
FY 2006 Performance Evaluation Report
of
Southeastern Universities Research Association, Inc. (SURA)
Contract No. DE-AC05-84ER40150

Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility
Site Office (TJSO)

U. S. Department of Energy

May 23, 2006



Background

The Department of Energy (DOE) extended its contract with the Southeastern Universities Research Association, Inc. (SURA) for the management and operation of the Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility (otherwise known as Jefferson Lab) through May 31, 2005, in order to provide additional time to complete the follow-on contract competition and provide ample time for contract transition between the two contractors. The contract extension continued the Department's and SURA's implementation of a Performance-Based Management Contract (PBMC). This approach focuses primarily on outcomes and results as demonstrated by performance measures rather than compliance with processes and procedures.

The FY 2005 Performance Evaluation and Management Plan (PEMP) was revised from prior years to incorporate the Preliminary Guidance for the Office of Science Laboratory Performance Appraisal Process issued on May 9, 2005. The Preliminary Guidance was intended to provide the SC Site Offices with an overall methodology and framework for the new SC-wide performance evaluation and incentive process. This process and methodology was implemented for all SC laboratory contracts beginning with the FY 2006 PEMP.

Each SC laboratory PEMP shall be standardized by utilizing a common set of Performance Goals and Objectives. The FY 2006 PEMP describes the primary measurement basis for DOE's evaluation of SURA's performance regarding the management and operations of Jefferson Lab for the period: October 1, 2005, through February 28, 2006; however, the period of performance extended through May 31, 2006. This performance evaluation provides a standard by which to determine whether the contractor is managerially and operationally in control of the Laboratory and is meeting the mission and required performance expectations/ objectives of the Department as stipulated in the contract. Since this is a fixed fee contract, no performance fee is part of the contract and the PEMP will not be used to determine any performance or incentive fees.

FY 2006 will be an anomaly in that the total contract extension is anticipated to be for eight months instead of a full year. Please note that because the PEMP is for five months, some agreed upon measures and targets cannot be fully evaluated since they occur after the period of performance or are on-going throughout the year. Therefore, the measures/targets are divided into the following three categories:

- Those goals, objectives and measures that have been identified and occur within the five month period will be scored, graded and include appropriate justification;
- Those goals, objectives and measures that cannot readily be quantitatively evaluated has a progress report and the contractor provided recommended scores, grades and appropriate justification for all progress reports identified in the PEMP; and,
- Those goals, objectives and measures that will occur outside the six month period will be designated "N/A" and will have a brief statement that addresses the reason for the designation.

Specifically, Clause H.32 of the PBMC requires: (1) DOE to utilize a performance based management system for Laboratory oversight; (2) the contractor to conduct an on-going self-assessment in accordance with the performance metrics in Appendix B (See Attachment 1 for a copy of SURA's Fiscal Year (FY) 2006 Self-Assessment/Performance Report); and (3) DOE to perform a written assessment of the contractor's performance based on the DOE appraisal program and DOE's evaluation of the contractor's self-assessment.

As a means of incorporating the results of the contractor's self-assessment along with other inputs in the overall evaluation of SURA's performance, DOE and SURA agreed that the Department would develop an independent Annual Evaluation/Overlay Performance Report. This report is intended to capture the highlights of the DOE Site Office observations/reviews, results of DOE appraisals, as well as other important information (including mitigating factors or events that may be outside the control of the contractor) that would balance the overall performance assessment for the year.

FY 1996 was the first Contractor Self-Assessment and Contracting Officer's Overlay Performance Evaluation Report following successful implementation of the PBMC. Subsequent evaluation reports were prepared for FY 1997 through FY 2005. The following is the DOE evaluation summary for FY 2006 for each of the eight performance goals.

Executive Summary

The performance measures defined in Appendix B of the contract yielded an overall weighted Laboratory grade for Science and Technology (S&T) of A and an overall weighted Laboratory grade for Management and Operations (M&O) of A-. In a few cases, the DOE assigned a lower grade than what was listed in the SURA PEMP Performance Report (October 1, 2005-February 28, 2006) and does not believe the performance described by SURA supported the higher grade. The breakdown by category and performance measures shows the following ratings:

FY 2006 TJSO Evaluation Score

S&T Performance Goal	Numerical Score	Letter Grade	Weight	Weighted Score	Total Score
1. Provide for Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishments	3.89	A	40%	1.56	
2. Provide for Efficient and Effective Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operations of Facilities	3.85	A	40%	1.54	
3. Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Program Management	3.68	A-	20%	0.74	
Total Score					3.84
M&O Performance Goal	Numerical Score	Letter Grade	Weight	Weighted Score	Total Score
4. Provide Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory	3.56	A-	35%	1.25	
5. Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health and Environmental Protection	3.19	B+	35%	1.11	
6. Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission	3.67	A-	20%	0.73	
7. Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs	3.42	B+	5%	0.17	
8. Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM) and Emergency Management Systems	3.89	A	5%	0.19	
Total Score					3.45

FY 2006 TJSO Evaluation Summary Score

	Numerical Score	Letter Grade
S&T Performance	3.84	A
M&O Performance	3.45	A-

Some of the significant achievements between October 1, 2005 and February 28, 2006 were:

- The 12 GeV CEBAF Upgrade project successfully passed both a scientific and technical review last year, and has recently received CD-1 Approval.
- Jefferson Lab's Free Electron Laser holds the world's record for average power levels and its successful demonstration of energy recovery techniques at very high power levels has resulted in a paradigm shift both for future light sources and for high energy colliders.
- In the relatively brief performance period, Jefferson Lab continued to safely commission and conduct high-quality experiments including: Hall A Proton Parity Experiment (HAPPEX); Hall A Proton Parity Experiment with Hydrogen (HAPPEX-H); Measurement of the Neutron Electric Form Factor G_E^n at High Q^2 ; Bound Nucleon Structure (BONUS); commissioning for the Measurement of the Gerasimov-Drell-Hearn Sum at very low Q^2 (eg4).
- The Laboratory's Cyber Security Program remains strong with no successful attacks thus far in FY 2006.

Some of the challenges facing the Laboratory for the remainder of FY 2006 are:

- Continue to enhance worker safety at JLab. Ensure that the principles of Integrated Safety Management (ISM) are implemented across the site. Apply the necessary cultural and organizational changes needed to achieve a safe work environment for all JLab employees and visitors.
- Continued enhancement of the Laboratory Self Assessment Program to ensure consistently high quality Self Assessments.
- Move forward with the 12 GeV and FEL Upgrade, with particular attention to meeting technical, cost and schedule baselines and key milestones, while satisfying National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements.
- Investigate efficiency initiatives to improve productivity, and to contain and, where possible, reduce costs.

- Enhancement of the Lab-wide Quality Assurance Program is needed. Documentation demonstrating implementation of appropriate quality assurance is sometimes not available. Implementation of a Lab-wide QA program is warranted to meet TJSO expectations of a world-class program that uniformly handles the way in which activities and processes are reviewed and managed.

