weight	**80%**	**75%**	**40%**	**65%**
1.1 Impact (significance)	40%	30%	35%	25%
1.2 Leadership (recognition of S&T accomplishments)	30%	20%	25%	30%
1.3 Output (productivity)	15%	20%	25%	30%
1.4 Delivery	15%	30%	15%	15%
Goal 2.0 Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operation of Facilities				
Goal Weight	**N/A**	**N/A**	**40%**	**N/A**
2.1 Design of Facility (the initiation phase and the definition phase, i.e. activities leading up to CD-2)			0%	
2.2 Construction of Facility/Fabrication of Components (execution phase, Post CD-2 to CD-4)			25%	
2.3 Operation of Facility			60%	
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Lab's Research Base and External User Community			15%	
Goal 3.0 Program Management				
Goal Weight	**20%**	**25%**	**20%**	**35%**
3.1 Stewardship of Scientific Capabilities and Programmatic Vision	30%	20%	40%	20%
3.2 Program Planning and Management	40%	30%	40%	40%
3.3 Program Management – Communication and Responsiveness (to HQ)	30%	50%	20%	40%

4.0 PROVIDE SOUND AND COMPETENT LEADERSHIP AND STEWARDSHIP OF THE LABORATORY

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

The weight of this Goal is 20%.

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

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the evaluating office as described within Section I of this document. Each Objective has one or more performance measures, the outcomes of which collectively assist the evaluating office in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each of the performance measures identifies significant tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones for which the outcomes/results are important to the success of the corresponding Objective. Although other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources may be used, the outcomes of performance measures identified for each Objective shall be the primary means of determining the Contractor's success in meeting an Objective. The overall Goal score is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 4.1 at the end of this section). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 4.2 to determine the overall Goal letter grade.

Note: Within Goal 4, the use of "JSA" refers to the laboratory management while the terms "JSA Board" and "Corporate Owners" refer to the corporate entities of SURA and CSC.

Objectives:

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

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

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

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

Measure 4.1.1: JSA's vision (20-year outlook) for the Laboratory addresses outstanding science questions of national priority to DOE. The vision informs and is aligned with that of the DOE Office of Science's and the NSAC long range plan. JSA monitors and reviews regularly its vision to ensure that critical elements (effective leadership, quality workforce, proper planning, outstanding research and operational processes, new initiative development) are in place to achieve the vision and to adapt to changes in plans that maximize the benefit to the Office of Science.

TARGET (B+): JSA's strategic vision is appropriately developed with and reviewed by the JSA Board annually to ensure credibility and relevance and to ensure that it optimally advances DOE's scientific agenda. JSA provides advice on an effective relations strategy that supports the vision and promotes leadership from the user community to communicate the vision.

Measure 4.1.2: The Business Plan (5-year) establishes the management agenda and identifies the opportunities, risks and required resources needed to realize Laboratory goals. The business plan sets the framework to optimize scientific output in a cost effective manner. Integrally, JSA develops a 5 year budget plan as a mechanism by which the Laboratory can ensure its goals are met.

TARGET (B+): JSA works actively with DOE to update the 5-year Business Plan within the established timelines. JSA engages with customers/stakeholders and appropriate outside experts to ensure its 5-year Business Plan, budget plan and site plan are realistic. JSA oversees the development of and monitors the Plan to ensure that Laboratory operations and systems foster program effectiveness.

Measure 4.1.3: The Laboratory has formalized vital collaborations and understandings within and among institutions in academe, users of the Laboratory, other national laboratories, and private sector entities for advancing priority issues in science, scientific workforce, and applications of science and technology.

TARGET (B+): As a user facility, JSA optimizes opportunities to develop and promote effective collaborations such as formal scientific collaborations with other organizations to advance priority issues in science. JSA ensures a world-class scientific staff and associated personnel, including collaborations such as joint and bridged faculty appointments, graduate fellowship programs, and sabbatical programs, all of which contribute to furthering the science priority issues. JSA ensures inclusion of Laboratory initiatives in the NSAC Long Range Plan through active participation on its NSAC subcommittee. JSA monitors the Laboratory's technology transfer and commercialization initiatives, leveraging opportunities to advance Laboratory technologies and capabilities.

Measure 4.1.4: JSA promotes and supports the Laboratory's corporate citizenship programs that encourage community support of the Laboratory and that draw on Laboratory competencies and meet community needs. These corporate citizenship efforts include public outreach and improved scientific literacy. The Laboratory also has an outreach program to the broader scientific community to increase the awareness and scientific community support of the Laboratory and its accomplishments.

