**AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT**

| 1. CONTRACT ID CODE | PAGE OF PAGES |
|---|---|
| | 1 31 |

| 2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. | 3. EFFECTIVE DATE | 4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. | 5. PROJECT NO. *(If applicable)* |
|---|---|---|---|
| 258 | See Block 16C | | |

| 6. ISSUED BY | CODE | 7. ADMINISTERED BY *(If other than Item 6)* | CODE |
|---|---|---|---|
| Idaho Operations<br>U.S. Department of Energy<br>Idaho Operations<br>1955 Fremont Avenue<br>Idaho Falls ID 83415 | 00701 | Idaho Operations<br>U.S. Department of Energy<br>Idaho Operations<br>1955 Fremont Avenue<br>MS 1221<br>Idaho Falls ID 83415 | 00701 |

| 8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR *(No., street, county, State and ZIP Code)* | | 9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. |
|---|---|---|
| BATTELLE ENERGY ALLIANCE, LLC<br>Attn: Dana Storms<br>P.O. BOX 1625<br>IDAHO FALLS ID 834150001 | (x) | 9B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 11)* |
| | x | 10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.<br>DE-AC07-05ID14517 |
| | | 10B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 13)*<br>11/09/2004 |
| CODE 152020629 | FACILITY CODE | |

**11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS**

☐ The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers ☐ is extended, ☐ is not extended.
Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning _____ copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

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

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

| CHECK ONE | |
|---|---|
| | A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: *(Specify authority)* THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A. |
| | B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES *(such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.)* SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b). |
| X | C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:<br>See Block 14 |
| | D. OTHER *(Specify type of modification and authority)* |

**E. IMPORTANT:** Contractor ☐ is not, ☒ is required to sign this document and return 1 copies to the issuing office.

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

Tax ID Number: 68-0588324
DUNS Number: 152020629
Block 13 C: Modification Authority: DEAR 970.5215-1, Total Available Fee: Base Fee Amount and Performance Fee Amount.

THE PURPOSE OF THIS MODIFICATION IS TO: INCORPORATE REV 1 DATED March 7, 2013, TO THE FY 2013 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND MEASUREMENT PLAN (PEMP).

REV 1 TO THE FY 2013 PEMP IS INCORPORATED INTO PART III, SECTION J, ATTACHMENT J-K, EFFECTIVE DATE March 7, 2013 (ATTACHED 29 PAGES).

Continued ...

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

| 15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER *(Type or print)* | | 16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER *(Type or print)* | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Dana M. Storms, Manager | | Suzette M. Olson | |
| 15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR<br>*(Signature of person authorized to sign)* | 15C. DATE SIGNED<br>3/14/2013 | 16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA<br>*(Signature of Contracting Officer)* | 16C. DATE SIGNED<br>3/14/13 |

NSN 7540-01-152-8070
Previous edition unusable

STANDARD FORM 30 (REV. 10-83)
Prescribed by GSA
FAR (48 CFR) 53.243

NAME OF OFFEROR OR CONTRACTOR
BATTELLE ENERGY ALLIANCE, LLC

| ITEM NO. (A) | SUPPLIES/SERVICES (B) | QUANTITY (C) | UNIT (D) | UNIT PRICE (E) | AMOUNT (F) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | The changes are to the following PEMP measures: 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3, 3.1.4, 3.1.5, 3.1.6, 3.1.8, 3.3.1, 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 5.1.2, and 5.1.3. The following PEMP measures were deleted: 3.1.7, 4.1.4, 5.4.1, and 5.4.2. PEMP measure 3.1.8 has been sequentially numbered 3.1.7. PEMP measure 5.4.9 was added and sequentially numbered 5.4.7. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged. Period of Performance: 11/09/2004 to 09/30/2014 | | | | |

**AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT**

| 1. CONTRACT ID CODE | PAGE OF PAGES |
|---|---|
| | 1 31 |

| 2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. | 3. EFFECTIVE DATE | 4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. | 5. PROJECT NO. *(If applicable)* |
|---|---|---|---|
| 258 | See Block 16C | | |

6. ISSUED BY CODE 00701

Idaho Operations
U.S. Department of Energy
Idaho Operations
1955 Fremont Avenue
Idaho Falls ID 83415

7. ADMINISTERED BY *(If other than Item 6)* CODE 00701

Idaho Operations
U.S. Department of Energy
Idaho Operations
1955 Fremont Avenue
MS 1221
Idaho Falls ID 83415

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR *(No., street, county, State and ZIP Code)*

BATTELLE ENERGY ALLIANCE, LLC
Attn: Dana Storms
P.O. BOX 1625
IDAHO FALLS ID 834150001

CODE 152020629 FACILITY CODE

(x) 9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO.

9B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 11)*

x 10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO. DE-AC07-05ID14517

10B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 13)* 11/09/2004

**11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS**

☐ The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers ☐ is extended, ☐ is not extended.
Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning _____ copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

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

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

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

**E. IMPORTANT:** Contractor ☐ is not. ☒ is required to sign this document and return 1 copies to the issuing office.

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

Tax ID Number: 68-0588324
DUNS Number: 152020629
Block 13 C: Modification Authority: DEAR 970.5215-1, Total Available Fee: Base Fee Amount and Performance Fee Amount.

THE PURPOSE OF THIS MODIFICATION IS TO: INCORPORATE REV 1 DATED March 7, 2013, TO THE FY 2013 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND MEASUREMENT PLAN (PEMP).

REV 1 TO THE FY 2013 PEMP IS INCORPORATED INTO PART III, SECTION J, ATTACHMENT J-K, EFFECTIVE DATE March 7, 2013 (ATTACHED 29 PAGES).

Continued ...

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

| 15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER *(Type or print)* | | 16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER *(Type or print)* | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Suzette M. Olson | |
| 15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR | 15C. DATE SIGNED | 16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA | 16C. DATE SIGNED |
| *(Signature of person authorized to sign)* | | Signature on File *(Signature of Contracting Officer)* | 03/14/2013 |

NAME OF OFFEROR OR CONTRACTOR
BATTELLE ENERGY ALLIANCE, LLC

| ITEM NO. (A) | SUPPLIES/SERVICES (B) | QUANTITY (C) | UNIT (D) | UNIT PRICE (E) | AMOUNT (F) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | The changes are to the following PEMP measures: 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3, 3.1.4, 3.1.5, 3.1.6, 3.1.8, 3.3.1, 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 5.1.2, and 5.1.3. The following PEMP measures were deleted: 3.1.7, 4.1.4, 5.4.1, and 5.4.2. PEMP measure 3.1.8 has been sequentially numbered 3.1.7. PEMP measure 5.4.9 was added and sequentially numbered 5.4.7. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged. Period of Performance: 11/09/2004 to 09/30/2014 | | | | |

**The FY 2013 Rev 1, PEMP is incorporated into Part III Section J, Attachment K, (Attached 29 pages, 3/7/13, Rev 1).**

The changes are to the following PEMP measures: 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3, 3.1.4, 3.1.5, 3.1.6, 3.1.8, 3.3.1, 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 5.1.2, and 5.1.3. The following PEMP measures were deleted: 3.1.7, 4.1.4, 5.4.1, and 5.4.2. PEMP measure 3.1.8 has been sequentially numbered 3.1.7. PEMP measure 5.4.9 was added and sequentially numbered 5.4.7.

**The following are the approved changes:**

**Table J. 3.0 Develop Capabilities for the Future – Performance Measures**

| Results and Performance Measures | Description |
|---|---|
| **3.1** | **Progress Toward Developing World-Class Nuclear Capabilities (fuel cycle, reactors, and non-traditional uses)** |
| 3.1.1 | Demonstrate progress toward developing world-class post irradiation examination (PIE) capabilities at the INL on a schedule which allows for effective prototyping of equipment in Irradiated Materials Characterization Laboratory (IMCL) and timely incorporation of results into design activities for the Advanced Post Irradiation Examination (APIE) project.<br><br>• Develop an IMCL Implementation Plan, **by April 30, 2013**, that addresses the installation of R&D equipment in IMCL. Show progress towards the installation of equipment in IMCL in FY 2013, in accordance with the implementation plan. The implementation plan shall also include all work in FY 2014 and FY 2015 necessary to meet mission objectives. |
| 3.1.2 | Demonstrate progress toward developing capabilities (including transient testing, ceramic fuel, and fuel modeling and simulation) to deliver transformational research in the development of fuels for future generations of reactors.<br><br>• Execute FY 2013 activities consistent with the most current ceramic fuel plan and its addendum.<br>• Demonstrate fabrication of uranium based ceramic fuel in the Experimental Fuels Facility (EFF).<br>• In FY 2013, finalize the analyses, path forward, and decisions to enable commencement of transuranic fuels glovebox work in 2015. The glovebox capabilities are to be consistent with the high-level requirements outlined in the most recent ceramic fuels research and development capabilities strategic plan. |

