

**U.S. Department of Energy**

**Fiscal Year**

—

**Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan  
for the Management and Direction of the Programs of  
Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education**

DRAFT

<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>I. DETERMINING THE CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE RATING AND AWARD FEE ...</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>II. GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND NOTABLE OUTCOMES.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Goal 1.0 Provide for Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment .....</b>	<b>10</b>
1.1 Provide Results with Meaningful Impact on the Designated Program Areas of ORISE.....	
1.2 Provide Quality Leadership that Advances the Mission Goals of DOE and its Customers	
<b>GOAL 2.0 Provide for Efficient and Effective Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operations of Research Facilities (RESERVED) .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Goal 3.0 Provide Effective and Efficient Program Management .....</b>	<b>15</b>
3.1 Provide Effective and Efficient Project / Program / Facilities Management	
3.2 Provide Effective and Efficient Management Systems and Processes to Serve Multiple Programs and Customers	
3.3 Provide Effective and Efficient Communications and Responsiveness to Customer Needs	
<b>GOAL 4.0 Provide Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of ORISE.....</b>	<b>20</b>
4.1 Leadership and Stewardship of ORISE.....	20
4.2 Management and Operation of ORISE.....	22
4.3 Contractor Value-added.....	24
<b>GOAL 5.0 Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection.....</b>	<b>25</b>
5.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Worker Health and Safety Program .....	25
5.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective Environmental Management System.....	25
<b>GOAL 6.0 Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of ORISE Mission(s) .....</b>	<b>26</b>
6.1 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Financial Management System(s).....	26
6.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition Management System and Property Management System(s) .....	26
6.3 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Human Resources Management System and Diversity Program.....	26

6.4	Provide Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Contractor Assurance Systems, including Internal Audit and Quality .....	26
<b>GOAL 7.0 Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet ORISE Needs.....</b>		<b>28</b>
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.....	28
7.2	Provide Planning for and acquire the Facilities and Infrastructure required to support the Continuation and Growth of ORISE Missions and Programs.....	28
<b>GOAL 8.0 Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management and Emergency Management Systems .....</b>		<b>30</b>
8.1	Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System .....	30
8.2	Provide an Efficient and Effective Cyber Security System for the Protection of Classified and Unclassified Information.....	30
8.3	Provide an Efficient and Effective Physical Security Program for the Protection of Special Nuclear Materials, Classified Matter, Classified Information, Sensitive Information, and Property.....	30

DRAFT

## INTRODUCTION

This document, the Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan, primarily serves as the Department of Energy's (DOE) Quality Assurance/Surveillance Plan for the evaluation of the contractor's performance regarding the management and direction of the programs of the Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education (hereafter referred to as "ORISE") under Contract Number TBD, for the evaluation period of FY XX.

The performance evaluation provides a standard by which to determine whether the Contractor is managerially and operationally in control of ORISE and is meeting the mission and requirement and performance expectations/objectives of the Department as stipulated within the contract.

This document also describes the preliminary distribution of the total available award fee and the methodology for determining the amount of fee earned by the Contractor as stipulated within the clauses entitled, DOE-B-2001 Cost-Plus-Award-Fee Contract: Total Estimated Cost, Fee and Period of Performance; DOE-H-2060 Base and Award Fee; and 952.223-76, Conditional Payment of Fee or Profit – Safeguarding Restricted Data and Other Classified Information and Protection of Worker Safety and Health. The Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) Site Office (OSO), in partnership with the Contractor and DOE Headquarters (HQ) will define the measurement basis that serves as the Contractor's performance-based evaluation and fee determination.

The Performance Goals (hereafter referred to as Goals), Performance Objectives (hereafter referred to as Objectives), and set of Notable Outcomes discussed herein will be developed in accordance with contract expectations set forth within the contract. The Notable Outcomes for meeting the Objectives will be developed in coordination with the HQ program offices and OSO 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 to be set forth within this plan.

The overall performance against each Objective of this performance plan, to include the evaluation of Notable Outcomes (once developed), will be evaluated by the appropriate HQ office(s), major customers, and/or the OSO, 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 OSO will work closely with each HQ program office and other customers throughout the year in evaluating the Contractor's performance and will provide observations regarding programs and projects, as well as other management and direction activities, conducted by the Contractor throughout the year. The OSO will also meet periodically with the Contractor to discuss performance.

Section I provides information on how the performance rating (grade) for the Contractor, as well as how the award fee earned (if any), will be determined. It 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 AND AWARD FEE**

The FY XX 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 Programmatic (PRO) and Management (MGMT) performance. Each Goal is composed of one or more weighted Objective(s). Additionally, a set of Notable Outcomes will be identified to highlight key aspects/areas of performance deserving special attention by the Contractor for the upcoming FY. 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) (i.e. if the contractor fails to meet expectations against a Notable Outcome tied to an Objective under Goal 1.0, 2.0, or 3.0, the program office that assigned the Notable Outcome shall award a grade less than "B+" for the Objective(s) to which the Notable Outcome is linked; and if the contractor fails to meet expectations against a Notable Outcome tied to an Objective under Goal 4.0, 5.0, 6.0, 7.0, or 8.0, SC shall award a grade less than "B+" for the Objective(s) to which the Notable Outcome is linked). 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. The following section describes the methodology for determining the Contractor's grades at the Objective level.

### Performance Evaluation Methodology:

The purpose of this section is to establish a methodology to develop grades at the Objective Level. Each evaluating organization will provide a proposed rating for each applicable Objective. A numerical score and corresponding letter grade for each Objective will be subjectively assigned. Each evaluation will measure the degree of effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in meeting the corresponding Objectives.