The Laboratory has done an effective job of preparing its FY 2006 (October 1-February 28, 2006) Self-Assessment under the performance-based management contract. Additional details are included in the body of this 2006 (October 1, 2005-February 28, 2006) Site Office Performance Evaluation report.

The TJSO FY 2006 Performance Evaluation of SURA is based upon a combination of Contract performance measures; reviews; Site Office assessments, walkthroughs, and observations; and input from representatives of the Office of Science Nuclear Physics Program and others.

GOAL 1.0
Provide for Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment (Quality, Productivity, Leadership & Timeliness of Research and Development)

The Site Office concurs with the overall rating of A resulting from the performance measures as an accurate evaluation of Jefferson Lab’s FY 2006 mission accomplishment performance. The following table summarizes the scoring from each of the objectives:

Goal Performance Rating Summary

Objectives	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
1.1 Impact Science and Technology Results Provide meaningful Impact on the Field	A	3.8	55%	2.09	
1.2 Provide Quality Leadership in Science And Technology	A	4.0	45%	1.8	
1.3 Provide and sustain Science and Technology Outputs that Advance Program Objectives and Goals	N/A	N/A	0%	N/A	
1.4 Provide for Effective Delivery of Science and Technology	N/A	N/A	0%	N/A	
Overall Performance Goal 1.0 Total					3.89

Objective 1.1 Science and Technology Results Provide Meaningful Impact on the Field

The Site Office concurs with the overall rating of A resulting from the performance measures as an accurate evaluation of the Laboratory’s FY 2006 of science and technology impact on the field performance based on the following:

Jefferson Lab has continued to execute high impact, high visibility, and difficult experiments and provided the prerequisite experimental equipment and accelerator beam capabilities and infrastructure support to make them successful.

The Laboratory continues to execute a program that is focused and aligned with the NSAC Long-Range Plan and enables the Department to stay on track meeting its milestones in Medium Energy Physics.

During the performance period, several very important experimental results were published in Physics Review Letters including “Parity-Violating Electron Scattering from ⁴He and the Strange Electric Form Factor of the Nucleon” and “Search for Θ^+ Pentaquark at CLAS.” Currently, the major paper/presentation season begins in April at the annual APS conference and the Laboratory will have at least two major announcements coming up at this meeting from the Lab’s nuclear physics program.

The 12 GeV CEBAF Upgrade project successfully passed both a scientific and technical review last year, and has recently received CD-1 Approval.

Jefferson Lab's Free Electron Laser holds the world's record for average power levels and its successful demonstration of energy recovery techniques at very high power levels has resulted in a paradigm shift both for future light sources and for high energy colliders.

Awards received in the performance period include: AAAS 2005 Fellowship to Accelerator Division Associate Director Swapan Chattopadhyay, APS Fellows bestowed on D. Douglas, Free-Electron Laser Staff Scientist, W. Brisco, JLab user, Charles E. Hyde-Wright, JLab user, Krishna S. Kumar, JLab user.

U. S. Patent Award Recipients include: David R. Douglas – Compaction Managed Mirror Bend Achromat, Ronald M. Sundelin, Tong Wang – System for Precise Position Registration, and George R. Neil, John Rathke, Thomas Schultheiss, Michelle Shinn, Lawrence Dillon-Townes – Radius of Curvature Controlled Mirror.

Objective 1.2 Provide Quality Leadership in Science and Technology

The Site Office concurs with the overall rating of A resulting from the performance measures as an accurate evaluation of the Laboratory's FY 2006 leadership in science and technology performance based on the following:

In the relatively brief performance period, Jefferson Lab continued to safely commission and conduct high-quality experiments including: Hall A Proton Parity Experiment (HAPPEX); Hall A Proton Parity Experiment with Hydrogen (HAPPEX-H); Measurement of the Neutron Electric Form Factor G_E^n at High Q^2 ; Bound Nucleon Structure (BONUS); commissioning for the Measurement of the Gerasimov-Drell-Hearn Sum at very low Q^2 (eg4).

Staff members at the laboratory are in visible leadership positions in the field, with the most notable example being Dr. Anthony Thomas' appointment as the Chair of WG9 of IUPAP and his nomination to the Global Science Forum Working Group on Nuclear Physics.

Awards received in the performance period include: AAAS 2005 Fellowship to Accelerator Division Associate Director Swapan Chattopadhyay, APS Fellows bestowed on D. Douglas, Free-Electron Laser Staff Scientist, W. Brisco, JLab user, Charles E. Hyde-Wright, JLab user, Krishna S. Kumar, JLab user.

U. S. Patent Award Recipients include: David R. Douglas – Compaction Managed Mirror Bend Achromat, Ronald M. Sundelin, Tong Wang – System for Precise Position Registration, and George R. Neil, John Rathke, Thomas Schultheiss, Michelle Shinn, Lawrence Dillon-Townes – Radius of Curvature Controlled Mirror.

Objective 1.3 Provide and Sustain Science and Technology Outputs that Advance Program Objectives and Goals

The relevant data will not be available at mid-year and the peer review will not occur until summer. This objective is marked not applicable (N/A) and is not scored.

Objective 1.4 Provide for Effective Delivery of Science and Technology

The relevant data will not be available at mid-year and the peer review will not occur until summer. This objective is marked not applicable (N/A) and is not scored.

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

The Site Office concurs with the overall rating of A resulting from the performance measures as an accurate evaluation of the Laboratory's FY 2006 design and operation of facilities performance. The following table summarizes the scoring from each of the objectives:

Goal Performance Rating Summary

Objectives	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)	A	4.0	25%	1.00	
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components	N/A	N/A	0%	N/A	
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities	A	3.8	75%	2.85	
2.4 Effective Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base	N/A	N/A	0%	N/A	
Overall Performance Goal 2.0 Total					3.85

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

The Site Office concurs with the overall rating of A resulting from the performance measures as an accurate evaluation of the Laboratory's of design efforts related to the 12 GeV CEBAF Upgrade Project performance based on the following:

All documents required for CD-1 approval for the 12 GeV CEBAF Upgrade Project have been developed including the following: Conceptual Design Report; Acquisition Strategy; Preliminary Project Execution Plan; and Preliminary Hazard Assessment. Additional supporting documentation has been developed including the following: Risk Management Plan; Risk Assessment; Technical Design Report; Scientific Conceptual Design Report; R&D Plan; Facility Comparative Cost Analysis; Summary of Long Lead Procurements; and CD-1 Approval Document. All provided documents comply with the requirements of DOE Order 413.3.

The Jefferson Lab team provided all necessary information required to carry out the critical decision process in an accurate and timely way. Approval of Critical Decision 1 occurred on February 14, 2006. The Jefferson Lab team continues to carry out the necessary project planning, R&D, and risk assessments in support of the Critical Decision 2 process.

In support of an anticipated CD-2A External Independent Review (EIR) in the summer 2006, The Jefferson Lab secured funds from the Commonwealth of Virginia in FY06 to begin the preliminary engineering and design of the Hall D complex. This effort notably exceeds expectations of performance as set for this Objective and has the potential to improve the overall mission of the Laboratory.

