

**U.S. Department of Energy**  
**and**  
**Brookhaven Science Associates, LLC**

**ATTACHMENT J.2**

**APPENDIX B**

**PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND  
MEASUREMENT PLAN**

**FY 2008**

**BROOKHAVEN NATIONAL LABORATORY**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
I Determining The Contractor's Performance Rating, And Performance-Based Fee	2
II Performance Goals, Objectives & Performance Measures	8
III Schedule	9
Goals, Objectives, Measures and Targets	
<b>1.0 Provide for Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment</b>	11
1.1 Science and Technology Results Provide Meaningful Impact on the Field	12
1.2 Provide Quality Leadership in Science and Technology	12
1.3 Provide and sustain Outputs that Advance Program Objectives & Goals	13
1.4 Provide for Effective Delivery of Products	14
<b>2.0 Provide for Efficient and Effective Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operations of Research Facilities</b>	19
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s) as Required to Support Laboratory Programs (i.e., activities leading up to CD-2)	19
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components (execution phase, Post CD-2 to CD-4)	21
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities	22
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Lab's Research Base and External User Community	23
<b>3.0 Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Program Management</b>	26
3.1 Provide Effective and Efficient Stewardship of Scientific Capabilities and Program Vision	27
3.2 Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Project/Program Planning and Management	28
3.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Communications and Responsiveness to Customer Needs	28
<b>4.0 Provide Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory</b>	35
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	35
4.2 Provide for Responsive and Accountable Leadership throughout the Organization	36
4.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Corporate Office Support as Appropriate	36

<b>5.0 Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection</b>	38
5.1 Provide a Work Environment that Protects Workers and the Environment	38
5.2 Provide Efficient and Effective Implementation of Integrated Safety, Health and Environment Management	39
5.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Waste Management, Minimization, and Pollution Prevention	41
<b>6.0 Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission(s)</b>	43
6.1 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Financial Management System(s)	43
6.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition and Property Management System(s)	43
6.3 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Human Resources Management System and Diversity Program	45
6.4 Provide Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Management Systems for Internal Audit and Oversight; Quality; Information Management; and Other Administrative Support Services as Appropriate	46
6.5 Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Technology and Commercialization of Intellectual Assets	47
<b>7.0 Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs</b>	49
7.1 Manage Facilities and Infrastructure in an Efficient and Effective Manner that Optimizes Usage and Minimizes Life Cycle Costs	49
7.2 Provide Planning for and Acquire the Facilities and Infrastructure Required to support Future Laboratory Programs	51
<b>8.0 Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM) and Emergency Management Systems</b>	54
8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System	54
8.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for Cyber-Security	55
8.3 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Special Nuclear Materials, Classified Matter, and Property	56
8.4 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Classified and Sensitive Information	56

## INTRODUCTION

This document, the Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan (PEMP), primarily serves as DOE's Quality Assurance/Surveillance Plan (QASP) for the evaluation of Brookhaven Science Associates (hereafter referred to as "the Contractor") performance regarding the management and operations of the Brookhaven National Laboratory (hereafter referred to as "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, "Performance and Other Available Fee", "Conditional Payment of Fee, Profit, or Incentives," and "Total Available Fee: Base Fee Amount and Performance Fee Amount." In partnership with the Contractor and key customers, the Department of Energy (DOE) Headquarters (HQ) and the Site Office have defined the measurement basis that serves as the Contractor's performance-based evaluation and fee determination.

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

The overall performance against each Objective of this performance plan, to include the evaluation of Performance Measures identified for each Objective, shall be evaluated jointly by the appropriate HQ office or major customer and the Site Office. 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 Site Office shall work closely with each HQ program office or major customer throughout the year in evaluating the Contractor's performance and will provide observations regarding programs and projects as well as other management and operation activities conducted by the Contractor throughout the year.

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

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, AND PERFORMANCE-BASED FEE**

The available fee for FY 2008 is \$7,400,000. 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 FY 2008. 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.) may be utilized in determining the Contractor's overall success in meeting an Objective. The following describes the methodology for determining the Contractor's grade for each Goal:

### Performance Evaluation Methodology:

The purpose of this section is to establish a methodology to develop scoring at the Objective Level. Each Objective within a Goal shall be assigned a numerical score, per Figure I-1 below, by the evaluating office. Each evaluation will measure the degree of effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in meeting the Objective and shall be based on the Contractor's success in meeting the set of Performance Measures identified for each Objective as well as other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources as identified above. The set of Performance Measures identified for each Objective represent the set of significant indicators that if fully met, collectively places performance for the Objective in the "B+" grade range. 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 evaluation 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.
B+	3.4 – 3.1	Meets expectations of performance as set by the performance measures identified for each Objective with no notable areas of increased or diminished performance identified. Deficiencies identified are offset by positive performance and have little to no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
B	3.0 – 2.8	Most expectations of performance as set by the performance measures identified for each Objective are met and/or other minor deficiencies are identified. Performance measures or other minor deficiencies identified are offset by positive performance within the purview of the Objective and have little to no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
B-	2.7 – 2.5	One or two expectations of performance set by the performance measures are not met and/or other deficiencies are identified and although they may be offset by other positive performance, they may have the potential to negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
C+	2.4 – 2.1	Some expectations of performance set by the performance measures are not met and/or other minor deficiencies are identified and although they may be offset by other positive performance, they may have the potential to negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
C	2.0 – 1.8	A number of expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or a number of other deficiencies are identified and although they may be somewhat offset by other positive performance, they have the potential to negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
C-	1.7 – 1.1	Most expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or other major deficiencies are identified which have or will

Letter Grade	Numeric Grade	Definition
		negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment if not immediately corrected.
D	1.0 – 0.8	Most or all expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or other significant deficiencies are identified which have negatively impacted the Objective and/or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
F	0.7 – 0	All expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or other significant deficiencies are identified which have significantly impacted both the Objective and the accomplishment of the Laboratory mission.

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

<b>S&amp;T Performance Goal</b>	<b>Numerical Score</b>	<b>Letter Grade</b>	<b>Weight<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Weighted Score</b>	<b>Total Score</b>
1.0 Mission Accomplishment			40%		
2.0 Construction and Operations of User Research Facilities and Equipment			36%		
3.0 Science and Technology Research Project/Program Management			24%		
<b>Total Score</b>					
<b>M&amp;O Performance Goal</b>	<b>Numerical Score</b>	<b>Letter Grade</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Weighted Score</b>	<b>Total Score</b>
4.0 Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory			25%		
5.0 Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection			20%		
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			20%		
<b>Total Score</b>					

**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**

**Determining the Amount of Performance-Based Fee Earned:**

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 FY 2008 as calculated within Table D.

