AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGES
	1 2

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO.	3. EFFECTIVE DATE	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.	5. PROJECT NO. *(If applicable)*
218	10/01/2011		

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)*
N/A

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).
	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:
X	See Block 14 of SF 30
	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 THE FY 2012 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND MEASUREMENT PLAN (PEMP).

THE FY 2012 PEMP IS INCORPORATED INTO PART III, SECTION J, ATTTACHMENT K, EFFECTIVE DATE OCTOBER 1, 2011 (ATTACHED 27 PAGES, 9-26-11) .

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)*	09/26/2011

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 FY 2011 PEMP remains in effect through September 30, 2011. 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 2

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO.	3. EFFECTIVE DATE	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.	5. PROJECT NO. *(If applicable)*
218	10/01/2011		

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)*
N/A

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 of SF 30
	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 THE FY 2012 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND MEASUREMENT PLAN (PEMP).

THE FY 2012 PEMP IS INCORPORATED INTO PART III, SECTION J, ATTTACHMENT K, EFFECTIVE DATE OCTOBER 1, 2011 (ATTACHED 27 PAGES, 9-26-11) .

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 pnnt)*	16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER *(Type or pnnt)*
Dana M. Storms	Suzette M. Olson

15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	16C. DATE SIGNED
(Signature of person authorized to sign)	9/26/2011	*(Signature of Contracting Officer)*	09/26/2011

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 FY 2011 PEMP remains in effect through September 30, 2011. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged. Period of Performance: 11/09/2004 to 09/30/2014				

FY 2012 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

Table of Contents

FY 2012 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

List of Tables

FY 2012 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) 2012.

The FY 2012 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 that 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 have impact on 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 2012 PEMP include: 1) Deliver Transformational Research and Development; 2) Deliver Research & Development Program Commitments; 3) Develop Capabilities for the Future; 4) Establish Broader, More Effective Collaborations; 5) Safety, Operations 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 or quantitative measures for evaluating performance. PEMP measures are expected to be achieved during FY 2012. 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:

- Program 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
- Formal, written change(s) to 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

3.0 Scoring

The scoring system used to arrive at the fee determination for INL performance has three components. Each PEMP Focus Area contains a number of PEMP Results. PEMP Results are graded by evaluating the Performance Measures described and assigning a letter grade and numeric grade for each Measure based on the definitions in the performance measures and grading definitions. Each numeric score is multiplied by the corresponding weight to arrive at a weighted score for each Measure. All weighted scores are added together to arrive at a total score for each Focus Area. After a total score is calculated for each PEMP Focus Area, those scores are transferred to Table B, FY 2012 Contractor Score Evaluation. Using Table A, Performance-Based Fee Earned Scale, the percent of fee earned is identified (rounded to the nearest hundredth) and entered on Table B. The percent of fee earned is multiplied by the corresponding weight and multiplied by the total available fee pool ($18,700,000) to arrive at the total fee earned for each PEMP Focus Area. The total fee earned for each 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 2012.

Unless otherwise stated, all PEMP Focus Areas and their associated Results, and Performance Measures are to be completed by September 30, 2012. 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 2012 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

Table A. Performance-Based Fee Earned Scale

Grade	Overall Weighted Score from Table A	Percent Fee Earned
A+	4.3-4.1	100%
A	4.0-3.8	97%
A-	3.7-3.5	94%
B+	3.4-3.1	91%
B	3.0-2.8	84%
B-	2.7-2.5	77%
C+	2.4-2.1	64%
C	2.0-1.8	38%
C-	1.7-1.1	0%
D	1.0-0.8	0%
F	0.7-0.0	0%

Table B. FY 2012 Contractor Score Evaluation

Focus Areas		Total Numeric Score (rounded to nearest hundredth)	Percent Fee Earned (from Table A)	Weight	Total Fee Earned
1	Deliver Transformational R&D		%	5%	$
2	Deliver R&D Program Commitments		%	35%	$
3	Develop Capabilities for the Future		%	20%	$
4	Establish Broader, More Effective Collaborations		%	10%	$
5	Safety, Operations, and Stewardship		%	25%	$
6	Leadership of the INL		%	5%	$
			Total Fee Earned		$
			Overall Fee %		%

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, Result, and associated 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, Result, and Performance Measure and will provide a final fee determination. The absence of specific PEMP performance measures in this plan does not diminish the need to comply with minimum 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 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.

