



FY 2007

**Contractor Performance Evaluation and
Measurement Plan**

for

***Management and Operations of the
Stanford Linear Accelerator Center***



Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	3
I. DETERMINING THE CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE.....	3
II. PERFORMANCE GOALS, OBJECTIVES & PERFORMANCE MEASURES.....	7
BACKGROUND.....	7
PERFORMANCE GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES.....	7
GOAL 1.0 PROVIDE FOR EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE MISSION ACCOMPLISHMENT (QUALITY, PRODUCTIVITY, LEADERSHIP, & TIMELINESS OR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT).....	8
1.1 SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY RESULTS PROVIDE MEANINGFUL IMPACT ON THE FIELD.....	8
1.2 PROVIDE QUALITY LEADERSHIP IN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY.....	9
1.3 PROVIDE AND SUSTAIN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY OUTPUTS THAT ADVANCE PROGRAM OBJECTIVES AND GOALS.....	9
1.4 PROVIDE FOR EFFECTIVE DELIVERY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY.....	10
GOAL 2.0 PROVIDE FOR EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE DESIGN, FABRICATION, CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATIONS OF RESEARCH FACILITIES.....	12
2.1 PROVIDE EFFECTIVE FACILITY DESIGN(S) AS REQUIRED TO SUPPORT LABORATORY PROGRAMS (i.e.; activities leading to CD-2).....	12
2.2 PROVIDE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES.....	13
2.3 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE OPERATION OF FACILITIES.....	14
2.4 UTILIZATION OF FACILITY TO GROW AND SUPPORT LAB'S RESEARCH BASE AND EXTERNAL USER COMMUNITY.....	15
GOAL 3.0 PROVIDE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	18
3.1 PROVIDE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT STEWARDSHIP OF SCIENTIFIC CAPABILITIES AND PROGRAM VISION.....	18
3.2 PROVIDE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROJECT/PROGRAM PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT.....	19
3.3 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATIONS AND RESPONSIVENESS TO CUSTOMER NEEDS.....	20
Attachment I SLAC APPRAISAL WEIGHT SHEET.....	23
GOAL 4.0 PROVIDE SOUND AND COMPLETE LEADERSHIP AND STEWARDSHIP OF THE LABORATORY.....	24
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.....	24
4.2 PROVIDE FOR RESPONSIVE AND ACCOUNTABLE LEADERSHIP THROUGHOUT THE ORGANIZATION.....	25
4.3 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE CORPORATE OFFICE SUPPORT AS APPROPRIATE.....	26
GOAL 5.0 SUSTAIN EXCELLENCE AND ENHANCE EFFECTIVENESS OF INTEGRATED SAFETY, HEALTH, AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION.....	28
5.1 PROVIDE A WORK ENVIRONMENT THAT PROTECTS WORKERS AND THE ENVIRONMENT.....	28
5.2 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF INTEGRATED SAFETY, HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT.....	29
5.3 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT, MINIMIZATION, AND POLLUTION PREVENTION.....	30

GOAL 6.0 DELIVER EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE BUSINESS SYSTEMS AND RESOURCES THAT ENABLE THE SUCCESSFUL ACHIEVEMENT OF THE LABORATORY MISSION(S).....33

6.1 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIBLE FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM(S).....33

6.2 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE ACQUISITION AND PROPERTY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM(S).....35

6.3 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AND DIVERSITY PROGRAM.....35

6.4 PROVIDE EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS FOR INTERNAL AUDIT AND OVERSIGHT; QUALITY; INFORMATION MANAGEMENT; AND, OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES AS APPROPRIATE.....36

6.5 DEMONSTRATE EFFECTIVE TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY AND COMMERCIALIZATION OF INTELLECTUAL ASSETS..... 37

GOAL 7.0 SUSTAIN EXCELLENCE IN OPERATING, MAINTAINING, AND RENEWING THE FACILITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE PORTFOLIO TO MEET LABORATORY NEEDS..... 39

7.1 MANAGE FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE IN AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE MANNER THAT OPTIMIZES USAGE AND MINIMIZES LIFE CYCLE COSTS.....39

7.2 PROVIDE PLANNING FOR AND ACQUIRE THE FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIRED TO SUPPORT FUTURE LABORATORY PROGRAMS.....40

GOAL 8.0 SUSTAIN AND ENHANCE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF INTEGRATED SAFEGUARD AND SECURITY MANAGEMENT (ISSM) AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS.....43

8.1 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM.....43

8.2 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE SYSTEM FOR CYBER-SECURITY.....44

8.3 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE SYSTEM FOR THE PROTECTION OF SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIALS AND PROPERTY.....45

8.4 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE SYSTEM FOR THE PROTECTION OF CLASSIFIED AND SENSITIVE INFORMATION.....46

Attachment II FY06 APPENDIX B PROGRAM OFFICE SCORE FOR EACH GOAL (STANFORD LINEAR ACCELERATOR CENTER).....48

INTRODUCTION

This document, the Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan (PEMP) primarily serves DOE's Quality Assurance/Surveillance Plan (QASP) for the evaluation of *Stanford University* (hereafter referred to as "the Contractor") performance regarding the management and operations of the *Stanford Linear Accelerator Center* (hereafter referred to as "the Laboratory") for the evaluation period from October 1, 2006, through September 30, 2007. 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.

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

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

Section I provides information on how the performance rating (grade) for the Contractor will be determined. This contract does not have a fee.

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

I. DETERMINING THE CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE RATING

The FY 2007 Contractor performance grades will be determined based on the weighted sum of the individual scores earned for each of the objectives under each of the Goals described within this document for Science and Technology and for Management and Operations (see Table A). 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 of each Goal will then be utilized to determine the overall Contractor performance grade for Science and Technology and Management and Operations. Each Goal is composed of two or more weighted Objectives and each Objective has a

set of Performance Measures, and as applicable, Targets, which are identified to assist the reviewer in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting the Objective. However, these should be considered as guidelines that do not restrict the evaluator from considering other factors that contribute to the evaluation. Each of the Performance Measures identifies significant activities, requirements, and/or milestones important to the success of the corresponding Objective and shall be utilized as the primary means of determining the Contractor's success in meeting the Objective. Although the Performance Measures are the primary means for determining performance, other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources to include, but not limited to, the Contractor's self-evaluation report, operational awareness (daily oversight) activities; "For Cause" reviews (if any); other outside agency reviews (OIG, GAO, DCAA, etc.), and the annual 2-week review (if needed), may be utilized in determining the Contractor's overall success in meeting an Objective. The following describes the methodology for determining the Contractor's grade for each Goal:

Performance Evaluation Methodology:

The purpose of this section is to establish a methodology to develop scoring at the Objective Level. Each Objective within a Goal shall be assigned a numerical score, per Figure I-1 below, by the evaluating office. Each evaluation will measure the degree of effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in meeting the Objective and shall be based on the Contractor's success in meeting the set of Performance Measures identified for each Objective as well as other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources as identified above. The set of Performance Measures identified for each Objective represent the set of significant indicators that if fully met, collectively places performance for the Objective in the "B+" grade range. For some targets, it serves the evaluator to provide additional grading details (for example at the A, C+, and D level" and in those cases details have been included in the PEMP). However, these should be considered as guidelines that do not restrict the evaluation from considering other factors that contribute to the evaluation.

