



U.S. Department of Energy
Savannah River Site

**PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
MEASUREMENT PLAN**

Evaluation Period: October 1, 2025 – September 30, 2026

Battelle Savannah River Alliance, LLC
Savannah River National Laboratory
Savannah River Site, Aiken SC
CONTRACT NO: 89303321CEM000080

Part III – Section J, Attachment J-2

Approval Page

Concurrence:

Date:

Stephen W. Stamper
Director, Savannah River Laboratory Office

Bernice Jenkins
Chief Counsel, Office of Chief Counsel

Jodi Gordon
Acting OAM Director, EM Consolidated Business Center

Aaron W. Deckard
Procurement Director, EM Consolidated Business Center

Derrick Watkins
Acting Chief Financial Officer, Office of the Field CFO

Lennie K. Mattis
Contracting Officer, Contracts Management Division

Edwin R. Deshong, III
Manager (Fee Determining Official/Award Term Determining Official)
Savannah River Operations Office

Approval:

Gregory Sosson
Associate Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Field Operations
Office of Environmental Management

Approved with the condition that additional PEMP revisions may be necessary after subsequent reviews by DOE-HQ.

Rev. #	Rev. Date	Affected Sections/Pages	Description of Revision
0	10/1/2025	All	Initial issue

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	6
II.	Performance Evaluation Methodology	7
A.	Calculating Individual Goal Scores and Letter Grades.....	12
B.	Determining the Amount of Performance-Based Fee Earned.....	14
C.	Adjustment to the Letter Grade and/or Performance-Based Fee Determination	16
D.	Performance Status Reporting and Evaluation Process	16
III.	Performance Goals, Objectives, and Notable Outcomes	19
A.	Background.....	19
B.	GOAL 1.0 – Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment	21
C.	GOAL 2.0 – Efficient and Effective Stewardship and Operation of Research Facilities	25
D.	GOAL 3.0 – Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory	27
E.	GOAL 4.0 – Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection	30
F.	GOAL 5.0 – Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission(s)	31
G.	GOAL 6.0 – Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs.....	33
H.	GOAL 7.0 – Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management and Emergency Management Systems.....	34
IV.	Appendix.....	35
	Table 1 - Letter Grade and Definitions (Goal 1.0).....	35
	Table 2 - Letter Grade and Definitions (Goal 2.0).....	40
	Table 3 - Letter Grade and Definitions (Goal 3.0, Objective 3.1)	41
	Table 4 - Letter Grade and Definitions (Goal 3.0, Objective 3.2)	42
	Table 5 - Letter Grade and Definitions (Goal 3.0, Objective 3.3)	44
	Table 6 - Letter Grade and Definitions (Goal 3.0, Objective 3.4)	45

FY2026 Savannah River National Laboratory
Performance Evaluation Measurement Plan

I. Introduction

This document, the Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan (“PEMP”), serves as the Department of Energy’s (“DOE”) plan for the evaluation of the Battelle Savannah River Alliance, LLC (hereafter referred to as “BSRA” or “Contractor”) performance regarding the Management and Operating (“M&O”) Contract for the Savannah River National Laboratory (hereafter referred to as “SRNL” or “Laboratory”) for the evaluation period from October 1, 2025, through September 30, 2026. This PEMP provides a standard by which to determine whether the Contractor is acting in a managerially and operationally responsible manner as well as meeting the mission requirements and performance expectations/objectives of the Department as stipulated within the Contract.

This PEMP 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 Part I, Section B – Supplies or Service and Prices/Costs, B.2 – DOE-B-7003 Performance Fee (Revised); and Part II, Section I – Contract Clauses, I.181 Department of Energy Acquisition Regulation (“DEAR”) 970.5215-1, Total Available Fee: Base Fee Amount and Performance Fee Amount (DEC 2000) (Alternates II and IV) (DEC 2000). In partnership with the Contractor, the DOE Office of Environmental Management (“EM”), DOE Savannah River Operations Office (“DOE-SR”), National Nuclear Security Administration (“NNSA”), and other federal customers have defined 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 were developed in accordance with the expectations set forth within the Contract. The Notable Outcomes for meeting the Objectives outlined in this PEMP have been developed in coordination with EM and NNSA program offices as appropriate. Except as otherwise provided for within the Contract, the evaluation and fee determination will depend solely on the Contractor’s performance of the Goals and Objectives described herein.

The Fiscal Year (“FY”) 2026 SRNL PEMP includes Goals which emphasize achievements in support of the DOE Research and Development (“R&D”) Mission for SRNL (Section C of the Contract), but do not undervalue the expectation of satisfactory performance levels in other areas of the statement of work. DOE expects BSRA to continue implementing and integrating environment, safety, and health (“ES&H”), quality, and security into its programs and operations to achieve overall mission success.

Overall performance against each Objective in this PEMP, including assessment of Notable Outcomes, shall be evaluated according to the criteria established herein by DOE-SR, incorporating input from the EM program office(s), NNSA program office(s), and major customers as appropriate. This review methodology will ensure that the overall evaluation of the Contractor results in a consolidated DOE position that accounts for specific Notable Outcomes along with all additional information available to the evaluating office. DOE-SR will work with EM program office(s), NNSA program office(s), and major customers throughout the year in evaluating the Contractor’s performance and will provide observations regarding programs and projects as well as other M&O activities conducted by the Contractor throughout the year.

This PEMP identifies Goals and Objectives where the Contractor can impact DOE strategic initiatives and missions. If applicable, Notable Outcomes, either met or not met, provide support for the Department’s subjective evaluation of Contractor performance in meeting expectations for corresponding Goals and Objectives.

II. Performance Evaluation Methodology

The FY2026 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 herein. Each Goal is composed of weighted Objectives. Additionally, a set of Notable Outcomes have been identified to highlight key aspects/areas of performance deserving special attention by the Contractor for the upcoming fiscal year.

The purpose of this section is to establish a methodology to develop grades at the Objective level. In accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (“FAR”) Subpart 16.4, DOE-SR shall provide a proposed adjectival rating, associated description, and award-fee pool available to be earned for each Objective. **Figure 1 - FAR 16-1 Contractor Adjectival Rating and Award-Fee Available Scale** establishes the adjectival rating and associated award-fee pool available to be earned for each Objective.

Figure 1 – FAR 16-1 Contractor Adjectival Rating and Award Fee Available Scale

Award Fee Pool Available to Be Earned	Adjectival Rating
91%-100%	Excellent
76%-90%	Very Good
51%-75%	Good
No Greater Than 50%	Satisfactory
0%	Unsatisfactory

DOE-SR shall provide a proposed grade and score from the corresponding numerical range for each Objective. See **Figure 2 – Letter Grade Scale**. Each evaluation will measure the degree of effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in meeting the corresponding Objectives.

Figure 2 – Letter Grade Scale

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

The Contractor shall be evaluated against the defined levels of performance provided for each Objective based on a specific grading table in each Goal. The specific grading tables are based on the general grading table in **Figure 3 – General Letter Grade, Adjectival Rating, Numeric Range, Definition, and Award-Fee Pool Available to be Earned** and each specific grading table

describes in more detail the grading criteria for these Goals. In accordance with FAR Subpart 16.4, the adjectival rating description has been supplemented and is included in Figure 3. Goals 1.0, 2.0, and 3.0 (Science & Technology) each have a specific grading table in each Goal section. Goals 4.0, 5.0, 6.0, and 7.0 (M&O) will be graded according to the general table in Figure 3.

DOE expects that the Contractor shall provide for and maintain 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 for Goals 1.0, 2.0, and 3.0, DOE shall assess the degree of effectiveness and performance in meeting each of the Objectives provided under each of the Goals. For Goals 4.0, 5.0, 6.0, and 7.0, DOE will rely on the combination of information available 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—such as the Office of the Inspector General (OIG), Government Accountability Office (GAO), Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA), etc.

The mission of the Laboratory is to deliver the Science and Technology ("S&T") 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 S&T 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 DOE and/or the Laboratory's reputation; or (3) does not provide the competent people, necessary facilities, and robust systems required to ensure sustainable performance, shall be graded below expectations as defined in Figure 3.

The Department sets high expectations and expects performance at "B+" level to optimize the efficient and effective operation of the Laboratory. Thus, the Department does not expect routine Contractor performance above expectations against Goals 4.0, 5.0, 6.0, or 7.0. Performance meriting grades above B+ must reflect the Contractor's significant contributions to the management and operations at SRNL, or recognition by external, independent entities as exemplary performance. Notable Outcomes will be considered against Goals, as applicable. Award fee *shall* not be earned if the Contractor's overall cost, schedule, and technical performance in the aggregate is below satisfactory.

Notable Outcomes are either "met" or "not met"; they are not given a numerical score or a letter grade for the performance period. Achievement of a Notable Outcome is a prerequisite for meeting the Department's expectations. Therefore, if the Contractor fails to meet expectations against a Notable Outcome tied to an Objective under a Goal; a grade less than "B+" for the corresponding Objective will result.