<sup>1</sup> Weightings for Goals 1, 2 and 3 are preliminary, based upon FY 2007 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.

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

**Table C. - Performance-Based Fee Earned Scale**

<b>Overall Fee Determination</b>	
<b>Percent S&amp;T Fee Earned from Table C.</b>	
<b>M&amp;O Fee Multiplier from Table C.</b>	X
<b>Overall Earned Performance-Based Fee</b>	

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

<b>Earned Fee Calculation</b>	
<b>Available Fee</b>	
<b>Overall Earned Performance -Base Fee (Table D)</b>	X
<b>Earned Fee</b>	

**Table E. – Earned Fee Calculation**

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

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

any); other outside agency reviews (OIG, GAO, DCAA, etc.), and the annual 2-week review (if needed).

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

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

## **II. PERFORMANCE GOALS, OBJECTIVES & PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

### **Background**

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

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

The performance-based approach focuses the evaluation of the Contractor's performance against these Performance Goals. Progress against these Goals is measured through the use of a set of Objectives. The success of each Objective will be measured based on a set of 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 FY 2008

### **III. Schedule**

In order to clearly define the path forward, the following generic schedule is presented as a guide. BSA and DOE acknowledge that the nature of the processes involved demands flexibility in the schedules.

#### **FY 2008 Performance Evaluation Schedule**

##### **October:**

- October 1 - Site Office incorporates PEMP into the prime contract for the **Next Fiscal Year**.
- October 1 - BSA initiates the Self-Evaluation process for the **Completed Fiscal Year**.
- Third Week – BSA sends the Site Office its performance evaluation of the PEMP for the Third Period. Site Office conducts the Third Period performance status review for the **Completed Fiscal Year**.

##### **November:**

- November 15 - BSA submits its Annual Self-Evaluation Report to DOE for the **Completed Fiscal Year**.
- November 15 – SC HQ, AD and other customer input due to BHSO Manager for the **Completed Fiscal Year**.

##### **December:**

- BHSO sends draft Performance Appraisal Report to BSA for review.

##### **January:**

- First Week - Site Office Performance Evaluation Presentation for SC-1 due to SC Office of Laboratory Policy for the **Completed Fiscal Year**.
- Third Week - Annual SC Laboratory Appraisal Meetings and Presentations to SC-1 for the **Completed Fiscal Year**.
- Last Week - Site Office adjustments to evaluations finalized as necessary based on results of SC-1 presentation and SC-1 approvals issued for the **Completed Fiscal Year**.

**February:**

- DOE transmits the final DOE Annual Performance Appraisal Report for the **Completed Fiscal Year** to BSA.
- Third Week – BSA sends the Site Office its performance evaluation of the PEMP for the First Period. Site Office conducts the First Period performance status review for the **Current Fiscal Year**.

**May:**

- DOE and BSA begin drafting the Measures and Targets for the **Next Fiscal Year**.
- May 1 - SC Laboratory Performance Assessment Process - Fiscal Year Supplemental Guidance issued to Site Offices for the **Next Fiscal Year**.

**June:**

- Third Week – BSA sends the Site Office its performance evaluation of the PEMP for the Second Period. Site Office conducts mid-year performance status review with input from HQ Program Offices for the **Current Fiscal Year**.
- BHSO and BSA work on measures and targets, then compile the draft PEMP for the **Next Fiscal Year**.

**July:**

- Third Week – Site Office and BSA senior management meet on the PEMP's final draft for the **Next Fiscal Year**.

**August:**

- August 1 - BSA submits its final draft of the Measures/Targets to BHSO for the **Next Fiscal Year**.
- August 15 - BHSO sends its final draft to DOE/SC Office of Laboratory Policy.
- SC Program ADs and Site Office Managers meet to review PEMP for **Next Fiscal Year**.

**September:**

- Second Week – SC PEMP Review Board comments issued to the Site Office as needed & Site Office incorporates/disposes comments for the **Next Fiscal Year**.
- Third Week – SC PEMP Review Board Meeting to discuss final PEMP approval recommendations to SC-1 for the **Next Fiscal Year**.
- Third Week - Site Office issues a call for SC year-end evaluation input (due to Site Office by November 15) for the **Completed Fiscal Year**.
- Last Week - SC PEMP Review Board presents recommendations to SC-1 and receives SC-1 approval for the **Next Fiscal Year**.
- Last Week - SC-1 approval memo issued to the Site Offices for the **Next Fiscal Year**.
- September 30 - The Goals, Objectives, Measures and Targets for the **Next Fiscal Year** will be ready to be incorporated into DOE's Prime Contract with BSA.

## 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 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) .3%
- Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES) 28.0%
- Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER) 6.8%
- Office of High Energy Physics (HEP) 12.7%
- Office of Nuclear Physics (NP) 48.2%
- Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS) .2%
- Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation (DNN) (1.6%)
- Department of Homeland Security (DHS) (1.0%)
- Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) (1.3%)

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

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

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

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

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

### 1.2 Provide Quality Leadership in Science and Technology

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

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

- Effectiveness in driving the direction and setting the priorities of the community in a research field.

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

### 1.3 Provide and sustain Outputs that Advance Program Objectives & Goals

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

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

<b>A to A+</b>	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>B<sup>+</sup></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>B</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.
<b>C</b>	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.
<b>D</b>	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.
<b>F</b>	All outputs have not met the amount and/or quality typically expected for the body of work; program office, client, end-user, independent expert and/or peer reviews identify significant deficiencies which have significantly impacted and/or damaged the overall program/project.

#### 1.4 Provide for Effective Delivery of Products

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

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

<b>A to A+</b>	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>B<sup>+</sup></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>B</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.
<b>C</b>	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.
<b>D</b>	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.
<b>F</b>	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.

<b>Science Program Office<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Letter Grade</b>	<b>Numerical Score</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Weighted Score</b>	<b>Overall Score</b>
<b>Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research</b>					
1.1 Impact			40%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			15%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
Overall ASCR Total					
<b>Office of Basic Energy Sciences</b>					
1.1 Impact			50%		
1.2 Leadership			20%		
1.3 Output			15%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
Overall BES Total					
<b>Office of Biological and Environmental Research</b>					
1.1 Impact			30%		
1.2 Leadership			20%		
1.3 Output			20%		
1.4 Delivery			30%		
Overall BER Total					
<b>Office of High Energy Physics</b>					
1.1 Impact			30%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			30%		
1.4 Delivery			10%		
Overall HEP Total					
<b>Office of Nuclear Physics</b>					
1.1 Impact			35%		
1.2 Leadership			25%		
1.3 Output			25%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
Overall NP Total					
<b>Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists</b>					
1.1 Impact			25%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			30%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
Overall WDTS Total					

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

<sup>2</sup> A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the SC Programs is provided within Attachment I to this plan.