5.0 Change Control

The FY 2012 PEMP was developed with the understanding that both parties engaged in good faith to define meaningful and challenging measures of success. It is also recognized that circumstances may arise in the course of the execution year that warrant a revisit of the agreements. 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 results and 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 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 2012 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 (5%)

2. Deliver Research & Development Program Commitments (35%)

3. Develop Capabilities for the Future (20%)

4. Establish Broader, More Effective Collaborations (10%)

5. Safety, Operations, and Stewardship (25%)

6. Leadership of the INL (5%)

These six Focus Areas are described in detail below.

1.0 Deliver Transformational Research & Development (R&D)

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. 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 C. 1.0 Deliver Transformational R&D – Performance Measures

Results and Performance Measures	Description
1.1	**R&D Strategy Implementation and Impact**
1.1.1	Impact; for example: • Original and creative results • Important contributions to overall research, development, demonstration, and deployment goals of NE. • Demonstrated progress toward DOE's goals to reduce dependence on energy imports and energy related emissions, improve energy efficiency and maintain US leadership in advanced energy technologies. • External acceptance and exploitation of INL accomplishments. • Implementation of INL R&D in the commercial Nuclear Industry and in the National Security arena. Vision and Leadership; for example: • Technical vision and leadership in core mission areas; • Insightful long-term and strategic planning • A research environment which delivers impactful results. Innovation: • Novel solutions to problems. Recognition; for example: • External acknowledgement of INL work in principal mission areas • Visible impacts on the direction and priorities of the nuclear research and development

FY 2012 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

Results and Performance Measures	Description
1.1	**R&D Strategy Implementation and Impact**
	• Leadership in workshops, and national/international meetings; • Peer-reviewed publications commensurate with a world-class laboratory External Peer Review in all major mission areas and initiatives: • External peer reviews evaluate the reputation, recognition, and impact of the laboratory's work key mission and progress towards world-class status. • External evaluation of effectiveness of the Laboratory Directed R&D (LDRD) project portfolio • Progress toward recommendations of prior external reviews and peer recommendations

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

Letter Grade	Definition
A+	Progress towards realizing strategic and technical objectives with significant positive impact on INL's, DOE and national multi-program objectives/mission/vision resulting from innovative performance that is recognized nationally and internationally for leadership in the field.
A	Progress towards realizing strategic and technical objectives with significant positive impact on INL's and DOE's objectives/mission/vision. INL is recognized for its innovation and leadership within DOE and the national laboratories.
A-	Progress towards realizing strategic and technical objectives with significant positive impact on INL objectives/mission/vision.
-	No grade if strategic impact is not achieved

Table E. 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 Commitments

To achieve DOE's vision, the INL must consistently fulfill program/customer commitments. As always, adequate quality of deliverables is expected. Commitments made to the research sponsors, as documented in the INL baseline, provide the basis for performance evaluation. The impact of these milestones on program objectives (e.g., NE R&D Roadmap Objectives) or on the field in general may be considered in Section 1.

FY 2012 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

Table F. 2.0 Deliver R&D Program Commitments – Performance Measures

Results and Performance Measures	Description
2.1	**Nuclear Energy Commitments**
	Meet NE milestones as defined in the contract baseline as these are required to achieve the R&D Goals identified in the NE R&D Roadmap. The number and impact of missed milestones will be considered in the evaluation of this measure.
2.2	**National and Homeland Security Commitments**
	Meet all NHS milestone commitments as defined in the contract baseline. The number and impact of missed milestones will be considered in the evaluation of this measure.
2.3	**Other Mission Related Commitments**
	Meet all other (non-nuclear energy and non-national security) milestone commitments as defined in the contract baseline. The number and impact of missed milestones will be considered in the evaluation of this measure.