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

Because construction of facilities for 12 GeV CEBAF Upgrade has not begun, this objective is marked N/A and is not scored.

Objective 2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities

The Site Office concurs with the overall rating of A resulting from the performance measures as an accurate evaluation of the Laboratory's FY 2006 CEBAF operations performance based on the following:

FY 2006 funding provided for 10.83 weeks of operation, however, the CEBAF actually operated for 11.47 weeks, 106% of the goal; and 100% of scheduled Users successfully ran their experiments during the reporting period.

In terms of accelerator availability, the goal for accelerator downtime is less than 15%. The actual accelerator downtime was 5.8%, surpassing the goal by 61%. The goal for the experimental equipment availability was >88.8%. The actual experimental equipment availability was 89.06%, which is 100.3% of goal.

With respect to beam delivery, experiments obtained 111.3% of anticipated data in Hall A, 103.1% in Hall B, and 155.8% in Hall C. Overall experimenters obtained 106.9% of anticipated data, and the beam current for all of the experiments was delivered at the maximum capability of the experimental target.

The facility provided the capability to support the experimental program with installation staff for new experiments and development of the appropriate beam conditions.

Jefferson Lab's accelerator R&D activities were conducted to develop/expand the capabilities of the facility. Improvements in beam optics and gun characteristics resulted in the lowest helicity-correlated errors ever measured in a parity experiment (HAPPEX). A new photocathode material was brought on line, raising the available polarization for ~80% to ~85%, an increase of 13% in beam effectiveness for experimenters. A new fiber laser was developed in house, increasing the laser power by a factor of 4 above the previous world's best, a commercial product.

The Laboratory's remains effective in balancing resources between facility R&D and User support. The Laboratory largely avoids conflict/resource competition between facilities R&D and user support in that facilities R&D is driven by user demands and user priorities. In the performance period, advances in photocathode/laser development are a good example, in that they were motivated by most urgent user demands, specified and executed with user participation. Facilities R&D at Jefferson Lab is a form and special case of user support.

Jefferson Lab continues to have a quality process to allocate facility time to the Users. The process involved an outside Program Advisory Committee, an internal Nuclear Physics Scheduling Committee, and real-time optimization of the three-Hall experimental program to avoid conflicting beam requirements.

Objective 2.4 Effective Utilization of Facilities to Grow and Support the Laboratory’s Research Base

The Site Office believes that a rating of A is warranted. Jefferson Lab’s primary mission is to serve an international external user base. That notwithstanding, the Laboratory has assembled a team of outstanding researchers who play a crucial role as “internal users,” exercising intellectual leadership far beyond simply enabling and supporting external users’ research. In FY 2006 to date, they continued this role that has been documented in earlier reviews. The Laboratory’s stewardship of its nuclear physics research base can be seen in many areas. About 25% of the nuclear physics PhDs in the United States are based on JLab research (with about half again as many from international institutions). Since the founding of the Laboratory in 1982 the SURA universities have added a total of 93 faculty members in nuclear physics. The national and international community of scientists using the facility has increased by about 40% over the past four years, indicating a growing recognition in the uniqueness of our research capabilities.

Insufficient tangible data exists for the period of performance, therefore, it has been determined that this objective is not applicable for this performance period. For example, reference to the August 2005 S&T Review is not relevant to this period of performance.

GOAL 3.0

Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Program Management

The Site Office has assigned an overall rating of A- resulting from the performance measures as an accurate evaluation of the Laboratory’s FY 2006 science and technology performance. The following table summarizes the scoring from each of the objectives:

Goal Performance Rating Summary

Objectives	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
3.1 Provide Effective and Efficient Stewardship of Scientific Capabilities and Program Vision	A	3.9	40%	1.56	
3.2 Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Project/Program Planning and Management	A-	3.6	40%	1.44	
3.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Communications & Responsiveness to Customer Needs	B+	3.4	20%	.68	
Overall Performance Goal 3.0 Total					3.68

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

The Site Office concurs with the overall rating of A resulting from the performance measures as an accurate evaluation of the Laboratory's FY 2006 protection of stewardship of scientific capabilities and program vision performance based on the following:

Jefferson Lab has effectively communicated and worked with the lab's stakeholders and particularly its 2,000 User member community. This has been accomplished through a well communicated vision, including: issuance of a 5-year business plan; an effective Program Advisory Committee (PAC) process that results in an independent peer assessment of proposed research; and finally the internal scheduling process allocating research time for a 15 month experimental period.

Specific 2006 results to date include; the December Cascade Physics workshop, the January PAC meeting, the March User Group Board of Directors meeting, and the initiation of SRF R&D for the ILC. The Laboratory has together with its users and utilizing the PAC process, developed in 2006 a set of 30 definitive, high impact, highest priority experiments to be completed in the near term and which form the basis of a transition plan to the 12 GeV program. Jefferson Lab/PAC process selected these experiments for their high pay-off and plans are in place to advance accelerator and equipment capabilities to meet advanced user requirements and mitigate risks. A key example is the GEN experiment that started in March 2006.

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

The Site Office has assigned an overall rating of A- resulting from the performance measures as an accurate evaluation of the Laboratory's FY 2006 science and technology project/program planning and management performance based on the following:

Jefferson Lab's R&D activities are in support of User facility strategic plans derived from the Laboratory's vision and Business Plan. These R&D activities include beam and equipment development for the high impact 6 GeV program, the implementation of the 12 GeV CEBAF Upgrade, and exploratory R&D for a follow-on electron-light ion collider (ELIC) of unprecedented luminosity. The final 2006 budget was a significant impact for the Laboratory, which was managed effectively, minimizing the impact to the experimental program. The impact to the experimental program was a reduced running scenario, giving priority to highest impact experiments and taking advantage of the need to run one such experiment at a very low energy not compatible with other experiments. This approach amounted to a cost savings while simultaneously addressing a pressing program need. Jefferson Lab initiated, despite budget challenges, to address identified issues with the accelerator's capability to run at 6 GeV and initiated a corrective action plan. The actions taken demonstrate a clear sense of priorities and a willingness to implement the most important actions at the expense of lesser ones if budget pressures demand sharp selections.

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

The Site Office concurs with the overall rating of B+ resulting from the performance measures as an accurate evaluation of the Laboratory’s FY 2006 communications and responsiveness performance based on the following:

Timely and accurate responses to Site Office and SC requests have been achieved consistently by Jefferson Lab throughout the performance period. In meeting this objective, several methods are utilized to maximize the effectiveness of the communications process. During the performance period, weekly meetings between the Lab Director and the TJSO Manager and monthly meetings are held with the Lab Director and the NP Program Director to allow for frequent and open exchange of information, including keeping the TJSO and NP informed of both positive and negative events. The TJSO Manager regularly attends Laboratory Director’s Council meetings for the report of operational data; subsequently, a bi-weekly operations report is generated by the Lab Director. This concise report is an effective tool for the NP and TJSO, that highlights experimental, ES&H, operations and productivity goals, as well as actuals for each past-two-weeks and year-to-date time periods. Additionally, a set of operating principles designed to guide interactions of the TJSO and Jefferson Lab staffs has been established to provide a clear outline of roles and responsibilities.

