U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Science (SC)
Stanford Site Office (SSO)
Stanford Linear Accelerator Center (SLAC)
2575 Sand Hill Road, MS-8A
Menlo Park, CA 94025

October 18, 2007

Mr. Stan S. Cohelan, Jr.
Director, Business Services Division
Stanford Linear Accelerator Center
2575 Sand Hill Road, MS 02
Menlo Park, CA 94025

10-19-07 06:48 RCVD

Subject: Contract DE-AC02-76-SF00515, Modification 544, Appendix B FY2008, Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

Dear Mr. Cohelan:

Enclosed is an executed copy of Modification 544. The purpose of this modification is to incorporate the Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan for October 1, 2007 thru September 30, 2008.

Should you have any questions regarding this action, please do not hesitate to contact me at extension 5076.

Sincerely,

Tyndal L. Lindler
Contracting Officer

Enclosure SF30/with Appendix B

EXCEPTION TO SF 30, APPROVED BY NARS 5/79

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT	1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGES 1 of 1

2. Amendment/Modification No.	3. EFFECTIVE DATE	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.	5. PROJECT NO. *(If applicable)*
M544	October 1, 2007	N/A	

6. ISSUED BY CODE		7. ADMINISTERED BY *(If other than Item 6)*	
U.S. Department of Energy Office of Science, Stanford Site Office 2575 Sand Hill Road, Bldg.41, Rm.118 Menlo Park, CA 94025		**DOE Points of Contact:** Contracting Officers: Tyndal L. Lindler (650) 926-5076 or Georgia M. McClelland (650)926-8608	

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR *(No., street, country, State, and ZIP Code)*	(,)	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO.
Board of Trustees for the Leland Stanford, Jr. University Director of Sponsored Projects Stanford University 651 Sera Street – Room # 260 Stanford, CA 94305-4125		
Mail To:		9B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 11)*
Stan S. Cohelan, Jr., Director Business Services Division Stanford Linear Accelerator Center 2575 Sand Hill Road, M/S 02 A&E Building #41, Room 203 Menlo Park, Ca 94025	x	10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO. DE-AC02-76SF00515/M474
		10B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 13)*
CODE / FACILITY CODE		3/29/04

10-03-07 09:57 RCVD

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

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

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA *(If required)*

N/A

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

	A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: *(Specify authority)* THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN CONTRACT/ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.
	B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES *(such as changes in paying office, appropriation data, etc.)* SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103 (b).
	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:
X	D. OTHER *(Specify type of modification and authority)* **H.021, "Standards of Contracting Performance Evaluation"**

IMPORTANT: Contractor is not, X is required to sign this document and return 2 copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.) **The purpose of this modification is to incorporate the FY2008 Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan (PEMP) into the contract.**

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

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER *(Type or print)*	16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER *(Type or print)*
Michiko T. Pane Associate Director	TYNDAL L. LINDLER CONTRACTING OFFICER

15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	16C. DATE SIGNED
(Signature of person authorized to sign)	10/15/07	*(Signature of Contracting Officer)*	10/17/07

DE-AC02-76SF00515
Appendix B
M544

FY 2008

Contractor Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

for

Management and Operations of the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center

Table of Contents

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, 2007, through September 30, 2008. 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 requirements and 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.

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 2008 Contractor performance grades for each Goal will be determined based on the weighted sum of the individual scores earned for each of the Objectives described within this document for Science and Technology and for Management and Operations. No overall rollup grade will be provided. The rollup of the performance of each Goal will then be utilized to determine the Contractor performance score for Science and Technology and Management and Operations (see Table A). Each Goal is composed of two or more weighted Objectives, and each Objective has a set of Performance Measures, which are identified to assist the reviewer in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each of the Performance Measures identifies significant activities, requirements and/or milestones important to the success of the corresponding Objective and shall be utilized as the primary means of determine 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); and other outside agency reviews (OIG, GAO, DCAA, etc.) 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, 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 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.

Letter Grade	Numeric Grade	Definition
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, to determine the overall S&T and M&O grades for FY 2008.

The raw score from each calculation shall be carried through to the next stage of the calculation process.

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

8.0 Integrated Safeguards and Security Management and Emergency Management Systems			15%		
				Total Score	

Table A. FY 2008 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 2008 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 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); and other outside agency reviews (OIG, GAO, DCAA, etc.).

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 2008.

1.0 Provide for Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment

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

The weight of this Goal is (TBD) %.

This 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) Program Offices as identified below. The overall Goal score from each HQ Program Office is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 1.1). Weightings for each office listed below are preliminary, based upon FY2007 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 2008.

- Office of Advance Scientific Computing Research (ASCR) <1%
- Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES) 62%
- Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER) 1%
- Office of High Energy Sciences (HEP) 37%
- Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS) <1%

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned by each of the offices identified above by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 1.2). 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 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 2008 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 by progress reports, peer reviews, Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

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

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 Outputs That Advance Program Objectives & Goals

