EXCEPTION TO SF 30, APPROVED BY NARS 5/79

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGES
	1 OF 1

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO.	3. EFFECTIVE DATE	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.	5. PROJECT NO. *(If applicable)*
M070	October 1, 2008		

6. ISSUED BY CODE	7. ADMINISTERED BY *(If other than Item 6)*
U.S. Department of Energy Chicago Service Center 9800 South Cass Avenue Argonne, Illinois 60439	U.S. Department of Energy Berkeley Site Office 1 Cyclotron Road, MS 90-1023 Berkeley, CA 94720

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR *(No., street, country, State, and ZIP Code)*	( )	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO.
The Regents of the University of California Office of the President, Laboratory Management 1111 Franklin Street Oakland, CA 94607-5206		
		9B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 11)*
	(X)	10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO. DE-AC02-05CH11231/A000
		10B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 13)*
CODE / FACILITY CODE		April 19, 2005

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers is extended. is not ex-tended. Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 25, and returning _____ copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA *(If required)* See Page 2

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

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

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor __ is not, X is required to sign this document and return 1 copies to the issuing office.

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

Replace the existing Appendix B – *Performance Evaluation Measurement Plan* with the attached Appendix B – *FY 2009 Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan* which provides the revised performance expectations for Fiscal Year 2009.

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

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER *(Type or print)*	16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER *(Type or print)*
Sandra M. Vinson, Director Contracts and Administration, Laboratory Management University of California	**Charles W. Marshall**, Contracting Officer U.S. Department of Energy

15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	16C. DATE SIGNED
(Signature of person authorized to sign)	10/1/2008	By *(Signature of Contracting Officer)*	10/1/08

30-105 STANDARD FORM 30

ATTACHMENT J-2

APPENDIX B

FY 2009
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND MEASUREMENT PLAN

Applicable to the Operation of
ERNEST ORLANDO LAWRENCE BERKELEY NATIONAL LABORATORY

CONTRACT NO. DE-AC02-05CH11231

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION **J-B-4**

I. DETERMINING THE CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE RATING, PERFORMANCE-BASED FEE AND AWARD TERM ELIGIBILITY **J-B-4**

II. PERFORMANCE GOALS, OBJECTIVES & MEASURES **J-B-9**

BACKGROUND **J-B-9**

PERFORMANCE GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES **J-B-9**

PART A – SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY COMPONENT **J-B-10**

1.0 PROVIDE FOR EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE MISSION ACCOMPLISHMENT **J-B-10**

- **1.1 SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY RESULTS PROVIDE MEANINGFUL IMPACT ON THE FIELD** **J-B-10**
- **1.2 PROVIDE QUALITY LEADERSHIP IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY** **J-B-11**
- **1.3 PROVIDE AND SUSTAIN OUTPUTS THAT ADVANCE PROGRAM OBJECTIVES AND GOALS** **J-B-11**
- **1.4 PROVIDE FOR EFFECTIVE DELIVERY OF PRODUCTS** **J-B-12**

2.0 PROVIDE FOR EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE DESIGN, FABRICATION, CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATIONS OF RESEARCH FACILITIES **J-B-18**

- **2.1 PROVIDE EFFECTIVE FACILITY DESIGN(S) AS REQUIRED TO SUPPORT LABORATORY PROGRAMS (I.E., ACTIVITIES LEADING UP TO CD-2)** **J-B-18**
- **2.2 PROVIDE FOR THE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES AND/OR FABRICATION OF COMPONENTS (EXECUTION PHASE, POST CD-2 TO CD-4)** **J-B-19**
- **2.3 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE OPERATION OF FACILITIES** **J-B-20**
- **2.4 UTILIZATION OF FACILITY(IES) TO GROW AND SUPPORT THE LABORATORY'S RESEARCH BASE AND EXTERNAL USER COMMUNITY** **J-B-21**

3.0 PROVIDE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM MANAGEMENT **J-B-24**

- **3.1 PROVIDE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT STEWARDSHIP OF SCIENTIFIC CAPABILITIES AND PROGRAM VISION** **J-B-24**
- **3.2 PROVIDE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROJECT/PROGRAM PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT** **J-B-25**
- **3.3 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATIONS AND RESPONSIVENESS TO CUSTOMER NEEDS** **J-B-26**

PART B – MANAGEMENT & OPERATIONS COMPONENT **J-B-30**

4.0 PROVIDE SOUND AND COMPETENT LEADERSHIP AND STEWARDSHIP OF THE LABORATORY **J-B-30**

- **4.1 PROVIDE A DISTINCTIVE VISION FOR THE LABORATORY AND EFFECTIVE PLANS FOR ACCOMPLISHMENT OF THE VISION TO INCLUDE STRONG PARTNERSHIPS REQUIRED TO CARRY OUT THOSE PLANS** **J-B-30**
- **4.2 PROVIDE FOR RESPONSIVE AND ACCOUNTABLE LEADERSHIP THROUGHOUT THE ORGANIZATION** **J-B-32**
- **4.3 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE CORPORATE OFFICE SUPPORT AS APPROPRIATE** **J-B-33**

5.0 SUSTAIN EXCELLENCE AND ENHANCE EFFECTIVENESS OF INTEGRATED SAFETY, HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION **J-B-34**

- **5.1 PROVIDE A WORK ENVIRONMENT THAT PROTECTS WORKERS AND THE ENVIRONMENT** **J-B-34**

5.1.6 DEMONSTRATE PROGRESS IN INSPECTING EXISTING ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT NOT NATIONALLY RECOGNIZED TESTING LABORATORY LISTED. J-B-35

FY 2009 TARGET: 95% COMPLETION OF THE COMPREHENSIVE SURVEY TO IDENTIFY ALL EQUIPMENT NEEDING INSPECTION, INCLUDING PRIORITIZATION OF HIGHER HAZARD ITEMS. J-B-35

5.2 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF INTEGRATED SAFETY, HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT J-B-35

5.3 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT, MINIMIZATION, AND POLLUTION PREVENTION J-B-36

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

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

6.2 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM.. . ……. J-B-38

6.3 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE PROPERTY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM ……..... J-B-39

6.4 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AND DIVERSITY PROGRAM J-B-40

