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

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO.	3. EFFECTIVE DATE	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.	5. PROJECT NO. *(If applicable)*
M056	See Block 16 C.	N/A	N/A

6. ISSUED BY CODE	7. ADMINISTERED BY *(If other than Item 6)* Code
U.S. Department of Energy Chicago Operations/Ames Site Office 9800 South Cass Avenue Argonne, IL 60439	**M056**

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR *(No. street, county, State and ZIP Code)*	(✓)	9.A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO.
Iowa State University of Science and Technology 1750 Beardshear Hall Ames, IA 50011-2038		9.B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 11)*
		10.A. MODIFICATION OF Contract/Order NO. DE-AC02-07CH11358
CODE N/A FACILITY CODE N/A		10.B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 13)* January 1, 2007

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 15, 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 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT 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 THE 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 date, etc.)* SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(B).
X	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF: Mutual Agreement of the Parties
	D. OTHER *(Specify type of modification and authority*

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor ☐ is not, ☒ is required to sign this document and return 3 copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION *(Organized by UCF section heading, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)*

See Page No. 2 of this Modification.

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER *(Type or print)*	16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER *(Type or print)*
Warren R. Madden Vice President for Business and Finance	Dennis L. Wilson Contracting Officer
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR — 15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA — 16C. DATE SIGNED
Warren R Madden — 12/6/09	BY Dennis Wilson — 1/7/10
(Signature of person authorized to sign	*(Signature of Contracting Officer)*

14. Description of Amendment/Modification:

Appendix B, Performance Evaluation Measurement Plan, attached hereto and made a part hereof, replaces Appendix B, Performance Assessment previously incorporated into this agreement under Modification No. 056.

ATTACHMENT J.2

APPENDIX B

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION MEASUREMENT PLAN

Applicable to the Operation of Ames Laboratory

Contract No. DE-AC02-07CH11358

Contract No. DE-AC02-07CH11358
Section J
Appendix B
Modification M056

FY 2010

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND MEASUREMENT PLAN

FOR

MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS OF THE

AMES LABORATORY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
AMES SITE OFFICE

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION **1**

I. DETERMINING THE CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE RATING AND PERFORMANCE-BASED FEE **2**

II. PERFORMANCE GOALS, OBJECTIVES & PERFORMANCE MEASURES **8**
BACKGROUND 8

1.0 PROVIDE FOR EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE MISSION ACCOMPLISHMENT **9**
1.1 SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY RESULTS PROVIDE MEANINGFUL IMPACT ON THE FIELD 10
1.2 PROVIDE QUALITY LEADERSHIP IN SCIENC AND TECHNOLOGY 10
1.3 PROVIDE AND SUSTAIN OUTPUTS THAT ADVANCE PROGRAM OBJECTIVES AND GOALS 11
1.4 PROVIDE FOR EFFECTIVE DELIVERY PRODUCTS TECHNOLOGY 12

2.0 PROVIDE FOR EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE DESIGN, FABRICATION, CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATIONS OF RESEARCH FACILITIES **14**

3.0 PROVIDE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM MANAGEMENT **15**
3.1 PROVIDE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT STEWARDSHIP OF SCIENTIFIC CAPABILITIES AND PROGRAM VISION 16
3.2 PROVIDE EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROJECT PROGRAM PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT 17
3.3 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATIONS AND RESPONSIVENESS TO CUSTOMER NEEDS 18

4.0 PROVIDE SOUND AND COMPETENT LEADERSHIP AND STEWARDSHIP OF THE LABORATORY **22**
4.1 LEADERSHIP AND STEWARDSHIP OF THE LABORATORY (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 22
4.2 MANAGEMENT AND OPERATION OF THE LABORATORY (PROVIDE FOR RESPONSIVE AND ACCOUNTABLE LEADERSHIP THROUGHOUT THE ORGANIZATION 22
4.3 CONTRACTOR VALUE-ADDED (PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE CORPORATE OFFICE SUPPORT AS APPROPRIATE 22

5.0 SUSTAIN EXCELLENCE AND ENHANCE EFFECTIVENESS OF INTEGRATED SAFETY, HEALTH, AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION 24
5.1 PROVIDE A WORK ENVIRONMENT THAT PROTECTS WORKERS AND THE ENVIRONMENT 24
5.2 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION OF INTEGRATED SAFETY, HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT 24
5.3 PROVIDE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT, MINIMIZATION, AND POLLUTION PREVENTION 24