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

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

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

1.4 Provide for Effective Delivery of Products

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

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

Grade	Performance
A to A +	Program/project goals and/or milestones are met well ahead of schedule and/or well under budget; program/project and/or mission objective(s) are fully met and results anticipate HQ guidance.
B+	Program/project goals and/or milestones are primarily met on schedule and within budget; program/project and/or mission objective(s) are fully met and are fully responsive to HQ guidance.
B	Most program/project goals and/or milestones are met on schedule and within budget; overall program/project and/or mission objective(s) are met, minor delays, overruns and/or deficiencies

	are minimized and/or have little to no adverse impact on the overall program/project.
C	A number of and/or key program/project goals and/or milestones are not met within the scheduled timeframe(s) (e.g. less than 6 months behind) and/or with the agreed upon budget (e.g., less than 15% over); overall program/project and/or mission objective(s) have not been met or have the potential to be missed; delays overruns and/or deficiencies are identified which have the potential to adversely impact the overall program/project if not corrected.
D	Most of and/or key program/project goals and/or milestones are not met within the scheduled timeframe(s) (e.g. more than 6 months behind) and/or within the agreed upon budget (e.g., less than 25% over); overall program/project and/or mission objective(s) have not been met or have the potential to be missed; sizeable delays, overruns and/or deficiencies are identified which have negatively impacted the overall program/project.
F	All and/or key program/project goals and/or milestones are not met within the scheduled timeframe(s) (e.g., more than 9 months behind) and/or within the agreed upon budget (e.g., greater than 25% over); overall program/project and mission objective(s) have not been met; significant delays, overruns, and/or deficiencies are identified which have negatively impacted the overall program/project.

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			<1%		
Office of Basic Energy Sciences			62%		
Office of Biological and Environmental Research			1%		
Office of High Energy Physics			37%		
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists			<1%		
				Performance Goal 1.0 Total	

Table 1.2 Overall Performance Goal Score Development[2]

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 FY2008.

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 are responsive to the user community.

The weight of this Goal is (TBD) %.

This 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 office 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 2008.

- Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES) 91%
- Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER) <1%
- Office of High Energy Sciences (HEP) 9%

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 2008 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 preconceptual R&D and design for life-cycle efficiency;
- Leverage of existing facilities at the site;
- Delivery of accurate ad timely information required to carry out the critical decision and budget formulation process; and
- Ability to meet the intent of DOE Order 413.3, Program and Project Management for the Acquisition of Capital Assets.

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 appraised of the status, near-term plans and the resolution of problems on a regular basis. Anticipates emerging issues that could impact plans and takes the initiative to inform DOE of possible consequences.
B	Fails to meet expectations in one of the areas listed under B+.
C	The laboratory team develops the required analyses and documentation in a timely manner. However, inputs are mundane and lack innovation and commitment to the vision of the acquisition.
D	The potential exists for credible science and business cases to be made for the acquisition, but the laboratory fails to take advantage of the opportunity.
F	Proposed approaches are based on fraudulent assumptions; the science case is weak to non-existent, the business case is seriously flawed.

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

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

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

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 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	

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 Basic Energy Sciences			91%		
Office of Biological and Environmental Research			<1%		
Office of High Energy Physics			9%		
				Overall Program Office Total	

Table 2.2 Overall Performance Goal Score Development[4]

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

[4] Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 2.2 are preliminary, based upon FY 2007 Budget Authority figures, and are provided for informational purposes only. The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2008.

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

3.0 Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Program Management

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

The weight of this Goal is (TBD) %.

This 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 is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 3.1). Weightings for each office 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 2008.

- Office of Advance Scientific Computing Research (ASCR) <1%
- Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES) 62%
- Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER) 1%
- Office of High Energy Sciences (HEP) 37%
- Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS) <1%

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned by each of the offices identified above by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 3.2). 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 2008 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 *always* initiate a communication with HQ on emerging issues there are no surprises.
B+	Good communication is valued by all staff throughout the contractor organization; responses to requests for information are thorough and are provided in a timely manner; the integrity of the information provided is never in doubt
B	Evidence of good communications is noted throughout the contractor organization and responses to requests for information provide the minimum requirements to meet HQ needs; with the exception of a few minor instances HQ is alerted to emerging issues.
C	Laboratory representatives recognize the value of sound communication with HQ to the mission of the laboratory. However, laboratory management fails to demonstrate that its employees are held accountable for ensuring effective communication and responsiveness; laboratory representatives do not take the initiative to alert HQ to emerging issues.
D	Communications from the laboratory are well-intentioned but generally incompetent; the laboratory management does not understand the importance of effective communication and responsiveness to the mission of the laboratory.
F	Contractor representatives are openly hostile and/or non-responsive – emails and phone calls are consistently ignored; communications typically do not address the request; information provided can be incorrect, inaccurate or fraudulent – information is not organized, is incomplete, or is fabricated.

Science Program Office[5]	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			<1%		
Office of Basic Energy Sciences			62%		
Office of Biological and Environmental Research			1%		
Office of High Energy Physics			37%		
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists			<1%		
				Overall Program Office Total	

Table 3.2 – Overall Performance Goal Score Development[6]

[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 FY2008.

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 Sheet	ASCR Weight	BES Weight	BER Weight	HEP Weight	WDTS Weight
Goal 1.0 Mission Accomplishment					
Goal's weight	**80**	**15**	**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)	15	15	20	30	30
1.4 Delivery	15	15	30	10	15
Goal 2.0 Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operation of Facilities					
Goal's weight	**0**	**65**	**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 and External User Community	0	10	10	0	0
Goal 3.0 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

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 25 %.

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

4.1 Provide a Distinctive Vision for the Laboratory and an Effective Plan for Accomplishment of the Vision to Include Strong Partnerships Required to Carry Out those 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 weight of this Objective is 30%.