TARGET (B+): JSA promotes and supports the Laboratory's high level of awareness with the public, the scientific community and DOE and implements a high level of science education programs to improve scientific literacy. Activities such as a biennial facilities open house for the public; a broad portfolio of science education programs; hosting of high school and middle school science bowls; internships, thesis and poster awards for undergrad and grad students; open lectures on a wide-range of scientific topics; submissions of scientific articles in local, regional, and national news media; and showcasing of experimental results at meetings contribute to a high level of public awareness of the Laboratory, its programs, and science in general.

Measure 4.1.5: Develop a baseline for understanding and trending the cost of doing business.

TARGET (B+): Identify and bin major laboratory costs identifying direct and indirect labor FTEs and costs as well as various operating costs, such as utilities, by December 31, 2007. The cost structure and associated baseline cost of doing business is sufficiently detailed (i.e. including all funding and costs, both direct and indirect with associated FTEs) so the laboratory and the Site Office have a common understanding of how the money is spent and the various cost drivers that effect the laboratory's cost of doing business.

4.2 Provide for Responsive and Accountable Leadership throughout the Organization

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

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

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

Measure 4.2.1: JSA's Board of Directors and its corporate owners assure effective leadership of the Laboratory and provide timely and effective policy guidance and oversight; offer subject matter expertise; facilitate corporate reach back; and provide entrée to vital, external resources for support of science and the programs of the Laboratory. JSA establishes an efficient organization that:

- Focuses the Laboratory Director on corporate, strategic, customer and stakeholder goals, priorities and issues.
- Empowers the Chief Scientist to provide overall direction for balanced, highest impact science.
- Empowers COO to integrate operations and business management functions-deliver more science with efficiencies.
- Optimizes matrix support functions to assure efficient deployment of resources.
- Fully integrates safety throughout the organization.
- Formalizes and documents roles and responsibilities and accountability and authorities.
- Organizes outside support for science and the programs of the Laboratory.

TARGET (B+): The JSA Board and its Committees provide responsible leadership and hold the Laboratory accountable for performance as measured by: reviews of JLab leadership on an annual basis; succession planning for key positions; identification and resolution of strategic issues that can impact the overall performance of the Laboratory; timely response to Laboratory issues and guidance for implementation of effective actions; cognizance of significant issues and monitoring of status of corrective actions; effective process to hold the laboratory management accountable for performance, including an effective and comprehensive self-assessment process; formulation of a safety strategy that is incorporated into management evaluations; effective communication with Laboratory stakeholders to garner support for the initiatives in the DOE Strategic Plan and other initiatives of the Laboratory; an effective and integrated Quality Assurance program.

4.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Corporate Office Support as Appropriate

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

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

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

Measure 4.3.1: The JSA Board provides corporate expertise and reach back to demonstrate its commitment to the success of the Laboratory in its provision of effective leadership and management, business support processes, and infrastructure needs. The JSA Board and its Committees are comprised of experts and leaders in science, education, and industry, who bring to bear tangible and intellectual resources to carry out the primary responsibility to manage and operate the Laboratory in accordance with the JSA/DOE contract and in support of the DOE scientific agenda.

> TARGET (B+): The JSA Board and Committees meet regularly to monitor and ensure that the Laboratory's performance meets or exceeds DOE expectations. The Board and Committees also convene in special meetings to address management and operational issues as they arise and to provide timely guidance to effectively resolve issues. Provides necessary additional resources including reach back through its owners and Board and Committee members to ensure that the necessary leadership and management team, business support processes, and infrastructure needs are addressed appropriately and in support of the Laboratory's vision and business plan. Monitors scientific and operational reviews of the Laboratory and addresses findings in a timely and effective manner mutually acceptable to JSA and DOE. The Board and Committees assess best management practices approaches and systems utilized at the Laboratory to ensure cost effective and efficient support of the Laboratory's mission, and implement corrective actions and/or improvements when warranted or determined necessary to maintain effective support.

Measure 4.3.2: The JSA Board proactively pursues opportunities that strengthen and facilitate the Laboratory's ties to academe and to the user community, both by improving upon current programs and initiatives, and by evaluating newly proposed programs and initiatives that enhance the basic science and research programs of the Laboratory.

> TARGET (B+): Monitors current programs that strengthen the Laboratory/academic connection and the Laboratory/user community to ensure continued relevance and implements programs enhancements as appropriate. Evaluates new proposals that further the Laboratory's science and technology programs and supports the vision and DOE's scientific agenda.

Measure 4.3.3: The JSA Board provides non-DOE resources (personnel and/or funds) through its owners, other organizations, and private sources to support programs, initiatives, and activities that promote and/or enhance the basic science and research programs of the Laboratory, and that support the Laboratory's extended user community.