Letter Grade	Numeric Grade	Definition
A+	4.3 – 4.1	Significantly exceeds expectations of performance as set within performance measures identified for each Objective or within other areas within the purview of the Objective. Areas of notable performance have or have the potential to significantly improve the overall mission of the Laboratory. No specific deficiency noted within the purview of the overall Objective being evaluated.
A	4.0 – 3.8	Notably exceeds expectations of performance as set within performance measures identified for each Objective or within other areas within the purview of the Objective. Areas of notable performance either have or have the potential to improve the overall mission of the Laboratory. Minor deficiencies noted are more than offset by the positive performance within the purview of the overall Objective being evaluated and have no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
A-	3.7 – 3.5	Meets expectations of performance as set within performance measures identified for each Objective with some notable areas of increased performance identified. Deficiencies noted are offset by the positive performance within the purview of the overall Objective being evaluated with little or no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
B+	3.4 – 3.1	Meets expectations of performance as set by the performance measures identified for each Objective with no notable areas of increased or diminished performance identified. Deficiencies identified are offset by positive performance and have little to no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
B	3.0 – 2.8	Most expectations of performance as set by the performance measures identified for each Objective are met and/or other minor deficiencies are identified. Performance measures or other minor deficiencies

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

Figure I-1 Letter Grade and Numerical Score Definitions

Calculating Individual Goal Scores and Letter Grade:

Each Objective is assigned the earned numerical score by the evaluating office as stated above. The Goal rating is then computed by multiplying the numerical score by the weight of each Objective within a Goal. These values are then added together to develop an overall score for each Goal. 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, 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 2007.

The raw score (rounded to the nearest hundredth) from each calculation shall be carried through to the next stage of the calculation process. A standard rounding convention of x.44 and less rounds down to the nearest tenth (here, x.4), while x.45 and greater rounds up to the nearest tenth (here, x.50).

S&T Performance Goal	Numerical Score	Letter Grade	Weight	Weighted Score	Total Score
1.0 Mission Accomplishment			20%		
2.0 Construction and Operations of User Research Facilities and Equipment			60%		
3.0 Science and Technology Research Project/Program Management			20%		
Total Score					
M&O Performance Goal	Numerical Score	Letter Grade	Weight	Weighted Score	Total Score
4.0 Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory			20%		
5.0 Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection			25%		
6.0 Business Systems			20%		
7.0 Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio			15%		
8.0 Integrated Safeguards and Security Management and Emergency Management Systems			20%		
Total Score					

Table A. FY 2007 Contractor Evaluation Score Calculation

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

Table B. FY 2007 Contractor Letter Grade Scale/Numeric Score Scale

Adjustment to the Letter Grade:

The lack of performance objectives and measures in this plan do not diminish the need to comply with minimum contractual requirements. Although the performance-based Goals and their corresponding Objectives shall be the primary means utilized in determining the Contractor's performance grade, the Contracting Officer may unilaterally adjust the rating based on the Contractor's performance against all contract requirements as set forth in the prime contract. Data to support rating adjustments may be derived from other sources to include, but not limited to, operational awareness (daily oversight) activities; "For Cause" reviews (if any); other outside agency reviews (OIG, GAO, DCAA, etc.), and the annual 2-week review (if needed).

The final Contractor performance-based grade for each Goal 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 adjustments made from the otherwise earned rating based on Performance Goal achievements.

II. PERFORMANCE GOALS, OBJECTIVES & PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Background

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

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

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

Performance Goals, Objectives, and Performance Measures

The following sections describe the Performance Goals, their supporting Objectives, and associated performance measures for FY 2007.

1.0 Provide for Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment

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

The weight of this Goal is 20%.

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 DOE HQ Office of Science's (SC), 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 FY2007 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 2007.

- Office of Advance Scientific Computing Research (ASCR) 0%
- Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES) 60%
- Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER) 1%
- Office of High Energy Sciences (HEP) 39%
- Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS) 0%

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned by each of the offices identified above by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 1.2). 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 Program Offices 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 2007 as compared to the total BA for those remaining HQ Program Offices.

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 through 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.

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

1.2 Provide Quality Leadership in Science and Technology

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

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

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

1.3 Provide and sustain 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 experimental and theoretical research; and
- Demonstrated progress against peer reviewed recommendations, headquarters guidance, etc.

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

Note: The numerical grade for “Pass” is 4.3 and for “Fail” it is 0.7

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 through 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; and
- Efficiency and effectiveness in transmitting results to the community and responding to DOE or other customer guidance.

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

Note: The numerical grade for “Pass” is 4.3 and for “Fail” it is 0.7

Science Program Office ¹	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Research					
1.1 Impact			40%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			15%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
Overall ASCR Total					
Office of Basic Energy Sciences					
1.1 Impact			50%		
1.2 Leadership			20%		
1.3 Output			15%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
Overall BES Total					
Office of Biological and Environmental Research					
1.1 Impact			30%		
1.2 Leadership			20%		
1.3 Output			20%		
1.4 Delivery			30%		
Overall BER Total					
Office of High Energy Physics					
1.1 Impact			30%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			30%		
1.4 Delivery			10%		
Overall HEP Total					

¹ A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the SC Programs is provided within Attachment I to this plan.

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

Table 1.1-1.0 Program Office Performance Goal Score Development

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Research			0%		
Office of Basic Energy Sciences			60%		
Office of Biological and Environmental Research			1%		
Office of High Energy Physics			39%		
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists			0%		
Performance Goal 1.0 Total					

Table 1.2 Overall Performance Goal Score Development²

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

Table 1.3 – 1.0 Goal Final Letter Grade

² Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 1.2 are preliminary, based upon FY 2007 Budget Authority figures, and are provided for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY2007.

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

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

The weight of this Goal is 60%.

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

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the DOE HQ Office of Science's (SC), 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 2.1). Weightings for each Customer listed below are preliminary, based upon FY 2007 Budget Authority figures, and are provided here for informational purposes only. Final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2007.

- Office of Advance Scientific Computing Research (ASCR) 0%
- Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES) 94%
- Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER) 0%
- Office of High Energy Sciences (HEP) 6%
- Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS) 0%

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned by each of the offices identified above the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 2.2). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 2.3 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. Individual Program Office weightings for each of the Objectives identified below are provided within Table 2.1. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as viewed by DOE HQ Office of Science's (SC) Program Offices 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 2007 as compared to the total BA for those remaining HQ Program Offices.

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

Grade	Performance
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.

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 through progress reports, Lehman reviews, Program/Staff Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

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

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

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

2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured through progress reports, peer reviews, Program/Staff Office reviews/oversight, performance against benchmarks, Approved Financial Plan (AFP), 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.

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

2.4 Utilization of Facility 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 through 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.

Grade	Performance
A to A+	Reviews document how 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 programs is in place.
B+	Reviews state strong and effective team approach exists toward establishing 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 programs is in place.
B	Reviews state that lab is establishing an external and internal user community, but laboratory is still not capitalizing fully on existence of facility to grow internal capabilities and/or reach out to external users.
C	Reviews state that the laboratory has made satisfactory use of the facility, but has not demonstrated much innovation.
D	Few facility users, with none using it in novel ways; research base is very thin.
F	Laboratory does not know how to operate/use its own facility adequately.

Science Program Office ³	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Advance Scientific Research					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			0%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components			0%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			0%		
2.4 Effective Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base			0%		
Overall ASCR Total					
Office of Basic Energy Sciences					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			10%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components			60%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			20%		
2.4 Effective Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base			10%		
Overall BES Total					
Office of Biological and Environmental Research					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			0%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components			0%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			90%		
2.4 Effective Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base			10%		
Overall BER Total					
Office of High Energy 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			80%		
2.4 Effective Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base			0%		
Overall HEP Total					
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			0%		

³ A complete listing of S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the SC Programs is provided within Attachment I to this plan.

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			0%		
2.4 Effective Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base			0%		
Overall WDTs Total					

Table 2.1 – 2.0 Program Office Performance Goal Score Development

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Research			0%		
Office of Basic Energy Sciences			94%		
Office of Biological and Environmental Research			0%		
Office of High Energy Physics			6%		
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists			0%		
Overall Program Office Total					

Table 2.2 Overall Performance Goal Score Development⁴

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

Table 2.3 – 2.0 Goal Final Letter

⁴ Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 2.2 are preliminary, based upon FY 2006 Budget Authority figures, and are provided for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2007.

