

September 13, 2006

June 1, 2006 – September 30, 2006

**CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
AND MEASUREMENT PLAN**

**Management and Operations of the
Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility
(TJNAF)**

U.S. Department of Energy

and

Jefferson Science Associates, LLC

Contract No. DE-AC05-06OR623177

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	i
GOAL 1.0 Provide for Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment (Quality, Productivity, Leadership, & Timeliness of Research and Development).....	1
Objective 1.1 Science and Technology Results Provide Meaningful Impact on the Field	1
Objective 1.2 Provide Quality Leadership in Science and Technology.....	2
Objective 1.3 Provide and sustain Science and Technology Outputs that Advance Program Objectives and Goals.....	3
Objective 1.4 Provide for Effective Delivery of Science and Technology.....	3
GOAL 2.0 Provide for Efficient and Effective Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operations of Facilities	5
Objective 2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s) as Required to Support Laboratory Programs (i.e., activities leading up to CD-2).....	5
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)	6
Objective 2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities	7
Objective 2.4 Effective Utilization of Facilities to Grow and Support the Laboratory’s Research Base	8
GOAL 3.0 Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Program Management..	10
Objective 3.1 Provide Effective and Efficient Stewardship of Scientific Capabilities and Program Vision	10
Objective 3.2 Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Project/Program Planning and Management.....	11
Objective 3.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Communications & Responsiveness to Customer Needs.....	12
GOAL 4.0 Provide Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory	15
Objective 4.1 Provide a Distinctive Vision for the Laboratory and an Effective Plan for Accomplishment of the Vision to Include Strong Partnerships Required to Carry Out those Plans	15
Objective 4.2 Provide for Responsive and Accountable Leadership throughout the Organization	18
Objective 4.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Corporate Office Support as Appropriate	20
GOAL 5.0 Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection	25
Objective 5.1 Provide a Work Environment that Protects Workers and the Environment	23
Objective 5.2 Provide Efficient and Effective Implementation of Integrated Safety, Health and Environment Management	26
Objective 5.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Waste Management, Minimization, and Pollution Prevention.....	28
GOAL 6.0 Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission(s).....	32
Objective 6.1 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Financial Management System(s)	30
Objective 6.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition and Property Management System(s).....	32
Objective 6.3 Provide an Efficient, Effective & Responsive Human Resources Management System and Diversity Program.....	34

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	35
Objective 6.5 Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Technology and Commercialization of Intellectual Assets	44
GOAL 7.0 Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs	42
Objective 7.1 Manage Facilities and Infrastructure in an Efficient and Effective Manner that Optimizes Usage and Minimizes Life Cycle Costs	43
Objective 7.2 Provide Planning for and Acquire the Facilities and Infrastructure Required to support Future Laboratory Programs.....	44
GOAL 8.0 Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM) and Emergency Management Systems	46
Objective 8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System	47
Objective 8.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for Cyber-Security	47
Objective 8.3 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Special Nuclear Materials, and Property	50
Objective 8.4 Provide and Efficient and Effective Program for the Protection of Sensitive Information.....	56

INTRODUCTION

The Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan (PEMP) primarily serves as DOE's Quality Assurance/Surveillance Plan (QASP) for the evaluation of Jefferson Science Associates, LLC (hereafter referred to as "JSA" or "the Contractor") performance regarding the management and operations of the Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility (hereafter referred to as "TJNAF" or "the Laboratory") for the evaluation period from June 1, 2006, through September 30, 2006. The performance evaluation provides a standard by which to determine whether the Contractor is managerially and operationally in control of the Laboratory and is meeting the mission and requirement performance expectations/objectives of the Department as stipulated within this contract.

This document also describes the distribution of the total available performance-based fee and the methodology for determining the amount of fee earned by the Contractor as stipulated within the clauses entitled "Determining Total Available Performance Fee Earned", "Conditional Payment of Fee, Profit or Incentives", and "Total Available Fee: Base Fee Amount and Performance Fee Amount." In partnership with the Contractor and other key customers, the DOE Headquarters (HQ) and the Site Office (TJSO) have defined the measurement basis that serves as the Contractor's performance-based fee and award term incentive determination.

This PEMP has been developed jointly by TJSO and JSA with two key objectives in mind. First, it is essential that every employee at the laboratory understand what their individual role is in accomplishing the goals and objectives of the PEMP and how those directly align with the achievement of Office of Science's goals. The measures included in this plan have been established to cover all critical activities required to reach each goal and at a level that permits individual contributors to see how they fit into the laboratory's success. Second, in order to meet or exceed the customer's expectations, clear and distinct performance levels must be identified for each measure. TJSO and JSA have worked closely together to establish specific requirements for the each performance level so that the customer's expectations can be met. The PEMP is more than just a plan for earning fee on the contract; it is a road map for use by TJSO and JSA to ensure we reach our goals together.

FY2006 is an anomaly in that the total contract performance period is only four months long due to the recent contract award. As this PEMP is for four months, some agreed upon measures and targets cannot be fully evaluated since they are on-going throughout the year. Therefore, the measures/targets are divided into two categories. They are:

- Those measures that have been identified and occur within the four month period will be scored, graded and include appropriate justification;
- Those measures that will occur outside the four month period will be designated "not applicable" and will have a brief statement that addresses the reason for the designation.

The DOE and the Contractor have mutually agreed upon this approach.

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

The overall performance against each Objective of this performance plan, to include the evaluation of Performance Measures identified for each Objective, shall be evaluated jointly by the Thomas Jefferson Site Office (TJSO) and the appropriate HQ office or major customer. This cooperative review methodology will ensure that the overall evaluation of the Contractor results in a consolidated DOE

position taking into account specific Performance Measures as well as all additional information not otherwise identified via specific Performance Measures. The TJSO shall work closely with each HQ program office or major customer throughout the year in evaluating the Contractor's performance and will provide observations regarding programs and projects as well as other management and operation activities conducted by the Contractor throughout the year. The TJSO and the Contractor will follow the document entitled "SC Laboratory Performance Appraisal Process," dated June 2006 as appropriate.

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

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

The following descriptions define each performance (measurement) level:

Performance Goal: A general overarching statement of the desired outcome for each major performance area that will be scored and reported annually under the appraisal process.

Performance Objective: A statement of desired results for an organization or activity. Note: The set of Performance Measures identified should be the primary means for determining the Contractor's performance in meeting the Performance Objective; however, other performance information available to the evaluator from other sources may be utilized in determining the overall performance rating of a Performance Objective.

Performance Measure: A quantitative or qualitative method for characterizing performance to assist the reviewer in assessing achievement of the corresponding Performance Objective (i.e., what you would measure).

Performance Target: The desired condition, milestone, or target level of achievement for each Performance Measure (objective or subjective as appropriate), established at an appropriately detailed level that can be tracked and used for a judgment or decision on performance assessment.

Note: For the purposes of this PEMP, the Target is identified in the B+ performance level table for each measure.

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

The FY 2006 Contractor performance grades will be determined based on the weighted sum of the individual scores earned for each of the Goals described within this document for Science and Technology and for Management and Operations (see Table A below). No overall rollup grade will be provided. Performance evaluations shall be measured and graded at the Objective level, which rollup to provide the performance evaluation determination for each Goal. Performance evaluations will be rolled up for an overall grade for Science and Technology and for Management and Operations. The rollup of the performance Goal will then be utilized to determine the overall Contractor performance grade for Science and Technology and Management and Operations. The total overall points derived for Science and Technology will be utilized to determine the amount of available fee that may be earned (see Table C). The overall points derived for Management and Operations will be utilized to determine the multiplier to be applied (see Table C) to the Science and Technology fee earned to determine the final amount of fee earned for FY2006. Each Goal is composed of two or more weighted Objectives and each Objective has a set of Performance Measures, which are identified to assist the reviewer in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each of the Performance Measures identifies significant activities, requirements, and/or milestones important to the success of the

corresponding Objective and shall be utilized as the primary means of determining the Contractor’s success in meeting the Objective. Although the Performance Measures are the primary means for determining performance, other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources to include, but not limited to, the Contractor’s self-evaluation report, operational awareness (daily oversight) activities as well as the results of inspections, appraisals and reviews; “For Cause” reviews (if any); other outside agency reviews (OIG, GAO, DCAA, etc.); and the annual two week review (if needed), may be utilized in determining the Contractor’s overall success in meeting an Objective. The following describes the methodology for determining the Contractor’s grade for each Goal:

Performance Evaluation Methodology:

The purpose of this section is to establish a methodology to develop scoring at the Objective level. Each Objective within a Goal shall be assigned a numerical score, per Figure 1 below, by the evaluating office. Each evaluation will measure the degree of effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in meeting the Objective and shall be based on the Contractor’s success in meeting the set of Performance Measures identified for each Objective as well as other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources as identified above.

TJSO and the HQ program offices, in coordination with the Contractor, developed Performance Measures and as applicable, targets for each Performance Objective. The set of Performance Measures identified for each Objective represent the set of significant indicators that if fully met, collectively places performance for the Objectives in the “B+” grade range. The FY2006 target is stated at the “B+” grade range. For some targets, it serves the evaluator to provide additional grading details (for example at the A, C+, and D levels) and in those cases these details have been included in the PEMP. However, these should be considered as guidelines that do not restrict the evaluator from considering other factors that contribute to the evaluation.

Figure 1. Letter Grade and Numerical Score Definitions

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

Letter Grade	Numeric Grade	Definition
B+	3.4 – 3.1	Meets expectations of performance as set by the performance measures identified for each Objective with no notable areas of increased or diminished performance identified. Deficiencies identified are offset by positive performance and have little to no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
B	3.0 – 2.8	Most expectations of performance as set by the performance measures identified for each Objective are met and/or other minor deficiencies are identified. Performance measures or other minor deficiencies identified are offset by positive performance within the purview of the Objective and have little to no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
B-	2.7 – 2.5	One or two expectations of performance set by the performance measures are not met and/or other deficiencies are identified and although they may be offset by other positive performance, they may have the potential to negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
C+	2.4 – 2.1	Some expectations of performance set by the performance measures are not met and/or other minor deficiencies are identified and although they may be offset by other positive performance, they may have the potential to negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
C	2.0 – 1.8	A number of expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or a number of other deficiencies are identified and although they may be somewhat offset by other positive performance, they have the potential to negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
C-	1.7 – 1.1	Most expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or other major deficiencies are identified which have or will negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment if not immediately corrected.
D	1.0 – 0.8	Most or all expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or other significant deficiencies are identified which have negatively impacted the Objective and/or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
F	0.7 – 0	All expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or other significant deficiencies are identified which have significantly impacted both the Objective and the accomplishment of the Laboratory mission.

Calculating Individual Goal Scores and Letter Grade:

Each Objective is assigned the earned numerical score by the evaluating DOE office. The Goal rating is then computed by multiplying the numerical score by the weight of each Objective within a Goal. These values are then added together to develop an overall score for each Goal. A set of tables is provided at the end of each Performance Goal section of this document to assist in the calculation of Objective scores to the Goal score. Utilizing Table A, below, the scores for each of the Science and Technology (S&T) Goals and Management and Operations (M&O) Goals are then multiplied by the weight assigned and these are summed to provide an overall score for each. The total score for Science and Technology and Management and Operations is compared to the letter grade scale found in Table B, below, to determine the overall S&T and M&O grades for FY 2006. Due to the competition for the laboratory and as noted earlier, the rating period for the Laboratory will be from June 1, 2006 through September 30, 2006.