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

6.6 DEMONSTRATE EFFECTIVE TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY AND COMMERCIALIZATION OF INTELLECTUAL ASSETS J-B-41

7.0 SUSTAIN EXCELLENCE IN OPERATING, MAINTAINING, AND RENEWING THE FACILITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE PORTFOLIO TO MEET LABORATORY NEEDS ….. ..... J-B-43

7.1 MANAGE FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE IN AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE MANNER THAT OPTIMIZES USAGE, MINIMIZES LIFE CYCLE COSTS, AND ENSURES SITE CAPABILITY TO MEET MISSION NEEDS. J-B-44

7.2 PROVIDE PLANNING FOR AND ACQUIRE THE FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIRED TO SUPPORT THE CONTINUATION AND GROWTH OF LABORATORY MISSIONS AND PROGRAMS. ..... ……...J-B-45

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

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

8.2 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE SYSTEM FOR CYBER-SECURITY J-B-47

8.3 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE SYSTEM FOR THE PROTECTION OF SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIALS, CLASSIFIED MATTER, AND PROPERTY J-B-48

8.4 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE SYSTEM FOR THE PROTECTION OF CLASSIFIED AND SENSITIVE INFORMATION J-B-48

INTRODUCTION

This document, the Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan (PEMP), primarily serves as DOE's Quality Assurance/Surveillance Plan (QASP) for the evaluation of *The Regents of the University of California* (hereafter referred to as "the Contractor") performance regarding the management and operations of the *Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory* (hereafter referred to as "the Laboratory") for the evaluation period from October 1, 2008, through September 30, 2009. The performance evaluation provides a standard by which to determine whether the Contractor is managerially and operationally in control of the Laboratory and is meeting the mission requirement and performance expectations/objectives of the Department as stipulated within this contract.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The FY 2009 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 overall numeric score derived for Science and Technology will be utilized to determine the amount of available fee that may be earned (see Table C).

The overall numeric score derived for Management and Operations will be utilized to determine the multiplier to be applied (see Table C) to the Science and Technology fee earned to determine the final amount of fee earned for FY 2009. Each Goal is composed of two or more weighted Objectives and each Objective may have a set of Performance Measures, which are identified to assist the reviewer in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each of the Performance Measures identifies significant activities, requirements, and/or milestones important to the success of the corresponding Objective and shall be utilized as the primary means of determining the Contractor's success in meeting the Objective. Although the Performance Measures are the primary means for determining performance, other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources to include, but not limited to, the Contractor's self-evaluation report, operational awareness (daily oversight) activities; "For Cause" reviews (if any); other outside agency reviews (OIG, GAO, DCAA, etc.), and an annual 2-week review (if needed), may be utilized in determining the Contractor's overall success in meeting an Objective. The following describes the methodology for determining the Contractor's grade for each Goal:

Performance Evaluation Methodology:
The purpose of this section is to establish a methodology to develop scoring at the Objective Level. Each Objective within a Goal shall be assigned a numerical score, per Figure I-1 below, by the evaluating office. Each evaluation will measure the degree of effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in meeting the Objective and shall be based on the Contractor's success in meeting the set of Performance Measures identified for each Objective as well as other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources as identified above. The set of Performance Measures identified for each Objective represent the set of significant indicators that if fully met, collectively places performance for the Objective in the "B+" grade range. The FY 2009 Target stated at 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 these details have been included in the PEMP. However these should be considered as guidelines that do not restrict the evaluator from considering other factors that contribute to the evaluation.

Letter Grade	Numeric Score	Definition
A+	4.3 – 4.1	Significantly exceeds expectations of performance as set within performance measures identified for each Objective or within other areas within the purview of the Objective. Areas of notable performance have or have the potential to significantly improve the overall mission of the Laboratory. No specific deficiency noted within the purview of the overall Objective being evaluated.
A	4.0 – 3.8	Notably exceeds expectations of performance as set within performance measures identified for each Objective or within other areas within the purview of the Objective. Areas of notable performance either have or have the potential to improve the overall mission of the Laboratory. Minor deficiencies noted are more than offset by the positive performance within the purview of the overall Objective being evaluated and have no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
A-	3.7 – 3.5	Meets expectations of performance as set within performance measures identified for each Objective with some notable areas of increased performance identified. Deficiencies noted are offset by the positive performance within the purview of the overall Objective being evaluated with little or no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
B+	3.4 – 3.1	Meets expectations of performance as set by the performance measures identified for each Objective with no notable areas of increased or diminished performance identified. Deficiencies identified are offset by positive performance and have little to no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.

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

Figure I-1. Letter Grade and Numerical Score Definitions

Calculating Individual Goal Scores and Letter Grade:

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

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

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

Table A. FY 2009 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 2009 Contractor Letter Grade Scale

Determining the Amount of Performance-Based Fee Earned:
Total available FY 2009 fee is $4,500,000 (Base Fee: None Performance Fee: $4,500,000). The percentage of the available performance-based fee that may be earned by the Contractor shall be determined based on the overall weighted score for the S&T Goals (see Table A above) and then compared to Table C below. The overall numerical score of the M&O Goals from Table 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 2009 as calculated within Table D .

[1] The final weights to be utilized for determining the overall S&T score will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009.

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

Table C. - Performance-Based Fee Earned Scale

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

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

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

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

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

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

Determining Award Term Eligibility. Pursuant to the clause entitled "Award Term Incentive" the contractor may also earn additional term by exceeding performance expectations. The contractor is eligible for award term in accordance with the clause when performance for the S&T and M&O components results in scores within the shaded areas of Table C, which would be scores of 3.5 or higher for S&T and 3.1 or higher for the M&O component. Notwithstanding the overall scores earned, if the contractor scores less than a 3.1 in any S&T goal or less than a 2.5 in any M&O goal the contractor will not be eligible for award term.

II. PERFORMANCE GOALS, OBJECTIVES & MEASURES

Background

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

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

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

Performance Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures

The following sections describe the Performance Goals, their supporting Objectives, and associated performance measures and targets for FY 2009. The weighting of Goals is provided in Table A, Section I and the weighting of

Objectives shall be shown in Tables at the end of each Goal. For convenience, the Program Offices stated goal and objective weightings are shown in Attachment I.