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 20%.

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

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science, Program Offices as identified below. The overall Goal score from each HQ Program Office and/or customer is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 3.1). Weightings for each Customer listed below are preliminary, based upon FY 2007 Budget Authority figures, and are provided here for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2007.

- Office of Advance Scientific Computing Research (ASCR) 0%
- Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES) 60%
- Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER) 1%
- Office of High Energy Sciences (HEP) 39%
- Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS) 0%

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned by each of the offices identified above by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 3.2 below). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 3.3 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. Individual Program Office weightings for each of the Objectives identified below are provided within Table 3.1. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as viewed by the Office of Science Program Offices 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 2007 as compared to the total BA for those remaining HQ Program Offices.

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.

Grade	Performance
A to A+	Providing strong programmatic vision that extends past the laboratory and for which the lab is a recognized leader within SC and in the broader research communities; development and maintenance of outstanding core competencies, including achieving superior scientific

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

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

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

- Quality of R&D and 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 lab management and/or include broadly-based input from within the laboratory; research plans exist for all program areas; plans are consistent with known budgets and well-aligned with DOE interests; work follows the plan.
B	Research plans exist for all program areas; work follows the plan.
C	Research plans exist for most program areas; work does not always follow the plan.
D	Plans do not exist for a significant fraction of the lab's program areas, or significant work is conducted outside those plans.
F	No planning is done.

3.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Communications and Responsiveness to Customer Needs

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured through 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 & 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 there are no surprises.
B ⁺	Good communication is valued by all staff throughout the contractor organization; responses to requests for information are thorough and are provided in a timely manner; the integrity of the information provided is never in doubt
B	Evidence of good communications is noted throughout the contractor organization and responses to requests for information provide the minimum requirements to meet HQ needs; with the exception of a few minor instances HQ is alerted to emerging issues.
C	Laboratory representatives recognize the value of sound communication with HQ to the mission of the laboratory. However, laboratory management fails to demonstrate that its employees are held accountable for ensuring effective communication and responsiveness; laboratory representatives do not take the initiative to alert HQ to emerging issues.
D	Communications from the laboratory are well-intentioned but generally incompetent; the laboratory management does not understand the importance of effective communication and responsiveness to the mission of the laboratory.
F	Contractor representatives are openly hostile and/or non-responsive – emails and phone calls are consistently ignored; communications typically do not address the request; information provided can be incorrect, inaccurate or fraudulent – information is not organized, is incomplete, or is fabricated.

Science Program Office⁵	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Research					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			30%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			30%		
Overall ASCR Total					
Office of Basic Energy Sciences					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			30%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			30%		
Overall BER Total					
Office of Biological and Environmental Research					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			20%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			30%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			50%		
Overall BES Total					
Office of High Energy Physics					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			20%		
Overall HEP Total					
Office of 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					

Table 3.1 – 3.0 Program Office Performance Goal Score Development

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Research			0%		
Office of Basic Energy Sciences			60%		
Office of Biological and Environmental Research			1%		
Office of High Energy Physics			39%		
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists			0%		
Overall Program Office Total					

Table 3.2 – Overall Performance Goal Score Development⁶

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

⁶ Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 3.1 and Table 3.2 are preliminary, based upon FY 2007 Budget Authority figures, and are provided for informational purposes only. 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 FY2007.

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

Table 3.3 – 3.0 Goal Final Letter Grade

Office of Science Program Office Goal & Objective Weightings

ATTACHMENT I

SLAC Appraisal Weight Sheet⁷

		ASCR	BES	BER	HEP	WDTS
		Weight	Weight	Weight	Weight	Weight
Goal #1 Mission Accomplishment						
	Goal's weight	80	20	10	40	65
1.1 Impact (significance)		40	50	30	30	25
1.2 Leadership (recognition of S&T accomplishments)		30	20	20	30	30
1.3 Output (productivity) (pass/fail)		15	15	20	30	30
1.4 Delivery (pass/fail)		15	15	30	10	15
Goal #2 Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operation of Facilities						
	Goal's weight	0	60	65	40	0
2.1 Design of Facility (the initiation phase and the definition phase, i.e. activities leading up to CD-2)		0	10	0	20	0
2.2 Construction of Facility/Fabrication of Components (execution phase, Post CD-2 to CD-4)		0	60	0	0	0
2.3 Operation of Facility		0	20	90	80	0
2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Lab's Research Base		0	10	10	0	0
Goal #3 Program Management						
	Goal's weight	20	20	25	20	35
3.1 Stewardship of Scientific Capabilities and Programmatic Vision		30	40	20	40	20
3.2 Program Planning and Management		40	30	30	40	40
3.3 Program Management-Communication & Responsiveness (to HQ)		30	30	50	20	40

⁷Final Goal and Objective weightings will be incorporated, as appropriate, once they are determined by each SC Program Office and provided to SSO.

4.0 Provide Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory

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

The weight of this Goal is 20%.

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 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 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.

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 advances 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. The weight of this Objective is 35%.

- 4.1.1 Effectiveness in meeting required milestones in the development and/or update of the Laboratory Vision and Strategic/Work Plan.
- 4.1.2 The Laboratory Vision provides a clear understanding of the distinctive characteristics of the Laboratory.
- 4.1.3 The Laboratory Business Plan provides all required data in a clear and concise manner and is completed within established guidelines and schedules.
- 4.1.4 Strategic partnerships are developed that demonstrate the Laboratory's leadership, support the leveraging of DOE resources, and support collaborative programs with other DOE laboratories and industry groups.

4.1.5 The Laboratory will achieve coherence with Office of Science communications goals.

Target 4.1.5.1 B+ = The Lab Communications Office will review its communications policies and procedures to assure they meet the Contracting Officer's procedures and guidelines for meeting requirements laid out in Contract Clause I.072, which implements DEAR 952.204-75 Public Affairs (Dec 2000).

Target 4.1.5.2 B+ = The Laboratory Communications Office, in concert with Lab and DOE management, will analyze its relationship with the surrounding community and determine any necessary steps to enhance that relationship.

Target 4.1.5.3 B+ = The Laboratory develops a Communications Plan in conjunction with the DOE Site Office within the first Quarter of the FY 2007 Performance Period which identifies actions to be completed during the remainder of the performance period.

Target 4.1.5.4 B+ = As stated in the DOE-approved Communications Plan, the Laboratory will meet all required communications actions and milestones identified for completion during the performance period. Should circumstances preclude meeting the milestones in a timely manner, the Laboratory will work with the Site Office to negotiate mutually agreed upon schedule revisions at least 30 days before the initial milestone date.

4.1.6 The Laboratory will provide and adhere to detailed roadmaps supporting the Laboratory's shift in primary sponsorship from HEP to BES.

Target 4.1.6.1 B+ = Facility Space Plan showing shift of available office space from HEP to BES in accordance with the program growth

Target 4.1.6.2 B+ = Detailed staff "migration plan" demonstrating the reduction in HEP resources commensurate to decommissioning of science installations, with transition of resources to BES activity where appropriate and to HEP where new projects are authorized

Target 4.1.6.3 B+ = Detailed bottoms up budget analysis reflecting forecast to actuals for BES and HEP, and reflecting the shift in spending driven by changes in program activity over the course of FY07.

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 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. The weight of this Objective is 35%.

4.2.1 Level of Leadership responding to Laboratory issues is commensurate with the issues' level of severity.

Target 4.2.1.1 B+ = Senior leadership at the laboratory is actively engaged in problem identification and development of mitigation strategies as well as capture of lessons learned. Positive reporting of results is provided to DOE at regular intervals and audit trails are maintained.

4.2.2 The Contractor's Leadership response to Laboratory issues was timely and immediate; mitigating actions were identified and implemented as appropriate.