The raw score (rounded to the nearest hundredth) from each calculation shall be carried through to the next stage of the calculation process. The raw score for Science and Technology and Management and

Operations will be rounded to the nearest tenth of a point for purposes of identifying the overall letter grade as indicated in Table B and for utilization in determining fee as indicated in Table C. A standard rounding convention of X .44 and less rounds down to the nearest tenth (here, X.4), while X.45 and greater rounds up to the nearest tenth (here, X.50).

Table A. FY 2006 Contractor Evaluation Score Calculation

S&T Performance Goal¹	Numerical Score	Letter Grade	Weight	Weighted Score	Total Score
1.0 Mission Accomplishment			45%		
2.0 Construction and Operations of User Research Facilities and Equipment			30%		
3.0 Science and Technology Research Project/Program Management			25%		
Total Score					
M&O Performance Goal	Numerical Score	Letter Grade	Weight	Weighted Score	Total Score
4.0 Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory			25%		
5.0 Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection			30%		
6.0 Business Systems			25%		
7.0 Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio			10%		
8.0 Integrated Safeguards and Security Management and Emergency Management Systems			10%		
Total Score					

Table B. FY 2006 Contractor Letter Grade Scale/Numeric Score Scale

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

¹ Weightings for each S&T Goal listed within Table A are preliminary, based on the averaged SC Program Office weightings according to the percentage of FY 2005 Budget Authority for each. *The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2006.

Determining the Amount of Performance-Based Fee Earned:

The total available FY06 performance fee is \$1,033,333.00. The percentage of the available performance-based fee that may be earned by the Contractor shall be determined based on the overall weighted score for the Science and Technology Goals (see Table A, above) and then compared to Table C, below. The overall numeric score of the Management and Operations Goals from Table A shall then be utilized to determine the final fee multiplier (see Table C), which shall be utilized to determine the overall amount of performance-based fee earned for FY2006 as calculated within Table D.

Table C. Performance-Based Fee Earned Scale

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

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

Overall Fee Determination	
Percent S&T Fee Earned from Table C	_____%
M&O Fee Multiplier from Table C	X _____%
Overall Earned Percentage of Performance-Based Fee	_____%

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

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

The adjustment of a grade and/or reduction of otherwise earned fee will be determined by the severity of the performance failure and mitigating factors. DEAR 97.5215-3 “Conditional Payment of Fee, Profit, and Other Incentives – Facility Management Controls” is the mechanism used for reduction of fee as it relates to performance failures relating to safeguarding of classified information and to adequate protection of the environment, health and safety. Its guidance can also serve as example for reduction of fee in other areas.

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

Determining Award Term Eligibility

Pursuant to the clause entitled “Award Term Incentive”, the Contractor may also earn additional term by exceeding performance expectations. The Contractor is eligible for award term in accordance with the clause when performance for Science and Technology and Management and Operations components results in scores within the shaded areas of Table C, which would be scores of 3.5 or higher for Science and Technology and 3.1 or higher for the Management and Operations component. Notwithstanding the overall scores earned, if the Contractor scores less than a 3.1 in any Science and Technology Goal or less than 2.5 in any Management and Operations Goal, the Contractor will not be eligible for award term.

II. Performance Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures

Background

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

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

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

In addition and as noted in the Introduction, this PEMP is for four months only, June 1, 2006 through September 30, 2006. The approach that has been taken to evaluate contractor performance for this period is to identify two categories to be evaluated. These categories are identified in the introduction and are shown in the body of this PEMP before each measure.

The following sections describe the Performance Goals, their supporting Objectives, and associated performance measures for June 1, 2006 through September 30, 2006. The weighting of Goals is provided in Table A, Section I and the weighting of objectives shall be shown in Tables at the end of each Goal.

GOAL 1.0 PROVIDE FOR EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE MISSION ACCOMPLISHMENT (QUALITY, PRODUCTIVITY, LEADERSHIP, & TIMELINESS OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT)

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

The weight of this Goal is 45%.

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

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers as identified below. The overall Goal score from each HQ Program Office and/or customer is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 1.1). Weightings for each Customer listed below are preliminary, based upon FY 2005 Budget Authority figures, and are provided here for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2006.

- Office of Science – High Energy Physics (NEP) (<1%)
- Office of Science - Nuclear Physics (NP) (99%)
- Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS) (<1%)

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned by each of the offices identified above by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 1.2 below). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 1.3 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. Individual Program Office weightings for each of the Objectives identified below are provided within Table 1.1. The Contractor’s success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor’s performance as viewed by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers for which the Laboratory conducts work. Should one or more of the HQ Program Offices choose not to provide an evaluation for this Goal and its corresponding Objectives the weighting for the remaining HQ Program Offices shall be recalculated based on their percentage of BA for FY 2006 as compared to the total BA for those remaining HQ Program Offices.

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

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

- The impact of publications on the field;
- Publication in journals outside the field indicating broad impact;
- Impact on DOE or other customer mission(s);
- Successful stewardship of mission-relevant research areas;
- Significant awards (R&D 100, FLC, Nobel Prizes, etc.);

- Invited talks, citations, making high-quality data available to the scientific community; and
- Development of tools and techniques that become standards or widely-used in the scientific community.

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

Objective 1.2 Provide Quality Leadership in Science and Technology

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

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

A to A+	Laboratory staff lead Academy or equivalent panels; laboratory's work changes the direction of research fields; world-class scientists are attracted to the laboratory, laboratory 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; laboratory 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

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

- The number of publications in peer-reviewed journals;
- The quantity of output from experimental and theoretical research; and
- Demonstrated progress against peer reviewed recommendations, headquarters guidance, etc.

Pass²	Not failing; see below.
Fail	Peer reviewers not satisfied; output not meeting general scientific standards; minimal progress against FWPs.

Objective 1.4 Provide for Effective Delivery of Science and Technology

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

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

Pass³	Not failing; see below.
Fail	Peer reviewers, HQ not satisfied; significant number of milestones not met, results not delivered to community while it matters.

Table 1.1 Goal Performance Rating Development

Science Program Office ⁴	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of High Energy Physics					
1.1 Impact			30%		
1.2 Leadership			0%		
1.3 Output			30%		
1.4 Delivery			40%		
Overall HEP Total					

² The numerical grade for pass is 4.3 and for fail it is 0.7.

³ The numerical grade for pass is 4.3 and for fail it is 0.7.

⁴ A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the SC Programs is provided within Attachment I to this plan.

Office of Nuclear Physics					
1.1 Impact			40%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			15%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
Overall NP Total					
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					

Table 1.2 – Overall Performance Goal Score Development

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

Table 1.3 Final Letter Grade

Total Score	4.3-	4.0-	3.7-	3.4-	3.0-	2.7-	2.4-	2.0-	1.7-	1.0-	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

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

The weight of this goal is 30%.

The Provide for Efficient and Effective Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operations of Facilities Goal shall measure the overall effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in planning for and delivering leading-edge user facilities and equipment to ensure the required capabilities are present to meet today’s and tomorrow’s complex challenges. It also measures the Contractor’s innovative operational and programmatic means for external scientists to add substantial value to their research by their utilization of facilities and equipment and the Contractor’s implementation of seamless management systems that ensures R&D resources are available for use to the maximum extent possible.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers as identified below. The overall Goal score from each SC Program Office is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 2.1). Final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2006.

- Office of Science - Nuclear Physics (NP) (100%)

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned to each of the objectives by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 2.1 below). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 2.2 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. The Contractor’s success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor’s performance as viewed by SC. Should one or more of the HQ Program Offices choose not to provide an evaluation for this Goal and its corresponding Objectives the weighting for the remaining HQ Program Offices shall be recalculated based on their percentage of BA for FY 2006 as compared to the total BA for those remaining HQ Program Offices.

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

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

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

A to A+	In addition to meeting all measures under B ⁺ , the laboratory is recognized by the research community as the leader for making the science case for the acquisition; Takes the initiative to demonstrate the potential for revolutionary scientific advancement. Identifies, analyzes and champions novel approaches for acquiring the new capability, including leveraging or extending the capability of existing facilities and financing. Proposed approaches are widely regarded as innovative, novel, comprehensive, and potentially cost-effective. Reviews repeatedly confirm potential for scientific discovery in areas that support the Department’s mission, and potential to change a discipline or research area’s direction.
B+	Provides the overall vision for the acquisition. Displays leadership and commitment to achieving the vision within preliminary estimates that are defensible and credible in terms of cost, schedule and performance; develops quality analyses, preliminary designs, and related documentation to support the approval of the mission need (CD-0), the alternative selection and cost range (CD-1) and the performance baseline (CD-2). Solves problems and addresses issues. Keeps DOE apprised of the status, near-term plans and the resolution of problems on a regular basis. Anticipates emerging issues that could impact plans and takes the initiative to inform DOE of possible consequences.
B	Fails to meet expectations in one of the areas listed under B+.

C	The laboratory team develops the required analyses and documentation in a timely manner. However, inputs are mundane and lack innovation and commitment to the vision of the acquisition.
D	The potential exists for credible science and business cases to be made for the acquisition, but the laboratory fails to take advantage of the opportunity.
F	Proposed approaches are based on fraudulent assumptions; the science case is weak to non-existent, the business case is seriously flawed.

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)

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

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

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

Objective 2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities

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

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

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

2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Lab's Research Base and External User Community

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

- The facility is being used to perform influential science;

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

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

Table 2.1 Goal Performance Rating Development

Science Program Office ⁵	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Nuclear Physics					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			20%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components			0%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			65%		
2.4 Effective Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base			15%		
Overall NP Total					

⁵ A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the SC Programs is provided within Attachment I to this plan.

Table 2.2 – Overall Performance Goal Score Development

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

Table 2.3 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 3.0 PROVIDE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

The Contractor provides effective program vision and leadership strategic planning and development of initiatives; recruits and retains a quality scientific workforce; and provides outstanding research processes, which improve research productivity.

The weight of this Goal is 25%.

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

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers as identified below. The overall Goal score from each HQ Program Office and/or customer is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 3.1). Weightings for each Customer listed below are preliminary, based upon FY 2005 Budget Authority figures, and are provided here for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2006 provided by the Program Offices listed below.

- Office of Science - Nuclear Physics (NP) (99%)
- Office of Science - Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS) (<1%)

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned by each of the offices identified above by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 3.2 below). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 3.3 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as assessed by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers for which the Laboratory conducts work. Should one or more of the HQ Program Offices choose not to provide an evaluation for this Goal and its corresponding Objectives the weighting for the remaining HQ Program Offices shall be recalculated based on their percentage of BA for FY 2006 as compared to the total BA for those remaining HQ Program Offices.

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

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

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

A to

Providing strong programmatic vision that extends past the laboratory and for which the laboratory is a recognized leader within SC and in the broader research communities;

A+	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.
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

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

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

Grade	Performance
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 laboratory 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 laboratory's program areas, or significant work is conducted outside those plans.
F	No planning is done.