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research			.3%		
Office of Basic Energy Sciences			28.0%		
Office of Biological and Environmental Research			6.8%		
Office of High Energy Physics			12.7%		
Office of Nuclear Physics			48.2%		
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists			.2%		
Performance Goal 1.0 Total					

**Table 1.2 – SC Program Office Overall Performance Goal Score Development<sup>3</sup>**

HQ Program Office <sup>4</sup>	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
<b>Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation</b>					
1.1 Impact			25%		
1.2 Leadership			25%		
1.3 Output			25%		
1.4 Delivery			25%		
Overall DNN Total					
<b>Department of Homeland Security</b>					
1.1 Impact			25%		
1.2 Leadership			25%		
1.3 Output			25%		
1.4 Delivery			25%		
Overall DHS Total					
<b>Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy</b>					
1.1 Impact			25%		
1.2 Leadership			25%		
1.3 Output			25%		
1.4 Delivery			25%		
Overall EERE Total					

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

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

<sup>4</sup> A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the other Programs and other customers is provided within Attachment I to this plan.

HQ Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Science			96.1%		
Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation			1.6%		
Department of Homeland Security			1.0%		
Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy			1.3%		
Performance Goal 1.0 Total					

**Table 1.4 – Overall Performance Goal Score Development<sup>5</sup>**

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

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

<sup>5</sup> Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 1.2 are preliminary, based upon FY 2007 Budget Authority figures, and are provided for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2008.

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

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

The weight of this Goal is 36%.

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

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science 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 Tables 2.1, & 2.2). 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) .3%
- Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES) 29.1%
- Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER) 7.0%
- Office of High Energy Physics (HEP) 13.2%
- Office of Nuclear Physics (NP) 50.2%
- Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS) .2%

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned to each of the objectives by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 2.2 below). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 2.3 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as viewed by SC.

### Objectives:

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

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by scientific/technical workshops developing pre-

conceptual R&D, progress reports, Lehman reviews, Program/Staff Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities

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

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

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

## 2.4 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.

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

<b>Science Program Office<sup>6</sup></b>	<b>Letter Grade</b>	<b>Numerical Score</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Weighted Score</b>	<b>Overall Score</b>
<b>Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research</b>					
2.1 Design of Facility			0%		
2.2 Construction of Facility/Fabrication of Components			0%		
2.3 Operation of Facility			0%		
2.4 Utilization of Facility			0%		
<b>Overall ASCR Total</b>					
<b>Office of Basic Energy Sciences</b>					
2.1 Design of Facility			30%		
2.2 Construction of Facility/Fabrication of Components			20%		
2.3 Operation of Facility			40%		
2.4 Utilization of Facility			10%		
<b>Overall BES Total</b>					
<b>Office of Biological and Environmental Research</b>					
2.1 Design of Facility			0%		
2.2 Construction of Facility/Fabrication of Components			0%		
2.3 Operation of Facility			90%		
2.4 Utilization of Facility			10%		
<b>Overall BER Total</b>					
<b>Office of High Energy Physics</b>					
2.1 Design of Facility			50%		
2.2 Construction of Facility/Fabrication of Components			50%		
2.3 Operation of Facility			0%		
2.4 Utilization of Facility			0%		
<b>Overall HEP Total</b>					
<b>Office of Nuclear Physics</b>					
2.1 Design of Facility			0%		
2.2 Construction of Facility/Fabrication of Components			0%		
2.3 Operation of Facility			85%		
2.4 Utilization of Facility			15%		
<b>Overall NP Total</b>					
<b>Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists</b>					
2.1 Design of Facility			0%		
2.2 Construction of Facility/Fabrication of Components			0%		
2.3 Operation of Facility			0%		

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

2.4 Utilization of Facility			%		
Overall WDTS Total					

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

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research			.3%		
Office of Basic Energy Sciences			29.1%		
Office of Biological and Environmental Research			7.0%		
Office of High Energy Physics			13.2%		
Office of Nuclear Physics			50.2%		
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists			.2%		
Performance Goal 2.0 Total					

**Table 2.2 – SC Program Office Overall Performance Goal Score Development<sup>7</sup>**

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

**Table 2.3 – 2.0 Goal Final Letter Grade**

<sup>7</sup> Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 2.2 are preliminary, based upon FY 2007 Budget Authority figures, and are provided for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2008.

### **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 24%.

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 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) .3%
- Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES) 28.0%
- Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER) 6.8%
- Office of High Energy Physics (HEP) 12.7%
- Office of Nuclear Physics (NP) 48.2%
- Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS) .2%
- Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation (DNN) (1.6%)
- Department of Homeland Security (DHS) (1.0%)
- Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) (1.3%)

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

Objectives:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<b>Science Program Office<sup>8</sup></b>	<b>Letter Grade</b>	<b>Numerical Score</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Weighted Score</b>	<b>Overall Score</b>
<b>Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			30%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			30%		
<b>Overall ASCR Total</b>					
<b>Office of Basic Energy Sciences</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			30%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			30%		
<b>Overall BER Total</b>					
<b>Office of Biological and Environmental Research</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			20%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			30%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			50%		
<b>Overall BES Total</b>					
<b>Office of High Energy Physics</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			20%		
<b>Overall HEP Total</b>					
<b>Office of Nuclear Physics</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			20%		
<b>Overall NP Total</b>					
<b>Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			20%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			40%		
<b>Overall WDTS Total</b>					

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

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

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research			.3%		
Office of Basic Energy Sciences			28.0%		
Office of Biological and Environmental Research			6.8%		
Office of High Energy Physics			12.7%		
Office of Nuclear Physics			48.2%		
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists			.2%		
Performance Goal 3.0 Total					

**Table 3.2 – SC Program Office Overall Performance Goal Score Development<sup>9</sup>**

HQ Program Office <sup>10</sup>	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
<b>Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			34%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			33%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			33%		
Overall DNN Total					
<b>Department of Homeland Security</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			34%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			33%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			33%		
Overall DHS Total					
<b>Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy</b>					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			34%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			33%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			33%		
Overall EERE Total					

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

<sup>9</sup> 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.