6.0 DELIVER EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE BUSINESS SYSTEMS AND RESOURCES THAT ENABLE THE SUCCESSFUL ACHIEVEMENT OF THE LABORATORY MISSION(S) **25**
6.1 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM(S) 25
6.2 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE ACQUISITION AND PROPERTY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM(S) 25
6.3 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE PROPERTY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM(S) 25
6.4 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AND DIVERSITY PROGRAM 25
6.5 PROVIDE EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE, AND RESPONSIVE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS FOR INTERNAL AUDIT AND OVERSIGHT; QUALITY; INFORMATION MANAGEMENT; AND OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES AS APPROPRIATE 25
6.6 DEMONSTRATE EFFECTIVE TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY AND COMMERCIALIZATION OF INTELLECTUAL ASSETS 25

7.0 SUSTAIN EXCELLENCE IN OPERATING, MAINTAINING, AND RENEWING THE FACILITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE PORTFOLIO TO MEET LABORATORY NEEDS **28**
7.1 MANAGE FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE IN AN EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE MANNER THAT OPTIMIZES USAGE AND MINIMIZES LIFE CYCLE COSTS 28
7.2 PROVIDE PLANNING FOR AND ACQUIRE THE FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIRED TO SUPPORT FUTURE LABORATORY PROGRAMS 28

8.0 SUSTAIN AND ENHANCE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY MANAGEMENT AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS **30**
8.1 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT & EFFECTIVE EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS 30
8.2 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT & EFFICTIVE SYSTEM FOR CYBER-SECURITY 30
8.3 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT & EFFECTIVE SYSTEM FOR THE PROTECTION OF SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIALS, CLASSIFIED MATTER, AND PROPERTY 30
8.4 PROVIDE AN EFFICIENT & EFFECTIVE SYSTEM FOR THE PROTECTION OF CLASSIFIED AND SENSITIVE INFORMATION 30

ATTACHMENT I. OFFICE OF SCIENCE PROGRAM OFFICE GOAL & OBJECTIVE WEIGHTINGS **32**

ATTACHMENT II. EVALUATION SCHEDULE **33**

INTRODUCTION

This document, the Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan (PEMP), primarily serves as DOE's Quality Assurance/Surveillance Plan (QASP) for the evaluation of Iowa State University (hereafter referred to as "the Contractor") performance regarding the management and operations of the Ames Laboratory (hereafter referred to as "the Laboratory") for the evaluation period from October 1, 2010, through September 30, 2011. 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 requirement and performance expectations/objectives of the Department as stipulated within this contract.

This document also describes the distribution of the total available performance-based fee and the methodology for determining the amount of fee earned by the Contractor as stipulated within the clauses entitled, "Determining Total Available Performance Fee and Fee Earned," "Conditional Payment of Fee, Profit, or Incentives," and "Total Available Fee: Base Fee Amount and Performance Fee Amount." In partnership with the Contractor and other key customers, the Department of Energy (DOE) Headquarters (HQ) and the Site Office have defined the measurement basis that serves as the Contractor's performance-based evaluation and fee determination. The total available fee: For the period October 1, 2009 to September 30, 2010, the **Base Fee is $500,000** and the **Performance Fee is $335,000.**

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

The overall performance against each Objective of this performance plan, to include the evaluation of Notable Outcomes, shall be evaluated jointly by the appropriate HQ office, major customer and/or the Site Office as appropriate. This cooperative review methodology will ensure that the overall evaluation of the Contractor results in a consolidated DOE position taking into account specific Notable Outcomes as well as all additional information available to the evaluating office. 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, as well as how the performance-based incentives fee earned (if any) will be determined. As applicable, also provides information on the award term eligibility requirements.

Section II provides the detailed information concerning each Goal, their corresponding Objectives, and Notable Outcomes identified, along with the weightings assigned to each Goal and Objective and a table for calculating the final grade for each Goal.

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

The FY 2010 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 numerical grade for Science and Technology and Management and Operations (see Table A below). The total overall numerical grade derived for Science and Technology will be utilized to determine the amount of available fee that may be earned (see Table C). The overall numerical grade derived for Management and Operations will be utilize to determine the multiplier to be applied (see Table C) to the Science and Technology fee earned to determine the final amount of fee earned for FY 2010. Each Goal is composed of two or more weighted Objectives and each Objective has set definitions and/or Notable Outcomes, which are linked to an Objective or set of Objectives to assist the reviewer in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting an Objective(s). Where utilized each of the Notable Outcomes highlight key aspects/areas of performance deserving special attention for the upcoming fiscal year and are utilized as a means of determining the Contractor's success in meeting the Objective along with other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources to include, but not limited to, operational awareness (daily oversight) activities; "For Cause" reviews (if any); other outside agency reviews (OIG, GAO, DCAA, etc.), and the annual 2-week review (if needed). The 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 grading at the Objective Level. Each Objective within a Goal shall be assigned a grade and corresponding numerical grade by the evaluating office. Each evaluation will measure the degree of effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in meeting the corresponding Objectives based on all performance information available to the evaluating office.