Table G. 2.0 Deliver R&D Program Commitments - Grading Definitions

Letter Grade	Definition
A to A+	Meets > 97% of performance milestones as set by the contract baseline.
A-	Meets 95-97% of performance milestones as set by the contract baseline.
B+	Meets 90-94% of performance milestones as set by the contract baseline.
B	Meets 87-89% of performance milestones as set by the contract baseline.
B-	Meets 83-86% of performance milestones as set by the contract baseline.
-	No grade if mission/program baseline is not achieved.

Table H. 2.0 Deliver R&D Program Commitments – Scoring.

2.0	Deliver R&D Program Commitments	Letter Grade	Numeric Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Total Score
2.1	Nuclear Energy Commitments			75%		
2.2	National and Homeland Security Commitments			15%		
2.3	Other Mission Related Commitments			10%		
Deliver R&D Program Commitments Focus Area Score						

FY 2012 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

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 I. 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. Execute FY 2012 activities consistent with the FY 2009 PIE Strategic Plan, to develop PIE capabilities to achieve world-class status (i.e. state-of-the-art capabilities in fully upgraded facilities). *Examples of specific milestones include:* **Advanced Post-Irradiation Examination Capability** • Complete draft acquisition strategy with alternatives evaluation • Complete NEPA compliance strategy • Prepare a draft Safety Design Strategy **Irradiated Materials Characterization Laboratory** • Complete 90% construction **Instrumentation & Technique Development** • Develop advanced analytical techniques, trace element analyses, and laser based acoustic techniques for micron-level characterization
3.1.2	Demonstrate progress toward developing capabilities to deliver transformational research in the development of fuels for future generations of reactors. • Execute FY 2012 activities consistent with the FY 2009 Ceramic Fuel Strategic Plan to develop a flexible ceramic fuel fabrication R&D capability at Materials and Fuels Complex (MFC) that is unique in the world in terms of the ability to test advanced processes with comprehensive characterization and analytical support. • Execute FY 2012 activities consistent with the FY 2010 Transient Experimental Research and Development Capability Strategic Plan for

FY 2012 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

Results and Performance Measures	Description
	TREAT Restart, to develop and qualify advanced fuel forms. • Execute FY 2012 activities consistent with the current Fuel Modeling and Simulation strategy. *Examples of specific milestones include:* **Transient Testing of Nuclear Fuels Capability** • Conduct the Programmatic Alternatives Analysis as required by DOE O 413.3B and support the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. • Initiate the Conceptual Design process for the Proposed Action. **Ceramic Fuel R&D** • Complete 100% GSL design – **1/15/2012**. • Fabricate and prepare GSL for installation • Complete CESB conversion for radiological work **Fuel Modeling and Simulation** • Develop a version of the fuel performance code that is used by CASL and industry • Expand the user base to additional laboratories and universities
3.1.3	Execute the INL Advanced Separations and Waste Forms RD&D Capabilities Strategic Plan and the 5 Year Implementation Plan for Separations and Waste Forms. *Examples of specific milestones include:* • Complete RAL transfer • Procure equipment, and augment staff as identified in the five-year implementation plan for Advanced Separations and Waste Forms Capabilities at the INL.