4.1.1 The Laboratory Business Plan or/and other SC defined institutional planning documents provide (s) all required data in a clear and concise manner and is completed within established guidelines and schedules. The Laboratory Mission included in the plan provides a clear understanding of the distinctive characteristics of the Laboratory.

Target 4.1.1.1 B+ = The Business Plan or/and other SC defined institutional planning documents will be quality documents(s) consistent with DOE schedule and guidance. The Laboratory will demonstrate that it is managing to the strategic agenda of the Laboratory through management actions and plans. (e.g. Laboratory Business Plan or/and other Office of Science defined institutional planning documents).

4.1.2 Strategic partnerships are developed that demonstrate the Laboratory's Leadership, leverage DOE resources, and support collaborative programs with other DOE laboratories, academic, and industry groups to advance the Office of Science Business Plan.

Target 4.1.2.1 B+ = Demonstrate growth and progress in the development of quality Research partnerships and collaborations, particularly in support of Photon Sciences, and Particle Physics and Particle Astrophysics.

4.1.3 Laboratory Leadership strives to improve diversity of the workforce and the quality of the working environment, and requires Workforce Diversity Planning by all Directorates.

Target 4.1.3.1 B+ = Demonstrate work environment improvement planning, by conducting workforce diversity planning in each directorates; and by developing and implementing a quality workforce climate

survey, completing an analysis, and preparing recommendations for improvement to the work environment based on the survey results.

4.1.4 Effectiveness in maintaining appropriate relations with the community to include providing for science education opportunities, outreach, and open and honest communications.

Target 4.1.4.1 B+ = Deliver on science education outreach activities that utilize the resources of SLAC to enhance and improve science teaching and learning in local school districts, as well as continued efforts to leverage and attract resources for science lessons in local schools.

Target 4.1.4.2 B+ = Stanford University will maintain open, honest, and effective communication with the Laboratory's many communities about the mission of the Office of Science, the Laboratory's scientific and technological achievements, and the priority initiatives as articulated in the Business Plan.

4.1.5 Develop a baseline for understanding and trending the cost of doing business.

Target 4.1.5.1 B+ = Identify and bin major laboratory costs identifying direct and indirect labor full-time equivalents (FTEs) and costs as well as various operating costs, such as utilities, by December 31, 2007. The cost structure and associated baseline cost of doing business is sufficiently detailed (i.e., including all funding and costs, both direct and indirect with associated FTEs) so the laboratory and site office have a common understanding of how the money is spent and the various cost drivers that effect the laboratory's cost of doing business.

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.
- Corporate Leadership maintains a sense of the Laboratory (knowledge of significant progress and issues) and acts to ensure the resolution of significant issues.
- The role of the University Board of Trustees in managing the SLAC contract will be a factor in assessing the level of corporate leadership. Effective involvement is important.

The weight of this Objective is 40%.

4.2.1 Level of Corporate and Institutional Leadership oversight and response to Laboratory Issues and opportunities is commensurate with the level of significance and severity.

Target 4.2.1.1 B+ = Stanford University's SLAC Oversight Board (SLACOB) operates effectively with a regular schedule of meetings which allow for review of significant, self-identified issues or potential concerns that the SLACOB and the Laboratory management address collaboratively to provide assurance that the performance of work is accomplished in a manner that meets the terms and conditions of the contract. Stanford University provides a timely and comprehensive annual assurance letter attesting to the adequacy and functionality of management controls for SLAC activities.

4.2.2 Leadership maintains an effective assurance function with cognizance of significant issues/concerns, and corrective action plans and insures their timely closure.

Target 4.2.2.1 B+ = SLAC's Office of Assurance is operating effectively. Areas for continuous improvement are identified. A consolidated corrective action tracking system is implemented.

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

Target 4.2.3.1 B+= A lessons learned and best practices database for M& O functions is developed and implemented. The system will serve as a repository of lessons learned.

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

Target 4.2.4.1 B+ = During FY 2008, Laboratory Management will ensure that the corrective actions resulting from the DOE FY 07 OIO/ISM Review are implemented and operating effectively.

4.2.5 Stanford University and Laboratory Leadership undertakes a review and analysis of the management and operations organizations to identify management initiatives that will improve laboratory operations. The improvement initiatives should streamline, and where appropriate automate processes, standardize and institutionalize practices, and improve the management of resources.

Target 4.2.5.1 B+ = The improvement initiatives targets for 2008 shall include, but not be limited to the following areas: (1) Infrastructure (e.g. number and condition of buildings, utilities, plant services major scientific facilities and equipment, D&D requirements); (2) Business Systems (e.g. accounting, human resources, payroll, project management and Safeguards and Security); and (3) Programs (e.g. organizational structure, staffing levels, and strategic planning for the future).

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;
- Establishing joint appointments that are aligned with the strategic objectives of the Laboratory;
- Assisting the Laboratory with infrastructure improvement opportunities; and
- Providing staff, expert advice, management systems, or similar assistance to achieve SLAC's Mission.

The weight of this Objective is 30%.

4.3.1 Corporate support of programs and Laboratory operations, including Business administration, finance, human resources, facilities, and Process and procedure improvements.

Target 4.3.1.1 B+ = Stanford University SLACOB meets regularly with an agenda that is balanced between scientific and operational topics. The SLACOB provides a written report to include recommendations to the President of the University concerning the management of the Laboratory and the quality of the University's support and oversight, including the effectiveness of the SLAC and Stanford University's assurance functions. Stanford University will follow-up on recommended improvements.