TARGET (B+): Commit an annual $.5M Initiatives Fund to support programs, initiatives, and activities that strengthen the Laboratory's scientific outreach and users programs and provide for new programs and program enhancement. Provides the relations and outreach support that underpins a successful strategy to acquire other funds and resources (land, personnel) that support Laboratory programs and facilities.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
4.0 Provide Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory					
4.1 Provide a Distinctive Vision for the Laboratory and an Effective Plan for Accomplishment of the Vision to Include Strong Partnerships Required to Carry Out those Plan			30%		
4.2 Provide for Responsive and Accountable Leadership throughout the Organization			35%		
4.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Corporate Support			35%		
				Performance Goal 4.0 Total	

Table 4.1 – 4.0 Program Office Performance Goal Score Development

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

Table 4.2 Final Letter Grade

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

The Contractor shall sustain excellence and enhance effectiveness of integrated safety, health, and environmental protection. (The goal shall measure the Contractor's overall success in preventing worker injury and illness; implement ISM down through and across the organization; and provide effective and efficient waste management, minimization, and pollution prevention.)

The weight of this Goal 30%.

The Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection Goal shall measure the Contractor's overall success in preventing worker injury and illness; implement Integrated Safety Management across the organization; and provide effective and efficient environmental protection.

Each Objective within this goal is to be assigned a numerical score by the evaluating office as described within Section I of this document. Each Objective has one or more measures, the outcomes of which collectively assist DOE in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting that objective. Each of the measures identifies significant tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones for which the outcomes/results of are important to the success of the corresponding objective. Although other performance information available to the DOE from other sources may be used, the outcomes of key measures identified for each objective shall be the primary means of determining the Contractor's success in meeting an objective. The overall goal score is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each objective, and summing them (see Table 5.1 at the end of this section). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 5.2 to determine the overall goal letter grade.

Objectives:

5.1 Provide a Work Environment that Protects Workers and the Environment

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

TARGET (B+): DART Rate = 0.25.

Measure 5.1.2: The Contractor's progress in achieving and maintaining "best-in-class" ES&H program performance as measured by the total reportable case rate (TRCR).

TARGET (B+): TRCR Rate = 0.65.

Measure 5.1.3: 100% of all jobs for which the projected collective Total Effective Dose Equivalent (TEDE) exceeds 100 mrem per Job Specific RWP are reviewed (pre and post job) by a radiological engineer for ALARA considerations. 90% of jobs for which a Job Specific RWP is generated where the collective TEDE does not exceed 100 mrem are reviewed (pre and post task) by a radiological engineer for ALARA considerations.

TARGET (B+): 100% of all jobs for which the projected TEDE exceeds 100 mrem per Job Specific RWP are reviewed (pre and post job) by a radiological engineer for ALARA considerations. 90% of jobs for which a Job Specific RWP is generated where the collective TEDE does not exceed 100 mrem are reviewed (pre and post job) by a radiological engineer for ALARA considerations. Targeted to be within 30 days of RWP close-out. Document that these reviews are conducted in docushare or equivalent. Submit revised RPP and implementation plan by January 4, 2008.

Measure 5.1.4: Number of environmental incidents resulting in administrative or technical permit violations: 1 administrative, 0 technical permit violations. Apply causal analysis principals to environmental incidents if one occurs in this period.

Note: Administrative and technical violations are those issued by the regulatory agency.

TARGET (B+): 1 administrative, 0 technical permit violations.

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

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

- The maintenance and appropriate utilization of hazard identification, prevention, and control processes/activities; and
- An open reporting culture is maintained at the Laboratory while appropriately responding to ESH&Q incidents/emergencies
- Identification of root causes to ES&H non-compliances and implementation of corrective actions
- Extent of the Laboratory's participation in working with other SC Laboratories or other entities/organizations outside SC in both giving and receiving external safety program audits as to advance staff skills and facilitate the sharing of lessons learned.

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

Measure 5.2.1: Number of Management Self Assessments (MSAs) conducted and reviewed and accepted by ESH&Q Division. The number of Independent Assessments (IAs) completed.

TARGET (B+): MSAs and IAs Completed - 100% of number of MSAs conducted and reviewed and accepted by ESH&Q. IAs Completed = 100% - of number scheduled are completed. Completed means IAs are conducted and draft reports are written. At least 30% of major division groups participate (FEL, Engineering, Physics, Accelerator and Facilities Management). Evidence of timely closure with verification for all ORPS, NTS, MSAs, IAs, and external assessments with Significance Level of 3 or higher.

Measure 5.2.2: Maintain an open reporting culture through an established employee concerns program, infusing management expectations in performance appraisals, conducting Director's Safety Council and Worker Safety Committees, providing training, and rewarding performance.