Figure 3 - General Letter Grade, Adjectival Rating, Numeric Range, Definition, and Award-Fee Pool Available to Be Earned

Letter Grade	Adjectival Rating	Numeric Range	Definition	Award-Fee Pool Available to be Earned
A+	Excellent	4.3 - 4.1	Contractor has exceeded all of the significant award-fee Goals and Objectives and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured in the PEMP for the award-fee evaluation period. Contractor performance significantly exceeds expectations of performance as set within Objectives identified for each Goal or within the purview of the Goal. Areas of notable performance have or have the potential to significantly improve the overall mission of the Laboratory. No specific deficiency noted within the purview of the overall result being evaluated.	100%
A	Excellent	4.0 - 3.8	Contractor has exceeded almost all of the significant award-fee Goals and Objectives and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured in the PEMP for the award-fee evaluation period. Contractor performance notably exceeds expectations of performance as set within Objectives identified for each Goal or within other areas within the purview of the Goal. Areas of notable performance either have or have the potential to improve the overall mission of the Laboratory. Minor deficiencies, if any, noted are more than offset by the positive performance within the purview of the desired Goal being evaluated and have no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.	97%
A-	Excellent	3.7 - 3.5	Contractor has exceeded almost all of the significant award-fee Goals and Objectives and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured in the PEMP for the award-fee evaluation period. Contractor performance exceeds expectations of performance as set within Objectives identified for each Goal or within other areas within the purview of the Goal, with some notable areas of increased performance identified. Minor	94%

Letter Grade	Adjectival Rating	Numeric Range	Definition	Award-Fee Pool Available to be Earned
			deficiencies, if any, noted are offset by the positive performance within the purview of the Goal being evaluated with little or no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.	
B+	Very Good	3.4 - 3.1	Contractor has exceeded many of the significant award-fee Goals and Objectives and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured in the PEMP for the award-fee evaluation period. Contractor performance exceeds many expectations of performance as set within Objectives identified for the Goal. Contractor performance that does not meet expectations is identified but is offset by positive performance within the purview of the Goal and has little to no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.	90%
B	Very Good	3.0 - 2.8	Contractor has exceeded many of the significant award-fee Goals and Objectives and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured in the PEMP for the award-fee evaluation period. Contractor performance meets most identified expectations as set within Objectives identified for the Goal. Minor deficiencies, if any, identified are offset by other exceptional performance within the Goal being evaluated and have little to no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.	84%
B-	Very Good	2.7 - 2.5	Contractor has exceeded many of the significant award-fee Goals and Objectives and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured in the PEMP for the award-fee evaluation period. However, one or two expectations of performance within the Objectives identified for some desired Goals are not met and/or minor deficiencies are identified, and although they may be offset by other positive performance, they have some potential to adversely impact the Goal or the mission of the Laboratory.	76%

Letter Grade	Adjectival Rating	Numeric Range	Definition	Award-Fee Pool Available to be Earned
C+	Good	2.4 - 2.1	Contractor has exceeded some of the significant award-fee Goals and Objectives and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured in the PEMP for the award-fee evaluation period. However, some expectations of performance set within Objectives identified for some desired Goals are not met and/or other deficiencies are identified, and although they may be offset by other positive performance, they have the potential to adversely impact the desired Goal or the mission of the Laboratory.	51%-75%
C	Satisfactory	2.0 - 1.8	Contractor has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured in the PEMP for the award-fee evaluation period. Either there are little or no areas of notable contractor performance or the areas of notable performance are offset by the performance that does not meet expectations, and/or several other deficiencies are identified. Deficiencies have the potential to adversely impact the desired Goal or mission of the Laboratory.	No greater than 50%
C-	Unsatisfactory	1.7 - 1.1	Contractor has failed to meet Goals and Objectives and overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured in the PEMP for the award-fee evaluation period. Many expectations as set within Objectives identified for Goals are not met and/or other significant deficiencies are identified that have or will have an adverse impact on the Goal or the mission of the Laboratory if not immediately corrected.	0%
D	Unsatisfactory	1.0 - 0.8	Contractor has failed to meet Goals and Objectives and overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured in the PEMP for the award-fee evaluation period. Most or all expectations as set within Objectives identified for Goals are not met and/or other major deficiencies are identified	0%

Letter Grade	Adjectival Rating	Numeric Range	Definition	Award-Fee Pool Available to be Earned
			that have adversely impacted the Goal or the mission of the Laboratory.	
F	Unsatisfactory	0.7 - 0	Contractor has failed to meet Goals and Objectives and overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured in the PEMP for the award-fee evaluation period. However, most or all expectations as set within Objectives identified for Goals are not met and/or other major deficiencies are identified that have a significant, adverse impact on both the Goal and the mission of the Laboratory.	0%

A. Calculating Individual Goal Scores and Letter Grades

Calculate individual Goal scores and letter grades using the scoring system below to arrive at the fee determination for SRNL performance.

- i. Each Goal contains several Objectives and associated Notable Outcomes. Objectives are graded by evaluating the associated criteria and assigning each of the Objectives a letter grade.
- ii. In accordance with **Figure 2 – Letter Grade Scale**, each Objective is given a Numerical Score from the corresponding range.
- iii. The Numerical Score is then multiplied by the corresponding weight of the Objective to reach a Weighted Score for the Objective.
- iv. The Weighted Scores for each Objective are then rounded to the nearest hundredth. The rounded scores are then summed to reach a Numerical Score for the Goal. *See Figure 4 – Example Numerical Score Calculation.*

Figure 4 – Example Numerical Score Calculation

Goal 1.0 Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment					
Objectives		Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Weighted Score
1.1	Environmental Management Mission	A	3.9	40%	1.56
1.2	National Security Mission				
	1.2.1 Nuclear Weapons	A	3.9	20%	.78
	1.2.2 Global Nuclear Security	A	3.9	20%	.78
1.3	Science Mission	A-	3.6	10%	.36
1.4	Energy Security Mission	B+	3.3	5%	.17
1.5	Legacy Management Mission	A-	3.6	5%	.17
Numerical Score for Goal 1.0					3.82

After a Numerical Score is calculated for each Goal, the scores are then transferred to **Figure 5 – Example Performance Goal Calculations**. The Numerical Score for each Goal is multiplied by its corresponding weight to determine the Weighted Score for each Goal. The Weighted Scores are rounded to the nearest hundredth and summed to reach Total Numerical Scores for Goals 1.0, 2.0, and 3.0 (S&T) and for Goals 4.0, 5.0, 6.0, and 7.0 (M&O).

Figure 5 – Example Performance Goal Calculations

Performance Goals (Science & Technology)		Numerical Score	Goal Weight	Weighted Score
1.0	Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment	3.82	70%	2.67
2.0	Efficient and Effective Stewardship and Operation of Research Facilities	3.67	15%	0.55
3.0	Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory	3.75	15%	0.56
Total Numerical Score (Goals 1.0, 2.0, 3.0)				3.78
Performance Goals (M&O)		Numerical Score	Goal Weight	Weighted Score
4.0	Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health and Environmental Protection	3.60	30%	1.08
5.0	Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission(s)	3.80	25%	0.95
6.0	Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs	3.62	20%	0.72
7.0	Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management and Emergency Management Systems	3.71	25%	0.93
Total Numerical Score (Goals 4.0, 5.0, 6.0, 7.0)				3.68

B. Determining the Amount of Performance-Based Fee Earned

In order to determine the amount of fee earned, **Figure 6 – Example Overall Fee Earned and Final Grade Determination/Adjectival Rating** is completed, which provides a summary of the fee determination results.

- i. The Total Numerical Score for Goals 1.0, 2.0, and 3.0 (rounded to the nearest tenth) is entered into **Figure 6**.
- ii. The corresponding Fee Percentage is derived from **Figure 7 – Performance Based Fee Earned and Multiplier Scale** utilizing the Total Numerical Score.
- iii. The Fee Multiplier is derived from **Figure 7** utilizing the Total Numerical Score for Goals 4.0, 5.0, 6.0, and 7.0.
- iv. The Overall Earned Performance-Based Fee percentage is calculated by multiplying the Fee Percentage by the Fee Multiplier.
- v. The Overall Earned Performance-Based Fee dollar value is calculated by multiplying the Overall Earned Performance-Based Fee percentage by the total available fee pool of \$6,076,620.
- vi. The Final Letter Grade is derived from **Figure 2** utilizing the Overall Earned Performance-Based Fee percentage.
- vii. The Final FAR Part 16 Adjectival Rating is derived from **Figure 1** utilizing the Overall Earned Performance-Based Fee percentage.

Figure 6 - Example Overall Fee Earned and Final Grade Determination/Adjectival Rating

Total Numerical Score (Goals 1.0, 2.0, 3.0) from Figure 5	3.8
Fee Percentage (Goal 1.0, 2.0, 3.0) from Figure 7	97 %
Total Numerical Score (Goals 4.0, 5.0, 6.0, 7.0)	3.7
Fee Multiplier (Goals 4.0, 5.0, 6.0, 7.0) from Figure 7	100 %
Overall Earned Performance Based Fee % (Fee Percentage x Fee Multiplier)	97 %
Overall Earned Performance Based Fee \$ (Available Fee Pool x Overall Earned Performance Based Fee %)	\$5,894,321
Final Letter Grade from Figure 2	A
Final FAR 16 Adjectival Rating from Figure 1	Excellent

Figure 7 - Performance Based Fee Earned and Multiplier Scale

Overall Weighted Score	Percent Fee Earned (Goals 1.0, 2.0 and 3.0)	Fee Multiplier (Goals 4.0, 5.0, 6.0 and 7.0)
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%

Unless otherwise stated, all Goals and associated Objectives are to be completed by September 30, 2026. Each of the Objectives identifies significant activities, requirements, and Notable Outcomes important to the success of the corresponding Goal and shall be used as the primary means of determining the Contractor's degree of success in meeting the desired Objective.

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

The absence of specific Goals, Objectives, and Notable Outcomes in this plan does not diminish the need to comply with contractual requirements. The Fee Determining Official (FDO) may unilaterally adjust the fee earned based on the Contractor's performance against all Contract requirements. At the discretion of the FDO, fee earned may be adjusted upward (not to exceed total eligible fee) or downward based on the Contractor delivering strategic value for real and relevant performance not otherwise specified in the PEMP. While reductions may be based on performance against any contractual requirement, specific attention should be paid 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 DEAR 970.5215-3 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 including, but not limited to: operational awareness (daily oversight) activities; "For Cause" reviews (if any); and other outside agency reviews (OIG, GAO, DCAA, etc.), as needed. The FDO may utilize, as appropriate, the **Figure 3** definitions to assist in making unilateral adjustment decisions.

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 reducing fee for performance failures related to safeguarding of classified information and to adequate protection of environment, health, and safety. DEAR 970.5215-3 guidance can also serve as an example for fee reduction in other areas. The final Contractor performance-based grades for each Goal and fee determination will be contained within a year-end report, documenting the results from 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 Goal achievements.