PART A – SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY COMPONENT

1.0 Provide for Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment

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

The weight of this goal is TBD%.

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

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers as identified below. The overall Goal score from each HQ Program Office and/or customer is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 1.1). Weightings for each Customer listed below are preliminary, based upon FY 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 2009.

- Office of Science (SC) (93.3%)
- Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) (4.7%)
- Assistant Secretary for Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (RW) (2.0%)

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned by each of the offices identified above by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 1.4 below). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 1.5 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as viewed by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers for which the Laboratory conducts work. Should one or more of the HQ Program Offices choose not to provide an evaluation for this Goal and its corresponding Objectives the weighting for the remaining HQ Program Offices shall be recalculated based on their percentage of BA for FY 2009 as compared to the total BA for those remaining HQ Program Offices.

Objectives:

1.1 Science and Technology Results Provide Meaningful Impact on the Field

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

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

- Development of tools and techniques that become standards or widely-used in the scientific community.

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

1.2 Provide Quality Leadership in Science and Technology

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

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

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

1.3 Provide and sustain Outputs that Advance Program Objectives and Goals

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

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

A to A+	Program offices, clients, end-users, independent experts and/or peers laud work results; output(s) exceeds the amount and/or quality typically expected for an excellent body of

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

1.4 Provide for Effective Delivery of Products

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

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

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

	timeframe(s) (e.g. more than 9 months behind) and/or within the agreed upon budget (e.g. greater than 25% over); overall program/project and/or mission objective(s) have not been met; significant delays, overruns, and/or deficiencies are identified which have negatively impacted overall program/project.

Science Program Office[2]	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research (ASCR)					
1.1 Impact			40%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			15%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
				Overall ASCR Total	
Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES)					
1.1 Impact			50%		
1.2 Leadership			20%		
1.3 Output			15%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
				Overall BES Total	
Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER)					
1.1 Impact			30%		
1.2 Leadership			20%		
1.3 Output			20%		
1.4 Delivery			30%		
				Overall BER Total	
Office of Fusion Energy Sciences (FES)					
1.1 Impact			30%		
1.2 Leadership			20%		
1.3 Output			25%		
1.4 Delivery			25%		
				Overall FES Total	
Office of High Energy Physics (HEP)					
1.1 Impact			30%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			20%		
1.4 Delivery			20%		
				Overall HEP Total	
Office of Nuclear Physics (NP)					
1.1 Impact			35%		
1.2 Leadership			25%		
1.3 Output			15%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
				Overall NP Total	

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

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

Table 1.1 – 1.0 SC Program Office Performance Goal Score Development

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

Table 1.2 – SC Program Office Overall Performance Goal Score Development[3]

[3] 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 2009.

HQ Program Office[4]	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE)					
1.1 Impact			35%		
1.2 Leadership			35%		
1.3 Output			15%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
				Overall EERE Total	
Office of Fossil Energy (FE)					
1.1 Impact			25%		
1.2 Leadership			25%		
1.3 Output			25%		
1.4 Delivery			25%		
				Overall FE Total	
Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (RW)					
1.1 Impact			25%		
1.2 Leadership			25%		
1.3 Output			25%		
1.4 Delivery			25%		
				Overall RW Total	

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

HQ Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Science			93.3%		
Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy			4.7%		
Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management			2.0%		
				Performance Goal 1.0 Total	

Table 1.4 – Overall Performance Goal Score Development[5]

[4] A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the other Programs and other customers is provided within Attachment I to this plan. Goal and Objective weightings indicated for non-science customers are reflective of FY 2008 weightings and will be updated as those customers provide their weightings. Final Goal and Objective weightings will be incorporated, as appropriate, once they are determined by each HQ Program Office and provided to the Site Office. Should a HQ Program Office fail to provide final Goal and Objective weightings before the end of the first quarter FY 2009 the preliminary weightings provided shall become final.

[5] Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 1.4 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 2009.

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

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

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

The weight of this goal is TBD%.

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

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers as identified below. The overall Goal score from each SC Program Office is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 2.1). Weightings for each Customer listed below are preliminary, based upon FY 2007 Budget Authority figures, and are provided here for informational purposes only. Final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009.

- Office of Science (SC) (100%)
  - Office of Advance Scientific Computing Research (ASCR) (22.8%)
  - Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES) (34.4%)
  - Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER) (22.7%)
  - Office of High Energy Physics (HEP) (14.1%)
  - Office of Nuclear Physics (NP) (6.0%)

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

Objectives:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	can vary in degree of completeness; Laboratory commitment to the project appears to be subsiding.
D	Reviews indicate project is likely to breach its cost/schedule performance baseline; and/or Laboratory commitment to environment, safety and health issues is inadequate; reports to DOE are largely incomplete; laboratory commitment to the project has subsided.
F	Laboratory falsifies data during project execution phase; shows disdain for executing the project within minimal standards for environment, safety or health, fails to keep DOE informed of project status; reviews regularly indicate that the project is expected to breach its cost/schedule performance baseline.

2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

DOE HQ Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
SC Office of Advanced Scientific Computing (ASCR)					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			10%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components			10%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			70%		
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base and External User Community			10%		

DOE HQ Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
SC Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES)					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			20%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components			15%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			50%		
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base and External User Community			15%		
SC Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER)					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			0%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components			0%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			90%		
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base and External User Community			10%		
SC Office of High Energy Physics (HEP)					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			40%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components			60%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			0%		
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base and External User Community			0%		
SC Office of Nuclear Physics (NP)					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			0%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components			0%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			85%		
2.4 Effective Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base and External User Community			15%		

Table 2.1 –DOE Program Office Performance Goal 2.0 Score Development

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

Table 2.2 – Overall Performance Goal 2.0 Score Development[7]

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

Table 2.3 – Goal 2.0 Final Letter Grade

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

[7] Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 2.2 are preliminary, based upon FY 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 2009.

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 TBD%.

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

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers as identified below. The overall Goal score from each HQ Program Office and/or customer is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 3.1). Weightings for each Customer listed below are preliminary, based upon FY 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 2009 provided by the Program Offices listed below.