It is the DOE's expectation that the Contractor provides for and maintains management and operational (M&O) systems that efficiently and effectively support the current mission(s) of the Laboratory and assure the Laboratory's ability to deliver against DOE's future needs. In evaluating the Contractor's performance, DOE shall assess the degree of effectiveness and performance in meeting each of the Objectives provided under each of the Goals. For the five M&O Goals, DOE will rely on a combination of the information through the Contractor's own assurance systems, the ability of the Contractor to demonstrate the validity of this information, and DOE's own independent assessment of the Contractor's performance across the spectrum of its responsibilities. The latter might include, but is not limited to operational awareness (daily oversight) activities; formal assessments conducted; "For Cause" reviews (if any); and other outside agency reviews (OIG, GAO, DCAA, etc.).

The mission of the Laboratory is to deliver the science and technology needed to support Departmental missions and other sponsor's needs. Operational performance at the Laboratory meets DOE's expectations (defined as the grade of B+) for each Objective if the Contractor is performing at a level that fully supports the Laboratory's current and future science and technology mission(s). Performance that has, or has the potential to, 1) adversely impact the delivery of the current and/or future DOE/Laboratory mission(s), 2) adversely impact the DOE and or the Laboratory's reputation, or 3) does not provide the competent people, necessary facilities and robust systems necessary to ensure sustainable performance, shall be graded below expectations as defined in Figure I-1 below.

The Department sets our expectations high, and expects performance at that level to optimize the efficient and effective operation of the Laboratory. Thus, the Department does not expect routine Contractor performance above expectations against the M&O Goals (4.0 – 8.0). Performance that might merit grades above B+ would need to reflect a Contractor's unexpectedly strong improvement in a particular area, significant contributions to the management and operations at the system of Laboratories, or recognition by external, independent entities as exemplary performance.

This year, a set of Notable Outcomes have been identified under each Goal to highlight the Contractor key aspects/areas of performance deserving special attention for the upcoming fiscal year. Each Notable Outcome is linked to one or more Objectives, and failure to meet expectations against any Notable Outcome will result in a grade less than B+ for that Objective(s). Performance above expectations against a Notable Outcome will be considered in the context of the Contractor's entire performance with respect to the relevant Objective.

Definitions for the grading scale for the Goal 4.0 – 8.0 Objectives are provided in Figure I-1, below:

Letter Grade	Numerical Grade	Definition
A+	4.3-4.1	Significantly exceeds expectations of performance against all aspects of the Objective in question. The Contractor's systems function at a level that fully supports the Laboratory's current and future science and technology mission(s). Performance is notable for its significant contributions to the management and operations across the SC system of laboratories, and/or has been recognized by external, independent entities as exemplary.
A	4.0-3.8	Notably exceeds expectations of performance against all aspects of the Objective in question. The Contractor's systems function at a level that fully supports the Laboratory's current and future science and technology mission(s). Performance is notable for its contributions to the management and operations across the SC system of laboratories, and/or as been recognized by external, independent entities as exemplary.
A-	3.7-3.5	Exceeds expectations of performance against all aspects of the Objective in question. The Contractor's systems function at a level that fully supports the Laboratory's current and future science and technology mission(s).
B+	3.4-3.1	Meets expectations of performance against all aspects of the Objective in question. The Contractor's systems function at a level that fully supports the Laboratory's current and future science and technology mission(s). No performance has, or has the potential to, adversely impact 1) the delivery of the current and/or future DOE/Laboratory mission(s), 2) the DOE and/or the Laboratory's reputation, or does not 3) provide a sustainable performance platform.
B	3.0 -2.8	Just misses meeting expectations of performance against a few aspects of the Objective in question. In a few minor instances, the Contractor's systems function at a level that does not fully support the Laboratory's current and future science and technology mission, or provide a sustainable performance platform.
B-	2.7-2.5	Misses meeting expectations of performance against several aspects of the Objective in question. In several areas, the Contractor's systems function at a level that does not fully support the Laboratory's current and future science and technology mission, or provide a sustainable performance platform.
C+	2.4-2.1	Misses meeting expectations of performance against many aspects of the Objective in question. In several notable areas, the Contractor's systems function at a level that does not fully support the Laboratory's current and future science and technology mission or provide a sustainable performance platform, and/or have affected the reputation of the Laboratory or DOE.
C	2.0-1.8	Significantly misses meeting expectations of performance against many aspects of the Objective in question. In many notable areas, the Contractor's systems do not support the Laboratory's current and future science and technology mission, nor provide a sustainable performance platform and may affect the reputation of the Laboratory or DOE.
C-	1.7- 1.1	Significantly misses meeting expectations of performance against most aspects of the Objective in question. In many notable areas, the Contractor's systems demonstrably hinder the Laboratory's ability to deliver on current and future science and technology mission, and have harmed the reputation of the Laboratory or DOE.
D	1.0-0.8	Most or all expectations of performance against the Objective in question are missed. Performance failures in this area have affected all parts of the Laboratory; DOE leadership engagement is required to deal with the situation and help the Contractor.
F	0.7-0	All expectations of performance against the Objective in question are missed. Performance failures in this area are not recoverable by the Contractor or DOE.