During the performance period, the Jefferson Lab has fulfilled numerous data requests from the DOE Program and Site Offices in a thorough and timely manner, often under very short turn-around time constraints. The Laboratory staff put forth tremendous efforts to consistently deliver responses of the highest integrity. Examples include responding to recent data calls providing the Jefferson Lab’s vital statistics, staffing projections, diversity plans, work-for-others statements, and facilities information for the lab’s 5-year business plan.

GOAL 4.0

Provide Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory

Goal Performance Rating Summary

Objectives	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
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	A	3.70	35%	1.30	
4.2 Provide for Responsive and Accountable Leadership throughout the Organization	A-	3.55	35%	1.24	
4.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Corporate Office Support as Appropriate	B+	3.40	30%	1.02	
Overall Performance Goal 4.0 Total					3.56

Objective 4.1 Provide a Dynamic Vision for the Laboratory and an Effective Plan to Accomplish the Vision Including Strong Partnerships Required to Carry Out those Plans

Measure 4.1.1 – The vision (20-year outlook) is solidly based on core competencies of world-leading caliber and extends and applies them to enhanced or new initiatives addressing outstanding science questions and national priorities.

The Site Office agrees with the rating of B+ and score of 3.4. The Laboratory's 20-year outlook and vision are focused on leading and advancing the nuclear physics science frontier.

Measure 4.1.2 – The Institutional Plan identifies the strategy that enumerates all critical success factors for the attainment of the vision and outlines means of assuring their realization.

The Site Office agrees with a rating of N/A.

Measure 4.1.3 – The business plan (5-year) is an ambitious but realistic document meeting both DOE's and Lab Management's needs to realize Lab objectives based on a clearly defined approach, identification of success factors, and ways to assure that they are met.

The Site Office agrees with a rating of N/A.

Measure 4.1.4 – Formalized Collaborations and Corporate Citizenship programs

The Site Office agrees with a rating of N/A.

Measure 4.1.4.1 – The Laboratory has formalized vital collaborations and understandings with institutions in academe, lab users, other national labs, and private sector entities for advancing priority issues in science, scientific workforce, and applications of science and technology.

The Site Office assigns the rating of B+ and score of 3.4. The Laboratory has taken further steps to strengthen ties that promote the scientific output of the Laboratory and has demonstrated a strong collaborative relationship with the user community on both 6 GeV and 12 GeV programs. This is particularly evident with respect to the User Community whose input into the research program of the Laboratory is key to its success in advancing science.

Measure 4.1.4.2 – The Laboratory has corporate citizenship programs that encourage community support of the Laboratory and its programs and that draws on lab competencies and meets community needs. These corporate citizenship efforts include public outreach and improved scientific literacy. This responsibility of the Laboratory is measured both by metrics and peer reviews.

The Site Office agrees with the rating of A and score of 4.0. The Laboratory's citizenship programs are broad and effective. The Laboratory is commended for its outreach efforts and the associated results. Jefferson Lab's science education program contributes to the Commonwealth and the nation's science education and literacy as evidenced in annual Public Participation

metrics. The educational centerpiece is the Lab's K-12 science education program – Becoming Enthusiastic About Math and Science (BEAMS). This program has yielded measurable results, increasing test scores of these students in Virginia Standards of Learning tests in Math and Science.

Measure 4.1.5 – The Laboratory has developed and implemented technology transfer and commercial applications and projects with other agencies to utilize effectively laboratory developed and related technologies especially in defense, homeland security and commerce.

The Site Office agrees with the rating of A and score of 4.0. The partnership with the University of Virginia Patent Foundation is a commendable technology transfer initiative to market the Laboratory's vast capabilities. The Department looks forward to the fruits of the partnership. In addition, the Laboratory provided enhanced opportunities for coordination of promising technologies and spin-off companies with funding sources.

Objective 4.2 Provide for Responsive and Accountable Leadership throughout the Organization

Measure 4.2.1 – The Laboratory is staffed and structured in an optimum way to assure that it meets its overall goals; that there are clear assignments of staff responsibilities and performance goals and performance criteria; and that commensurate responsibility, authority, accountability, and resources are assigned.

The Site Office assigns a rating of A- and score of 3.7. The Laboratory dealt with a potential reduction in force in an exemplary manner. SURA/TJNAF is commended for developing a functional work breakdown structure. The Site Office supports and looks forward to discussions on the work breakdown structure prior to its implementation. SURA/TJNAF are commended for establishing a Chief Operation Officer position which will assist the Laboratory in establishing a more efficient and effective operation.

Measure 4.2.2 – The contractor will ensure that the organization has a structured quality program, that benchmarking against national or international standards will be used; that important processes are mapped, measured, and improved; and that there is a structure to address urgent emerging issues.

The Site Office agrees with the rating of B+ and score of 3.4. The Contractor is encouraged to conduct further benchmarking of Laboratory programs and processes. The Contractor is encouraged to review the internal audit program to ensure it is carrying out the intended function and purposes in an effective and beneficial manner. The Department has high expectations regarding Contractor oversight of Laboratory operations through conducting internal audits, supporting peer reviews and similar activities. Such efforts help ensure and assist in furthering the effective and efficient conduct of operations.

Objective 4.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Corporate Office Support as Appropriate

Measure 4.3.1 – The contractor will ensure that outside, nationally recognized, expertise in such areas as project management, IT organization, risk assessment, and a variety of business disciplines will be made available on an as needed basis for the solution of emerging problems or for improvement in processes.

The Site Office agrees with a rating of N/A.

Measure 4.3.2 – Key staff has university appointments, joint positions for young, promising researchers are routinely available, and means (such as time limited fellowships) are used to cycle a stream of highly accomplished researchers through the lab.

The Site Office agrees with a rating of B+ and score of 3.4. The university appointments, joint positions, fellowships, Minority Serving Institutions program, and similar activities demonstrate SURA/TJNAF commitment and support. It is recognized that the Laboratory has initiated the new Minority Serving Institutions program designed to attract minority students into PhD programs in physics and related sciences through collaborative efforts between and among minority and majority universities.

Measure 4.3.3 – The contractor will initiate ways to secure outside investment in the Laboratory or to enter into innovative financing of infrastructure or scientific apparatus on an as needed basis.

The Site Office agrees with a rating of N/A.

GOAL 5.0

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

The performance objectives and measures for this category are intended to provide an overall assessment of the Laboratory's Environment, Health and Safety Program. In the FY 2006 rating period (October 2005 to February 2006), there are three main objectives that broadly evaluated the Laboratory's performance and four measures that provide more detailed validity of the objectives. Based solely on the established performance metrics, the Site Office agrees with the Laboratory's Self-Assessment grades and scores identified for each objective and measure of their performance in Environment, Health and Safety.