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

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

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

Grade	Performance
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.
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.

Table 3.1 Goal Performance Rating Development

Science Program Office ⁶	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Nuclear Physics					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			20%		
Overall NP Total					
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			20%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			40%		
Overall WDTS Total					

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

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 Nuclear Physics			99%		
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists			<1%		
Overall Program Office Total					

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

Office of Science Program Office Goal & Objective Weightings for FY 2006

SC Program Offices	ASCR	BES	BER	FES	HEP	NP	WDTS
	Weight	Weight	Weight	Weight	Weight	Weight	Weight
Goal 1 - Mission Accomplishment							
Goal Weight	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%	45%	65%
1.1 Impact					30%	40%	25%
1.2 Leadership					0%	30%	30%
1.3 Output					30%	15%	30%
1.4 Delivery					40%	15%	15%
Goal 2 - Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operation of Facilities							
Goal Weight	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	30%	N/A
2.1 Design of Facility						20%	
2.2 Construction of Facility/Fabrication						0%	
2.3 Operation of Facility						65%	
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Lab's Research Base						15%	
Goal 3 –The Contract Provides Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Research Project/Program Management							
Goal Weight	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	25%	35%
3.1 Stewardship of Scientific Capabilities and Programmatic Vision						40%	20%
3.2 Program Planning and Management						40%	40%
3.3 Program Management – Communication and Responsiveness to HQ						20%	40%

GOAL 4.0 PROVIDE SOUND AND COMPETENT LEADERSHIP AND STEWARDSHIP OF THE LABORATORY

The Contractor's Leadership effectively provides direction in strategic planning to meet the mission and vision of the overall Laboratory; is accountable and responsive to specific issues and needs when required; and corporate office leadership provides appropriate levels of resources and support necessary for the overall success of the Laboratory.

The weight of this Goal is 25%.

The Provide Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory Goal shall measure the Contractor's Leadership capabilities in leading the direction of the overall Laboratory. It also measures the responsiveness of the Contractor to issues and opportunities for continuous improvement and corporate office involvement/commitment to the overall success of the Laboratory.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the evaluating office as described within Section I of this document. Each Objective has one or more performance measures, the outcomes of which collectively assist the evaluating office in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each of the performance measures identifies significant tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones for which the outcomes/results are important to the success of the corresponding Objective. Although other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources may be used, the outcomes of performance measures identified for each Objective shall be the primary means of determining the Contractor's success in meeting an Objective. The overall Goal score is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 4.1 at the end of this section). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 4.2 to determine the overall Goal letter grade.

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

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

- Quality of the Vision developed for the Laboratory and effectiveness in identifying its distinctive characteristics;
- Quality of Strategic/Work Plan for achieving the approved Laboratory vision;
- Quality of required Laboratory Business Plan;
- Ability to establish and maintain long-term partnerships/relationships that advance/expand ongoing Laboratory missions and/or provide new opportunities/capabilities; and
- Effectiveness in developing and implementing commercial research and development opportunities that leverage accomplishment of DOE goals and projects with other federal agencies that advance the utilization of Laboratory technologies and capabilities

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

Measure 4.1.1: The vision (20-year outlook) addresses outstanding science questions of national priority to DOE. The vision informs and is aligned with that of the DOE Office of Science’s and the NSAC long range plan and is maintained in a dynamic way to carry out and adapt to changes in these plans, and to allow for innovative initiatives that maximize the benefit to the Office of Science.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
JSA takes extra measures, such as drawing on outside expertise (e.g. the JSA Board’s Science Council and Programs Committee, the NSAC Long Range Plan subcommittee, the JLab User Group, the Global Sciences Forum Working Group on Nuclear Physics, the WG9 of IUPAP, the IM and S&T peer review experts) to ensure a proper level of involvement of the Laboratory’s staff and users in activities that affect the future of nuclear physics in general and the science of the Laboratory in particular. Including especially the NSAC planning process; service on relevant committees of the American Physical Society (Nuclear Physics Division, especially); participation in conferences and workshops that relate to the Laboratory’s scientific mission, engagement with working groups focused on next-generation accelerators and related technologies; coordination of the Laboratory’s 12 GeV upgrade and eLIC goals with the OECD Nuclear Science Working Group; and more generally assisting, as appropriate and as called upon by DOE, to help advance the DOE’s broader agenda.	4.3 – 3.5
JSA’s strategic vision is appropriately developed, reviewed annually to ensure credibility and relevance, and communicated in order to advance DOE’s scientific agenda.	3.4 – 3.1
JSA fails to meet the minimum expectations as one of DOE’s scientific laboratories but once realized does initiate an action plan to remedy deficiencies.	3.0 – 2.5

Measure 4.1.2: The Business Plan (5-year) establishes the management agenda and identifies the opportunities, risks and required resources needed to realize Laboratory goals. The business plan sets the framework to optimize scientific output in a cost effective manner. Integrally, JSA develops a 5 year budget plan as a mechanism by which the Laboratory can ensure its goals are met.

Note: Measure Not Applicable to FY06 – due to 4 month performance period.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
JSA takes extra measures, such as drawing on outside expertise (e.g., the JSA Board’s committees on Operations, Finance and Audit, Safety and Risk Management, and Compensation as well as ad hoc reviews as deemed appropriate by the Board) to ensure that the Laboratory’s 5-year Business Plan is credible and relevant in light of constraints on the Laboratory. The Laboratory’s plans identify ongoing methods to maximize effective use of available funds and ways to assure that the Laboratory’s goals are met. These may include, for example, utilizing appropriate expertise from its owner members (SURA and CSC) and developing tools such as annual work plans with complementary work breakdown structures for project management.	4.3 – 3.5

Performance Levels	Measure Score
JSA engages with customers/stakeholders and appropriate outside experts to ensure its 5-year Business Plan, budget plan and site plan are realistic.	3.4 – 3.1
JSA fails to demonstrate progressive steps towards the development of a credible 5-year Business Plan that meets DOE’s expectations.	3.0 – 2.5

Measure 4.1.3: The Laboratory has formalized vital collaborations and understandings within and among institutions in academe, users of the Laboratory, other national laboratories, and private sector entities for advancing priority issues in science, scientific workforce, and applications of science and technology.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
JSA takes extra steps (e.g., conferring with the JSA Board’s Science Council and Programs Committee) to assure that the laboratory optimizes opportunities to develop and promote effective collaborations with other organizations such as: entering into new MOUs for financial or in-kind support of the 12 GeV upgrade; partnering to offer JLab SRF expertise that adds measurable value to the Office of Science ILC initiative. The degree of JSA’s influence in the NSAC planning process is notable and the number and quality of joint and bridged faculty appointments is extensive.	4.3 – 3.5
As a user facility, JSA provides reasonable opportunities to develop and promote effective collaborations such as formal scientific collaborations (e.g. Halls A, B, C and collaborative work agreements with other laboratories via MOUs) and with other organizations to advance priority issues in science. JSA secures world-class scientific staff and associated personnel; makes effective joint and bridged faculty appointments and ensures inclusion of Laboratory initiatives in the NSAC Long Range Plan through active participation on its NSAC subcommittee.	3.4 – 3.1
JSA provides few opportunities to develop and promote effective collaborations such as formal scientific collaborations (e.g. Halls A, B, C and collaborative work agreements with other laboratories via MOUs) and with other organizations to advance priority issues in science.	3.0 – 2.5

Measure 4.1.4: The Laboratory has corporate citizenship programs that encourage community support of the Laboratory and its programs and that draws on Laboratory competencies and meets community needs. These corporate citizenship efforts include public outreach and improved scientific literacy. This responsibility of the Laboratory is measured by metrics and peer reviews. The Laboratory also has an outreach program to the broader scientific community to increase the awareness and scientific community support of the Laboratory and its accomplishments.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
JSA takes extra measures (working as appropriate in conjunction with the JSA Board's Relations Committee) to ensure that the laboratory has model programs in public relations, community awareness, and science education. Initiatives demonstrate a high level of quality or effectiveness that exceeds expectations or is noted as an example program at SC.	4.3 – 3.5
The laboratory achieves a high level of awareness with the public, the scientific community and DOE and implements a high level of science education programs to improve scientific literacy. Specific activities could include: hosting biennially, a facilities open house to the public; providing broad portfolio of science education programs including BEAMS, TAPs, HUGS; hosting of high school and middle school science bowls; internships for undergrad and grad students; ensuring high level of awareness with the public through free lectures on a wide-range of scientific topics; providing scientific articles in local and national news media; and showcasing experimental results at APS annual meeting in April.	3.4 – 3.1
JSA is inwardly focuses with little investment of time or effort in outreach activities either within or beyond those that are essential to its core mission.	3.0 – 2.5

Measure 4.1.5: JSA and its corporate owners have developed and implemented technology transfer, commercial applications and projects with other agencies and organizations to augment Laboratory efforts and to enhance utilization of Laboratory-developed and related technologies. (Metrics for laboratory technology transfer activities are reported under Goal 6, Objective 6.5.)

Performance Levels	Measure Score
JSA and its corporate owners take extra measures to strengthen technology transfer activities at the Laboratory, such as providing unique opportunities for its spin-out companies to obtain outside funding from venture capitalists and other private sources; providing JSA funding for investment or commercialization assistance; or creating cross-agency programs to bundle technologies for commercialization opportunities.	4.3 – 3.5
JSA and corporate owners assure the continued vitality and productiveness of laboratory technology transfer, commercialization and related activities to enhance the full breadth of societal benefit for laboratory research and development efforts.	3.4 – 3.1
JSA and it owners largely rely on laboratory staff to undertake technology transfer and commercialization and laboratory does an effective job.	3.0 – 2.5

Objective 4.2 Provide for Responsive and Accountable Leadership throughout the Organization

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

- Leadership's, to include Corporate Office Leadership's, ability to instill responsibility and accountability down and through the entire organization; and

- The effectiveness and efficiency of Leadership, to include Corporate Office Leadership, in identifying and/or responding to Laboratory issues or opportunities for continuous improvement.

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

Measure 4.2.1: JSA has a responsive Board of Directors and corporate owners that provide timely and effective policy guidance and oversight; offers subject matter expertise; facilitates corporate reach back; and provides entrée to vital, external resources. JSA establishes an efficient organization that:

- Focuses the Laboratory Director on corporate, strategic, customer and stakeholder goals, priorities and issues.
- Empowers the Chief Scientist to provide overall direction for balanced, highest impact science.
- Empowers COO to integrate operations and business management functions-deliver more science with efficiencies.
- Optimizes matrix support functions to assure efficient deployment of resources.
- Fully integrates safety throughout the organization.
- Formalizes and documents roles and responsibilities and accountability and authorities (R2A2).