Figure I-1. Letter Grade and Numerical Grade Definition

Calculating Individual Goal Scores and Letter Grades:

Each Objective is assigned the earned numerical grade by the evaluating office as stated above. The Goal rating is then computed by multiplying the numerical grade by the weight of each Objective within a Goal. These values are then added together to develop an overall numerical grade for each Goal. For the purpose of determining the final Goal grade, the raw numerical grade for each Goal will be rounded to the nearest tenth of a point utilizing the standard rounding convention discussed below and then compared to Table B. A set of tables is provided at the end of each Performance Goal section of this document to assist in the calculation of Objective numerical grades to the Goal grade. Utilizing the raw numerical grade for each Goal within Table A, below, the grades 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 raw numerical grade for each.
As stated above the raw numerical grade from each calculation shall be carried through to the next stage of the calculation process. The raw numerical grade for Science and Technology and Management and Operations will be rounded to the nearest tenth of a point for purposes of determining fee as indicated in Table C. A standard rounding convention of x.44 and less rounds down to the nearest tenth (i.e. X .4), while x.45 and greater rounds up to the nearest tenth (i.e. X .5).

S&T Performance Goal	Numerical Grade	Letter Grade	Weight[1]	Weighted Score	Total Score
1.0 Mission Accomplishment			TBD		
2.0 Construction and Operations of User Research Facilities and Equipment			0%		
3.0 Science and Technology Research Project/Program Management			TBD%		
				Total Score	
M&O Performance Goal	**Numerical Grade**	**Letter Grade**	**Weight**	**Weighted Score**	**Total Score**
4.0 Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory			20%		
5.0 Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection			30%		
6.0 Business Systems			20%		
7.0 Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio			20%		
8.0 Integrated Safeguards and Security Management and Emergency Management Systems			10%		
				Total Score	

[1] The final weights to be utilized for determining the overall S&T score will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2010.

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 2010 Contractor Letter Grade Scale

Determining the Amount of Performance-Based Fee Earned:

The percentage of the available performance-based fee that may be earned by the Contractor shall be determined based on the overall weighted numerical grade for the S&T Goals (see Table A. above) and then compared to Table C. blow. The overall numerical grade of the M&O Goals from Table A. above shall then be utilized to determine the final fee multiplier (see Table C.), which shall be utilized to determine the overall amount of performance-based fee earned for FY 2010 as calculated within Table D.

Overall Weighted Score from Table A.	Percent S&T Fee Earned	M&O Fee Multiplier
4.3	100%	100%
4.2		
4.1		
4.0	97%	100%
3.9		
3.8		
3.7	94%	100%
3.6		
3.5		
3.4	91%	100%
3.3		
3.2		
3.1		
3.0	88%	95%
2.9		
2.8		
2.7	85%	90%
2.6		
2.5		
2.4	75%	85%
2.3		
2.2		
2.1		
2.0	50%	75%
1.9		
1.8		
1.7	0%	60%
1.6		
1.5		
1.4		
1.3		
1.2		
1.1		
1.0 to 0.8	0%	0%
0.7 to 0.0	0%	0%

Table C. - Performance-Based Fee Earned Scale

Overall Fee Determination	
Percent S&T Fee Earned from Table C.	
M&O Fee Multiplier from Table C.	X
Overall Earned Performance-Based Fee	