The two main lagging indicators, Total Recordable Case (TRC) and Days Away, Restricted or Transferred (DART) rate have sharply increased over this short rating period. While there does not appear to be any obvious similarities in the injuries sustained during this rating period, the causal analysis training that is scheduled for the near future should improve the quality of incident investigations, with the desired outcome of reducing the likelihood of similar occurrences in the future.

The Site Office strongly believes that improvement in the leading indicators will take significant Laboratory emphasis on improving the overall assessment program. Furthermore, improvement

of the Integrated Safety Management (ISM) program is warranted to incorporate the ISM principles across the site and strengthen the Lab’s Environmental Safety and Health posture.

Goal Performance Rating Summary

Objectives	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
5.1 Provide a Work Environment that Protects Workers and the Environment	B	2.96	55%	1.63	
5.2 Provide Efficient and Effective Implementation of Integrated Safety, Health and Environment Management	B+	3.4	35%	1.19	
5.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Waste Management, Minimization, and Pollution Prevention	A-	3.7	10%	.37	
Overall Performance Goal 5.0 Total					3.19

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

For FY 2006, the Office of Science benchmarked its laboratories using U.S. Department of Labor statistics for research firms (SIC classification 873). The performance goals are referenced against the top industry performers in this classification on both the Total Recordable Case (TRC) rate, and Days Away, Restricted or Transferred (DART) rate. These two “key indicators” were used to measure the Laboratory’s overall performance in this area. The Site Office agrees with the overall rating of B.

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. Expected performance (3.4 score) was established as the arithmetic average between Office of Science’s FY 2005 and FY 2007 goals for DART (0.5 and 0.25, respectively). These rates include: All SURA/Jefferson Laboratory Staff, nuclear physics Users, and contractors, official travel, personnel paid under joint salary arrangements.

The Contractor’s progress in achieving and maintaining “best-in-class” ES&H program performance as measured by the days away, restricted or transferred (DART) case rate. Expected performance (3.4 score) was established as the arithmetic average between Office of Science’s FY 2005 and FY 2007 goals for DART (0.5 and 0.25, respectively). These rates include: All SURA/Jefferson Laboratory Staff, nuclear physics Users, and contractors, official travel, personnel paid under joint salary arrangements.

The Site Office agrees with the overall grade of B- and score of 2.65 for the Lab’s performance as measured by the DART case rate. The performance through the end of the rating period, February 2006, was 0.67. The Site Office believes that the Laboratory accurately evaluated their performance in this area. The FY 2006 to-date DART performance represents a substantial departure from the exemplary DART case rate of 0.1 in FY 2005. Sustained improvement in the Lab’s DART performance will be needed to compare favorably with the expectations set for FY 2006, and SC’s goal for FY 2007. The Site Office believes Lab Management needs to continue to emphasize safety culture initiatives to help the Lab meet this performance measure.

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). Expected performance (3.4 score) was established as the arithmetic average between Office of Science’s FY 2005 and FY 2007 goals for TRC (1.17 and 0.65, respectively). These rates include: All SURA/Jefferson Laboratory Staff, nuclear physics Users, and contractors, official travel, personnel paid under joint salary arrangements.

The Contractor’s progress in achieving and maintaining “best-in-class” ES&H program performance as measured by the total reportable case rate (TRCR). Expected performance (3.4 score) was established as the arithmetic average between Office of Science’s FY 2005 and FY 2007 goals for TRC (1.17 and 0.65, respectively). These rates include: All SURA/Jefferson Laboratory Staff, nuclear physics Users, and contractors, official travel, personnel paid under joint salary arrangements.

The Site Office agrees with the overall rating of B+ for the Lab’s performance as measured by the TRCR. The performance through the end of the rating period, February 2006, was 1.01. The Site Office believes that the Laboratory accurately evaluated their performance in this area. The FY 2006 to-date TRCR performance is twice that of the exceptional FY 2005 TRCR performance of 0.5. Improvement in the Lab’s DART performance will be needed to compare favorably with the expectations set for FY 2006, and SC’s goal for FY 2007.

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

The Site Office agrees with a rating of B+ for the Lab’s performance. Two critical measures, the self assessment program and the radiation protection program, were evaluated to determine the effectiveness of the Laboratory’s implementation of integrated safety, health and environmental management. The Site Office concurs with the overall grades and scores for these particular measures as evaluated against the scoring criteria, however, significant improvements are still needed. The Site Office believes that the Laboratory’s overall Quality Assurance (QA) program requires improvement. Implementation of a Lab-wide QA program is warranted to meet TJSO expectations of a world-class program that uniformly handles the way in which activities and processes are reviewed and managed.

Measure 5.2.1 – Provide an effective Self Assessment Program

The Site Office agrees with the overall grade of B+ and score of 3.4 for the Lab’s performance as measured by the effectiveness criteria used to evaluate the self assessment program. The Quality Assurance/Self-Assessment program is in the initial stages of the re-vitalization process; as such one topical area was assessed during this limited rating period. While there are other self assessments in progress, there is room for improvement in the quality of these assessments and Lab-wide participation. The Site Office believes the Management Self-Assessments (MSA’s) have significant challenges remaining as it strives to become a robust program. The Lab should focus on performing more assessments of actual work and behavior based safety. Meaningful self-assessments are inherently difficult but successful execution is a core element of a high performing safety program.

Measure 5.2.2 – Effective EH&S Program measured by results of Radiological Control Program Peer review and annual individual doses. Dose period is from July 1 2005 through June 30, 2006, due to dosimeter processing (calendar year cycle) and processed every 6 months.

Effective EH&S Program measured by results of Radiological Control Program Peer review and annual individual doses. Dose period is from July 1 2005 through June 30, 2006, due to dosimeter processing (calendar year cycle) and processed every 6 months.

The Site Office agrees with the overall rating of B+ and score of 3.4 for the Lab's performance as measured by the available dosimetry records. The Laboratory must pay close attention to dose management through effective radiation work permits (RWP) and monitoring to ensure that no individual worker exceeds the 200 mRem annual dose objective. The Lab should consider reviewing the Jefferson Laboratory Radiation Review Panel (JRRP) charter to ensure that the panel is in a position to help forge continuous improvement of the Radiation Safety Program.

During this rating period, the Site Office was in a unique position to observe the work performed during normal, and off-hours by several Assistant Radiation Monitors (ARM's) within the Accelerator Division. The work performed by these individuals was consistent with the limitations identified within the Accelerator Operations Directive and these individuals also possessed ample knowledge of the instrumentation used and associated calibration protocols. The high performance of this group is vital to the smooth and safe operation of the accelerator and this high performance is attributed to training initiated by the Accelerator Operations crew, and the Radiation Control staff.

