



*Southeastern Universities
Research Association*

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006

**CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
AND MEASUREMENT PLAN**

PERFORMANCE REPORT

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

FY 2006 Contractor Evaluation Score Calculation

S&T Performance Goal	Numerical Score	Letter Grade	Weight	Weighted Score	Total Score
1.0 Mission Accomplishment	3.86	A	40%	1.54	
2.0 Construction and Operation of User Research Facilities and Equipment	3.83	A	40%	1.53	
3.0 Science and Technology Research Project/Program Management	3.80	A	20%	.76	
Total Score					3.83
M&O Performance Goal	Numerical Score	Letter Grade	Weight	Weighted Score	Total Score
4.0 Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory	3.64	A-	35%	1.27	
5.0 Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection	3.17	B+	35%	1.11	
6.0 Business Systems	3.67	A-	20%	0.73	
7.0 Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio	3.42	B+	5%	0.17	
8.0 Integrated Safeguards and Security Management and Emergency Management Systems	3.89	A	5%	0.19	
Total Score					3.47

	Numerical Score	Letter Grade
S&T Performance	3.8	A
M&O Performance	3.5	A-

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction:	1
Goal 1.0 Provide for Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment (Quality, Productivity, Leadership, & Timeliness of Research and Development)	2
Objective 1.1 Science and Technology Results Provide Meaningful Impact on the Field	2
Objective 1.2 Provide Quality Leadership in Science and Technology	3
Objective 1.3 Provide and Sustain Science and Technology Outputs that Advance Program Objectives and Goals	4
Objective 1.4 Provide for Effective Delivery of Science and Technology	4
Goal 2.0 Provide for Efficient and Effective Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operation of Facilities	7
Objective 2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s) as Required to Support Laboratory Programs (i.e., activities leading up to CD-2).....	7
Objective 2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components (execution phase, Post CD-2 to CD-4)	8
Objective 2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities.....	8
Objective 2.4 Effective Utilization of Facilities to Grow and Support the Laboratory’s Research Base	10
Goal 3.0 Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Program Management	12
Objective 3.1 Provide Effective and Efficient Stewardship of Scientific Capabilities and Program Vision	12
Objective 3.2 Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Project/Program Planning and Management	13
Objective 3.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Communications and Responsiveness to Customer Needs.....	14
Goal 4.0 Provide Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory.....	17
Objective 4.1 Provide a Dynamic Vision for the Laboratory and an Effective Plan to Accomplish the Vision Including Strong Partnerships Required to Carry Out those Plans.....	17
Objective 4.2 Provide for Responsive and Accountable Leadership throughout the Organization	24
Objective 4.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Corporate Office Support as Appropriate	26
Goal 5.0 Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection.....	30

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

Objective 5.1	Provide a Work Environment that Protects Workers and the Environment.....	30
Objective 5.2	Provide Efficient and Effective Implementation of Integrated Safety, Health and Environmental Management	31
Objective 5.3	Provide Efficient and Effective Waste Management, Minimization, and Pollution Prevention.....	33
Goal 6.0	Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission(s).....	35
Objective 6.1	Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Financial Management System(s).....	35
Objective 6.2	Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition and Property Management System(s).....	38
Objective 6.3	Provide an Efficient, Effective & Responsive Human Resources Management System	42
Objective 6.4	Provide Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Management Systems for Internal Audit and Oversight; Quality; Information Management; and Other Administrative Support Services as Appropriate	45
Objective 6.5	Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Technology and Commercialization of Intellectual Assets	47
Goal 7.0	Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs	50
Objective 7.1	Manage Facilities and Infrastructure in an Efficient and Effective Manner that Optimizes Usage and Minimizes Life Cycle Costs	50
Objective 7.2	Provide Planning for and Acquire the Facilities and Infrastructure Required to support Future Laboratory Programs	53
Goal 8.0	Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM) and Emergency Management Systems	56
Objective 8.1	Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System.....	56
Objective 8.2	Provide an Efficient and Effective System for Cyber-Security	57
Objective 8.3	Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Special Nuclear Materials, and Property	59
Objective 8.4	Provide an Efficient and Effective Program for the Protection of Sensitive Information	60

Introduction:

During the five month assessment period, the laboratory delivered high quality physics while facing an inordinate number of hardships and challenges. Among the most demanding was preparing and competing for the M&O contract. The long-awaited RFP was issued in mid December with a 45 day turn around time. While fulfilling a rigorous experimental operations schedule and completing the many requirements toward attaining CD-1 for the 12 GeV Upgrade, the proposal exercise put tremendous workload demands on the management and staff resulting in the sacrifice of much of the winter holidays.

Anticipating an unfavorable FY06 budget outcome, lab management instituted a number of measures in FY05, one being a hiring freeze, which allowed us to continue advancing science while minimizing adverse impacts on operations. In December, budget news broke resulting in an 8% cut for the lab. But, as a result of the preventive measures taken in FY05, along with a voluntary separation program in FY06, the loss of critical staff was avoided.

We feel the laboratory managed exceptionally well under what were unusually difficult circumstances during this performance period. Among the accomplishments were strong scientific and technical productivity, CD-1 award for the Upgrade, and the on cost and schedule completion of the newly occupied CEBAF Center Addition.

This self-evaluation of contractor performance for SURA/TJNAF covers the period October 1, 2005 through February 28, 2006. Because many of the measures in the Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan (PEMP) can be evaluated fully only at the end of the fiscal year, this evaluation has a larger than usual subjective component. However, SURA/TJNAF has sought to "grade" itself against the performance levels defined in the PEMP to the extent possible.

For each measure defined in the PEMP the evaluation states the measure, gives the score and grade assigned through self-evaluation, the justification for that score and then for reference the performance levels from the PEMP. For detailed information about scoring methodology, please see the PEMP. Note that the PEMP designates several goals, objectives and measures as occurring outside this performance period. These are marked "N/A" in accordance with the instructions on page i of the PEMP.

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

The DOE will make a comprehensive, independent assessment of items 1.1 through 1.4 in the context of the S&T review scheduled for July 12-14, 2006. In SURA/TJNAF's judgment, the Lab has in the first half of FY 2006:

- ✓ Continued to execute high impact, high visibility, and difficult experiments and provided the prerequisite experimental equipment and accelerator beam capabilities.
- ✓ Has achieved for these experiments progress against the posted schedule, slightly exceeding projected data acquisition rates.
- ✓ Has executed a program that is aligned with the NSAC Long-Range Plan and enables the Department to stay on track meeting its milestones in Medium Energy Physics.

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

Grade: A

Score: 3.9

- (i)**Justification:** The SURA/TJNAF research program in hadronic physics is recognized as world-leading. The lab's publications are broadly and frequently referenced (there have been over 10,000 citations of JLab work in the refereed literature). The annual S&T reviews (the most recent of which was in August 2005) have consistently identified the JLab research program as “outstanding” and regularly emphasized the impact of the lab's science programs on the field of nuclear physics, and the growing fraction of the program that is connecting to both high energy physics and nuclear astrophysics. During the performance period, several very important experimental results were published in Physics Review Letters including “Parity-Violating Electron Scattering from ^4He and the Strange Electric Form Factor of the Nucleon” and “**Search for $\Theta^+(1540)$ Pentaquark in High-Statistics Measurement of $\gamma p \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 K^+ n$ at CLAS**”. Currently, the major paper/talk season begins in April at the annual APS conference and we will have at least two major announcements coming up at this meeting from the Lab's nuclear physics program.
- (ii)With over 110 invited talks on JLab work presented at international conferences last year SURA/TJNAF's stewardship is clearly visible in the well developed plan for the evolution of its research capabilities – the 12 GeV CEBAF Upgrade Project, which was included in the 2002 NSAC Long Range Plan and the Office of Science 20-year facilities plan. The Upgrade project successfully passed both a scientific and technical review last year, and has just received CD-1 Approval.

SURA/TJNAF's leadership in SRF technology has had a tremendous impact on many Office of Science missions, with recent examples being the lab's construction of the Superconducting linac for the SNS and the decision of the ILC community to use SRF for that major accelerator project. JLab's Free Electron Laser holds the world's record for average power levels and its successful demonstration of energy recovery techniques at

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

in the NSAC Long Range Plan and the Office of Science 20-year facilities plan, and by the international interest in participating in its research program. The value of the Upgrade was re-emphasized by the recent (June 2005) report of NSAC on guidance for implementing the 2002 Long Range Plan, and by the independent (April 2005) DOE review of the science driving the Upgrade.

Grade	Performance Levels
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.

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

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

Grade	Performance Levels
Pass	Not failing (see below).
Fail	Peer reviewers, HQ not satisfied; significant number of milestones not met, results not delivered to community while it matters.

Objective 1.4 Provide for Effective Delivery of Science and Technology

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

Grade	Performance Levels
Pass	Not failing; see below.
Fail	Peer reviewers not satisfied; output not meeting general scientific standards; minimal progress against FWPs.

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

Goal Performance Rating Development

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research					
1.1 Impact			40%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			15%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
Overall ASCR Total					
Office of Biological and Environmental Research					
1.1 Impact			30%		
1.2 Leadership			20%		
1.3 Output			20%		
1.4 Delivery			30%		
Overall BER Total					
Office of Nuclear Physics					
1.1 Impact	A	3.9	40%	1.56	
1.2 Leadership	A	3.8	30%	1.14	
1.3 Output	N/A	N/A	15%	N/A	
1.4 Delivery	N/A	N/A	15%	N/A	
Overall NP Total					3.86*
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists					
1.1 Impact			25%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			30%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
Overall WDTS Total					

*Scaled to account for N/A items

Overall Performance Goal Score Development

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research			<1%		
Office of Biological and Environmental Research			<1%		

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Nuclear Physics	A+	3.86	99%	3.87	
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists			<1%		
Performance Goal 1.0 Total					3.86

Final Letter Grade

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

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

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

Grade: A **Score:** 4.0

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

The SURA/TJNAF team provided all necessary information required to carry out the critical decision process in an accurate and timely way. Approval of Critical Decision 1 occurred on February 14, 2006. The SURA/TJNAF team continues to carry out the necessary project planning, R&D, and risk assessments in support of the Critical Decision 2 process. Safety is a very high priority during all planning and work activities.

The 12 GeV CEBAF Upgrade Project is designed to maximally leverage the existing facility by using the entire accelerator as well as nearly all the existing experimental equipment. The R&D effort is geared toward identifying technical approaches that could achieve similar performance for lesser cost.

In support of an anticipated CD-2A External Independent Review (EIR) in Summer 2006, SURA/TJNAF secured funds from the Commonwealth of Virginia in FY06 to begin the preliminary engineering and design of the Hall D complex.

SURA/TJNAF scientists are actively involved in demonstrating and championing the revolutionary scientific advancement provided by the capability of the 12 GeV CEBAF Upgrade.

Grade	Performance Levels
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.

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

ever measured in a parity experiment (HAPPEX). A new photocathode material was brought on line, raising the available polarization for ~80% to ~85%, an increase of 13% in beam effectiveness for experimenters. A new fiber laser was developed in house, increasing the laser power by a factor of 4 above the previous world's best, a commercial product.

- ◆ Effectiveness in balancing resources between facility R&D and User support. SURA/TJNAF largely avoids conflict/resource competition between facilities R&D and user support in that facilities R&D is driven by user demands and user priorities. The 2006 to date advances in photocathode/laser development are a good example, in that they were motivated by most urgent user demands, specified and executed with user participation. Facilities R&D at TJNAF is a form and special case of user support.
- ◆ Quality of the process used to allocate facility time to the Users. The process involved an outside Program Advisory Committee, an internal Nuclear Physics Scheduling Committee, and real-time optimization of the three-Hall experimental program to avoid conflicting beam requirements.