Note: Measure Not Applicable to FY06 – due to 4 month performance period.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
JSA Board and its corporate owners, where appropriate, take extra measures to provide responsible and accountable leadership by: formulating innovative solutions for Laboratory problems and issues; securing local, state and federal support for the missions and goals of the Laboratory; favorably impacting policies for the support of science; rallying support for science among its member universities and the academic world; and by incubating new ideas and identifying and implementing, where appropriate, innovative and alternate sources of financing for laboratory programs and activities to include state, federal and private sources.	4.3 – 3.5
JSA Board and its corporate owners provide responsible and accountable leadership through measures such as: (1) reviews JLab leadership on at least an annual basis; (2) identifies and ensures the resolution of strategic issues that can impact the overall performance of the laboratory; (3) timely responds to laboratory issues, and identifies and implements immediate actions; (4) maintains cognizance of significant issues and corrective actions plans and ensures their timely closure; and (5) maintain an effective process to hold the laboratory management accountable for performance, including an effective and comprehensive self-assessment process.	3.4 – 3.1
JSA corporate owners do not have adequate accountable leadership but the laboratory performs effectively.	3.0 – 2.5

Measure 4.2.2 Fully implements a performance based integrated management system including: A Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) developed to at least the fourth level for all Laboratory activities; and proposed management information systems (Applied Insight/AQIS/Maximo) implementation underway.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Complete what has been labeled as the Phase II portion of the implementation for JLab Insight (Applied Insight) and complete the plan for Phase III.	4.3 – 3.5
WBS developed. Complete what has been labeled as the Phase II portion of the implementation for JLab Insight (Applied Insight) as approved in the Applied Insight Project Plan.	3.4 – 3.1
Detailed project plans are not developed or applications are significantly behind on their respective schedules. No WBS developed in this FY.	3.0 – 2.5

Objective 4.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Corporate Office Support as Appropriate

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

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

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

Measure 4.3.1: The corporate owners offer reach back to their own corporate expertise and that of outside, nationally recognized experts serving on the Board of Directors subcommittees in areas such as scientific leadership, project management, IT organization, risk assessment, and a variety of business disciplines to address emerging problems and for a process of continuous improvement.

Corporate commitments include a \$500K per year Initiatives Fund to support initiatives and activities that promote the science and technology of the Jefferson Lab in ways complementing and enhancing its basic and applied research programs, particularly activities that leverage commitments by others and that support the Laboratory’s extended user community. Examples of specific initiatives and activities include: scientific outreach programs (e.g. graduate fellowship, post doctoral fellowship, faculty sabbatical and research leave support, thesis prizes, poster contests, MSI initiatives, Director’s discretionary fund, and tech transfer activities.

Note: Measure Not Applicable to FY06 – due to 4 month performance period.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Corporate owners and JSA will implement a program for the use of the Initiatives Fund in FY2007, and provide appropriate resources/expertise to initiate improvement in several high leverage areas.	4.3 – 3.5
Corporate owners have identified a program of priority improvements with tangible metrics and corporate owners have made their resources/expertise available to realize desired results.	3.4 – 3.1
Corporate owners have identified a program or priority improvements but have not made their resources/expertise available to realize desired results.	3.0 – 2.5

Measure 4.3.2: The JSA Board will facilitate close connections of key staff to academe and assist the Laboratory in taking steps to strengthen ties to the user community. To this end, the owners will work with the Laboratory Director to arrange for university appointments for key staff – including Governor’s CEBAF Distinguished Professorships (GDCP) and Scientists (GCS) – and facilitate joint and bridge appointments between universities and the Laboratory.

The JSA Board’s Programs Committee will allocate and manage the annual \$500K Initiatives Fund established by the JSA owners, including especially scientific outreach programs (e.g. graduate fellowship, post doctoral fellowship, faculty sabbatical and research leave support, thesis prizes, poster contests, MSI initiatives).

Note: Measure Not Applicable to FY06 – due to 4 month performance period.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Majority of Laboratory scientific leaders (Laboratory Director, Chief Scientist, AD Experimental Nuclear Physics, AD Accelerator) hold GDCP or GCS assignments; most have a university affiliation; and the appropriate Board committee approves the allocations of corporate commitment funds to support TJNAF based on an annual approved budget and long-term vision to achieve maximum benefits.	4.3 – 3.5
Some Laboratory scientific leaders hold GDCP or GCS assignments; have a university affiliation; and the appropriate Board committee approves the allocations of corporate commitment funds to support TJNAF based on an annual approved budget and long-term vision to achieve maximum benefits.	3.4 – 3.1
Few Laboratory scientific leaders hold GDCP or GCS assignments or university affiliation.	3.0 – 2.5

Measure 4.3.3: When appropriate opportunities arise and are agreed to by DOE, JSA and its corporate owners will pursue creative financing options and implement those that make prudent business sense and that are approved by the DOE.

Note: Measure Not Applicable to FY06

Performance Levels	Measure Score
If the opportunity arises during the year, demonstrate that extra steps have been taken to provide a full range of options for innovative financing that benefit DOE.	4.3 – 3.5
Explore innovative financing agreements and/or options that demonstrate productive outcomes of benefit to DOE. Implement those that make solid business sense and are agreed to by DOE.	3.4 – 3.1
JSA provides DOE with innovative proposals but misses some opportunities and the proposals often are not presented to DOE on a timely basis.	3.0 – 2.5

Table 4.1 Goal Performance Rating Development

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
4.0 Provide Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory					
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			35%		
4.2 Provide for Responsive and Accountable Leadership throughout the Organization			35%		
4.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Corporate Support			30%		
Performance Goal 4.0 Total					

Table 4.2 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

Goal 5 Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection

The contractor shall sustain excellence and enhance effectiveness of integrated safety, health, and environmental protection. (The goal shall measure the Contractor’s overall success in preventing worker injury and illness; implement ISM down through and across the organization; and provide effective and efficient waste management, minimization, and pollution prevention.)

The weight of this Goal 30%.

The Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection Goal shall measure the Contractor’s overall success in preventing worker injury and illness; implement Integrated Safety Management across the organization; and provide effective and efficient environmental protection.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned a numerical score by the evaluating office as described within Section I of this document. Each Objective has one or more measures, the outcomes of which collectively assist DOE in determining the Contractor’s overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each of the measures identifies significant tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones for which the outcomes/results of are important to the success of the corresponding Objective. Although other performance information available to the DOE from other sources may be used, the outcomes of key measures identified for each Objective shall be the primary means of determining the Contractor’s success in meeting an Objective. The overall Goal score is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 5.1 at the end of this section). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 5.2 to determine the overall Goal letter grade.

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. This rate includes: All JSA/Jefferson Laboratory staff, nuclear physics users, and contractors, official travel, and personnel paid under joint arrangements.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
DART Rate less than 0.38 and implement Behavior Based Safety program in high injury rate areas such as Engineering. Implement causal analysis program consisting of training and application.	4.3 – 3.5
DART Rate = 0.38. Expected performance was established as an arithmetic average between Office of Science’s FY05 and FY07 goals for DART (0.5 and 0.25 respectively).	3.4 – 3.1
DART Rate 0.60	3.0 – 2.1
DART Rate 0.80	2.0 – 0.8
DART Rate 1.10	0.7 - 0

Note: Measure scores for actual DART rates between the Performance Levels above are assigned by Linear Interpolation, using the immediate bounding upper and lower criteria (e.g. A DART performance

of 0.30 corresponds to a score of 3.71 (A-). For scores higher than “A”, the bounding upper criterion for the interpolation will be a DART = 0.0, which corresponds to a score of A+ (4.3). For performance level up to 3.4 the DART rate includes DART cases and hours worked for laboratory staff and subcontractors with 11 or more employees. For performance level of 3.5 and higher the DART rate includes DART cases and hours worked for laboratory staff, users, and subcontractors. This includes hours worked from service and construction subcontractors having fewer than 11 on-site employees. This excludes DART cases involving subcontractor employees whose work is limited to transient activities and direction/oversight is not provided by DOE or JSA (e.g. copy machine repair, express mail delivery, telephone installation/repair, vending machine service).

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). This rate includes: All JSA/Jefferson Laboratory staff, nuclear physics users, contractors, official travel, and personnel paid under joint arrangements.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
TRCR less than 0.91 and implement Behavior Based Safety program in high injury rate areas such as Engineering. Implement causal analysis program consisting of training and application.	4.3 – 3.5
TRCR Rate = 0.91. Expected performance was established as an arithmetic average between Office of Science’s FY05 and FY07 goals for TRC (1.17 and 0.65 respectively).	3.4 – 3.1
TRCR 1.2	3.0 – 2.1
TRCR 2.0	2.0 – 0.8
TRCR 2.5	0.7 - 0

Note: Measure scores for actual TRCR between the Performance Levels above are assigned by Linear Interpolation, using the immediate bounding upper and lower criteria (e.g. A TRCR performance of 0.60 corresponds to a score of 3.93 (A). For scores higher than “A”, the bounding upper criterion for the interpolation will be a TRCR = 0.0, which corresponds to a score of A+ (4.3).

For performance level up to 3.4 the TRC rate includes recordable injury cases and hours worked for laboratory staff and subcontractors with 11 or more employees. For performance level of 3.5 and higher the TRC rate includes recordable injury cases and hours worked for laboratory staff, users, and subcontractors. This includes hours worked from service and construction subcontractors having fewer than 11 on-site employees. This excludes recordable injury cases involving subcontractor employees whose work is limited to transient activities and direction/oversight is not provided by DOE or JSA (e.g. copy machine repair, express mail delivery, telephone installation/repair, vending machine service).

Measure 5.1.3: 100% of all jobs for which the projected collective TEDE exceeds 100 mrem per Job Specific RWP are reviewed (pre and post job) by a radiological engineer for ALARA considerations. 90% of jobs for which an RWP is generated where the collective TEDE does not exceed 100 mrem are reviewed (pre and post task) by a radiological engineer for ALARA considerations.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
50% of all radiological work permits (RWP) generated in the performance period (June 1 to Sept. 30, 2006) FY06 are audited independently for accuracy. Assist local, state and federal entities in radiological advisory role or assistance/augmentation. Submit at least one best management practice on radiological safety to DOE Office of Science.	4.3 – 3.5
100% of all jobs for which the projected collective TEDE exceeds 100 mrem per Job Specific RWP are reviewed (pre and post job) by a radiological engineer for ALARA considerations. 90% of jobs for which an RWP is generated where the collective TEDE does not exceed 100mrem are reviewed (pre and post job) by a radiological engineer for ALARA considerations.	3.4 – 3.1
Between 50% and 100% of all jobs for which the projected TEDE exceeds 100 mrem per Job Specific RWP are reviewed (pre and post job) by a radiological engineer for ALARA considerations. 80% of jobs for which an RWP is generated where the project TEDE does not exceed 100mrem are reviewed (pre and post job) by a radiological engineer for ALARA considerations.	3.0 – 2.1
0% of all job for which the projected TEDE exceeds 100 mrem per Job Specific RWP are reviewed (pre and post job) by a radiological engineer for ALARA considerations. 50% of jobs for which an RWP is generated where the project TEDE does not exceed 100mrem are reviewed (pre and post job) by a radiological engineer for ALARA considerations.	2.0 – 0.8
0% of all jobs for which the projected TEDE exceeds 100 mrem per Job Specific RWP are reviewed (pre and post job) by a radiological engineer for ALARA considerations. <50% of jobs for which an RWP is generated where the project TEDE does not exceed 100mrem are reviewed (pre and post job) by a radiological engineer for ALARA considerations.	0.7 - 0

Measure 5.1.4: Sealed Source Radioisotopes are accounted for and controlled in accordance with all relevant procedures.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
100% compliance with the requirements in 10 CFR 835.1201 for sealed sources that exceed Appendix E quantities and 95% accountability for all "non-accountable" quantity radioactive sealed sources.	4.3 – 3.5
100% compliance with the requirements accountable source limits established in 10 CFR 835.1201 for sealed sources that exceed Appendix E quantities.	3.4 – 3.1

Performance Levels	Measure Score
75 - 99% compliance with the requirements accountable source limits established in 10 CFR 835.1201 for sealed sources that exceed Appendix E quantities.	3.0 – 2.5

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

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

- The maintenance and appropriate utilization of hazard identification, prevention, and control processes/activities; and
- An open reporting culture is maintained at the Laboratory while appropriately responding to ESH&Q incidents/emergencies
- Identification of root causes to ES&H non-compliances and implementation of corrective actions
- Extent of the Laboratory’s participation in working with other SC Laboratories or other entities/organizations outside SC in both giving and receiving external safety program audits as to advance staff skills and facilitate the sharing of lessons learned.