Pursuant to the "Award Term Incentive" clause in section F.3 of the Contract, the Contractor may also earn additional terms by exceeding performance expectations. To earn additional award terms, the Contractor must have been assessed by the FDO to have achieved a minimum overall score of 3.5 for S&T and a minimum overall score of 3.1 for M&O for each performance evaluation period, and have met the Contract performance goals, objectives, standards, or criteria and other applicable Contract requirements, as defined in the PEMP (or equivalent document) and determined by the Award Term Determining Official (ATDO). Provided, however, that the Contractor must also obtain a minimum score of at least 3.1 for each individual S&T Goal and 2.8 for each individual M&O Goal.

D. Performance Status Reporting and Evaluation Process

PEMP administration is a formal process that includes requirements for status reports, change control, and final fee determination.

The Contractor should conduct a formal self-assessment of its performance relative to each Goal, Objective, and associated Notable Outcomes on a quarterly basis. The Contractor will monitor subcontractor performance to ensure compliance with all requirements including small business subcontracting plans, Buy American Act, and applicable labor statutes.

Performance status will be provided to the Contractor by DOE through routine oversight activities (i.e., scheduled management interfaces and documented assessment results) and quarterly formal feedback meetings. The Contractor will provide DOE with self-assessment performance updates on a quarterly basis. DOE should identify both the strengths and weaknesses of performance during the evaluation period. Areas of disagreement will be highlighted and addressed. Performance Status Reviews will be conducted periodically as agreed upon by DOE and BSRA. Savannah River Laboratory Office (“SRLO”) is responsible for defining and coordinating the process for conducting the reviews and ensuring the involvement of appropriate personnel. DOE quarterly formal feedback evaluations will focus on Goals, Objectives, and Notable Outcomes as well as other performance expectations.

On an annual basis, the Contractor shall conduct a formal assessment of self-performance relative to each Goal, Objective, and associated Notable Outcome. The Contractor shall provide DOE with a written report documenting the self-evaluation. It should be provided to DOE within ten (10) calendar days after the end of the performance period.

In addition to quarterly reporting, DOE will perform and document a final evaluation of the Contractor’s performance relative to each Goal, Objective, and Notable Outcome and will provide a final fee determination. As described in the EM National Laboratory Governance Framework, the EM Laboratory Policy Office (“LPO”) will lead the evaluation of the Contractor’s performance with coordination from DOE-SR, SRLO, EM Technology Development and Chief Engineers Office, and NNSA program offices, etc.

As required by the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (“CPARS”), DOE interim evaluation of BSRA performance will be aligned with the final evaluations results of the DOE-approved Goals, Objectives, and Notable Outcomes. **Figure 8** outlines the crosswalk between the CPARS Rating Evaluation Areas and the Goals for the Laboratory. **Figure 9** outlines the crosswalk between the CPARS Adjectival Ratings and the PEMP Rating Score. At the end of the period of performance, Goal scores will be used as the basis to determine the adjectival rating for the CPARS Evaluation Areas using the crosswalk. The narrative for the CPARS Evaluation Areas should be a summary based on the final period of performance PEMP Goal evaluations and provide sufficient detail to meet the DOE Acquisition Guide 42.1502 guidelines.

Figure 8 - CPARS Element Areas and PEMP Goals Crosswalk

CPARS Evaluation Areas	PEMP Goals	PEMP Rating Score
Technical/Quality of Product or Service	Goal 1.0 – Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment; and Goal 2.0 – Efficient and Effective Stewardship of Research Facilities.	Equals the average of the rating scores calculated for Goals 1.0 and 2.0.
Cost Control	Cost Control will be evaluated under Quality of Product or Services under Goal 2.0, Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory under Goal 3.0, Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of	

	the Laboratory Mission under Goal 5.0, and Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs under Goal 6.0.	
Schedule	Schedule will be evaluated under Quality of Product or Services under Goal 2.0.	
Management/Business Relations	Goal 3.0 – Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory Goal; 5.0 – Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission; Goal 6.0 – Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs; and Goal 7.0 – Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management and Emergency Management Systems.	Equal the average of the rating scores calculated for Goals 3.0, 5.0, 6.0, and 7.0.
Small Business Subcontracting	Rating will be in accordance with the definitions described in FAR Table 42-1 -Evaluation Rating Definitions.	Use the rating in accordance with FAR Part 42.
Regulatory Compliance	Goal 4.0 – Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection.	Equals the rating score calculated for Goal 4.0.
Other (Contractor Assurance System)	Note: Contractor Assurance will be evaluated under Management/Business Relations under Goal 5.0.	

Figure 9 - CPARS Adjectival Rating and PEMP Score Crosswalk

CPARS Adjectival Rating	Rating Determination
Exceptional	3.8 – 4.3 (A to A+)
Very Good	3.1 – 3.7 (B+ to A-)
Satisfactory	2.5 – 3.0 (B- to B)
Marginal	1.1 – 2.4 (C- to C+)
Unsatisfactory	0.0 – 1.0 (F to D)

III. Performance Goals, Objectives, and Notable Outcomes

A. Background

The current performance-based management approach to oversight at DOE has established a culture that emphasizes the customer-supplier partnership between DOE and Contractor. This approach 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 laboratories and develops annual performance plans (such as this PEMP) to assess the contractors' performance in meeting that direction in accordance with contract requirements. DOE policy for implementing performance-based management includes the following guiding principles:

- 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 the Goals outlined herein. Progress against these Goals is measured using a set of Objectives. The success of each Objective will be measured based on demonstrated performance by BSRA, and on a set of Notable Outcomes that focus Laboratory leadership on the specific items that represent the most important initiatives and highest risk issues the Laboratory must address during the fiscal 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.

The following sections describe the Goals, supporting Objectives, and associated Notable Outcomes for FY2026:

PID Number:	BSRA2026SRNL
Activity Name:	Savannah River National Laboratory
WBS Number:	Numerous
Performance Period:	October 1, 2025 – September 30, 2026
Allocated Fee:	\$6,076,620
Revision Number:	0
Senior Level Manager:	Edwin DeShong, DOE-SR
Senior Level Supervisor/Division Manager:	Ming Zhu, EM-3 CTO/LPO Stephen Stamper, SRLO Jodi Gordon, EMCBC Lennie K. Mattis, OAM Edward Bauser, NNSA-SRFO
Performance Outcome: Savannah River National Laboratory is one of DOE’s multi-program National Laboratories. The Laboratory is a Federally Funded Research and Development Center (“FFRDC”) established in accordance with FAR Part 35 and operated under this M&O contract, as defined in FAR Subpart 17.7 and DEAR Subpart 917.6. The Laboratory supports DOE strategic goals in science and energy, nuclear security, and management and performance (including cleanup of nuclear legacy) in accomplishing the Department’s mission. The Laboratory mission is to conduct basic and applied R&D to advance scientific knowledge, to protect the Nation’s energy resources, national security, environmental quality and human health, and to strengthen educational foundations and national economic competitiveness. DOE programs are carried out in partnership with other DOE National Laboratories, academia, Government agencies, the international scientific community, and the private sector. BSRA will seek to advance the frontiers of S&T through broad interdisciplinary R&D programs that answer fundamental questions, solve technical problems (locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally), and support the development and application of technologies to address societal needs. All work under the SRNL M&O Contract shall be conducted in a manner that protects the environment and assures the safety, health, and security of employees and the public. This objective is to be accomplished by the Laboratory implementing a process that includes an Environmental Management System. BSRA shall implement appropriate program and project management systems to track progress and maximize cost-effectiveness of work activities; develop integrated plans and schedules to achieve program objectives, incorporating input from DOE and stakeholders; maintain sufficient technical expertise to manage activities and projects throughout the life of a program; utilize appropriate technologies and management systems to improve cost efficiency and performance; and maintain Laboratory facilities and infrastructure as necessary to accomplish assigned missions. BSRA shall conduct all work in a manner that optimizes productivity, and fully complies with all applicable laws, regulations, and terms and conditions of the SRNL M&O Contract. BSRA has a responsibility to develop and implement innovative approaches and adopt practices that foster continuous improvement in accomplishing the mission of the Laboratory. DOE expects BSRA to employ effective and efficient management structures, systems, and operations that maintain high levels of quality, safety and security while accomplishing the work required under this Contract, and that, to	

the extent practicable and appropriate, rely on national, commercial, and industrial standards that can be verified and certified by independent, nationally recognized experts and other independent reviewers.

B. GOAL 1.0 – Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment

SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY (GOALS 1.0, 2.0, and 3.0)	
Performance Goal 1.0 – BSRA2026SRNL-1.0	
Provide for Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment	
Description/Background/Justification	
The S&T programs at the Laboratory produce high-quality, original, and creative results that advance S&T; demonstrate sustained scientific progress and impact; receive appropriate external recognition of accomplishments; and contribute to overall research and development goals of the Department and customers. The weight of this Goal is 60%. The <u>Provide for Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment Goal</u> measures the overall effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in delivering S&T results which contribute to and enhance DOE's (or other relevant supporting agencies') mission of protecting our national and economic security by providing world-class scientific research capacity and advancing scientific knowledge through recognized world-class, peer-reviewed scientific results. Each Objective within this Goal shall be assigned the appropriate numerical score by EM, other cognizant DOE Program Offices, and other customers as identified in the table below. The Goal score from each DOE Mission Role is computed by multiplying each Objective numerical score by the associated weight assigned.	
1.1 Environmental Management Mission: Provide science, technology, engineering, and deployment support to the DOE effort towards aggressively cleaning up the environmental legacy of nuclear weapons development and production, and Government-sponsored nuclear research. Provide S&T expertise that enables site cleanup and closure decisions to have a sound, scientific basis. Expand deployment of innovative technologies and practical solutions that substantially reduce lifecycle cost, accelerate schedule, and reduce risk to achieve optimal end states. Provide program management support and S&T expertise for mission-relevant engagement with colleges and universities. The weight of this Objective is <u>40%</u>.	
1.2 National Security Mission: Advance DOE efforts that support the nuclear deterrent, reduce global nuclear threats, respond to nuclear/radiological incidents and accidents, and expand scientific knowledge and application to execute NNSA and DOE missions and strategic objectives.	
1.2.1 Nuclear Weapons – Contributions include: supporting a robust nuclear weapons stockpile through reservoir development and testing; performing tritium R&D and providing support to the overall tritium mission; supporting the processing and isotope recovery from target assemblies; providing support to the pit production mission through	

technology evaluation, training, and workforce development, etc. The weight of this Objective is 20%.