Taken together these metrics support the assessment that the performance of the accelerator facility exceeded expectations. In FY05 SURA/TJNAF achieved TRC and DART rates that put it in the lead among SC laboratories. The Laboratory continued its pursuit of enhanced safety and aggressive implementation of ISM under the leadership of the recently hired AD for ESH&Q and by continuing the services of Perot Systems. In FY06, the operation of the accelerator and user end stations including experiment installation was free of injuries to lab staff, users, and subcontractors. A number of maintenance staff injuries, however, brought current TRC and DART values to 1.18 and 0.88, respectively through March 2006. SURA/TJNAF believes to have identified and isolated root causes and will aggressively eliminate them.

Grade	Performance Levels
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 facility 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.

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

Grade	Performance Levels
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.

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

Grade: A- **Score:** 3.7

Justification: TJNAF’s primary mission is to serve an international external user base. That notwithstanding, SURA/TJNAF has assembled a team of outstanding researchers who play a crucial role as “internal users”, exercising intellectual leadership far beyond simply enabling and supporting external users’ research. In FY06 to date, they continued this role that has been documented in earlier reviews. The laboratory’s stewardship of its nuclear physics research base can be seen in many areas. About 25% of the nuclear physics PhDs in the United States are based on JLab research (with about half again as many from international institutions). Since the founding of the laboratory in 1982 the SURA universities have added a total of 93 faculty members in nuclear physics. The national and international community of scientists using the facility has increased by about 40% over the past four years, indicating a growing recognition in the uniqueness of our research capabilities. The recent (August 2005) Science and Technology Review noted that “TJNAF staff play leadership roles in most of the experimental research conducted at TJNAF, and an integral role in all phases of the experiments. The staff participation in conference and workshop organization, and service on review panels, are excellent examples of its community involvement and impact.” They went on to note that the “productivity shown by the many publications etc. is indicative of the high creativity and productivity of both the scientific and technical staff.” The review also recognized the leadership of the accelerator division staff by noting “TJNAF staff continues to take world leadership in SRF technology, ERLs, and high power FELs, providing technological advances that are relevant to the NP mission and other areas.”

Grade	Performance Levels
A to A+	Reviews document how multiple disciplines are using the facility in new and novel ways and reviews document that full advantage has been taken of the facility to strengthen the laboratory’s research base.
B+	Reviews state strong and effective team approach exists toward establishing an internal user community; laboratory is capitalizing on existence of facility to grow internal capabilities.
B	Reviews state that lab is establishing an internal user community, but laboratory is still not capitalizing fully on existence of facility to grow internal capabilities.

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

Grade	Performance Levels
C	Reviews state that the laboratory has made satisfactory use of the facility, but has not demonstrated much innovation.
D	Few indigenous staff use the facility, with none using it in novel ways; research base is very thin.
F	Laboratory does not know how to operate/use its facility adequately.

Goal Performance Rating Development

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Nuclear Physics					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)	A	4.0	20%	0.80	
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components	N/A	N/A	0%	N/A	
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities	A	3.8	65%	2.47	
2.4 Effective Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base	A-	3.7	15%	0.56	
Overall NP Total					3.83

Overall Performance Goal Score Development

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Nuclear Physics	A	3.83	100%	3.83	
Overall Program Office Total					3.83

Final Letter Grade

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

Goal 3.0 Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Program Management

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

Grade: A **Score:** 3.9

Justification: SURA/TJNAF is tightly and seamlessly coupled to its stakeholders and particularly its 2000 member user community through a well communicated vision, a 5-year business plan, the PAC process that results in an independent peer assessment of proposed research, and finally the internal scheduling process allocating research time for a 15 month period. The business plan – first formulated in 2005, updated in 2006 – defines core competencies crisply and identifies implementation strategies. Specific 2006 actions to date include the December Cascade Physics workshop, the January PAC meeting, the March User Group Board of Directors meeting, and the initiation of SRF R&D for the ILC. SURA/TJNAF has – together with its users and utilizing the PAC process, developed in 2006 a set of 30 definitive, high impact, highest priority experiments to be completed in the near term and which form the basis of a transition plan to the 12 GeV era. SURA/TJNAF selected these experiments for their high pay-off and plans are in place to advance accelerator and equipment capabilities to meet advanced user requirements and mitigate risks. A key example is the GEN experiment that started in March 2006.

SURA/TJNAF is in final negotiations for the hire of two outstanding senior investigators. These hires will visibly demonstrate the attractiveness and front-line character of the TJNAF research program.

Grade	Performance Levels
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 cognizant of the need for both high-risk research and stewardship for mission-critical research ; attracting and retaining scientific staff who are very talented in all programs.
B	Programmatic vision that is only partially coherent and not entirely well connected with external communities; development and maintenance of some, but not all core competencies with attention to, but not always the correct balance between, high-risk and mission-critical research; attraction and retention of scientific staff who are talented in most programs.

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

Grade	Performance Levels
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.

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

Grade: A

Score: 3.9

Justification: SURA/TJNAF has solid R&D supporting user facility strategic plans derived from its vision and Business Plan. They include beam and equipment development for the high impact 6 GeV program, the implementation of the 12 GeV CEBAF Upgrade, and exploratory R&D for a follow-on electron-light ion collider (ELIC) of unprecedented luminosity. The final 2006 budget was a serious setback for the laboratory. SURA/TJNAF managed to weather its impact through voluntary staff reductions and an austerity program in procurement. SURA/TJNAF made these reductions such as to allow a reduced running scenario giving priority to highest impact experiments and taking advantage of the need to run one such experiment at a very low energy not compatible with other experiments. This approach amounted to a cost savings while simultaneously addressing a pressing program need. SURA/TJNAF started – despite budget issues – to address identified issues with the accelerator’s capability to run at 6 GeV and initiated a corrective action plan. The actions taken demonstrate a clear sense of priorities and a willingness to implement the most important actions at the expense of lesser ones if budget pressures demand sharp selections.

Grade	Performance Levels
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.

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

Grade: B+

Score: 3.4

Justification: Effective communication of information to the DOE is highly valued and important to SURA/TJNAF. Timely, accurate responses to customer requests through well-defined channels have been achieved consistently and are deemed vital for the continued progress and success of the laboratory. In meeting this objective, several mechanisms exist to maximize the effectiveness of the communications process. During the performance period, weekly meetings between the Lab Director and the TJSO Manager and monthly meetings of the Lab Director and the NP Program Director took place to allow for frequent and open exchange of information, keeping the customer informed of both positive and negative events. The TJSO Manager regularly attends Director's Council meetings for the report of operational data; subsequently, a bi-weekly operations report is generated by the Lab Director for the Program and Site Offices that highlights experimental, ES&H, operations and productivity goals and actuals for each past-two-weeks and year-to-date time periods. Furthermore, a set of operating principles designed to guide interactions of the TJSO and JLab (Nov. 15, 2005) has been established to provide a clear outline of roles and responsibilities. SURA/TJNAF management sees an opportunity to enhance the depth of interactions with the TJSO, and will continue taking steps toward achieving optimum communications.

During the performance period, the contractor has fulfilled numerous data requests from the DOE Program and Site Offices in a thorough and timely manner, often under very short turn-around time constraints. SURA/TJNAF staff put forth tremendous efforts to consistently deliver responses of the highest integrity. More than 200 transmissions of key information from the laboratory were conveyed to DOE during the performance period in areas such as operations, budget, finance, facilities, procurement, safety and security. Many of these transmissions involved compliance with Project Management Order 413.3 while advancing the 12 GeV CEBAF Upgrade. Other examples include responding to recent data calls providing the lab's vital statistics, staffing projections, diversity plans, work-for-others statements, and facilities information for the lab's 5-year business plan, to cite a few.

Grade	Performance Levels
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 <i>always</i> initiate a communication with HQ on emerging issues.
B+	Good communication is valued by all staff throughout the contractor organization; responses to requests for information are thorough and are provided in a timely manner; the integrity of the information provided is never in doubt.
B	Evidence of good communications is noted throughout the contractor organization and responses to requests for information provide the minimum requirements to meet HQ needs; with the exception of a few minor instances HQ is alerted to emerging issues.

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

Grade	Performance Levels
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.

Goal Performance Rating Development

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Research					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			35%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			35%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			30%		
Overall ASCR Total					
Office of Biological and Environmental Research					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			20%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			30%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			50%		
Overall BER Total					
Office of Nuclear Physics					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship	A+	3.9	40%	1.56	
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management	A+	3.9	40%	1.56	
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness	B+	3.4	20%	.68	
Overall NP Total					3.80
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			20%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			40%		
Overall WDTS Total					3.80

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

Table 3.2 – Overall Performance Goal Score Development

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Research			<1%		
Office of Biological and Environmental Research			<1%		
Office of Nuclear Physics	A	3.80	99%	3.80	
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists			<1%		
Overall Program Office Total					3.80

Table 3.3 Final Letter Grade

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

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

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

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

Grade: B+ **Score:** 3.4

Justification: SURA/TJNAF has reviewed the “Vision” document that was provided to the Office of Science in April 2004. It remains a sound and relevant document. Nevertheless SURA/TJNAF reviewed the details of the “Vision” and a number of editorial revisions have been made to statements that are no longer current or in keeping with DOE policies and plans. Such revisions cover, for example, references to the 12 GeV CEBAF Upgrade to reflect the recent CD-1 approval and changes to JLab involvement in and support of RIA in view of an anticipated delay of the RIA project.

SURA/TJNAF notes that the relatively recent S&T review, at the end of August 2005 – while it did not specifically review the “Vision” – did support and endorse the long range planning efforts of the laboratory that are reflective of the “Vision”. The S&T review panel particularly endorsed key aspects of the vision including the 12 GeV CEBAF Upgrade and the further development and future use of the lab’s core competencies in the national interest. SURA/TJNAF believes that this provides further assurance that the “Vision” is still appropriate to the future of the laboratory and the advancement of science.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
The contractor takes extra measures, such as drawing on outside expertise, to assure that the vision is appropriately developed, reviewed, updated and implemented in a timely fashion	4.3
The contractor assures that the vision is appropriately reviewed and updated, that the review is conducted in a timely fashion, and that the updates are implemented.	3.4
The contractor relies on the lab to assure that the vision is appropriately reviewed, updated and implemented. The lab performs well	2.0
The contractor provides insufficient support, to consistently develop and implement updates in the vision in a timely manner.	1.0
The contractor provides insufficient support to create a meaningful vision for its future.	0.0

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

Institutional Plan already prepared. Issued every two years. Institutional Plan now supplanted by Business Plan. This measure is marked N/A and not scored.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
The contractor takes extra measures, such as drawing on appropriate outside experts, to ensure that the strategy identified in the Institutional Plan enumerates the critical success factors, meets DOE and the scientific community's expectations, and that the success factors are implemented.	4.3
The contractor assures that the strategy identified in the Institutional plan is realistic and achievable; that it is reflective of the scientific, technical and management competencies of the lab; that it is aligned with the lab's vision and meets the expectations of DOE and the scientific community.	3.4
The contractor relies on the lab to assure that the strategy is realistic and achievable, meets expectations and is implemented. The lab performs well.	2.0
The contractor does not provide sufficient support to ensure that the strategy is realistic and achievable and/or the lab fails to implement the strategy in its entirety.	1.0
The contractor fails to deliver a meaningful strategy.	0.0

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

Business plan already issued for the 5 year period, not subject to updating during the rating period. This measure is marked N/A and not scored.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
The contractor uses appropriate outside expertise to ensure that the business plan is realistic in light of the constraints on the lab and that the plan identifies ways/methods to maximize effective use of funds and identifies ways to assure the lab goals are met.	4.3
The contractor ensures that the business plan is realistic in light of the constraints on the lab and maximizes the effective use of funds available to the lab in meeting its goals and its commitment to scientific excellence.	3.4
The contractor relies on the lab to ensure that the business plan is realistic, implemented and make effective use of funds. The lab performs well.	2.0
In the absence of corporate involvement, the lab does not develop the most realistic business plan that meets lab goals and the plan is not implemented completely	1.0
In the absence of corporate involvement, the business plan fails to meet DOE and Lab objectives, effective use of funds is not maximized and success factors are not identified.	0.0