For Goals 1.0, 2.0 and 3.0, the Contractor will be evaluated against the defined levels of performance provided for each Objective under each Goal. Goal 2.0, while identified is held in reserve. The contractor performance under goal 4.0 will also be evaluated using the defined levels of performance described for the three Objectives listed under goal 4.0. The descriptions for these defined levels of performance are included in Section II.

It is DOE's expectation that the Contractor provides for and maintains management systems that efficiently and effectively support the current mission(s) of ORISE and assures ORISE's ability to deliver against DOE's future needs. In evaluating the Contractor's performance, DOE will assess the degree of effectiveness and performance in meeting each of the Objectives provided under each of the Goals. For Goals 5.0 through 8.0, 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; "For Cause" reviews (if any); and other outside agency reviews (Office of Inspector General, General Accounting Office, Defense Contract Audit Agency, etc.).

ORISE is to deliver the specialized products and services needed to support Departmental and other sponsors' needs. Management performance at ORISE meets DOE's expectations (defined as the grade of B+ for each Objective) if the Contractor is performing at a level that fully supports ORISE's current and future designated program areas. Performance that has, or has the potential to, (1) adversely impact the delivery of the current and/or future DOE missions supported by ORISE; (2) adversely impact the DOE and/or ORISE's reputation; or (3) does not provide the competent people, necessary facilities, and robust systems necessary to ensure sustainable performance, will be graded below expectations.

The Department sets our expectations high, and expects performance at that level to optimize the efficient and effective operation of ORISE. Thus, the Department does not expect routine Contractor performance

above expectations against the MGMT Goals (4.0 – 8.0). Performance that might merit grades above B+ would need to reflect a Contractor’s significant contributions to the management and operations at the system of DOE Laboratories, or recognition by external, independent entities as exemplary performance.

Definitions for the grading scale for the Objectives associated with Goals 5.0 - 8.0 are provided in Figure A.

DRAFT

<b>Letter Grade</b>	<b>Numerical Score</b>	<b>Definition</b>
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 ORISE's current and future mission(s). Performance is notable for its significant contributions to the management and operations across the Office of Science (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 ORISE's current and future mission(s). Performance is notable for its contributions to the management and operations across the SC system of laboratories, and/or has 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 ORISE's current and future 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 ORISE's current and future mission(s). No performance has, or has the potential to, adversely impact (1) the delivery of the current and/or future DOE/ORISE mission(s), (2) DOE and/or ORISE'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 ORISE's current and future mission(s) 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 ORISE's current and future mission(s) 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 ORISE's current and future mission(s) or provide a sustainable performance platform and/or have affected the reputation of ORISE 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 ORISE's current and future mission(s) or provide a sustainable performance platform and may affect the reputation of ORISE 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 ORISE's ability to deliver on current and future mission(s) and have harmed the reputation of ORISE 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 ORISE; DOE leadership engagement is required to deal with the situation and help the Contractor.
F	0.7-0.0	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 A. Letter Grade Definitions**

Calculating Individual Goal Scores and Letter Grade:

Each Objective is assigned an earned numerical score 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 raw numerical score for each Goal. The raw numerical score for each Goal will be rounded to the nearest tenth of a point using the standard rounding convention discussed below and then compared to Figure B to determine the final Goal score and grade. 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 scores to the Goal grade. No overall rollup grade shall be provided.

As stated above, the raw numerical score from each calculation will be carried through to the next stage of the calculation process. The raw numerical score for PRO and MGMT will be rounded to the nearest tenth of a point for purposes of determining fee. A standard rounding convention of x.44 and less rounds down to the nearest tenth (here, x.4), while x.45 and greater rounds up to the nearest tenth (here, x.5).

Determining the Amount of Award Fee Earned:

<b>PRO Performance Goal</b>	<b>Numerical Score</b>	<b>Weight</b>		
1.0 Provide for Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment		TBD		
2.0 Provide Effective and Efficient Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operation of Research Facilities (RESERVED)		NA		
3.0 Provide Effective and Efficient Program Management		TBD		
			<b>Initial PRO Score</b>	

**Table A. FY XX Contractor Evaluation Score Calculation**

<b>MGMT Performance Goal</b>	<b>Numerical Score</b>	<b>Weight</b>		
5.0 Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection		TBD		
6.0 Business Systems		TBD		
7.0 Acquiring, Constructing, Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio		TBD		
8.0 Integrated Safeguards and Security Management and Emergency Management Systems		TBD		
			<b>Initial MGMT Score</b>	

**Table B. Fiscal Year XX Contractor Evaluation Initial MGMT Score Calculation**



These initial scores will then be adjusted based on the numerical score for Goal 4.0 (see Table C, below).

	Numerical Score	Weight		
Initial PRO Score		0.75		
Goal 4.0		0.25		
<b>Final PRO Score</b>				
Initial MGMT Score		0.75		
Goal 4.0		0.25		
<b>Final MGMT Score</b>				

**Table C. Fiscal Year Final PRO and MGMT Score Calculation**

	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F
<b>Total Score</b>	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

**Figure B. FY 2015 Contractor Letter Grade Scale**

The percentage of the available award fee that may be earned by the Contractor will be determined based on the final score for PRO (see Table A) and then compared to Figure C below. The final score for MGMT (see Table A) will then be compared to Figure C to determine the MGMT fee multiplier, which will be utilized to determine the Overall Earned Award Fee for FY XX as calculated within Table D.