TARGET (B+): Every six weeks hold rotating senior JSA/TJSO safety focus meetings with Laboratory Director, COO, Chief Scientist, Accelerator Representative, Physics Representative, Engineering Representative, FEL Representative, ESH&Q and Facilities Management. Evaluate and trend employee concerns. The Worker's Safety Committee is actively engaged in improving laboratory safety and conducts at least quarterly employee led Worker Safety Committee meeting with the Laboratory Director and COO. Efforts to continue activities promoting safety culture improvement will be evident.

Measure 5.2.3: Implement the pressure safety requirements of 10CFR851 in accordance with the JLab non-compliance tracking system (NTS) submittal.

TARGET (B+): Complete all actions as scheduled in the NTS submittal for pressure safety implementation.

Measure 5.2.4: Number of work observations on average per week and observations conducted are documented.

For the purposes of this measure, observations are performed by supervisors and managers or their designee.

TARGET (B+): Conduct three work observations on average per week during the scheduled accelerator down (SAD) and at least one work observation per week on average for each major division (Accelerator, FEL, Physics, and Facilities. Document that these observations were conducted in docushare or equivalent.
*These observations can be performed by supervisor or designee.

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

Measure 5.3.1: EMS scorecard self-evaluation is Grade C or better in majority of categories (D is best grade).

TARGET (B+): Six of eight responses of grade C or better and no responses of "A".

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	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 Environment Management			60%		
5.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Waste Management, Minimization, and Pollution Prevention			10%		
				Performance Goal 5.0 Total	

Table 5.1 – 5.0 Program Office Performance Goal Score Development

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

Table 5.2 Final Letter Grade

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

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

The weight of this Goal is 20%.

They Provide Business Systems that Efficiently and Effectively Support the Overall Mission of the Laboratory. Goal shall measure the Contractor's overall success in deploying, implementing, and improving integrated business system that efficiently and effectively support the mission(s) of the Laboratory.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by DOE as described within Section I of this document. Each Objective has one or more measures, the outcomes of which collectively assist the evaluating office in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each of the measures identifies significant tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones for which the outcomes/results are important to the success of the corresponding Objective. Although other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources may be used, the outcomes of key measures identified for each Objective shall be the primary means of determining the Contractor's success in meeting an Objective. The overall Goal score is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 6.1 at the end of this section). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 6.2 to determine the overall Goal letter grade.

Objectives:

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

Measure 6.1.1: Effectively track costs against budgets to ensure cost performance.

TARGET (B+): Perform monthly variance analysis at WBS level 3 and report on JLab Insight. Develop monthly Estimates at Completion (EACs). Costs and commitments do not exceed available funding in the contract at the cost level of the Program Parent/Control Point in the financial plan at any point during the fiscal year. Monitor JSA Overhead spending and provide information as may be requested to facilitate DOE's lab-wide study of Overhead spending. Routine accounting and budget reports are accurate, timely and complete in accordance with requirements for key activities/deliverables. Budget formulation actions are completed in accordance with guidance and schedules provided.

Measure 6.1.2: Demonstrate an effective financial management system through accurate, timely and complete financial reports to DOE, external reviews, internal and external audits, and self-assessments.

TARGET (B+): Accurate, timely and complete financial reports are provided to DOE in accordance with Departmental requirements for key activities/deliverables including accelerated financial statement reporting and other financial data calls. No material/major findings as defined in DOE Order 413.1A Attachment 2 or findings from internal/external audit reviews. There are no repeat audit findings identified in any external reviews where contractor had received notification of the finding and had reasonable opportunity to implement corrective actions. Explore improvements to financial system through self-assessment process which takes into account recommendations from

internal and external reviews as well as self-identified improvements. Analyze potential financial system improvements. Recommend and submit cost effective improvements to management for consideration.

Measure 6.1.3: Financial attestations accurately reflect the status of internal controls and are provided in a timely manner.

TARGET (B+): Financial attestations accurately reflect the status of internal controls and are provided in a timely manner. In addition, there are no reportable financial management internal control weaknesses identified in the annual financial statement audit.

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

Measure 6.2.1: Demonstrate efficacy of the acquisition system through outstanding results on annual performance measures (Procurement Balanced Scorecard) that cover critical aspects of the procurement process.

Additional credit for exceptional performance in areas outside the balanced scorecard purview may be given (i.e., system enhancements, demonstrated cost savings measures, improvements in procedures and practices, implementation of new programs, etc.)

TARGET (B+): Achieve Procurement Balanced Scorecard Total Score > 89 ("Excellent")

Measure 6.2.2: Demonstrated efficacy of Small Business Program through goal achievement and effective outreach.

Additional credit for exceptional performance outside of small business goal achievement may be given (i.e., support to DOE's small business program, special outreach activities/support to disadvantaged, women-owned and service disabled small business firms, and/or advancement of awards to minority, women-owned and service disabled small business firms.