<sup>10</sup> A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the other Programs and other customers is provided within Attachment I to this plan.

HQ Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Science			96.1%		
Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation			1.6%		
Department of Homeland Security			1.0%		
Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy			1.3%		
Performance Goal 3.0 Total					

**Table 3.4 – Overall Performance Goal Score Development<sup>11</sup>**

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

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

<sup>11</sup> Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 3.2 are preliminary, based upon FY 2007 Budget Authority figures, and are provided for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2008.

**Attachment I**

**Program Office Goal & Objective Weightings**

**Office of Science**

		<b>ASCR</b>	<b>BES</b>	<b>BER</b>	<b>HEP</b>	<b>NP</b>	<b>WDS</b>
		<b>Weight</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Weight</b>
<b>Goal #1 Mission Accomplishment</b>							
	<b>Goal's weight</b>	80%	30%	50%	40%	40%	65%
1.1 Impact (significance)		40%	50%	30%	30%	35%	25%
1.2 Leadership (recognition of S&T accomplishments)		30%	20%	20%	30%	25%	30%
1.3 Output (productivity)		15%	15%	20%	30%	25%	30%
1.4 Delivery		15%	15%	30%	10%	15%	15%
<b>Goal #2 Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operation of Facilities</b>							
	<b>Goal's weight</b>	0%	50%	25%	30%	40%	0%
2.1 Design of Facility (the initiation phase and the definition phase, i.e. activities leading up to CD-2)			30%	0%	50%	0%	
2.2 Construction of Facility/Fabrication of Components (execution phase, Post CD-2 to CD-4)			20%	0%	50%	0%	
2.3 Operation of Facility			40%	90%	0%	85%	
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Lab's Research Base and External			10%	10%	0%	15%	
<b>Goal #3 Program Management</b>							
	<b>Goal's weight</b>	20%	20%	25%	30%	20%	35%
3.1 Stewardship of Scientific Capabilities and Programmatic Vision		30%	40%	20%	40%	40%	20%
3.2 Program Planning and Management		40%	30%	30%	40%	40%	40%
3.3 Program Management-Communication & Responsiveness (to HQ)		30%	30%	50%	20%	20%	40%

**Attachment I**

**Program Office Goal & Objective Weightings**

**All Other Customers**

	DNN	DHS	EERE
	Weight	Weight	Weight
<b>Goal 1.0 Mission Accomplishment<sup>12</sup></b>			
<b>Goal's weight</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>50%</b>
1.1 Impact (significance)	25%	25%	25%
1.2 Leadership (recognition of S&T accomplishments)	25%	25%	25%
1.3 Output (productivity) (pass/fail)	25%	25%	25%
1.4 Delivery (pass/fail)	25%	25%	25%
<b>Goal 2.0 Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operation of Facilities</b>			
<b>Goal's weight</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
2.1 Design of Facility (the initiation phase and the definition phase, i.e. activities leading up to CD-2)	0%	0%	0%
2.2 Construction of Facility/Fabrication of Components (execution phase, Post CD-2 to CD-4)	0%	0%	0%
2.3 Operation of Facility	0%	0%	0%
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Lab's Research Base and External User Community	0%	0%	0%
<b>Goal 3.0 Program Management</b>			
<b>Goal's weight</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>50%</b>
3.1 Stewardship of Scientific Capabilities and Programmatic Vision	34%	34%	34%
3.2 Program Planning and Management	33%	33%	33%
3.3 Program Management-Communication & Responsiveness (to HQ)	33%	33%	33%

<sup>12</sup> The Goal and Objective weights are based on previous discussions with the Other Customers.

**Goal 4.0 Provide Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory**

**The Contractor's leadership provides effective and efficient direction in strategic planning to meet the mission 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 for the overall success of the laboratory.**

The weight of this Goal is 25%.

**Objective 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.**

The weight of this Objective is 30%.

**Measure 4.1.1**

BSA will deliver and implement an effective integrated strategy to sustain the viability of BNL as a leading scientific institution into the foreseeable future.

**Target 4.1.1.1**

BSA will demonstrate that it is managing to the strategic agenda of the laboratory through management actions and plans (e.g., Strategic Research Partnerships, Annual Laboratory Plan, Organizational Unit Business Plans).

**Target 4.1.1.2**

BSA will maintain effective communication with the Laboratory's many communities about the mission of the Office of Science, the Laboratory's scientific and technological achievements, and the priority initiatives as articulated in the Strategic Plan.

**Measure 4.1.2**

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

**Target 4.1.2.1**

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 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.

**Objective 4.2 – Provide for Responsive and Accountable Leadership throughout the Organization.**

The weight of this Objective is 40%.

**Measure 4.2.1**

Corporate Leadership - BSA is responsible and accountable for Laboratory performance.

**Target 4.2.1.1**

BSA's laboratory management team demonstrates effective stewardship and accountability of Laboratory assets, operations, systems, and managers.

**Target 4.2.1.2**

The Laboratory Management will engage constructively with BSA Corporate to ensure they fully understand and, where necessary, assist in resolution of Laboratory issues including those related to environmental cleanup.

**Objective 4.3 - Provide Efficient and Effective Corporate Office Support as Appropriate.**

The weight of this Objective is 30%.

**Measure 4.3.1**

BSA Corporate will provide resources to demonstrate its commitment to the success of BNL. Consideration will be given to the strategic impact and the magnitude of corporate support, which may be in any form, such as:

- Enhancing relationships with state and local entities.
- Assuring leadership positions are filled in a timely manner.
- Leveraging agreements with external partners.
- Assisting with infrastructure improvement opportunities.
- Increasing operating efficiency.
- Supporting effort to increase efficiency of business and effectively manage indirects.
- Establishing joint appointments that are aligned with the strategic objectives of the Lab.
- Providing staff, expert advice, management systems, or similar assistance to achieve BNL objectives.

**Target 4.3.1.1**

Tangible resources will be provided by BSA Corporate to facilitate BNL objectives.

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

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

**The Contractor protects the safety and health of the doe contractor workforce, subcontractors, the community, and the environment in all DOE-sponsored work at the site, and sustains and enhances the effectiveness of integrated safety, health and environmental protection through a strong and well-deployed system.**

The weight of this Goal is 20%.

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

The weight of this Objective is 20%.