| Results and Performance Measures | Description |
|---|---|
| 3.1.3 | Demonstrate progress toward developing unique capabilities in aqueous and electrochemical separations and waste forms R&D.<br><br>• Execute FY 2013 activities consistent with the updated FY 2013 Separations and Waste Forms Strategic Plan and the updated FY 2013 Five-Year Implementation Plan for Advanced Separations and Waste Forms.<br>• Complete the installation of a glovebox capability to support laboratory scale aqueous actinide separations research.<br>• Expand lab-scale cold or warm R&D capabilities in pyroprocessing by installing a new glovebox for work in Engineering Development Lab (EDL). |
| 3.1.4 | Demonstrate progress toward developing world-class used fuel storage and transportation R&D capabilities. Execute FY 2013 activities consistent with the "Extended Storage and Transportation for Used Nuclear Fuel – INL Capability Assessment and Development Plan for FY 2013 Strategic Development Activities."<br><br>• Viability Assessment of Existing INL Facilities for Dry Storage Cask Handling by **April 30, 2013.**<br>• Provide thermodynamic calculations to Sandia National Laboratory to develop a zirconium hydride reorientation model by **August 15, 2013.**<br>• Strategy for Used Fuel Acquisition by **September 15, 2013**. |
| 3.1.5 | Demonstrate the capabilities necessary to expand the relevance of nuclear energy by developing and enabling technologies for nuclear hybrid systems and continue to establish world-class capabilities to deliver transformational R&D for other non-traditional applications, such as space power.<br><br>• Execute FY 2013 activities consistent with the 2012 INL Hybrid Nuclear Energy Systems Strategic Plan.<br><br>▪ Complete the design concept and ROM cost estimates for a functional control room mock up as described in the Nuclear Energy Hybrid Systems Strategic Plan.<br>▪ Complete the design concept and ROM cost estimates for a converter connection to the INL grid that provides capabilities for real-time grid simulations. |
| 3.1.6 | Submit Critical Decision-1 documents for the APIE project to DOE in accordance with the agreed upon schedule.<br><br>In order to demonstrate progress on the Resumption of Transient Testing Program, INL will develop and submit the following deliverables to DOE by |

| Results and Performance Measures | Description |
|---|---|
| | **August 15, 2013**. The documentation will include an Environmental Assessment for public comment, Analysis of Alternatives, an Assessment Plan, and a Program Management Plan that identifies a management and funding strategy for the resumption of transient testing by the end of FY 2018. |
| 3.1.7 | Provide new capabilities to support the existing fleet of light water reactors and reactors that have the possibility of near term deployments.<br>• Continue with the development of expanded high performance control room simulator capabilities that can be used in broad applications including Light Water Reactor Sustainability (LWRS), Small Modular Reactors (SMRs) and potentially non-nuclear plants.<br>• Continue development of MOOSE - based applications extending the capabilities beyond just the fuel performance modeling with the objective of coupling capability among applications - e.g. Relap7, Raven, and Grizzly. |

**Table J. 3.0 Develop Capabilities for the Future – Performance Measures**

| Results and Performance Measures | Description |
|---|---|
| **3.3** | **Science & Technology Capabilities Supporting the Principal Missions** |
| 3.3.1 | Demonstrate progress toward establishing world-class research, development and demonstration capabilities in advanced clean energy systems consistent with NE and National Security (NS) missions. Leverage resources of vendors, end-users, and other sponsors to establish and implement these capabilities. Focus includes:<br><br>• Novel system design and development concepts to speed deployment<br>• Energy storage and grid integration<br>• Dynamic/intelligent control methodologies<br>• Continued efforts to explore and implement beneficial opportunities to expand the use of the MOOSE computer code to a wider range of applications in support of NS and NE missions. |

**Table L. 4.0 Establish Broader, More Effective Collaborations – Performance Measures**

| Results and Performance Measures | Description |
|---|---|
| **4.1** | **Engagement of the Nuclear Industry, Nuclear-Interested Parties (including relevant domestic and international nuclear collaborations with industry and the commercial sector)** |
| 4.1.1 | Engage with strategically relevant industry, academic and other parties to assess and understand key needs of the nuclear industry, where the INL may provide value added research, development and/or demonstration support utilizing laboratory capabilities, to measurably address critical scientific, engineering or |

| Results and Performance Measures | Description |
|---|---|
| | policy issues.<br>• By **May 31, 2013**, identify at least five potential strategic partners and, with input from the potential partners, identify and document key needs of the nuclear industry and where INL can support in meeting those needs.<br>• Update the "INL Plan for Building an Effective Industry Engagement Program" to reflect input from potential strategic partners on how INL has potential long-term strategic relevance to them and what INL needs to do to increase relevance to the nuclear industry. |
| 4.1.2 | Being aware of domestic and international capabilities, and through engagement with the nuclear industry and in association with industry needs identified in Measure 4.1.1, identify key gaps in domestic capabilities that need to be filled and identify those that should be addressed by INL to enhance its ability to address critical scientific, engineering or policy issues confronting the nuclear industry in the medium and long term (3-20 years).<br>• Identify and document key gaps in domestic capabilities and identify those that INL should address to allow INL to support industry and develop strategic plans for filling those identified gaps.<br>• Support filling a currently known capability gap, by completing phase II qualifications (out of cell) of the Visual Exam Machine and Eddy Current Upgrade Project.<br>• To support filling a currently known capability gap, complete readiness activities for irradiated sample testing in the Irradiation Assisted Stress Corrosion Cracking (IASCC) test rigs 1 and 2. |
| 4.1.3 | Successfully negotiate and execute agreements for the performance of defined work tasks that advance the needs of the nuclear industry.<br>• Establish and/or modify existing Cooperative Research and Development Agreements (CRADAs) or Work for Others (WFO) agreements which results in at least $1M of new non-U.S. Government funding being brought into INL.<br>• To support currently identified key agreements, complete the 'Capsule A' Zr growth measurements for CRADA # 09-CR-06. |

**Table N. 5.0 Safety, Operations, Business Management, and Stewardship – Performance Measures**

| Results and Performance Measures | Description |
|---|---|
| **5.1** | **Operations Performance in Support of Research and Production Programs** |
| 5.1.2 | Measurement of Materials and Fuels Complex's (MFC) operations performance in support of research, production and nuclear material disposition based on execution of the approved FY2013 Annual Mission Plan (AMP) and areas of emphasis identified on a Customer Requirements Form (CRF) approved by DOE. This CRF form establishes specific measures and criteria for success in achieving FY 2013 performance objectives in areas of MFC Facilities, Nuclear Energy Programs, National and Homeland Security Programs, Nuclear Materials Disposition and Experimental Breeder Reactor (EBR) II driver fuel receipts and processing. |
| 5.1.3 | MFC Documented Safety Analyses (DSAs) Completion: Submit all upgraded DSAs to allow DOE approval (based on a 90 day approval process) by **September 30, 2013**. Complete resolution of Unreviewed Safety Questions (USQ) and upgraded DSA implementation to support Fuel Conditioning Facility (FCF) return to operations by **April 30, 2013**. Complete implementation of the upgraded DSA in the Analytical Lab by **September 30, 2013**. Complete project initiation scope planning and cost estimates for Hot Fuel Examination Facility (HFEF) and Zero Power Physics Reactor (ZPPR) DSA implementation by **March 31, 2013** and initiate long lead activities associated with de-inventory of the TREAT Warehouse (draft transportation plan and development and finalization of a method to validate the configuration of the Spent Fuel Treatment Product (SFTP) containers) by **September 30, 2013**. |

**Table N. 5.0 Safety, Operations, Business Management, and Stewardship – Performance Measures**

| Results and Performance Measures | Description |
|---|---|
| **5.4** | **Environmental Management and Sustainability** |
| 5.4.7 | INL Site Lead for Sustainability – Demonstrate leadership for INL Site sustainability. Coordinate input from INL Site contractors and complete the integrated INL Site Sustainability Plan (SSP), Consolidated Energy Data Report (CEDR), annual accomplishments, and summary documents, and award nominations for annual site-wide sustainability reporting to DOE-HQ according to the DOE-HQ schedule and guidance. |

**All other terms and conditions remain unchanged**.

# FY 2013 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

## Table of Contents

# FY 2013 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

6.1 Quality Leadership in Management and Operations

**List of Tables**

# FY 2013 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

## Section A

## Approach and Performance Rating Process

### 1.0 Introduction

This contract attachment sets forth the Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan (PEMP) that will be used by the Department of Energy (DOE) to evaluate the performance of Battelle Energy Alliance, LLC (BEA) for the management and operation of the Idaho National Laboratory (INL) in Fiscal Year (FY) 2013, in accordance with Sections B.2 and I.17 of the contract.