Target 4.2.2.1 B+ = The SLAC Leadership team ensures the site office receives immediate notification regarding Safety and Security incidents of consequence, in no case later than two hours after the incident occurs. Updated status provided at regular intervals and a closeout status including root cause analysis is delivered.

4.2.3 Leadership maintains cognizance of corrective action plans and insures their timely closure.

Target 4.2.3.1 B+ = Leadership audits corrective action plan open and closed items regularly and ensures disposition is adequate, that the responses address the concerns accurately and completely with the appropriate level of quality. SLAC provides read-only access to the Site Office on request so that periodic quality audits can be performed.

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. The weight of this Objective is 30%.

4.3.1 Level of Corporate Leadership involvement in reviewing and establishing risk limits for Laboratory operations.

Target 4.3.1.1 B+ = The Contractor Leadership team provides routine oversight and engages in activities associated with Emergency Preparedness, Safety and Security. Risk Assessment requirements identified by DOE are completed on time.

4.3.2 Level of Corporate Leadership involvement in assessing management approaches and systems utilized at the Laboratory to ensure they are comprehensive and sufficient to address significant risks attendant to Laboratory operations and strategic mission accomplishment.

Target 4.3.2.1 B+ = Contractor management applies continuous improvement techniques in assessing the business and logistics systems and business processes utilized by the laboratory, pursuing tactical solutions and identifying strategic deliverables that will enhance the existing tools or provide upgrade paths to better meet the SC mission.

4.3.3 Level and comprehensiveness of Corporate Leadership assessments of the implementation of management systems and approaches to ensure they are working as intended and are effective in controlling the risks attendant to Laboratory operations and mission accomplishment within acceptable risks.

Target 4.3.3.1 B+ = Contractor provides lifecycle management oversight and does self assessments as required by DOE and the Laboratory Quality Assurance office guidance.

- 4.3.4 Level of Corporate Leadership involvement in development of corrective actions for identified issues or deficiencies at the Laboratory; involvement in reviewing progress in implementing corrective action plans; and the effectiveness of the corrections as implemented.

Target 4.3.4.1 B+ = The Laboratory Quality Assurance office or Chief Operating Officer (COO) oversee the development of corrective action plans that properly target areas in need of improvement and provide fixed timeframes for completion of corrective actions. Any schedule deviations are negotiated with the QA Lab Executive and the Lab COO and executive briefings are presented to the Site Office at periodic intervals so there are no surprises. Further, the COO or the designee will be accountable for the quality of execution pertaining to the corrective action(s).

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
4.0 Effectiveness and Efficiency of Contractor Leadership and Stewardship					
4.1 Provide a Distinctive Vision for the Laboratory and an Effective Plan for Accomplishment of the Vision to Include Strong Partnerships Required to Carry Out those Plans			35%		
4.2 Provide for Responsive and Accountable Leadership throughout the Organization			35%		
4.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Corporate Office Support as Appropriate			30%		
Performance Goal 4.0 Total					

Table 4.1- 4.0 Goal Performance Rating Development

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

Table 4.2 – 4.0 Goal Final Letter Grade

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

The Contractor sustains and enhances the effectiveness of integrated safety, health and environmental protection through a strong and well deployed system.

The weight of this Goal is 25%.

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 and achieving the Office of Science safety goals; implementing a robust and effective environmental protection program; effectively implementing the SLAC Integrated Safety and Environmental Management System down, through and across the SLAC organization and its contractors and sub-tier subcontractors; and providing effective and efficient waste management, minimization, and pollution prevention.

SLAC is expected to effectively and efficiently manage and operate the Laboratory through best-in-class management practices designed to enable research while assuring the protection and proper maintenance of DOE research and information assets, and protecting the health and safety of workers, the public and the environment. SLAC is expected to manage and operate the Laboratory so as to ensure compliance with all applicable federal, state, local laws and regulations, DOE directives, SLAC policies and requirements and other standards and requirements imposed by the contract. SLAC is expected to effectively implement safety and environmental management systems in all work processes. SLAC is also expected to conduct an ongoing and robust self-assessment program to ensure continuous improvement in safety and environmental management systems and work processes and to achieve and maintain excellence in safety and environmental performance. The safety and environmental performance of the Laboratory related to the mobilization and start of two major Office of Science construction projects at the site, Linac Coherent Light Source (LCLS) and Safety & Operational Reliability Improvements (S&ORI), will be of paramount importance through out all of FY07. SLAC will continue to maintain a goal of zero lost time injuries on construction sites, which will have a major bearing on the Laboratory's performance evaluation.

The performance goal, objectives, and measures are fundamentally linked to the seven Guiding Principles and five Core Functions of Integrated Safety Management System (ISMS) and the specific DOE/Stanford University contract provisions that require SLAC to integrate environment, safety and health into work planning and execution at all levels.

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 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 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 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.

5.1 Provide a Work Environment that Protects Worker Safety, Health and the Environment

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

- The success in meeting ES&H goals.

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. For the purposes of Level 3 measures 5.1 and 5.1b, "Meeting expectations" is equivalent to meeting the quantitative goals specified by the Office of Science for TRC and DART rates in FY07. The weight of this Objective is 30%.

5.1.1 The Contractor's progress in meeting the Office of Science FY07 safety goal for days away, restricted or transferred (DART) case rate.

Target 5.1.1.1 B+ = The DART rate for FY07 is equal to the SC safety goal of 0.25 and SLAC has no Type A or Type B accidents.

5.1.2 The Contractor's progress in meeting the Office of Science FY07 safety goal for total reportable case (TRC) rate.

Target 5.1.2.1 B+ = The TRC rate for FY07 is equal to the SC safety goal of 0.65 and SLAC has no Type A or B accidents.

5.1.3 The number of reportable occurrences of release(s) to the environment

Target 5.1.3.1 B+ = There are no reportable occurrences of releases) to the environment.

5.1.4 The number of instances of uncontrolled spread of radioactive contamination meeting the criteria of DOE M 231.1-2

Target 5.1.4.1 B+ = There are no instances of uncontrolled spread of radioactive contamination per DOE M 232.1-1A.

5.1.5 Timely identification of ES&H non-compliances and implementation of corrective actions.

Target 5.1.5.1 B+ = There are no overdue corrective action issues and non-compliances are reported timely per DOE reporting criteria.

5.1.6 Timely corrective action follow-up and closure tracking mechanisms. This includes timely notification to the DOE/SSO on safety ES&H corrective actions.

Target 5.1.6.1 B+ = Timely corrective action follow-up and closure for safety ES&H items

5.1.7 The Contractor shall conduct a comprehensive review of their Industrial Hygiene (IH) Program by the third quarter of FY07

Target 5.1.7.1 B+ = IH self-assessment program review conducted by 3rd quarter of FY07.

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 commitment of leadership to effective implementation of Integrated Safety Management and strong ES&H performance is appropriately demonstrated;
- The maintenance and appropriate utilization of hazard identification, prevention, and control processes/activities; and
- The identification of hazards and appropriate hazard controls is effectively implemented during the work planning process and prior to formal authorization of work activities.
- Staff, line managers, and contractors have received appropriate safety training and possess demonstrated skills, knowledge, and abilities prior to commencement of work activities.

- Hazards and ES&H non-compliances area identified, tracked in a consolidated site-wide database and corrected in a timely manner.
- A lessons learned program plan has been developed and approved, with initial implementation in the preconstruction and construction areas.

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. The weight of this Objective is 50%.

- 5.2.1 Safety and environmental training and other competence requirements for staff, line managers, and SLAC contractors are fully identified, implemented, and formally tracked in a timely manner.

Target 5.2.1.1 B+ = Mandatory and supervisor-required ES&H training requirements are completed to a level of 93% per the SLAC Training Database Metrics Reporting System.