4.3.2 Corporate Leadership maintains cognizance of significant commitments made and assures their timely accomplishments; or provides corporate expertise and reach back to demonstrate its commitment to the success of the laboratory.

Target 4.3.2.1 B+ = Corporate Leadership ensures that contractor commitments made to DOE are successfully accomplished as planned.

4.3.3 The demonstrated accomplishment of the Contractor to enter into and maintain faculty appointments.

Target 4.3.3.1 B+ = New Stanford University appointments in the areas that are aligned with the strategic objectives of the Laboratory (e.g. Photon Sciences and Particle Physics and Particle Astrophysics – broadly defined and independent of disciplinary boundaries, and in a number of areas of DOE Mission).

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			30%		
4.2 Provide for Responsive and Accountable Leadership throughout the Organization			40%		
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 20%

This 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 implement effective 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 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 FY2008. 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 goal also incorporates measures to evaluate SLAC performance in the implementation of the Corrective Action Plan (CAP) resulting from the DOE Office of Independent Oversight Inspection (OIO) of the Environment, Safety and Health Programs at the Stanford Linear Center report issued in November 2006. The milestones in the OIO CAP approved by the Office of Science in May 2007 are being tracked to completion and closure by the SSO in the DOE CATS database.

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 ISO 14001 elements of an effective Environmental Management System (EMS) 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.

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 weight of this Objective is 30%.

5.1.1 The Contractor's progress in meeting the Office of Science FY2008 safety goal for days away, restricted or transferred (DART) case rate. In addition to the Office of Science goal, the Contractor shows continuous improvement against its historical DART performance.

Target 5.1.1.1 B+ = The DART rate for FY2008 is equal to the SC safety goal of 0.25.

Target 5.1.1.2 B+ = Demonstrating a process of continuous improvement, the Contractor shows reductions against its historical DART rates as compared to a five year baseline. The DART rate for FY2008 is equal to or less than 90% of the DART rate over the previous 5 fiscal years.

Target 5.1.1.3 B+ = SLAC has no Type A or B injury or exposure incidents. This may be mitigated/excluded if there is an incident where the investigation determines that the Contractor's program did not contribute to the severity of the incident.

5.1.2 The Contractor's progress in meeting the Office of Science FY2008 safety goal for total reportable case (TRC) rate. In addition to the Office of Science goal, the Contractor shows continuous improvement against its historical TRC performance.

Target 5.1.2.1 B+ = TRC rate for FY2008 is equal to the SC safety goal of 0.65.

Target 5.1.2.2 B+ = Demonstrating a process of continuous improvement, the Contractor shows improvement over FY2007. The TRC rate for FY2008 is equal to or less than 90% of the TRC rate of FY2007.

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

Milestones:

1. Update Spill Prevention Controls and Countermeasure Plan (SPCC) per 40 CFR 112 Final Rule.

2. Complete and document monthly above ground tank inspection.

3. Perform annual site wide storm water compliance inspection.

4. Perform annual review of the SLAC Storm water Pollution Prevention Plan

Definition: A reportable occurrence of release is an incident that releases pollutants to the environment to the extent that non-routine written notification to regulatory agencies is required. This does not include courtesy calls to local agencies or historical releases discovered in the current reporting year.

Target 5.1.3.1 B+ = There is no more than one reportable occurrence of releases to the environment and 4 of the 4 milestones listed above are completed.

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 Manual 231.1-2.

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

OCAs = "Overdue Corrective Actions," meaning the number of overdue corrective action issues and non-compliances identified per DOE reporting criteria

Target 5.1.5.1 B+ = There are no overdue corrective actions (corrective action issues and/or non-compliance items identified per DOE reporting criteria).

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

Target 5.1.6.1 B+ = 90% of the ES&H safety-related corrective actions are tracked and closed within the original SLAC target completion date.

Target 5.1.6.2 B+ = 90% of the SLAC closed findings from Facility Walkthroughs conducted by SSO are validated by the Office of Assurance.

5.1.7 The Contractor shall complete the development of a chapter in the ES&H Manual covering non-ionizing radiation and its implementation plan.

Target 5.1.7.1 B+ = Publication of a Non-Ionizing Radiation Chapter and its implementation plan in the ES&H Manual is completed by the end of the 2nd quarter in FY2008, and implementation plan milestone are met. Final report from the survey of major radiofrequency sources (e.g., Klystron Gallery) conducted in the 4th quarter of FY2007 is completed and actions closed out by end of the 2nd quarter FY2008.

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

The weight of this Objective is 55 %.

5.2.1 Safety and environmental training and other competence requirements for SLAC employees, and SLAC contractors, are fully identified. Training for SLAC employees is tracked in SLAC's Training Database Metrics Reporting. SLAC contractors are responsible for ensuring training identified by the contract UTR or Point of Contact and are required to provide written confirmation that their workers at SLAC are compliant with the training requirements.

Target 5.2.1.1 B+ = Mandatory ES&H training requirements for SLAC employees (defined as safety training as required by regulation) are completed to a level of 90% per the SLAC Training Database Metrics Reporting System.

Target 5.2.1.2 B+ = Reviews of subcontractor Site Specific Safety Plans indicates that training requirements for SLAC contractors are maintained current to a level of 90%.

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 FY2008, 95% of the corrective actions from ISM reviews and DOE Assessments that are tracked in either the SLAC Corrective Tracking System (CATS) database or the Office of Health, Safety and Security (HSS) CATS database are completed by the SSO approved completion dates.