- Office of Science (SC) (93.3%)
- Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) (4.7%)
- Assistant Secretary for Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (RW) (2.0%)

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned by each of the offices identified above by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 3.4 below). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 3.5 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as viewed by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers for which the Laboratory conducts work. Should one or more of the HQ Program Offices choose not to provide an evaluation for this Goal and its corresponding Objectives the weighting for the remaining HQ Program Offices shall be recalculated based on their percentage of BA for FY 2009 as compared to the total BA for those remaining HQ Program Offices.

Objectives:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A to A+	Research plans are proactive, not reactive, as evidenced by making hard decisions and taking strong actions; plans are robust against budget fluctuations – multiple contingencies planned for; new initiatives are proposed and funded through reallocation of resources from less effective programs; plans are updated regularly to reflect changing scientific and fiscal conditions; plans include ways to reduce risk, duration of programs.
B$^+$	Plans are reviewed by experts outside of lab management and/or include broadly-based input from within the laboratory; research plans exist for all program areas; plans are consistent with known budgets and well-aligned with DOE interests; work follows the plan.
B	Research plans exist for all program areas; work follows the plan.
C	Research plans exist for most program areas; work does not always follow the plan.
D	Plans do not exist for a significant fraction of the lab's program areas, or significant work is conducted outside those plans.

F	No planning is done.

3.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Communications and Responsiveness to Customer Needs

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

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

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

Science Program Office[8]	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research (ASCR)					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			30%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			30%		
				Overall ASCR Total	
Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES)					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			30%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			30%		
				Overall BES Total	
Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER)					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			20%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			30%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			50%		
				Overall BER Total	
Office of Fusion Energy Sciences (FES)					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			35%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			30%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			35%		
				Overall FES Total	
Office of High Energy Physics (HEP)					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			20%		
				Overall HEP Total	
Office of Nuclear Physics (NP)					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			20%		
				Overall NP Total	
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS)					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			20%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			40%		
				Overall WDTS Total	

Table 3.1 – 3.0 SC Program Office Performance Goal Score Development

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

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

Table 3.2 – SC Program Office Overall Performance Goal Score Development[9]

HQ Program Office[10]	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE)					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			50%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			25%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			25%		
				Overall EERE Total	
Office of Fossil Energy (FE)					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			30%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			30%		
				Overall FE Total	
Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management (RW)					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			20%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			40%		
				Overall OE Total	

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

[9] 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 2009.

[10] A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the other Programs and other customers is provided within Attachment I to this plan. Goal and Objective weightings indicated for non-science customers are reflective of FY 2008 weightings and will be updated as those customers provide their weightings. Final Goal and Objective weightings will be incorporated, as appropriate, once they are determined by each HQ Program Office and provided to the Site Office. Should a HQ Program Office fail to provide final Goal and Objective weightings before the end of the first quarter FY 2009 the preliminary weightings provided shall become final.

HQ Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Science			93.3%		
Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy			4.7%		
Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management			2.0%		
				Performance Goal 3.0 Total	

Table 3.4 – Overall Performance Goal Score Development[11]

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

[11] Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 3.4 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 2009.

PART B – MANAGEMENT & OPERATIONS COMPONENT

Evaluating Management and Operations Goals/Objectives

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

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

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

4.0 Provide Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory

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

The weight of the Goal is 25%.

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

Objectives:

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

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

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

- Effectiveness in Work for Others planning and management; including developing and implementing research and development opportunities that leverage accomplishment of DOE goals and projects with other federal agencies, states, universities, and industry to advance the utilization of Laboratory technologies and capabilities.

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

Measures:

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

FY 2009 Target: The Annual Laboratory Plan or/and other SC defined institutional planning documents will be quality document(s) consistent with DOE schedule and guidance. Should DOE elect to not issue guidance, the Laboratory will prepare an Integrated Strategic Plan that addresses scientific and operational goals and strategies.

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

FY 2009 Target: Continue to demonstrate growth and progress in the development of quality research partnerships and collaborations, in particular for support of the Joint BioEnergy Institute (JBEI), the Deep Underground Science and Engineering Laboratory, Joint Genome Institute, and Molecular Foundry user program.

4.1.3 Effectiveness of the Work-for-Others (WFO), planning, management, and reporting that serves the needs of both LBNL and DOE, facilitates the project approval process.

.

FY 2009 Target: Based on the Work For Others Program Plan, demonstrate continued progress in improving the WFO information system reporting protocol for the management and oversight of the WFO portfolio.

4.1.4 Effectiveness in developing and implementing communications and community relations strategies that enhance the reputation of LBNL, the Office of Science, and DOE.

FY 2009 Targets: Develop and implement Communications and Community Relations Plans that actively seek to raise public awareness and appreciation for the value of the Laboratory's and DOE's science and technology research, and for their contributions locally, nationally, and internationally.

4.1.5 Valued partnership in supporting the local counterintelligence office (CI) in implementing and maintaining successful CI plans and programs at the Lab through leadership and management effectiveness.

FY 2009 Target: Continue to provide the local CI office the necessary space, staff, and access to other Lab resources for a successful CI Program and Site-Specific CI Support Plans.

4.1.6 Analysis of the cost baseline developed during FY08 to evaluate strengths and weaknesses of baseline costs in meeting mission needs and recommend areas where cost savings could be realized and additional resources would enhance mission accomplishment.

FY 2009 Target: The University completes a responsive and thorough cost study by June 30, 2009.

4.2 Provide for Responsive and Accountable Leadership throughout the Organization

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

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

Measures:

4.2.1 Leadership maintains an effective assurance function with cognizance of robust feedback and continuous improvement. Laboratory risks are managed commensurate with the level of significance and severity.

FY 2009 Target: LBNL will address assurance gaps identified in the Operations assurance gap analysis. LBNL will implement appropriate assurance mechanisms for all identified risks according to implementation plans that consider risk assessment and resource requirements.

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

FY 2009 Target: The Laboratory provides the leadership and organizational resources to ensure active and sustainable Integrated Safety Management (ISM). Leadership reduces safety risks by allocating appropriate resources and ensuring work planning is effective and proactive. Leadership will review staffing levels and expertise to ensure that ISM is maintained for long-term sustainability. Leadership commitment is documented with specific and representative leadership actions.

4.2.3 The Contractor will demonstrate that its Senior Managers are kept informed about evolving cyber security risks and threats.