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

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

The lack of performance objectives and notable outcomes 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 and/or amount of performance-based fee earned, the Contracting Officer may unilaterally adjust the rating and/or reduce the otherwise earned fee based on the Contractor's performance against all contract requirements as set forth in the Prime Contract. While reductions may be based on performance against any contract requirement, specific note should be made to contract clauses which address reduction of fee including, Standards of Contractor Performance Evaluation, DEAR 970.5215-1 – Total Available Fee: Base Fee Amount and Performance Fee Amount, and Conditional Payment of Fee, Profit, and Other Incentives – Facility Management Contracts. Data to support rating and/or fee adjustments may be derived from other sources to include, but not limited to, operational awareness (daily oversight) activities; "For Cause" reviews (if any); other outside agency reviews (OIG, GAO, DCAA, etc.), and the annual 2-week review (if needed).

The adjustment of a grade and/or reduction of otherwise earned fee will be determined by the severity of the performance failure and consideration of mitigating factors. DEAR 970.5215-3 Conditional Payment of Fee, Profit, and Other Incentives – Facility Management Contracts is the mechanism used for reduction of fee as it relates to performance failures related to safeguarding of classified information and to adequate protection of environment, health and safety. Its guidance can also serve as an example for reduction of fee in other areas.

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

Determining Award Term Eligibility

Ames Laboratory Contract offers Award Term Incentives to the operating Contractor. The base term of the contract is five years. The contract contains a non-monetary performance incentive which will allow the contractor to earn up to an additional fifteen years of contract term for exemplary performance. (Please refer to section F, Clause F.2 of Ames Contract for details)

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 Notable Outcomes, both objective and subjective, that are to focus primarily on end-results or impact and not on processes or activities. Notable Outcomes 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 Notable Outcomes

The following sections describe the Performance Goals, their supporting Objectives, and associated Notable Outcomes for FY 2010.

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%.

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

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science Program Office as identified below. The overall Goal score from each Program Office is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 1.1). 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 2010.

- Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES) (TBD%)
- Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER) (TBD%)
- Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS) (TBD%)

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned by each of the offices identified above by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 1.2 below). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 1.3 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. Individual Program Office weightings for each of the Objectives identified below are provided within Table 1.1. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as viewed by the Office of Science 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 2010 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 by progress reports, peer reviews, Field Work Proposals (FWPs), Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- The impact of publications on the field;
- Publication in journals outside the field indicating broad impact;
- Impact on DOE or other customer mission(s);
- Successful stewardship of mission-relevant research areas;
- Significant awards (R&D 100, FLC, Nobel Prizes, etc.);
- Invited talks, citations, making high-quality data available to the scientific community; and
- Development of tools and techniques that become standards or widely-used in the scientific community.

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

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.

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

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 measures through defined project products, progress reports, statements of work, program management plans, Program Office and/or other reviews/oversight, 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.

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 program/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.
E	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 (FWPs), Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Efficiency and effectiveness in meeting goals/milestones documented within FWPs 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.

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 meet 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 meet 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 meet; minor delays, overruns, and/or deficiencies are minimized and/or have little to no adverse impact 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 within 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 is 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/or 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[2]	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Basic Energy Sciences					
1.1 Impact			45%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			15%		
1.4 Delivery			10%		
				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 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 Basic Energy Sciences			TBD%		
Office of Biological and Environmental Research			TBD%		
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists			TBD%		
				Performance Goal 1.0 Total	

Table 1.2 – Overall Performance Goal Score Development[3]

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

3 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 2010.

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

GOAL 2.0 AND CORRESPONDING OBJECTIVES WILL NOT BE WEIGHTED OR ASSESSED DURING THE FY2010 RATING PERIOD.

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%.

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

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science Program Office as identified below. The overall Goal score from each Program Office is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 3.1). 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 2010.

- Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES) (TBD%)
- Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER) (TBD%)
- Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS) (TBD%)

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned by each of the offices identified above by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 3.2 below). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 3.3 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. Individual Program Office weightings for each of the Objectives identified below are provided within Table 3.1. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as viewed by the Office of Science Program Offices for which the Laboratory conducts work. Should one or more of the HQ Program Offices choose not to provide an evaluation for this Goal and its corresponding Objectives the weighting for the remaining HQ Program Offices shall be recalculated based on their percentage of BA for FY 2010 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.

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

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 by Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

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

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.

Office of Science Program Office Notable Outcomes

Provide effective leadership for the BES portfolio at Ames, including response to FY 2009 peer review. (Objective 3.2)

Science Program Office[4]	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
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 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 Basic Energy Sciences			TBD%		
Office of Biological and Environmental Research			TBD%		
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists			TBD%		
				Overall Program Office Total	

Table 3.2 – Overall Performance Goal Score Development[5]

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

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

[5] 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 2010.