1.2.2 Global Nuclear Security – Contributions include: developing nuclear proliferation detection and security technologies; supporting permanent threat reduction activities from both foreign and domestic stockpiles; developing, operating, and maintaining mobile global deployment capabilities to carry out characterization, stabilization, treatment, and packaging of plutonium and other materials; conducting technical reviews of chemical, biological, and nuclear related licensing and interdiction cases both domestically and internationally; providing timely technical and policy analysis on nonproliferation issues; maintaining technology and technical expertise required for on-site verification and monitoring of foreign nuclear material production activities; and supporting counterterrorism and counterproliferation missions through R&D, analytical operations, and making personnel available for training, exercises, responses to nuclear/radiological incidents and accidents. The weight of this Objective is 20%.

1.3 Science Mission: Deliver the fundamental scientific knowledge and discoveries to advance the frontiers defined by EM and EM's support for the DOE Office of Science core capabilities. Translate those discoveries into contributions to the DOE Science Strategic Objectives of delivering the scientific discoveries and major scientific tools that transform the understanding of nature and strengthen the connection between advances in fundamental S&T innovation. The weight of this Objective is 10%.

1.4 Energy Security Mission: Support DOE mission objectives for energy security to: advance DOE goals and objectives by supporting prudent development, deployment, and efficient use of "energy strategies" that also create new jobs and industries; and support a more economically competitive, environmentally responsible, secure and resilient U.S. energy infrastructure. The weight of this Objective is 5%.

1.5 Legacy Management Mission: Contribute to S&T needs by providing viable alternatives and technological solutions for optimizing long-term stewardship operations of groundwater monitoring and treatment systems and of engineering liner and cover systems installed over closed waste units. The weight of this Objective is 5%.

In assessing the performance of BSRA against these Objectives, an assessment of the Laboratory's success in providing S&T results with meaningful impact on the field should consider:

- Performance of the Laboratory with respect to proposed research plans;
- Performance of the Laboratory with respect to community impact and peer review;
- Performance of the Laboratory with respect to impact to DOE (or other customer) mission needs;
- Innovativeness/novelty of research ideas put forward by the Laboratory;
- Extent to which Laboratory staff members take on substantive or formal leadership roles in their community; and
- Extent to which Laboratory staff members take on formal leadership roles in DOE, EM, and/or other customer activities; and
- Extent to which Laboratory staff members contribute thoughtful and thorough peer reviews and other research assessments as requested by DOE, EM, or other supporting customers.

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

- Impact of publications on the field, as measured primarily by peer review;
- Impact of S&T results on the field, as measured primarily by peer review;
- Impact of S&T results outside the field indicating broader interest;
- Impact of S&T results on DOE or other customer mission(s);
- Successful stewardship of mission-relevant research areas;
- Delivery on proposed S&T plans;
- Significant awards (Nobel Prizes, R&D 100, Federal Laboratory Consortium, etc.);
- Invited talks, citations, making high-quality data available to the scientific community;
- Development of tools and techniques that become standards or widely adopted by the scientific community;
- 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 previous risky decisions by the Principal Investigator (PI)/research staff have proved to be correct and are paying off;
- Considering the uniqueness and challenge of science, pursued recognition for doing the best work in the field;
- Extent and quality of collaborative efforts;
- Staff members visible in leadership positions in the scientific community;
- Involvement in professional organizations, National Academies panels and workshops;
- Effectiveness in driving the direction and setting the priorities of the community in research field; and
- Success in competition for R&D resources.

The example factors for measuring performance listed above are neither inclusive nor are they intended to be a checklist for meeting performance expectations of the Objectives under Goal 1.0. The evaluation of each Objective will use a combination of relevant factors.

Number	Date	Notable Outcome(s)
BSRA2026SRNL-1.1a	09/30/2026	Provide technology solutions to advance the EM missions across the complex. Examples include: • Flowsheet and strategies to improve throughput and allow EM closure of SRS to include completion of Phase I testing for Tank 48 to define key flowsheet parameters for the process; • Complete deliverables associated with start-up and operation of Direct-Feed Low-Activity Waste (DFLAW) and to support baseline design of the High-Level Waste (HLW) and Tank Farm facilities for Direct-Feed High-Level Waste (DFHLW); • Flowsheet options and strategies to accelerate the timeline for treatment of Oak Ridge tank waste; and • Assist the Moab site in addressing critical uncertainties to accelerate site closure at the Moab site.

BSRA2026SRNL-1.1b	5/31/2026	Complete Year 2 milestones and deliverables, pending funding availability, for the Hanford Tank Waste R&D projects, including: • Integrity Monitoring and Assessment, Prediction, Repair, and Corrosion Control of the Hanford Storage Tanks; • Efficient Electrochemical Denitration and Caustic Generation (“EDCGe”) System for Direct-Feed Waste Pretreatment to Accelerate the Hanford Mission and Operations; and • Direct Stabilization of LAW with Advanced Engineered Cellular Magmatics.
BSRA2026SRNL-1.1c	9/30/2026	Complete development of the analysis of alternatives for post-Canyon processing of Spent Nuclear Fuel at SRS and support CD-1 development if mission need is approved and funded.
BSRA2026SRNL-1.1d	9/30/2026	Provide technology solution for following activities: • Identify conditions in which mercury vapors increase through vapor monitoring in mercury contaminated facility in Oak Ridge. • Provide continuous monitoring of Mercury Vapor Suppression Technology Demonstration Areas in Oak Ridge.
BSRA2026SRNL-1.1e	9/30/2026	Work with regulators and contractors at the Savannah River Site to reduce groundwater sampling requirements through a monitoring program (“ALTEMIS”) that could save a projected \$1.5 million/year.
BSRA2026SRNL-1.1f	9/30/2026	Establishes a lead role in continuous improvement of cement waste form technology with programs that sequester radionuclides, that examine the ultra-low permeability grout as a high-performance material and develop the use of natural pozzolans to replace the fly ash component in grout which has short supply.
BSRA2026SRNL-1.1g	9/30/2026	Support the Office of Chief Technology Officer implementing the EM Technology Development Framework.
BSRA2026SRNL-1.1h	12/31/2025	Lead NNLEMS to complete the Soil and Groundwater R&D Roadmap.
BSRA2026SRNL-1.1i	12/31/2025	Lead NNLEMS to initiate the development of the AI R&D Roadmap.
BSRA2026SRNL-1.2.1a	9/30/2026	Execute the necessary weapons research, development, testing, and evaluation activities to support FY26 deliverables as prescribed by the NA-11 Program/Implementation Plans, to include specific outcomes for engineering and technology maturation (“NA-115”), experimental sciences (“NA-113”), and advanced simulation and computing (“NA-114”).

BSRA2026SRNL-1.2.1b	9/30/2026	Execute the defined activities to support deliverables as identified by NA-192 enabling tritium production operations research and development.
BSRA2026SRNL-1.2.1c	9/30/2026	Execute FY26 scope for He-3 recovery as defined in the project plan and approved by the Office of Science.
BSRA2026SRNL-1.2.2a	9/30/2026	Complete processing of Mk-18 targets per funding allocation by NNSA and availability of the transportation cask.
BSRA2026SRNL-1.2.2b	6/30/2026	Execute the Mobile Plutonium Facility cold weather exercise Atlas Tundra at Malmstrom Air Force Base.
BSRA2026SRNL-1.2.2c	9/30/2026	Complete testing of and prepare the Mobile Melt-Consolidate facility for shipping to Norway.
BSRA2026SRNL-1.3a	9/30/2026	Advance the Fusion Fuel Cycle through the Fuel Cycle Fusion Innovation Research Engine (FIRE) Collaborative by: • Developing a summary report of expected impurities for Magnetic Fusion Energy and Inertial Fusion Energy; and • Complete synthesis and initial testing of sorbents for isotope rebalancing and continuous separation.
BSRA2026SRNL-1.4a	9/30/2026	Leverage nuclear material processing and waste form development competencies to back-end fuel cycle applications in commercial nuclear energy to expand SRNL's impact in energy resilience.
BSRA2026SRNL-1.5a	9/30/2026	Work with Legacy Management ("LM") to: (1) Facilitate remedy resilience analysis for high risk sites; (2) Advance the development of Groundwater Compliance Action Plans utilizing regulatory and technical expertise; (3) Provide technology solutions to advance their long-term stewardship mission; and (4) Evaluate remedial strategies to ensure the continued protection of human health and the environment.
Acceptance Criteria		
DOE-SR will perform validation reviews of any identified Notable Outcomes and consider the above relevant factors for measuring performance in accordance with the Table 1 – Letter Grade and Definitions (Goal 1.0) . The weighted score for each objective is computed by multiplying the numerical score by the assigned weight. <i>See Figure 4</i> . The numerical score for Goal 1.0 will be the sum of all Goal Objectives.		

C. GOAL 2.0 – Efficient and Effective Stewardship and Operation of Research Facilities

SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY (GOALS 1.0, 2.0, and 3.0)
Performance Goal 2.0 – BSRA2026SRNL-2.0
Provide for Efficient and Effective Stewardship and Operation of Research Facilities
Description/Background/Justification

BSRA provides effective and efficient strategic planning; design, fabrication, and construction of Laboratory research facilities; and is responsive to the user community.

The weight of this Goal is **10%**.