TARGET (B+): Achieve All Small Business Goals Established in JLab's Annual Small Business Plan.

Measure 6.2.3: Demonstrate efficacy of the property management system through outstanding results on annual performance measures that cover critical aspects of JLab's personal property management.

Additional credit for exceptional performance in areas outside the balanced scorecard purview may be given (i.e., system enhancements, improvements in procedures and practices, implementation of new programs, etc.)

Overall evaluation of the measure may also consider any other relevant information directly or indirectly related to the property management system (property, material, and fleet) that provides evidence (either positive or negative) of the effectiveness/efficiency of the contractor in meeting the performance objective.

Other factors that may be considered in the evaluation of this objective include:

- Effectiveness of the property management system as validated by internal and external audits and reviews;
- Continual improvement of the property management system through the use of results of audits, reviews, and other information;
- The degree of knowledge and appropriate utilization of established system processes/procedures by Contractor management and staff; and

• Timely and responsive reporting for all areas of property management.

TARGET (B+): Annual Property Balanced Composite Score is less than 96 points but greater than or equal to 93 points.

6.3 Provide an Efficient, Effective & Responsive Human Resources Management System

Measure 6.3.1: Balanced Score Card Results Based on the Following:

A. Measure 1- Diversity - Protected Class Representation: Representation of protected classes (PC) within each EEO-1 category at the end of the fiscal year compared to the beginning of the fiscal year (adjusted for voluntary separations).

Measurement:

$$\text{PC Assessment Factor} = \frac{\%\text{ of PC to total workforce at the end of FY within each EEO-1 category}}{\%\text{ of PC to total workforce at the beginning of FY within each EEO-1 category}}$$

where:

Meets Expectations = Achieve availability or increase representation in 85% or more of the EEO categories.

B. Measure 2 - Compensation - Alignment with the Market: Achieve compensation positions aligned with market practices to reflect the Laboratory's mid-market compensation philosophy.

Measurement:

$$\text{Compensation Factor} = \frac{\sum(\text{weighted average salary within each classification})}{\sum(\text{weighted salary range midpoint* within each classification})}$$

*Assumes salary range midpoints reflect mid-market position

Meets Expectations = ±3%.

C. Measure 3 – Learning and Growth – Supervisors will attend two management course within the first year of assuming a supervisory level position.

Meets Expectations = 75% of supervisors complete two training courses.

D. Measure 4 - Learning and Growth – During the FY08 year, a targeted group of employees (25) will be identified for the Project Management (PM) Certification Program utilizing SkillPort. This goal is in support of larger DOE objectives with the Earned Value Management System (EVMS).

Meets Expectations = 90% of the identified employees will complete 2 out of the 3 components required to obtain the PM Certification in FY08.

E. Measure 5 - Retention of Talent - Attrition rate of Top Performers.

Measurement: Percentage of top performers (employees who receive the top two performance ratings) who voluntarily separate from the Laboratory will be within 10 percent of the industry average based on recognized staff retention surveys.

Note: Excludes involuntary terminations due to funding issues, restructuring or contractor turnover. Excludes voluntary terminations due to retirement, or participation in a voluntary separation program or early retirement program.

Compared to industry average:
Meets Expectations = ≤ 10% above industry average

F. Measure 6- Recruitment - Quality of Hire – Facilitate the new employee selection process to assure a continued world-class workforce.

Measurement: Combined average score of all Quality of Hire questionnaires completed by hiring managers within the first 6 months of employment.

Meets Expectations = 3.5 (on a scale of 1-5)

G. Measure 7 – Recruitment – Quality of Hires

Measurement: The first performance review for all new hires will receive a rating of 3 or above.

Meets Expectations = 75% of all new hires receive a score of 3 or above

H. Measure 8 – Attrition rate of new hires within the first year of employment.

Measurement: Attrition rate will be less than or equal to 10% annualized for new employees hired within FY08.

Meets Expectations = ≤10%

TARGET (B+): 7 of 8 BSC Measures Meet Expectations and demonstrates improvement to human resources management through self-assessment process which takes into account recommendations from internal and external reviews as well as self-identified improvements.

Note: Jefferson Laboratory may be given additional credit for exceptional performance in areas outside the balanced scorecard purview (i.e., system enhancements, improvements in procedures practices, implementation of new programs).

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

Measure 6.4.1: Oversight Through Internal Audit - Internal audits completed in accordance with annual audit plan.