**Measure 5.1.1**

BSA will demonstrate progress in achieving and maintaining “best in class” safety and health performance. Within the framework of its Integrated Safety Management System, BSA will particularly focus on reducing worker injuries through:

- Worker involvement in work planning and feedback and improvement processes.
- Tracking and trending worker injuries, near misses, and error precursor conditions and events.
- Developing and sustaining a reporting culture that ensures feedback and improvement opportunities.
- Evaluating the causes of adverse incident/injury trends and taking effective corrective actions.
- Assessing nature and severity of worker injuries.
- Benchmarking best in class performers and incorporating lessons-learned into BSA’s ISM program.
- Ensuring high quality radiological and industrial hygiene monitoring of facilities and jobsites.
- Providing appropriate medical surveillance of workers.
- Maintaining a “Green” safety performance as reported in the Environmental Management (EM) Quarterly Performance Review throughout the Fiscal Year.

**Target 5.1.1.1**

BSA will meet the Office of Science goal of 0.25 DART cases per 200,000 hours worked

**Target 5.1.1.2**

BSA will meet the Office of Science goal of 0.65 TRC cases per 200,000 hours worked

**Target 5.1.1.3**

BSA will demonstrate a reporting culture through effective implementation of feedback and improvements processes for ES&H performance. DOE will evaluate through assessment of a representative sample of issues/events for appropriate categorization and effective causal analysis.

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

The weight of this Objective is 60%.

**Measure 5.2.1**

BSA will implement, maintain, and continually improve an integrated safety management system that:

- Clearly states environmental and occupational health and safety (ESH) policies, programs and objectives appropriate for BNL operations,
- Identifies ES&H risks and legal requirements,
- Takes a proactive approach to ES&H risks and involves employees in the development and implementation of procedures,
- Controls or eliminates ES&H risks to prevent accidents,
- Monitors environmental management system (EMS) and occupational safety and health management (OSH) system performance, and
- Ensures continual review, evaluation, and improvement of the system.

**Target 5.2.1.1**

BSA will demonstrate full implementation of the three tiered Work Planning & Control Process based on DOE evaluation of a representative sample of work planning packages against the revised Work Planning and Control subject area.

**Target 5.2.1.2**

Work Planning and Control - Collective Exposure (ALARA). BSA will develop and meet an agreed-upon ALARA goal for FY08 based upon anticipated Laboratory work scope. The goal will be established and agreed upon by October 5, 2007. This goal will include Total Effective Dose Equivalent (TEDE) radiological exposure from all BNL Organizations, including Environmental Restoration Projects.

*[Change control: During the course of the FY, BSA may submit an ALARA adjustment that changes the FY08 goal by +/- 10% for BHSO review and approval. Collective exposure goal changes must include a solid explanation for the adjustment].*

**Target 5.2.1.3**

Development and Implementation of Hazard Controls - BSA will develop and implement an appropriate risk-based Corrective Action Plan in response to the BHSO FY07 Fire Protection Assessment and the BSA FY07 NTS Report.

**Target 5.2.1.4**

Feedback and improvement – BSA will demonstrate effective implementation of their safety observation process for Level 1, 2, and 3 managers by:

- Full implementation of the tracking and trending database evidences by the submission of mid-year and end of year reports.
- Meeting the established FY2008 Department/Division goals established in each manager's performance plan for number of documented safety observations (90% of Level 1, 2, and 3 Managers meeting goal).

**Target 5.2.1.5**

Feedback and Improvement - BSA will develop a set of performance measures for BHSO review and approval by March 30, 2008, that will demonstrate that the BNL ISMS program is effective. Performance against measures is to be incorporated into BSA Annual ISM Declaration.

**Measure 5.2.2**

ISO 14001 EMS and OHSAS 18001 Certification - BSA has acquired and maintained third-party certifications for the Environmental Management System (ISO 14001:2004) and the Occupational Safety and Health Management System (OHSAS 18001). These external certifications provide credibility and rigor to the implementation of the systems.

**Target 5.2.2.1**

Maintain certification of the Environmental Management System to the ISO 14001:2004 standard as determined by the third party audit.

**Target 5.2.2.2**

Maintain certification of the Occupational Safety & Health Management System to the OHSAS 18001 standard as determined by the third party audit.

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

The weight of this Objective is 20%.

**Measure 5.3.1**

BSA will demonstrate that it has effective processes in place for sustaining and enhancing Waste Management, Minimization, and Pollution Prevention to include:

- A management focus on reducing the inventory of unneeded materials and chemicals.
- Meeting the waste processing needs of BNL customers.
- Maintaining waste storage and processing areas in compliance with applicable laws and regulations.
- Working with internal customers to communicate best practices for waste minimization.
- Incentive programs for proposing projects to reduce waste and eliminate emissions.
- Developing new disposal pathways for wastes.
- Continuous improvement in waste management and pollution prevention practices.

**Target 5.3.1.1**

Develop and implement a plan to make the Pollution Prevention program sustainable:

Task 1:

- a. Evaluate a minimum of 4 alternatives for funding the P2 program including:
  1. Internal direct funding through direct allocation
  2. Tariff/tax on waste generation
  3. Continued overhead funding
  4. Recycle revenue
- b. Prepare an evaluation of alternatives and submit the evaluation to Management by 3/31/08.

Task 2:

- a. Management reviews the alternatives and directs the path forward by 6/30/08.

Task 3:

- a. Proceed with Management directive and establish new P2 program by 9/3/08.

**Target 5.3.1.2**

Continue progress with disposition of nuclear materials, legacy waste, excess materials and chemicals, and environmental projects including disposition of all excess U-233 with a goal of an overall reduction of the excess material footprint at BNL. A prioritized inventory of materials for disposition that apply to this target will be submitted to BHSO by December 31, 2007.

**Target 5.3.1.3**

Conduct a gap analysis, consistent with available guidance from DOE/SC, for implementation of Executive Order 13423, “Strengthening Federal Environmental, Energy and Transportation Management,” and develop baselines to measure performance against.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
<b>5.0 Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection</b>					
5.1 Provide a Work Environment that Protects Workers and the Environment			20%		
5.2 Provide Efficient and Effective Implementation of Integrated Safety, Health and Environmental Management			60%		
5.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Waste Management, Minimization, and Pollution Prevention			20%		
Goal 5.0 Total					

**Goal 6.0 Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of Laboratory Missions**

**The Contractor sustains and enhances core business systems that provide efficient and effective support to laboratory programs and its missions.**

The weight of this Goal is 20%.

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

The weight of this Objective is 30%.

**Measure 6.1.1**

The effectiveness and efficiency of the Financial Management System is validated by exercising appropriate control of funds and management of costs. This effort is substantiated through a vigorous process involving operational controls and day-to-day management, audits, assurances and reviews.