5.2.3 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 5.2.3.1 B+ = Quarterly report on trending and casual factors is provided to DOE as related to safety occurrences.

5.2.4 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 5.2.4.1 B+ = In FY2008, ISMS reviews produce no more than two concerns or findings related to staff and line management's understanding of ISMS and the 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+ = Submit all quarterly reports to DOE on trending and causal factors related to safety occurrences.

5.2.6 Contractor will develop a comprehensive control program and an auditable mechanism for tracking its successful implementation for Hot Work operations.

Target 5.2.6.1 B+ = Contractor will have a comprehensive and effective Hot Work control program. Contractor will have comprehensive and effective Hot Work control program and mechanism for tracking its implementation by end of the 3rd Quarter FY08. No significant finding identified during conduct of subsequent audits and reviews (internal, external or DOE).

5.2.7 Contractor will develop a comprehensive fire protection systems impairment control program and an auditable mechanism for tracking its successful implementation.

Target 5.2.7.1 B+ = Contractor will have a comprehensive and effective fire protection system impairment control program. Contractor will have a comprehensive and effective fire protection systems impairment control program and mechanism for tracking its implementation by 06/30/2008. No significant finding identified during conduct of audits and reviews (internal, external or DOE).

5.2.8 Contractor will maintain an effective fire safety review and inspection program for facilities and operations. All deficiencies are documented complete with recommended mitigations and corrective actions tracked to completion.

Target 5.2.8.1 B+ = Contractor will have a documented and auditable fire safety review and inspection program by 7/31/08. No more than one scheduled review/inspection missed or two significant deficiencies documented and tracked.

5.2.9 Contractor will provide an effective program to ensure compliance with Life Safety Code requirements.

Target 5.2.9.1 B+ = Contractor will assess the effectiveness of the Life Safety Code compliance. All deficiencies are documented complete with report of findings, recommended mitigations and corrective actions tracked to completion by the end of the 3rd Quarter FY08.

Target 5.2.9.2 B+ = Contractor will have a documented and auditable life safety review and assessment program in place by the end of the 3rd Quarter FY08 to demonstrate compliance with the Life Safety Code.

5.2.10 Contractor will provide an effective program to ensure compliance with fire suppression requirements.

Target 5.2.10.1 B+ = Contractor will assess the effectiveness of the compliance with fire suppression requirements such as fire sprinkler systems. All deficiencies are documented, complete with report of findings, recommended mitigations and corrective actions tracked to completion by the end of the 3rd Quarter FY08.

Target 5.2.10.2 B+ = Contractor will have a documented and auditable fire suppression review and assessment program in place by the end of the 3rd Quarter FY08 to demonstrate compliance with applicable codes and criteria with no more than two minor deficiencies uncorrected.

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.
- Identify opportunities for waste minimization, emission reduction, and/or resource conservation.
- Improvements in implementation and performance of SLAC Environmental Management System (e.g., pollution prevention opportunity assessments, EMS training).

The weight of this Objective is 15%.

5.3.1 Complete milestones to develop, implement, and maintain certification equivalence of SLAC Performance-based Environmental Management System is achieved.

Milestones:

1. Review environmental aspects and impacts.
2. Determine the set of significant environmental aspects.
3. Revise existing Environmental Management Programs as needed, or develop new ones.
4. Complete internal annual assessment.

Target 5.3.1.1 B+ = SLAC completes four of the four target milestones listed above.

5.3.2 For designated projects, identification of waste minimization, emission reduction, and/or resource conservation opportunities.

SLAC will review potential candidate projects and their technical feasibility and SLAC's ability to implement these projects based on available funding and other project priorities. Project implementation will be conducted as feasible. Examples of projects include sustainable building design measures such as white roofing; procurement of environmental friendly products such as product substitutes for wood decking and carpets with recycled content; toxic chemical substitutions and waste prevention measures such as cyanide and sulfur hexafluoride reduction; composting of cafeteria wastes; replacement of cafeteria food packaging with biodegradable or more sustainable materials.

Target 5.3.2.1 B+ = SLAC will select and evaluate four waste minimization, emission reduction, and/or resource conservation opportunities and implement one project in FY2008, or placed in budget cycle for subsequent year (s) and approved by DOE/SSO.

5.3.3 Results of the Office of Assurance Independent Internal Assessment in FY2007 identified several issues in the Hazardous Materials Program for which improvements will enhance hazardous materials operations safety.

- Ensure Hazardous Materials /Hazardous Waste training is current for handlers of hazardous waste.
- Ensure Chemical Hygiene Plan (CHP) is updated and accurate, and workers in covered laboratories have received lab-specific training as required by the Plan.
- Subcontractor chemical storage is compliant with applicable OSHA, Building, Fire Codes, and SLAC's ES&H Manual Chapter 40: Hazardous Materials. Inventory of subcontractor chemicals is integrated into SLAC's overall chemical inventory management.
- Further reduction of legacy chemicals (i.e., those pre-dating the implementation of the Chemical Management System) will require the development and implementation of a project plan that will be completed through FY2009.

Target 5.3.3.1 B+ = Required Haz Mat/Haz Waste Training (i.e., mandatory ES&H training) requirements are completed to a level of 90% in the SLAC Training Database Metrics Reporting.

Target 5.3.3.2 B+ = CHP is updated by December 31, 2007 (Q1), and 90% of the affected lab users are trained by June 30, 2008 (Q3).