TARGET (B+): Complete all audits in accordance with annual audit plan. (Notes 1, 2, 3)
1 – Includes audit plan changes and/or substitutes.
2 – Due to the nature of internal audits completion dates may not coincide with the organization's fiscal year end. For Performance Level purposes, all current year audits (excluding Transaction Testing) are targeted for a report release date no later than 90 days after the close of the fiscal year, unless extenuating circumstances can be established. The Transaction Testing audit for Performance Level purposes is targeted for a report release date no later than 180 days after the close of the fiscal year, unless extenuating circumstances can be established.
3 – Percentage of completion will be utilized where practical including requests for other than annual reporting, e.g., mid-year.

Measure 6.4.3: Monitor/Maintain a Quality Improvement Plan

TARGET (B+): The following QA documents are to be signed by Lab management, distributed for immediate implementation, and posted on the Lab's QA group website by 9-30-08:

QAP 1) Control of Measuring and Test Devices (Calibration)
QAP 2) Control of Nonconforming Products
QAP 3) Control of Suspect/Counterfeit Items
QAP 4) Control of User Supplied Property
QAP 5) Record Control Procedure
QAP 6) Material Identification and Traceability Policy and Procedure(s)
QAP 7) Receiving Inspection and Acceptance Testing Policy and Procedure
QAP 8) Procurement Procedure
QAP 9) Work Controls and Processes Procedure
QAP 10) Equipment Design Procedure (phase II), (Conduct of Engineering Manual)
QAP 11) Training and Qualification Procedure

QIP 1) Incorporate Outputs from Contract Requirements Management and Analysis

Measure 6.4.4: Deliver an integrated efficient and effective Information Technology Architecture that supports the mission of the Laboratory and benchmarks favorably with respect with other DOE laboratories, research universities and commercial industry best practices.

TARGET (B+): The IT Steering Committee includes participation from key Laboratory stakeholders, users, outside experts from SURA universities and CSC, and TJSO. The Committee participates in the execution of IT Architecture vision and policy recommendations and considers Laboratory-wide IT performance, including prioritization of work, linkage to the Laboratory's mission, and progress on all IT related contract metrics. The IT Steering Committee works with programmatic division representatives to align the IT architecture and projects with Lab and divisional priorities as appropriate with budget levels.

Measure 6.4.6: The Laboratory's Information Technology favorably benchmarks with other DOE laboratories, research universities and commercial industry best practices.

TARGET (B+): The Lab will implement those recommendations from the FY2007 IT External Review Committee (including more formal project analysis and tracking) that the IT Steering Committee identifies for FY08 implementation commensurate with the Appropriations Budget.

6.5 Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Technology and Commercialization of Intellectual Assets

The effectiveness of Technology Transfer activities at Jefferson Lab can be measured by three specific measures listed below. Note: Jefferson Lab may be given additional credit (points) for exceptional performance in areas outside the performance measures (i.e., system enhancements, improvements in procedures practices, implementation of new program, etc.).

Measure 6.5.1: The proper stewardship of intellectual assets and Laboratory owned or originated technology as measured by Invention Disclosures and Patent Applications. Intellectual Property Stewardship as indicated by the annual number of Invention Disclosures and/or Patents awarded.

TARGET (B+): Number of Invention Disclosures Greater than or Equal to 7 and Number of Patents Awarded Greater than or Equal to 3

Measure 6.5.2: The market impacts created/generated as a result of technology transfer and deployment activities as measured by licenses and/or options agreements executed.

TARGET (B+): 2 licenses awarded or 2 option agreements executed or any combination of license and option agreements executed equal to 2.

Measure 6.5.3: Contributions to the transfer of Laboratory originated knowledge and technology as measured by customer assessments.

Points will be awarded based on the customer's overall adjectival rating of the system.
TARGET (B+): Annual Customer Rating = "Excellent"

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	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)			25%		
6.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition and Property Management System(s)			25%		
6.3 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Human Resources Management System			20%		
6.4 Provide Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Management Systems for Internal Audit and Oversight; Quality; Information Management; and Other Administrative Support Services as Appropriate			15%		
6.5 Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Technology and Commercialization of Intellectual Assets			15%		
				Performance Goal 6.0 Total	

Table 6.3 - 6.0 Program Office Performance Goal Score Development

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

Table 6.4 Final Letter Grade

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

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

The weight of this Goal is 15%.

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

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by DOE as described within Section I of this document. Each Objective has one or more measures, the outcomes of which collectively assist the evaluating office in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each of the measures identifies significant tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones for which the outcomes/results of are important to the success of the corresponding Objective. Although other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources may be used, the outcomes of key measures identified for each Objective shall be the primary means of determining the Contractor's success in meeting an Objective. The overall Goal score is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 7.1 at the end of this section). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 7.2 to determine the overall Goal letter grade.

Objectives:

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

Measure 7.1.1: Asset Condition Index (ACI):

ACI = 1 minus the Facility Condition Index (FCI). FCI is the ratio of Deferred Maintenance to Replacement Plant Value. The FCI is derived from data in FIMS.