Measure 4.1.4 Formalized Collaborations and Corporate Citizenship programs

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

Grade: A- **Score:** 3.7

Justification: SURA/TJNAF has taken further steps to strengthen ties that promote the scientific output of the laboratory. This is particularly true with respect to the User community whose input into the research program of the laboratory is key to its success in advancing science. SURA has recently used its financial support of living expenses for scientists on sabbatical at the Lab to encourage the current chair of the JLab User Group Board of Directors to take a sabbatical at the Lab. It has done the same for a university collaborator from the university with the most faculty involvement in the nuclear physics program of the laboratory. SURA has also provided living expense support for a key university supporter of the 12 GeV CEBAF Upgrade and spokesman for the GlueX experiment in Hall D, a key component of the Upgrade, to encourage him to take a position at the laboratory during a critical stage in the preparation for construction of the 12 GeV CEBAF Upgrade and Hall D.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
The contractor takes extra steps to assure that the lab optimizes opportunities to develop and promote effective collaborations with other organizations to advance priority issues in science.	4.3
The contractor ensures that the laboratory has optimized opportunities to develop and promote effective collaborations and understandings with other organizations—and particularly with the lab user group.	3.4
The contractor relies on the lab to optimize opportunities to develop and promote effective collaborations. The lab achieves this goal.	2.0
The contractor relies on the lab and the lab fails to take reasonable advantage of collaborations.	1.0
Neither the contractor nor the lab promote collaborations	0.0

Measure 4.1.4.2 The Laboratory has corporate citizenship programs that encourage community support of the laboratory and its programs and that draw on lab competencies and meet community needs. These corporate citizenship efforts include public outreach and improved scientific literacy. This responsibility of the laboratory is measured both by metrics and peer reviews. “Corporate citizenship” related tech transfer responsibilities of the contractor are covered under 4.1.5.

Grade:A **Score:** 4.0

Justification: SURA/TJNAF recognizes that its responsibility for world-class science and operations at JLab extends to a broader commitment: to leverage our capabilities into new growth for lab-specific opportunities; and to support efforts, beyond its primary mission, for the advancement of the larger science community.

SURA has engaged with the Eastern Virginia Medical School to promote development of an EVMS Bioscience Center at Jefferson Lab. This partnership intends to leverage the \$82 million federal investment in the JLab Free Electron Laser facility in order to capture the biomedical research opportunities of the FEL. A 27,000 square foot user lab, contiguous to the FEL facility, will provide research space for opportunities to make advances in the high-profile fields of bioscience. Specifically, research could be performed in the understanding of protein dynamics, cell structure and the use of lasers for optical surgery and photosensitizing drug behavior.

Researchers from EVMS, Harvard, the University of Virginia, William and Mary, Princeton, George Washington University and East Carolina University have initiated experiments and developed proposals to utilize the Laser Bioscience Center. A scientific workshop scheduled for June 2006 will help form a Biomedical Research Action Plan for the Center, with numerous research proposals already identified. SURA, with EVMS, has made preliminary investments in advocating for Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) funding through the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Additionally, SURA/TJNAF is prepared to advocate for Commonwealth of Virginia funds for the \$6 million construction cost, as it did in acquiring FEL construction funds (\$5 million) from the Commonwealth in the mid-1990's..

Leveraging the science produced by JLab can be extended through the Free Electron Laser in an applied research format with such an expansion. A corollary result will not only be that it benefits biolaser science for quality of life, and medical solutions but that it will also serve as a practical example of the corporate citizenship and visionary leadership of SURA/TJNAF.

Additionally, SURA has been increasingly involved in efforts to advance science literacy and public awareness of the importance of science to our national competitiveness and economic leadership. SURA/TJNAF is an active member of the Energy Science Coalition (ESC), the Task Force for the Future of American Innovation and the Alliance for Science and Technology Research in America (ASTRA). While the ESC is geared toward support and advocacy for DOE's Office of Science, the other two organizations aim for broader public understanding and support of the sciences and the importance of basic physical sciences funding. With independent studies and private surveys, SURA has participated in their efforts to arm policymakers and opinion leaders with the rationale for greater support of science as a means of ensuring our nation's continued preeminence. Pursuit of, support for, and dissemination of such reports

as *Rising Above the Gathering Storm* (published in October 2005 by the National Academies) has been most helpful to this end. President Bush has not only cited the report, but announced in his State of the Union Address on January 31 his “American Competitiveness Initiative” that would “double the Federal commitment to the most critical basic research programs in the physical sciences over the next ten years.” Work by the Task Force and ASTRA was instrumental in advancing this initiative.

SURA/TJNAF believes that to be good corporate citizens and responsible stewards of JLab requires that it participate in public debate and advocacy that will inform and sustain policy discussion to support its mission of advancing science and building our nation’s research capacity.

SURA has fully supported TJNAF’s Science Education Activities

SURA/TJNAF’s science education program contributes to the Commonwealth and the nation’s science education and literacy as evidenced in annual Public Participation metrics. The educational centerpiece is the Lab’s K-12 science education program, Becoming Enthusiastic About Math and Science, most often referred to as BEAMS. The BEAMS program serves all sixth, seventh, and eighth grade students and teachers from two local schools with the most “at-risk” students (~1200 students annually.) Students and teachers visit Jefferson Lab for two to five days of hands-on math and science activities conducted by Jefferson Lab scientists, engineers, and technicians. This continued interaction has yielded measurable results, increasing test scores of these students in Virginia Standards of Learning tests in Math and Science.

During the summer of 2006, 17 middle school science teachers will participate in the Lab’s Teacher Academy in the Physical Science program, a four-week summer classroom and research program for 5th - 8th grade teachers designed to:

- build teachers’ content knowledge and skill base in the physical sciences;
- equip teachers with more engaging and advanced teaching methods;
- increase teachers’ ability to positively influence students’ interest and understanding of the physical sciences; and
- acknowledge the important role that teachers play in maintaining the educational “pipeline” that develops students with the critical thinking skills needed to solve the nation’s future challenges.

Additional activities in science education include classroom visits to assist teachers and students in math and science educational activities; Physics Fest days (field trips to the Lab); providing internship programs for high school and college students interested in science and technology careers; participating as local and regional science fair judges; providing science lectures to the public; and hosting the Department of Energy’s High School and Middle School Science Bowls. To date in FY06, TJNAF’s Science Education program served more than 6,500 students. In addition, the Lab provided in-service activities, which include access to the Lab’s expertise and equipment, to more than 400 teachers.

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

Four public lectures were offered to the public on such diverse topics as “The Physics of Football” to “How Things Work” that generated an average of over 200 attendees per event.

Public visibility and awareness of the Department of Energy and Jefferson Lab is reinforced through the use of the all types of media and outlets that interaction with the public. Local and regional news articles covered events related to Jefferson Lab including the Lab’s science, public lectures, and technology development. The Lab’s major science announcements are always between April and September during the two major Nuclear Physics conferences sponsored by the American Physical Society. Therefore this reporting period resulted in no significant independent press coverage. However TJNAF has submitted and had published several articles on the Lab’s activities in the *CERN Courier*, an international scientific magazine published by CERN. The Lab is increasing its attention to its website and is increasing its publication of scientific features as home page articles. A new design for the JLab website was introduced in November to continue to keep the public visiting the site. The science education section of the website sees over 500,000 hits per day during the weeks leading up to the Standards of Learning tests given to all Virginia students. It is cited by most Virginia as the one tool that helps students practice for the test effectively.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
The contractor takes extra measures to ensure that the laboratory takes effective measures to achieve a high level of awareness with the public, the scientific community and DOE. This responsibility is measured by metrics and peer reviews.	4.3
The contractor ensures that the laboratory has taken effective measures to achieve a high level of public awareness of the laboratory and its achievements on behalf of DOE and the science community and to enhance pre-college science education in the local community by drawing on the resources of the laboratory.	3.4
The contractor relies on Lab programs to ensue effective measures are taken on an on-going basis. The lab performs well.	2.0
The lab’s program is incomplete and the lab fails to meet its metrics. The contractor fails to take corrective actions.	1.0
There is no lab or corporate outreach program that encourages community and scientific support. The contractor takes no actions.	0.0

Measure 4.1.5 The Laboratory has developed and implemented technology transfer and commercial applications and projects with other agencies to utilize effectively laboratory developed and related technologies especially in defense, homeland security and commerce. (Metrics for this goal are included in section 6 of this document.)

Grade: A Score: 4.0

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
Performance Report

Justification: SURA/TJNAF continues to play an active role in technology transfer and commercialization activities that benefit Jefferson Lab. For example, several years ago SURA/TJNAF recognized the commercial potential for terahertz waves and looked for a productive means to promote the powerful THz source at JLab. Thus, SURA began hosting the annual Terahertz Applications Symposium, bringing together hundreds of corporate, academic, and government participants to discuss emerging applications for terahertz waves. The 2005 event led to a growing partnership between SURA/TJNAF and the Air Force Research Laboratory's group that conducts research on biological hazards of radiation. SURA Corporate is now pursuing a Memorandum of Agreement with them, which may be accompanied by Air Force funds for research at the THz User Facility at JLab.

More examples of SURA/TJNAF's proactive commitment to technology commercialization can be seen in the mechanisms and partnerships established for managing, marketing, and funding technology transfer opportunities. To better manage all of the JLab invention disclosures and patent portfolio, SURA purchased with its own funds the powerful Inteum C/S Intellectual Property management system. This system came online in the fall of 2005 once all of the legacy data was entered into the system and the new procedures for capturing new inventions were developed. In January 2006 SURA/TJNAF conducted a training seminar for all JLab inventors, attended by over 75 people, to promote new technology transfer activities and to demonstrate this new web-based system, which allows inventors to enter, edit, submit, and track the status of all their inventions online. And SURA/TJNAF continues to work with startup companies based on JLab technologies, including Dilon Technologies and Eye on Science, to help them with their commercialization efforts.

To market its technologies better, SURA has entered into partnership with the highly respected University of Virginia Patent Foundation, responsible for managing over \$10 million in licensing revenues for UVA each year. Through SURA/TJNAF's efficient and cost-effective arrangement, UVAPF conducts comprehensive market analyses and full-scale marketing efforts for those JLab technologies selected by the JLab Technology Review Committee paid for by SURA. This has allowed SURA/TJNAF to more effectively connect its technologies with promising licensees and has already led to not only licensing discussions but also the elimination of unnecessary patent fees for technologies not valuable to the marketplace. Finally, to provide better opportunities to connect promising technologies and spin-off companies with funding sources, SURA has established connections with private sector investors across the country. Working through affiliate partners, the Girvan Institute (former NASA Tech Transfer organization), SURA provides opportunities for promoting its technologies to the Silicon Valley entrepreneurial and venture capital community at the quarterly Technology Showcase, Venture Capital Forum, and VC-Angel Roundtable events. SURA has also established relationships with investors on the

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

East Coast, in the mid-Atlantic region, and throughout the South to ensure connectivity to the investment community.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
The contractor takes special steps to encourage and promote technology transfer, commercial applications, and projects with other agencies to effectively use lab technologies wherever possible, in addition to working with the Lab to promote such activities.	4.3
The contractor works with the Lab to encourage and promote lab technology transfer that effectively draws on lab technologies/capabilities to serve commercial and national interests. Effectiveness of the organization will be measured, in part, by metrics, e.g. patents issued and by peer reviews.	3.4
The contractor relies on the lab to promote technology transfer and commercial applications. The lab performs well.	2.0
The contractor does not do a credible job of transferring its technologies or of promoting commercial applications of its technologies. The lab does not meet its metric goals and the contractor takes no corrective action.	1.0
The contractor fails to develop a viable technology transfer program. The contractor takes no corrective action.	0.0

Objective 4.2 Provide for Responsive and Accountable Leadership throughout the Organization

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

Grade: A **Score:** 4.0

Justification: During this assessment period, SURA/TJNAF met its target of ensuring that an effective process is in place to assess lab performance and to address and appropriately resolve lab management deficiencies. SURA has developed an annual internal audit plan that helps to identify and overcome lab management deficiencies. See Section 6.4 for performance against internal audit metrics.