Target 5.3.3.3 B+ = Subcontractor chemicals stored and used on site are in compliance with applicable regulations and Chapter 40; and inventory integrated by the end of the 2nd quarter FY2008.

Target 5.3.3.4 B+ = Development of a project plan with implementation schedule for further reduction of legacy chemicals (i.e., those pre-dating the implementation of the Chemical Management System) by end of the 2nd quarter of FY2008.

5.3.4 SLAC actively pursues the reduction of its volume of legacy low-level radioactive waste stored on-site by preparing the waste for off-site shipment (i.e., the waste has been properly characterized & packaged, pending shipment off-site or has been shipped off-site).

Target 5.3.4.1 B+ = 360 cubic feet of legacy low-level radioactive waste (based upon disposal container external volumes) has been properly packaged or shipped for disposal by the end of the FY2008.

5.3.5 SLAC conducts low-level radioactive waste (LLRW) generator training, emphasizing reduction, reuse, and recycling.

Target 5.3.5.1 B+ = SLAC identifies a list of primary LLRW generators by November 15, 2007 and conducts 3 training classes to certify LLRW generators by September 30, 2008.

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			55%		
5.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Waste Management, Minimization, and Pollution Prevention			15%		
				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 25%.

This 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.

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

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

- SLAC financial management systems' effectiveness as validated by internal {Stanford University(SU) Internal Audit Department (SIAD)}and external audits and reviews {Inspector General (IG), General Accounting Office (GAO)}, and DOE, and other external reviewers;
- SLAC's continual improvement of their financial management system through self-assessments;
- SLAC's financial management system process reporting 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.
- SLAC's financial policy and procedures.

The weight of this Objective is 15%.

6.1.1 The effectiveness of the Financial Management System as validated by internal and external audits and reviews. The audits/results must state that the laboratory's financial management system have been evaluated, and has received a positive result, with no notable performance deficiencies identified.

Target 6.1.1.1 B+ = The target will be no material findings. A material finding is a failure or shortcoming which is in violation of the contract, applicable laws and regulations, or a violation of internal controls sufficiently large as to cause a serious case of mismanagement, the charging of unallowable costs, or a situation that misstates the facts.

6.1.2 Financial Management System Continual Improvements. The continual improvement of the Laboratory's Financial Management System is based on recommendations from audits, reviews and self-assessments.

Target 6.1.2.1 B+ = SLAC reports to the SSO semi-annually on the implementation of completed recommendations for improvement.

6.1.3 Financial Management System Reporting Expectations. This measure addresses the timely execution of the fiscal year financial reporting requirements for programs funded through the Department.

Target 6.1.3.1 B+ = Financial Management System Process Expectations. Target level performance is timely submittal of 95% of routine financial statement closings and all other DOE routinely required financial reports and analyses. Examples of Financial Management System processes meeting expectations:

- Timely transmittal of month-end and year-end financial statement closings.
- Timely submission of all DOE required financial reports and analyses.

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 per formulation guidance, effective budget execution, and timely submission of required documents.

Target 6.1.4.1 B+ = Budget Submissions: Timeliness and Format. Target level performance is submission of the Field Budget Request within the prescribed DOE Headquarters due dates. SLAC will ensure that their supportable budget submissions/Field Work Proposals (FWPs) all follow the prescribed DOE format, include all data requested, and are submitted within prescribed DOE due dates. Earlier submission to meet Integrated Support Center (ISC), and Site Office due dates would merit recognition above the Target Level.

6.1.5 SLAC will ensure that all Financial Policies and Procedures are current, accurate, and complete.

Target 6.1.5.1 B+ = Changes to SLAC Financial Policies and Procedures are to be effectively communicated to SLAC staff, understood by the applicable staff members, and assurance of compliance with the policies and procedures is achieved. Current policies and procedures will be submitted to the SSO Contracting Officer by November 30, 2007. SLAC will provide copies of new policies and updates to the SSO Contracting Officer.

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

The weight of this Objective is 50%.

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) through the use of the results of audits, review, corrective action plans, and other information.
- 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.

6.2.1 Demonstrate effective acquisition and property management systems through external reviews, surveys, and inspection as necessary or required.

Target 6.2.1.1 B+ = All corrective actions resulting from any external or internal reviews are completed and implemented by the end of FY2008 on accepted milestones. SLAC procurement will report quarterly to the DOE/SSO contracting officer.

Target 6.2.1.2 B+ = All corrective actions resulting from any external or internal reviews are completed and implemented by the end of FY2008 on accepted milestones. SLAC Property/Fleet will report quarterly to the DOE/SSO contracting officer.

6.2.2 Perform Procurement Balanced Scorecard evaluation in accordance with the FY 2008 Balanced Scorecard Plan and successfully meet at least 90% of the BSC targets.

Target 6.2.2.1 B+ = 90% BSC targets successfully meets.

6.2.3 As part of the effective Procurement Learning and Growth, SLAC will demonstrate that all Procurement Personnel are trained in the following areas:

1. Types of Contracts
2. Cost Price Analysis
3. Contract Administration
4. Contract Law

Target 6.2.3.1 B+ = By the end of FY08, 90% Procurement Personnel will have completed training in Types of Contracts, Cost Price Analysis, Contract Administration and Contract Law.

6.2.4 Perform Property Balanced Scorecard evaluation in accordance with the FY 2008 Balanced Scorecard Plan and successfully meet at least 90% of the BSC targets.