**Target 6.1.1.1**

BSA will demonstrate budget, fiscal and financial enterprise effectiveness and efficiency through BSA, DOE and third party assessments which conclude that no material weaknesses were identified.

**Target 6.1.1.2**

The effectiveness of the Financial Management System is validated by internal and external audits, assurances and reviews such as BSA's implementation of OMB Circular A-123 and DOE IG and GAO audits. BSA's success will be determined principally through audit/review results. At the expected performance level, the reports will disclose no material weaknesses and relatively few non-material weaknesses.

**Target 6.1.1.3**

Verifiable cost avoidance and/or cost saving measures will amount to \$250,000 or more.

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

The weight of this Objective is 25%.

**Measure 6.2.1**

The following items will be considered in determining the performance level of an effective and efficient Procurement System:

- The continued certification of the procurement system.
- Meeting the needs of the internal and external customers.

- The establishment and maintenance of appropriate internal controls.
- The continuous improvement of the acquisition management system in accordance with audits, reviews, strategic and corrective action plans.
- The development of responsible corporate citizenship by establishing desirable business practices.
- The continuous professional development of staff including awareness of acquisition management processes and procedures.

The overall evaluation of the measure may also consider any other relevant information directly or indirectly related to the acquisition management system that provides evidence (either positive or negative) of the effectiveness/efficiency of the contractor in meeting the objective.

#### **Target 6.2.1.1**

The summary result of the Procurement Balanced Scorecard (BSC) self-assessment that has been verified and validated by DOE will be used as the target. Achieving 90% of the BSC Measures meet expectations = B+.

#### **Target 6.2.1.2**

The demonstration that adequate staffing levels have been achieved and maintained to accomplish and sustain the goals and objectives of planned initiatives, strategic plans and corrective actions. During the first quarter of the year, BSA will provide DOE with a self-assessment of staffing levels needed for the upcoming year. The level necessary to achieve a B+ rating will be established jointly.

### **Measure 6.2.2**

The following items will be considered in determining the performance level of an effective and efficient Property Management System:

- The continued certification of the property system.
- Meeting the needs of the internal and external customers.
- The establishment and maintenance of appropriate internal controls.
- The continuous improvement of the property management system in accordance with audits, reviews, strategic and corrective action plans.
- The development of responsible corporate citizenship by establishing desirable business practices.
- The continuous professional development of staff including awareness of property management processes and procedures.

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

#### **Target 6.2.2.1**

The summary result of the Property Balanced Scorecard (BSC) self-assessment that has been verified and validated by DOE will be used as the target. Achieving 90% of the BSC Measures meet expectations = B+.

**Target 6.2.2.2**

Demonstration of successful control of laptop computers. Provide DOE with a quarterly report regarding the loss of laptops. This report should:

- A. Include a trending analysis compared to prior FY losses (at a minimum, FY07 shall be included).
- B. Include an analysis on causes for the losses, identifying trends, and highlight deficiencies, if any, in the current system.
- C. Identify corrective action(s) taken to minimize losses.

**Objective 6.3 - Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Human Resources Management System and Diversity Program.**

The weight of this Objective is 20%.

**Measure 6.3.1**

BSA will achieve success in attracting and retaining highly qualified employees while maintaining an effective compensation and benefits program.

**Target 6.3.1.1**

By the end of FY 2008, BSA will have filled (75%) of the positions identified.

**Target 6.3.1.2**

Percent of terminating employees with the two highest performance levels (DP & CP) = 10% less than percentage of BNL's overall population with those two performance levels.

**Target 6.3.1.3**

Demonstrate proactive efforts in monitoring effectiveness of the Laboratory's benefits program. BSA will generate a report at the end of the fiscal year that documents the cost savings and or cost avoidances which resulted from BSA's proactive efforts to operate the benefits program in an efficient manner.

**Target 6.3.1.4**

CY 2008 salary plan for Scientific Staff is within 2% of its targeted market position.

**Measure 6.3.2**

BSA demonstrates successful Diversity Management practices that have a positive impact on workforce demographics and foster an inclusive work environment.

**Target 6.3.2.1**

95% of Level II Managers will complete Diversity Engagement Practices Checklist(s).

**Target 6.3.2.2**

100% of Scientific Departments will incorporate a diversity management component in their FY09 Business Plan.

**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.**

The weight of this Objective is 15%.

**Measure 6.4.1**

BSA will demonstrate that it has an effective Contractor Assurance System. Factors to be considered in determining the performance level of the Contractor Assurance program include the effectiveness of the:

- BNL Quality Assurance Program;
- Integrated Assessment Program;
- Internal Audit and Oversight;
- Events and Issues Management Program;
- Causal analysis process;
- Assessment Tracking System (ATS);
- Corrective action effectiveness verification process.
- Employee Concerns Program.

**Target 6.4.1.1**

BSA will develop, implement and demonstrate significant progress towards completing actions responding to the FY 2007 review of the Contractor Assurance System.

**Target 6.4.1.2**

BSA will demonstrate a more effective and consistent process for analyzing SCBNL events and issues from surveillances and assessments using defined causal analysis methodologies.

**Target 6.4.1.3**

Reviews of Internal Audit will disclose no material weaknesses.

**Measure 6.4.2**

BSA will demonstrate that it has effective information management processes in place for the business related administrative enterprise systems (i.e., procurement, property, HR, Guest Information, etc.).

**Target 6.4.2.1**

BSA will demonstrate effectiveness for these business support enterprise systems through a joint customer survey of the Business Systems Division and the Information Technology Division. BSA will use the results of the survey to identify areas for improvement and develop an action plan.

**Objective 6.5 - Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Technology and Commercialization of Intellectual Assets.**

The weight of this Objective is 10%.

**Measure 6.5.1**

In accordance with its strategy and stewardship role, BSA will identify and protect intellectual assets and work to broaden the current portfolio.

**Target 6.5.1.1**

BSA will demonstrate through its commitment to broaden the portfolio and effective deployment of intellectual assets. BSA will report tri-annually on the progress of these targets. Further, BSA will deliver to BHSO a final report covering the entire performance period, which summarizes the results of its actions to demonstrate success. A rating of B+ will be assigned if actions identified, and accepted by DOE, demonstrate improvement over the previous year's technology transfer efforts.

**Target 6.5.1.2**

BSA will demonstrate through its commitment to increasing the commercial potential of its IP portfolio. BSA will report tri-annually on the progress of these targets. Further, BSA will deliver to BHSO a final report covering the entire performance period, which summarizes the results of its actions to demonstrate success. A rating of B+ will be assigned if actions identified, and accepted by DOE, demonstrate improvement over the previous year's technology transfer efforts.