SURA/TJNAF has taken extra steps to ensure that the lab staffing and structure support its fundamental principles of identifying roles and authorities, and instilling responsibility and accountability throughout the entire organization. In addition to supporting an effective leadership culture and decision making process, these principles were used as SURA/TJNAF dealt with a potential reduction in force due to curtailed budgets. The impact of these budget cuts was successfully minimized through a voluntary separation program offering and targeted cost containment measures.

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

As SURA/TJNAF continues to strive to achieve a most efficient organization, the structure of which would help to identify and respond proactively to lab issues and opportunities, SURA/TJNAF is considering a logical succession management plan for the laboratory. To this end, SURA at its own initiative, engaged the services of a highly qualified individual with private sector experience to serve as the Acting Chief Operating Officer (COO), assigned to the Lab Director to move aggressively on its continuous improvement agenda. The Acting COO, together with a project control manager and other outside expertise, has established a functional work breakdown structure that serves as the blue print to move the lab toward a more efficient and effective operation supporting a world-class scientific facility.

SURA/TJNAF believes it has exceeded its target during this assessment period and has demonstrated its commitment to move toward a most efficient organization to enable the lab to achieve fully its scientific mission.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
The contractor takes extra steps to ensure that the lab is staffed and structured in an optimum way, e.g. by using appropriate outside expertise; that a system is in place for timely corporate reviews to ensure that clear assignments of staff responsibilities, performance goals and criteria are up to date and relevant.	4.3
The contractor ensures that there is an effective process in place for addressing and resolving lab management structure and staffing deficiencies. The contractor ensures that there is an effective internal audit program in place to assist in identifying and overcoming lab deficiencies and that the audit program is responsible to the board finance/audit committee. (Metrics for internal audit included in goal 6 of this document).	3.4
The contractor relies on the lab to ensure that an effective process is in place to assess its performance, address & resolve its deficiencies. The lab performs well. Some audit recommendations and findings are not implemented and the contractor takes no action.	2.0
The contractor takes no action to ensure effective lab staffing, structuring and performance and the lab fails to perform to expectations. Audit recommendations are not implemented.	1.0
There is no process in place to assess lab organization or performance issues. There is no viable internal audit program. The contractor takes no action to resolve these deficiencies.	0.0

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

Grade: B+ **Score:** 3.4

Justification: SURA has reviewed the laboratory’s quality assurance program with the director of the lab’s Office of Performance Assurance. The Laboratory

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

has a quality assurance program that responds effectively to lab issues and opportunities for continuous improvement. The action tracking system is effective especially for safety issues.

The laboratory's quality assurance program has the requisite components to meet the mission and operational needs of the laboratory. There is an established issue management system that:

- addresses emerging issues or problems in a timely manner;
- has a corrective action mechanism which tracks issues and monitors implementation of corrective actions; and,
- has a lessons learned web page that includes both internal lessons and those from other parts of the DOE complex.

In addition, the SURA internal auditor reviews the program on a scheduled basis and reports findings to the SURA president, the Lab Director, and the SURA finance and audit committee.

However, SURA believes that the quality assurance program can be improved and urges laboratory management to review the present program against new DOE requirements, standard benchmarking techniques, and any new initiatives in the quality assurance area. SURA is prepared, with laboratory management, to assist in independent reviews and to support the implementation of any recommendations from either the laboratory or independent reviews.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
The contractor will take extra measures to ensure that the lab quality assurance program is able to respond to lab issues and to identify and implement opportunities for continuous improvement.	4.3
The contractor ensures a quality assurance program is maintained that responds effectively to lab issues and opportunities for continuous improvement. An effective and comprehensive action item tracking system is established and used.	3.4
The contractor relies on the lab quality assurance program to identify continuous improvement opportunities. The lab implements these opportunities	2.0
The contractor does not ensure that, the lab's quality program can identify major opportunities for continuous improvement or efficiencies and this is noted in reviews. Contractor takes no corrective action.	1.0
The contractor does not ensure that the lab has a viable process to identify opportunities for improvement or efficiencies. The contractor takes no corrective action.	0.0

Objective 4.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Corporate Office Support as Appropriate

Measure 4.3.1 The contractor will ensure that outside, nationally recognized, expertise in such areas as project management, IT organization, risk assessment, and a

variety of business disciplines will be made available on an as needed basis for the solution of emerging problems or for improvement in processes.

Recent major organization reviews and changes occurred prior to this rating period and no planned reviews are expected to occur in the first half of FY06. This measure is marked N/A and is not scored.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
The contractor takes special measures to provide the necessary expertise to review and assess laboratory operations in key operational areas. These reviews will focus on major programmatic areas to identify significant areas for improvement. Corporate leadership helps ensure the timely and appropriate implementation of review recommendations.	4.3
Contractor will provide oversight through reviews and other means to ensure timely and relevant support of Lab business operations and infrastructure processes, procedures and improvements.	3.4
The contractor relies on the lab to review and improve business operations and infrastructure processes, procedures and improvements. The lab performs well.	2.0
In the absence of contractor involvement, the lab fails to review its business and infrastructure operations and programs on a timely and regular basis. Some implementation of corrective actions are not met. The contractor takes no corrective actions.	1.0
There is no program to review or improve its business operations, and infrastructure processes and procedures are not reviewed. The contractor takes no corrective actions.	0.0

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

Grade: B+ **Score:** 3.4

Justification: SURA/TJNAF is keenly aware of the critical importance of bringing new blood with fresh ideas to bear on the research of JLab. In December SURA/TJNAF requested an update of the laboratory’s joint and bridged university positions programs to assure that it is being effectively pursued by the laboratory to bring capable faculty members into the lab’s research effort. This program not only benefits the laboratory but strengthens the research and teaching capabilities of the universities involved in the national and DOE science interests.

Through its ongoing fellowship program SURA/TJNAF continues actively to encourage young talent to undertake careers in science. For 2006 SURA has secured 19 applications from graduate students at its member universities from which eight are to be selected for support, including one for the FEL program. These applications have been screened, as usual, by a SURA Fellowship Committee that makes recommendation for SUR awards. SURA has taken further

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

steps to strengthen the screening process by requiring approval by the Jefferson Lab Committee of the SURA Board before any awards are made.

As noted under measure 4.1.4.1 SURA has enhanced its use of its sabbatical support program to strengthen ties to the user community. SURA/TJNAF has further encouraged young people in science careers by offering an annual thesis prize for graduate students undertaking research as JLab. SURA/TJNAF has augmented that effort by offering prizes for posters that exhibit the work of graduate students at the JLab. Thus SURA/TJNAF constantly endeavors to strengthen efforts to bring highly accomplished researchers to the JLab and to encourage the new generation of such researchers.

Finally SURA would note that it has initiated a new Minority Serving Institutions program designed to attract minority students into PhD programs in physics and related sciences through collaborative efforts between and among minority and majority universities. In November 2005 SURA took steps to strengthen the leadership of this initiative by providing financial sabbatical support for a faculty member from a SURA member university with experience in attracting minority students into its PhD program. While the MSI program is not targeted to JLab it will enlarge the pool from which nuclear physicists are drawn and is in keeping with DOE interest in attracting minorities into science careers in general and at its laboratories

Performance Levels	Measure Score
In addition to laboratory activities in this area, the contractor uses fellowships, sabbaticals, and awards to ensure an active user participation in the life and science of the laboratory. Contractor takes measures to strengthen programs that enhance user participation in laboratory science.	4.3
The contractor monitors lab programs to ensure university appointments of key staff, joint appointments and other means are used to assure the viability of these programs.	3.4
The contractor relies on lab management to ensure that there is an on-going program to achieve key staff appointments and joint appointments. The lab performs well.	2.0
In absence of contractor oversight and involvement, Lab management fails to achieve key staff appointments to universities and joint positions for promising researchers. The contractor takes no corrective action.	1.0
There is no program or effort made to achieve joint appointments for key staff, joint positions for promising researchers are not achieved. The contractor takes no corrective action.	0.0

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

No outside investment opportunities are planned at this time. This measure is marked N/A and is not scored.

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

Performance Levels	Measure Score
The contractor takes pro-active steps to identify, as needed, alternate financing opportunities that will provide for investment in the laboratory. The contractor will take extra measures to identify and resolve user quality of life issues.	4.3
Contractor will review lab identified alternate financing opportunities on an as needed basis and make appropriate investments of time and effort. The SURA residence facility is managed safely and in an environmentally sound manner.	3.4
Contractor relies on the lab to identify and implement alternate financing opportunities on an as needed basis. Minor lapses in maintaining the residence facility are noted.	2.0
In the absence of corporate involvement, few alternate financing opportunities are identified. Major lapses in maintaining the residence facility are noted and the contractor takes no corrective actions.	1.0
Due to corporate inaction the residence facility closes. No alternate financing opportunities are identified.	0.0

Goal Performance Rating Development

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
4.0 Effectiveness and Efficiency of Contractor Leadership and Stewardship					
4.1 Provide a Distinctive Vision for the Laboratory and an Effective Plan for Accomplishment of the Vision to Include Strong Partnerships Required to Carry Out those Plan	A	3.78	35%	1.32	
4.2 Provide for Responsive and Accountable Leadership throughout the Organization	A-	3.70	35%	1.30	
4.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Contractor Support	B+	3.40	30%	1.02	
Performance Goal 4.0 Total					3.64

Final Letter Grade

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

Goal 5.0 Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection

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

Measure 5.1.1 The Contractor’s progress in achieving and maintaining “best-in-class” ES&H program performance as measured by the day away, restricted or transferred (DART) case rate. Expected performance (3.4 score) was established as the arithmetic average between Office of Science’s FY05 and FY07 goals for DART (0.5 and 0.25, respectively). These rates include: All SURA/Jefferson Laboratory Staff, nuclear physics Users, and contractors, official travel, personnel paid under joint salary arrangements.

Grade: B- Score: 2.65

Justification: The lab’s DART rate at the end of February is 0.67. By linear interpolation, this corresponds to a score of 2.65 and a grade of B-. This somewhat higher than desired DART value corresponds to only two lost time injuries during the rating period. This DART rate is higher than the lab’s goal. SURA/TJNAF intends to reverse the trend that has seen this measure increase from 0.1 in FY05 to its current level. A major step in achieving this improvement was a site wide January 26 safety stand-down in which the Lab Director challenged management and staff to keep the lab injury free for the remainder of FY06. More than 368 areas for improvement were identified and are being tracked to closure through the Corrective Action Tracking System (CATS).