Target 6.2.2.1 B+ = 90% BSC targets successfully meets.

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 weight of this Objective is 20%.

6.3.1 Continuous improvement of Human Resources (HR) systems/processes through annually selected projects that streamline or enhance HR services.

Target 6.3.1.1 B+ = Three projects are identified and successfully implemented during FY08. The data from these projects are submitted to Contracting Officer as the projects are completed.

For FY2008, those projects are:

1. SLAC HR will provide direction and guidance to the Laboratory Management to facilitate the ramping down of LCLS construction-phase staff.
2. SLAC will initiate processes to streamline HR work. This includes:
   - Implementing a self service process in which employees can update appropriate information in their Personnel Records.

- Coordinate with senior management to propose and implement a training course for departmental level managers which will include the legal requirements of management, communication skills, and problem solving skills.

- Implement the electronic distribution of routine Personnel Management Reports.

3. HR will implement an *Interviewing Skills Workshop* for hiring managers which emphasizes how to identify and select the most qualified candidate for a position.

6.3.2 Success in attraction/retention of highly qualified employees.

Target 6.3.2.1 B+ = The in-hire compensation package assures 85% acceptance rate for management and operation personnel in the environmental safety and health, financial, procurement, and facilities classifications and (2) the SLAC turnover rate for the classifications above is between 5% and 9%.

6.3.3 Diversity Recruitment Plan. Develop and implement a diversity recruitment plan aimed at increasing representation of women and minorities in under-represented job groups (as identified in the annual Affirmative Action Plan).

Target 6.3.3.1 B+ = A diversity recruiting plan, with milestones for implementation during FY2008, will be developed and submitted to the DOE Stanford Site Office by November 30, 2007. This plan will be tied to the areas of under-utilization for women and minorities in FY2008 Affirmative Action Plan.

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

Determination of the (Stanford University) provision of an efficient, effective, and responsive financial management system (s) for internal audit and oversight, quality, information management, and other administrative support systems will be based upon SLAC's implementation of DOE directions, guidelines, and recommendations; 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 for these various areas, in the determination of effectiveness for these management system.

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

- Demonstration of efficient and effective management systems support;

- The effectiveness of the management systems as validated by internal and external audits and reviews;

- The continual improvement of management systems 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 adequacy and compliance of SLAC's Cost Accounting Disclosure Statement.

The weight of this Objective is 15%.

6.4.1 Internal Controls and Audit Findings. SLAC will complete the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) data requirements, from the CAS Disclosure Statement Compliance and Adequacy Audit.

Target 6.4.1.1 B + =SLAC will provide all DCAA required data by November 1, 2007.

Target 6.4.1.2 B+ = SLAC will complete the CAS Disclosure Statement by January 31, 2008.

6.4.2 Internal Audit Processes. Stanford Internal Audit Department (SIAD) will plan for and conduct audits of SLAC business functions as defined within the SLAC Audit Plan, or additional work areas as needed, and agreed to by the Site Office (SO) and SIAD.

Target 6.4.2.1 B+ = Target performance level is SIAD performance of 100% of the SLAC audit plan, adjusted for unplanned, DOE-requested changes during the year.

6.4.3 Comparison (benchmark) of Information Technology (IT) cost performance with like industry and government entities for; 1) IT spending as a percent of overall cost plan; 2) percent of Laboratory employees in IT jobs; and 3) IT budget per end user.

Target 6.4.3.1 B+ = The target is to develop a benchmark and a plan to meet or exceed the benchmark.

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)			15%		
6.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition and Property Management System(s)			50%		
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			15%		
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.

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 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%.

7.1.2 Effective reduction of Deferred Maintenance (DM). The DMR is expressed as the dollar amount by which the Deferred Maintenance Backlog list is reduced during the course of the fiscal year for the site.

Target 7.1.2.1 B+ = SLAC meets DM reduction goal as stated in the approved FY08 Ten Year Site Plan:

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

Target 7.1.3.1 B+ = SLAC completed 85% of Planned Preventative Maintenance within 30 days. (Planned Preventative Maintenance for this measure is defined as those activities that are not dependent on an interruption of operations for completion.)

Target 7.1.3.2 B+ = Meets 90% agreed-on milestones on the FY08 Computerized Maintenance Management System (CMMS) Plan.

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

Target 7.1.4.1 B+ = Greater than or equal to 95% for all assets.

7.1.5 A plan is developed and approved by DOE that adequately addresses the site's contribution to meeting the Agency wide goals of the Secretarial Transformational Energy Action Management (TEAM) initiative and the goals set forth in Executive Order 13423.

Target 7.1.5.1 B+ = SLAC will develop a plan approved by DOE that will address DOE's goal in meeting Secretarial Transformational Energy Action Management (TEAM) initiatives and the goals per Executive Order 13423 by August 29, 2008.

7.1.6 Timely completion and submission of all plans, reports, data and inputs as requested by DOE according to DOE schedule.

Target 7.1.6.1 B+ = SLAC completes all critical tasks and submits all reports, plans and inputs on time as required by DOE to meet required schedules.

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 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 weight of this Objective is 50 %.

7.2.1 Effective integrated planning for the SLAC Environmental Restoration project. Complete milestones and make progress as measured against the SLAC prepared, DOE accepted Project Baseline. The overall performance of the following set of milestones shall be utilized by the evaluator as the primary measure of the Contractor's success in meeting the performance expectation.