- 5.2.2 Safety management systems are developed and implemented that enhance the process for work planning, identifying hazards, and ensuring that controls and formal written procedures are in place prior to authorizing and conducting work, including construction activities.

Target 5.2.2.1 B+ = In FY07, 95% of the corrective actions from ISM reviews and DOE assessments requiring SSO approval of completion dates that are tracked in either the SLAC Corrective Action Tracking System (CATS) database or the Office of Health, Safety and Security (HSS) CATS database are completed by the SSO approved completion dates, or have a revised completion date approved by SSO.

- 5.2.3 Line management is ensuring that work is formally authorized by line management and work activities are adequately and routinely monitored for compliance with ES&H requirements.

Target 5.2.3.1 B+ = There are no documented incidents of unauthorized work during FY07.

- 5.2.4 Staff and line managers fully understand and implement the seven Guiding Principles and five Core Functions of ISMS and the ISO 14001 elements of EMS.

Target 5.2.4.1 B+ = ISMS reviews performed in FY07 do not identify significant concerns or findings related to staff and line management understanding of ISMS and the ISO 14001 elements of EMS.

- 5.2.5 Contractor shall provide ES&H trending analysis as it relates to injuries, illness, and safety events in an effort to provide a causal analysis and proactive identification of any systemic safety or programmatic gaps or weaknesses.

Target 5.2.5.1 B+ = Quarterly report on trending is provided as related to safety occurrences.

- 5.2.6 Contractor shall conduct a comprehensive review of their lessons learned program, based on internal data and external data across the DOE Office of Science (SC) Complex. DOE Corporate Lessons Learned Program may be used as a guide (Ref. DOE-STD-7501-99, latest revision). The lessons learned program review shall include a comprehensive focus in the area of construction safety, including preconstruction planning.

Target 5.2.6.1 B+ = Comprehensive self-assessment program review of lessons learned program conducted and results submitted to DOE/SSO.

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

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

- Significant progress on implementation of SLAC Chemical Management Services (CMS) project in reducing chemical inventories and improving ES&H data management.
- Increased efficiency and effectiveness of efforts to minimize the generation of sanitary and hazardous waste and low-level radioactive waste and enhance site-wide recycling.
- Improvements in implementation and performance of SLAC Environmental Management System (e.g., pollution prevention opportunity assessments, EMS training)

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. The weight of this Objective is 20%.

5.3.1 Significant increase in post-consumer recycling of non-hazardous waste.

Target 5.3.1.1 B+ = SLAC recycles 56% of non-hazardous waste.

5.3.2 Success in minimizing waste generation (low-level, hazardous)

Target 5.3.2.1 B+ = Based on FY06 baseline, SLAC evaluates waste reduction opportunities for low-level waste generation from routine operations and provides recommendations to DOE.

Target 5.3.2.2 B+ = SLAC develops a radioactive waste generator training course which emphasizes reduction, reuse, and recycling.

Training course content and presentation format is completed and approved by SLAC by May 1, 2007.

Training course draft implementation plan is completed and submitted to DOE/SSO by May 1, 2007.

Training course pilot is completed and comments received by August 1, 2007.

Course revisions and final implementation plan are completed and submitted to DOE/SSO by September 1, 2007.

Target 5.3.2.3 B+ = SLAC reduces by 72% (by weight) the generation of hazardous waste from routine operations by the end of FY07 relative to the 1993 baseline.

5.3.3 Significant reduction is achieved on-site toxic chemical inventories and marked improvements demonstrated in life cycle tracking and chemical management through implementation of the recently implemented SLAC Chemical Management Services (CMS) project.

Target 5.3.3.1 B+ = SLAC completes an assessment of the implementation and performance of the recently implemented SLAC Chemical Management Services (CMS) project. The assessment must demonstrate progress on reducing on-site chemical inventories and costs and implementation of improvements in ES&H data management (e.g., MSDS management, chemical mapping, life cycle tracking), ES&H reporting and other chemical risk reduction activities in FY07.

5.3.4 Establishment of pollution prevention (P2) and environmental stewardship objectives and measurable targets in site Environmental Management System (e.g., P2 assessments, waste reduction, environmentally preferable purchasing).

Target 5.3.4.1 B+ = SLAC reviews and updates in FY07 the objectives and measurable targets for pollution prevention and environmental stewardship in the site EMS.

5.3.5 Establish operational assessments (OAs) such as pollution prevention opportunity assessments (PPOAs) as measurable targets in the site EMS.

Target 5.3.5.1 B+ = SLAC completes five (5) PPOAs in FY07. The PPOAs must include at least one PPOA in each of the five (5) pollution prevention and sustainable stewardship goals identified in Attachment 3 of DOE Order 450.1, Chg. 2, "Environmental Protection Program." Alternatively, and with adequate justification, SLAC may propose for prior DOE/SSO approval, five (5) PPOAs covering fewer than the five (5) goals identified in Attachment 3 of DOE O 450.1, Chg. 2.

5.3.6 Environmental Management System (EMS) Awareness training is incorporated as mandatory training into the SLAC Training Assessment (STA).

Target 5.3.6.1 B+ = SLAC provides report to DOE/SSO on percentage completion of EMS Awareness Training.

5.3.7 SLAC will develop an inventory management system for all scrap metals on-site that are currently subject to the DOE suspension on the recycling of scrap metals from radiological areas. The inventory report will be submitted to the SSO by the end of the 3rd quarter of FY07 and specifically identify storage locations and quantities of scrap metals subject to the DOE suspension.

Target 5.3.7.1 B+ = The scrap metal inventory is developed and submitted to DOE/SSO by the end of the 3rd quarter of FY07.

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			30%		
5.2 Provide Efficient and Effective Implementation of Integrated Safety, Health and Environment Management			50%		
5.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Waste Management, Minimization, and Pollution Prevention			20%		
Performance Goal 5.0 Total					

Table 5.1 – 5.0 Goal Performance Rating Development

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

Table 5.2 – 5.0 Goal Final Letter Grade

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

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

The weight of this Goal is 20%.

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 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. The target identified for each performance measure, if achieved, will receive a rating of B+ (Meets Expectations). 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 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.

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

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. The weight of this Objective is 20%.

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

- SLAC financial management systems' effectiveness as validated by internal and external audits and reviews;
- SLAC's continual improvement of their financial management system through self-assessments;
- SLAC's financial management system process performance expectations for timely, accurate, and complete financial reporting;
- SLAC's effective budget management and execution; and
- SLAC's effective management of direct and indirect costs

6.1.1 The effectiveness of the Financial Management System as validated by internal and external audits and reviews.

Demonstration of an effective financial management system through a reliance on the work of others requires verifiable documentation from external reviews by the Inspector General (IG), Government Accountability Office (GAO), or other external audit/review organization. The review results must state that the Laboratory's financial management system has been evaluated, and has received a positive result, with no notable areas of diminished performance identified.

Target 6.1.1.1 B+ = Results of Internal and External Audits. To meet the target level for the results from performance audits conducted on SLAC's implementation of OMB Circular A-123, by organizations such as Stanford University (SU) Internal Audit Department (SIAD), DOE, DOE Inspector General (IG), the

Government Accountability Office (GAO), and other external organizations, the outcomes must demonstrate adequate SLAC control over unallowable costs.

- 6.1.2 Financial Management System Continual Improvements. The continual improvement of the Laboratory's Financial Management System is based on audit and review results; the evaluation of A-123 internal controls at the Entity, Process, and the Transaction Levels; self-assessments/internal performance measures including appropriate staff training, and other information.

Target 6.1.2.1 B+ = Financial System Self-Assessment. Semi-Annually, the SLAC CFO reports on improvements to SLAC's financial system resulting from self assessment process or recommendations from internal and external reviewers. This would also include actions taken to address issues in the management system identified during normal operations.