Total Score from Table A	Percent PRO Fee Earned	MGMT 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	88%	95%
3.0		
2.9		
2.8	85%	90%
2.7		
2.6		
2.5	75%	85%
2.4		
2.3		
2.2		
2.1	50%	75%
2.0		
1.9		
1.8	0%	60%
1.7 to 1.1		
1.0 to 0.0	0%	0%

**Figure C. Award Fee Earned Scale**

Overall Fee Determination	
Percent PRO Fee Earned	
MGMT Fee Multiplier	×
Overall Earned Award Fee (%)	

**Table D. Final Percentage of Award Fee Earned Determination**

The Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) requirements for using and administering cost-plus-award-fee contracts provide for a five-level Adjectival Grading System with associated levels of available fee. SC has addressed the FAR 16 language by mapping its standard numerical scores and associated fee determinations to the FAR Adjectival Rating System, as noted in Figure D.

<b>Range of Total STPA Score</b>	<b>FAR Adjectival Rating</b>	<b>Maximum Award Fee Pool Available to be Earned</b>
3.1 to 4.3	Excellent	100%
2.5 to 3.0	Very Good	88%
2.1 to 2.4	Good	75%
1.8 to 2.0	Satisfactory	50%
0.0 to 1.7	Unsatisfactory	0%

**Figure D. Crosswalk of SC Scores and the FAR Rating System**

Adjustment to the Letter Grade and/or Award Fee Determination:

The lack of Objectives and Notable Outcomes in this plan does not diminish the need to comply with minimum contractual requirements. Although the performance-based Goals and their corresponding Objectives will be the primary means utilized in determining the Contractor’s performance grade and/or amount of award 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. Data to support rating and/or fee adjustments may also be derived from other previously addressed sources.

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. The DEAR Clause 952.223-76 - *CONDITIONAL PAYMENT OF FEE OR PROFIT - SAFEGUARDING RESTRICTED DATA AND OTHER CLASSIFIED INFORMATION AND PROTECTION OF WORKER SAFETY AND HEALTH* 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, safety, and health (ES&H). Its guidance can also serve as an example for reduction of fee in other areas.

The final Contractor 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 rating and/or fee adjustments made from the otherwise earned rating/fee based on Goal achievements.

Determining Award Term Eligibility:

Pursuant to the Section F.5 Clause AWARD TERM INCENTIVE, the Contractor may also earn additional award term of 12 months during this evaluation period by meeting or exceeding performance expectations as described in the clause.

## II. GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND NOTABLE OUTCOMES

### 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 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, DOE provides clear direction to the contractors and develops annual performance plans 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:

- Objectives will be established in partnership with affected organizations and are directly aligned to 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 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 demonstrated performance by the Contractor, and on a set of Notable Outcomes that focus Contractor leadership on the specific items that are the most important initiatives and highest risk issues the Contractor must address during the year. These Notable Outcomes should be objective, measurable, and results-oriented to allow for a definitive determination of whether or not the specific outcome was achieved at the end of the year.

### Goals, Objectives, and Notable Outcomes:

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

## **Goal 1.0 Provide for Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment**

**The programs at ORISE produce high-quality results that advance the designated program areas of ORISE; demonstrate sustained progress and impact; receive appropriate external recognition of accomplishments; and contribute to overall goals of the Department and its customers.**

This Goal measures the overall effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in delivering results which contribute to and enhance the DOE mission by providing science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education and workforce training, promoting the quality of DOE's world-class scientific research capacity, and supporting world-class scientific and technical capabilities for protection of workers, the environment, and national nuclear security, which are recognized by others.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers as identified below. The overall Goal score from each HQ Program Office and/or customer is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 1.1). 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 cost for FY XX.

- Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research (ASCR)
- Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES)
- Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER)
- Office of Fusion Energy Sciences (FES)
- Office of Nuclear Physics (NP)
- Office of High Energy Physics (HEP)
- Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS)
- Office of Environmental Management (EM)
- Associate Administrator for Emergency Operations (NA-40)
- Office of Health and Safety (AU-10)

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 Figure B to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as viewed by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers for which ORISE 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 cost for FY XX as compared to the total cost for those remaining HQ Program Offices.

### **Objectives**

#### **1.1 Provide Results with Meaningful Impact on the Designated Program Areas of ORISE**

In assessing the performance of ORISE against this Objective, the following assessment elements should be considered:

- Performance of ORISE with respect to proposed program plans;
- Performance of the ORISE with respect to community impact and peer review; and
- Performance of the ORISE with respect to impact to DOE mission needs.

The following is a sampling of factors to be considered in determining the level of performance for ORISE against this Objective. The evaluator(s) may consider the following as measured through progress reports, peer reviews, Field Work Proposals (FWPs), Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.

- Impact of publications on the field and/or community, as measured primarily by peer review;
- Impact of STEM training results on the field, as measured primarily by peer review or external studies;
- Impact of STEM training results outside the field indicating broader interest;
- Impact of program results on DOE or other customer mission(s);
- Successful stewardship of mission-relevant program and capability areas;
- Delivery on proposed program plans;
- Significant awards and/or citations (R&D 100, FLC, S1 Honor awards, etc.);
- Invited talks, citations, making high-quality data available to the scientific community or safety and security communities; and
- Development of tools and techniques that become standards or widely-used in the respective scientific or technical community.

<b>Letter Grade</b>	<b>Definition</b>
A+	TBD
A	TBD
A-	TBD
B+	TBD
B	TBD
B-	TBD
C	TBD
D	TBD
F	TBD

**Figure 1.1 Letter Grade Definitions**

## **1.2 Provide Quality Leadership that Advances the Mission Goals of DOE and its Customers.**

In assessing the performance of ORISE against this Objective, the following assessment elements should be considered:

- Innovativeness/Novelty of ideas and/or solutions put forward by ORISE;
- Extent to which ORISE staff takes on substantive leadership roles within the communities relevant to their designated program areas;
- Extent to which ORISE contributes thoughtful and thorough peer reviews and other research or technical assessments as requested by DOE and SC.

