

Peer Review Report of Jefferson Laboratory's Implementation of the Mission Readiness Process

This serves to report the results of a peer review of the Jefferson Laboratory (JLAB) implementation of the Office of Science Mission Readiness process conducted September 8-10, 2010 as requested by your letter of July 1, 2010. The JLAB Peer Review team consisted of the following members:

Kent Collins, Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory
Shawn Connolly, Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory
Karla Gaither, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory
Keith McClanahan, Facility Issues
Mark Murphy, COO, Ames Laboratory
Randy Ortgiesen, (Team Lead), Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory

Executive Summary

JLAB demonstrated a clear commitment to the Mission Readiness tenets and the processes and work products offered as part of this review demonstrated implementation. The dedication of JLAB staff was evident from both the scientific and the support organizations of the Laboratory. It is apparent that all involved fully understand the importance of a proper balance among facilities, equipment, and staff to meet the core missions.

The organization has benefited by building strong governmental relationships with state, local and community governmental leaders.

The lab has been very active in other Mission Readiness reviews and has embraced many of the best practices at other labs that have been appropriate to implement at JLAB.

Conclusions

The following provides the summary of our conclusions for the four Objectives you charged the team to report on:

Objective 1: Is the Mission Readiness process being implemented?

Yes, objective 1 is being met.

- The mission readiness process is being followed by JLAB. The annual planning process identifies F&I needs based on current and future scientific priorities.
- The mission readiness process is fully integrated in to the Labs strategic planning process and is documented.
- The scientific divisions are engaged in mission readiness planning and implementation. Presentations and discussions with senior scientific staff validated this conclusion.
- Successful delivery of F&I services has helped foster a constructive relationship with the scientific divisions.

**Peer Review Report of Jefferson Laboratory's
Implementation of the Mission Readiness Process**

Objective 2: Are the results from the implementation of Mission Readiness process reasonably valid and the capability gaps and solutions clearly aligned with mission objectives?

Yes, objective 2 is being met.

- The identification of the capability gaps, and the projects that are developed, are clearly aligned with mission objectives.
- Use of scientific advisory groups to assist Science and F&I in the identification of gaps helps keep the focus on mission readiness.
- Use of software and condition assessments to track gaps and completion of work throughout the year are important contributions.
- Development of possible alternatives for meeting mission critical objectives ensure viable plans to close the gaps.

Objective 3: Do the results represent an institutional plan for which there is general Lab agreement?

Yes, objective 3 is being met.

- Plans are developed through an iterative, inclusive, and continuous activity based process that is top-down and bottom-up.
- JLAB Annual Work Planning Process contributes directly to the full integration of mission readiness into the Lab's strategic planning processes.
- All levels of Lab management are engaged in connecting Lab priorities with F&I. There is senior management agreement on infrastructure investments and their priority.

Objective 4: Are the results produced likely to be comparable to what is produced at the other Labs to produce a comparable set of needs from all SC laboratories?

Yes, objective 4 is being met.

- The JLAB Mission Readiness processes are used to insure F&I information is included in planning documentation in a manner comparable to what would be expected from other SC Labs.

Peer Review Report of Jefferson Laboratory's Implementation of the Mission Readiness Process

Strengths & Noteworthy Practices

From the material provided, the peer review team identified the following JLAB strengths that should be considered at other SC labs:

- High level support of Mission Readiness as evidenced by presence and active involvement of the Lab Director and COO for all briefings and presentations.
- Strong governmental relationships (state, local and community) have been developed and continue to be strengthened that provide strong support for the lab.
- Use of state agency classification to obtain preferential power rates.
- Planning and coordination:
 - Lab Planning and Coordination meeting hosted by Lab Director at frequent intervals to integrate / identify Science initiatives throughout the site.
 - Facilities Quarterly Review Meeting hosted by Director of FM is a noteworthy practice with representation of all Science Divisions and all other key stakeholders.
 - Weekly Disruption Avoidance Meeting (20 minute stand-up) hosted by F&I to update key stakeholders regarding lab activities planned for the week.
- Utilizing the MR program to build ownership, enthusiasm, and engagement across the Lab.
- Development / use of web technologies for communications.
- Each scientific division has an F&I liaison who
 - Provides a single point of contact
 - Filters requests
 - Attends quarterly facilities coordination meetings
- Full integration of Facility Operations and conventional facility projects due to the reporting structure.
- Use of subcontractors to manage workload increases and decreases as needed.
- Annual planning categories of: MUST...SHOULD...LIKE, creates a good discussion for priority setting.
- A clear single program lab benefit demonstrated and validated for close coordination among scientific and support personnel.
- The understanding that Facilities and Science need to work together to produce desired results is apparent.
- Coordination and communication between DOE Site Office and JLAB is good. DOE Site Office presentation and participation throughout the MR process is beneficial.

Items to consider for continuous improvement

The peer review team offers the following as items for your further consideration as JLAB matures its Mission Readiness implementation:

Peer Review Report of Jefferson Laboratory's Implementation of the Mission Readiness Process

- Numerous system improvements (i.e. software, data bases, procedures, web based communications) have been implemented moving the organization to a more structured approach. As the organization matures, the organization should continue to evaluate these systems for appropriateness in application, and provide resources at required levels.
- Ensure that, upon completion of the construction program, the existing trailers are removed and not reused unless justified.
- Continue to evaluate and transition the preventive maintenance program from the vendor's management system to F&I Maximo systems.

Global Peer Review Noted Process Improvements

- Summary/concluding presentation (two days of presentations in a short overview) by the director of facilities was an improvement to the MR process.
- Observer participation was beneficial to the MR review.

Conclusions

It is clear that the lab has been performing to the intent of the mission readiness program for some time and the MR process and peer review, like many labs, have benefited the lab by creating an opportunity for a more formal disciplined planning process.

The Review Team would like to thank the JLAB participants in this review and commend them for their hospitality, coordination, and teamwork. JLAB has set an excellent example for those that will follow in subsequent peer reviews.