**Measure 6.5.2**

BSA will maintain, and seek to improve, effective and efficient processes for the Laboratory's WFO and CRADA programs to enable successful relationships with industry.

**Target 6.5.2.1**

A rating of B+ will be assigned for demonstrated improvements made to foster the migration to more automated processes which support the efficient processing of WFO proposals and agreements.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
<b>6.0 Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission(s)</b>					
6.1 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Financial Management System(s)			30%		
6.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition and Property Management System(s)			25%		
6.3 Provide an Efficient, Effective, Responsive Human Resources Management System, and Diversity Program			20%		
6.4 Provide Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Management Systems for Internal Audit and Oversight; Quality; Information Management; and Other Administrative Support Services as Appropriate			15%		
6.5 Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Technology and Commercialization of Intellectual Assets			10%		
<b>Goal 6.0 Total</b>					

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

**The Contractor provides appropriate planning for laboratory facilities and infrastructure needs required to efficiently and effectively carry out current and future S&T programs, and manages DOE facilities and infrastructure in a cost effective manner that ensures their safe and reliable operation consistent with program missions needs and DOE stewardship requirements.**

The weight of this Goal is 15%.

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

The weight of this Objective is 50%.

**Measure 7.1.1**

The management of real property assets to maintain effective operational safety, worker health, environmental protection and compliance, property preservation, and cost effectiveness while meeting program missions, through effective facility utilization, maintenance and budget execution. Factors to be considered in determining the performance level include:

- Conducting an ongoing Condition Assessment Survey (CAS) process and utilizing the CAS data in site, facilities, and maintenance planning.
- Maintaining an accurate space management database and optimizing space utilization.
- Accurately determining and recording real property valuation data.
- Ensuring optimum allocation of infrastructure project funding through a risk-based evaluation and decision process (3PBP and related budget processes).
- Determining when facilities should be declared excess and placing them in excess status with effective surveillance and maintenance programs.
- Promptly providing site, energy, and facilities information to DOE through regular reporting and periodic data calls.
- Managing the energy conservation program.
- Managing the DOE Environmental Restoration program projects.

**Target 7.1.1.1**

Maintain balanced priorities through effective utilization of the BNL Project, Planning, Programming and Budgeting Process (3PBP) project tracking and prioritization process. Have the Consolidated Unfunded Requirements List (CURL) funded projects approved by the BNL Policy Council in a timely manner.

**Target 7.1.1.2**

Environmental Restoration Projects must demonstrate effective project planning and cost control of remediation projects throughout the life cycle of the assigned projects.

Expectation: Annual Schedule Performance Index and Cost Performance Index will be maintained above 0.90.

**Measure 7.1.2**

The maintenance and renewal of building systems, structures and components associated with the Laboratory's facility and land assets. Factors to be considered in determining the performance level include:

- Operating an effective maintenance program including predictive and preventive maintenance.
- Deciding on level and allocation of maintenance effort and resources based on the Laboratory's Ten Year Site Plan.
- Integrating management of the deferred maintenance backlog with the Ten Year Site Plan.
- Tracking, trending, and managing facilities and utility systems reliability and availability to ensure customers can accomplish their mission objectives.

**Target 7.1.2.1**

BSA will maintain reliable electrical and building infrastructure. (Use existing infrastructure reliability index calculation.) The infrastructure reliability index (RI) will be 0.9997 (or better) for FY08.

$$(RI) = 0.6 (ESR) + 0.4 (BFR)$$

Electric System Reliability (ESR):

$$(ESR) = \frac{\text{Total Customer Hours} - \text{Unplanned Outage Customer Hours}}{\text{Total Customer Hours}}$$

Building and Facilities Reliability (BFR):

$$(BFR) = \frac{\text{Total Building Availability (ft}^2\text{-days)} - \text{Building Failures (ft}^2\text{-days)}}{\text{Total Building Availability (ft}^2\text{-days)}}$$

**Target 7.1.2.2**

The Laboratory's Maintenance Investment Index will meet DOE goals of  $MII \geq 2.0$ .

**Target 7.1.2.3**

The Laboratory's Deferred Maintenance Reduction expenditures will meet DOE SC proposed target for FY 2008. (Current DOE SC DMR target for BNL for FY 08 is \$7.163 million, as of 9/13/07).

**Measure 7.1.3**

In support of the goals of the Department of Energy's Transformational Energy Action Management (TEAM) initiative, and the goals and objectives contained in Executive Order 13423, Strengthening Federal Environmental, Energy, and Transportation Management, the Contractor shall cooperate with federal Site Office personnel to provide full and open access to the maximum extent practicable to NNSA/DOE-contracted Energy Service Companies (ESCOs) under Energy Savings Performance Contracts (ESPCs), to facilitate on-site assessments of opportunities to improve the Site's energy efficiency, water reduction and renewable energy improvements, and shall provide advisory assistance in reviewing ESCO recommendations as directed by the Contracting Officer. The Contractor shall ensure ESCO personnel are granted access pursuant to contractual requirements; monitor ESCO activities to ensure that site safety and security requirements are adhered to; promptly provide information requested by ESCO personnel to assist them in developing viable recommendations; and, when directed by the Contracting Officer, assist the Site Office in the monitoring and execution of ESPC projects.

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

**Target 7.1.3.1**

The Team portion of the BNL TYSP will include detailed plans and milestones for achieving site-specific energy efficiency goals and objectives; will constitute an executable plan to meet the TEAM initiative; and be reviewed and accepted by BHSO by 9/30/2008.

**Objective 7.2 - Provide Planning for and Acquire the Facilities and Infrastructure Required to Support Future Laboratory Programs.**

The weight of this Objective is 50%.

**Measure 7.2.1**

Integration and alignment of the Ten Year Site Plan to the Laboratory's comprehensive strategic plan. Factors to be considered in determining the performance level include:

- Planning and managing the acquisition of utilities including load forecasting, utilities options studies, and negotiating long term utilities contract terms for recommendation to BHSO.
- Planning and obtaining budget support for line item infrastructure projects to meet the needs of the Lab's Strategic Plan.
- Developing sound business cases and proposing alternatively financed projects to meet the needs of the Lab's Strategic Plan.

- Coordinating the site, facility, and utility needs of large programmatic projects to ensure the project-Lab infrastructure interface is well-managed.