FY 2012 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

Results and Performance Measures	Description
3.1.4	Develop a science-based strategy that integrates used fuel dry storage requirements with current and future testing capabilities. Correctly size the testing program and utilize DOE-NE infrastructure wherever practical. Integrate advanced modeling and simulation, theory, and separate effects testing with used fuel testing to establish the baseline for predicting the long-term performance and aging of used fuel and to guide/inform large scale validation testing that may be required. *Examples of specific milestones include:* • Develop a strategy that guides the integration of used fuel dry storage data needs with the needed testing capabilities **by 3/31/2012** • Develop the capability plan and a test plan to demonstrate long-term used fuel dry storage using a science-based approach.
3.1.5	Demonstrate progress toward developing world-class research capabilities for non-traditional uses of nuclear energy, with the end goal of a nuclear hybrid system demonstration at INL. • Advance nuclear hybrid energy system concepts, opportunities, knowledge base, plans, and approaches through stakeholder interactions and/or partnerships to affect the objectives stated in the DOE Strategic Plan. • From NE's perspective, define nuclear hybrid component, subsystem, and system design and testing capabilities to speed the deployment of advanced nuclear hybrid energy systems, with emphasis on demonstration of grid performance, process heat usage, and load following for the overall system. *Examples of specific milestones include:* • Develop nuclear hybrid system technical bases through regional, national, and international partnerships and engagement as evidenced by technical workshops, agreements, and other demonstrable collaboration. • Define the needs and requirements from NE's perspective for energy systems test and analyses capabilities and approaches that enhance regional economic development consistent with the INL Energy Park Strategic Plan (2011). This will be evidenced by industry, university, and other stakeholder engagement in capability development and the development of component and systems test capability (such as grid-scale energy storage or others) that may be leveraged to eventual nuclear hybrid system test capability.

FY 2012 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

Results and Performance Measures	Description
3.2	**Progress Toward Establishing the INL as a Major Center for National Security Technology Development and Demonstration**
3.2.1	Nonproliferation: • INL will progress toward establishing itself as a Nonproliferation Center of Excellence for technology development, test, evaluation and demonstration and personnel training for the prevention and mitigation of nuclear and radiological threats. Satisfactory progress will be demonstrated by expanded use of the Zero Power Physics Reactor facility to include the Reactor Cell area, operations on the Stand-Off Experiment Range, and Radiological Response Training Range, and use of nuclear fuel cycle facilities, equipment, nuclear materials and expertise in support of training and technology evaluation. Infrastructure enhancements and the level of impact of on and off-site support provided to responders will be a factor in discriminating between fully successful and exceptional performance. • INL will leverage its nuclear fuel cycle expertise to provide analytical products in support of international nuclear security efforts, develop training that enables government analysts to develop such products themselves, and provide reach back support in areas for which INL has specialized expertise. Success in meeting this measure will be demonstrated through the development and implementation of a strategic plan and securing at least one new project with long-term opportunity in support of the community consistent with the strategic plan. • INL will invest in and leverage facilities and capabilities in support of international safeguards and nuclear infrastructure facility monitoring. Success in meeting this measure will be demonstrated by INL support of the safeguards portion of the Joint Fuel Cycle Studies initiative, and at least one expanded or new project that leverages INL nuclear facilities and/or equipment for safeguards or signatures demonstration and development efforts.

FY 2012 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

Results and Performance Measures	Description
3.2.2	Critical Infrastructure Protection: Electric Grid Research - Advance a stand-alone electric grid test bed at the INL to provide real world testing capabilities to a variety of customers and execute FY 2012 actions: • Develop a project plan for phased developments of the research grid; • Enhance the grid's current testing capability and attract additional customers; • Develop an operations framework for electric grid test bed experimentation, operations, and business model; and • Develop a cooperative research partnering and investment strategy, leveraging relationships with government, industry and academia. Wireless Communications - Develop INL's wireless test bed as a national scientific user facility that actively supports spectrum sharing R&D and testing in FY 2012: • Demonstrate leadership in the national Spectrum Sharing initiative; • Develop a cooperative research partner and investment strategy, leveraging relationships with government, industry, and academia; • Develop an operations framework for wireless user facility experimentation, operations, and business model.
3.2.3	National Defense: • INL will leverage its unique capabilities in armor, explosives, and materials technologies to provide applied solutions and operational support. (Success measures will include elements such as increased use of the National Security Test Range located at the site, as well as increased use of in-town facilities for special programs, sustained innovation in product development for special applications, leveraging Specific Manufacturing Capability expertise and facilities, and expansion of analysis and technical reach-back support.) • INL will leverage the Test Range assets and expertise to support technology development, testing, and training. (Success measures will include elements such as utilization rates of the Test Range for wireless/communication, cyber, power grid, etc., testing and training, as well as internal and external investments in capability expansion.)