The following is a sampling of factors to be considered in determining the level of performance for ORISE against this Objective. The evaluator(s) may consider the following as measured through progress reports, peer reviews, Field Work Proposals (FWPs), Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Willingness to pursue novel approaches and/or demonstration of innovative solutions to problems;
- Willingness to take on high-risk/high payoff/long-term problems, evidence that previous risky decisions by the staff have proved to be correct and are paying off;
- The uniqueness and challenge of programs pursued, recognition for doing the best work in the field;
- Extent and quality of collaborative efforts;

- Staff members visible in leadership positions in the communities relevant to the designated program areas;
- Effectiveness in driving the direction and setting the standard in designated programs areas; and
- Success in competition for resources; and
- Demonstrated program leadership and quality that results in the ability of ORISE to provide effective support to its large base of non-DOE customers in its designated program areas.

Letter Grade	Definition
A+	TBD
A	TBD
A-	TBD
B+	TBD
B	TBD
B-	TBD
C	TBD
D	TBD
F	TBD

Figure 1.2 Letter Grade Definitions

**Notable Outcomes**

- TBD 1
- TBD 2

Program Office <sup>1</sup>	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Overall Score
<b>Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research</b>				
1.1 Impact			TBD	
1.2 Leadership			TBD	
Overall ASCR Total				
<b>Office of Basic Energy</b>				
1.1 Impact			TBD	
1.2 Leadership			TBD	
Overall BES Total				
<b>Office of Biological and Environmental Research</b>				
1.1 Impact			TBD	
1.2 Leadership			TBD	
Overall BER Total				
<b>Office of Fusion Energy Sciences</b>				
1.1 Impact			TBD	
1.2 Leadership			TBD	
Overall FES Total				
<b>Office of Nuclear Physics</b>				

<sup>1</sup>A complete listing of the Objectives weightings under the PRO Goals for the SC Programs and other customers is provided within Attachment I to this plan.

1.1 Impact			TBD	
1.2 Leadership			TBD	
Overall NP Total				
<b>Office of High Energy Physics</b>				
1.1 Impact			TBD	
1.2 Leadership			TBD	
Overall HEP Total				
<b>Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists</b>				
1.1 Impact			TBD	
1.2 Leadership			TBD	
Overall WDTS Total				
<b>Associate Administrator for Emergency Operations</b>				
1.1 Impact			TBD	
1.2 Leadership			TBD	
Overall NA-40 Total				
<b>Office of Health and Safety</b>				
1.1 Impact			TBD	
1.2 Leadership			TBD	
Overall AU Total				

**Table 1.1 Goal 1.0 Score Development**

Program Office <sup>2</sup>	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (cost)	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Research				
Office of Basic Energy Sciences				
Office of Biological and Environmental Research				
Office of Fusion Energy Sciences				
Office of Nuclear Physics				
Office of High Energy Physics				
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists				
Office of Environmental Management				
Associate Administrator for Emergency Operations				
Office of Health and Safety				
<b>Performance Goal 1.0 Total</b>				

**Table 1.2 Overall Performance Goal 1.0 Score Development**

<sup>2</sup> 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 cost for FY XX.



**GOAL 2.0 Provide for Efficient and Effective Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operation of Research Facilities**

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

DRAFT

### **Goal 3.0 Provide Effective and Efficient Program Management**

**ORISE provides effective program vision and leadership; implements and manages high quality programs; recruits and retains a skilled and qualified workforce; and provides outstanding, integrated management processes and systems, which improve program efficiency.**

This Goal shall measure the Contractor's overall management in executing its designated program areas. Dimensions of program management covered include: 1) providing key competencies to support programs to include key staffing requirements; 2) successful deployment of integrated management systems that effectively serve multiple programs and customers; and 3) maintaining effective communications with customers to include providing quality responses to customer needs.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers as identified below. The overall Goal score from each HQ Program Office and/or customer is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 3.1). 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 cost for FY XX.

- Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research (ASCR)
- Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES)
- Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER)
- Office of Fusion Energy Sciences (FES)
- Office of Nuclear Physics (NP)
- Office of High Energy Physics (HEP)
- Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS)
- Office of Environmental Management (EM)
- Associate Administrator for Emergency Operations (NA-40)
- Office of Health and Safety (AU-10)

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 Figure B to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as viewed by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers for which the Laboratory conducts work. Should one or more of the HQ Program Offices choose not to provide an evaluation for this Goal and its corresponding Objectives the weighting for the remaining HQ Program Offices shall be recalculated based on their percentage of cost for FY XX as compared to the total cost for those remaining HQ Program Offices.

#### **3.1 Provide Effective and Efficient Project/Program/Facilities Management**

In assessing the performance of ORISE against this Objective, the following assessment elements should be considered:

- ORISE's implementation and management of programs, facilities, and services according to proposed plans;
- The extent to which ORISE's implementation and management of projects/programs/facilities supports the ORISE strategic plan
- Adequacy of ORISE's consideration of technical and management risks;
- The extent to which ORISE is successful in identifying/avoiding technical and management problems;

- Effectiveness in leveraging capabilities across multiple activities within a designated program area;
- The extent to which ORISE demonstrates a willingness to make tough decisions (i.e., cut programs with sub-critical mass of expertise, divert resources to more promising areas, etc.); and
- The use of ORISE overhead funds to improve the competitiveness of the ORISE.