Target 7.2.1.1 B+ = Meet Target Milestones 7 and 8; Meet 5 of the remaining 6 milestones.

Milestones:

1. Completion of the FSUST Dual Phase Extraction (DPE) system construction upgrade.
2. Completion of the Group 1 Removal Action Completion Report.
3. Maintain the site-wide database of sample information including incorporation of ID/IQ contractor collected data consistent with the SLAC SOPs and in accordance to the SLAC Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) with all Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) items resolved by the project manager(s).
4. Perform Operations and Maintenance activities on the installed treatment systems including those accepted from the ID/IQ contractor.
5. Complete the Groundwater Volatile Organic Compound (VOC) Operable Unit Feasibility Study and Remedial Action Plan (RAP).
6. Perform groundwater monitoring consistent with SLAC's self-monitoring plan per the RWQCB Order.

7. Maintain and report on SLAC prepared, DOE accepted M&O contractor project baseline per DOE O 413.3A CRD, as applicable including the development and utilization of an earned value management system and a project baseline.

8. Support transition of DOE EM work to the ID/IQ contractor and provide logistical support to the EM ID/IQ contractor, as applicable, for remedial investigations and removal actions.

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

Target 7.2.2.1 B+ = SLAC prepares the TYSP and delivers a completed finalized copy for SSO review, comment and approval ten (10) business days before the deadline established by the DOE Guidance.

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

Target 7.2.3.1 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 3 months overdue as defined in the SORI Project Execution Plan (PEP).

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

Target 7.2.4.1 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 date. All projects >$250K will be completed within 3 years of start date. The cost performance rating is established by calculating the cost variance 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).

Additionally, SLAC will maintain a list of all GPP and Operating projects planned for each FY. The list will be based on the TYSP, the SLAC Convention and Experimental Facility (CEF) Five Year Plan and other inputs. The list may be changed by the SLAC Infrastructure Committee in consultation with the SSO Federal Project Director (FPD) during the year as conditions warrant. Before construction is approved by the infrastructure committee, each project will have an approved baseline cost estimate and a schedule. The baseline cost and schedule may be altered only by permission of the infrastructure committee and in consultation with the SSO FPD. If this occurs, the project is then tracked and scored against the new cost and schedule baseline.

7.2.5 Develop a strategy for increasing investment in infrastructure which minimizes increases to the cost of doing business.

Target 7.2.5.1 B + = Develop strategy by September 30, 2008.

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

Table 7.1 – 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 objective is 15%.

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.

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 and Continuity of Operations (COOP) are developed or updated (in addition to Chapter 37 in the ES&H Manual) and effectively implemented, due to the size and complexity of the lab, and it's proximity to major earthquake faults.

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 operational emergency events. All events are documented with follow-up corrective actions tracked and lessons learned issued by the end of the 3rd Quarter FY08. No more than one event with incomplete follow-up mitigation.

8.1.2 Contractor will submit a Site Emergency Management Plan to the DOE/SSO for review, compliant with program elements outlined in the DOE Emergency Management Guide and DOE O 151.1C.

Target 8.1.2.1 B+ = The SLAC Site Emergency Management Plan is submitted and approved by the end of 3rd Quarter of FY08.

8.1.3 Contractor will implement the Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) for SLAC. This includes the development and approval of an implementation plan and development of mechanism (including drills) to test the effectiveness.

Target 8.1.3.1 B+ = Contractor development and approval of a COOP implementation plan for SLAC by end of 3rd Quarter of FY08.

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 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 hours.

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 SC Program Cyber Security Plan (PCSP).

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) in accordance with FISMA requirements.

Target 8.2.4.1 B+ = POA&M schedule is completed in accordance with FISMA requirements.

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 statement is provided to DOE/SSO on an annual basis or when changes to this document are made. Employees are trained on and accepted cyber security responsibilities prior to using SLAC IT systems.

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

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 weight of this objective is 10 %.

8.3.1 Commitment to strong Safeguards is evidenced by the security of property and inventory loss control (e.g. property tags, and property management of assets) such that there is no loss. If a Safeguard event occurs it is reported and mitigated in accordance with DOE O 470.4A.

Target 8.3.1.1 B+ = Radioisotopes are accounted for and controlled in accordance with DOE Orders.

8.3.2 External or internal 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.

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

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) 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 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+ = There are no events involving the loss of sensitive information.

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+ = As a result of contractor's security systems for the protection of Personally Identifiable Information (PII) there is no loss of PII.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
8.0 Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM)					
8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System			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 2008 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 2008 Budget Request

Goal 1 Weighting by Funding

Program Office		$ in thousands	
SC	Other	Funding	Weighting
HEP		$114,627,000	36.99%
BES		$190,498,000	61.48%
ASCR		$0	0%
WD		$300,000	.10%

Attachment II

BER	$4,419,000	1.43%
	$309,847,000	100.00%

Goal 2 Weighting by Funding

Program Office		$ in thousands	
SC	**Other**	**Funding**	**Weighting**
HEP		$144,627,000	36.99%
BES		$190,498,000	61.48%
ASCR		$0	0%
WD		$300,000	.10%
BER		$4,419,000	1.43%
		$309,847,000	100.00%

Goal 3 Weighting by Funding

Program Office		$ in thousands	
SC	**Other**	**Funding**	**Weighting**
HEP		$144,627,000	36.99%
BES		$190,498,000	61.48%
ASCR		$0	0%
WD		$300,000	.10%
BER		$4,419,000	1.43%
		$309,847,000	100.00%