- 6.1.3 Financial Management System Performance Expectations. This measure addresses the execution of the fiscal year budget and other financial reporting requirements for programs funded through the Department. This includes ensuring costs and commitments are properly reported and within DOE-authorized funding levels; the proper management of uncosted balances; and that the Work-For-Others (WFO) and Reimbursable WFO costs are managed within DOE requirements and guidelines.

Target 6.1.3.1 B+ = Financial Management System Process Expectations. Examples of Financial Management System processes meeting expectations:

- Timely transmittal of month-end and year-end closings.
- Timely A-123 milestone completions and output product/results.
- Timely submission of all DOE required financial reports.

- 6.1.4 Effective Budget Management and Execution. The DOE Chief Financial Officer (CFO) provides annual guidance for Budget Formulation for all programs, including formats and submission schedules. Some DOE programs may issue separate, additional guidance. The Laboratory will ensure quality budget submissions by accurate formulation, effective budget execution, and timely submission of required documents. The annual budget validation must report no significant findings.

Target 6.1.4.1 B+ = Budget Submissions: Timeliness, Format and Validation.

The Laboratory will ensure that their supportable budget submissions/Field Work Proposals (FWPs) all follow the prescribed DOE format, include all data requested, incorporated recommendations from DOE budget validation, and are submitted within prescribed DOE, Integrated Support Center (ISC), and Site Office due dates. In addition, the subsequent annual budget validation must report no significant findings.

- 6.1.5 Effective management of costs (direct and indirect). The success of the Contractor's management and reporting of Indirect costs will be measured by an evaluation of the Contractor's Direct-to-Indirect Ratio costs (1) as measured by Direct/Indirect cost calculations; and (2) the presentation of a semi-annual analysis to the site office.

Target 6.1.5.1 B+ = Direct/Indirect Cost Reporting. SLAC must provide, in a semi-annual presentation to the Site Office, verifiable documentation of the Indirect cost calculations; evidence that the Indirect cost and rate data has been collected and applied in accordance with any recommendations of the IG, GAO, DOE, or other independent review organization, etc.; and that the Indirect Rate data and performance has been reviewed and evaluated by SLAC's Senior Assessment Team. This semi-annual presentation to the Site Office would occur at the Mid-Year Briefing and by August 30th of each year. This presentation should include, at a minimum, the following data:

- A generation of funding sources and cost projections.
- An analysis of the composition of indirect charges: from internal organization source charges, summarized up to the total laboratory indirect percentage number.
- Related variance analyses.

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

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

- The continued certification of the procurement and property systems.
- Demonstration of efficient and effective acquisition and property management system(s) support.
- The effectiveness of the acquisition and property management system(s) as validated by internal and external audits and reviews.
- The continued improvement of acquisition and property management system(s) through the use of the results of audits, review, corrective action plans, and other information.
- The degree of knowledge and appropriate utilization of established system processes/procedures by management and staff.

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. The weight of this Objective is 40%.

- 6.2.1 Demonstrate effective acquisition and property management systems through external reviews, surveys, and inspection as necessary or required.
- 6.2.2 Perform Procurement Balanced Scorecard evaluation in accordance with the FY2007 Balanced Scorecard Plan and successfully meet the at least 90% of the BSC targets.
- 6.2.3 Perform Property Balanced Scorecard evaluation in accordance with the FY 2007 Balanced Scorecard Plan and successfully meet at least 90% of the BSC targets.

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

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

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

The overall performance of the following set of performance measures shall be utilized as the primary measure of the Contractor's success in meeting this Objective and for determining the numerical score awarded. The evaluation of the 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. The weight of this Objective is 20%.

- 6.3.1 Effectiveness of HR systems/processes/services as validated through the use of a customer service survey.

Target 6.3.1.1 B+ = Overall customer feedback is between 2 and 2.5 on a five-point scale, or Action plans are implemented and measurable progress/action taken.

The customer survey tool used by SLAC's Human Resources Department measures feedback on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being outstanding and 5 the unsatisfactory level. A score of between 2 and 2.5 was identified as appropriate for the B+ level because a score of less than 2 (1-1.9) would be at the A level.

6.3.2 Continuous improvement of HR systems/processes through annual self assessment.

Target 6.3.2.1 B+ = One or two major systems/process are reviewed annually. Analysis against baseline data demonstrates clear improvement, or System/Process is streamlined, enhanced or eliminated.

6.3.3 Success in attraction/retention of highly qualified employees.

Target 6.3.3.1 B+ = In-hire compensation package assures 85% acceptance rate. (2) SLAC turnover (i.e., departure of any benefits eligible employee from SLAC for any reason) is lower than Stanford University by between 15% and 24%. (3) SLAC turnover rate for PhD physicists and engineers is between 5% and 9%.

6.3.4 Increase diversity in the workforce through participation of minorities and women in feeder programs. Such feeder programs would serve students at various educational levels including post-high school (Youth Opportunity Program), two year training institutions (Work Study Program), four year colleges (Science Internship Program), and graduate level.(Graduate Engineering for Minorities).

Target 6.3.4.1 B+ = Increase in diversity within each of the feeder programs and an increase in participation by technical employees in hosting minorities and female students in their respective departments.

6.3.5 Removed in its entirety

Target 6.3.5.1 Removed in its entirety

6.4 Provide Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Management Systems for Internal Audit and Oversight; Quality; Information Management

Determination of the (Stanford University) provision of an efficient, effective, and responsive financial management system (s) for internal controls will be based upon SLAC's implementation of the DOE directions, guidelines, and recommendations for OMB Circular A-123; and the reliance on the work of others, particularly the Stanford University Audit Department (SIAD), to accomplish overall assessments of the design and operation of internal controls in the determination of the financial management system(s) effectiveness for financial reporting. The weight of this objective is 20%.

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

- The effectiveness of SLAC's internal controls and audit oversight management systems as validated by internal control/audit findings, implemented recommendations, continual improvement assessments, and third party oversight.

6.4.1 Internal Control and Audit Findings. SLAC will provide for effective financial internal controls; develop and implement a tracking system to effectively monitor audit findings and/or recommendations to ensure timely and effective resolution or appropriate corrective action is accomplished; and/or any other subsequent follow-up on external and internal review group findings. Any findings' corrective actions are prioritized to achieve timely resolution.

Target 6.4.1.1 B+ = Third Party Review of Internal Controls and Oversight. SLAC will evaluate the results, based on a Third Party review of internal controls and oversight, and develop improvements where appropriate while monitoring performance. This target will measure progress toward implementation of actions.

6.4.2 Assessment of Continual Improvement. SLAC will demonstrate efficient and effective business management systems resulting from audit/assessment/benchmarking that drives continual improvement as appropriate.

Target 6.4.2.1 B+ = Comparison of IT Business System Expenditure. SLAC will conduct a comparison study of SLAC's IT Business Systems annual expenditure and average historical investment over a four year period with at least one other M&O contractor organization. This study will be given to the Site Office by September 30th of each year, and will compare and evaluate the overall level of financial system expenditures between different M&O Contractors at national laboratories. The results should assist in the assessment / benchmarking determination of the effectiveness of SLAC's current IT Business System investment and expenditures. This assessment should drive the opportunity and direction for SLAC's continual improvement in IT Business Systems.

6.5 Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Technology and Commercialization of Intellectual Assets

The weight of this Objective is 0% as technology transfer is not a large enough activity at SLAC to be weighted.

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)			20%		
6.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition and Property Management System(s)			40%		
6.3 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Human Resources Management System			20%		
6.4 Provide Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Management Systems for Internal Audit and Oversight; Quality; Information Management; and Other Administrative Support Services as Appropriate			20%		
6.5 Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Technology and Commercialization of Intellectual Assets			0%		
Performance Goal 6.0 Total					

Table 6.1 – 6.0 Goal Performance Rating Development

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

Table 6.2 – 6.0 Goal Final Letter Grade

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

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

The weight of this Goal is 15%.