TARGET (B+): Greater or equal to 95%

Measure 7.1.2: Extent Contractor validates accuracy of data in the Facilities Information Management System (FIMS).

TARGET (B+): The contractor has demonstrated validation of the accuracy of data in the FIMS data base with at least 90% statistical certainty that the data contains no more than a 10% error rate.

Measure 7.1.3: The efficiency and effectiveness of contractor efforts for recapitalization and acquisition of required facilities and infrastructure to support laboratory programs and performance of maintenance to achieve a MII of at least 2%.

TARGET (B+): MII = 2% and the contractor has demonstrated that maintenance activities, recapitalization and acquisition of facilities and infrastructure to support laboratory programs have been performed efficiently.

Measure 7.1.4: An update to the Ten Year Site Plan is developed and approved by DOE that adequately addresses the site's contribution to meeting the Agency wide goals of the Secretarial Transformational Energy Action Management (TEAM) initiative and the goals set forth in Executive Order 13423.

TARGET (B+): The plan is acceptable to DOE no later than September 30, 2008.

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

Measure 7.2.1: The Ten Year Site Plan (TYSP) is recognized by funding entities as providing a sound strategy for acquisition of required facilities and infrastructure to support future laboratory programs.

TARGET (B+): The contractor assures that the TYSP is appropriately developed, reviewed, updated, in line with the Laboratory Business Plan, and utilized as a Laboratory management document.

Measure 7.2.2: Cost and schedule performance on all GPP projects and maintenance projects greater than or equal to $100K (for construction phase of projects only).
Maintain level of construction control to limit change orders and cost overruns to only those which bring added value to the project or are appropriate to produce the desired end product. Performance level will be calculated by taking the contracted amounts compared to the final contract actual costs considering all applicable funding increases for all appropriate contracts. Increases considered not applicable are those whose root cause is:

- Post-design programmatic change by user (physical or schedule)
- New technology deemed a value-added inclusion (post-award)
- Value engineering proposals accepted (both additive and deductive)

Schedule performance will be based on average of the actual number of days to completion of identified projects (or designated milestones) to the number specified by the original contracts. This will be expressed as a coefficient of actual divided by contracted. Additional time attributed to the following categories will not be included for the purpose of this metric.

- Acts of God (as contractually accepted)
- Labor disputes/strikes
- Documented material unavailability (contractually accepted)
- User desired post-award change orders for which additional time is appropriate

For purposes of this report, "completion" shall be when the project is physically complete; turned over to user or beneficial occupancy taken.

TARGET (B+): Applicable changes and cost overruns are less or equal to 8% of the total awarded bid amount and average scheduled index actual number of days to project completion or beneficial occupancy to original contract duration in the awarded contract is > 1.0 to ≤ 1.1.

Measure 7.2.3: GPP planning and execution are well coordinated to ensure effective utilization of resources.

TARGET (B+): The contractor coordinates project planning and provides information on project status in accordance with the TJSO expectations provided in the TJSO GPP Management Process.

Measure 7.2.4: Demonstrate effective project management and leadership for the Technology and Engineering Development Facility (TEDF) project.

TARGET (B+): The contractor provides the necessary documentation to support critical decisions on schedule for the funding profile provided.

Measure 7.2.5: Develop a strategy for increasing investment in infrastructure which minimizes increases to the cost of doing business.

TARGET (B+): Develop strategy by September 30, 2008.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
7.0 Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs					
7.1 Manage Facilities and Infrastructure in an Efficient and Effective Manner that Optimizes Usage and Minimizes Life Cycle Costs			40%		
7.2 Provide Planning for and Acquire the Facilities and Infrastructure Required to support Future Laboratory Programs			60%		
				Performance Goal 7.0 Total	

Table 7.1 - 7.0 Program Office Performance Goal Score Development

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

Table 7.2 Final Letter Grade

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

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

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

The weight of this Goal is 15%.
The Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM) and Emergency Management Systems Goal shall measure the Contractor's overall success in safeguarding and securing Laboratory assets that supports the mission(s) of the Laboratory in an efficient and effective manner and provides an effective emergency management program.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the evaluating office as described within Section I of this document. Each Objective has one or more key measures, the outcomes of which collectively assist the evaluating office in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each of the key measures identifies significant tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones for which the outcomes/results of are important to the success of the corresponding Objective. Although other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources may be used, the outcomes of key measures identified for each Objective shall be the primary means of determining the Contractor's success in meeting an Objective. The overall Goal score is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 8.1 at the end of this section). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 8.2 to determine the overall Goal letter grade.