FY 2009 Target: The Computer Protection Program Manager or CIO will provide cyber security risk and threat updates to Division Directors and/or Senior Management three times during the performance period.

4.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Corporate Office Support as Appropriate

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

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

Measures:

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

FY 2009 Target: Demonstrate tangible UC support that contributes to the intellectual and organizational assets available to LBNL to advance its national missions and goals. Examples include leadership development for staff, business systems policy support, and facilitating the use of University research resources.

4.3.2 The demonstrated accomplishment of the Contractor to conduct appropriate corporate oversight and assurance.

FY 2009 Target: Maintain, improve, or add systems, policies, and actions that demonstrate proactive corporate responsibility. Examples include continued function of UC's LBNL Advisory Board and the Contract Assurance Council. The University will provide an annual Assurance Letter to DOE, consistent with the DOE schedule and guidance, that documents responsible and effective management control systems.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Weighted Score	Total Points
4.0 Effectiveness and Efficiency of Contractor Leadership and Stewardship					
4.1 Provide a Distinctive Mission for the Laboratory and an Effective Plan for Accomplishment of the Vision to Include Strong Partnerships Required to Carry Out those Plans			40%		
4.2 Provide an Assurance System for Responsive and Accountable Leadership throughout the Organization			40%		
4.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Corporate Office Support as Appropriate			20%		
				Performance Goal 4.0 Total	

Table 4.1 – Goal 4.0 Performance Rating Development

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

Table 4.2 – Goal 4.0 Final Letter Grade

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

The weight of this goal is 27%.

Objectives:

5.1 Provide a Work Environment that Protects Workers and the Environment

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

- The success in meeting ES&H goals.

Measures:

5.1.1 Demonstrate effective implementation of the 10 CFR 851 program.

FY 2009 Target: The Contractor shall submit an annual update of the LBNL Worker Safety and Health (WSH) Program Description for DOE approval in accordance with 10 CFR 851. 90% of corrective action and abatement plans as defined in 10 CFR 851 and Noncompliance Tracking System (NTS) reports are fully implemented as scheduled.. Implementation status is effectively communicated to DOE-BSO.

5.1.2 Demonstrate effective management of the 10 CFR 830 and 10 CFR 835 program for nuclear safety and quality assurance.

FY 2009 Target: The laboratory's PAAA program will demonstrate self- identification, thorough analysis, comprehensive development of corrective actions, accurate completion, and timely implementation of corrective actions, and mitigation of enforcement actions. 90% of corrective actions are implemented on schedule. Implementation status is effectively communicated to DOE-BSO

5.1.3 Demonstrate progress toward full compliance with DOE facility safety requirements.

FY 2009 Target: All facility safety analyses documents (accelerator and radiological facilities) are updated and compliant with statutory requirements and DOE Directives by September 30, 2009. The SAD for the 88-inch Cyclotron and the remaining sections of the SAD for the ALS will be submitted to the Berkeley Site Office for review and approval by March 31, 2009.

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

FY 2009 Target: DART rate is 0.25

5.1.5 The Contractor's progress in achieving and maintaining "best-in-class" ES&H program performance, as measured by the total recordable case (TRC) rate.

FY 2009 Target: TRC rate is 0.65

5.1.6 Demonstrate progress in inspecting existing electrical equipment not Nationally Recognized Testing Laboratory listed.

FY 2009 Target: 95% completion of the comprehensive survey to identify all equipment needing inspection, including prioritization of higher hazard items.

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

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

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

Measures:

5.2.1 Validation of effective ISM implementation within each Laboratory Division.

FY 2009 Target: All LBNL divisions perform and document division ES&H self-assessments. Management of Environment Safety and Health (MESH) reviews are completed as scheduled. Line Managers perform effective walkthroughs of responsible space and document results in division self-assessments. On-line safety survey is available to all LBNL staff. Results of these activities are analyzed for opportunities for improvement and corrective actions are developed and implemented.

5.2.2 Institutional processes effectively report events/incidents and conditions promoting continuous improvement and lessons learned.

FY 2009 Target: The elements of the Contractor Assurance system meet contract requirements. Event, incident, and condition reporting determinations are timely and accurate, and reports comply with DOE requirements. Events and incidents are analyzed for recurring causes. When recurring causes are identified, corrective actions and lesson learned are developed and implemented to initiate process/program improvements.

5.2.3 Implementation of the JHA processes will be verified and validated as part of the work authorization process.

FY 2009 Target: 95% of affected staff will have active and accurate JHAs signed by the worker and respective supervisor/work lead.

5.2.4 Implementation of the Technical Assurance Program (TAP) will be completed per the 3-year schedule. Systemic safety program issues will be identified and their causes analyzed per appropriate causal analysis methodology.

FY 2009 Target: Demonstrate the effectiveness of the processes and activities designed to identify deficiencies and opportunities for improvement, report ability of those deficiencies, completion of corrective actions, and sharing of lessons learned, effectively across all aspects of LBNL operations. Success will be evidenced by:

- Performance and documentation of all scheduled FY09 TAP reviews.

- Identified deficiencies are tracked and completed on schedule.
- Causal analysis is performed per requirements.

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

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

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

Measures:

5.3.1 The Contractor shall develop, implement, and maintain certification equivalence of an LBNL Performance-based Environmental Management System (EMS).

FY 2009 Target: : Meet the minimum requirements for green rating on the EMS Annual Report Scorecard, based on guidance developed for federal agencies to comply with the EMS reporting requirements of Executive Order 13423 *Strengthening Federal Environmental, Energy, and Transportation Management.*

LBNL's EMS performance will be assessed for each one of the following 7 metrics:
Environmental Aspects
Goals, Objectives, and Targets
Operational Controls
Environmental Training
Contracts
EMS Audit/Evaluation Procedures
Management Review

Using the E.O. 13423 EMS reporting guidance, the overall facility score is used to determine a green/yellow/red rating. It is based on a rating system where an "A" indicates the minimum amount of implementation for a metric and a "D" indicates full implementation for a metric. The minimum requirements for green, yellow and red ratings are as follows:

Green Rating	At least 5D's, no more than 1 B, no A's at all; or at least 4 D's, no B's at all, no A's at all
Yellow Rating	At least 4 C's (or D's) , no more than 1 A
Red Rating	Neither green nor yellow

5.3.2 The Contractor shall complete the EMS Projects designed to minimize waste, reduce emissions and/or conserve resources..