The FY 2013 INL PEMP includes six Focus Areas, which emphasize achievements of the DOE Vision for INL (in 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 INL will continue to implement and integrate environment, safety and health (ES&H), quality, and security into its programs and operations to enhance overall mission success.

This PEMP identifies Focus Areas where INL can impact results supportive of DOE strategic initiatives and NE mission objectives in particular. These Focus Areas provide evaluation of mission achievement with both subjective and objective measures of performance. The six Focus Areas for the FY 2013 PEMP include: 1) Deliver Transformational Research and Development (R&D); 2) Deliver Research & Development Program Outcomes; 3) Develop Capabilities for the Future; 4) Establish Broader, More Effective Collaborations; 5) Safety, Operations, Business Management, and Stewardship; and 6) Leadership of the INL.

### 2.0 Definitions

PEMP Focus Areas: These are the six topical areas that are used to group the PEMP Results and related Performance Measures.

PEMP Results: Results that have been agreed upon by INL and DOE for encouraging contractor performance. PEMP Measures are part of and make up the PEMP Results. The grade and numerical score for each Result will be determined using the definitions in the grading table assigned for each Focus Area.

Performance Measure: Within the PEMP Results are the qualitative and/or quantitative measures for evaluating performance. PEMP Measures are expected to be achieved during FY 2013. Absence of a Performance Measure in the PEMP process does not diminish the requirement for the contractor to comply with specific contractual requirements. Failure to meet a significant contractual requirement may result in the Contracting Officer overriding the PEMP Measure score.

The following are examples of criteria that can be used for evaluating and differentiating grades of performance:

## FY 2013 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

- Program PEMP milestones – and specific program performance expectations
- Performance related to a Result, but that is considered to go above and beyond
- Performance related to a Result that is considered not to have a negative impact
- Performance that has a negative impact to an identified Result or some other aspect of laboratory activities.
- Formal, written change(s) to PEMP milestone(s), as directed by the program manager or higher
- Degree of innovation applied to performance
- Degree of difficulty to achieve, issues resolved, innovations applied
- Degree of integration with existing INL programs
- Degree of collaboration/leverage obtained from outside partnerships
- Degree of impact (INL, DOE Office of Nuclear Energy (NE), national, international)
- Performance that, while not specifically related to program milestones, provides value to DOE
- Quality of products and deliverables

**Table A. 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 almost all of the significant award-fee Focus Areas and Results 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 made toward realizing strategic objectives with significant positive impact on INL's or DOE's mission. Contractor performance significantly exceeds expectations of performance as set within Performance Measures identified for each desired Result or within the purview of the desired Result. 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 Focus Areas and Results 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 | 97% |

## FY 2013 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

| Letter Grade | Adjectival Rating | Numeric Range | Definition | Award-Fee Pool Available To Be Earned |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | exceeds expectations made toward realizing strategic objectives with positive impact on INL's or DOE's mission. Contractor performance notably exceeds expectations of performance as set within Performance Measures identified for each desired result or within other areas within the purview of the desired Result. 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 Result being evaluated and have no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory. | |
| A- | Excellent | 3.7-3.5 | Contractor has exceeded almost all of the significant award-fee Focus Areas and Results and has met overall cost, schedule and technical requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured in the PEMP for the award-fee evaluation period. Contractor performance exceeds expectations made toward realizing strategic objectives. Contractor performance exceeds expectations of performance as set within Performance Measures identified for each desired Result or within other areas within the purview of the desired Result, with some notable areas of increased performance identified. Minor deficiencies, if any, noted are offset by the positive performance within the purview of the desired Result being evaluated with little or no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory. | 94% |
| B+ | Very Good | 3.4-3.1 | Contractor has exceeded many of the significant award-fee Focus Areas and Results 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 expectations of performance as set within Performance Measures identified for desired Results. Minor deficiencies, if any, identified are offset by other exceptional performance within the desired Result being evaluated and have little to no potential to adversely impact the mission of the | 90% |

## FY 2013 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

| Letter Grade | Adjectival Rating | Numeric Range | Definition | Award-Fee Pool Available To Be Earned |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Laboratory. | |
| B | Very Good | 3.0-2.8 | Contractor has exceeded many of the significant award-fee Focus Areas and Results 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 Performance Measures identified for many desired Results. Contractor performance that does not meet expectations is identified, but is offset by positive performance within the purview of the desired Result and has 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 Focus Areas and Results 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 Performance Measures identified for some desired Results 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 Result or the mission of the Laboratory. | 76% |
| C+ | Good | 2.4-2.1 | Contractor has exceeded some of the significant award-fee Focus Areas and Results 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 Performance Measures identified for desired Results 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 Result or the mission of the Laboratory. | 51-75% |

# FY 2013 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

| Letter Grade | Adjectival Rating | Numeric Range | Definition | Award-Fee Pool Available To Be Earned |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 Result or mission of the Laboratory. | No greater than 50% |
| C- | Unsatisfactory | 1.7-1.1 | Contractor has failed to meet Focus Areas and Results 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 Performance Measures identified for desired Results are not met and/or other significant deficiencies are identified that have or will have an adverse impact on the desired Result or the mission of the Laboratory if not immediately corrected. | 0% |
| D | Unsatisfactory | 1.0-0.8 | Contractor has failed to meet Focus Areas and Results 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 Performance Measures identified for desired Results are not met and/or other major deficiencies are identified that have adversely impacted the desired Result or the mission of the Laboratory. | 0% |
| F | Unsatisfactory | 0.7-0 | Contractor has failed to meet Focus Areas and Results 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 Performance Measures identified for desired Results are not met and/or other major deficiencies are identified that have a significant, adverse impact on both the desired Result and the mission of the Laboratory. | 0% |

# FY 2013 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

## 3.0 Scoring

The scoring system used to arrive at the fee determination for INL performance has the following four components:

- First, each PEMP Focus Area contains a number of PEMP Results. PEMP Results are graded by evaluating the Performance Measures described and assigning each of the PEMP Measures a letter grade (in accordance with the "Grading Definitions" for each PEMP Focus Area, if applicable) and corresponding numeric grade (in accordance with Table A, General Letter Grade, Adjectival Rating, Numeric Range, Definition, and Award-Fee Pool Available To Be Earned).

- Second, multiply the numeric scores for each PEMP Result by their respective "Weights" within each PEMP Focus Area. Add all of the weighted scores together to arrive at a total score for each PEMP Focus Area.

- Third, after a total score is calculated for each PEMP Focus Area, those scores are transferred to Table C, FY 2013 Contractor Score Evaluation. Using Table B, Performance-Based Fee Earned Scale, the percent of fee earned is identified (rounded to the nearest hundredth) and entered on Table C. The percent of fee earned is multiplied by both the corresponding weight and the total available fee pool ($18,700,000) to arrive at the total fee earned for each PEMP Focus Area.

- Fourth, the total fee earned for each PEMP Focus Area is summed together to arrive at total fee earned for all PEMP Focus Areas. This total fee earned is divided by the total available fee pool to calculate the overall percent of fee earned for FY 2013. The final adjectival rating, in accordance with Table 16-1 in the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Section 16.401, will be in accordance with Table A, General Letter Grade, Adjectival Rating, Numeric Range, Definition, and Award-Fee Pool Available To Be Earned.

**Unless otherwise stated, all PEMP Focus Areas and their associated PEMP Results, and Performance Measures are to be completed by September 30, 2013.** Each of the Performance Measures identifies significant activities, requirements, or milestones important to the success of the corresponding PEMP Result and shall be used as the primary means of determining the contractor's degree of success in meeting the desired Result.

Although evaluation of Performance Measure completeness is the primary means for determining performance, other performance information from other sources including, but not limited to, BEA's self-evaluation report, customer service evaluations, other performance areas within the purview of a Result, operational awareness (daily oversight) activities, "For Cause" reviews (if any), peer reviews, and other outside agency reviews (Office of the Inspector General (OIG) and the Government Accountability Office (GAO), etc.) may be used in determining INL's overall success in meeting a Result.