The following is a sampling of factors to be considered in determining the level of performance for ORISE against this Objective. The evaluator(s) may consider the following as measured through progress reports, peer reviews, Field Work Proposals (FWPs), Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.

- ORISE plans that are reviewed by experts outside of ORISE management and/or include broadly-based input from within ORISE.
- Quality of experience of program participants’ interactions with ORISE as identified by completed programmatic participant surveys conducted by ORISE on behalf of the DOE customer.
- Responsiveness to time critical programmatic activities.

Letter Grade	Definition
A+	TBD
A	TBD
A-	TBD
B+	TBD
B	TBD
B-	TBD
C	TBD
D	TBD
F	TBD

**Figure 3.1 Letter Grade Definitions**

### **3.2 Provide Effective and Efficient Management Systems and Processes to Serve Multiple Programs and Customers**

In assessing the performance of ORISE against this Objective, the following assessment elements should be considered:

- Effectiveness in leveraging capabilities and operational knowledge across designated program areas.
- The extent to which programs take advantage of ORISE capabilities in other program areas — programs are more than the sum of their individual project parts.
- The extent to which the integration of capabilities and operational knowledge across designated program areas results in program improved program effectiveness and efficiency.
- The extent to which the integration of capabilities stimulated innovation on management systems and processes.
- The extent to which work for non-DOE sponsors stimulates improvements in management system and processes that benefit DOE work activities

The following is a sampling of factors to be considered in determining the level of performance for ORISE against this Objective. The evaluator(s) may consider the following as measured through progress reports, peer reviews, Field Work Proposals (FWPs), Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.

- TBD 1.
- TBD 2, etc.

Letter Grade	Definition
A+	TBD
A	TBD
A-	TBD
B+	TBD
B	TBD
B-	TBD
C	TBD
D	TBD
F	TBD

**Figure 3.2 Letter Grade Definitions**

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

In assessing the performance of ORISE against this Objective, the following assessment elements should be considered:

- The quality, accuracy and timeliness of ORISE’s response to customer requests for information;
- The extent to which ORISE provides point-of-contact resources and maintains effective internal communications hierarchies to facilitate efficient determination of the appropriate point-of-contact for a given issue or program element;
- The effectiveness of ORISE’s communications and depth of responsiveness under extraordinary or critical circumstances;
- The appropriateness and consistency of ORISE communications with program participants and stakeholders relative to customer requirements and guidance; and
- The effectiveness of ORISE management in accentuating the importance of communication and responsiveness.

The following is a sampling of factors to be considered in determining the level of performance for ORISE against this Objective. The evaluator(s) may consider the following as measured through progress reports, peer reviews, Field Work Proposals (FWPs), Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.

- TBD 1.
- TBD 2.

Letter Grade	Definition
A+	TBD
A	TBD
A-	TBD
B+	TBD
B	TBD
B-	TBD
C	TBD
D	TBD
F	TBD

**Figure 3.3 Letter Grade Definitions**

**Notable Outcomes**

- TBD 1
- TBD 2

Program Office <sup>3</sup>	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Overall Score
<b>Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research</b>				
3.1 Project / Program / Facilities Management			TBD	
3.2 Management Systems and Processes			TBD	
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			TBD	
Overall ASCR Total				
<b>Office of Basic Energy Sciences</b>				
3.1 Project / Program / Facilities Management			TBD	
3.2 Management Systems and Processes			TBD	
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			TBD	
Overall BES Total				
<b>Office of Biological and Environmental Research</b>				
3.1 Project / Program / Facilities Management			TBD	
3.2 Management Systems and Processes			TBD	
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			TBD	
Overall BER Total				
<b>Office of Fusion Energy Sciences</b>				
3.1 Project / Program / Facilities Management			TBD	
3.2 Management Systems and Processes			TBD	
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			TBD	
Overall FES Total				
<b>Office of Nuclear Physics</b>				
3.1 Project / Program / Facilities Management			TBD	
3.2 Management Systems and Processes			TBD	
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			TBD	

<sup>3</sup>A complete listing of the Objectives weightings under the S&T Goals for the SC Programs and other customers is provided within Attachment I to this plan.

Overall NP Total				
<b>Office of High Energy Physics</b>				
3.1 Project / Program / Facilities Management			TBD	
3.2 Management Systems and Processes			TBD	
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			TBD	
Overall HEP Total				
<b>Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists</b>				
3.1 Project / Program / Facilities Management			TBD	
3.2 Management Systems and Processes			TBD	
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			TBD	
Overall WDTS Total				
<b>Associate Administrator for Emergency Operations</b>				
3.1 Project / Program / Facilities Management			TBD	
3.2 Management Systems and Processes			TBD	
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			TBD	
Overall NA-40 Total				
<b>Office of Health and Safety</b>				
3.1 Project / Program / Facilities Management			TBD	
3.2 Management Systems and Processes			TBD	
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			TBD	
Overall AU Total				

**Table 3.1. Program Performance Goal 3.0 Score Development**

<b>Program Office<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Letter Grade</b>	<b>Numerical Score</b>	<b>Funding Weight (cost)</b>	<b>Overall Weighted Score</b>
<b>Office of Advanced Scientific Research</b>				
<b>Office of Basic Energy Sciences</b>				
<b>Office of Biological and Environmental Research</b>				
<b>Office of Fusion Energy Sciences</b>				
<b>Office of Nuclear Physics</b>				
<b>Office of High Energy Physics</b>				
<b>Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists</b>				
<b>Office of Environmental Management</b>				
<b>Associate Administrator for Emergency Operations</b>				
<b>Office of Health and Safety</b>				
<b>Performance Goal 1.0 Total</b>				

**Table 3.2 Overall Performance Goal 3.0 Score Development**

<sup>4</sup> 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 cost for FY XX.