FY 2009 Target: Complete the equivalent of two projects from the jointly agreed to list of potential projects.

Protocol:

By March 31, 2009 LBNL and BSO will jointly agree on the potential candidate projects and their respective potential point values with the understanding that several small projects may be grouped together and counted as one project. Additional projects may be identified after March 31, 2009, and

used for this performance measure. The examples of projects to be considered include: LEED building design and certification, sealing of ventilation ducts, cooling tower water treatment, procurement of environmentally friendly products, and reducing LBNL commute traffic. The number of points earned will determine the grade for this performance measure.

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

Table 5.1 – Goal 5.0 Performance Rating Development

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

Table 5.2 – Goal 5.0 Final Letter Grade

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

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

The weight of this goal is 20%.

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

Objectives:

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

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

Measure:

6.1.1 The Laboratory will present data and analysis demonstrating theLaboratory¹s success in meeting Financial Management goals and expectations using the Laboratory's Balanced Scorecard Model Index approved by the DOE BSO.

FY 2009 Target: Achieve a score of 86.8% or better on the Balanced Scorecard Model Index consisting of the following performance targets:

- Integrated Contractor Summary of Collection is submitted to the Energy Finance and Accounting Service Center (EFASC) with no submissions beyond the second workday of the month.
- Monthly accounting data is submitted to STARS with no submissions beyond the third workday of each month.
- Every active balance sheet account is regularly reconciled in timely, accurate and complete manner reported quarterly.
- Audit corrective actions completed as a percentage of scheduled corrective actions measured quarterly.
- Policies reviewed and updated as a percent of scheduled measured quarterly.
- Conduct up to three self-assessments subject to DOE concurrence on scope and methodology.
- Budget documents are submitted in hight quality and timely manner IAW DOE guidance.
- Number of reports not elsewhere measured completed on time compared to those scheduled to be submitted measured quarterly.
- No cost overruns or suspense items reported in STARS causing costs to exceed funding and B&R Obligational and Reporting Level.
- No material findings in internal or external audits/reviews and contractor self-assessments.
- The OCFO reduces the frequency of significant unallowable costs (>$2.5K) to no more than 3 incidents due to cost overruns at the 9 digit B&R caused by inadequacies in systems or procedures.

6.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition Management System

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

The Laboratory's approved Acquisition Management System ensures that this business operation is performed effectively, efficiently, and in accordance with Prime Contract requirements and with policies and procedures approved by DOE. In support of this system, the Laboratory solicits customer feedback, performs self-assessments, provides a sound management system for ensuring accountability for government resources from acquisition to disposition, manages costs and performance and tracks trends, and ensures staff has the tools and training necessary to perform their responsibilities and to support this objective.

Measure:

6.2.1 The Laboratory will present data and analysis demonstrating its success in meeting Acquisition Management objectives and expectations using the Laboratory's Balanced Scorecard Model Index approved by the DOE BSO.

FY 2009 Target: Achieve a score of 86.8% or better on the Balanced Scorecard Model Index.

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

Point Value

DOE and the Contractor have established a consensually acceptable point value for each measure, The range in point value is from 0 to 30 per measure. The total earned points for each Performance Measure/Activity are combined to arrive at the overall fiscal year-end score for the Procurement Department. Points are converted to percentage on a one for one basis, 100 points are available to Procurement. The points are distributed to the following perspectives:

PERSPECTIVE	POINTS
Customer	15
Internal Business Processes	55
Learning and Growth	25
Managing Financial Aspects	5
TOTAL	**100**

If DOE and the Contractor agree in advance that a measured activity will not be performed the parties will determine an equitable way of distributing the assigned points.

6.3 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Property Management System

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

The Laboratory's approved Property Management system ensures that this business operation is performed effectively, efficiently, and in accordance with Prime Contract requirements and with policies and procedures approved by DOE. In support of this system, the Laboratory solicits customer feedback, performs self-assessments, provides a sound management system for ensuring personal property accountability for government property from acquisition to disposition, manages costs and performance and tracks trends, and ensures staff has the tools and training necessary to perform their responsibilities and to support this objective.

Measure:

6.3.1 The Laboratory will present data and analysis demonstrating its success in meeting Property Management objectives and expectations using the Laboratory's Balanced Scorecard Model Index approved by the DOE BSO.

FY 2009 Target: Achieve a score of 86.8% or better on the Balanced Scorecard Model Index.

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

Point Value
LBNL, DOE, and UCLMO established a consensually acceptable point value for each measure. The range in point value is from 0 to 10 per measure. Points are converted to percentage on a one for one basis, (e.g. 90 points = 90%), 100 points are available to Property. The points are distributed to the following perspectives:

PERSPECTIVE	POINTS
Customer	20
Internal Business	55
Learning and Growth	6

Financial	19
TOTAL	**100**

If DOE and the Contractor agree in advance that a measured activity will not be performed the parties will determine an equitable way of distributing the assigned points.

6.4 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Human Resources Management System and Diversity Program

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

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

Measures:

6.4.1 Operate an efficient, effective, and responsive Human Resources System and maintain National Academy of Public Administrators (NAPA) certification in three standards: HR Operations and Program Assurance, Total Compensation and Benefits, and Work Environment and Employee/Labor Relations.

FY 2009 Target: By 9/30/09, satisfactorily complete 6 initiatives with no notable areas of increased or diminished performance identified.

1) Create, review, and/or revise HR policies on an established cycle.
2) Develop a Total Rewards brochure for use in recruitment and retention.
3) Lead the salary planning processes in the Divisions.
4) Track Benefits statistics and assess employees' satisfaction with these services.
5) Develop and deploy a web-based course on supervisor "Roles and Accountability".
6) Track internal and external complaints and grievances. Analyze results for emerging trends.

6.4.2 Recruit and retain the most qualified and most diverse personnel available.

FY 2009 Target: By 9/30/09, satisfactorily complete 3 initiatives with no notable areas of increased or diminished performance identified.