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

Measure 5.2.1: 100% of Management Self Assessments (MSAs) (4 of 4) conducted and reviewed and accepted by ESH&Q Division (100% means that Physics, Accelerator, Administration, and EH&S will perform at least one MSA (meaning a department, group or division level can perform this MSA to meet this measure) during the 4th quarter of FY06). Independent Assessments (IAs) Completed = 100% - means two IAs (2 of 2) conducted and draft reports are in written. Meet the milestone commitments identified in memorandum from Christoph W. Leemann to James A. Turi: JSA Acceptance of SURA ESH&Q Documents, dated May 16, 2006. Conduct 15 work observations during the scheduled accelerator down (SAD) (June – July 2006).

Performance Levels	Measure Score
MSAs completed during 4 th quarter of FY06 is 100% (4 of 4); and the issues management system is set up to start tracking MSA findings by 09/30/06. Ability to trend results is demonstrated by 09/30/06. IAs completed 100% (2 of 2) and joins EFCOG and become member of an EFCOG working group. Benchmark other DOE and non-DOE laboratories for best management practices by September 30, 2006. Develop plan for an external assessment of JLAB's ISMS in 1 st quarter of FY07. Conduct 16 or more work observations during the SAD (June-July 2006).	4.3 - 3.5
100% of MSAs (4 of 4) conducted and reviewed and accepted by ESH&Q Division (100% means that Physics, Accelerator, Administration, and EH&S will perform at least one MSA (meaning a department, group or division level can perform this MSA to meet this measure) during the 4th quarter of FY06). IAs Completed = 100% - means two IAs conducted and draft reports are in written. Meet the milestone commitments identified in memorandum from Christoph W. Leemann to James A. Turi: JSA Acceptance of SURA ESH&Q Documents, dated May 16, 2006. Conduct 15 work observations during the scheduled accelerator down (SAD) (June – July 2006).	3.4 – 3.1
MSAs completed =50% (2 of 4) of MSAs conducted and reviewed and accepted by ESH&Q Division. IAs completed = 50% (1 of 2 IAs completed and the draft report is written). One of the 2 milestones identified in memorandum from Christoph W. Leemann to James A. Turi: JSA Acceptance of SURA ESH&Q Documents, dated May 16, 2006 was met. Conduct 5 of 10 work observations during the SAD (June-July 2006).	3.0 - 2.5

Measure 5.2.2: Maintain an open reporting culture through an established employee concerns program, infusing management expectations in performance appraisals, conducting Director's Safety Council and Worker Safety Committees, re-establishing the "stop work" authority for every employee via a policy memo from the Laboratory Director and additional training, and rewarding safety performance.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Chief Scientist and COO to hold quarterly round table with randomly selected cross-section of staff to solicit feedback. The Laboratory will develop and implement a recognition program for positive reinforcement of safety by 09/30/06.	4.3 - 3.5
Reissue JSA ESH&Q Policy to include stop work, quality, ES&H aspects by 07/15/06. Reinvalidate employee concerns program by establishing a "hot line" employee concerns at Director Office level and updating communication about employee concerns program by 08/30/06. The worker's safety committee is actively engaged in improving laboratory safety and conducts at least one employee led worker safety committee meeting with Laboratory Director and COO.	3.4 – 3.1
Reissue JSA ESH&Q Policy to include stop work, quality, ES&H aspects by 09/15/06. Reinvalidate employee concerns program by establishing a "hot line" employee	3.0 - 2.5

Performance Levels	Measure Score
concerns at Director Office level and updating communication about employee concerns program by 09/30/06. Conduct quarterly employee led worker safety committee meetings with Laboratory Director and COO.	

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

Measure 5.3.1: Number of environmental incidents resulting in administrative or technical permit violations and EMS Action Plan implementation: 1 administrative, 0 technical permit violations. Complete remaining EMS Action Plan items scheduled for completion by September 30, 2006. Apply causal analysis principals to environmental incidents if one occurs in this period.

Note: Administrative and technical violations are those issued by the regulatory agency.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
0 administrative, 0 technical permit violations, EMS 2005 Action Plan items due in FY06 are completed in FY06 by CATS due dates, and submit one DEQ/EPA award application for environmental stewardship. Complete 2 or more of the additional CATS implementation items internally identified in 2006 and establish oil recycling goal for FY07 and document the goal by 9/30/06.	4.3 – 3.5
1 administrative, 0 technical permit violations. Complete remaining EMS Action Plan items scheduled for completion by September 30, 2006. Apply causal analysis principals to environmental incidents if one occurs in this period.	3.4 – 3.1
≤ 2 administrative, 1 technical permit violations and complete all but one of the EMS 2005 Action Plan items by CATS due dates.	3.0 – 2.1
≤ 3 administrative, 1 technical permit violations and complete all but two of the EMS 2005 Action Plan items by CATS due, no more than 1 environmental exceedence resulting in significant environmental impact.	2.0 – 0.8
≥ 4 administrative, > 2 technical permit violations, do not complete more than three3 of the EMS 2005 Action Plan items by CATS due dates; more than 2 environmental exceedences resulting in significant environmental impact. None of the EMS action items are completed on time.	0.7 - 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			45%		
5.2 Provide Efficient and Effective Implementation of Integrated Safety, Health and Environment Management			45%		
5.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Waste Management, Minimization, and Pollution Prevention			10%		
Performance Goal 5.0 Total					

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-	B+	B	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)

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

The weight of this Goal is 25%.

They Provide Business Systems that Efficiently and Effectively Support the Overall Mission of the Laboratory. Goal shall measure the Contractor’s overall success in deploying, implementing, and improving integrated business system that efficiently and effectively support the mission(s) of the Laboratory.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by DOE as described within Section I of this document. Each Objective has one or more measures, the outcomes of which collectively assist the evaluating office in determining the Contractor’s overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each of the measures identifies significant tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones for which the outcomes/results are important to the success of the corresponding Objective. Although other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources may be used, the outcomes of key measures identified for each Objective shall be the primary means of determining the Contractor’s success in meeting an Objective. The overall Goal score is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 6.1 at the end of this section). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 6.2 to determine the overall Goal letter grade.

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

Measure 6.1.1: Effectively track costs against budgets to ensure cost performance.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
In addition to meeting expectations (B+), adhoc reports requested by the customer are responded to in a timely manner. Cost variance is less than or equal to 5% for organizational budgets and G&A and fringe pools.	4.3 – 3.5
Develop monthly Estimates at Completion (EACs). Costs and commitments do not exceed available funding in the contract at the cost level of the budget and reporting code in the financial plan at any point during the fiscal year. Regular accounting and budget reports are accurate, timely and complete in accordance with requirements for key activities/deliverables.	3.4 – 3.1
No Estimates at Completion are developed. Costs and commitments do not exceed available funding in the contract at the cost level of the budget and reporting code in the financial plan at any point during the fiscal year. Regular accounting and budget reports are not in accordance with requirements for key activities/deliverables.	3.0 – 1.1
No Estimates at Completion are developed. Costs and commitments exceed available funding in the contract at the cost level of the budget and reporting code in the financial plan some time during the fiscal year. Regular accounting and budget reports are not in accordance with requirements for key activities/deliverables.	1.0 – 0.8
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.	0.7 – 0

Measure 6.1.2: Demonstrate an effective financial management system through accurate, timely and complete financial reports to DOE, external reviews, internal and external audits, and self-assessments.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
In addition to meeting B+ expectations, significant financial management process improvement or best practice implemented as a result of benchmarking with outside expertise.	4.3 – 3.5
Accurate, timely and complete financial reports are provided to DOE in accordance with Departmental requirements for key activities/deliverable including accelerated financial statement reporting and other financial data calls. No material/major findings as defined in DOE Order 413.1A Attachment 2 and no unallowable cost findings for internal/external audit reviews.	3.4 – 3.1

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Accurate, timely and complete financial reports are not provided to DOE in accordance with Departmental requirements for key activities/deliverable including accelerated financial statement reporting and other financial data calls. No material/major findings as defined in DOE Order 413.1A Attachment 2 and no more than one unallowable cost findings for internal/external audit reviews.	3.0 – 1.1
Accurate, timely and complete financial reports are not provided to DOE in accordance with Departmental requirements for key activities/deliverable including accelerated financial statement reporting and other financial data calls. No more than one material/major findings as defined in DOE Order 413.1A Attachment 2 and no more than three unallowable cost findings for internal/external audit reviews.	1.0 – 0.8
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.	0.7 – 0

Measure 6.1.3: Financial attestations accurately reflect the status of internal controls and are provided in a timely manner.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
In addition to meeting the requirements for B+, meet all requirements for OMB Circular A-123 Appendix A within DOE timelines identified.	4.3 – 3.5
Financial attestations accurately reflect the status of internal controls and are provided in a timely manner. In addition, there are no reportable financial management internal control weaknesses identified in the annual financial statement audit.	3.4 – 3.1
Financial attestations accurately reflect the status of internal controls but are not provided in a timely manner. In addition, there is no more than one reportable financial management internal control weakness identified in the annual financial statement audit.	3.0 – 1.1
Financial attestations accurately reflect the status of internal controls but are not provided in a timely manner. In addition, there are no more than three reportable financial management internal control weaknesses identified in the annual financial statement audit.	1.0 – 0.8
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.	0.7 – 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.

Additional credit for exceptional performance in areas outside the balanced scorecard purview may be given (i.e., system enhancements, improvements in procedures and practices, implementation of new programs, etc.)