Performance Levels	Measure Score
DART Rate 0.25	3.9 – 4.3
DART Rate 0.38	3.4
DART Rate 0.60	3.0
DART Rate 0.80	2.0
DART Rate 1.10	0.0

Measure 5.1.2 The Contractor’s progress in achieving and maintaining “best-in-class” ES&H program performance as measured by the total reportable case rate (TRCR). Expected performance (3.4 score) was established as the arithmetic average between Office of Science’s FY05 and FY07 goals for TRC (1.17 and 0.65, respectively). These rates include: All SURA/Jefferson Laboratory Staff, nuclear physics Users, and contractors, official travel, personnel paid under joint salary arrangements

Grade: B+ Score: 3.26

Justification: The lab’s TRC score at the end of February is 1.01. By linear interpolation, this corresponds to a score of 3.26 and a grade of B+. This somewhat higher than desired TRC corresponds to only three recordable injuries during the rating period. This TRC rate is higher than the lab’s goal and we intend to reverse the trend that has seen this measure increase from 0.5 in FY05 to its current level. Again our site wide January 26 Safety Stand-down is already resulting in improvements in processes, procedures and practices.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
TRCR 0 .65	3.9 – 4.3
TRCR 0.91	3.4
TRCR 1.2	3.0
TRCR 2.0	2.0
TRCR 2.5	0.0

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

In addition to the following pair of measures several factors contribute to the Lab's effective and efficient implementation of integrated EH&S. Management works to maintain an open reporting culture. Employees have several ways in which they can bring safety concerns to the attention of management. The newest of these is the Workers Safety Committee which reports directly to the Lab Director and the Director's Safety Council. Employees are encouraged to report all injuries to their supervisors and the occupational medicine department and are required to report all but the most minor injuries.

Accident and other incident investigations are carried out to identify underlying causes so that corrective actions address real causes, not symptoms. SURA/TJNAF is not satisfied with its ability to consistently identify root causes and is planning additional investigation and root cause analysis training for FY06.

The Lab's EH&S Reporting Manager is a participant in DOE's monthly SELLS (Society for Effective Lessons Learned Sharing) calls. SURA/TJNAF monitors lessons learned from both inside and outside the DOE complex and is a member of NLIC (National Laboratory Improvement Council), an excellent forum for sharing best practices and lessons learned.

Measure 5.2.1 Provide an effective self assessment program.

Grade: B+ **Score:** 3.4

Justification: Justification: In FY05 SURA/TJNAF recognized that its self-assessment program had opportunities for improvement. It was not as effective in promoting continuous improvement as lab management desired. The line self

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

assessment part of the program in particular was not operating effectively. Therefore in early FY06 (November 23, 2006) new independent and management-self assessment procedures were implemented which are available on the JLab web site (http://www.jlab.org/div_dept/dir_off/oa/assess.html). The Manager of the Office of Performance Assurance briefed division managers on the new procedures. The Director's Council approved an FY06 assessment schedule that integrates the lab's assessments, SURA/TJNAF's audits and the Site Office surveillances to avoid unwanted duplication. Less than half way through the fiscal year the lab has made significant progress towards a revitalized self-assessment program, both management and independent. New procedures are in place; two independent assessments (ISMS, welding) have been completed and a third (10 CFR 835, subparts H and I) is underway; several management self-assessments have been completed (PPE) and more are underway (LO/TO) with training offered for those doing the assessments. It is anticipated that by the end of FY06 all of the conditions in the performance level corresponding to 3.4 will have been met, justifying the midyear grade assigned.

As with any significant initiative there will be growing pains, but all major divisions are participants in the assessment program as planned. In addition, the quality of the assessments is improving as we become more experienced in the process.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Revitalized management self assessment (MSA) program in place on or before 10/15/05 and 10 MSAs completed in FY06 Revitalized independent assessment (IA) program in place on or before 10/15/05 and 6 IAs completed in FY06	3.9 – 4.3
Revitalized MSA program in place on or before 1/1/06 and 6 MSAs completed in FY06 Revitalized IA program in place on or before 1/1/06 and 4 IAs completed in FY06	3.4
Revitalized MSA program in place on or before 4/1/06 and 3 MSAs completed in FY06 Revitalized IA program in place on or before 1/1/06 and 3 IAs completed in FY06	3.0
Revitalized MSA program in place on or before 4/30/06 IA program in place by 4/1/06 and 2 IAs completed in FY06	2.0
No MSA program in place by end of FY06 No IA program in place by end of FY06	0.0

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

Grade: B+ Score: 3.4

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

Justification: The Radiation Control Program Peer Review will occur in the last half of FY06. Past peer reviews have identified no major deficiencies or program breakdowns and a similar result is anticipated this year. The most recent dosimetry results for the period July through December of 2005 showed no individual dose greater than 113 mrem. The most recent dosimetry results for the period July through December of 2005 showed no individual dose greater than 113 mrem. Rad Con monitors personnel through entry control (Radiological Work Permits) and it is unlikely that an individual dose of 200 mrem will be received.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
A program peer review resulting in recognition of programmatic best management practices and identification of only minor program opportunities for improvement. Includes participation with outside RadCon programs to share lessons learned	3.9 – 4.3
A program peer review resulting in only minor deficiencies and no programmatic breakdown; no individual dose >200 mrem	3.4
A program peer review identifying one significant deficient program element directly affecting employee radiation safety; no individual dose >300 mrem	3.0
A program peer review identifying two to three significantly deficient program elements directly affecting employee radiation safety; no individual dose >500 mrem	2.0
A program peer review identifying more than three significantly deficient program elements directly affecting employee radiation safety; no individual dose >1000 mrem	0.0

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

Grade: A- **Score:** 3.7

Justification: Although SURA/TJNAF did not submit a DOE P2 award application during FY06, the lab did submit a nomination for a Hampton Roads Sanitation District (HRSD) CY2005 P2 award in February, 2006. SURA/TJNAF self declared its EMS on October 20, 2005 and has improved its program since that date. The lab had no administrative or technical violations against any environmental permit during this period.

A grade of A- is justified because these accomplishments, while not fully meeting the performance level for an A, do exceed the performance level required for a grade of B+.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Submission of 1 DOE P2 award application and SURA self declaration of EMS implementation on or before 10/20/05	3.9 – 4.3

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

Performance Levels	Measure Score
No more than 1 administrative environmental permit violation and SURA self declaration of EMS implementation on or before 11/20/05	3.4
No more than 2 administrative and 1 technical environmental permit violations	3.0
No more than 3 administrative violations or no more than 1 environmental exceedence resulting in significant environmental impact of > 30 days. JSO declaration not achieved on or before 12/30/05 due to unresolved questions from validation	2.0
More than 2 environmental exceedences resulting in significant environmental impact of > 30 days	0.0

Table 5.1 Goal Performance Rating Development

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

Table 5.2 Final Letter Grade

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-	<u>B+</u>	<u>B</u>	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

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

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

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

Grade: A **Score:** 4.0

Justification: SURA/TJNAF has had no material/major findings (as defined in DOE O 413.1A Attachment 2) and no Unallowable cost findings from internal/external audits/reviews to date in this fiscal year. The external financial statement audit of SURA/TJNAF and the internal audit of transactions are both in process and no material/major findings based on our past experience are anticipated. No material weaknesses have been identified in financial operations and the OMB Circular A-123 Review is currently in progress which is anticipated to document and support the fact that SURA/TJNAF has no material weaknesses in financial operations. It is anticipated that there will be a need to implement new policies as they relate to labor associated with capitalization of fabricated equipment, however the extent of this change is not known at this time. All previous findings/recommendations are being addressed and implemented as agreed upon to preclude negative impact on operations. The Lab is on schedule to meet all deadlines as detailed in the action plan for the recommendations from the Funds Control Review, the only findings/recommendations which are currently open. There have been no repeat findings identified in internal or external reviews where SURA/TJNAF received notification of the finding and had reasonable opportunity to implement corrective actions. All required documentation, reports and assurance statements to date have been provided in a timely manner.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
No material/major findings (as defined in DOE O 413.1A Attachment 2) and no Unallowable cost findings from internal/external audits/reviews. No material weaknesses identified in financial operations. All previous findings/recommendations are addressed and implemented as agreed upon to preclude negative impact on operations. No repeat findings identified in internal or external reviews where the contractor received notification of the finding and had reasonable opportunity to implement corrective actions. Required documentation, reports and assurance statements provided in a timely manner.	3.9 – 4.3

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

Performance Levels	Measure Score
No material/major findings (as defined in DOE O 413.1A Attachment 2) and no more than one Unallowable cost finding from internal/external audits/reviews. No material weaknesses identified in financial operations. All previous findings/recommendations are addressed and implemented as agreed upon to preclude negative impact on operations. No repeat findings identified in internal or external reviews where the contractor received notification of the finding and had reasonable opportunity to implement corrective actions. Required documentation, reports and assurance statements provided in a timely manner	3.4
No material/major findings (as defined in DOE O 413.1A Attachment 2) and no more than two Unallowable cost findings from internal/external audits/reviews. No material weaknesses identified in financial operations. All previous findings/recommendations are addressed and implemented as agreed upon to preclude negative impact on operations. No repeat findings identified in internal or external reviews where the contractor received notification of the finding and had reasonable opportunity to implement corrective actions. Required documentation, reports and assurance statements provided in a timely manner.	3.0
No more than one material/major finding (as defined in DOE O 413.1A Attachment 2) and no more than three Unallowable cost findings from internal/external audits/reviews. Failure to initiate corrective actions on any identified problem.	2.0
None of the expectations set by the performance measures are met and/or other significant deficiencies are identified which have significantly impacted both the objective and the accomplishment of the Laboratory mission.	0.0

Measure 6.1.2 World-class Financial Management Organization

Grade: A- **Score:** 3.9

Justification: SURA/TJNAF maintains a strong foundation of financial control and accountability throughout the lab organization. The Chief Financial Officer is an integral member of the Director’s Council and advises Director’s Council members on financial issues. Managers within the CFO organization are often consulted on financial matters and provide guidance and leadership. Examples include on-line travel training for travel coordinators, working with DOE on reconciliation of 533M data to STARS and teaming with the lab’s technology transfer committee to develop methods to deal with royalty income. Financial management leadership and staff are engaged in the identification and implementation of improvements to financial management systems and processes that improve efficiency and strengthen financial management. One example during this time period is implementation of electronic funds transfer (EFT) for travel reimbursements. Staff is regularly involved in financial aspects of acquisitions and projects to identify and resolve funding issues. Staff credentials and certifications are up to date, with all members of the CFO organization participating in a Federal Appropriations Law class for 2 days in January. In addition, approximately 30 non-financial employees of the lab attended the class.

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Strong foundation of control and accountability throughout the Lab organization. Evidence of clear and strong executive leadership on financial matters. Financial management leadership and staff are engaged in the identification and implementation of improvements to financial management systems and processes that improve efficiency and strengthen financial management. Staff is regularly involved in financial aspects of acquisitions and projects to identify and resolve funding issues. Staff credentials and certifications are up to date.	3.9 – 4.3
Financial management leadership and staff are engaged in the identification and implementation of improvements to financial management systems and processes that improve efficiency and strengthen financial management. Staff is regularly involved in financial aspects of acquisitions and projects to identify and resolve funding issues. Staff credentials and certifications are up to date.	3.4
Financial management leadership and staff are engaged in the identification and implementation of improvements to financial management systems and processes that improve efficiency and strengthen financial management. Staff is regularly involved in financial aspects of acquisitions and projects to identify and resolve funding issues. 75% of staff credentials and certifications are up to date.	3.0
Personnel turnover in financial organization has negative impacts on the ability of the organization to meet its mission. No evidence of training or resources devoted for professional development of staff	2.0
None of the expectations set by the performance measures are met and/or other significant deficiencies are identified which have significantly impacted both the objective and the accomplishment of the Laboratory mission.	0.0

Measure 6.1.3 Accounting and Budget

Grade: A- **Score:** 3.9

Justification: Since budget submissions are not yet due, the performance level criteria dealing with these submissions cannot be judged. However, all calls for information to date have been responsive, timely, complete and justifiable/defendable. Costs and commitments during the continuing resolution did not exceed available funding. Accounting reports are accurate, timely and complete in accordance with requirements for key activities/deliverables. Practices disclosed in the Cost Accounting Standards (CAS) Disclosure Statement comply with CAS and clearly describe contractor’s actual cost accounting practices followed. The accuracy of indirect rates cannot be measured until fiscal year end, however they are monitored on a regular basis. Although most of this measure requires data for a full year and specific year end data, it is anticipated that, based on past experience, the Lab will meet all expectations in the measure.