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

The weight of this Goal is 20%.

This Goal evaluates the Contractor's Leadership capabilities in leading the direction of the overall Laboratory, 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 Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory (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). (33%)

4.2 Management and Operation of the Laboratory (Provide for Responsive and Accountable Leadership throughout the Organization). (33%)

4.3 Contractor Value-added (Provide Efficient and Effective Corporate Office Support as Appropriate). (34%)

In measuring the performance of the above Objectives, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider performance trends, outcomes and continuous improvement in overall Contractor Leadership's planning for, integration of, responsiveness to and support for the overall success of the Laboratory. This may include, but is not limited to, the quality of Laboratory Vision/Mission strategic planning documentation and progress in realizing the Laboratory vision/mission; the ability to establish and maintain long-term partnerships/relationships with the scientific and local communities as well as private industry that advance, expand, and benefit the ongoing Laboratory mission(s) and/or provide new opportunities/capabilities; implementation of a robust assurance system; Laboratory and Corporate Office Leadership's ability to instill responsibility and accountability down and through the entire organization; overall effectiveness of communications with DOE; understanding, management and allocation of the costs of doing business at the Laboratory commensurate with associated risks and benefits; utilization of corporate resources to establish joint appointments or other programs/projects/activities to strengthen the Laboratory; and advancing excellence in stakeholder relations to include good corporate citizenship within the local community.

4A Notable Outcome: Laboratory leadership will develop a strategic plan for the future scientific and technical activities of the Laboratory, which aligns with Office of Science and Department goals, and a detailed strategy for executing the plan during the next 2-5 years. (Obj. 4.1)

4B Notable Outcome: Laboratory leadership will provide a strategy for its Work for Others (WFO) program including the future of the Midwest Forensic Resources Center; the WFO program should align with and support Office of Science, Department, and Laboratory goals. (Obj. 4.1)

4C Notable Outcome: Laboratory leadership will make significant progress in defining and implementing its contractor assurance system. It is expected that a collaborative and uniform approach to this issue among all contractors will be evident. (Obj. 4.2)

4D Notable Outcome: The contractor will fill all key leadership positions at the Laboratory in a timely manner. (Obj 4.3)

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
4.0 Provide Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory					
4.1 Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory (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			33%		
4.2 Management and Operation of the Laboratory (Provide for Responsive and Accountable Leadership throughout the Organization			33%		
4.3 Contractor Value-added (Provide Efficient and Effective Corporate Office Support as Appropriate)			34%		
Performance Goal 4.0 Total					

Table 4.1 – Goal 4.0 Performance Rating Development

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 – 0.0

Table 4.2 - Goal 4.0 Final Letter Grade Scale

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

The weight of this Goal is 30%.

This Goal evaluates the Contractor's overall success in deploying, implementing, and improving integrated ES&H systems that efficiently and effectively support the mission(s) of the Laboratory.

5.1 Provide a Work Environment that Protects Workers and the Environment. (40%)

5.2 Provide Efficient and Effective Implementation of Integrated Safety, Health and Environment Management. (40%)

5.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Waste Management, Minimization, and Pollution Prevention. (20%)

In measuring the performance of the above Objectives, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider performance trends, outcomes and continuous improvement in protecting workers, the public and the environment. This may include, but is not limited to, minimizing the occurrence of environment, safety and health (ESH) incidents; effectiveness of the Integrated Safety Management (ISM) system relative to the Core Functions and Guiding Principles of ISM and addresses efficiency with respect to the performance of the ISM program at the Laboratory; the effectiveness of work planning, feedback, and improvement processes; the strength of the safety culture throughout the Laboratory; the effective development, implementation and maintenance of an efficient and effective Environmental Management system covering cradle to grave Laboratory level management of waste, pollution prevention and regulatory compliance; and the effectiveness of responses to identified hazards and/or incidents.