Note: Measure Not Applicable to FY06 – due to 4 month performance period.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Achieve Procurement Balanced Scorecard Total Score ≥ 97 (“Outstanding”) Achieve satisfactory PERT Team Review result that supports DOE’s continued approval of JSA’s Purchasing System	4.3 – 4.1
Achieve Procurement Balanced Scorecard Total Score ≥ 95 (“Outstanding”)	4.0 – 3.8
Achieve Procurement Balanced Scorecard Total Score ≥ 92 (“Outstanding”)	3.7 – 3.5
Achieve Procurement Balanced Scorecard Total Score ≥ 90 (“Excellent”)	3.4 – 3.1
Achieve Procurement Balanced Scorecard Total Score ≥ 86 (“Excellent”)	3.0 – 2.8
Achieve Procurement Balanced Scorecard Total Score ≥ 82 (“Excellent”)	2.7 – 2.5
Achieve Procurement Balanced Scorecard Total Score ≥ 78 (“Good”)	2.4 – 2.1
Achieve Procurement Balanced Scorecard Total Score ≥ 75 (“Good”)	2.0 – 1.8
Achieve Procurement Balanced Scorecard Total Score ≥ 72 (“Good”)	1.7 – 1.1
Achieve Procurement Balanced Scorecard Total Score ≥ 62 (“Marginal”)	1.0 – 0.8
Achieve Procurement Balanced Scorecard Total Score < 62 (“Poor”)	0.7 – 0

Measure 6.2.2: Effectiveness of JSA’s Small Business Program Outreach- Small Business Program Goal Achievement.

Additional credit for exceptional performance in areas outside the balanced scorecard purview may be given (i.e., system enhancements, improvements in procedures and practices, implementation of new programs, etc.)

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Exceed all Small Business Goals established in JSA's Annual Small Business Plan and identify at least two Protégé mentor firms by 9/30/2006 that are viable candidates for Protégé Mentor agreements.	4.3 – 4.1
Achieve all Small Business Goals established in JSA's Small Business Plan	4.0 – 3.5
Achieve Five of the Six Small Business Goals Established in JSA's Annual Small Business Plan	3.4 – 3.1
Achieve Four of the Six Small Business Goals Established in JSA's Annual Small Business Plan	3.0 – 1.1
Achieve Three of the Six Small Business Goals Established in JSA's Annual Small Business Plan	1.0 – 0.8
Achieve Less than Three of the Six Small Business Goals Established in JSA's Annual Small Business Plan	0.7 - 0.0

Measure 6.2.3: Demonstrate efficacy of the property management system through outstanding results on annual performance measures that cover critical aspects of JLab's personal property management.

Additional credit for exceptional performance in areas outside the balanced scorecard purview may be given (i.e., system enhancements, improvements in procedures and practices, implementation of new programs, etc.)

Note: Measure Not Applicable to FY06 – due to 4 month performance period.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Annual Property Balanced Scorecard Composite Score is greater than or equal to 100 points.	4.3 – 4.1
Annual Property Balanced Scorecard Composite Score is less than 100 points but greater than or equal to 98 points.	4.0 – 3.8
Annual Property Balanced Scorecard Composite Score is less than 98 points but greater than or equal to 96 points.	3.7 – 3.5
Annual Property Balanced Scorecard Composite Score is less than 96 points but greater than or equal to 93 points.	3.4 – 3.1
Annual Property Balanced Scorecard Composite Score is less than 93 points but greater than or equal to 91 points.	3.0 – 2.8

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

Measure 6.3.1: Balanced Score Card Results Based on the Following:

A. Measure 1-Diversity- Protected Class Representation: Representation of protected classes (PC) within each EEO-1 category at the end of the fiscal year compared to the beginning of the fiscal year (adjusted for voluntary separations).

Scoring:

$$\text{PC Assessment Factor} = \frac{\% \text{ of PC to total workforce at the end of FY within each EEO-1 category}}{\% \text{ of PC to total workforce at the beginning of FY within each EEO-1 category}}$$

where:

Total Workforce = Total number of regular and term employees (excludes casuals, temps, and students)

EEO-1 Category = Occupational job categories as defined by EEOC (N=10)

Protected Classes (PC) = Women and minorities as defined by EEOC (N = 20): 2PC * 10 EEO-1 CATEGORIES

Note: EEO-1 categories where Utilization percentages meet or exceed 80% of availability percentages are determined to be fully in compliance with this metric.

B. Measure 2- Benefits - Premium Increases vs. the Market: Three-year rolling average of annual increases in medical insurance premium cost relative to market.

Scoring: Difference in the laboratory's percent increase in medical insurance premium compared to the market trend percent increase in medical insurance premiums averaged over three years.

C. Measure 3- Compensation - Alignment with the Market: Achieve compensation positions aligned with market practices to reflect the Laboratory's mid-market compensation philosophy.

Scoring:

$$\text{Compensation Factor} = \frac{\sum (\text{weighted average salary within each classification})}{\sum (\text{weighted salary range midpoint* within each classification})}$$

*Assumes salary range midpoints reflect mid-market position

D. Measure 4- Retention of Talent- Attrition rate of Top Performers.

Scoring: Percentage of top performers (employees who receive the top two performance ratings) who voluntarily separate from the Laboratory

Note: Excludes involuntary terminations due to funding issues, restructuring or contractor turnover. Excludes voluntary terminations due to retirement, or participation in a voluntary separation program or early retirement program.

E. Measure 5- Internal Business Practices- Annual Review of Policies/Procedures.

Scoring: Number of policies/processes reviewed for the fourth quarter of Fiscal Year 2006.

F. Measure 6 – Timely reporting to DOE

Reports:

- Baseline Employment Data (7/15)
- Report of Contractor Employment (7/15)
- Postretirement Benefits Other Than Pensions (June 14, 2006)
- Any Additional Reporting required by DOE

Scoring: Reports submitted by due date.

MEASURE	TARGET
Diversity	
1. Protected class representation	85%
Benefits	
2. Premium increases vs. the market	+2%
Compensation	
3. Alignment with market	±3.0%
Retention of Talent	
4. Attrition rate of top performers	2.5%
Internal Business Process	
5. 4 th quarter review of policies/procedures	4
Timely Reporting	
6. 4 th quarter DOE required reports submitted by due date	100%

Performance Levels	Measure Score
6 of 6 BSC Measures Meet Target	4.3 – 3.5
5 of 6 BSC Measures Meet Target	3.4 – 3.1
4 of 6 BSC Measures Meet Target	3.0 – 2.5
3 of 6 BSC Measures Meet Target	2.4 – 1.8
2 of 6 BSC Measures Meet Target	1.7 – 1.1
1 of 6 BSC Measures Meet Target	1.0 – 0.8
0 of 6 BSC Measures Meet Target	0.7 - 0

Note: Jefferson Laboratory may be given additional credit for exceptional performance in areas outside the balanced scorecard purview (i.e., system enhancements, improvements in procedures practices, implementation of new programs).

Measure 6.3.2: Completion of Outstanding Contract Activities - Timely reporting to DOE on:

- Appendix A Negotiations finalized (H.4(1))
- Benefits Value Study submitted to DOE (H.18(5))
- Compensation Plan finalized (H.18(6))
- Compensation Increase Plan Submitted (H.18(7))
- Submit for Certification of Compensation System (H.18(7))

GOAL	TARGET
Appendix A	9/30/2006
Benefits Value Study	7/28/2006
Compensation Plan	8/31/2006
Compensation Increase Plan	9/30/2006
Request Certification of Compensation System	8/21/2006

Performance Levels	Measure Score
	4.3 – 3.5
5 of 5 Measures Meet Target	3.4 – 3.1
4 of 5 Measures Meet Target	3.0 – 2.5
3 of 5 Measures Meet Target	2.4 – 1.8
2 of 5 Measures Meet Target	1.7 – 1.1
1 of 5 Measures Meet Target	1.0 – 0.8
0 of 5 Measures Meet Target	0.7 - 0

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: Oversight Through Internal Audit - Internal audits completed in accordance with annual audit plan.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Complete all audits in accordance with annual audit plan and at least one additional audit and one advisory service engagement-- from any or a combination of Internal Audit, JSA Board Committees; SURA Universities; CSC Review Teams, including Centers of Excellence.	4.3 – 4.1
Complete all audits in accordance with annual audit plan and at least one additional audit--from any or a combination of Internal Audit, JSA Board Committees; SURA Universities; CSC Review Teams, including Centers of Excellence.	4.0 – 3.8
Complete all audits in accordance with annual audit plan and provides at least one advisory service engagement.	3.7 – 3.5

Performance Levels	Measure Score
<p>Complete all audits in accordance with annual audit plan. (Notes 1, 2, 3)</p> <p><i>1 – Includes audit plan changes and/or substitutes.</i></p> <p><i>2 – Due to the nature of internal audits completion dates may not coincide with the organization’s fiscal year end. For Performance Level purposes, all current year audits (excluding Transaction Testing) are targeted for a report release date no later than 90 days after the close of the fiscal year, unless extenuating circumstances can be established. The Transaction Testing audit for Performance Level purposes is targeted for a report release date no later than 180 days after the close of the fiscal year, unless extenuating circumstances can be established.</i></p> <p><i>– Percentage of completion will be utilized where practical including requests for other than annual reporting, e.g., mid-year.</i></p>	3.4 – 3.1
<p>Completes > 75% of audits on plan. (Notes 1)</p> <p><i>1 –Average number of audits conducted per year at current resource level is 4. Hence completion of 3 of 4 audits represents a 75% grading.</i></p>	3.0 – 2.8
Completes > 70% of audits on plan.	2.7 – 2.5
Completes > 65% of audits on plan.	2.4 – 2.1
Completes > 60% of audits on plan.	2.0 – 1.8
Completes > 55% of audits on plan.	1.7 – 1.1
Completes = 50% of audits on plan.	1.0 – 0.8
Completes < 50% of audits on plan.	0.7 – 0

Measure 6.4.2: Oversight Through Internal Audit - Consistent with Professional Auditing Standards and DOE contract requirements receive an overall satisfactory rating from an external peer review by qualified persons from other DOE contractor internal audit organizations every five years.