# FY 2013 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

**Table B. Performance-Based Fee Earned Scale**

| Grade | Overall Weighted Score from Table A | Award-Fee Pool Available To Be Earned | Adjectival Rating |
|---|---|---|---|
| A+ | 4.3-4.1 | 100% | Excellent |
| A | 4.0-3.8 | 97% | Excellent |
| A- | 3.7-3.5 | 94% | Excellent |
| B+ | 3.4-3.1 | 90% | Very Good |
| B | 3.0-2.8 | 84% | Very Good |
| B- | 2.7-2.5 | 76% | Very Good |
| C+ | 2.4-2.1 | 51-75% | Good |
| C | 2.0-1.8 | 50% | Satisfactory |
| C- | 1.7-1.1 | 0% | Unsatisfactory |
| D | 1.0-0.8 | 0% | Unsatisfactory |
| F | 0.7-0.0 | 0% | Unsatisfactory |

**Table C. FY 2013 Contractor Score Evaluation**

| Focus Areas | | Total Numeric Score (rounded to nearest hundredth) | Percent Fee Earned (from Table B) | Weight | Total Fee Earned ("percent fee earned" x "weight" x total available fee pool) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Deliver Transformational R&D | | % | 10% | $ |
| 2 | Deliver R&D Program Outcomes | | % | 25% | $ |
| 3 | Develop Capabilities for the Future | | % | 20% | $ |
| 4 | Establish Broader, More Effective Collaborations | | % | 10% | $ |
| 5 | Safety, Operations, Business Management, and Stewardship | | % | 25% | $ |
| 6 | Leadership of the INL | | % | 10% | $ |
| | | | **Total Fee Earned** | | $ |
| | | | **Overall Fee % ("total fee earned" / "total available fee pool")** | | % |

# FY 2013 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

## 4.0 Performance Status Reporting and Evaluation Process

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

Monthly status of performance will be provided by both DOE and INL with the first monthly report combining October and November and the last monthly report covering August. Areas of disagreement will be highlighted and addressed. Performance Status Reviews will be conducted periodically as agreed upon by DOE and INL. INL is responsible to define and coordinate the process for conducting the reviews and to ensure the involvement of appropriate DOE and INL counterparts. Reviews will focus on PEMP Results and Performance Measures as well as other significant issues.

On an annual basis, INL will conduct a formal self-evaluation of its performance relative to each Focus Area, PEMP Result, and associated Performance Measures. A written report documenting the self-evaluation will also address other significant issues and will be provided to DOE within ten calendar days after the end of the performance period. The report will be limited to 50 pages.

In addition to monthly reporting, DOE will perform and document a final evaluation of INL's performance relative to each Focus Area, PEMP Result, and Performance Measure and will provide a final fee determination. The absence of specific Performance Measures in this plan does not diminish the need to comply with contractual requirements. The Fee Determination Official (FDO) may unilaterally adjust the fee earned based on the contractor's performance against all contract requirements. It is recognized that at the discretion of the FDO, fee earned may be adjusted upward (not to exceed total eligible fee) based on the contractor delivering strategic value for real and relevant performance not otherwise specified in the PEMP. Data to support downward fee adjustments may be derived from other sources to include, but not limited to, operational awareness (daily oversight) activities; "For Cause" reviews (if any); other outside agency reviews (OIG, GAO, Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA), etc.), significant events or incidents within the control of the contractor, or other reviews as appropriate. The FDO may utilize, as appropriate, the Table A definitions to assist in making unilateral adjustment decisions.

## 5.0 Change Control

The FY 2013 PEMP was developed with the understanding that both parties engaged in good faith to define meaningful and challenging outcomes for success. It is also recognized that circumstances may arise in the course of the execution year that warrant a revisit of the agreed upon Performance Measures. When the need for a change has been identified and validated in accordance with INL change control principles, INL and DOE will engage in INL PEMP change control process to negotiate and process changes in a timely manner.

# Section B

# PEMP Focus Areas, Results, and Performance Measures

In determining the performance of PEMP Results and Performance Measures, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider progress reports, Program Office reviews/oversight, deliveries against milestone dates, etc., in accordance with the described Performance Measures. Each of the

# FY 2013 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

Performance Measures identifies significant activities and/or requirements important to the success of the corresponding PEMP Result and shall be used as the primary means of determining the contractor's success in meeting the desired Result.

The six Focus Areas for the FY 2013 PEMP continue the DOE Vision for INL. The desired Results and associated Performance Measures are included in the following six Focus Areas:

1. Deliver Transformational Research & Development (10%)
2. Deliver Research & Development Program Outcomes (25% )
3. Develop Capabilities for the Future (20%)
4. Establish Broader, More Effective Collaborations (10%)
5. Safety, Operations, Business Management, and Stewardship (25%)
6. Leadership of the INL (10%)

These six Focus Areas are described in detail below.

## 1.0 Deliver Transformational Research & Development

INL must deliver transformational research to demonstrate its ability to achieve DOE's vision for the Laboratory. For this Focus Area, DOE will evaluate the programmatic and technical impact of INL research, development, and demonstration activities and outcomes. In the evaluation, DOE will consider INL technical leadership, innovation and overall impact as measured by progress reports, peer reviews, Program Office review/oversight, adoption/deployment by end users, etc. The following characteristics will be considered in the evaluation:

**Table D. 1.0 Deliver Transformational R&D – Performance Measures**

| Results and Performance Measures | Description |
|---|---|
| **1.1** | **R&D Strategy Implementation and Impact** |
| 1.1.1 | The programs at the Laboratory produce high-quality, original, and creative results that advance science, technology and demonstration; demonstrate sustained scientific and engineering progress and impact; receive appropriate external recognition of accomplishments; and contribute to overall research and development goals of the Department and its customers. |

**Table E. 1.0 Deliver Transformational R&D - Grading Definitions**

| Letter Grade | Definition |
|---|---|
| A+ | Research, development and demonstration activities that exceed almost all expectations with significant impact and relevance towards INL's or DOE's strategic objectives/mission/vision. Significantly exceeds expectations of |

## FY 2013 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

| Letter Grade | Definition |
|---|---|
| | performance as set within Performance Measures identified within the purview of the desired Result. Research, development and demonstration activities conducted at the Laboratory have exceptional merit and quality and provide major advances that significantly accelerate DOE or other customer mission(s). INL has made at least one contribution which will make a fundamental change in approach to a major mission area or shift a paradigm in research, development or deployment. |
| A | Research, development and demonstration activities that exceed almost all expectations made toward realizing strategic objectives with positive impact on INL's or DOE's strategic objectives/mission/vision. Notably exceeds expectations of performance as set within Performance Measures identified within other areas within the purview of the desired Result. Research, development and demonstration activities conducted at the Laboratory are of exceptional merit and quality and have significant positive impact to DOE or other customer mission(s). |
| A- | Research, development and demonstration activities that exceed almost all expectations made toward realizing INL's or DOE's strategic objectives/mission/vision. Exceeds expectations of performance as set within Performance Measures identified for each desired Result or within other areas within the purview of the desired Result, with many notable areas of increased performance identified. Research, development and demonstration activities conducted at the Laboratory are of significant quality and merit and at the Laboratory significantly impacts DOE or other customer mission(s). |
| B+ | Exceeded many of the significant criteria and most overall research, development and demonstration expectations of performance as set within Performance Measures identified. Research, development and demonstration activities conducted at the Laboratory are uniformly of high merit and quality and can be demonstrated to advance DOE or other customer mission(s) in most areas. |
| B | Exceeded many of the significant criteria and most overall research, development and demonstration expectations of performance as set within Performance Measures identified for each desired Result. Performance that does not meet expectations is identified, but is offset by positive performance within the purview of the desired Result and has little to no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory. Most research, development and demonstration activities conducted at the Laboratory are uniformly of high merit and quality and can be demonstrated to advance DOE or other customer mission(s) in many areas. |
| B- | Exceeded many of the significant criteria and one or two overall research, development and demonstration expectations of performance within the Performance Measures identified for each desired Result are not met and /or minor deficiencies are identified, and although they may be offset by other positive performance. Research, development and demonstration activities conducted at the Laboratory are uniformly of high merit and quality and can be demonstrated to advance DOE or other customer mission(s) in some areas. A few significant areas of research, development and demonstration conducted at the Laboratory are not of high merit and quality or a few areas of research, previously supported, have become uncompetitive. |

**FY 2013 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan**

| Letter Grade | Definition |
|---|---|
| - | No grade if measure is below the B- level |

**Table F. 1.0 Deliver Transformational R&D - Scoring**

| 1.0 | Deliver Transformational Research & Development | Letter Grade | Numeric Score | Weight | Weighted Score | Total Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.1 | R&D Strategy Implementation and Impact | | | 100% | | |
| **Deliver Transformational R&D Focus Area Score** | | | | | | |

## 2.0 Deliver R&D Program Outcomes

To achieve DOE's vision, the INL must consistently fulfill program/customer commitments and outcomes. As always, adequate quality of deliverables is expected. Commitments made to the research sponsors, as set by the PEMP milestones identified in the INL baseline, provide the basis for performance evaluation. The impact of these PEMP milestones on program objectives (e.g., NE R&D Roadmap Objectives) or on the field in general may be considered in Section 1.0.