The Provide for Efficient and Effective Stewardship of Research Facilities Goal shall measure the overall effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in planning for and delivering leading-edge specialty research and/or user facilities to ensure that the required capabilities are available to meet present and future complex challenges. This Goal also measures the Contractor's innovative operational and programmatic means for implementation of systems that ensure the availability, reliability, and efficiency of these facilities; and the appropriate balance between R&D and user support.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by EM, other cognizant DOE HQ Program Offices, and other customers as identified in Table 2 below. The Goal score from each DOE Mission Role is computed by multiplying each Objective numerical score by the associated weight assigned.

2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s) as Required to Support Laboratory Programs (i.e., activities leading up to CD-2): Provide quality justifications for new R&D facility needs, quality conceptual and pre-conceptual designs, leveraging the use existing facilities and available financing options. The weight of this Objective is 20%.

2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components (execution phase, post CD-2 to CD-4): Provide successful fabrication of components while meeting construction schedules and budgets and ensuring quality oversight and transparent communication. The weight of this Objective is 10%.

2.3 Utilization of Facility(ies) to Provide Impactful S&T Results and Benefits to Internal and External User Communities: Ensure Laboratory facilities and other Savannah River Site facilities and geo-physical resources are being used to perform influential science and generating impactful S&T results; expanding facility capabilities and/or are recognized as scientific leaders in the community, while balancing both site and external customers. The weight of this Objective is 70%.

In assessing the performance of BSRA against this Goal, the following elements should be considered:

- Delivery of accurate and timely information required to carry out the critical decision and budget formulation process associated with the operation of major SRNL facilities;
- BSRA's ability to meet the intent of DOE Order 413.3B, Program and Project Management for the Acquisition of Capital Assets;
- The extent to which BSRA appropriately assesses risks and contingency needs associated with the operation of major SRNL facilities;
- The extent to which BSRA is effective in its management role and partnership with DOE;
- The availability, reliability, performance, and efficiency of Laboratory major research facility(ies);
- The degree to which relevant facilities are optimally arranged to support the user community;
- The degree to which BSRA addresses and advances the disposition of identified environmental liabilities;
- The extent to which the capabilities of the facility(ies) has been developed/expanded; and

- The quality of the process used to allocate facility time to users. Additional elements to be considered in determining the level of performance for the Laboratory against this Goal include, but are not limited to: - The quality of the mission related and scientific justification of any proposed facilities; - The technical quality of conceptual and preliminary designs and the credibility of the associated cost estimates; - The leveraging of existing facilities and capabilities of the DOE laboratory complex in plans for proposed facilities and capabilities; and - The innovation and potential impact of new technologies embodied in SRNL facilities. The example factors for measuring performance listed above are neither inclusive nor are they intended to be a checklist for meeting performance expectations of the Objectives under Goal 2.0. The evaluation of each Objective will use a combination of relevant factors.		
Number	Date	Notable Outcome(s)
BSRA2026SRNL-2.3a	9/30/2026	Initiate Documented Safety Analysis (“DSA”) 2.0 Development to increase working with large fissile and Material at Risk (“MAR”) quantities in SRNL to support national mission needs.
BSRA2026SRNL-2.3b	9/30/2026	Demonstrate continuous reduction in MAR and overall radiological waste reduction to support risk reduction and future SRNL mission growth.
BSRA2026SRNL-2.3c	9/30/2026	Develop plan for rightsizing secure footprint in line with laboratory strategy.
Acceptance Criteria		
DOE-SR will perform validation reviews of any identified Notable Outcomes and consider the above relevant factors for measuring performance in accordance with the Table 2 – Letter Grade and Definitions (Goal 2.0) . The weighted score for each objective is computed by multiplying the numerical score by the assigned weight. <i>See Figure 4</i> . The numerical score for Goal 2.0 will be the sum of all Goal Objectives.		

D. GOAL 3.0 – Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory

SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY (GOALS 1.0, 2.0, and 3.0)
Performance Goal 3.0 – BSRA2026SRNL-3.0
Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory
This Goal evaluates the Contractor’s Leadership capabilities in leading the overall direction of the 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. The weight of this Goal is 30%. In measuring the performance of the Objectives listed below, DOE evaluator(s) shall consider performance trends and outcomes related to 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 Leadership's ability to facilitate and effectively manage external engagements and partnerships; Laboratory and Corporate Office Leadership's ability to instill responsibility and accountability throughout 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.

3.1 Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory

The performance of BSRA's senior management team as demonstrated by their ability to do such things as:

- Define an exciting yet realistic scientific vision/mission for the future of the Laboratory;
- Make progress in realizing the vision for the Laboratory;
- Effectively manage the selection, retention, support, and replacement of key personnel and demonstrate the contract team's ability to progress the Laboratories strategic mission/vision: and
- Establish and maintain long-term partnerships/relationships that maintain appropriate relations with the scientific and local communities that benefit the Laboratory and the U.S. taxpayer.

The weight of this Objective is 30%.

3.2 Management and Operation Leadership of the Laboratory

The performance of BSRA's senior management team as demonstrated by their ability to do such things as:

- Implement a robust contractor assurance system and demonstrate BSRA corporate oversight of the SRNL;
- Understand the costs of doing business at the laboratory 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;
- Ensure good and timely communication between the Laboratory, DOE-SR, EM headquarters, and other site/external customers so that DOE can deal effectively with both internal and external constituencies; and
- Demonstrate accountability for Laboratory leadership toward championing a safety culture that emphasizes leadership, employee/worker engagement, and organizational learning.

The weight of this Objective is 30%.

3.3 Leadership of External Engagements and Partnerships

The performance of BSRA leadership team to achieve the following:

- Establish a vision for developing and promoting technology transfer activities at the laboratory that align with the laboratory research portfolio, further DOE missions, and promote national and economic security of the United States;

- Identify potential partners, implement outreach activities, and manage external engagements to promote accomplishment of technology transfer objectives, and to develop a feedback loop with industry that both informs planned and ongoing technology transfer activities;
- Develop and leverage appropriate relationships with private industry and universities to the benefit of the laboratory, DOE, and U.S. taxpayers (e.g., public-private partnerships, long-term research relationships);
- Facilitate regional partnerships and initiatives that contribute to the local economy and support DOE and laboratory outreach efforts and scientific missions; and,
- Foster a culture of entrepreneurship at the laboratory that encourages staff at all levels to consider potential technology transfer opportunities within their program work and other laboratory activities.

The weight of this Objective is 25%.

3.4 Contractor Value-Added

The additional benefits that accrue to the Laboratory and the DOE by virtue of having this particular M&O contractor in place. Included here, typically, are things over which BSRA does not have immediate authority, such as:

- Corporate involvement/contributions that facilitate DOE strategic plans and program initiatives and/or deal with operational challenges at the Laboratory;
- Using corporate resources to enhance DOE mission objectives by establishing programs/projects/activities that strengthen the Laboratory (e.g. joint appointments, integrated research initiatives, novel educational opportunities);
- Demonstrate proactive communication with Corporate Official and parent companies to identify project issues early and resolve; and
- Providing other contributions, beyond what DOE can supply, that enable the Laboratory to do things that are in the best interest of DOE, the Laboratory, and the community.

The weight of this Objective is 15%.

The example factors for measuring performance listed above are neither inclusive nor are they intended to be a checklist for meeting performance expectations of the Objectives under Goal 3.0. The evaluation of each Objective will use a combination of relevant factors.

Number	Date	Notable Outcome(s)
BSRA2026SRNL-3.1a	9/30/2026	Achieve Advanced Manufacturing Collaborative (“AMC”) operations including lab utilization to enable SRNL strategic program objectives and partnership with the University of South Carolina – Aiken (“USCA”): • Execute staffing & operations plan to enable productive utilization of Analytical and Materials Characterization Lab; and • Execute staffing and operations plan to enable productive use of Additive Manufacturing, Robotics and fusion fuel cycle labs.
BSRA2026SRNL-3.2a	9/30/2026	Institute expectations/performance management across the Laboratory regarding cost effectiveness, quality products, and customer commitment management in

		order to maintain the Laboratory's reputation and cost competitiveness.
BSRA2026SRNL-3.3a	9/30/2026	Plan and execute counterintelligence workshop at a university partner location.
BSRA2026SRNL-3.3b	9/30/2026	Align the SRNL strategy across research directorates and research support organizations to achieve mission impact successes that include: • R&D testbed developments; • LDRD program reset to increase agile program development; • Workshop creation to support the strategic R&D priorities; and • Increased Lab recognition through publications and awards.
BSRA2026SRNL-3.3c	9/30/2026	Leverage existing competencies with infrastructure investments to increase bandwidth and provide governmental efficiencies such as addressing the pit surveillance sample backlog at partner national security enterprise site.
Acceptance Criteria		
DOE-SR will perform validation reviews of any identified Notable Outcomes and consider the above relevant factors for measuring performance in accordance with Tables 3 through 5. The weighted score for each Objective is computed by multiplying the numerical score by the assigned weight. <i>See Figure 4.</i> The numerical score for Goal 3.0 will be the sum of all Goal Objectives.		