FY 2012 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

Results and Performance Measures	Description
3.2.4	Achieve recognition as a science and technology provider in Nuclear Nonproliferation/Counterproliferation and Critical Infrastructure Protection/National Defense. Success will be measured by engaging current and potential National and Homeland Security customers to ensure awareness and understanding of INL's capabilities to support their missions. Examples of success may include customers coming to INL, their inviting INL to participate in conferences/ workshops, recognition of INL technical leaders in the scientific/technical community via publications in relevant journals, conference hosting and/or chairing/co-chairing activities, and recognition of science-based solutions or other technical support that delivers impact to their mission.
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 which integrate nuclear energy and support NE and NS missions. Leverage resources of vendors, end-users, and other sponsors to establish and implement these capabilities. • Progress toward deployment and demonstration of reconfigurable test bed facilities supporting clean energy systems • Progress toward the test and demonstration of integrated systems and controls for hybrid energy systems • Progress toward improving the management of energy/water and critical/strategic materials to advance clean energy systems. • Execute FY 2012 capability development activities consistent with the Hybrid Energy Systems Testing & Demonstration (HYTEST) Implementation Plan. • Expand battery testing infrastructure, equipment resources, and research capabilities to assess the performance and fidelity of energy storage devices. • Expand the infrastructure, equipment resources, and research to enhance biomass /biofuels processing RD&D capabilities.
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 both a core DOE value and a strategic business imperative. Measured items include:	

FY 2012 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

Results and Performance Measures	Description
3.4.1	STEM Education: • Develop future human capital capability to support INL Missions by improving Science Technology Engineering and Math Education (STEM) in the State of Idaho. Improvements to the i-STEM program have a measureable impact as demonstrated by stakeholder advocacy. i-STEM continues to expand its reach to Idaho schools. • INL Education Programs will lead integration and partnering efforts with Idaho colleges and universities to secure DOL grant funding and implement programs that enhance energy workforce development in Idaho and provide a pipeline of skilled employees to meet the INL mission needs. This will be evidenced by the joint programs that are proposed and implemented.
3.4.2	Workforce Development: • Demonstrate the results of a Workforce Development Program that establishes a pipeline of talent in critical skill areas such as ATR and MFC operators, technical support and laboratory engineering staff in support of NE's vision of INL as a Nuclear Energy User Facility and in support of INL programs. • Attract and retain highly qualified staff in order to support long term, sustainable programs. Ensure pre-eminent talent in key programmatic areas.

Table J. 3.0 Develop Capabilities for the Future - Grading Definitions

Letter Grade	Definition
A+	Progress made toward realizing strategic objectives with significant positive impact on INL's mission. 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.
A	Progress that exceeds expectations made toward realizing strategic objectives with positive impact on INL's or DOE's mission. 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 noted are more than offset by the positive performance within the purview of the overall result being evaluated and have no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.

FY 2012 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

Letter Grade	Definition
A-	Progress that exceeds expectations made toward realizing strategic objectives. Meets expectations of performance as set within performance measures identified for each desired result with some notable areas of increased performance identified. Deficiencies noted are offset by the positive performance within the purview of the overall result being evaluated with little or no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
B+	Meets expectations of performance as set by the performance measures identified for each desired result with no notable areas of increased or diminished performance identified. Minor deficiencies identified are offset by other exceptional performance and have little to no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
B	Most expectations of performance as set by the performance measures identified for each desired result are met. 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 Laboratory.
B-	One or two expectations of performance set by the performance measures are not met and /or minor deficiencies are identified, and although they may be offset by other positive performance, they may have the potential to negatively impact the result or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
C+	Some expectations of performance set by the performance measures are not met and /or other deficiencies are identified, and although they may be offset by other positive performance, they may have the potential to negatively impact the desired result or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
-	No grade if measure is not achieved

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			20%		
3.3	Science & Technology Capabilities Supporting the Principal Missions			15%		
3.4	Workforce Capabilities that Enable Principal Missions			15%		
Develop Capabilities for the Future Focus Area Score						