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Meet all transition deadlines for finance as part of the transition to a new contract. Budget submissions and calls for information are responsive, timely, complete and justifiable/defendable. Costs and commitments do not exceed available funding. Accounting reports are accurate, timely and complete in accordance with requirements for key activities/deliverables. Practices disclosed in the Cost Accounting Standards (CAS) Disclosure Statement comply with CAS and clearly describe contractor's actual cost accounting practices followed. Indirect rates are accurately estimated and efficiently managed such that programs and customers are not adversely impacted.	3.9 – 4.3
Budget submissions and calls for information are responsive, timely, complete and justifiable/defendable. Costs and commitments do not exceed available funding. Accounting reports are accurate, timely and complete in accordance with requirements for key activities/deliverables. Practices disclosed in the Cost Accounting Standards (CAS) Disclosure Statement comply with CAS and clearly describe contractor's actual cost accounting practices followed. Indirect rates are accurately estimated and efficiently managed such that programs and customers are not adversely impacted.	3.4
95% of standard and 90% of written ad hoc DOE requests with one day turnaround or more for financial information are submitted by requested deadline. Costs and commitments do not exceed available funding. Practices disclosed in the Cost Accounting Standards (CAS) Disclosure Statement comply with CAS and clearly describe contractor's actual cost accounting practices followed. Indirect rates are accurately estimated and efficiently managed such that programs and customers are not adversely impacted.	3.0
90% of standard and 90% of written ad hoc DOE requests with one day turnaround or more for financial information are submitted by requested deadline. Costs and commitments do not exceed available funding. Significant issues/problems identified with cost accounting practices utilized and indirect rates.	2.0
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.	0.0

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

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

Grade: B+

Score: 3.4

Justification: This Report is issued solely to provide data required to close out the SURA Contract under the Contract Performance Evaluation Management Plan (PEMP) document currently established by DOE. Based on an interim Balanced Score Card (BSC) score of 94.5 for performance measures evaluated during the period 10/1/2005 through 1/31/2006 the lab earned a score of 3.4 (B+) under PEMP part 6.2.1. It is important to note that the measured performance period

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

through 1/31/2006 had to be limited to maximize the number of measures reported. Additionally, in all cases, the targets for the metrics measured were designed to measure annual performance outcomes and therefore the interim results may not provide a clear picture of the true efficacy of our performance, particularly because the data does not include end of year activity which can greatly influence results. Accordingly, current data was used when readily available; otherwise, FY05 results were used when data was not readily available. The basis of the data for all findings is shown in the table below.

It is important to note, that SURA/TJNAF feels that all areas within procurement are functioning at a high level of reliability and efficiency and therefore believe that a score of 3.4 (B+) under the PEMP guidelines does not adequately reflect the outstanding results of the lab's performance.

Interim FY 2006 Balanced Score Card Summary (through 1/31/2006)

Objectives	Data used	Points Awarded	Measures
CP-1 Customer Satisfaction	FY 06	25	CP 1.1 Real-time Transaction Survey
IP-1 Effective Internal Control	FY 05 FY 06	8.5 5	IP 1.1 Compliance Reviews IP 1.2 Ratio of Approving Officials to P-card holders
IP-2 Effective Supplier Management	FY 06	5	IP 2.1 On-Time Delivery
IP-3 Effective Competition	FY 06	5	IP 3.1 Total dollars awarded competitively for actions >\$100K
IP-4 Effective Utilization of Alternate Procurement Approaches	FY 06 FY 06 FY 06	3 3 3	IP 4.1 Number of Actions Placed By Users IP 4.2 Percent Rapid Purchasing Techniques IP 4.3 Percentage of eCommerce Actions
IP-5 Acquisition Process	FY 06	9	IP 5.1 Timely Support Actions < \$100K
IP-6 Corporate Citizenship Through Purchasing	FY 06	11	IP 6.1-6.6 Socioeconomic Goal Attainment
LG-1 Employee Satisfaction Work Envr.	FY 05	5	LG 1.1 Employee Survey
LG-2 Employee Alignment with Mission & Lab Culture	FY 06	5	LG 2.1 Performance Appraisals
FP-1 Optimum Cost Efficiency of Purchasing Operations	FY 06	7	FP 1.1 Cost to Spend Ratio
		94.5	Interim Score = 3.4 (B+)

I. Customer Perspective (Cp) 25 Points

CP-1.0 Customer Satisfaction Sub-Weight 25 Points
25 Points Earned: 99% of Procurement Customers indicated satisfaction with procurement services (there was only 1 dissatisfied customer from 407 respondents surveyed through 1/31/2006.)

Avg Rating	Points
$\geq 92\%$	25

II. Internal Business Process Perspective (IP) 55 Points

The Internal Perspective assures that customer requirements and expectations are understood, and that the appropriate infrastructure and processes are in place.

IP-1.0 Effective Internal Controls Sub-Weight 15 Points

8.5 Points Earned: The BSC compliance reviews have not been completed therefore no data is available, 8.5 points is based on last year's results.

5 Points Earned: The ratio of issued PCard Holders to Approving Officials is 2:1
 Ratio of Active PCard Holders to Approving Officials - $< 7:1 = 5$ Points

IP-2.0 Effective Supplier Management Sub-Weight 5 Points

A consistent on-time delivery rate is essential to effectively plan and implement program requirements, and to ensure that JLab is not placing unreasonable delivery requirements on vendors that may artificially inflate the price of purchased goods and services.

5 Points Earned: The current on time vendor delivery rate is 88%

Percentage of Items Delivered On Time	Points
$\geq 84\%$	5.0

IP-3.0 Use of Effective Competition Sub-Weight 5 Points

5 Points Earned: The current percentage of dollars awarded competitively = 65%

Percentage of Competitive Awards	Points	Percentage of Competitive Awards	Points
$\geq 65\%$	5	$\geq 60\%$	4

IP-4.0 Effective Utilization of Alternate Procurement Approaches Sub-Weight 9 Points

3 Points Earned: The current percentage of decentralized actions = 79.9%

Percentage of Decentralized Actions	Points
$\geq 75\%$	3

3 Points Earned: The current % of Actions placed by Rapid Purchasing Techniques = 79.9%

Percentage of Actions With Rapid Purchasing Techniques	Points
$\geq 75\%$	3

3 Points Earned: The current percentage of Actions placed by eCommerce = 67.5%

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

Percentage of eCommerce Actions	Points
$\geq 30\%$	3

IP-5.0 Acquisition Process (timeliness of) Sub-Weight 9 Points

3 Points Earned: The procurement cycle time for actions < \$100,000 = 4.06 Days

Cycle Time Actions < \$100K
 < 9 Calendar Days = 3 Points

3 Points Earned: The procurement cycle time for actions > \$100,000 = 7.88 Days

Cycle Time Actions > \$100K
 < 32 Calendar Days = 3 Points

3 Points Earned: The procurement cycle time for all actions = 4.08 Days

Cycle Time All Actions
 < 12 Calendar Days = 3 Points

IP-6.0 Corporate Citizenship- Small Business Program Performance Sub-Weight 12 Points

11 Points Earned: Based in the following SB Goal Achievement

- 4 Points Percentage of Small Business Subcontracting Plan Goal Achieved
- 2 Points Percentage of Small Disadvantaged Business Subcontracting Plan Goal Achieved
- 2 Points Percentage of Small Women-owned Business Goal Subcontracting Plan Goal Achieved
- 2 Points Percentage of Hub Zone Small Business Subcontracting Plan Goal Achieved
- 0 Points Percentage of Disabled Veteran Small Business Subcontracting Plan Goal Not Achieved
- 1 Point Percentage of Veteran Small Business Subcontracting Plan Goal Achieved

LG-1.0 Employee Satisfaction with the Work Environment Sub-Weight 5 Points

5 Points Earned: Based on results of the FY 2005 Survey- (Survey has not been taken in FY 06)

LG-2.0 Employees Aligned With Mission and Culture of the Laboratory Sub-Weight 5 Points

5 Points Earned: Based on results of employee performance evaluations and other sources

FP-1 Optimize Cost Efficiency of Purchasing Operations Sub-Weight 10 Points

7 Points Earned: Based on current cost to purchase \$1 of good and services = 3.4¢

COST TO PURCHASE \$1 OF GOODS AND SERVICES			
$\leq \$.025$	10 Points	$\leq \$.031$	8 Points
$\leq \$.028$	9 Points	$\leq \$.034$	7 Points

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Annual Procurement Balanced Scorecard Total Score \geq 98.0%	3.9 – 4.3
Annual Procurement Balanced Scorecard Total Score \geq 90.0%	3.4
Annual Procurement Balanced Scorecard Total Score \geq 85.0%	3.0
Annual Procurement Balanced Scorecard Total Score \geq 75.0%	2.0
Annual Procurement Balanced Scorecard Total Score $<$ 75.0%	0.0

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

Grade: B+ **Score:** 3.4

Justification: Property and Vehicle BSC results are based on annual inventory, disposal and mileage results which are reported after the close of the fiscal year. While the vehicle monthly mileage usage is on track, there are no quantifiable FY06 performance data for property until after the annual inventories are completed in September 2006.

In support of the assigned grade we note the following:

- The only FY05 Property BSC core measure less than outstanding was the annual inventory for “sensitive” personal property. The goal was to locate 99% of this property; during the inventory we located 97.4%. After the FY05 BSC was submitted a site wide “round up” of excess equipment was conducted during which several additional items were located. Based on acquisition cost 98.94% of the sensitive property in the FY05 inventory sample have been located. That is only .06% below the goal, demonstrating the efficacy of the property program.
- The Lab is in the process of completely validating its property inventory. This process requires that every SURA/TJNAF Custodian locate and verify their assigned property. This individual validation along with the annual property “round up” should improve the FY06 sensitive property inventory results.

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

Measure 6.3.1 Balanced Score Card (BCS) results based on the following targets:

Grade: A **Score:** 3.9 (Achieved 6 of 7 Targets)

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

Justification: Human Resources is on course to achieve 6 of 7 targets in its BSC. One target for the year has already been achieved: Internal Business Process. The targets for Diversity (2 targets), Compensation, and Retention are likely to be achieved. The target for Benefits will be achieved. The target for Recruitment will be very difficult to achieve (see discussion below).

Measure	Target
Diversity	
1. Protected class representation	85%
2. Protected class development opportunities	90%
Benefits	
3. Premium increases vs. the market	+2%
Compensation	
4. Alignment with market	±3.0%
Retention of Talent	
5. Attrition rate of top performers	7%
Recruitment	
6. Acceptance rate of employment offers	85%
Internal Business Process	
7. Annual review of policies/procedures	6

Performance Levels	Measure Score
6 of 7 BSC Measures Meet Target	3.9 – 4.3
5 of 7 BSC Measures Meet Target	3.4
4 of 7 BSC Measures Meet Target	3.0
3 of 7 BSC Measures Meet Target	2.0
2 of 7 BCS Measures Meet Target	0.0

Measure 1 Diversity: Protected Class Representation

Score: 95% **Target:** 85%

Justification: Protected class representation met/exceeded availability or maintained/increased representation in 19 of 20 categories. In the category (Female Scientists) where the target was not met the lab was only 0.2% below maintaining representation. The lab expects this score to have little change in the remainder of the fiscal year since minimal turnover is expected.

Measure 2 Diversity: Protected Class Development Opportunities

Score: 92% **Target:** 90%

Justification: Protected class participation in job related training was measured separately for females and minorities for each class. In 92% of the cases, protected classes were enrolled at a rate equal to or better than their proportion of the relevant population of employees eligible to take the course.