5A Notable Outcome:

Ames Laboratory will ensure that appropriate ES&H requirements are applied To 100% of subcontracts and are implemented at all levels to ensure that ARRA projects are performed in a safe manner. (Obj. 5.1)

5B Notable Outcome:

Ames Laboratory will conduct beryllium sampling and decontamination efforts with the utmost concern for the health and safety of employees and the public. Ames Laboratory will produce a close-out or status report by September 30, 2010, detailing the levels of beryllium contamination identified in Spedding Hall, the assurances of protection to workers and the public, and a summary of remediation accomplishments. (Obj. 5.1)

5C Notable Outcome:

Ames Laboratory will demonstrate improvement in their Environmental Management System by incorporating 100% of the findings from the Independent Review by September 30, 2010. (Obj. 5.2)

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			40%		
5.2 Provide Efficient and Effective Implementation of Integrated Safety, Health and Environment Management			40%		
5.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Waste Management, Minimization, and Pollution Prevention			20%		
Performance Goal 5.0 Total					

Table 5.1 – Goal 5.0 Performance Rating Development

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 – 0.0

Table 5.2 - Goal 5.0 Final Letter Grade Scale

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

The weight of this Goal is 20%.

This Goal evaluates the Contractor's overall success in deploying, implementing, and improving integrated business systems that efficiently and effectively support the mission(s) of the Laboratory.

6.1 Provide an Efficient, Effective, & Responsive Financial Management System(s) (20%)

6.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, & Responsive Acquisition Management System (15%)

6.3 Provide an Efficient, Effective, & Responsive Property Management System. (10%)

6.4 Provide an Efficient, Effective, & Responsive Human Resources Management System & Diversity Program. (15%)

6.5 Provide Efficient, Effective, & Responsive Management Systems for Internal Audit & Oversight; Quality; Information Management; & Other Administrative Support Services as Appropriate. (15%)

6.6 Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Technology & Commercialization of Intellectual Assets. (25%)

In measuring the performance of the above Objectives, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider performance trends, outcomes and continuous improvement in the development, deployment and integration of foundational program (e.g., Quality, Financial Management, Acquisition Management, Requirements Management, and Human Resource Management) systems across the Laboratory. This may include, but is not limited to, minimizing the occurrence of management systems support issues; quality of work products; continual improvement and improvement driven by the results of audits, reviews, and other performance information; the integration of system performance metrics and trends; the degree of knowledge and appropriate utilization of established system processes/procedures by Contractor management and staff; benchmarking and performance trending analysis. The DOE evaluator(s) shall also consider the stewardship of the pipeline of innovations and resulting intellectual assets at the Laboratory along with impacts and returns created/generated as a result of technology transfer and intellectual asset deployment activities.

6A Notable Outcome:

Ames Laboratory will ensure that its new Prime Contract Clause H.41 – Special provisions relating to work funded under American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Feb 2009) will flow down to all subcontracts over $25,000 that are funded in whole or in part by the Recovery Act (unless the subcontract is with an individual) (Obj. 6.2)

6B Notable Outcome:

Ames Laboratory will complete IM projects (which includes the Payroll/Leave portion of Deltek) as identified in FY 2010 IM plans and demonstrate measurable improvement, and the FY 2011 IM plans are in place by September 30, 2010. (Obj. 6.5)

6C Notable Outcome:

Ames Laboratory will disclose each subject invention to DOE Patent Counsel within two months after the inventor discloses it in writing to contractor personnel responsible for patent matters. All invention disclosures should be submitted through the I-Edison system and be accurate and complete. (Obj.6.6)

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
6.0 Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission(s)					
6.1 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Financial Management System(s)			20%		
6.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition System			15%		
6.3 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Property Management System			10%		
6.4 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Human Resources Management System			15%		
6.5 Provide Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Management Systems for Internal Audit and Oversight; Quality; Information Management; and Other Administrative Support Services as Appropriate			15%		
6.6 Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Technology and Commercialization of Intellectual Assets			25%		
				Performance Goal 6.0 Total	

Table 6.1 – 6.0 Goal Performance Rating Development

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 – 0.0

Table 6.2 - Goal 6.0 Final Letter Grade Scale

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

The weight of this Goal is 20%.

This Goal evaluates 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 mission(s) and complex challenges.

7.1 Manage Facilities and Infrastructure in an Efficient and Effective Manner that Optimizes Usage, Minimizes Life Cycle Costs, and Ensures Site Capability to Meet Mission Needs. (70%)

7.2 Provide Planning for and Acquire the Facilities and Infrastructure required to support the Continuation and Growth of Laboratory Missions and Programs. (30%)

In measuring the performance of the above Objectives, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider performance trends, outcomes and continuous improvement in facility and infrastructure programs. This may include, but is not limited to, the management of real property assets to maintain effective operational safety, worker health, environmental protection and compliance, property preservation, and cost effectiveness; effective facility utilization, maintenance and budget execution; day-to-day management and utilization of space in the active portfolio; maintenance and renewal of building systems, structures and components associated with the Laboratory's facility and land assets; management of energy use and conservation practices; the integration and alignment of the Laboratory's comprehensive strategic plan with capabilities; facility planning, forecasting, and acquisition; the delivery of accurate and timely information required to carry out the critical decision and budget formulation process; quality of site and facility planning documents; and Cost and Schedule Performance Index performance for construction projects.