E. GOAL 4.0 – Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection

MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS (GOALS 4.0, 5.0, 6.0 and 7.0)
Performance Goal 4.0 – BSRA2026SRNL-4.0
Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection
This Goal evaluates the Contractor's overall success in deploying, implementing, and improving integrated ES&H systems that protect workers, the public, and the environment while efficiently and effectively supporting the mission(s) of the Laboratory. DOE's evaluation will include a review of the Contractor's success in delivering its measures and commitments to Objectives established per DEAR 970.5223-1.
The weight of this Goal is 25% .
4.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Worker Health and Safety Program
The Contractor has established and implemented a Worker Safety and Health Program that reduces or prevents occupational injuries, illnesses, and accidental losses by providing BSRA workers with safe and healthful workplaces at SRNL. The Contractor has implemented procedures for investigating whether a violation of established requirements has occurred, for

determining the nature and extent of any such violation, and for imposing an appropriate remedy. The Contractor will demonstrate effective use of domestic suppliers for personal protective equipment (“PPE”) and achieving on-time-delivery of PPE. The contractor has progressed with a phased approach to implementation of an OSHA Plus framework. The weight of this Objective is 65%. 4.2 Provide Efficient and Effective Environmental Management System The Contractor has implemented an Environmental Management System (“EMS”) as part of the overall Site safety management. The EMS provides for the systematic planning, integrated execution, and evaluation of SRS activities for: (1) worker and public health and environmental protection, (2) pollution prevention and waste minimization, (3) compliance with applicable environmental and cultural resources protection requirements, and (4) continuous improvement. The weight of this Objective is 35%. There are no Notable Outcomes for this Performance Goal.
Acceptance Criteria DOE-SR will perform validation reviews of any identified Notable Outcomes and consider the above relevant factors for measuring performance in accordance with Figure 3. The weighted score for each objective is computed by multiplying the numerical score by the assigned weight. <i>See Figure 4</i>. The numerical score for Goal 4.0 will be the sum of all Goal Objectives. In measuring the performance of the Objectives listed above, DOE evaluator(s) shall consider performance trends and outcomes 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 (“ISM”) system; effectiveness of work planning, feedback, and improvement processes; the strength of the safety culture throughout the Laboratory; the strength of the Nuclear/Facility Safety Programs; the effective development, implementation and maintenance of an efficient and effective EMS; and the effectiveness of responses to identified hazards and/or incidents.

F. GOAL 5.0 – Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission(s)

MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS (GOALS 4.0, 5.0, 6.0 and 7.0)
Performance Goal 5.0 – BSRA2026SRNL-5.0 Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission(s) 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. DOE’s evaluation will include a review of the Contractor’s success to delivering its measures and commitments to Objectives established per DEAR 970.5223-1. The weight of this Goal is 25%. 5.1 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Financial Management System

The weight of this Objective is 30%. 5.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition Management System and Property Management System The weight of this Objective is 10%. 5.3 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Human Resources Management System The weight of this Objective is 20%. 5.4 Provide Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Contractor Assurance Systems, including Internal Audit and Quality The weight of this Objective is 30%. 5.5 Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Knowledge and Technology and the Commercialization of Intellectual Assets The weight of this Objective is 10%.		
Number	Date	Notable Outcome(s)
BSRA2026SRNL-5.1a	9/30/2026	Leverage the Artificial Intelligence (“AI”) abilities within chatSRS to provide a time saving tool for effective Laboratory management and operations.
BSRA2026SRNL-5.1b	9/30/2026	Enhance accounting practices and financial management to boost the accuracy and transparency of financial reporting, consequently enhancing accountability.
BSRA2026SRNL-5.2a	9/30/2026	Migrate office products to SRNL tenant for architectural strategy and data management.
Acceptance Criteria		
DOE-SR will perform validation reviews of any identified Notable Outcomes and consider the above relevant factors for measuring performance in accordance with Figure 3. The weighted score for each objective is computed by multiplying the numerical score by the assigned weight. <i>See Figure 4.</i> The numerical score for Goal 5.0 will be the sum of all Goal Objectives. In measuring the performance of the Objectives listed above, DOE evaluator(s) shall consider performance trends and outcomes in the development, deployment, and integration of foundational program (e.g., Contractor Assurance, Quality, Financial Management, Acquisition Management, Property 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 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. DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the Laboratory’s performance in making progress toward comprehensive collection and submission to the Office of Scientific and Technical Information (“OSTI”) of peer-reviewed accepted manuscripts for journal articles (and associated metadata) resulting from DOE-funded research as called for in the DOE Public Access Plan 10, and cooperation with the		

Department in meeting the relevant requirements to provide other forms of scientific and technical information to OSTI per DOE O 241.1B. 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, work for others, and intellectual asset deployment activities.

G. GOAL 6.0 – Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs

MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS (GOALS 4.0, 5.0, 6.0 and 7.0)
Performance Goal 6.0 – BSRA2026SRNL-6.0
Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs
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. DOE's evaluation will include a review of the Contractor's success to delivering its measures and commitments to Objectives established in accordance with DEAR 970.5223-1.
The weight of this Goal is 25%.
In measuring the performance of the Objectives listed below, DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the Contractor's ability to provide balanced resources between facility operations and R&D user support to ensure the accomplishment of site and external customer deliverables. performance trends and outcomes in facility and infrastructure programs. This may include, but is not limited to, the conduct of operations, conduct of maintenance, management of real property assets to maintain effective operational safety, worker health, environmental protection and compliance, property preservation, and optimize efficiencies in Min-Safe/Base-Operational to improve cost effectiveness while maintaining equivalent levels of safety, quality and security; planning and executing strategies to promote the resilience and reliability of Laboratory infrastructure; 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, conservation, and sustainability 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 facility and infrastructure projects.
6.1 Sustain Excellence in Real Property Asset Management
The weight of this Objective is 20%.
6.2 Sustain Excellence in the Operations and Maintenance of Laboratory Facilities
The weight of this Objective is 80%.
There are no Notable Outcomes for this Performance Goal.

Number	Date	Notable Outcome(s)
BSRA2026SRNL-6.2a	9/30/2026	Upgrade classified computing physical infrastructure to ensure delivery of virtual infrastructure for classified missions.
BSRA2026SRNL-6.2b	9/30/2026	Maintain Institutional General Plant Projects (“IGPP”) within schedule and budget.
Acceptance Criteria		
DOE-SR will perform validation reviews of any identified Notable Outcomes and consider the above relevant factors for measuring performance in accordance with Figure 3 . The weighted score for each objective is computed by multiplying the numerical score by the assigned weight. <i>See Figure 4</i> . The numerical score for Goal 6.0 will be the sum of all Goal Objectives.		

H. GOAL 7.0 – Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management and Emergency Management Systems

MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS (GOALS 4.0, 5.0, 6.0 and 7.0)
Performance Goal 7.0 – BSRA2026SRNL-7.0
Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management and Emergency Management Systems
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. DOE’s evaluation will include a review of the Contractors success to delivering its measures and commitments to Objectives established per DEAR 970.5223-1. The weight of this Goal is 25%. In measuring the performance of the Objectives listed below, DOE evaluator(s) shall consider performance trends and outcomes 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. 7.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System The weight of this Objective is 20%. 7.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective Cyber Security System for the Protection of Classified and Unclassified Information The weight of this Objective is 40%.

7.3 Provide an Efficient and Effective Physical Security Program for the Protection of Special Nuclear Materials, Classified Matter, Classified Information, Sensitive Information, and Property The weight of this Objective is 40%. There are no Notable Outcomes for this Performance Goal.		
Number	Date	Notable Outcome(s)
BSRA2026SRNL-7.2a	9/30/2026	Develop a Protection of Classified Matter/Classified Information Program for SRNL in accordance with DOE Regulations.
BSRA2026SRNL-7.2b	9/30/2026	Maintain compliant cybersecurity programs in accordance with applicable DOE orders to ensure information and information systems are properly maintained and protected against cybersecurity vulnerabilities. Utilize a risk-management approach for analyzing threats and/or risks to information and information systems; risk-based decision-making with consideration to security, cost, and mission effectiveness; and implementation of cybersecurity controls consistent with DOE and EM guidance.
Acceptance Criteria DOE-SR will perform validation reviews of any identified Notable Outcomes and consider the above relevant factors for measuring performance in accordance with Figure 3. The weighted score for each objective is computed by multiplying the numerical score by the assigned weight. <i>See Figure 4</i>. The numerical score for Goal 7.0 will be the sum of all Goal Objectives.		

IV. Appendix

Table 1 - Letter Grade and Definitions (Goal 1.0)

Letter Grade	Definition
A+	In addition to satisfying the conditions for B+ - There are <i>significant research areas for which the Laboratory has exceeded the expectations of the proposed research plans in significant ways through creative, new, or unconventional methods that allow greater scientific reach than expected.</i> - S&T conducted at the Laboratory <i>has resolved one of the most critical questions in the field or has changed the way the research community thinks about a particular field through paradigm shifting discoveries that would be considered the most influential discovery of the decade for that field.</i> - S&T conducted at the Laboratory <i>provided major advances that significantly accelerate DOE or other customer mission(s).</i> - Laboratory staff members have leadership positions in professional organizations AND in National Academy or equivalent panels to discuss and determine further research directions. - Laboratory staff members have leadership positions in DOE (or in other supporting agencies) sponsored workshops and strategic planning activities, for example, Laboratory

Letter Grade	Definition
	staff members chair or co-chair DOE-sponsored or other supporting agency sponsored workshops and strategic planning activities. • The Laboratory program consistently produces and submits competitive proposals that challenge convention and open significant new fields for research that are well aligned with DOE and/or other supporting agencies mission needs, and the Laboratory has a strong recognized role in setting priorities and driving the direction in key research areas and are internationally recognized leaders in the field. • Laboratory staff hold leadership positions in multi-institutional research collaborations.
A	In addition to satisfying the conditions for B+ • There are <i>important examples</i> where the Laboratory <i>exceeded the expectations</i> of the proposed research plans <i>in significant ways through creative, new, or unconventional methods that allow greater scientific reach than expected</i>. • <i>All areas</i> of S&T conducted at the Laboratory are of <i>exceptional or outstanding</i> merit and quality. • S&T conducted at the Laboratory has <i>significant positive impact</i> to DOE or other customer missions. • Laboratory staff members have <i>leadership positions</i> in professional organizations AND <i>staff has contributing role in National Academy or equivalent panels to discuss further research directions</i>. • Laboratory staff members have <i>leadership positions</i> in DOE and/or in other supporting agencies sponsored workshops and strategic planning activities. • The Laboratory program consistently produces and submits competitive proposals that challenge convention and open <i>significant new fields</i> for research that are well aligned with DOE or other supporting agency mission needs and <i>the Laboratory has a strong recognized role in setting priorities and driving the direction in key research areas</i>. • Laboratory staff hold <i>leadership positions</i> in multi-institutional research collaborations.
A-	In addition to satisfying the conditions for B+ • There are <i>important examples</i> where the Laboratory <i>exceeded the expectations</i> of the proposed research plans. • <i>Significant areas</i> of S&T conducted at the Laboratory are of <i>exceptional or outstanding</i> merit and quality. • S&T conducted at the Laboratory <i>significantly impact</i> DOE or other customer missions. • Laboratory staff members have <i>leadership positions</i> in professional organizations OR staff has contributing role in National Academy or equivalent panels to discuss further research directions. • Laboratory staff members have <i>leadership positions</i> in DOE and/or other supporting agency-sponsored workshops and strategic planning activities. • The Laboratory program consistently submits competitive proposals that challenge convention and open <i>significant</i> new avenues for research that are well aligned with DOE or other supporting agencies mission needs. • Laboratory staff hold <i>leadership positions</i> in multi-institutional research collaborations.
B+	The Laboratory has achieved each of the following objectives: • The Laboratory has successfully executed proposed research plans. • S&T conducted at the Laboratory are of <i>high</i> scientific merit and quality. • S&T conducted at the Laboratory <i>advance</i> DOE or other customer missions.