**Table G. 2.0 Deliver R&D Program Outcomes – Performance Measures**

| Results and Performance Measures | Description |
|---|---|
| **2.1** | **Nuclear Energy Outcomes** |
| | Meet NE PEMP milestones identified in the contract baseline. |
| **2.2** | **National and Homeland Security (NHS) Outcomes** |
| | Meet NHS PEMP milestones identified in the contract baseline. |
| **2.3** | **Other Mission Related Outcomes** |
| | Meet other (non-nuclear energy and non-national security) PEMP milestones identified in the contract baseline. |

**Table H. 2.0 Deliver R&D Program Outcomes - Grading Definitions**

| Letter Grade | Definition |
|---|---|
| A to A+ | Meets > 97% of PEMP milestones as identified in the contract baseline. |
| A- | Meets 95-97% of PEMP milestones as identified in the contract baseline. |
| B+ | Meets 90-94% of PEMP milestones as identified in the contract baseline. |
| B | Meets 87-89% of PEMP milestones as identified in the contract baseline. |
| B- | Meets 83-86% of PEMP milestones as identified in the contract baseline. |

**FY 2013 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan**

| Letter Grade | Definition |
|---|---|
| C+ | Meets 81-82% of PEMP milestones as identified in the contract baseline. |
| C | Meets 78-80% of PEMP milestones as identified in the contract baseline. |
| C- | Meets 75-77% of PEMP milestones as identified in the contract baseline. |
| - | No grade if below 75%. |

**Table I. 2.0 Deliver R&D Program Outcomes – Scoring**

| 2.0 | Deliver R&D Program Outcomes | Letter Grade | Numeric Score | Weight | Weighted Score | Total Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2.1 | Nuclear Energy Outcomes | | | 55% | | |
| 2.2 | National and Homeland Security Outcomes | | | 35% | | |
| 2.3 | Other Mission Related Outcomes | | | 10% | | |
| **Deliver R&D Program Outcomes Focus Area Score** | | | | | | |

### 3.0 Develop Capabilities for the Future

To enable INL to become the preeminent, internationally recognized nuclear energy research, development and demonstration laboratory, INL must maintain existing core capabilities and develop strategically important capabilities consistent with its core mission areas. DOE evaluation of INL performance towards achieving the strategy takes into consideration capability development in terms of human capital (talent), facilities, and equipment. These capabilities are successfully applied/demonstrated to achieve mission objectives.

The following performance measures provide the basis for earning grades as described in Section 3.0.

**Table J. 3.0 Develop Capabilities for the Future – Performance Measures**

| Results and Performance Measures | Description |
|---|---|
| **3.1** | **Progress Toward Developing World-Class Nuclear Capabilities (fuel cycle, reactors, and non-traditional uses)** |
| 3.1.1 | Demonstrate progress toward developing world-class post irradiation examination (PIE) capabilities at the INL on a schedule which allows for effective prototyping of equipment in Irradiated Materials Characterization Laboratory (IMCL) and timely incorporation of results into design activities for the Advanced Post Irradiation Examination (APIE) project.<br><br>• Develop an IMCL Implementation Plan, **by April 30, 2013**, that addresses the installation of R&D equipment in IMCL. Show progress towards the installation of equipment in IMCL in FY 2013, in accordance with the |

## FY 2013 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

| Results and Performance Measures | Description |
|---|---|
| | implementation plan. The implementation plan shall also include all work in FY 2014 and FY 2015 necessary to meet mission objectives. |
| 3.1.2 | Demonstrate progress toward developing capabilities (including transient testing, ceramic fuel, and fuel modeling and simulation) to deliver transformational research in the development of fuels for future generations of reactors.<br><br>• Execute FY 2013 activities consistent with the most current ceramic fuel plan and its addendum.<br>• Demonstrate fabrication of uranium based ceramic fuel in the Experimental Fuels Facility (EFF).<br>• In FY 2013, finalize the analyses, path forward, and decisions to enable commencement of transuranic fuels glovebox work in 2015. The glovebox capabilities are to be consistent with the high-level requirements outlined in the most recent ceramic fuels research and development capabilities strategic plan. |
| 3.1.3 | Demonstrate progress toward developing unique capabilities in aqueous and electrochemical separations and waste forms R&D.<br><br>• Execute FY 2013 activities consistent with the updated FY 2013 Separations and Waste Forms Strategic Plan and the updated FY 2013 Five-Year Implementation Plan for Advanced Separations and Waste Forms.<br>• Complete the installation of a glovebox capability to support laboratory scale aqueous actinide separations research.<br>• Expand lab-scale cold or warm R&D capabilities in pyroprocessing by installing a new glovebox for work in Engineering Development Lab (EDL). |
| 3.1.4 | Demonstrate progress toward developing world-class used fuel storage and transportation R&D capabilities. Execute FY 2013 activities consistent with the "Extended Storage and Transportation for Used Nuclear Fuel – INL Capability Assessment and Development Plan for FY 2013 Strategic Development Activities."<br><br>• Viability Assessment of Existing INL Facilities for Dry Storage Cask Handling by **April 30, 2013.**<br>• Provide thermodynamic calculations to Sandia National Laboratory to develop a zirconium hydride reorientation model by **August 15, 2013.**<br>• Strategy for Used Fuel Acquisition by **September 15, 2013**. |
| 3.1.5 | Demonstrate the capabilities necessary to expand the relevance of nuclear energy by developing and enabling technologies for nuclear hybrid systems and continue to establish world-class capabilities to deliver transformational R&D for other non-traditional applications, such as space power. |

**FY 2013 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan**

| Results and Performance Measures | Description |
|---|---|
| | • Execute FY 2013 activities consistent with the 2012 INL Hybrid Nuclear Energy Systems Strategic Plan.<br><br>▪ Complete the design concept and ROM cost estimates for a functional control room mock up as described in the Nuclear Energy Hybrid Systems Strategic Plan.<br>▪ Complete the design concept and ROM cost estimates for a converter connection to the INL grid that provides capabilities for real-time grid simulations. |
| 3.1.6 | Submit Critical Decision-1 documents for the APIE project to DOE in accordance with the agreed upon schedule.<br><br>In order to demonstrate progress on the Resumption of Transient Testing Program, INL will develop and submit the following deliverables to DOE by **August 15, 2013**. The documentation will include an Environmental Assessment for public comment, Analysis of Alternatives, an Assessment Plan, and a Program Management Plan that identifies a management and funding strategy for the resumption of transient testing by the end of FY 2018. |
| 3.1.7 | Provide new capabilities to support the existing fleet of light water reactors and reactors that have the possibility of near term deployments.<br>• Continue with the development of expanded high performance control room simulator capabilities that can be used in broad applications including Light Water Reactor Sustainability (LWRS), Small Modular Reactors (SMRs) and potentially non-nuclear plants.<br>• Continue development of MOOSE - based applications extending the capabilities beyond just the fuel performance modeling with the objective of coupling capability among applications - e.g. Relap7, Raven, and Grizzly. |
| **3.2** | **Progress Toward Establishing the INL as a Major Center for National Security Technology Development and Demonstration** |
| 3.2.1 | Nonproliferation & Global Nuclear Security:<br>Continue to progress in establishing itself as a major center for nonproliferation and global nuclear security technology development, testing and demonstration, and training for nuclear and radiological threat response. Roll out the Nonproliferation Technologies Evaluation Center (NTEC) consistent with the implementation and communications plans and expand use of the Zero Power Physics Reactor (ZPPR) facility and other capabilities of NTEC. These other capabilities may include, but aren't limited to, the Radiological Response Test Range, nuclear fuel cycle and research facilities and equipment, and the INL site.<br><br>International Safeguards & Security:<br>Progress towards the vision of being a leader for safeguards and security technologies and approaches for nuclear fuel cycle facilities, leveraging and |

## FY 2013 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

| Results and Performance Measures | Description |
|---|---|
| | growing facilities and capabilities in support of international safeguards and security with particular emphasis on integrating safety, security and safeguards for safe and secure nuclear energy. Support key programs such as the safeguards portion of the Joint Fuel Cycle Studies initiative, expanded training for the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), an expanded or new project that leverages INL capabilities, and application of distinctive INL cyber security capabilities to nuclear facilities.<br><br>Intelligence Community Support:<br>Continue implementation of the strategic plan in support of the intelligence community pertaining to leveraging of its nuclear fuel cycle expertise. Enhance capability, recognition, and application in the areas of fuel cycle analysis, nuclear facility security, signatures, forensics, training, and reach back support in areas for which INL has specialized expertise. |
| 3.2.2 | Critical Infrastructure Protection<br><br>Control System Cyber Security: Continue to enhance capabilities in cyber and controls systems by:<br><br>• Establishing INL's Industrial Control Systems-Mission Support Center (ICS-MSC) as a recognized Threat Analysis capability to solve national challenges.<br><br>Electric Grid: Enhance Grid security and stability capabilities by:<br><br>• Developing the INL Strategic Advisory Group for the Center of Excellence for Grid Reliability. The Strategic Advisory Group will: (1) help identify national gaps in electric grid research, development, demonstration, and deployment that can be addressed by INL and (2) provide recommendations on capability investments to enhance INL's ability to solve national grid challenges.<br>• Establishing and hosting the first annual INL chaired workshop to promote understanding of and protection for Geomagnetic Disturbance (GMD) effects.<br><br>Wireless: Extend INL's unique wireless communications capabilities by:<br><br>• Implementing the Wireless National User Facility (W-NUF) and expanding industry and government collaboration on national spectrum challenges as part of the Wireless National Scientific User Facility. |
| 3.2.3 | National Defense: Leverage its unique capabilities in armor, explosives and materials technologies by:<br><br>• Expanding INL's National Security Test Range (NSTR) capabilities by |