Measure 3 Benefits: Premium Increases vs. the Market

Score: -11.8% **Target:** No more than 2% above market

Justification: The lab has had excellent medical benefits renewals for the last three years and therefore has attained a score that is well below the target. Medical benefit insurance premiums have been rising at double digit rates for the last few years. The lab's premium rates will increase at a rate closer to this trend in the new plan year beginning in April. Therefore, the score will be closer to the target, but still well below the market movement.

Measure 4 Compensation: Alignment with the Market

Score: -0.4% **Target:** \pm 3.0%

Justification: The lab is well within the target range for this measure. Since the lab anticipates minimal hiring and salary adjustments for the remainder of the year, not much change is expected in this score.

Measure 5 Retention of Talent: Attrition Rate of Top Performers

Score: 2.8% **Target:** Less than 7%

Justification: The lab has succeeded in retaining its top performers having lost 2.8% of employees with the top 2 performance ratings during the first 5 months of the fiscal year. Over the course of the fiscal year this projects to a rate of 6.7%, slightly below the target.

Measure 6 Recruitment: Acceptance Rate of Employment Offers:

Score: 76.2% **Target:** 85%

Justification: The lab has had 76.2% (16 out of 21) of job offers accepted. This is below the target rate of 85% acceptances. Since the lab anticipates minimal hiring for the remainder of the fiscal year, achieving this objective will be difficult.

Measure 7 Internal Business Process: Annual Review of Policies/Procedures

Score: 26 **Target:** 6 or more

The Human Resources Department has been very active in reviewing policies and procedures in FY06. The target has already been exceeded by a large margin.

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

Measure 6.4.1 Internal audits completed in accordance with annual audit plan

Grade: A **Score:** 3.8

Justification: Internal Audit has made significant progress towards achieving its FY06 programmatic goals. Specifically, all planned audit and follow-up reviews are on schedule consistent with the FY06 Audit Plan with 5 planned audits of which three are work in progress and one unplanned audit that is a work in progress. Audit training needs have been identified for audit staff and completed or scheduled. Further, in answer to a special unplanned management request from the lab’s CFO, Internal Audit has provided substantial support to lab management’s efforts to comply with OMB’s A-123 implementation requirements.

Scheduling and completion of planned audits is partially relevant for the period of assessment and justification of the assigned grades.

Specifically the overriding rationale and justification for assigned grade for SURA Internal Audit is a function of:

1. Progress and/or completion of scheduled audits consistent with Annual Audit Plan;
2. Progress and/or completion of unplanned Special Management requests for audit services

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Completes all audits on plan and meets management requests for special audits	3.9 – 4.3
Completes all audits on plan	3.4
Completes \geq 75% of audits on plan	3.0
Completes \geq 50% of audits on plan	2.0
Completes less than 50% of audits on plan	0.0

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

Grade: B+ **Score:** 3.4

Justification: FY06 will present an unusually challenging year for Internal Audit. In addition to its established FY06 Audit Plan requirements and the unplanned resource requirements associated with supporting the lab's A-123 implementation effort, Internal Audit is scheduled to undergo its 5-year external review in August 2006. Planning and preparation for the intensive week long review is underway. In preparation for the external review a Project Plan has been established with milestone dates and responsibilities.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Receive an overall satisfactory rating from external peer review with at least one outstanding comment or observation	3.9 – 4.3
Receive an overall satisfactory rating from external peer review	3.4
Receive an overall satisfactory rating with two or less findings	3.0
Receive an overall satisfactory rating with three or more findings	2.0
Receive an overall unsatisfactory rating	0.0

Measure 6.4.3 Replacement of all Ingres database applications developed and maintained by Management Information System (MIS)

Grade: B+ **Score:** 3.4

Justification: Although the final application will not be replaced until 4/1, two months later than the 2/8 date required in the performance level for 3.4, the score of 3.4 is justified because the schedule slippage was caused by a delay of more than two months in the procurement of needed software. The lab's reduced budget, a situation outside the lab's control, was the cause of this delay. The actual dates for application replacement are:

- Credit card application was converted from Ingres to Oracle in September.
- Username audit application was converted from Ingres to Oracle in December.
- Account request form was converted from Ingres to Oracle in December.
- User registration form, FACTS form were converted from Ingres to Oracle in December.
- Property application was converted from Ingres to Oracle in December.
- Travel application was converted from Ingres to Oracle in early January.
- Badging system (CANS) links were converted in early January.
- Training application was completely converted to Oracle in Mid-February.
- Web applications linking to CIS and CMN database systems were converted in February.
- SRL, REQ, ACM applications to be converted by April 1.

Measure 6.4.4 New MIS applications thoroughly documented, including approved customer requirements

Grade: A **Score:** 4.0

Justification: Documentation for all new MIS systems was provided and documented in the standard MIS directory. Specifically, very thorough requirements documents were created for the SRL and REQ application upgrades.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
100%	3.9 – 4.3
> 90%	3.4
> 80%	3.0
> 70%	2.0
< 70%	0.0

Measure 6.4.5 Critical MIS services availability during business hours

Grade: A+ **Score:** 4.3

Justification: A new system to track metrics was implemented, and all critical MIS services sustained uptime of 99% or better.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
> 95%	3.9 – 4.3
> 92%	3.4
> 90%	3.0
> 85%	2.0
≤ 85%	0.0

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

Measure 6.5.1 Stewardship of intellectual assets

Measure 6.5.1.1: Invention Disclosures Number: 4 Score: 2.0
Measure 6.5.1.2: Patents Awarded Number: 4 Score: 4.3

Grade: B+ **Score:** 3.15

Justification: The number of Invention Disclosures, Year to Date (YTD) is 4, resulting in a score of 2.0 for measure 6.5.1.1. The number of Patents awarded YTD is also 4, resulting in a score of 4.3 for 6.5.1.2. The average of these two scores is 3.15.

Invention Disclosures	
Performance Levels	Measure Score
Number of Invention Disclosures ≥ 9	3.9 – 4.3

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Number of Invention Disclosures ≥ 7	3.4
Number of Invention Disclosures ≥ 5	3.0
Number of Invention Disclosures ≥ 3	2.0
Number of Invention Disclosures ≤ 1	0.0

Patents Awarded

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Number of patents awarded ≥ 4	3.9 – 4.3
Number of patents awarded ≥ 3	3.4
Number of patents awarded ≥ 2	3.0
Number of patents awarded ≥ 1	2.0
No Patents were awarded	0.0

Measure 6.5.2 Licenses & Options Agreements

Grade: B+ **Score:** 3.40

Justification: SURA/TJNAF has executed two licenses of its intellectual property YTD, resulting in a score of 3.4.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
≥ 2 Licenses Awarded and ≥ 2 Option Agreements Executed	3.9 – 4.3
≥ 2 Licenses Awarded or ≥ 2 Option Agreements Executed	3.4
≥ 1 Licenses Awarded and ≥ 1 Option Agreements Executed	3.0
1 License Awarded or 1 Option Agreement Executed	2.0
No Licenses Awarded or Option Agreements Executed	0.0

Measure 6.5.3 Customer Satisfaction

N/A

Score N/A

Grade: N/A **Score:** N/A

Justification: Customer Satisfaction is determined in an annual survey which is not being conducted until the end of the fiscal year. Therefore no score for this measure is available at this time..

The composite score for 6.5 is 3.28 (average of 6.5.1 and 6.5.2) corresponding to a grade of B+.

A – A+	B+	B	C	F
3.9 - 4.3	3.4	3.0	2.0	0.0

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

Goal Performance Rating Development

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
6.0 Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission(s)					
6.1 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Financial Management System(s)	A	3.93	25%	.98	
6.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition and Property Management System(s)	B+	3.40	25%	.85	
6.3 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Human Resources Management System	A	3.90	20%	.78	
6.4 Provide Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Management Systems for Internal Audit and Oversight; Quality; Information Management; and Other Administrative Support Services as Appropriate	A-	3.78	15%	.57	
6.5 Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Technology and Commercialization of Intellectual Assets	B+	3.28	15%	.49	
Performance Goal 6.0 Total					3.67

Final Letter Grade

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

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

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

Measure 7.1.1 Asset Condition Index (ACI):

Grade: B+ **Score:** 3.4

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

FIMS Category	Deferred Maintenance (DM)	Replacement Plant Value (RPV)	FCI	ACI
Buildings	\$3,103,479	\$103,974,164	2.98	97.02
Real Property Trailers	\$1,771,011	\$1,813,305	97.70	2.30
OSF	\$1,715,011	\$119,907,919	1.43	98.57
Total	\$6,590,079	\$225,695,388	2.92	97.08

An ACI of 97% corresponds to a Performance Level with a score of 3.4.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
≥ 98%	3.9 – 4.3
≥ 95%	3.4
≥ 90%	3.0
≥ 75%	2.0
< 75%	0.0

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

Facility Condition Inspections have been delayed and are now scheduled for July and August. Because of this delay, which is largely due to budget delays, no data are available to score this measure. Therefore this measure is being marked N/A and not scored.

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Completed on more than 30% of real property assets	3.9 – 4.3
Completed on more than 25% of real property assets	3.4
Completed on more than 20% of real property assets	3.0
Completed on 20% of real property assets	2.0
Completion on less than 20% of real property assets	0.0

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

Grade: B+ **Score:** 3.4

Justification: A total of 19 projects valued at \$451,000 were identified as indirect construction at the beginning of FY06. Due to reduced funding 7 of these projects have been identified as possibly deferred and two unplanned projects have been added to date.

Indirect Project Description	Building	Estimate	Status
2005 Projects In Progress			
Recoat VARC & Test Lab Roofs	28 & 58	\$120,000	Project Complete
Roof Access Ladders	N/S Access Buildings	\$16,000	Complete
ARC Laboratory Ventilation	ARC	\$20,000	Complete
Paint Accelerator Site Service Building Doors	Various Accelerator Service Bldgs	\$48,000	Complete
FY 2006			
Repair/Replace Weather Stripping for service doors in Accelerator bldgs	Various Accelerator Service Buildings	\$15,000	Complete
Road Repair around Hall C	Roads	\$40,000	Possibly deferred due to Budget
MCC Interior Renovation (Wall reconfiguration and Carpet)	85	\$75,000	Possibly deferred due to Budget
Replace Exterior Doors	28	\$35,000	Est Completion Mar 06
VFD for LCW pumps: 1 ea	91	\$40,000	30% complete

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

Indirect Project Description	Building	Estimate	Status
Interface roll-up doors control with HVAC system	90	\$10,000	10% complete
R&D and Production Chem room occupancy set back for outdoor air	58	\$20,000	5% complete
Replace remaining AC two way control valves	58	\$20,000	75% complete
Replace outdoor air actuators and intake louvers	58	\$20,000	100% complete
Replace outdoor air actuators and intake louvers	12	\$10,000	10% complete
A-E design AC rezone for EEL building ducting in conjunction with door mods	90	\$20,000	Possibly deferred due to Budget
Install occupancy sensors in offices	12	\$14,000	75% complete
Rebuild/replace Waste Oil Shed	58	\$20,000	Possibly deferred due to Budget
Generator Power Receptacles	58	\$15,000	Possibly deferred due to Budget
CANS/Crash Bars for Chem Rooms.	58	\$6,000	Possibly deferred due to Budget
Auditorium Step lighting	12	\$25,000	
Replace Flooring	89	\$50,000	Possibly deferred due to Budget
ARC Lobby Finishes & Corner Guards	ARC	\$8,000	
ARC Repaint Exterior Columns	ARC	\$8,000	
		\$451,000	
Added Projects			
CEBAF Center Potable Water Heater and Tank	12	\$25,000	Complete
ARC Lab Hot Water Heater	ARC	\$12,000	Complete

Of the 12 planned and 2 unplanned projects for FY06, three are complete. SURA/TJNAF anticipates completing at least 95% of the remaining plus at least one additional unplanned project. This performance level corresponds to a score of 3.4.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
100%	3.9 – 4.3
≥ 95%	3.4

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

Performance Levels	Measure Score
≥ 90%	3.0
≥ 75%	2.0
< 75%	0.0

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

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

Grade: B+ **Score:** 3.4

Justification: Occupancy of CEBAF Center Addition began 4 January 2006 and was complete by the end of January 2006, on schedule. Demolition of the trailers continues. Excessing these trailers has caused some delay. However the trailers identified in the contract should be removed by the end of March 2006, on schedule.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Ahead of schedule by more than 1 month	3.9 – 4.3
1 month behind to 1 month ahead of schedule	3.4
Behind by less than 2 months	3.0
Behind by less than 4 months	2.0
Behind by 4 months or more	0.0

Measure 7.2.2 Cost Performance on CEBAF Center Addition Project

Grade: B+ **Score:** 3.4

Justification: At this point the facility has been completed as expected.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Enhanced performance features in facility	3.9 – 4.3
Facility completed as expected	3.4
No significant reduction in expected functionality	3.0
Reduced functionality in facility	2.0
Additional funding required to complete project	0.0

Measure 7.2.3 Cost Performance on Projects ≥ \$100K.