Letter Grade	Definition
	- Laboratory staff members are <i>active participants</i> in professional organizations, committees, and activities, and take on leadership responsibilities commensurate with experience and expertise. - Laboratory staff members are <i>active participants</i> in DOE and/or other supporting agencies-sponsored workshops and strategic planning activities. - Laboratory staff members contribute thoughtful and thorough peer review in a timely manner, when requested by DOE or other supporting agencies. - The Laboratory program consistently provides competitive proposals that challenge convention and open new avenues for research that are well aligned with DOE or other supporting agencies mission needs. - Laboratory staff are <i>active participants</i> in multi-institutional research collaborations.
B	- The Laboratory has successfully executed proposed research plans. - S&T conducted at the Laboratory <i>advance</i> DOE or other customer missions. - Laboratory staff members contribute thoughtful and thorough peer review in a timely manner, when requested by DOE and/or other supporting agencies. - The Laboratory program consistently provides competitive proposals that challenge convention and open new avenues for research that are well aligned with DOE and/or other supporting agencies mission needs. BUT the Laboratory fails to meet the conditions for B+ for <i>at least one</i> of the following reasons: - S&T conducted at the Laboratory are <i>not uniformly of high</i> merit and quality OR <i>some areas of research, previously supported, have become uncompetitive</i> OR <i>the Laboratory does not produce sufficiently competitive proposals to receive program support at a level commensurate with its unique capabilities.</i> - Although <i>regular participants</i> in professional organizations, committees, and activities, <i>the extent to which staff take on leadership roles falls short of what would be expected, given the level of experience and expertise of the staff.</i> - Although <i>regular participants</i> in DOE and/or other supported agencies sponsored workshops and strategic planning activities, <i>the extent to which staff take on leadership roles falls short of what would be expected, given the level of experience and expertise of the staff.</i> - Although <i>active members of</i> multi-institutional research collaborations, <i>the extent to which staff take on leadership roles falls short of what would be expected, given the level of experience and expertise of the staff.</i>
B-	- Laboratory staff members contribute thoughtful and thorough peer review in a timely manner, when requested by DOE or other supporting agencies. BUT the Laboratory fails to meet the conditions for B+ for <i>at least one</i> of the following reasons: - The Laboratory has <i>failed to successfully execute</i> proposed research plans, <i>but contingencies were in place such that no funding was or will be terminated.</i> OR S&T conducted at the Laboratory <i>does little to advance</i> DOE or other customer missions. <i>Significant areas of</i> S&T conducted at the Laboratory are <i>not of high</i> merit and quality OR <i>some areas of research, previously supported, have become uncompetitive</i> OR <i>the Laboratory do not produce sufficiently competitive proposals to receive program support at a level commensurate with its unique capabilities.</i> - The Laboratory program submits competitive proposals <i>but these either lack innovation or are not well aligned with DOE or other supporting agencies mission needs.</i>

Letter Grade	Definition
	- Laboratory staff are <i>infrequent participants</i> in professional organizations, committees, and activities, and <i>the extent to which staff take on leadership roles falls short of what would be expected, given the level of experience and expertise of the staff.</i> - Laboratory staff are <i>infrequent participants</i> in DOE or other supported agencies sponsored workshops and strategic planning activities, and <i>the extent to which staff take on leadership roles falls short of what would be expected, given the level of experience and expertise of the staff.</i> - Although <i>active members</i> of multi-institutional research collaborations, <i>the extent to which staff take on leadership roles falls short of what would be expected, given the level of experience and expertise of the staff.</i>
C	The Laboratory fails to meet the conditions for B+ for <i>at least one</i> of the following reasons: <i>In several significant aspects, the Laboratory failed to deliver on proposed research plans using available resources such that some funding was or will be terminated OR S&T conducted at the Laboratory failed to contribute to DOE or other customer missions.</i> <i>Significant areas of S&T conducted at the Laboratory are of poor merit and quality OR some areas of research, previously supported, have become uncompetitive AND the Laboratory does not produce sufficiently competitive proposals to receive program support at a level commensurate with its unique capabilities.</i> - Laboratory staff members <i>do not reliably</i> contribute thoughtful and thorough peer review in a timely manner, when requested by DOE or other supporting agencies. <i>Some areas of research, previously supported, are no longer competitive.</i> - Laboratory staff members are <i>infrequent participants</i> in professional organizations, committees, and activities, AND <i>the extent to which staff take on leadership roles falls short of what would be expected, given the level of experience and expertise of the staff.</i> - Laboratory staff members are <i>infrequent participants</i> in DOE or other supported agencies sponsored workshops and strategic planning activities, and <i>the extent to which staff take on leadership roles falls short of what would be expected, given the level of experience and expertise of the staff.</i> - Although Laboratory staff members are <i>active members</i> of multi-institutional research collaborations, <i>the extent to which staff take on leadership roles falls short of what would be expected, given the level of experience and expertise of the staff.</i>
D	The Laboratory fails to meet the conditions for B+ for <i>at least one</i> of the following reasons: <i>Multiple program elements at the Laboratory failed to deliver on proposed research plans using available resources such that significant funding was or will be terminated.</i> <i>Multiple significant areas of S&T conducted at the Laboratory are of poor merit and quality OR some areas of research, previously supported, have become uncompetitive AND the Laboratory does not produce sufficiently competitive proposals to receive program support at a level commensurate with its unique capabilities.</i> - S&T conducted at the Laboratory <i>failed to contribute to DOE or other customer missions.</i> <i>Multiple program elements at the Laboratory failed to deliver on proposed research plans using available resources resulting in total termination of funding.</i> <i>Multiple significant areas of S&T conducted at the Laboratory are of poor merit and quality OR some areas of research, previously supported, have become uncompetitive AND the Laboratory does not produce sufficiently competitive proposals to receive program support at a level commensurate with its unique capabilities OR the Laboratory has been found to have engaged in gross scientific incompetence and/or scientific fraud.</i>

Letter Grade	Definition
	• S&T conducted at the Laboratory <i>failed to contribute to</i> DOE or other customer missions. • <i>Laboratory staff are working on problems that are no longer at the forefront of science and are considered mundane.</i>
F	The Laboratory fails to meet the conditions for B+ for <i>at least one</i> of the following reasons: • <i>Multiple program elements at the Laboratory failed to deliver on proposed research plans using available resources resulting in total termination of funding.</i> • <i>Multiple significant areas of S&T conducted at the Laboratory are of poor merit and quality OR some areas of research, previously supported, have become uncompetitive AND the Laboratory does not produce sufficiently competitive proposals to receive program support at a level commensurate with its unique capabilities OR the Laboratory has been found to have engaged in gross scientific incompetence and/or scientific fraud.</i> • S&T conducted at the Laboratory <i>failed to contribute to</i> DOE or other customer missions. • Review has found the Laboratory staff to be <i>guilty of gross scientific incompetence and/or scientific fraud.</i>

Table 2 - Letter Grade and Definitions (Goal 2.0)

Letter Grade	Definition
A+	In addition to satisfying all conditions for B+, the Laboratory <i>exceeds expectations</i> in <i>all</i> of these categories: • Approaches proposed by the Laboratory are widely regarded as innovative, novel, comprehensive, and potentially cost-effective. • Reviews repeatedly confirm strong potential for scientific and engineering discovery in areas that support the Department’s mission, and potential to change a discipline or research area’s direction. • The Laboratory identifies, analyzes and champions novel approaches for acquiring the new capability, including leveraging or extending the capability of existing facilities while reducing cost and/or risk while enhancing capability. • Performance of the facility <i>exceeds</i> expectations for cost of operations, users served, availability, and capability. • The schedule and the costs associated with steady state operations are <i>significantly less</i> than planned and are acknowledged to be ‘leadership caliber’ by reviews. • Data on environment, safety, and health continues to be exemplary and widely regarded as among the ‘best in class’. • The Laboratory took extraordinary means to deliver an extraordinary result for the program and/or users in the performance/review period.
A	In addition to satisfying all conditions for B+, <i>all</i> of the following conditions are also met: • The Laboratory takes the initiative to demonstrate the potential for revolutionary scientific advancement working in partnership with HQ. • The Laboratory identifies, analyzes, and champions, to DOE and Savannah River Site, novel approaches for acquiring the new capability, including leveraging or extending the capability of existing facilities. • Performance of the facility exceeds expectations in most of these categories: cost of operations, users served, availability, and capability. • The schedule and the costs associated with the ramp-up and/or steady state operations are less than planned and are acknowledged to be ‘leadership caliber’ by reviews. • Data on environment, safety, and health continues to be exemplary and widely regarded as among the ‘best in class’.
A-	In addition to satisfying all conditions for B+, <i>all</i> of the following conditions are also met: • The approaches proposed by the Laboratory are widely regarded as innovative, novel, comprehensive, and potentially cost-effective. • Reviews repeatedly confirm potential for scientific discovery in areas that support the Department’s mission, and potential to change a discipline or research area’s direction. • Performance of the facility exceeds expectations in any of these categories: cost of operations, users served, availability, and capability. • The schedule and the costs associated with the ramp-up and/or steady state operations are less than planned and are acknowledged to be among the best by reviews.
B+	The Laboratory has achieved each of the following objectives: • The operation and maintenance meet its management performance measures. • The Laboratory provides sustained leadership and commitment to environment, safety and health.