**Target 7.2.1.1**

BNL's Ten Year Site Plan is aligned with BNL's Business Plan. BNL's Project, Planning, Programming and Budgeting Process (3PBP) outcomes (e.g., projects approved by Policy Council) are aligned with BNL Business Plan. BNL will continue to study electric power supply options beyond the current three-year NYPA contract.

**Measure 7.2.2**

Effectively utilize Cost and Schedule Performance Index for management of construction projects (when appropriate). Factors to be considered in determining the performance level include:

- Develop and continuously improve a Lab-wide Earned Value Management System (EVMS) and supporting procedures.
- Train project engineers and managers in EVMS and related project management tools and techniques.
- Utilize cost, schedule, and technical baselines and regularly monitor performance to manage projects from GPP to line items, utilizing project management tools appropriate to project size and complexity.

**Target 7.2.2.1**

BSA manages SLI Line Item and GPP projects effectively to agreed scope, schedule, obligation and cost baselines using agreed upon Project Management measures. Programmatic Research Facilities (addressed in Goal 2) and Environmental Management funded projects (addressed in Target 7.1.1.2) are excluded here.

**Measure 7.2.3**

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

**Target 7.2.3.1**

Develop strategy by September 30, 2008.

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

**Goal 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. Commensurate, to the greatest degree possible, with an "open campus" philosophy, protect laboratory facilities, personnel, and classified and sensitive information from harm by implementing effective safeguards, security, and emergency management programs.**

The weight of this Goal is 20%.

**Objective 8.1 - Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System.**

The weight of this Objective is 35%.

**Measure 8.1.1**

BSA will implement and maintain an Emergency Management program in a state of readiness. Factors to be considered in determining the performance level include:

- Conducting and maintaining a complete survey of hazards (chemical and radiological) at the Laboratory (Hazard Survey).
- Preparing and maintaining Emergency Planning Hazards Assessments (EPHAs) on facilities identified as needing them in the Hazard Survey.
- Developing and implementing Emergency Action Levels (EALs) and Protective Action Guides (PAGs) as needed.
- Conducting required training for ERO staff
- Conducting drills and exercises to assess ERO capability and laboratory staff response.
- Maintaining a consequence assessment team.
- Preparing and maintaining a Public Information program.
- Developing and maintaining memoranda of understanding/mutual aid agreements with appropriate offsite emergency response organizations.
- Establishing and maintaining a fully functional Emergency Operations Center (EOC).
- Continuously improving the Emergency Management program.

**Target 8.1.1.1**

All required Emergency Management procedures and processes will be implemented and available by September 30, 2008.

**Target 8.1.1.2**

Operational Emergencies are reported, managed and mitigated in manner that minimizes impacts to employee, guest and visitor safety and site operations; including timely notifications to DOE as discussed in the

Order; timely on-site notifications of affected personnel; and ERO participation/support.

**Target 8.1.1.3**

Results of external reviews, surveys and inspections demonstrate that emergency management systems are effective.

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

The weight of this Objective is 35%.

**Measure 8.2.1**

BSA will operate a cyber-security system that enhances the scientific mission by:

- Protecting the confidentiality, integrity and availability of Laboratory information and information systems;
- Minimizing the impact to the open, collaborative, scientific environment.
- Implementing the requirements of the Office of Science Program Cyber Security Plan (PCSP);
- Adopting DOE and industrial best practices;
- Striving for open dialog with, and feedback from our stakeholders – DOE employees, guests, and users;
- Continuously improving the system;
- Managing the Plan of Action and Milestones (POAM) process;
- Maintaining a current Authority to Operate (ATO).

**Target 8.2.1.1**

The results of external Cyber-Security program evaluations will be generally satisfactory, with only minor areas for improvement noted, demonstrating BSA's commitment to comply with DOE requirements.

**Target 8.2.1.2**

Plans of Action & Milestones (POA&M) will be completed on or ahead of schedule, demonstrating BSA's commitment to continually improve Cyber-Security and address any shortcoming in implementing DOE requirements.

**Target 8.2.1.3**

Regular communication with all stakeholders – DOE, employees, guests and users – will demonstrate the commitment to open dialog and feedback to continuously improve the Cyber-Security system.

**Target 8.2.1.4**

Contribute to Cyber-Security initiatives throughout the Office of Science by participating in workshops, peer reviews, site-assist visits, security tests and evaluations, and by promoting standards and evaluating technologies in collaboration with other laboratories.

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

The weight of this Objective is 15%.

**Measure 8.3.1**

BSA will operate a safeguards and security system that protects special nuclear materials (SNM), classified matter, and property. Factors to be considered in determining the performance level include:

- Maintaining a well-trained and equipped protective force.
- Maintaining a DOE-approved Site Security Plan by periodic updates to integrate evolving site conditions and the changing security environment.
- Reducing risk by reducing the Laboratory's nuclear inventory.
- Continuously improving the site security surveillance and alarm system.
- Thoroughly investigating all security incidents.
- Coordinating with local law enforcement agencies and establishing mutual aid agreements where appropriate.
- Managing the access authorization and foreign visits and assignment processes.
- Communicating to the laboratory community about safeguards and security as appropriate.

**Target 8.3.1.1**

BSA will demonstrate an effective Safeguards system through external reviews, surveys, and inspections validated by satisfactory ratings and no evidence of programmatic failures.

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

The weight of this Objective is 15%.

**Measure 8.4.1**

Strong protection of classified and sensitive information is appropriately demonstrated.

**Target 8.4.1.1**

Assess, mitigate, and properly report security events involving protection of classified and sensitive information within required reporting time frames.

**Target 8.4.1.2**

BSA will demonstrate an effective Security system through external reviews, surveys, and inspections validated by satisfactory ratings and no evidence of programmatic failures.

**Measure 8.4.2**

Implement an effective counterintelligence (CI) program to ensure that the Laboratory, Site Office and serviced facilities are provided the CI services that protect them from foreign intelligence services, espionage and international terrorist related threats.

**Target 8.4.2.1**

Develop a counterintelligence program plan for the northeast region that includes roles, responsibilities, authorities, accountabilities, functions and performance criteria. Manage the CI program to the plan.

**Target 8.4.2.2**

Keep Laboratory management, the Site Office and Headquarters elements informed in a timely manner regarding CI activities and issues. Manage and resolve issues appropriately.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
<b>8.0 Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM) and Emergency Management Systems</b>					
8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System			35%		
8.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for Cyber-Security			35%		
8.3 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Special Nuclear Materials, Classified Matter, and Property			15%		
8.4 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Classified and Sensitive Information			15%		