1) Complete a single comprehensive online Recruitment Resource Guide of applicant sources for specific positions (within high priority job groups).
2) Develop an online diversity index which uses demographic data to assess hiring, utilization (career advancement), and attrition. Provide a standard scorecard of respective health in each of these areas.
3) Complete and publish online compendium of each division's diversity practices and programs.

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

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

Scoring
Internal Audit Services and Information Technology will use a balanced scorecard approach for assessing achievement.

Measures:

6.5.1 The Laboratory will present data and analysis demonstrating the Laboratory's success in meeting Internal Audit goals and expectations using the Laboratory's Balanced Scorecard Model Index.

FY 2009 Target: Achieve a score of 85 or better on the IAS Scorecard consisting of the following performance targets:

- Submit annual internal audit plan to DOE timely
- Solicit DOE input in annual risk assessment and in periodic meetings with site office management throughout the year
- Maintain an effective and efficient internal audit function by:
  - Issuing at least three recommendations for saving costs and/or improving the efficiency of laboratory operations
  - Maintaining professional certification for all but two of the audit staff by completing required continuing professional education (CPE) hours as necessary
  - Reporting directly to the Laboratory Director and University Auditor.
- Complete 90% of the approved (original or revised) annual audit plan in accordance with LBNL Audit Committee, DOE, and UCOP audit management expectations
- Follow up on Management Corrective Actions (MCAs) within 60 days of MCA closure

6.5.2 Information Management: The Laboratory will achieve a score of 85 points or above on the IT Scorecard which includes measures of customer service, system availability, network availability, and efficiency.

FY 2009 Target: The Laboratory will achieve a score of 85 points or above on the IT Scorecard which is based on the followi*ng performance targets representing the maximum points to be assigned each scorecard measure:*

- Telephony cost per service call is more than 1% below FY08.
- Network availability for science exceeds 99.99%.
- Network availability for business exceeds 99.9%.
- Overall satisfaction with Helpdesk assigned tickets exceeds 9.5 on 10 point scale

6.6 Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Technology and Commercialization of Intellectual Assets

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

- The proper stewardship of intellectual assets and Laboratory owned or originated technology;
- The market impacts created/generated as a result of technology transfer and deployment activities; and
- Communication products contributing to the transfer of Laboratory originated knowledge and technology.

Measures:

6.6.1 The Contractor will write non-confidential descriptions of Laboratory inventions and post them on the Contractor's Technology Transfer website.

FY 2009 Target: The Contractor will write and post on the web at least 30 - 34 Technology Announcements (i.e. non-confidential descriptions).

6.6.2 The Contractor will require companies that execute exclusive license agreements for Berkeley Lab technologies to contractually agree to multiple technology development milestones as part of the license agreement to ensure diligent progress toward commercialization.

FY 2009 Target: The Contractor will include in at least 80% of exclusive licenses multiple technology development milestones as described in the following:

The recent Secretarial Policy Statement on Technology Transfer at DOE Facilities states that among the guiding principles, "commercialization transactions involve partners with substantial business plans to further develop and deploy the technology as expeditiously as possible." TTIPM seeks to negotiate technology development milestones in its exclusive licenses that reflect a sound business plan leading to introduction into the market in a timely manner of products and services embodying Berkeley Lab intellectual property. These contractual provisions may include specific technical development, financing, manufacturing, and/or product introduction milestones, as is appropriate for each technology.

"Exclusive licenses" in this context include any license that grants any degree of exclusivity, including exclusive field of use, exclusive for a period of time, or exclusive in a geographic area. If the exclusive licensee fails to meet the contractual milestones, the Contractor will retain the right to terminate the license and/or reduce the license to a non-exclusive license in order to ensure that the technology can be made available to another party with the ability to commercialize it.

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

Table 6.1 – Goal 6.0 Performance Rating Development

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

Table 6.2 – Goal 6.0 Final Letter Grade

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

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

The weight of this goal is 20%.

Goal 7.0 shall measure the overall effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in planning for, delivering, and operations of Laboratory facilities and equipment needed to ensure required capabilities are

present to meet today's and tomorrow's complex challenges.

Objectives:

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

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

- The management of real property assets to maintain effective operational safety, worker health, environmental protection and compliance, property preservation, and cost effectiveness while meeting program missions, through effective facility utilization, maintenance and budget execution;
- The day-to-day management and utilization of space in the active portfolio;
- The maintenance and renewal of building systems, structures and components associated with the Laboratory's facility and land assets; and
- The management of energy use and conservation practices.
- Specific tasks associated with each Measure is documented in the UC/LBNL/BSO FY09 Facilities and Infrastructure Performance Assessment Model (PAM).

Measures:

7.1.1 Maintenance Management- Effectiveness and efficiency of maintenance activities to maximize the operational life of facility systems, structure and Components.

FY 2009 Target: LBNL achieves the following milestones based on the Facilities and Infrastructure Performance Assessment Model (PAM). The PAM milestones are:

- 2009 Mission Readiness Implementation Plan Completed by end of 3rd Quarter.;
- FY09 Condition Assessment Summary Report (20% required per year or on 5 year cycle),
- FY08 Actual Maintenance Report (Due Oct 30, 2008) FY09 Required Maintenance Report (Due Dec. 15, 2008)
- Review and update the LBNL Maintenance Plan. Update will address deferred maintenance over the next 5-years (sustainment period in RPAM) and validation of current DM totals.
- The metric/measure of the amount of actual dollars spent annually on Proactive Maintenance (preventive and predictive) of DOE Real Property Assets to the actual dollars spent annually on Total Maintenance, expressed as a percentage.

$$\text{Proactive Maintenance (PrM)} = \frac{\text{Preventive + Predictive Maintenance}}{\text{Total Maintenance}} \times 100$$

7.1.2 LBNL Site Executable Plan for Environmental Energy and Transportation Management-LBNL demonstrates the application of proactive sustainable/renewable energy, transportation, and environmental management practices and requirements as defined in DOE O 430.2B**,** Attachment 1, Contractor Requirements Document (CRD). LBNL implements the requirements and 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, and as described in the FY2009 LBNL Site Executable Plan. LBNL will provide the DOE Berkeley Site Office (BSO) with a draft Site Executable Plan by October 1, 2008, in support of final approval by the DOE Federal Energy Management Program (FEMP) by December 31, 2008. Effective and successful completion of this measure will be measured by implementation of the FY2009 LBNL Site Executable Plan. The gradient will be established based on the final FEMP-approved plan and no later than December 31, 2008.