7A Notable Outcome:

Ames Laboratory will manage the ARRA project to keep it within budget and on schedule. (Obj. 7.1)

7B Notable Outcome:

Ames Laboratory will complete the implementation of the Mission Readiness plan and incorporate the results into the Facilities and Infrastructure section of the Annual Laboratory Plan. (Obj. 7.2)

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, Minimizes Life Cycle Costs, and Ensures Site Capability to Meet Mission Needs			70%		
7.2 Provide Planning for and Acquire the Facilities and Infrastructure Required to Support the Continuation and Growth of Laboratory Missions and Programs			30%		
Performance Goal 7.0 Total					

Table 7.1 – 7.0 Goal Performance Rating Development

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 – 0.0

Table 7.2 - Goal 7.0 Final Letter Grade Scale

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

The weight of this Goal is 10%.

This Goal evaluates 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. (35%)

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, Classified Matter, and Property. (10%)

8.4 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Classified and Sensitive Information. (15%)

In measuring the performance of the above Objectives, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider performance trends, outcomes and continuous improvement in the safeguards and security, cyber security and emergency management program systems. This may include, but is not limited to, the commitment of leadership to strong safeguards and security, cyber security and emergency management systems; the integration of these systems into the culture of the Laboratory; the degree of knowledge and appropriate utilization of established system processes/procedures by Contractor management and staff; maintenance and the appropriate utilization of Safeguards, Security, and Cyber risk identification, prevention, and control processes/activities; and the prevention and management controls and prompt reporting and mitigation of events as necessary.

8A Notable Outcome:

Ames Laboratory will work with the Ames Site Office to benchmark and prepare a draft COOP plan that meets the requirements of DOE O 151.1C, by the end of FY2010. (Obj. 8.1)

8B Notable Outcome:

The Ames Laboratory will identify sensitive data and apply controls as defined in the sensitive enclave policy for Cyber Security. (Obj. 8.2)

8C Notable Outcome:

Authority To Operate (ATO) will be renewed by the end of FY2010. (Obj. 8.2)

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			35%		
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, Classified Matter, and Property			10%		
8.4 Provide an Efficient and Effective CI System for the Protection of Classified and Sensitive Information			15%		
Performance Goal 8.0 Total					

Table 8.1 – 8.0 Goal Performance Rating Development

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 – 0.0

Table 8.2 - Goal 8.0 Final Letter Grade Scale

Attachment I

Office Science Program Office Goal & Objective Weightings

	BER	BES	WDTS
Goal's weight	**Weight 75**	**Weight 60**	**Weight 65**
1a. Impact (significance)	30	45%	25
1b. Leadership (recognition of S&T accomplishments)	20	30%	30
1c. Output (productivity) (pass/fail)	20	15%	30
1d. Delivery (pass/fail)	30	10%	15
check sum **Goal's weight**	100 **0**	100 **0**	100 **0**
2a. Design of Facility (the initiation phase and the definition phase, i.e. activities leading up to CD-2)	0	0	0
2b. Construction of Facility/Fabrication of Components (execution phase, Post CD-2 to CD-4)	0	0	0
2c. Operation of Facility	0	0	0
2d. Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Lab's Research Base	0	0	0
check sum **Goal's weight**	0 **25**	0 **40%**	0 **35**
3a. Stewardship of Scientific Capabilities and Programmatic Vision	20	40%	20
3b. Program Planning and Management	30	30%	40
3.c Program Management-Communication & Responsiveness (to HQ)	50	30%	40
check sum	100	100	100
Goal check sum			

Attachment II. Evaluation Schedule

September 1, 2009	Site Offices issue calls for 2009 year-end evaluation input
September 30, 2009	End of 2009 evaluation period
November 16, 2009	Site Office Performance Evaluation Briefing Package for SC-1 due to OLPE
Week of November 30,2009	Site Office adjustments to evaluations finalized as necessary based on results of SC-1 presentation and SC-1 approvals issued
December 7 & 9, 2009	SC-1, SC-2, SC-3 and Site Office Manager discuss report and grades with Contractor leadership (e.g., Laboratory Director)
Week of December 14, 2009	Approved Performance Evaluation Report and Incentive Determination issued to contractor Report Cards published on SC Website
May 30, 2010	2010 Mid Year feedback to Contractor