Below outlines areas that have been identified through Site Office walkthroughs as areas requiring continual improvements by the Laboratory:

- Maintenance of radiological postings
- Timely radiological instrument calibration and configuration control reviews.
- Tritium disposal area radiological work practices
- Maintaining defensibility of RWP exposure records

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

The Site Office agrees with the overall rating of A- for the Lab's performance as measured by the SURA self declaration of EMS implementation before 10/20/06; however, considerable refinement of the EMS documentation was identified to be warranted during the DOE validation process. The Laboratory established an aggressive action plan to address the areas where vulnerabilities had been identified. The Lab is currently meeting its targets, goals, and objects outlined in the action plan. Completion of these goal/objectives is critical to ensure that the EMS program is a success. Although a DOE P2 award application was not completed, the Lab did complete a local Hampton Roads Sanitation District P2 award application. Continued Laboratory management emphasis in this area is needed.

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

The Site Office agrees with the overall rating of A- for this performance goal. The following table summarizes the scores and overall grade for this Goal. Comments are contained within the individual objectives that follow.

Goal Performance Rating Summary

Objective	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
6.1 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Financial Management System(s)	A	3.9	25%	.98	
6.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition and Property Management System(s)	B+	3.4	25%	.85	
6.3 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Human Resources Management System	A	3.9	20%	.78	
6.4 Provide Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Management Systems for Internal Audit and Oversight; Quality; Information Management; and Other Administrative Support Services as Appropriate	A	3.8	15%	.57	
6.5 Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Technology and Commercialization of Intellectual Assets	B+	3.3	15%	.49	
Overall Performance Goal 6.0 Total					3.67

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

This objective consists of three performance measures related to financial management systems. The Lab performed well in all three areas for the five month period. The Site Office agrees with a rating of A based upon the following:

Measure 6.1.1 – Demonstrate an effective financial management system through external reviews and internal and external audits

The Site Office agrees with the rating of A and a score of 4.0. Limited scheduled financial reviews have been performed during this period and no material weaknesses in the financial management system have been noted. During this period, the Lab has been actively engaged with Oak Ridge Office (ORO) in implementing the requirements of OMB Circular A-123, Appendix A, “Internal Control over Financial Reporting.” The Lab is required to implement an assessment program that incorporates the necessary review requirements and for the period of performance has met established milestones. All previous findings/recommendations are being addressed.

The Lab is on schedule to meet all deadlines as detailed in the action plan for the recommendations from the Funds Control Review. All required documentation, reports and assurance statements to date have been provided in a timely manner.

Measure 6.1.2 – World-class Financial Management Organization

The Site Office agrees with a rating of A- and a score of 3.9. SURA/TJNAF maintains a strong foundation of financial control and accountability throughout the lab organization. The Director of the Lab utilizes his position to set the direction for all Lab employees and they are kept informed of resource issues affecting the Lab. With a reduced FY 2006 budget, the Director issued revised guidance on new funding procedures that were being implemented to reduce costs as well as workforce restructuring actions that were going to be needed. The Chief Financial Officer is an integral member of the Director's Council and advises Director's Council members on financial issues. Staff credentials and certifications are up-to-date, with all members of the CFO organization participating in a Federal Appropriations Law class during this period.

Measure 6.1.3 – Accounting and Budget

The Site Office agrees with a rating of A- and a score of 3.9. Award of a new Management and Operating contract scheduled for this period did not take place so no transition activities occurred; however according to the ORO CFO, the Lab contributed significantly in the correction of FY 2005 uncosted balances in the Standard Accounting and Reporting System (STARS). The FY 2005 uncosted balances in STARS were incorrect due to system delays when reporting entity identifications were changed in STARS in mid-September. The Lab responded to DOE with timely and detailed backup information for reported costs. The completion dates for SURA's budget activities were previously scheduled after the performance period ended. As a result, SURA could not complete the budget actions during the performance period. The Lab's response for other data calls and information were responsive and timely throughout the period. The Lab did not exceed available funding. Accounting reports are accurate, timely and complete in accordance with requirements for key activities/deliverables. Practices disclosed in the Cost Accounting Standards (CAS) Disclosure Statement comply with CAS and clearly describe contractor's actual cost accounting practices followed. Although most of this measure requires data for a full year and specific year end data, it is anticipated that, based on past experience, the Lab will meet all expectations in the measure.

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

The Site office agrees with the overall rating of B+ based on the following:

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.

The Site Office agrees with the overall rating of B+ and a score of 3.4 resulting from the "interim" Balanced Score Card (BSC) score of 94.5 for performance measures evaluated during the period October 1, 2005 through January 31, 2006, as an accurate evaluation of the Laboratory's FY 2006 procurement performance. Note that the BSC targets for metrics

measured were designed to measure annual performance outcomes and the “interim” score is an estimate of the results from the current data that was readily available as of the end of January. The Business Services Department continues to have a high level of customer satisfaction within the Laboratory and their efforts have resulted in an average procurement cycle time of 4.06 days. The use of P-cards and e-commerce appears to be well controlled. The procurement managers have an average of 20+ years of experience and are dedicated to supporting the mission of the Laboratory. The successful transition of property management into the Business Services Department appears to have gone very smoothly with little to no interruption in the service level provided.

Jefferson Lab continues to support the Department’s socio-economic objectives and goals. Their dedicated efforts exceeded five of their six FY 2006 contractually required socio-economic subcontracting goals. The reason that the Laboratory did not meet or exceed the Service-Disabled Veteran business concerns goals is due to the lack of potential subcontractors in this category. This will continue to be a challenge for the Laboratory for the remainder of FY 2006 and in FY 2007.

The Laboratory’s Small Business Manager is on the Virginia Minority Supplier Development Council and is the Small Business Representative on the Department’s Integrated Contractors Purchasing Team which once again shows the Laboratory’s strong commitment to the Department’s small business program. Jefferson Laboratory’s “Small/Disadvantaged Subcontractor of the Year” award continues to be greatly appreciated by the proud recipients and demonstrates, once again, the Laboratory’s strong support of DOE’s socio-economic objectives. The Laboratory continues to do an outstanding job of balancing achievement of socio-economic goals while maintaining subcontracting competition and optimizing a cost efficient purchasing organization.

On April 1, 2006, four of the Laboratory-held small business subcontracts were reassigned to the Site Office as DOE prime contracts as part of the Department’s initiative to increase direct prime contracts with small businesses. This transition was successfully implemented due to a high degree of communication, coordination and cooperation by the Laboratory.

Measure 6.2.2 – Demonstrate efficacy of the property system through outstanding results on annual performance measures (Property and Vehicle Balanced Scorecard) that cover critical aspects of the personal Property management process.

The Site Office concurs in the overall rating of B+ and a score of 3.4 which resulted from the level of achievement of the FY 2005 performance goals.

As noted in the self-assessment, this objective can be measured thoroughly and accurately only on an annual basis. The Lab’s continued efforts to locate property not found during the required annual inventory are to be commended. The Lab must also continue to emphasize the need for its property custodians to understand their responsibility and accountability for protection and use of assigned sensitive property. Such emphasis should include the need for consistency in following established procedures in the approved Property Management System.

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

The Site Office agrees with the grade of A for this objective. FY 2006 is the first year the Lab is utilizing a balanced scorecard approach to measure performance in the Human Resource area.