## FY 2013 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

| Results and Performance Measures | Description |
|---|---|
| | completing and publishing environmental assessment/impact requirements for FY 2014 investments.<br>• Expansion of unique capabilities to provide applied solutions in support of special programs through internal and/or external investments.<br>• Establishing a new Science & Technology (S&T) program with the United States Special Operations Command (SOCOM).<br>• Leveraging Specific Manufacturing Capability (SMC) expertise and facilities. |
| 3.2.4 | Achieve recognition as a science and technology provider in Nuclear Nonproliferation/Counterproliferation and Critical Infrastructure Protection/National Defense. Representative examples include:<br><br>• Recognition of INL technical leaders in the scientific/technical community via publications in relevant peer reviewed journals, awards, presentation of peer reviewed conference papers, dissemination of intelligence analyses, and participating in national panels or committees.<br>• Notable citations of INL research, or recognition by INL clients or national/international technical peers. |
| **3.3** | **Science & Technology Capabilities Supporting the Principal Missions** |
| 3.3.1 | Demonstrate progress toward establishing world-class research, development and demonstration capabilities in advanced clean energy systems consistent with NE and National Security (NS) missions. Leverage resources of vendors, end-users, and other sponsors to establish and implement these capabilities. Focus includes:<br><br>• Novel system design and development concepts to speed deployment<br>• Energy storage and grid integration<br>• Dynamic/intelligent control methodologies<br>• Continued efforts to explore and implement beneficial opportunities to expand the use of the MOOSE computer code to a wider range of applications in support of NS and NE missions. |
| **3.4** | **Workforce Capabilities that Enable Principal Missions** |
| The Department of Energy and the Nation need extraordinary scientific and technical talent to compete in a global economy. As defined in the American Competitiveness Initiative, DOE has the responsibility to encourage American innovation and strengthen the Nation's ability to compete. Development of clean energy supplies poses demanding scientific and engineering challenges, which will require highly qualified staff in DOE's National Laboratories and other R&D Institutions. The United States faces an impending shortage of students and a future workforce trained to lead and support the low-carbon economy. To meet these needs, DOE has a goal of increasing energy systems education and workforce development and providing the educational and technical training opportunities to meet DOE's advanced energy missions. To further meet these challenges, DOE policy recognizes that full utilization of the talents and capabilities of a diverse work-force is critical to the achievement of its mission. Diversity is | |

**FY 2013 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan**

| Results and Performance Measures | Description |
|---|---|
| both a core DOE value and a strategic business imperative.<br>Measured items include: | |
| 3.4.1 | Science Technology Engineering and Math (STEM) Education:<br>Develop future human capital capability to support INL Missions by improving STEM in the State of Idaho. Improve the Idaho STEM ( i-STEM) program and demonstrate a measureable impact to stakeholder advocacy. Expand i-STEM's reach to Idaho schools. Lead efforts to analyze the current i-STEM program and identify gaps and areas for improvement. Support STEM education effort by working on joint programs to enhance workforce readiness in the region. |
| 3.4.2 | Strategic Technical Capabilities:<br>Develop strategic technical capabilities in material science that provide for the INL's long term ability to contribute to the overall research and development goals of the Department and its customers and positions INL to support future Energy missions. |

For grading Section 3.0, Develop Capabilities for the Future, refer to Table A, General Letter Grade, Adjectival Rating, Numeric Range, Definition, and Award-Fee Pool Available To Be Earned.

**Table K. 3.0 Develop Capabilities for the Future – Scoring**

| 3.0 | Develop Capabilities for the Future | Letter Grade | Numeric Score | Weight | Weighted Score | Total Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3.1 | Progress Toward Developing World-Class Nuclear Capabilities (fuel cycle, reactors, and non-traditional uses) | | | 50% | | |
| 3.2 | Progress Toward Establishing the INL as a Major Center for National Security Technology Development and Demonstration | | | 30% | | |
| 3.3 | Science & Technology Capabilities Supporting the Principal Missions | | | 10% | | |
| 3.4 | Workforce Capabilities that Enable Principal Missions | | | 10% | | |
| **Develop Capabilities for the Future Focus Area Score** | | | | | | |

## 4.0 Establish Broader, More Effective Collaborations

DOE Policy is to support the private sector in bringing innovative clean energy technologies to market as quickly and efficiently as possible. Partnerships with industry broaden the interdisciplinary nature of energy research and facilitate prompt transition from research to products. National Laboratories are strongly connected to the international science and technology community. University and other strategic partnerships and collaborations support

development of innovative programs and the creation of a robust science base to address the DOE Mission. Collaborations with academic, Government, and industrial organizations bring their research bases and infrastructures to bear on INL's missions to provide impact regionally, nationally and internationally. In particular, strong public-private sector partnerships are key to a successful effort to rebuild the national nuclear enterprise. To establish these collaborations, INL will focus on the following results:

**Table L. 4.0 Establish Broader, More Effective Collaborations – Performance Measures**

| Results and Performance Measures | Description |
|---|---|
| **4.1** | **Engagement of the Nuclear Industry, Nuclear-Interested Parties (including relevant domestic and international nuclear collaborations with industry and the commercial sector)** |
| 4.1.1 | Engage with strategically relevant industry, academic and other parties to assess and understand key needs of the nuclear industry, where the INL may provide value added research, development and/or demonstration support utilizing laboratory capabilities, to measurably address critical scientific, engineering or policy issues.<br>• By **May 31, 2013**, identify at least five potential strategic partners and, with input from the potential partners, identify and document key needs of the nuclear industry and where INL can support in meeting those needs.<br>• Update the "INL Plan for Building an Effective Industry Engagement Program" to reflect input from potential strategic partners on how INL has potential long-term strategic relevance to them and what INL needs to do to increase relevance to the nuclear industry. |
| 4.1.2 | Being aware of domestic and international capabilities, and through engagement with the nuclear industry and in association with industry needs identified in Measure 4.1.1, identify key gaps in domestic capabilities that need to be filled and identify those that should be addressed by INL to enhance its ability to address critical scientific, engineering or policy issues confronting the nuclear industry in the medium and long term (3-20 years).<br>• Identify and document key gaps in domestic capabilities and identify those that INL should address to allow INL to support industry and develop strategic plans for filling those identified gaps.<br>• Support filling a currently known capability gap, by completing phase II qualifications (out of cell) of the Visual Exam Machine and Eddy Current Upgrade Project.<br>• To support filling a currently known capability gap, complete readiness activities for irradiated sample testing in the Irradiation Assisted Stress Corrosion Cracking (IASCC) test rigs 1 and 2. |
| 4.1.3 | Successfully negotiate and execute agreements for the performance of defined work tasks that advance the needs of the nuclear industry. |

## FY 2013 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

| Results and Performance Measures | Description |
|---|---|
| | • Establish and/or modify existing Cooperative Research and Development Agreements (CRADAs) or Work for Others (WFO) agreements which results in at least $1M of new non-U.S. Government funding being brought into INL.<br>• To support currently identified key agreements, complete the 'Capsule A' Zr growth measurements for CRADA # 09-CR-06. |
| **4.2** | **Enhance Regional, National and International Partnerships** |
| 4.2.1 | Educational Partnerships (Center for Advanced Energy Studies (CAES)):<br>• Demonstrate significant partnerships with Idaho universities through CAES.<br>• Execute collaborative research and development projects with CAES partners to strengthen relevant academic programs and graduate students and faculty capabilities in energy related areas.<br>• Grow collaborative partnerships and research portfolios with industry.<br>• Provide internship opportunities that keep INL as one of the top internship programs in the country. |
| 4.2.2 | • Provide leadership to regional states/provinces relative to energy and environment.<br>• Demonstrate partnerships with regional states to enable safe, clean and economically feasible development of energy resources.<br>• Provide support to regional Department of Defense (DoD) facilities in their development of clean energy options. |
| 4.2.3 | • Fully implement the joint proposal call and review process between the Advanced Test Reactor (ATR) National Scientific User Facility (NSUF) and an Office of Science User Facility.<br>• Implement key (FY 2012) recommendations of ATR-NSUF Scientific Review Board and the ATR NSUF user organization. |
| **4.3** | **Technology Transfer, Deployment and Commercialization** |
| 4.3.1 | Demonstrate substantial progress in enhancing the impact and value of the technology deployment function to the INL mission, operations and performance, including improved commercialization of INL-developed technology.<br>• Transfer and facilitate the commercialization of INL developed technology through appropriate mechanisms, including Cooperative Research and Development Agreements (CRADAs), Work For Other (WFOs), licenses, license options, spin-outs and start-ups.<br>• Continue INL's Technology Based Economic Development program to foster an entrepreneurial culture in the region: position INL and CAES as key contributors driving economic development in the region. |

| Results and Performance Measures | Description |
|---|---|
| | • Meet a goal of 0.9% matching funds to private partners in order to promote promising energy related technologies for commercial purposes. This may be met entirely with CRADA and similar technology transfer agreements where government funds in can be attributed to the agreement. The base for calculating this percentage will be DOE funding provided for applied energy research, development, demonstration and commercial application. |
| 4.3.2 | Demonstrate innovation and improvement in the overall quality and performance of INL technology transfer. |

For grading Section 4.0 Establish Broader, More Effective Collaborations, refer to Table A, General Letter Grade, Adjectival Rating, Numeric Range, Definition, and Award-Fee Pool Available To Be Earned.