## **GOAL 4.0 Provide Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of ORISE**

This Goal evaluates the Contractor's Leadership capabilities in leading the direction of ORISE, the responsiveness of the Contractor to issues and opportunities for continuous improvement, and Corporate Office involvement/commitment to the overall success of ORISE.

The weight of this Goal is TBD.

In measuring the performance of the above Objectives, the DOE evaluator(s) will 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 ORISE. This may include, but is not limited to, the quality of ORISE Vision/Mission strategic planning documentation and progress in realizing ORISE's 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 on-going ORISE mission(s) and/or provide new opportunities/capabilities; implementation of a Robust Assurance System; the contractor's Corporate Office Leadership's ability to instill responsibility and accountability down and through the entire organization; overall effectiveness of communications with DOE and other cognizant customers; understanding, management, and allocation of the costs of doing business at ORISE commensurate with associated risks and benefits; utilization of corporate resources to establish joint appointments or other programs/projects/activities to strengthen ORISE; and advancing excellence in stakeholder relations to include good corporate citizenship within the local community.

### Objectives:

#### **4.1 Leadership and Stewardship of ORISE**

By which we mean the performance of the contractor's Senior Management Team as demonstrated by their ability to do such things as:

- Define an exciting yet realistic scientific vision for the future of ORISE;
- Make progress in executing strategic plans for future ORISE activities;
- Establish and maintain long-term partnerships/relationships that maintain appropriate relations with the scientific and local communities; and
- Develop and leverage appropriate relations with academia and private industry to the benefit of ORISE and the U.S. taxpayer.

<b>Letter Grade</b>	<b>Definition</b>
A+	The Senior Leadership has made outstanding progress (on an order of magnitude scale) over the previous year in realizing their vision for ORISE, and has had a demonstrable impact on the Department and the Nation. Strategic plans are of outstanding quality, have been externally recognized and referenced for their excellence, and have an impact on the vision/plans of other national laboratories. The Senior Leadership may have been faced with very difficult challenges and plotted, successfully, its own course through the difficulty, with minimal handholding by the Department. Partners in the scientific and local communities applaud ORISE in national forums, and the Department is strengthened by this.
A	The Senior Leadership has made significant progress over the previous year in realizing their vision for ORISE, and has made demonstrable positive impacts on SC and the Department. Strategic plans are of outstanding quality and recognize and reflect the vision/plans of other national laboratories. Faced with difficult challenges, actions were taken by the Senior Leadership to redirect activities to enhance the long-term future of ORISE. Partners in the scientific and local communities applaud ORISE in national forums, and the Department is strengthened by this.
A-	Senior Management performs better than expected (B+ grade) in these areas.
B+	The Senior Leadership has made progress over the previous year in realizing their vision for ORISE. Strategic plans present long-range goals that are both exciting and realistic. Decisions and actions taken by Leadership align work, facilities, equipment, and technical capabilities with ORISE's vision and plan. The Senior Leadership has faced difficult challenges and successfully plotted its own course through the difficulty, with help from the Department. Partners in the scientific and local communities are supportive of ORISE.
B	The Senior Leadership has made little progress over the previous year in realizing their vision for ORISE. Strategic plans present long-range goals that are exciting and realistic; however, DOE is not fully confident that that the contractor is taking the actions necessary for the goals to be achieved. The contractor is not fully engaged with its partners/relationships in the scientific and local communities to maximize the potential benefits these relations have for ORISE.
C	The Senior Leadership has made no progress over the previous year in realizing their vision for ORISE or aligning work, facilities, equipment, and technical capabilities with ORISE's vision and plan. Strategic plans present long-range goals that are either unexciting or unrealistic. Business plans exist, but they are not linked to the strategic plan and do not inspire DOE's confidence that the strategic goals will be achieved. Partnerships with the scientific and local communities with potential to advance ORISE exist, but they may not always be consistent with the mission of or vision for ORISE. Affected communities and stakeholders are mostly supportive of ORISE and aligned with the management's vision for ORISE.
D	The Senior Leadership has made no progress or has back-slid over the previous year in realizing their vision for ORISE or in aligning work, facilities, equipment, and technical capabilities with ORISE's vision and plan. Strategic plans present long-range goals that are neither exciting nor realistic. Partnerships that may advance ORISE towards strategic goals are inappropriate, unidentified, or unlikely. Affected communities and stakeholders are not adequately engaged with ORISE and indicate non-alignment with DOE priorities.



F	The Senior Leadership has made no progress or has back-slid over the previous year in realizing their vision for ORISE or in aligning work, facilities, equipment, and technical capabilities with ORISE’s vision and plan. Strategic plans present long-range goals that are not aligned with DOE priorities or the mission of ORISE. Partnerships that may advance ORISE towards strategic goals are inappropriate, unidentified, and unlikely, and/or the Senior Management Team does not demonstrate a concerted effort to develop, leverage, and maintain relations with the scientific and local communities to assist ORISE in achieving a successful future. Affected communities and stakeholders are openly non-supportive of ORISE and DOE priorities.
---	---

**Figure 4.1. Letter Grade Definitions**

#### **4.2 Management and Operation of ORISE**

By which we mean the performance of the contractors Senior Management Team as demonstrated by their ability to do such things as:

- Maintain a Contractor Assurance System which meets the requirements of the clause in Section H entitled, Contractor Assurance System;
- Understand the costs of doing business at ORISE and prioritize the management and allocation of these costs commensurate with their associated risks and benefits;
- Instill a culture of accountability and responsibility down and through the entire organization; and
- Ensure good and timely communication between the contractor, SC HQ, and DOE local offices so that DOE can deal effectively with both internal and external constituencies.