Measure 6.3.1 – Balanced Score Card Results

The Site Office agrees with a rating of A and a score of 3.9. The Lab identified seven performance targets relating to six critical areas of Human Resources services. These areas included diversity, compensation, benefits, retention, recruitment and internal business processes. While ideally performance would be measured for a full year, at the end of the current performance period, the Lab was meeting or exceeding the target on six of the seven measures. The one measure that did not meet the target was “acceptance rate of employment offers.” The Lab had 16 of 21 (76%) job offers accepted which was below the target of 85%. All other areas were within target ranges of performance and are reflective of sound performance in the Human Resource office. Additionally, the staff has been professional and responsive to employee and management needs especially given the atypical circumstances facing the Lab during this period including budget cuts, workforce restructuring, and the contract re-competition.

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

This objective consisted of five measures which contributed to the overall score. The Site Office concurs with the rating of “A” for this objective based on the following:

Measure 6.4.1 – Internal Audit completed in accordance with annual audit plan

The Site Office agrees with a rating of A and a score of 3.8. For the internal audit and oversight function, the Lab’s internal audit schedule was published and is being tracked. There was an unplanned requirement levied on the internal audit staff to provide assistance to help the CFO with implementation of OMB Circular A-123 requirements.

Measure 6.4.2 – Consistent with Professional Auditing Standards receive an overall satisfactory rating from external reviews every five years

The Site Office agrees with a rating of B+ and a score of 3.4. One area to be measured was the results of an external review of the Lab’s internal audit function. This external review is not scheduled to take place until August 2006.

Measure 6.4.3 – Replace all Ingress Database Applications

The Site Office agrees with a rating of B+ and a score of 3.4. In the information management area, the following applications were successfully converted from Ingres to Oracle: Credit card, Username audit, Account request form, User registration form, FACTS form, Property application, and the Travel application. Badging system links were converted in early January.

Web applications linking to CIS and CMN (common database) database systems were converted and the training application was completely converted to Oracle. However, SRL, REQ, ACM applications were scheduled to be converted a month after the evaluation period.

Measure 6.4.4 – New MIS Applications thoroughly documented

The Site Office agrees with a rating of A and a score of 4.0. MIS documentation for all new MIS systems was provided and documented in the standard MIS directory. The Site Office has verified this documentation and the utilization of “Use case” documents are detailed and thorough.

Measure 6.4.5 – Critical MIS Services availability

The Site Office agrees with a rating of A+ and a score of 4.3. MIS critical services availability during working hours was outstanding. A new system to track metrics was implemented, and all critical MIS services sustained uptime of 99% or better. The Site Office analyzed the associated statistics for each machine and validated the impressive consistency for the evaluation period. Maintaining availability of these systems is critical to performance throughout the entire Laboratory, as interruptions can result in negative impact on other critical Lab metrics.

Objective 6.5 Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Technology and Commercialization of Intellectual Assets

The Site Office agrees with the overall rating of B+ for performance measures evaluated during this period as an accurate evaluation of the Laboratory’s FY 2006 technology transfer program. This performance objective measures the degree to which key technologies related to Jefferson Lab’s primary scientific mission are disseminated to industry. Performance is measured by the amount of intellectual property generation and the level of customer satisfaction.

Measure 6.5.1 – Stewardship of Intellectual Assets

The Site Office agrees with a rating of B+ and a score of 3.15. In FY 2006 (October 1, 2005 through February 28, 2006), the Laboratory successfully executed four invention disclosures, awarded four patents and executed two license agreements that related directly to Jefferson Lab’s core competencies. The Laboratory continues to have an effective technology transfer program. One prime example of transferring Laboratory technology to the private sector for commercialization is the Laboratory’s collaboration with Dilon Technologies medical imaging equipment. Under a license awarded to Dilon Technologies, the Laboratory transferred the gamma camera technology “know-how” and relevant technical information for conversion into a commercial product that will be used as a medical device for use in scintimammography procedures for breast cancer detection.

Measure 6.5.2 – Licenses and Options Assessments

The Site Office agrees with a rating of B+ and a score of 3.4. Dilon Technologies has successfully secured FDA approval and is successfully manufacturing this scintimammography equipment. Dilon has sold more than fifty of these unique devices and the licenses of related intellectual property are currently under negotiations for other biomedical applications. Also, a

modified version of Jefferson Lab’s compact gamma camera has been adapted for small imaging which is useful for drug testing developed under a partnership with ORNL and John Hopkins University. In addition, the Laboratory continues to participate in DOE’s Small Business Innovative Research (SBIR) Program and there were two active Cooperative Research and Development Agreements (CRADAs) in FY 2006.

Measure 6.5.3 – Customer Satisfaction

As it relates to customer satisfaction, this measure is determined by an annual survey which is not being conducted until the end of the fiscal year. The Site Office agrees with N/A.

**GOAL 7
Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and
Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs**

The Site Office agrees with the overall rating of B+ based on scores achieved for the quantitative measures used to rate performance on this goal. Overall performance meets expectations of performance as set by the performance measures specified for the objectives with no notable areas of increased or diminished performance identified. The following table summarizes the scores and overall grade for this goal. Comments are contained within the individual objects that follow.

Goal Performance Rating Summary

Objective	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
7.1 Manage Facilities and Infrastructure in an Efficient and Effective Manner that Optimizes Usage and Minimizes Life Cycle Costs	B+	3.40	50%	1.70	
7.2 Provide Planning for and Acquire the Facilities and Infrastructure Required to support Future Laboratory Programs	B+	3.43	50%	1.72	
Overall Performance Goal 7.0 Total					3.42

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

The Site Office agrees with the rating of B+. The score for this objective was based on averaging the score on two of three quantitative performance measures. Comments on how the measures were scored follow.

Measure 7.1.1 – Asset Condition Index (ACI)

The Site Office agrees with the rating of B+ and a score of 3.4. The score for this measure is calculated based on data in the Facilities Information Management System (FIMS) and performance level requirements specified in DOE O 430.1B “Real Property Asset Management.”

Measure 7.1.2 – Percentage of planned facility condition assessments completed during the fiscal year

The Site Office agrees with the no rating for this measure based upon the following. Facility Condition Inspections were not conducted during this performance period due to delay in receipt of funding.

Measure 7.1.3 – Percentage of indirect projects completed from the planned project list for the fiscal year: Indirect projects completed include those that are procured as well as those that have been closed out. The planned project list is determined after the budget has been finalized. Projects delayed by operations, including those displaced by higher priority projects, and so documented will be rescheduled. The new completion date will be used for performance level calculation.

The Site Office agrees with the rating of B+ and a score of 3.4. The score for this measure was based on an average of the percentage completion of projects at the end of the performance period as compared to the expected percentage completion. The average equates to a corresponding performance level of 95%. This level of performance meets expectations.

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

The Site Office agrees with the rating of B+. The score for this objective was based on averaging the score of the following four quantitative performance measures. Comments on how the measures were scored follow.