**Table M. 4.0 Establish Broader, More Effective Collaborations – Scoring**

| 4.0 | Establish Broader, More Effective Collaborations | Letter Grade | Numeric Score | Weight | Weighted Score | Total Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4.1 | Engagement of the Nuclear Industry, Nuclear-Interested Parties | | | 50% | | |
| 4.2 | Enhance Regional, National and International Partnerships | | | 30% | | |
| 4.3 | Technology Transfer, Deployment and Commercialization | | | 20% | | |
| **Establish Broader, More Effective Collaborations Focus Area Score** | | | | | | |

## 5.0 Safety, Operations, Business Management, and Stewardship

INL will bring about measureable improvements in management systems, controls, and deploy management practices that increase overall effectiveness of the Laboratory. To demonstrate improvement in safety, operations, business management, and stewardship, INL should focus on the following objective results:

**Table N. 5.0 Safety, Operations, Business Management, and Stewardship – Performance Measures**

| Results and Performance Measures | Description |
|---|---|
| **5.1** | **Operations Performance in Support of Research and Production Programs** |
| 5.1.1 | Measurement of ATR's support of customers based on the approved FY 2013 ATR Integrated Strategic Operational Plan (ISOP) which includes items specifically related to priority experiments as well as items related to overall experiment execution. If revisions of the ISOP occur during FY 2013 and are directly related to customer requested changes affecting milestones and commitments, the customer requirements form may be subsequently revised |

## FY 2013 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

| Results and Performance Measures | Description |
|---|---|
| | with DOE approval. |
| 5.1.2 | Measurement of Materials and Fuels Complex's (MFC) operations performance in support of research, production and nuclear material disposition based on execution of the approved FY2013 Annual Mission Plan (AMP) and areas of emphasis identified on a Customer Requirements Form (CRF) approved by DOE. This CRF form establishes specific measures and criteria for success in achieving FY 2013 performance objectives in areas of MFC Facilities, Nuclear Energy Programs, National and Homeland Security Programs, Nuclear Materials Disposition and Experimental Breeder Reactor (EBR) II driver fuel receipts and processing. |
| 5.1.3 | MFC Documented Safety Analyses (DSAs) Completion: Submit all upgraded DSAs to allow DOE approval (based on a 90 day approval process) by **September 30, 2013**. Complete resolution of Unreviewed Safety Questions (USQ) and upgraded DSA implementation to support Fuel Conditioning Facility (FCF) return to operations by **April 30, 2013**. Complete implementation of the upgraded DSA in the Analytical Lab by **September 30, 2013**. Complete project initiation scope planning and cost estimates for Hot Fuel Examination Facility (HFEF) and Zero Power Physics Reactor (ZPPR) DSA implementation by **March 31, 2013** and initiate long lead activities associated with de-inventory of the TREAT Warehouse (draft transportation plan and development and finalization of a method to validate the configuration of the Spent Fuel Treatment Product (SFTP) containers by **September 30, 2013**. |
| 5.1.4 | Specific Manufacturing Capability Productions:<br><br>• Meet approved FY 2013 front armor production quantities<br>• Meet approved FY 2013 side armor production quantities<br>• Cumulative quality of 98% or above<br>• Schedule and conduct effective maintenance activities that maintain facility capabilities. |
| 5.1.5 | Demonstrate management excellence in the execution of the Research Reactor Infrastructure (RRI) Program.<br><br>• Complete all university contract reviews, renewals and modifications, including reporting, fuel cost sharing arrangements and mechanism for updates.<br>• Establish and maintain a comprehensive fuel tracking system to support fuel acquisition and disposition planning, to include all domestic university reactors.<br>• Develop and issue the first annual comprehensive RRI program report **by November 30, 2012**. |

# FY 2013 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

| Results and Performance Measures | Description |
|---|---|
| **5.2** | **Contractor Assurance System (CAS), Implementation and Operational/Safety Assurance** |
| 5.2.1 | The Operational CAS is effective, which includes:<br><br>• Rigorous, risk-informed, and credible self-assessment and feedback and improvement activities. Assessment programs are risk-informed, formally documented, and appropriately cover high consequence activities.<br>• Implementation of an effective issues management system that is formally documented and:<br>(a) Captures program and performance deficiencies (individually and collectively) in systems that provide for timely reporting, and taking appropriate and effective corrective actions;<br>(b) Is a process that is capable of categorizing significant issues based on risk and priority and other appropriate factors that ensures problems are evaluated and corrected on a timely basis; and,<br>(c) Includes a consistent set of INL wide metrics that can be used as leading indicators to perform analysis and trending to assess operational performance.<br>• Operational events are adequately critiqued, reported, and investigated, with appropriate and timely corrective actions.<br>• CAS data (e.g., assessment results, performance metrics, plans, schedules, issues management data, etc.) is documented and readily available to DOE. Results of assurance processes are periodically (i.e., quarterly) compiled, and reported.<br>• A method for validating the effectiveness of assurance system processes. Third party audits, peer reviews, independent assessments, and external certification may be used and integrated into the CAS to complement internal assurance systems. |
| **5.3** | **Project Management** |
| 5.3.1 | Demonstrate performance of the ATR Near Term Remote Monitoring and Management Project by completing a final design. |
| 5.3.2 | Provide timely and accurate project information to INL and DOE-ID management for designated capital asset projects via a single reporting mechanism. |
| 5.3.3 | Establish and track project management metrics for designated projects. Manage all designated projects within a ± 10% cumulative project to date cost and schedule variance against the approved project performance baseline. |
| 5.3.4 | Sustain Earned Value Management System (EVMS) certification through INL internal assurance and maintenance activities. Successfully pass an annual surveillance of the EVMS. |

## FY 2013 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

| Results and Performance Measures | Description |
|---|---|
| **5.4** | **Environmental Management and Sustainability** |
| Execute Environmental Management activities to successfully impact the following: | |
| 5.4.1 | Submit a revised process knowledge document for MFC Analytical Laboratory remote-handled transuranic (RH TRU) waste or provide documentation to develop a new process knowledge document for currently stored or future generated MFC Analytical Lab RH TRU waste **by August 1, 2013**. Submit an RH TRU waste certification plan for the Analytical Laboratory RH TRU waste **by August 1, 2013**. |
| Implement DOE's Strategic Sustainability Performance Plan, including an overall approach that uses available funding to prioritize projects or upgrades with the greatest overall impact to the following goals: | |
| 5.4.2 | Complete an analysis of the potential use of blended fuels in INL fleet to increase use of alternative fuels. |
| 5.4.3 | Evaluate ATR Complex water reduction projects, including the four conservation projects proposed in the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) INL Water Assessment Report. Implement at least one project that reduces water usage by 5M gallons. |
| 5.4.4 | Infrastructure: Complete the Guiding Principles review and establish the score in Portfolio Manager for 4 additional buildings, >5000gsf, to meet the Guiding Principles in FY 2013. Install 20,000 ft2 of roofing that meets the DOE "Cool Roof" requirements; incorporate cool roof requirements for new or existing buildings. |
| 5.4.5 | Sustainability: Reduce energy intensity by a minimum of 2% from FY 2012 levels. Work toward the 50% diversion goals in the DOE Strategic Sustainability Performance Plan by diverting at least 35% of nonhazardous solid waste and 20% construction and demolition waste from landfills. |
| 5.4.6 | Sustainable Acquisition: 95% of all new procurement actions, including task and delivery orders, will state a preference for the supply or use of products and services that are energy efficient (Energy Star or Federal Energy Management Program (FEMP) designated), water efficient, bio-based, environmentally preferable (including Electronic Product Environmental Assessment Tool (EPEAT) registered products), non-ozone depleting, recycled content, or are non-toxic or less toxic alternatives. Implement processes as necessary to measure and report performance, **by August 2013**, against the 95% Sustainable Procurement Goal from the DOE Strategic Sustainability Performance Plan and Executive Order (EO) 13514. |
| 5.4.7 | INL Site Lead for Sustainability – Demonstrate leadership for INL Site sustainability. Coordinate input from INL Site contractors and complete the integrated INL Site Sustainability Plan (SSP), Consolidated Energy Data Report (CEDR), annual accomplishments, and summary documents, and award nominations for annual site-wide sustainability reporting to DOE-HQ according to the DOE-HQ schedule and guidance. |