The sustained excellence in operating, maintaining, and renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to meet Laboratory needs 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 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. DOE and SLAC will identify and agree to annual milestones/activities for performance measures by November 2007. Higher or lower ratings will be determined as a percentage above or below the Meets Expectations rating level. 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 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.

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

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

- The management of real property assets to maintain effective operational safety, worker health, environmental protection and compliance, property preservation, and cost effectiveness while meeting program missions, through effective facility utilization, maintenance and budget execution; and
- The maintenance and renewal of building systems, structures and components associated with the Laboratory's facility and land assets.
- The management of energy use and conservation practices.
- The contractor makes progress toward completing the environment restoration project through strong project management and an effective closure strategy.

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. The weight of this Objective is 50%.

7.1.1 Achieve the Office of Science Maintenance Investment Index (MII) goal of 2.0% for non-waiver assets.

Target 7.1.1.1 B+ = SLAC achieves the Office of Science MII goal of 2.0% in FY07.

7.1.2 Effective reduction of Deferred Maintenance (DM).

Target 7.1.2.1 B+ = SLAC meets DM reduction goal as stated in the Ten Year Site Plan for FY07.

7.1.3 Efficient completion of scheduled preventive maintenance activities for conventional facilities.

Target 7.1.3.1 B+ = SLAC completes 100% of planned preventive maintenance within 30 days.

Target 7.1.3.2 B+ = Meets agreed-on milestones on the FY07 Computerized Maintenance Management System (CMMS) plan.

7.1.4 Effective execution of annual goals within the Energy Performance Management Agreement.

Target 7.1.4.1 B+ = SLAC accomplishes 100% of annual goals identified and agreed to by DOE and SLAC.

7.1.5 Provide Efficient, and Effective Implementation of Project Management (Relates to 2.1).

Target 7.1.5.1 B+ = SLAC successfully implemented DOE O 413.3A, Program & Project Management for the Acquisition of Capital Assets. The overall performance of the following set of performance measures shall be utilized by evaluator as the primary measure of the Contractor's success in meeting this measure.

- SLAC has developed a Performance Measurement Baseline.
- SLAC has implemented and self-certified their Performance Management System that meets ANSI/EIA-748-A-1998.
- SLAC is maintaining a resource loaded critical path and a project master schedule.
- SLAC has implemented a risk management plan.
- SLAC has implemented a project management plan.

The evaluation of this measure may also consider other tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones not otherwise identified above but that provide evidence to the effectiveness/performance of the Contractor in meeting this measure.

7.1.6 Make Substantial Progress in Completing the Project (Relates to 2.2).

Target 7.1.6.1 B+ = Reasonable progress is being made in relations to the amount of funding that is provided to SLAC. The overall performance of the following set of performance measures shall be utilized by evaluator as the primary measure of the Contractor's success in meeting this measure.

- The completion of designs for treatment systems at the Plating Shop and Former Solvent Underground Storage Tank areas.
- Construction of the FSUST Dual Phase Extraction (DPE) system is at least 80% complete and the construction of the Plating Shop DPE has commenced.
- Contaminated soil from seven Investigation/Misc. Soil Areas (EBR Table 4-3) has been removed, disposed, and all confirmation sampling completed.
- Issue the Feasibility Study for the Groundwater VOC Operable Unit.
- Obtain and present sufficient data to allow the Core Team to make decisions on whether Investigation Areas and Misc. Soil Sites are either No Further Action or require Removal or Remedial Action.

The evaluation of this measure may also consider other tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones not otherwise identified above but that provide evidence to the effectiveness/performance of the Contractor in meeting this measure.

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

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

- Integration and alignment of the Ten Year Site Plan to the Laboratory's comprehensive strategic plan;

- The facility planning, forecasting, and acquisition for effective translation of business needs into comprehensive and integrated facility site plans;
- The effectiveness in producing quality site and facility planning documents as required;
- The involvement of relevant stakeholders in all appropriate aspects of facility planning and preparation of required documentation;
- Overall responsiveness to customer mission needs; and
- Efficiency in meeting cost and schedule performance indices for facility construction projects.

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. The weight of this Objective is 50%.

7.2.1 Effective integrated planning for the acquisition, utilization, maintenance, infrastructure recapitalization and disposition of real property.

Target 7.2.1.1 B+ = SLAC completes 100% of integrated planning milestones identified and agreed to by DOE and SLAC in the areas of deferred maintenance, maintenance plan, FIMS and Rehab and Improvement Cost. Prior year carryover shall be 100% costed in the following year. The Infrastructure Recapitalization program consist of small capital projects and may include:

- Strategic Laboratory Projects (SLI)
- General Planned Projects (GPP)
- Energy Efficiency projects
- Other small capitalized projects

7.2.2 Effective execution of the Safety and Operational Reliability Improvement (SORI) project.

Target 7.2.2.1 B+ = SLAC executes the SORI project within 10% of target for cost at Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) level 2 and no level II milestone is more than 1 month overdue as defined in the SORI Project Execution Plan (PEP). The cost variance will be 10% or less of the baseline value established in the PEP.

7.2.3 Effective execution of facility and infrastructure projects greater than \$250K.

Target 7.2.3.1 B+ = SLAC executes effective facility and infrastructure projects (General Plant Project and Operating projects) by completing projects within 10% of target for cost and 3 months of scheduled completion. All projects >\$250K will be completed within 3 years of start date. The cost performance rating is established by calculating the cost performance index at completion for each project. The cost variance for each project will be multiplied by a weighted factor based on their Total Project Cost (TPC) all projects > \$250K completed within the Fiscal Year (FY).

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			50%		

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
Cycle Costs					
7.2 Provide Planning for and Acquire the Facilities and Infrastructure Required to support Future Laboratory Programs			50%		
Performance Goal 7.0 Total					

Table 7.1 – 7.0 Goal Performance Rating Development

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

Table 7.2 – 7.0 Goal Final Letter Grade

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

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

The weight of this Goal is 20%.

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 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 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 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 the 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 is then compared to Table 8.2 to determine the overall Goal letter grade.

8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System

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

- The Contractor's success in meeting Emergency Management goals and expectations;
- The commitment of leadership to a strong Emergency Management performance is appropriately demonstrated; and
- The maintenance and appropriate utilization of Emergency Management procedures and processes are effectively demonstrated.
- A SLAC Site Emergency Response Plan is developed (in addition to Chapter 37 in the ES&H Manual), due to the size and complexity of the lab, and it's proximity to major earthquake faults.

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. The weight of this objective is 30%.

8.1.1 Emergency Management events are reported and mitigated as necessary. Events are documented, corrective action measures are implemented, and a "Lessons-learned" record is generated.

Target 8.1.1.1 B+ = no unreported emergency event in FY07.

8.1.2 Contractor will provide for an internal assessment of their emergency management response plans, and provide a level of adequacy including a gap analysis with corrective actions for any findings. Results of reviews and surveys demonstrate that emergency management systems are effective.

Target 8.1.2.1 B+ = Internal assessment of SLAC Emergency Management Response plans and program conducted by 3rd Quarter of FY07.

8.1.3 Employee and Management awareness of their Emergency Management responsibilities. Develop Emergency Response plans sufficient to show emergency preparedness. Provide training for employee during emergency situations, including building evacuations. Establish points of contact (POCs) for handling site emergencies, including emergency communication services. A formal SLAC Site Emergency Plan should be developed, and submitted to the DOE/SSO for review, compliant with program elements outlined in the DOE Emergency Management Guide, DOE G 151.1-1. Elements of the plan should address:

1. SLAC Emergency Plan
2. Emergency response procedures
3. Sample facility emergency action plans
4. Emergency public information plan/procedures
5. Plan for public education on emergency plan and protective actions
6. Emergency Readiness Assurance Plan (latest)
7. Site map and list of facilities
8. MOUs and MOAs
9. ERO Training program description
10. Process/procedure for conducting hazards surveys/hazards assessments
11. Hazards screening process
12. Record of program exemptions
13. Emergency response organization roster
14. Latest SLAC emergency exercise package and report
15. Emergency drill schedule
16. Emergency Action Level and protective action procedures
17. Preventive maintenance plan for emergency response equipment and emergency communications equipment
18. Offsite notification procedure/form
19. Description of consequence assessment methods
20. Site Medical Plan (emergency response portion)

Target 8.1.3.1 B+ = Development and approval by DOE/SSO of SLAC Site Emergency Response Plan by 3rd Quarter of FY07.