Note: Measure Not Applicable to FY06 – due to 4 month performance period.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Receive an overall satisfactory rating from external peer review with at least three noteworthy practices.	4.3 – 4.1
Receive an overall satisfactory rating from external peer review with at least two noteworthy practices.	4.0 – 3.8
Receive an overall satisfactory rating from external peer review with at least one noteworthy practice.	3.7 – 3.5
Receive an overall satisfactory rating from external peer review.	3.4 – 3.1

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Receive an overall satisfactory rating from external peer review with one finding of noncompliance & one noteworthy practice.	3.0 – 2.8
Receive an overall satisfactory rating from external peer review with one finding of noncompliance.	2.7 – 2.5
Receive an overall satisfactory rating from external peer review with two findings of noncompliance & one noteworthy practice.	2.4 – 2.1
Receive an overall satisfactory rating from external peer review with two findings of noncompliance.	2.0 – 1.8
Receive an overall satisfactory rating from external peer review with three findings of noncompliance & one noteworthy practice.	1.7 – 1.1
Receive an overall satisfactory rating from external peer review with three findings of noncompliance.	1.0 – 0.8
Receive an overall unsatisfactory rating from external peer review.	0.7 – 0

Measure 6.4.3: Develop a Quality Improvement Plan

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Develop a JSA Laboratory Director approved Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) by 9/1/06 that contains the following elements: quality improvement objectives and measures, process improvement/efficiency methodology (including Value Methodology), AQIS implementation, work activity and process quality enhancement, issues management and closure quality, procurement quality, work closeout quality objectives and methodology, and documentation and recordkeeping supporting the quality program objectives. Conduct information sessions on the final QA plan for Accelerator, Engineering, Physics, Procurement, ESH&Q, and Facilities Management by 9/30/06. Submit a Quality Assurance Plan (QAP) for TJSO approval by 09/30/06.	4.3 – 3.5
Develop a JSA Laboratory Director approved QIP by 9/30/06 that contains the following elements: quality improvement objectives and measures, process improvement/efficiency methodology (including Value Methodology), AQIS implementation, work activity and process quality enhancement, issues management and closure quality, procurement quality, work closeout quality objectives and methodology, and documentation and recordkeeping supporting the quality program objectives. QA and continuous improvement manager hired and fully integrated into the organization.	3.4 – 3.1
Develop a DRAFT JSA Laboratory Director approved QIP that contains the following elements: quality improvement objectives and measures, process improvement/efficiency methodology (including Value Methodology), AQIS implementation, work activity and process quality enhancement, issues management and closure quality, procurement quality, work closeout quality objectives and methodology, and documentation and recordkeeping supporting the quality program objectives.	3.0 – 2.5

Measure 6.4.4: Deliver an integrated efficient and effective Information Technology Architecture that supports the mission of the Laboratory and benchmarks favorably with respect with other DOE laboratories, research universities and commercial industry best practices.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
IT Steering Committee is fully operational by September 1, 2006 and a charter has been developed.	4.3 – 3.5
Set up an IT Steering Committee including charter and with participation from key Laboratory stakeholders, users, outside experts from SURA universities and CSC, and TJSO. The Committee will participate in the establishment of IT Architecture vision and policy recommendations and will consider Laboratory-wide IT performance, including prioritization of work, linkage to the Laboratory’s mission, and progress on all IT related contract metrics.	3.4 – 3.1
IT Steering Committee is operational by September 30, 2006.	3.0 – 0.8
IT Steering Committee is not operational by September 30, 2006.	0.7 - 0

Measure 6.4.5: The Laboratory’s Information Technology favorably benchmarks with other DOE laboratories, research universities and commercial industry best practices.

Note: Measure Not Applicable to FY06 – due to 4 month performance period.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Set up the Advanced Board of Outside Expertise from SURA Universities and CSC and conduct the first annual review by mid-Summer 2007; have no major findings from the review; have outstanding comments from the Board across all areas of IT activities.	4.3 – 3.5
Establish annual review of IT with Advanced Board of Outside Expertise from SURA Universities, CSC and other DOE laboratories. By February 1, 2007, provide a charter and identify the membership for the board. Perform the first annual IT review by mid-Summer of 2007. The review will be an external assessment and include benchmarking IT activities and performance.	3.4 – 3.1
Set up the Advanced Board of Outside Expertise from SURA Universities and CSC and conduct the first annual review by the end of FY07; have five or fewer major findings from the review.	3.0 – 2.5

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

The effectiveness of Technology Transfer activities at Jefferson Lab can be measured by three specific measures listed below. Note: Jefferson Lab may be given additional credit (points) for exceptional performance in areas outside the performance measures (i.e., system enhancements, improvements in procedures practices, implementation of new program, etc.).

Measure 6.5.1: The proper stewardship of intellectual assets and Laboratory owned or originated technology as measured by Invention Disclosures and Patent Applications. Intellectual Property Stewardship as indicated by the annual number of Invention Disclosures and/or Patents awarded.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Number of Invention Disclosures Greater than or Equal to 9 and Number of Patents Awarded Greater than or Equal to 4	4.3 – 3.5
Number of Invention Disclosures Greater than or Equal to 7 and Number of Patents Awarded Greater than or Equal to 3	3.4 – 3.1
Number of Invention Disclosures Greater than or Equal to 5 and Number of Patents Awarded Greater than or Equal to 2	3.0 – 2.1
Number of Invention Disclosures Greater than or Equal to 3 and Number of Patents Awarded Greater than or Equal to 1	2.0 – 0.8
Number of Invention Disclosures Greater than or Equal to 1 and Number of Patents Awarded Greater than or Equal to 0	0.7 - 0

Measure 6.5.2: The market impacts created/generated as a result of technology transfer and deployment activities as measured by licenses and/or options agreements executed.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Additional credit will be awarded for exceptional performance as a result of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Income producing licenses from newly executed or existing agreements to include royalties, maintenance fees or execution fees paid during the fiscal year. Measurable initiatives that mentor or promote the establishment of small businesses through technology transfer. 	4.3 – 4.1
Greater than or equal to 2 licenses awarded and greater than or equal to 2 option agreements executed.	4.0 – 3.5
Greater than or equal to 2 licenses awarded or greater than or equal to 2 option agreements executed.	3.4 – 3.1
Greater than or equal to 1 licenses awarded and greater than or equal to 1 option agreements executed.	3.0 – 2.1

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Greater than or equal to 1 licenses awarded or greater than or equal to 1 option agreements executed.	2.0 – 0.8
No licenses awarded or option agreements executed.	0.7 - 0

Measure 6.5.3: Contributions to the transfer of Laboratory originated knowledge and technology as measured by customer assessments.

Points will be awarded based on the customer’s overall adjectival rating of the system.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Additional credit will be awarded for exceptional performance as a result of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational initiatives that promote commercialization of JSA’s technology. • Favorable responses from customer service surveys. 	4.3 – 4.1
Annual Customer Rating = 3.9 (A)	4.0 – 3.5
Annual Customer Rating = 3.4 (B+)	3.4 – 3.1
Annual Customer Rating = 3.0 (B)	3.0 – 2.1
Annual Customer Rating = 2.0 (C)	2.0 – 0.8
Annual Customer Rating = 0 (F)	0.7 - 0

Table 6.3 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)			25%		
6.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition and Property Management System(s)			25%		
6.3 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Human Resources Management System			20%		
6.4 Provide Efficient, Effective, and			15%		

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
Responsive Management Systems for Internal Audit and Oversight; Quality; Information Management; and Other Administrative Support Services as Appropriate					
6.5 Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Technology and Commercialization of Intellectual Assets			15%		
Performance Goal 6.0 Total					

Table 6.4 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

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

The weight of this Goal is 10%.

The Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs Goal shall measure the overall effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in planning for, delivering, and operations of Laboratory facilities and equipment needed to ensure required capabilities are present to meet today’s and tomorrow’s complex challenges.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by DOE as described within Section I of this document. Each Objective has one or more measures, the outcomes of which collectively assist the evaluating office in determining the Contractor’s overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each of the measures identifies significant tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones for which the outcomes/results of are important to the success of the corresponding Objective. Although other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources may be used, the outcomes of key measures identified for each Objective shall be the primary means of determining the Contractor’s success in meeting an Objective. The overall Goal score is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 7.1 at the end of this section). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 7.2 to determine the overall Goal letter grade.

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):

ACI = 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.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Greater or equal to 99%	4.3 – 4.1
Greater or equal to 98%	4.0 – 3.8
Greater or equal to 96.5%	3.7 – 3.5
Greater or equal to 95%	3.4 – 3.1
Greater or equal to 90%	3.0 – 2.8
Greater or equal to 85%	2.7 – 2.5
Greater or equal to 80%	2.4 – 2.1
Greater or equal to 75%	2.0 – 1.8
Greater or equal to 70%	1.7 – 1.1
Greater or equal to 60%	1.0 – 0.8
Less than 60%	0.7 – 0

Measure 7.1.2: Extent Contractor validates accuracy of data in the Facilities Information Management System (FIMS).

Note: Measure Not Applicable to FY06 – due to 4 month performance period.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
The contractor has demonstrated validation of the accuracy of data in the FIMS data base with greater than 90% statistical certainty that the data contains no more than a 5% error rate.	4.3 – 3.5
The contractor has demonstrated validation of the accuracy of data in the FIMS data base with at least 90% statistical certainty that the data contains no more than a 10% error rate.	3.4 – 3.1
The contractor has demonstrated validation of the accuracy of data in the FIMS data base with at least 80% statistical certainty that the data contains no more than a 10% error rate.	3.0 – 1.1
The contractor has demonstrated validation of the accuracy of data in the FIMS data base with at least 80% statistical certainty that the data contains no more than a 20% error rate.	1.0 – 0.8
The contractor fails to demonstrate validation of the accuracy of data in the FIMS data base.	0.7 – 0

Measure 7.1.3: The efficiency and effectiveness of contractor efforts for sustainment, recapitalization, and acquisition of required facilities and infrastructure to support laboratory programs through the performance of maintenance by achieving MII of at least 2%.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Analyze and trend maintenance and repair data by utilizing a central maintenance management system (Maximo) to track all work orders. Develop plan to implement a Reliability Centered Maintenance (RCM) program. The contractor has demonstrated substantial cost savings approaches in performance of maintenance activities, recapitalization, and acquisition of facilities and infrastructure to support laboratory programs.	4.3 – 3.5
MII = 2% and the contractor has demonstrated that maintenance activities, recapitalization and acquisition of facilities and infrastructure to support laboratory programs have been performed efficiently.	3.4 – 3.1
The contractor has performed required maintenance activities, recapitalization and acquisition of facilities and infrastructure to support laboratory programs.	3.0 – 1.1
The contractor has failed to perform all required maintenance activities, recapitalization and acquisition of facilities and infrastructure to support laboratory programs.	1.0 – 0.8
The contractor has shown significant lapses in the performance of maintenance activities, recapitalization and acquisition of facilities and infrastructure to support laboratory programs.	0.7 – 0

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

Measure 7.2.1: The Ten Year Site Plan is recognized by funding entities as providing a sound strategy for acquisition of required facilities and infrastructure to support future laboratory programs.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
The contractor takes extra measures, such as drawing on outside expertise, to assure that the strategy is appropriately developed, reviewed, updated, in line with the Laboratory Business Plan, and utilized as a Laboratory management document in a timely fashion.	4.3 – 3.5
The contractor assures that the strategy is appropriately developed, reviewed, updated, in line with the Laboratory Business Plan, and utilized as a Laboratory management document.	3.4 – 3.1
The contractor applies marginally sufficient resources to assure that the strategy is appropriately updated and implemented.	3.0 – 1.1
The contractor applies insufficient resources to consistently develop and implement updates in the strategy in a timely manner.	1.0 – 0.8
The contractor provides insufficient resources to create a meaningful strategy for its future.	0.7 – 0

Measure 7.2.2: Cost Performance on projects greater than or equal to \$100K.

Maintain level of construction control to limit change orders and cost overruns to only those which bring added value to the project or are appropriate to produce the desired end product. Performance level will be calculated by taking the average of initial bid (contracted) amounts compared to the final contract amounts considering all applicable funding increases for all appropriate contracts closed out during the rating period. Increases considered not applicable are those whose root cause is:

- Post-design programmatic change by user (physical or schedule)
- New technology deemed a value-added inclusion (post-award)
- Value engineering proposals accepted (both additive and deductive)

Performance Levels	Measure Score
No overrun	4.3 – 4.1
Less than 3%	4.0 – 3.5
Applicable changes and cost overruns are less than or equal to 8% of the total awarded bid amount.	3.4 – 3.1
Greater than 8%	3.0 – 2.1
Greater than 15%	2.0 – 0.8
Greater than 25%	0.7 – 0

Measure 7.2.3: Scheduled performance on projects greater than or equal to \$100K.