## FY 2013 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

| Results and Performance Measures | Description |
|---|---|
| **5.5** | **Safeguards & Security Optimization** |
| Through coordination with NE, DOE-ID, and INL Nuclear Operations develop a plan including scope, cost and schedule for implementation of DOE Order 474.2, Change 1, Nuclear Material Control and Accountability consistent with the Department's Graded Security Protection Policy. | |
| 5.5.1 | Compile facility characterization using DOE Order 474.2, Change 1, Nuclear Material Control and Accountability dated August 3, 2011. |
| 5.5.2 | Perform vulnerability analysis on required facilities consistent with the Department's Graded Security Protection Policy. |
| 5.5.3 | Coordinate INL path forward for implementation of DOE Order 474.2, Change 1, Nuclear Material Control and Accountability consistent with the Department's Graded Security Protection Policy with the Office of Health Safety and Security (HSS). |
| 5.5.4 | Develop a specific plan including scope, cost and schedule for implementation of DOE Order 474.2, Change 1, Nuclear Material Control and Accountability consistent with the Department's Graded Security Protection Policy. |
| **5.6** | **Business Management** |
| 5.6.1 | Business Systems: INL shall perform a critical self assessment/evaluation of the current Business Management Systems employed by the contractor for alignment with timely program mission accomplishment and needs. A report comprising the results of this evaluation, including process and system realignment changes deemed necessary as a result of the review, shall be submitted to DOE **by June 30, 2013**. The report shall also contain descriptive action plans and scheduled completion dates for the business system changes identified as a result of this review. |
| 5.6.2 | Indirect Baseline Management: Establish and maintain a responsive, flexible, and efficient indirect cost management planning and execution process focused on INL program mission accomplishment that results in predictable and constant to decreasing indirect labor multiplier to programs and a fiscal year end indirect cost recovery position as close to zero as possible, but not exceeding -$3M (under-recovered). Continual evaluation of indirect services/efficiencies needs to be maintained to focus INL funds availability for mission accomplishment. |

For grading Section 5.0 Safety, Operations, Business Management, and Stewardship, refer to Table A, General Letter Grade, Adjectival Rating, Numeric Range, Definition, and Award-Fee Pool Available To Be Earned.

**Table O. 5.0 Safety, Operations, Business Management, and Stewardship – Scoring**

| 5.0 | Safety, Operations, Business Management, and Stewardship | Letter Grade | Numeric Score | Weight | Weighted Score | Total Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5.1 | Operations Performance in Support of Research and | | | 35% | | |

**FY 2013 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan**

| 5.0 | Safety, Operations, Business Management, and Stewardship | Letter Grade | Numeric Score | Weight | Weighted Score | Total Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Production Programs | | | | | |
| 5.2 | Contractor Assurance System (CAS), Implementation and Operational/Safety Assurance | | | 20% | | |
| 5.3 | Project Management | | | 10% | | |
| 5.4 | Environmental Management and Sustainability | | | 10% | | |
| 5.5 | Safeguards & Security Optimization | | | 15% | | |
| 5.6 | Business Management | | | 10% | | |
| **Safety, Operations, Business Management, and Stewardship Focus Area Score** | | | | | | |

## 6.0 Leadership of the INL

Laboratory leadership must translate INL vision and strategies into explicit performance expectations that are effective in aligning all managers and the workforce into a cohesive, collaborative, and integrated team pursuing mission execution. DOE shall consider performance trends, outcomes and continuous improvement in overall Contractor Leadership's planning for, integration of, responsiveness to and support for the overall success of the INL. DOE's subjective evaluation of INL performance will be based upon oversight reports, peer review, etc. The following characteristics will be considered in the evaluation:

**Table P. 6.0 Leadership of the INL – Performance Measures**

| Results and Performance Measures | Description |
|---|---|
| **6.1** | **Quality Leadership in Management and Operations** |
| 6.1.1 | Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory:<br>Laboratory's senior management team must demonstrate their ability to define a realistic vision for the future of the Laboratory and make progress in realizing that vision.<br><br>Management and Operation of the Laboratory:<br>Laboratory's senior management team must demonstrate understanding of the costs of doing business at the Laboratory and prioritize the management and allocation of these costs commensurate with their associated risks and benefits and instill a culture of accountability and responsibility down and through the entire organization.<br><br>Contractor Commitment to the INL and Value-added:<br>The Laboratory's leadership must bring additional value through corporate involvement/contributions to address challenges at the Laboratory and provide other contributions to the Laboratory and its community that enables |

## FY 2013 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

| Results and Performance Measures | Description |
|---|---|
| | accomplishments towards the missions and vision of the Laboratory that DOE cannot provide.<br><br>Other Consideration:<br>Build one team at MFC with shared goals, accountability, and ownership for the mission. Build confidence in work acceptance and execution which includes planning, cost estimating, scheduling, and performance. Gain efficiency without compromising safety. Effectively integrate corrective action plans and paths to excellence. |

**Table Q. 6.0 Leadership of the INL – Grading Definitions**

| Letter Grade | Definition |
|---|---|
| A+ | Leadership of the Laboratory has made outstanding progress over the previous year in realizing the vision for the INL, exceeding almost all DOE expectations for technical, cost and schedule performance of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured in the PEMP for the award fee evaluation period. Planning, operation and management 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 has overcome difficult challenges, avoided problems, and been exceptionally successful in all areas with minimal DOE assistance or oversight. |
| A | Leadership of the Laboratory has made significant progress over the previous year in realizing the vision for the INL, exceeding almost all DOE expectations for technical, cost and schedule performance as defined and measured in the PEMP for the award fee evaluation period. Planning, operation and management are of superior quality, have been recognized and referenced for their excellence DOE-wide, and have an impact on the vision/plans of other national laboratories. Faced with difficult challenges, actions were taken proactively by the senior leadership of the Laboratory to redirect activities to avoid problems and enhance the long-term future of the INL. |
| A- | Leadership of the Laboratory has made important progress over the previous year in realizing the vision for the INL, exceeding almost all DOE expectations for technical, cost and schedule performance of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured in the PEMP for the award fee evaluation period. Planning, operation and management are high quality and are recognized and referenced for their excellence. Faced with difficult challenges, actions were taken by the senior leadership of the Laboratory to redirect activities to avoid and solve problems and enhance the long-term future of the INL |
| B+ | Leadership of the Laboratory has exceeded many of the measures and made good progress over the previous year in realizing their vision for the INL, exceeding many DOE expectations for technical, cost and schedule performance of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured in the PEMP for the award fee |

## FY 2013 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

| Letter Grade | Definition |
|---|---|
| | evaluation period. Strategic plans present long range goals that are both exciting and realistic. Planning, operation and management are of high quality. Decisions and actions taken by the Laboratory leadership to avoid problems, align work, facilities, equipment and technical capabilities with the INL vision and plan. The INL leadership faced difficult challenges and successfully plotted its course through the difficulty, with limited help from DOE. |
| B | Leadership of the Laboratory has exceeded many of the measures and made progress in most areas over the previous year in realizing their vision for the INL, exceeding many DOE expectations for technical, cost and schedule performance of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured in the PEMP for the award fee evaluation period. Strategic plans present long range goals that are exciting and realistic; however limited improvements may be required for full implementation of the goals to be achieved. Planning, avoiding problems, operation and management demonstrate high quality with a few minimal deficiencies. |
| B- | The senior leadership of the Laboratory has exceeded many of the measures and made progress in many areas over the previous year in realizing their vision for the INL, exceeding many DOE expectations for technical, cost and schedule performance of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured in the PEMP for the award fee evaluation period. Strategic plans present long range goals that are realistic; however some improvements may be required for full implementation of the goals to be achieved. While Laboratory operations are successful; planning, avoiding problems, operation and management demonstrate some deficiencies. |
| - | No grade if below a B-. |

**Table R. 6.0 Leadership of the INL - Scoring**

| 6.0 | Leadership of the INL | Letter Grade | Numeric Score | Weight | Weighted Score | Total Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6.1 | Quality Leadership in Management and Operations | | | 100% | | |
| **Leadership of the INL Focus Area Score** | | | | | | |