FY 2009 Target: LBNL implements the FY2009 LBNL Site Executable Plan.

7.1.3 Real Property Management Space/Facility Utilization - Effectively managed consistent with mission, requirements, and DOE direction. Intent is to measure the effectiveness, completeness, and timeliness of implementation of Real Property management using Facilities Information Management System (FIMS) office space utilization, facilities asset and utilization index (AUI), and real property leases.

FY 2009 Target: LBNL achieves 5 of the 6 milestones based on the Facilities and infrastructure Performance Assessment Model (PAM) The PAM milestones include:

- Populate FIMS with Executive Order 13327 required data elements;
- Document underutilized or unsuitable excess space and AUI, and recommend its inclusion in FIMS and the Ten-Year Site Plan
- Submit a list of active and planned leases including pertinent information. Complete the lease termination of Bldg 937 on-time. Track quarterly progress.
- Ensure FIMS consistency with other DOE databases. Produce documentation that shows quarterly reconciliation between FIMS and Management and Analysis Reporting System (MARS). Complete Internal FIMS Data Validation per DOE requirements.
- Ensure FIMS supports Space Banking Reporting. Prepare annual memo to DOE regarding Space Banking, reflecting FIMS archived square footage, facilities flagged as excess and excess years.
- Partner with DOE to develop a protocol agreement for tenant improvement projects at leased facilities to ensure timely planning, completion, and customer satisfaction.

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

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

- Integration alignment and effectiveness of the Ten Year Site Plan to the Laboratory's comprehensive strategic plan;
- The facility planning, forecasting, and acquisition for effective translation of business needs into comprehensive and integrated facility site plans;
- Effectiveness in meeting project performance baselines for scope, schedule and cost;
- Overall responsiveness to customer mission needs; and
- Efficiency in meeting Cost and Schedule Performance Index for construction projects (when appropriate).

Measures:

7.2.1 Integrated Site Planning - The Laboratory develops, documents, and maintains an integrated site planning process that is aligned with DOE mission needs and the Laboratory strategic/business plan. Intent is to measure the effectiveness of integrated site planning activities using any related site development planning documents. Each task is assessed individually.

FY 2009 Target: LBNL meets expectations for two tasks based on the Facilities and Infrastructure Performance Assessment Model (PAM) The two tasks to be performed are:

- Prepare and ensure DOE Planning Documents such as the Infrastructure section of the Annual Laboratory Plan addresses LBNL strategic goals, SC's guidance and BSO Comments.
- Review and process research, construction, maintenance, and operations proposals for NEPA/CEQA compliance.

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

FY 2009 Target: LBNL adheres to the performance baseline for selected projects and manages GPP priority list and associated cost and schedule based on the Facilities and Infrastructure Performance Assessment Model (PAM). The rated projects/programs are:

- Demolition of B51 and the Bevatron;
- B77 Phase II Rehabilitation;
- User Support Building;
- Seismic Phase I;
- Seismic Phase 2;
- Develop Process and Monitor Completion of GPP Projects in the transition to an IGPP System; and,
- Develop new process for managing and monitoring IGPP projects in compliance with established DOE practices.

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

Table 7.1 –Goal 7.0 Performance Rating Development

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

Table 7.2 – Goal 7.0 Final Letter Grade

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

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

The weight of this goal is 8%.

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

Objectives:

8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System

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

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

Measures:

8.1.1 The Contractor will demonstrate Emergency Management commitment through developing a long term Emergency Operations Center (EOC) improvement plan for the improvement of emergency operations.

FY 2009 Target: Implement the approved EOC improvements for FY 2009 by 9/30/2009.

8.1.2 The Contractor will demonstrate Emergency Management commitment through its development, execution, and maintenance of emergency management activities to achieve full implementation of DOE O 151.1C.

FY 2009 Target: Complete the approved implementation plan for DOE O 151.1C before September 30, 2009.

8.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for Cyber-Security

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

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

Measures:

8.2.1 The contractor will demonstrate commitment to cyber security and continuous improvement across a group of performance metrics which include training, corrective action management, certification and accreditation, risk assessment, and self assessment.

FY 2009 Target: Score of 85 or above on Cyber Security 2009 Scorecard, which is based on the following performance targets:

- The results of Laboratory conducted internal and external reviews of security programs are generally satisfactory, with only minor areas for improvement;
- Corrective actions from Plans of Actions and Milestones (POA&Ms) completed on target;
- Risk assessment conducted for enclaves;
- New or improved management, operational, and technical controls in place;
- Training is updated to reflect current threats and challenges; and,
- Personal Identifying Information (PII) training delivered to applicable individuals.

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

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

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

Measures:

8.3.1 The Contractor will ensure on-going compliance with internal procedures to implement DOE Manual 470.4-6 in a graded approach. The Contractor will develop corrective actions addressing peer review findings and submit to BSO for approval.

FY 2009 Target: Schedules and conducts peer review of LBNL MC&A Procedure by 05/31/09. The contractor will develop and submit peer review Corrective Action Plan, if required, to BSO by 07/31/09.

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

8.4.1 The Contractor will assure that classified and sensitive information are handled in an efficient and effective manner.

FY 2009 Target: Review and update guidance on the protection of classified and sensitive information and make available on the Laboratory's security website by March 31, 2009 and there are no significant issues with Laboratory handling of incidents involving classified or sensitive information.
.

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

Table 8.1 – Goal 8.0 Performance Rating Development

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

Table 8.2 – Goal 8.0 Final Letter Grade

Attachment I – Program Office Goal & Objective Weightings

Office of Science

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

All Other Customers[12]

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

[12] Goal and Objective weightings indicated for non-science customers are reflective of FY 2008 weightings and will be updated as those customers provide their weightings. Final Goal and Objective weightings will be incorporated, as appropriate, once they are determined by each HQ Program Office and provided to the Site Office. Should a HQ Program Office fail to provide final Goal and Objective weightings before the end of the first quarter FY 2009 the preliminary weightings provided shall become final.