FY 2012 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

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 and Nuclear-Interested Parties (including relevant nuclear collaborations with industry and the commercial sector)**
4.1.1	In collaboration with industry, community, federal government and other interested stakeholders, assess opportunities to leverage INL capabilities to advance clean energy systems deployment and, if practical and feasible, assist in such deployment consistent with the DOE's Asset Re-vitalization (energy parks) Initiative and INL engagement strategy related to this initiative.
4.1.2	INL to support industry needs in testing and demonstration of nuclear systems that lead to the licensing and commercial deployment of those systems. Jointly with industry and other participants of integrated energy production systems (e.g., hybrid systems) demonstrate the viability for improved economics, safety and security for commercial deployment.
4.1.3	Advance coordination with and endorsement by the nuclear industry and regulators of INL planned nuclear energy R&D as necessary and useful for the future commercial deployment of advanced reactor or fuel cycle systems.
4.1.4	Identify industry needs that support commercial deployment of technologies as evidenced by agreements resulting from workshops and other laboratory/industry interactions.
4.1.5	Demonstrate effective management of the Light Water Reactor Sustainability (LWRS) program as evidenced by the successful implementation of corrective measures in response to the August 2011 LWRS Steering Committee report **by 3/31/12.**
4.2	**Enhance Regional, National and International Partnerships**
4.2.1	Educational Partnerships (CAES): • Demonstrate significant partnerships with Idaho universities through CAES, including joint research partnerships and joint hires as programmatically applicable. • Execute collaborative research and development projects with CAES

FY 2012 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

Results and Performance Measures	Description
	partners to strengthen academic science and engineering programs and graduate students and faculty capabilities in areas of key energy applications (e.g. nuclear science and engineering, bioenergy, carbon management, etc.). • Evaluate CAES corporate structure with a view to enhancing collaboration with Idaho businesses. • Grow collaborative partnerships and research portfolio with industry. • Provide internship opportunities that keep INL as one of the top internship programs in the country.
4.2.2	Regional and National Energy Partnerships: • Develop additional successful National & Homeland Security research collaborations with industry, academia and other research institutions in answer to national program calls (e.g., DOE, National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), Department of Defense (DoD), Department of Homeland Security (DHS), NIST, National Science Foundation (NSF), etc.) • Provide leadership to regional states/provinces relative to energy and environment, including within the Western Energy Corridor, Pacific Energy Corridor, Idaho and locally. • Demonstrate partnerships with regional states (including contained federal sites) to help enable safe, clean and economically feasible development and use of wide-ranging regional energy resources pertinent to energy security. • Assist implementation of DoD-DOE MOU by providing support to DoD facilities in their development of clean energy options.
4.2.3	• Create a joint proposal call and review process between the ATR NSUF and an Office of Science User Facility. • Plan and execute a concurrent series of summer schools (User's Week and the MeV School) jointly with ORNL.
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 based culture; including improved commercialization of INL-developed technology. • Transfer and facilitate the commercialization of INL developed technology through appropriate mechanisms, including licensing, spin-outs and the Department of Energy's *Start-up America* Program. • Continue INL's Technology Based Economic Development program to foster an entrepreneurial culture in the region: position INL and CAES as key contributors driving e*conomic develop*ment in the region.

FY 2012 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

Results and Performance Measures	Description
4.3.2	Demonstrate innovation and improvement in the overall quality and performance of INL technology transfer.

Table M. 4.0 Establish Broader, More Effective Collaborations - Grading Definitions

Letter Grade	Definition
A+	Progress made toward realizing strategic objectives with significant positive impact on INL's mission. 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.
A	Progress that exceeds expectations made toward realizing strategic objectives with positive impact on INL's or DOE's mission. 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 noted are more than offset by the positive performance within the purview of the overall result being evaluated and have no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
A-	Progress that exceeds expectations made toward realizing strategic objectives. Meets expectations of performance as set within performance measures identified for each desired result with some notable areas of increased performance identified. Deficiencies noted are offset by the positive performance within the purview of the overall result being evaluated with little or no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
B+	Meets expectations of performance as set by the performance measures identified for each desired result with no notable areas of increased or diminished performance identified. Minor deficiencies identified are offset by other exceptional performance and have little to no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
B	Most expectations of performance as set by the performance measures identified for each desired result are met. 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 Laboratory.
B-	One or two expectations of performance set by the performance measures are not met and /or minor deficiencies are identified, and although they may be offset by other positive performance, they may have the potential to negatively impact the result or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.