Measure 7.2.1 – Schedule Performance on CEBAF Center Addition: Actual completion compared to baseline completion

The Site Office agrees with the rating of B+ and a score of 3.4. The project was completed on schedule. This level of performance meets expectations.

Measure 7.2.2 – Cost Performance on CEBAF Center Addition Project

The Site Office agrees with the rating of B+ and a score of 3.4. The CEBAF Center Addition project was completed on cost with the level of technical performance meeting expectations.

Measure 7.2.3 – Cost Performance on Projects \geq \$100K

The Site Office agrees with the rating of B+ and a score of 3.4. The average value of change orders on project completed during this performance period was 1%. This level of performance meets expectations.

Measure 7.2.4 – Scheduled Performance on Projects \geq \$100K

The Site Office agrees with the rating of B+ and a score of 3.5. The average of construction project durations during this performance period was 1.06 times the planned duration. This level of performance meets expectations.

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

The Site Office concurs with the overall rating of A resulting from the performance measures as an accurate evaluation of the Laboratory’s FY 2006 Emergency Management, Cyber Security and ISSM performance. The following table summarizes the scoring from each of the objectives:

Goal Performance Rating Summary

Objectives	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System	B+	3.40	30%	1.02	
8.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for Cyber-Security	A+	4.17	50%	2.09	
8.3 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Special Nuclear Materials, Classified Matter, and Property	A	3.90	10%	.39	
8.4 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Classified and Sensitive Information	A	3.90	10%	.39	
Overall Performance Goal 8.0 Total					3.89

Objective 8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System

The Site Office concurs with the overall rating of B+ resulting from the performance measure as an accurate evaluation of the Laboratory’s FY 2006 emergency management performance.

Measure 8.1.1 – Provision of effective Emergency Management System

The Site Office agrees with a rating of B+ and a score of 3.4. Jefferson Lab provided an accurate evaluation and assessment of their performance during the rating period. The Lab conducted an Avian Influenza Pandemic Tabletop which displaced another, previously scheduled event. This change was dictated by the increasing level of public-health concern about the spread of avian flu and the impact it will have on all types of non-essential operations. There were no major emergency events during the rating period. On-site and off-site responses to 911 calls were prompt and efficient. Fire alarms and system operational alarms were properly verified and notification issued per rapid-page and other procedures. The Lab partially completed the six recommendations from the 2005 Peer Review.

Objective 8.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for Cyber Security

The Site Office concurs with the overall rating of A+ resulting from the performance measures as an accurate evaluation of the Laboratory’s FY 2006 Cyber Security performance based on the following:

Measure 8.2.1 – Compromises, attacks and reporting

The Site Office agrees with a rating of A+ and a score of 4.3. There have been no successful attacks so far in FY 2006. There were no root-level compromises during this period. Cyber security controls range from mitigating risks with Internet-based technology and processes that provide assurance for information and systems. This includes automatic edits to analyze large quantities of data, the ability to trace Internet-based actions and transactions to individuals, as well as written policy and its implementation within coded instructions. This is a comprehensive and critical metric for cyber security for it indicates related security processes are working. Just one occurrence of a compromise has potential for disastrous effects, and the loss of time, data, and money could cause severe ramifications to any division. Most importantly, cyber security is not negatively impacting the delivery of science.

Measure 8.2.2 – Employee and user awareness of cyber-security vulnerabilities

The Site Office agrees with a rating of A and a score of 3.9. 100% of employees have completed their annual security awareness training which includes cyber-security awareness. The annual User training is separate and will take place later this spring. All new Users have had the training.

Measure 8.2.3 – Performance on addressing identified cyber-security vulnerabilities

The Site Office agrees with a rating of A and a score of 4.3. At the start of FY 2006, the Lab had six milestones open. The Site Office met with the Lab CIO on a recurring basis to discuss and verify status of each POAM. Three of these metrics were scheduled for completion by the end of FY 2006 Q2, (1) Deploy workflow management system for vulnerability scanning operations, (2) add history to the UNIX/Windows user management utility, and (3) training. These were completed, closed out and verified by the Site Office.

The metric associated with authentication for core systems, has been on hold in accordance with a DOE administrative directive. The Site Office considers this milestone closed but reopened under a new project in order to address additional requirements and compatibility with new DOE standards.

Two milestones, Integration Agent, and VLAN implementation, were due for closure in the third quarter. The specified objectives of Integration Agent are substantially complete. It has been closed. An assessment of VLAN execution shows that substantial work has been completed, but the complexity of the problem and newly available technology justify a reorganization of the project, incorporating extended goals of an integration agent along the way. The Site Office believes this is reflected in new findings for Asset Management and Network Control which has been inserted into both the DOE POAM and Site Office oversight systems.

The performance levels measure the percent of milestones complete, and as explained above, all milestones planned for completion during the PEMP evaluation period were completed on schedule.

Objective 8.3 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Special Nuclear Materials and Property

The Site Office concurs with the overall rating of A resulting from the performance measures as an accurate evaluation of the Laboratory's FY 2006 security program, nuclear materials accountability and other security-related activities performance based on the following:

Jefferson Lab reorganized administrative resources to provide more efficient international registration and JLab badge controls. The Laboratory's Human Resources now register all persons requesting badge access to the Laboratory. Jefferson Lab badges are now controlled and issued by Facility Management. Additionally, Administrative Manual 301.05 Unclassified Foreign Visits & Assignment policy, the JLab Site Security Plan, and FY 2006 Security Profile were all revised to update and document new policy and procedures. One of the new policies developed and implemented was public area procedures at CEBAF Center to aid in international scientific exchange.

With respect to the Laboratory's Physical Security program, a new small business, woman-owned security services subcontract was selected competitively to provide, operate and maintain unarmed, uniformed security guard services at Jefferson Lab. The new security guard subcontractor, Top Guard Security, has provided highly qualified unarmed guards, who project a professional image, are licensed by the Commonwealth of Virginia, and have maintained currency in all required training. Additionally, Top Guard Security supervisor attended the Safety Training Observation Program (STOP) and has actively performed work force observations to identify at-risk behaviors.

Jefferson Lab has improved the site's physical security systems by installing new automated access controls, passive video surveillance, additional automated key control boxes, and improved passive video recording systems at the CEBAF Accelerator.

In regards to Nuclear Materials Control & Accountability, Jefferson Lab has submitted all required Nuclear Materials "transactions" and quarterly "inventories" accurately and on time.

Objective 8.4 Provide an Efficient and Effective Program for the Protection of Sensitive Information

The Site Office concurs with the overall rating of A resulting from the performance measures as an accurate evaluation of the Laboratory's FY 2006 protection of sensitive information performance based on the following:

While there is no classified information at Jefferson Lab, there is sensitive information (e.g., business sensitive information, personnel records, and employee concerns records) that require protection from unauthorized access. For this evaluation period, there have been no issues identified with respect to any deficiencies with the control of sensitive information from any internal or external; reviews, assessments, or audits. Authorized access to sensitive information is being managed professionally and is being properly protected. In addition, the annual security awareness training that is required by all site personnel provides sensitive information awareness as part of the training.