Letter Grade	Definition
	- Reviews regularly recognize the Laboratory for being proactive in the management of the execution phase of the operation and maintenance. - To a large extent, problems are identified and corrected by the Laboratory while minimizing impact on scope, cost or schedule. - DOE is kept informed of operation and maintenance status on a regular basis; reviews regularly indicate operation, and maintenance is expected to meet its cost/schedule performance baseline.
B	The Laboratory fails to meet expectations in <i>one</i> of the areas listed under B+.
B-	The Laboratory fails to meet expectations in several of the areas listed under B+.
C	The Laboratory fails to meet the expectations in several of the areas listed under B+ AND the required analyses and documentation developed by the Laboratory are EITHER not innovative OR reflect a lack of commitment and leadership.
D	The Laboratory fails to meet the expectations in several of the areas listed under B+ AND the Laboratory fails to provide a compelling justification.
F	The Laboratory fails to meet the expectations in several of the areas listed under B+ AND the approaches proposed by the Laboratory are based on fraudulent assumptions; the science case is weak to non-existent, and the business case is seriously flawed.

Table 3 - Letter Grade and Definitions (Goal 3.0, Objective 3.1)

Letter Grade	Definition
A+	The Senior Leadership of the laboratory has made outstanding progress (on an order of magnitude scale) over the previous year in realizing their vision for the laboratory 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 of the laboratory may have been faced 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 the laboratory in national fora, and the Department is strengthened by this.
A	The Senior Leadership of the laboratory has made significant progress over the previous year in realizing their vision for the laboratory and has through this has had a demonstrable positive impact on the Office of Science 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 of the laboratory to redirect laboratory activities to enhance the long-term future of the laboratory. Partners in the scientific and local communities applaud the laboratory in national fora, and the Department is strengthened by this.
A-	The laboratory senior management performs better than expected (B+ grade) in these areas.
B+	The Senior Leadership of the laboratory has made significant progress over the previous year in realizing their vision for the laboratory. Strategic plans present long-range goals that are both exciting and realistic. Decisions and actions taken by the lab leadership align work, facilities, equipment and technical capabilities with the laboratory vision and plan. The Senior leadership of the laboratory 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 the laboratory.

Letter Grade	Definition
B	The Senior Leadership of the laboratory has made little progress over the previous year in realizing their vision for the laboratory. Strategic plans present long-range goals that are exciting and realistic; however, DOE is not fully confident that the laboratory is taking the actions necessary for the goals to be achieved. The Laboratory is not fully engaged with its partners/relationships in the scientific and local communities to maximize the potential benefits these relations have for the laboratory.
C	The Senior Leadership of the laboratory has made no progress over the previous year in realizing their vision for the laboratory or aligning work, facilities, equipment and technical capabilities with the laboratory 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 the laboratory exist, but they may not always be consistent with the mission of or vision for the laboratory. Affected communities and stakeholders are mostly supportive of the laboratory and aligned with the management's vision for the laboratory.
D	The Senior Leadership of the laboratory has made no progress or has backslid over the previous year in realizing their vision for the laboratory or in aligning work, facilities, equipment and technical capabilities with the laboratory vision and plan. Strategic plans present long-range goals that are neither exciting nor realistic. Partnerships that may advance the Laboratory towards strategic goals are inappropriate, unidentified, or unlikely. Affected communities and stakeholders are not adequately engaged with the laboratory and indicate non-alignment with DOE priorities.
F	The Senior Leadership of the laboratory has made no progress or has backslid over the previous year in realizing their vision for the laboratory or in or aligning work, facilities, equipment and technical capabilities with the laboratory vision and plan. Strategic plans present long-range goals that are not aligned with DOE priorities or the mission of the laboratory. Partnerships that may advance the Laboratory 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 the laboratory in achieving a successful future. Affected communities and stakeholders are openly non-supportive of the laboratory and DOE priorities.

Table 4 - Letter Grade and Definitions (Goal 3.0, Objective 3.2)

Letter Grade	Definition
A+	The laboratory 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 internal and external to the Department establish similarly outstanding practices. The laboratory understands the drivers of cost at their lab and are prioritizing and managing these costs commensurate with the associated risks and benefits to the laboratory and DOE. Laboratory management and processes reflect a sense of accountability and responsibility which is evident down and through the entire organization. Communication between the laboratory and its customers and the Site Office is such that all the national laboratories and the Department as a whole benefits.
A	The laboratory has improved dramatically in the last year in all of the following: building a robust and transparent contractor assurance system that integrates internal and external

Letter Grade	Definition
	(corporate) evaluation processes to evaluate risk; demonstrating the use of this system in making decisions that are aligned with the laboratory's vision and strategic plan; understanding the drivers of cost at their lab, and prioritizing and managing these costs consistent with their associated risks and benefits to the laboratory and DOE; demonstrating laboratory management and processes reflect a sense of accountability and responsibility which is evident down and through the entire organization; assuring communication between the laboratory and its customers that is beneficial to both the lab and the department.
A-	The laboratory senior management performs better than expected (B+ grade) in these areas.
B+	The laboratory has a robust and transparent contractor assurance system in place that integrates internal and external (corporate) evaluation processes to evaluate risk. The laboratory can demonstrate use of this system in making decisions that are aligned with the laboratory's vision and strategic plan. The laboratory understands the drivers of cost at their lab and are prioritizing and managing these costs commensurate with the associated risks and benefits to the laboratory and DOE. Laboratory management and processes reflect a sense of accountability and responsibility which is evident down and through the entire organization. Communication between the laboratory and its customers and the Site Office is such that there are no surprises or embarrassments.
B	The laboratory has a contractor assurance system in place, but further improvements are necessary, or the link between the CAS and the laboratory's decision-making processes are not evident. The laboratory understands the drivers of cost at their lab, but they are not prioritizing and managing these costs as well as they should to be commensurate with the associated risks and benefits to the laboratory and DOE. Laboratory management and processes reflect a sense of accountability and responsibility which is mostly evident down and through the entire organization. Communication between the laboratory and its customers and the Site Office is such that there are no significant surprises or embarrassments.
C	The laboratory lacks a robust and transparent contractor assurance system in place that integrates internal and external (corporate) evaluation processes to evaluate risk. The laboratory cannot demonstrate use of this system in making decisions that are aligned with the laboratory's vision and strategic plan. The laboratory does not fully understand the drivers of cost at their lab, and thus are not prioritizing and managing these costs as well as they should to be commensurate with the associated risks and benefits to the laboratory and DOE. Communication between the laboratory and its customers and the Site Office is such that there has been at least one significant surprise or embarrassment.
D	The laboratory lacks a contractor assurance system, doesn't understand the drivers of cost at their lab, and is not prioritizing and managing costs. DOE must intercede in management decisions. Poor communication between the laboratory and its customers and the Site Office has resulted in more than one significant surprise or embarrassment.
F	Lack of management by the laboratory's senior management has put the future of the laboratory at risk or has significantly hurt the reputation of DOE.

Table 5 - Letter Grade and Definitions (Goal 3.0, Objective 3.3)

Letter Grade	Definition
A+	Laboratory leadership has an exemplary technology transfer vision and is a leader across the complex in engaging external partners to identify technology transfer activities that are in strategic alignment with the laboratory research portfolio and in furtherance of the DOE mission. The laboratory is recognized as a preeminent leader in the technology transfer community across the DOE complex and has assisted other national laboratories to develop strategies for identifying and engaging external partnerships. The laboratory leadership successfully develops national and regional partnerships that significantly enhance DOE and laboratory outreach efforts and scientific missions. The laboratory staff are strongly encouraged to seek out and pursue potential technology transfer activities that are clearly connected and/or complementary to their research and development work at the laboratory and the laboratory is able to demonstrate how this outreach informs their ongoing technology transfer efforts.
A	The laboratory has a strong vision for engaging strategic partners and identifying strong connections between the laboratory research portfolio and potential technology transfer activities. The laboratory is one of the leaders in the technology transfer community across the DOE complex. The laboratory leadership develops national and regional partnerships that positively impact DOE and laboratory outreach efforts and scientific missions. The laboratory staff are encouraged to pursue technology transfer activities that are connected and/or complementary to their research and development work at the laboratory.
A-	The laboratory senior management performs better than expected (B+ grade) in these areas.
B+	The laboratory has a vision for engaging external partners, capturing intellectual property, and connecting laboratory research with potential technology transfer activities in furtherance of the DOE mission. The laboratory leadership develops national and regional partnerships that support DOE and laboratory outreach efforts and scientific missions. Laboratory staff are encouraged to seek out and engage in opportunities for technology transfer activities.
B	The laboratory has some external engagements that support development of a vision for technology transfer activities at the laboratory; however, this vision is not fully realized and requires more work to identify potential external partners or challenges in capturing intellectual property. The laboratory has limited partnerships to advance DOE and laboratory outreach efforts and scientific missions.
C	The laboratory lacks a vision and the mechanisms to implement a strategy to promote technology transfer at the laboratory and has little success in developing partnerships.
D	Laboratory leadership lack a vision and have not supported the mechanisms/resources necessary to develop or implement an external engagement strategy to promote technology transfer activities at the laboratory including partnership efforts. Laboratory staff are discouraged from seeking out opportunities to solicit external partner input and are also discouraged from identifying potential activities for technology transfer and from engaging in efforts to protect intellectual property.
F	Lack of vision and resources by the laboratory's senior management has hindered the ability of the laboratory to engage external partners and has hurt the laboratory's ability to identify and plan for technology activities and partnerships, this failure has significantly hurt the Department's ability to achieve its missions.

Table 6 - Letter Grade and Definitions (Goal 3.0, Objective 3.4)

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