Letter Grade	Definition
A+	The contractor has a nationally or internationally recognized Contractor Assurance System in place that integrates internal and external (corporate) evaluation processes to evaluate risk, and is working to help others in the Department establish similarly outstanding practices. The contractor understands the drivers of cost and is prioritizing and managing these costs commensurate with the associated risks and benefits to ORISE and the SC Laboratory System. Contractor management and processes reflect a sense of accountability and responsibility, which is evident down and through the entire organization. Communication between the contractor, SC HQ, and the local DOE offices is such that the SC Laboratory System and the Department as a whole benefit.
A	The contractor has improved dramatically in all of the following: building a robust and transparent Contractor Assurance System that integrates internal and external (corporate) evaluation processes to evaluate risk; demonstrating the use of this system in making decisions that are aligned with ORISE’s vision and strategic plan; understanding the drivers of cost and prioritizing and managing these costs consistent with their associated risks and benefits to ORISE and the SC Laboratory System; demonstrating that contractor Management and processes reflect a sense of accountability and responsibility which is evident down and through the entire organization; assuring communication between the contractor, SC HQ, and the local DOE offices that is beneficial to both ORISE and DOE.
A-	Senior Management performs better than expected (B+ grade) in these areas.
B+	The contractor has a robust and transparent Contractor Assurance System in place that integrates internal and external (corporate) evaluation processes to evaluate risk. The contractor can demonstrate use of this system in making decisions that are aligned with ORISE’s vision and strategic plan. The contractor understands the drivers of cost and is prioritizing and managing these costs commensurate with the associated risks and benefits to ORISE and the SC Laboratory System. Management and processes reflect a sense of accountability and responsibility, which is evident down and through the entire organization. Communication between the contractor, SC HQ, and local DOE offices is such that there are no surprises or embarrassments.
B	The contractor has a Contractor Assurance System in place, but further improvements are necessary, or the link between the Contractor Assurance System and decision-making processes are not evident. The contractor understands the drivers of cost, but it is not prioritizing and managing these costs, as well as they should to be commensurate with the associated risks and benefits to ORISE and the SC Laboratory System. Management and processes reflect a sense of accountability and responsibility, which is mostly evident down and through the entire organization. Communication between the contractor, SC HQ, and local DOE offices is such that there are no significant surprises or embarrassments.
C	The contractor lacks a robust and transparent Contractor Assurance System in place that integrates internal and external (corporate) evaluation processes to evaluate risk. The contractor cannot demonstrate use of this system in making decisions that are aligned with ORISE’s vision and strategic plan. The contractor does not fully understand the drivers of cost, and thus are not prioritizing and managing these costs, as well as they should to be commensurate with the associated risks and benefits to ORISE and the SC Laboratory System. Communication between the contractor, SC HQ, and local DOE offices is such that there has been at least one significant surprise or embarrassment.
D	The contractor lacks a Contractor Assurance System, does not understand the drivers of cost, and is not prioritizing and managing costs. SC HQ must intercede in management decisions. Poor communication between the contractor, SC HQ, and local DOE offices has resulted in more than one significant surprise or embarrassment.
F	Lack of management by the contractors Senior Management has put the future of ORISE at risk, or has significantly hurt the reputation of SC.

**Figure 4.2. Letter Grade Definitions**

### 4.3 Contractor Value-added

By which we mean the additional benefits that accrue to ORISE and DOE by virtue of having this particular contractor in place. Included here, typically, are things such as:

- Corporate involvement/contributions to deal with challenges at ORISE;
- Using corporate resources to establish joint appointments or other programs/projects/activities that strengthen ORISE; and
- Providing other contributions to ORISE to do things that are good for it and its community and that DOE cannot supply.

Letter Grade	Definition
A+	ORISE has been transformed as a result of the many, substantial, additional benefits that accrue as a result of this contractor's operation of ORISE.
A	Over the past year, ORISE has become demonstrably stronger, better and more attractive as a place of employment as a result of the many, substantial, additional benefits that accrue as a result of this contractor's operation of ORISE.
A-	Senior Management performs better than expected (B+ grade) in these areas.
B+	ORISE enjoys additional benefits above and beyond those associated with managing ORISE's activities that accrue as a result of this contractor's operation of ORISE.
B	ORISE enjoys few additional benefits that accrue as a result of this contractor's operation of ORISE; help by the contractor is needed to strengthen ORISE.
C	ORISE enjoys few additional benefits that accrue as a result of this contractor's operation of ORISE; the contractor seems unable to help ORISE.
D	ORISE enjoys few additional benefits that accrue as a result of this contractor's operation of ORISE; the contractor's efforts are inconsistent with the interests of ORISE and the Department.
F	ORISE enjoys no additional benefits that accrue as a result of this contractor's operation of ORISE; the contractor's efforts are counter-productive to the interests of the Department.

**Figure 4.3 Letter Grade Definitions**

#### Notable Outcomes

- TBD 1
- TBD 2

Element	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Overall Score
<b>Goal 4.0 Provide Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of ORISE</b>				
4.1 Leadership and Stewardship of ORISE			TBD	
4.2 Management and Operation of ORISE			TBD	
4.3 Contractor Value-Added			TBD	
<b>Goal 4.0 Total</b>				

**Table 4.1. Goal 4.0 Score Development**

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

The weight of this Goal is TBD.