Grade: B+ **Score:** 3.4

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

Justification: The projects with a contract value greater than \$100K completed during FY06 are listed in the table. The value of contract changes for these projects totaled 1%.

Project	Contract Award	Total Change Orders	Adjusted Change Orders*
VARC & Test Lab re-roof	\$119,925	\$2,849	\$2,849
North Retention Pond	\$453,436	\$9,200	\$9,200
Lead Storage Facility	\$105,074	\$0	\$0
TOTAL	Pending	\$12,049	\$12,049

* Does not include post-design programmatic changes, value-added new technology, and value engineering proposals.

Total Initial Contract Amount	Pending
Applicable Final Contract Cost	\$913,797
Performance Level	$[(913,797/\text{Pending})-1]*100 = 1\%$

Performance Levels	Measure Score
No overrun	3.9 – 4.3
≤ 8%	3.4
> 8%	3.0
> 15%	2.0
> 25%	0.0

Measure 7.2.4 Scheduled Performance on Projects ≥ \$100K.

Grade: B+ **Score:** 3.5

Justification: The projects with a contract value greater than \$100K completed during FY06 are listed in the table. The construction contract durations for these projects averaged 1.06 longer than planned.

Project	Original Contract Duration (Days)	Actual Duration (Days)	Adjusted Actual Duration* (Days)
VARC & Test Lab re-roof	70	129	70
North Retention Pond	200	200	200
Lead Storage Building	64	102	83
TOTAL	334	431	353

* Time attributed to acts of God (weather), labor disputes, documented material unavailability, and user desired post-award change orders is not included.

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

Performance Level 353/334 = 1.06

Performance Levels	Measure Score
< 1.0	3.9 – 4.3
≥ 1.0 to < 1.10	3.5
≥ 1.10 to < 1.15	3.0
≥ 1.15 to < 1.25	2.0
≥ 1.25	0.0

Goal Performance Rating Development

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

Final Letter Grade

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+	<u>B</u>	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

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

Objective 8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System

Measure 8.1 Provision of effective emergency management system

Grade: B+ **Score:** 3.4

Justification: There were six actionable recommendations from the 2005 Peer Review. These have been completed to the 85-percent level. Of these, five addressed program aspects in which the Peer Review Panel recommended JLab consider, explore, or review new approaches to processes in place. Four of these are complete; the fifth – increasing the degree of challenge placed upon the Director’s Command Staff in an exercise – is accepted in concept, but a specific exercise has not yet been designed and approved. The sixth and last recommendation – increasing the number of “live” exercises with outside agency involvement relative to table-top exercises – is also accepted in concept, but specific changes have not yet been made to the exercise schedule for the remainder of 2006.

Exercises were conducted in the quarter scheduled. An Avian Influenza Pandemic Tabletop displaced another, previously scheduled event. This change was dictated by the increasing level of public-health concern about the spread of avian flu and the impact it will have on all types of non-essential operations.

There have been no major emergency events thus far in 2006. On-site and off-site response to 911 calls was prompt and efficient. Fire alarms and system operational alarms were properly verified and notification issued per rapid-page and other procedures.

Given the lack of any major events, there has been limited opportunity to pass on lessons-learned thus far in FY06. The Public Health Director expressed appreciation at being included in the pandemic exercise, and he specifically commented that it was a useful experience as he and his staff have begun advising other local organizations and businesses on their preparation.

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

Performance Levels	Measure Score
All scheduled and Director's Safety Council (DSC) approved FY06 follow on actions from the FY05 Emergency Management Program peer review are completed ahead of schedule. All FY06 exercises completed in the quarter scheduled. Response to actual or simulated emergency events demonstrates a high level of proficiency and opportunities for improvement are identified and acted upon. Lessons learned and experiences shared with other Office of Science (SC) or non-SC organizations.	3.9 – 4.3
80% of the scheduled and DSC approved FY06 follow-on actions from the FY05 Emergency Management Program peer review are completed on time or ahead of schedule. Majority of FY06 exercises completed in quarter scheduled. Response to actual or simulated emergency events demonstrates an above average level of proficiency and opportunities for improvement are identified and acted upon.	3.4
A majority of the scheduled and DSC approved FY06 follow-on actions from the FY05 Emergency Management Program peer review are completed on time. Response to actual or simulated emergency events demonstrates a satisfactory level of proficiency and opportunities for improvement are identified and acted upon.	3.0
Less than half of the scheduled and DSC approved FY06 follow-on actions from the FY05 Emergency Management Program peer review are completed on time. Lessons learned are not repeated. Response to actual or simulated emergency events demonstrates an inadequate level of proficiency	2.0
Responses to actual emergency events demonstrate an inadequate level of proficiency and result in serious injury or significant property loss.	0.0

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

Measure 8.2.1 Compromises, attacks and reporting

Grade: A+ **Score:** 4.3.

There have been no successful attacks so far in FY06.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
CSI=0	4.3
CSI = 1	3.9
CSI > 1 and ≤ 3	3.4
CSI > 3 and ≤ 5	3.0
CSI > 5 and ≤ 12	2.0
CSI > 12	0.0

Scoring: $CSI = RC + .5(CA)$ where

RC = the number of incidents of system level (root) compromises on Computer Center or Accelerator Controls managed systems per year

CA = the number of incidents in which a node in the jlab.org domain is used to carryout a cyber attack on other locations on the Internet

Measure 8.2.2 Employee and user awareness of cyber-security vulnerabilities

Grade: A **Score:** 3.9

Justification: 100% of employees have completed their annual security awareness training which includes cyber-security awareness. The annual User training is separate and will take place later this spring. All new Users have had the training. Grade A, Score = 3.9.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
>99%	4.3
> 95%	3.9
> 90%	3.4
>80%	3.0
>70%	2.0
≤ 70%	0.0

Measure 8.2.3 Performance on addressing identified cyber-security vulnerabilities.

Grade: A **Score:** 4.3

Justification: At the start of FY06, the Lab had six milestones open. Three of these were scheduled for completion by the end of FY06 Q2 (C7, S4, S2). These were completed and closed.

One project (S5) has been on hold in accordance with a DOE administrative directive. This milestone has been closed and reopened under a new project in order to address additional requirements and compatibility with new DOE standards.

Two milestones (I3 and L3) were due for closure in the third quarter. The specified objectives of I3 are substantially complete. It has been closed. An assessment of L3 shows that substantial work has been completed, but the complexity of the problem and newly available technology justify a reorganization of the project, incorporating extended goals of I3 along the way. This new finding has been opened as Asset Management and Network Control.

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

Performance Levels	Measure Score
≥ 99	4.3

Performance Levels	Measure Score
≥ 90	3.9
≥ 85	3.4
≥ 75	3.0
≥ 65	2.0
< 65	0.0

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

A – A+	B+	B	C	F
3.9 - 4.3	3.4	3.0	2.0	0.0

Measure 8.3 In the analysis of this area, the TJSO will consider Laboratory input described below in conjunction with other relevant factors to assign final score. The Laboratory’s CIO, Admin AD, Director of Facilities Management and Security Manager shall perform an annual self-assessment and provide an appropriate score

Grade: A **Score:** 3.9

Justification: The following initiatives enhance JLab’s systems to protect nuclear materials, property, and enhance additional cross-cutting security related programs:

- FY05 Unclassified Foreign Visits & Assignments Peer Review validated JLab’s international visitor and assignment review process as effective.
- JLab reorganized administrative resources to provide more efficient international registration and JLab badge controls. Human Resources now register all persons requesting badged access to JLab. JLab badges are now controlled and issued by Facility Management.
- Revised *Administrative Manual 301.05 Unclassified Foreign Visits & Assignment policy*, the *JLab Site Security Plan*, and *FY06 Security Profile* to update and document new policy and procedures.
- Successfully solicited a new small business, woman owned security services subcontract to provide, operate and maintain unarmed, uniformed security guard services for JLab.
- Top Guard Security has provided highly qualified unarmed guards, who project a professional image, are licensed by the Commonwealth of Virginia, and have maintained currency in all required training.
- A Top Guard Security Supervisor attended the Safety Training Observation Program (STOP) and has actively performed work force observations to identify at-risk behaviors.
- The Top Guard Security work force has assumed additional duties of monitoring and issuing parking and motor vehicle citations to enhance site safety.

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

- Developed, coordinated, and implemented public area procedures at CEBAF Center to aid in international scientific exchange.
- All required Other Nuclear Materials “transactions” and quarterly “inventories” were submitted accurately and on time using the latest software provided by the Nuclear Materials Management and Safeguards System.
- Installed nine new automated access controls, passive video surveillance, and automated key control boxes at CEBAF Center to provide more robust physical security systems.
- Improved passive video recording systems at the CEBAF Accelerator access control point to document vehicles and persons.
- Informed the Thomas Jefferson Lab Site Office promptly, as required to report property thefts in a timely manner for follow-on reporting to the DOE Inspector General’s office.
- JLab security staff continues sound community relations by coordinating minor property theft and trespass procedures and cases with the local District Court and Newport News Police, and access to communications security equipment and confidential meeting space with the Department of Defense.
- Two JLab security staff were personally recognized by Secretary Bodman for providing assistance to his executive protection detail during the Secretary of Energy’s visit on February 22, 2006.
- The JLab Facility Security Officer promotes good contractor/government relations by serving as a member of the DOE Office of Science Safeguards and Security Advisory Committee at the request of the DOE Office of Science Security Management Team Leader and serves as SURA/TJNAF’s counterintelligence representative to assist in resolving issues of CI concern.

A – A+	B+	B	C	F
3.9 - 4.3	3.4	3.0	2.0	0.0

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

Measure 8.4 In the analysis of this area, the TJSO will consider Laboratory input described below in conjunction with other relevant factors to assign final score. The Laboratory’s CIO, Admin AD, CFO and Cyber Security Manager shall perform an annual self assessment and provide an appropriate measurement score.

Grade: A Score: 3.9.

Justification: There have been no issues with sensitive information from any reviews, assessments, audits, etc. and sensitive information has been appropriately considered. All staff received training with respect to sensitive information as part of their annual security awareness training.

October 1, 2005 – February 28, 2006
 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan
 Performance Report

Points awarded based on the results of the committee’s overall adjectival rating of the system as follows:

A – A+	B+	B	C	F
3.9 - 4.3	3.4	3.0	2.0	0.0

Goal Performance Rating Development

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
8.0 Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM)					
8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System	B+	3.40	30%	1.02	
8.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for Cyber-Security	A+	4.17	50%	2.09	
8.3 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Special Nuclear Materials, Classified Matter, and Property	A	3.90	10%	.39	
8.4 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Classified and Sensitive Information	A	3.90	10%	.39	
Performance Goal 8.0 Total					3.89

Table 8.2 Final Letter Grade

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