8.1.4 Contractor will develop a Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) during a major emergency.

Target 8.1.4.1 B+ = Contractor development and approval of a COOP for SLAC during a major emergency by 3rd Quarter of FY07.

8.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for Cyber-Security

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

- The Contractor's success in meeting Cyber-Security goals and expectations.
- The commitment of leadership to a strong Cyber-Security performance is appropriately demonstrated through security plans, audits, and reporting/follow-up on all Cyber-Security incidents.
- The maintenance and appropriate utilization of Cyber-Security risk identification, prevention, and control processes/activities. One aspect of this area would involve network firewall implementation and audit reviews.

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, accomplishment, and/or milestones not otherwise identified below but that provide evidence to the effectiveness/performance of the Contractor in meeting this Objective. The weight of this objective is 40%.

8.2.1 Cyber-Security Incidents are reported and mitigated immediately.

Target 8.2.1.1 B+ = Mitigation measures are initiated as soon as the computer security team determines an incident has occurred, and reporting occurs within 24 hrs.

8.2.2 Performance of network vulnerability scans of the SLAC network systems are performed on a monthly basis, or after significant system upgrades/changes. Reports from network system scans shall be submitted on a quarterly basis to the DOE/SSO.

Target 8.2.2.1 B+ = Network scans are performed on a monthly basis and quarterly report are delivered to DOE/SSO.

8.2.3 In support of demonstrating an effective Cyber-Security system, SLAC will provide DOE/SSO with a copy of the risk assessment and the current plans for action, study or inaction done in accordance with NIST SP 800-37.

Target 8.2.3.1 B+ = A copy will be provided each time the approval of cited report is renewed by SLAC's Associated Directors Committee on Computing (ADCC).

8.2.4 SLAC maintains all the Plan Of Action and Milestones (POA&M) on schedule.

Target 8.2.4.1 B+ = POA&M schedule is met.

8.2.5 SLAC maintains and implements a cyber security program that informs all users of their Cyber-Security responsibilities. The program will require that each individual user provide written acknowledgement of their individual cyber-security responsibilities.

Target 8.2.5.1 B+ = A sample copy of the cyber-security responsibility state is provided to DOE/SSO on an annual basis or when changes to this document made.

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

There is very minimal handling of nuclear material at SLAC. In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator shall consider the following:

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

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. The weight of this objective is 10%.

8.3.1 Safeguard events are reported and mitigated as necessary. Plans are developed for security of property, and inventory loss control (e.g. property tags, and property management of assets). SLAC assets reside in a database.

Target 8.3.1.1 B+ = Safeguard events are reported within 24 hours to DOE/SSO.

8.3.2 External reviews, surveys, or inspections will be conducted once per year, unless there is a significant event requiring follow-up and corrective action, which may result in additional reviews being required.

Target 8.3.2.1 B+ = All correction actions resulting from external reviews, surveys, or inspections will be completed in accordance with agreed to schedule.

8.3.3 Ability to complete corrective actions for reviews in accordance with approved Corrective Action Plans.

Target 8.3.3.1 B+ = Corrective actions are completed without the need for follow-up actions.

8.3.4 Employee and Management awareness of their Safeguards responsibilities – responsibilities are defined, and appropriate training commensurate with the level of responsibility has been completed.

Target 8.3.4.1 B+ = DOE/SSO will review training material in order to verify that material meets objective.

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

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

- The Contractor's success in meeting goals and expectations for the protection of sensitive information.
- The identification, marking and protection of sensitive information (e.g., Official Use Only) that has the potential to damage governmental, commercial, or private interests if inappropriately disseminated.
- The Contractor performs a formal assessment of safeguards and security systems for the protection of Personally Identifiable Information (PII).

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. The weight of this objective is 20%.

8.4.1 The commitment of leadership to strong protection of sensitive information is appropriately demonstrated.

Target 8.4.1.1 B+ = Events involving protection of sensitive information are reported and mitigated as necessary.

8.4.2 Demonstrate an effective security system for the protection of sensitive information through internal and external reviews, surveys and inspections.

Target 8.4.2.1 B+ = Contractor will perform a formal assessment with corrective actions, as necessary, of security systems for the protection of Personally Identifiable Information (PII) by the end of 2nd quarter of FY07.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
8.0 Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security					

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
Management (ISSM)					
8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System			30%		
8.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for Cyber-Security			40%		
8.3 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Special Nuclear Materials, and SLAC Property			10%		
8.4 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Sensitive Information			20%		
Performance Goal 8.0 Total					

Table 8.1 – 8.0 Goal Performance Rating Development

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	1.0-08	0.7-0
Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F

Table 8.2 – 8.0 Goal Final Letter Grade

**FY 2007 Appendix B - Program Office Score for each Goal
 Stanford Linear Accelerator Center**

Attachment II

	ASCR		BES		BER		HEP		WDTS	
	Program Office Score	Objective Weight	Program Office Score	Objective Weight	Program Office Score	Objective Weight	Program Office Score	Objective Weight	Program Office Score	Objective Weight
Goal 1	1		1		1		1		1	
Obj 1.1	1	40%	1	50%	1	30%	1	30%	1	25%
Obj 1.2	1	30%	1	20%	1	20%	1	30%	1	30%
Obj 1.3	1	15%	1	15%	1	20%	1	30%	1	30%
Obj 1.4	1	15%	1	15%	1	30%	1	10%	1	15%
Goal 2	0		1		1		1		0	
Obj 2.1	1	0%	1	10%	1	0%	1	20%	1	0%
Obj 2.2	1	0%	1	60%	1	0%	1	0%	1	0%
Obj 2.3	1	0%	1	20%	1	90%	1	80%	1	0%
Obj 2.4	1	0%	1	10%	1	10%	1	0%	1	0%
Goal 3	1		1		1		1		1	
Obj 3.1	1	30%	1	40%	1	20%	1	40%	1	20%
Obj 3.2	1	40%	1	30%	1	30%	1	40%	1	40%
Obj 3.3	1	30%	1	30%	1	50%	1	20%	1	40%

The weightings are based on FY 2007 Budget Request

Goal 1 Weighting by Funding

Program Office		\$ in thousands	
SC	Other	Funding	Weighting
HEP		\$145,964,000	39.89%
BES		\$215,469,000	58.89%

Attachment II

ASCR	\$0	0%
WD	\$150,000	.04%
BER	\$4,311,000	1.18%
	<u>\$365,894,000</u>	<u>100.00%</u>

Goal 2 Weighting by Funding

Program Office		\$ in thousands	
SC	Other	Funding	Weighting
HEP		\$144,964,000	39.89%
BES		\$215,469,000	58.89%
ASCR		\$0	0%
WD		\$150,000	.04%
BER		\$4,311,000	1.18%
		<u>\$365,894,000</u>	<u>100.00%</u>

Goal 3 Weighting by Funding

Program Office		\$ in thousands	
SC	Other	Funding	Weighting
HEP		\$144,964,000	39.89%
BES		\$215,469,000	58.89%
ASCR		\$0	0%
WD		\$150,000	.04%
BER		\$4,311,000	1.18%
		<u>\$365,894,000</u>	<u>100.00%</u>