Calculation of performance toward this goal will be the average of the actual number of days to completion of identified projects (or designated milestones) to the number specified by the original contracts. This will be expressed as a coefficient of actual divided by contracted. Additional time attributed to the following categories will not be included for the purpose of this metric:

- Acts of God (as contractually accepted)
- Labor disputes/strikes
- Documented material unavailability (contractually accepted)
- User desired post-award change orders for which additional time is appropriate

For purposes of this report, “completion” shall be when the project is physically complete; turned over to user or beneficial occupancy taken.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Index less than 1.0 including project closeout	4.3 – 4.1
Index less than 1.0	4.0 – 3.8
≥ 1.0 to < 1.10	3.7 – 3.5
The average index actual number of days to project completion or beneficial occupancy to original contract duration in the awarded contract is ≥ 1.10 to < 1.15.	3.4 – 3.1

Performance Levels	Measure Score
≥ 1.15 to < 1.25	3.0 – 0.8
≥ 1.25	0.7 – 0

Table 7.1 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			50%		
7.2 Provide Planning for and Acquire the Facilities and Infrastructure Required to support Future Laboratory Programs			50%		
Performance Goal 7.0 Total					

Table 7.2 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

Goal 8 Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM) and Emergency Management Systems

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

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

The weight of this Goal is 10%.

The Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM) and Emergency Management Systems Goal shall measure the Contractor’s overall success in safeguarding and securing Laboratory assets that supports the mission(s) of the Laboratory in an efficient

and effective manner and provides an effective emergency management program.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the evaluating office as described within Section I of this document. Each Objective has one or more key measures, the outcomes of which collectively assist the evaluating office in determining the Contractor’s overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each of the key measures identifies significant tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones for which the outcomes/results of are important to the success of the corresponding Objective. Although other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources may be used, the outcomes of key measures identified for each Objective shall be the primary means of determining the Contractor’s success in meeting an Objective. The overall Goal score is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 8.1 at the end of this section). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 8.2 to determine the overall Goal letter grade.

Objective 8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System

Measure 8.1.1: An emergency response exercise is conducted. Response to an actual or simulated emergency event demonstrates an above average level of proficiency and opportunities for improvement are identified and acted upon. Completion of the remaining FY05 Emergency Management Program peer review elements.

* An actual emergency may be counted as an exercise in the quarter in which it occurs.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
100% and document final laboratory-wide pandemic response plan by September 30, 2006 and assists in the revision of the final COOP. Demonstrate laboratory-wide hurricane readiness through a corporate assessment of hurricane preparedness activities by August 31, 2006.	4.3 – 3.5
Conduct one emergency management exercise (actual emergency may be counted as an exercise in the quarter in which it occurs). Response to an actual or simulated emergency event demonstrates an above average level of proficiency and opportunities for improvement are identified and acted upon. Complete the remaining approved Director’s Safety Council (DSC) FY05 Emergency Management Program peer review elements. Participate in at least one local emergency preparedness exercise assisting a local entity in their preparedness.	3.4 – 3.1
Complete planning for an emergency exercise. 50% of the remaining Director’s Safety Council (DSC) FY05 Emergency Management Program peer review elements are completed.	3.0 – 2.5

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

Assure appropriate level of cyber security risk assessment and program planning and that Jefferson Lab computer systems are not compromised or used in attacks on other Internet locations.

Measure 8.2.1: Number of times JLAB computer systems were compromised or were used to attack other systems and that any incidents were reported within the required timeframes. Potential Cyber Security

Incidents (CSI) considered in this metric include system level (root) compromises on Computer Center and Accelerator Controls managed systems, as well as situations where nodes in the jlab.org domain are used to carry out cyber attacks on other locations on the Internet. Computer Center and Accelerator Controls staff will track incidents and report on them at the end of the fiscal year.

$$CSI = RC + 0.5(CA)$$

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.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
CSI = 0; and favorable results on internal/external reviews, surveys and inspections that demonstrate the cyber security program is: effective, integrated into laboratory culture, and laboratory leadership's commitment to strong cyber security performance.	4.3 – 3.5
CSI = 1	3.4 – 3.1
CSI >= 2	3.0 – 2.8
CSI >= 3	2.7 – 2.5
CSI >= 4	2.4 – 2.1
CSI >= 5	2.0 – 1.8
CSI >= 8	1.7 – 1.1
CSI >= 12	1.0 – 0.8
CSI >= 20	0.7 – 0

Measure 8.2 2: Performance on addressing identified cyber security vulnerabilities. The metric will measure the average completion date and/or percent of systems complete for addressing identified cyber security vulnerabilities versus the scheduled completion date and/or percent of systems complete. The scheduled completion dates and/or percent of systems to be completed will be negotiated between the TJSO Cyber Security Manager and the CIO at the beginning of the performance period with an agreement in place within the first six weeks of the performance period. Two types of identified cyber security vulnerabilities will be used:

Type A = A vulnerability correlated to completion date.

Type B = A vulnerability which correlates to a percentage that an identified system has been completed.

In the paragraphs below, M is the total number of elements for Type A, and N is the total number of elements for Type B.

Type A with M vulnerabilities – Scoring for vulnerabilities that have completion dates: The percentage of available points earned for each vulnerability (A1, A2, ..., AM) shall be numerically equal to 100 plus (minus) 10 times the number of months (including fractions thereof) that the completion date for

addressing the identified cyber security vulnerability is ahead (behind). No points will be awarded for a given vulnerability if the completion date is more than five months behind schedule. For the mid-year score, the coefficient shall be 20 rather than 10. The Contracting Officer may make allowance for project plan changes and/or schedule adjustments associated with causes beyond Jlab’s control. The dates used in evaluating performance at midyear and end-of-year are the project schedule dates in place at the time of evaluation.

Score $A_i = 100 \pm 10 \times$ (no. of months) either ahead (+) or behind (-) for vulnerability A_i

Type B with N vulnerabilities – Scoring for vulnerabilities that have percent of systems complete: The percentage of available points earned for each vulnerability (B_1, B_2, \dots, B_N) shall be numerically equal to 100 times the ratio of the number of systems that are complete divided by the number that were scheduled to be complete on the specified date (mid-year or end-of-year as appropriate) for addressing identified cyber security vulnerabilities. The Contracting Officer may make allowance for project plan changes and/or schedule adjustments associated with causes beyond Jlab’s control.

Score $B_i = 100 \times$ (actual completed/scheduled completed) for vulnerability B_i

The scores for the two types of vulnerabilities will be combined as follows with the composite constrained to lie between 0 and 100:

Score = $(\text{Score}A_1 + \text{Score}A_2 + \dots + \text{Score}A_M + \text{Score}B_1 + \text{Score}B_2 + \dots + \text{Score}B_N) / (M + N)$

One Type A milestone is due in 4Q06:

Under Authentication/Authority finding: Establish a pilot project that will test 2-factor authentication and the new model for separation of privilege for core system administrators (due 9/30/2006).

Zero Type B milestones are due in 4Q06.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Score > 97%	4.3 – 3.5
Score at Least 90%	3.4 – 3.1
Score at Least 30% and Less than 90%	3.0 – 2.5

Measure 8.2.3: Establish a SANS top-twenty scanning program to track the scanning and remediation of SANS “Top Twenty” vulnerabilities. Measure the number of completed scans including remediation of discovered vulnerabilities.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Scanning and remediation of SANS top-twenty vulnerabilities on 425 machines of the active database (currently varying between 1,300 and 1,400 machines).	4.3 – 3.5

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Scanning and remediation of SANS top-twenty vulnerabilities on 300 machines of the active database (currently varying between 1,300 and 1,400 machines).	3.4 – 3.1
Scanning and remediation of SANS top-twenty vulnerabilities on 200 machines of the active database (currently varying between 1,300 and 1,400 machines).	3.0 – 2.5

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

Measure 8.3.1: Maintain an effective Security Program, demonstrated by:

- Ensuring non-U.S. citizens’ from sensitive countries who have badged access to JLab facilities, or perform work on CRADAs or Work for Others are identified, and are entered into the Foreign Access Central Tracking System.
- Current timely and approved security-related Admin Policy and Security Plans.
- Reportable and accountable “Other Nuclear Materials” are inventoried and reported with DOE approved procedures.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Maintain effective professional relations with threat reduction officials at DOE Headquarters, FBI Norfolk, and Newport News Police Department by participating in opportunities to share information in security, community policing, and incident management. Update JLab Security policy and plans to optimize and assure effective support with external support agencies.	4.3 – 3.5
Maintain an effective Security Program in accordance with all applicable requirements.	3.4 – 3.1
DOE TJSO is not informed of UFV&A T-6 country of origin foreign national’s unauthorized access to JLab non-public areas as soon as it becomes known to the Facility Security Officer.	3.0 – 2.5

Note: Jefferson Lab may be given additional credit (points) for exceptional performance in areas outside the adjectival rating resulting from the committee’s assessment (i.e., system enhancements, improvements in procedures practices, implementation of new program, etc.).

Measure 8.3.2: Demonstrate effective Security Program through internal, self-assessment and external reviews, surveys and inspections.

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Receive a Satisfactory rating in all evaluated areas during the independent Security Survey and receive at least one laudatory comment in the final report.	4.3 – 3.5

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Conduct and document a self-assessment of all applicable aspects of the Security Program and submit to TJSO 6-months prior to the next Security Survey.	3.4 – 3.1
Did not coordinate in advance with the DOE TJSO security contact an annual self-assessment and security survey to evaluate the Security Program on an annual basis.	3.0 – 2.5

Measure 8.3.3: Complete all corrective actions in accordance with approved Corrective Action Plans (CAPS).

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Complete all CAPS and agreed corrective actions 1-month ahead of the agreed completion date to the DOE TJSO, and achieve favorable results.	4.3 – 3.5
Complete all corrective actions associated w/formal CAPS on schedule.	3.4 – 3.1
Did not submit Corrective Action Plan or corrective actions to the DOE TJSO at the previously agreed date.	3.0 – 2.5

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

Measure 8.4.1: Effectively operate a sensitive information system for the Laboratory’s Business Sensitive and Personnel Sensitive information

Performance Levels	Measure Score
Documentation complete and reviewed; and favorable results on internal/external reviews, surveys and inspections that demonstrate the cyber security program is: effective, integrated into laboratory culture, and laboratory leadership’s commitment to strong cyber security performance.	4.3 – 3.5
Document the Laboratory’s current holdings and processes for sensitive information.	3.4 – 3.1
Documentation not fully complete.	3.0 – 2.5

Note: Jefferson Lab may be given additional credit (points) for exceptional performance in areas outside the adjectival rating resulting from the committee’s assessment (i.e., system enhancements, improvements in procedures practices, implementation of new program, etc.).

Table 8.1 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)					

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System			30%		
8.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for Cyber-Security			50%		
8.3 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Special Nuclear Materials, Classified Matter, and Property			10%		
8.4 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Classified and Sensitive Information			10%		
Performance Goal 8.0 Total					

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