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 ORISE.

Objectives:

**5.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Worker Health and Safety Program**

**5.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective Environmental Management System**

In measuring the performance of the above Objectives, the DOE OSO evaluator(s) will 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 ES&H incidents;
- Effectiveness of the Integrated Safety Management System;
- Effectiveness of contractor assurance, work planning, feedback, and improvement processes;
- The strength of the safety culture throughout ORISE;
- The effective development, implementation, and maintenance of an efficient Environmental Management System; and
- The effectiveness of responses to identified hazards and/or incidents.

Notable Outcomes

- TBD 1
- TBD 2

Element	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Overall Score
<b>GOAL 5.0 Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection</b>				
5.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Worker Health and Safety Program			TBD	
5.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective Environmental Management System			TBD	
<b>Goal 5.0 Total</b>				

**Table 5.1. Goal 5.0 Score Development**

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

The weight of this Goal is TBD.

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 ORISE.

Objectives:

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

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

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

**6.4 Provide Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Contractor Assurance Systems, including Internal Audit and Quality**

In measuring the performance of the above Objectives, the DOE OSO evaluator(s) will 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 ORISE. 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; and
- Benchmarking and performance trending analysis.

Notable Outcomes

- TBD 1
- TBD 2

Element	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Overall Score
<b>GOAL 6.0 Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of ORISE Mission(s)</b>				
6.1 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Financial Management System(s)			TBD	
6.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition Management System and Property Management System(s)			TBD	
6.3 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Human Resources Management System and Diversity Program			TBD	
6.4 Provide Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Contractor Assurance Systems, including Internal Audit and Quality			TBD	
<b>Goal 6.0 Total</b>				

**Table 6.1. Goal 6.0 Score Development**

## **GOAL 7.0 Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet ORISE Needs**

The weight of this Goal is TBD.

This Goal evaluates the overall effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in planning for, delivering, and operations of ORISE facilities and equipment needed to ensure required capabilities are present to meet today's and tomorrow's mission(s) and complex challenges.

### Objectives:

#### **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**

#### **7.2 Provide Planning for and acquire the Facilities and Infrastructure required to support the Continuation and Growth of ORISE Missions and Programs**

In measuring the performance of the above Objectives, the DOE OSO evaluator(s) will 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 ORISE's facility and land assets;
- Management of energy use and conservation practices;
- The integration and alignment of ORISE's comprehensive strategic plan and Ten-Year Site Plan with capabilities; and
- Facility planning, forecasting, acquisition, and quality of site and facility planning documents.

### Notable Outcomes

- TBD 1
- TBD 2

Element	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Overall Score
<b>GOAL 7.0 Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet ORISE Needs</b>				
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			TBD	
7.2 Provide Planning for and acquire the Facilities and Infrastructure required to support the Continuation and Growth of ORISE Missions and Programs			TBD	
<b>Goal 7.0 Total</b>				

**Table 7.1. Goal 7.0 Score Development**



## **GOAL 8.0 Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management and Emergency Management Systems**

The weight of this Goal is TBD.

This Goal evaluates the Contractor's overall success in safeguarding and securing ORISE assets that support the mission(s) of ORISE in an efficient and effective manner and providing an effective Emergency Management Program.

### Objectives:

#### **8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System**

#### **8.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective Cyber Security System for the Protection of Classified and Unclassified Information**

#### **8.3 Provide an Efficient and Effective Physical Security Program for the Protection of Special Nuclear Materials, Classified Matter, Classified Information, Sensitive Information, and Property**

In measuring the performance of the above Objectives, the DOE OSO evaluator(s) will 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 ORISE;
- 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.

### Notable Outcomes

- TBD 1
- TBD 2

Element	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Overall Score
<b>GOAL 8.0 Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management and Emergency Management Systems</b>				
8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System			TBD	
8.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective Cyber Security System for the Protection of Classified and Unclassified Information			TBD	
8.3 Provide an Efficient and Effective Physical Security Program for the Protection of Special Nuclear Materials, Classified Matter, Classified Information, Sensitive Information, and Property			TBD	
<b>Goal 8.0 Total</b>				

**Table 8.1. Goal 8.0 Score Development**

**Attachment I**

**Program Office Goal & Objective Weightings**

**Office of Science**

		ASCR	BER	BES	FES	HEP	NP	WDTS
		Weight	Weight	Weight	Weight	Weight	Weight	Weight
<b>Goal 1.0 Mission Accomplishment</b>								
1.1 Impact								
1.2 Leadership								
<b>Goal 3.0 Program Management</b>								
3.1 Project/Program/Facilities Management								
3.2 Management Systems and Processes								
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness								

**Attachment I**

**Program Office Goal & Objective Weightings**

**All Other Customers<sup>5</sup>**

	NA-40	AU-10	EERE	EM	FE	IE	NE	OE
	Weight	Weight	Weight	Weight	Weight	Weight	Weight	Weight
<b>Goal 1.0 Mission Accomplishment</b>								
1.1 Impact								
1.2 Leadership								
<b>Goal 3.0 Program Management</b>								
3.1 Project/Program/Facilities Management								
3.2 Management Systems and Processes								
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness								

<sup>5</sup> Objective weightings indicated for non-science customers are reflective of FY [Year] weightings and will be updated as those customers provide their weightings. Final Objective weightings will be incorporated, as appropriate, once they are determined by each HQ Program Office and provided to the Site Office. Should a HQ Program Office fail to provide final Objective weightings before the end of the first quarter FY [Year] the preliminary weightings provided shall become final.