Objectives:

8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System

Measure 8.1.1: Conduct emergency management exercises* as identified in the ERAP for FY08. Response to an actual or simulated emergency event demonstrates an above average level of proficiency and opportunities for improvement are identified and acted upon. Participate in at least one local emergency preparedness exercise assisting a local entity in their preparedness.

* An actual emergency may be counted as an exercise in the quarter in which it occurs.

TARGET (B+): Conduct one emergency management exercise*. The extent and level of implementation should be proportional to the nature and magnitude of threats to JLab and its interaction with off-site emergency responders. Response to an actual or simulated emergency event demonstrates an above average level of proficiency and opportunities for improvement are identified and acted upon. Participate in at least one local emergency preparedness exercise assisting a local entity in their preparedness. Results of internal and external reviews, surveys and inspections demonstrate that Emergency Management System is effective, and Emergency Management Program has no repetitive deficiencies (or) corrective actions are completed in accordance with approved corrective action plan.

8.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for Cyber-Security

Assure appropriate level of cyber security risk assessment and program planning and that Jefferson Lab computer systems are not compromised or used in attacks on other Internet locations.

Measure 8.2.1: Number of times JLAB computer systems were compromised or were used to attack other systems and that any incidents were reported within the required timeframes. This is for system level (root) compromises or incidents where jlab.org nodes were used to carry out cyber attacks on other locations on the Internet.
CSI = RC + 0.5(CA)

TARGET (B+): CSI = 1; and favorable results on internal/external reviews, surveys and inspections that demonstrate the cyber security program is: effective, integrated into laboratory culture, and laboratory leadership's commitment to strong cyber security performance.

Measure 8.2.2: Ensure less than 5% of scanned machines are flagged by the SANS system has having a severe vulnerability.

TARGET (B+): < 5% of scanned machines identified as having a severe vulnerability.

Measure 8.2.3: Average number of working days to remediate (reconfigure, repair, patch, mitigate, or classify as false positive) those systems identified by alarms from the automated system log filtering and notification process including the intrusion detection system.

TARGET (B+): Remediate in five working days.

Measure 8.2.4: Effectively manage cyber security enhancement projects in the areas of authentication, encryption, network (audit, registration, dynamic configuration, VPN, etc.), and security training. In the first month of the fiscal year, and with quarterly updates, determine the new requirements scope and schedule in agreement with the Thomas Jefferson Site Office.

TARGET (B+): Manage projects for cyber security enhancements on schedule, as applicable to JLab according to a revised Plans of Action & Milestones (POA&Ms) and project schedules matched to the appropriation budget.

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

Measure 8.3.1: Maintain an effective Security Program, demonstrated by:

- Ensuring non-U.S. citizens' from sensitive countries who have badged access to JLab facilities, or perform work on CRADAs or Work for Others are identified, and are entered into the Foreign Access Central Tracking System.
- Current timely and approved security-related Admin Policy and Security Plans.
- Reportable and accountable "Other Nuclear Materials" are inventoried and reported with DOE approved procedures.
- Provide effective support for on-site Counter Intelligence (CI) activities.

TARGET (B+): Maintain an effective Security Program in accordance with all applicable requirements. Maintain effective professional relations with threat reduction officials at DOE Headquarters, FBI Norfolk, and Newport News Police Department by participating in opportunities to share information in security, community policing, and incident management. Effectively perform functions specified in Site Specific CI Support Plan.

Note: Jefferson Lab may be given additional credit (points) for exceptional performance in areas outside the adjectival rating resulting from the committee's assessment (i.e., system enhancements, improvements in procedures practices, implementation of new program, etc.).

Measure 8.3.2: Demonstrate effective Security Program through internal, self-assessment and external reviews, surveys and inspections.

TARGET (B+): Conduct and document a self-assessment of all applicable aspects of the Security Program and submit to TJSO 6-months prior to the next Security Survey.

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

Measure 8.4.1: Effectively operate a sensitive information system for the Laboratory's Business Sensitive and Personnel Sensitive information

TARGET (B+): Meet existing and new requirements for management of sensitive information on an appropriation budget schedule, as applicable to JLab; and favorable results on internal/external reviews, surveys and inspections that demonstrate the protection of classified and sensitive information program is: effective, integrated into laboratory culture, and laboratory leadership's commitment to strong cyber security performance.

Note: Jefferson Lab may be given additional credit (points) for exceptional performance in areas outside the adjectival rating resulting from the committee's assessment (i.e., system enhancements, improvements in procedures practices, implementation of new program, etc.).

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
8.0 Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM)					
8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System			30%		
8.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for Cyber-Security			50%		
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			10%		
				Performance Goal 8.0 Total	

Table 8.1 - 8.0 Program Office Performance Goal Score Development

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

Table 8.2 Final Letter Grade