FY 2012 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

Letter Grade	Definition
C+	Some expectations of performance set by the performance measures are not met and /or other deficiencies are identified, and although they may be offset by other positive performance, they may have the potential to negatively impact the desired result or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
-	No grade if measure is not achieved

Table N. 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 and 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, 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, and stewardship, INL should focus on the following objective results:

Table O. 5.0 Safety, Operations and Stewardship – Performance Measures

Results and Performance Measures	Description
5.1	**Operations Performance in Support of Programs**
5.1.1	Measurement of ATR's support of customers based on the approved FY 2012 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 2012 and are directly related to customer requested changes affecting milestones and commitments, the customer requirements form may be subsequently revised with DOE approval.
5.1.2	Develop an implementation strategy/plan for the Risk Monitor based on the Probabilistic Risk Assessment completed in FY 2011.
5.1.3	Materials and Fuels Complex: • All upgraded MFC Documented Safety Analyses are implemented within 60 days of DOE approval, or per a DOE-approved implementation plan, as applicable.

FY 2012 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

Results and Performance Measures	Description
	• Demonstrate effective operational support to R&D programs by achieving a cumulative facility availability of at least 80% by the end of the year. The facility availability is calculated using the method developed by INL in FY 2011.
5.1.4	Measurement of INL support for customer requirements achieving nuclear materials management objectives. A customer requirements form, similar in form to the one in use at ATR for section 5.1.1 will be generated to establish specific measures and criteria for success in achieving FY 2012 nuclear materials management performance objectives supporting DOE complex-wide objectives. The customer requirements form will be submitted by INL and approved by DOE-ID after FY 2012 funding is established and within 45 days of receipt of the FY 2012 IFM Work Authorization and Program Guidance.
5.1.5	Specific Manufacturing Capability (SMC) Productions: • Meet approved FY 2012 front armor production quantities • Meet approved FY 2012 side armor production quantities • Cumulative quality of 98% or above
5.1.6	Perform work scope for Defense in Depth for Beyond Design Basis Events which include: ATR primary heat exchanger support modification work through milestone completion of prefabrication and installation of column support base plates; Auxiliary ATR canal water supply completion; and Station black out equipment procurement.
5.1.7	Perform selected work scope for the ATR Life Extension Project: receive twenty reversed engineered N-16 Beta Detectors as part of the Nuclear Instrumentation Replacement Project; and, demonstrate and document core physics model validation procedures through analysis of neutron activation spectrometry data obtained in FY 2011 at the Advanced Test Reactor Critical Facility.
5.2	**Validation of INL Operational Assurance Activities**
5.2.1	The operational CAS is performing effectively; giving DOE confidence that INL is actively seeking "gaps to excellence" by critically assessing its operations and management systems, and finding and fixing its own problems. Key elements considered in evaluating effectiveness include: • Risk-informed operational assurance activities are planned, executed, and closed out in a timely fashion, are identifying substantive issues, and are followed by appropriate and timely corrective actions. • BEA has effectively implemented a graded, high-volume, low threshold issues management system which appropriately prioritizes and resolves issues site-wide. • Operational events are adequately critiqued, reported, and investigated, with appropriate and timely corrective actions. • Metrics and targets to assess the effectiveness of operational performance

FY 2012 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

Results and Performance Measures	Description
	are in place. • Appropriate analysis and trending is performed and lessons learned are applied site-wide. • All assessment results, performance metrics, plans, schedules, issues management data, and other CAS products are readily available for review and analysis by DOE. • An independent validation review of the INL operational CAS concludes that effective implementation has been achieved. The validation review scope will be agreed to by DOE.
5.3	**Project Management Improvements**
The INL must continue to mature the Project Management systems, rigor and capabilities to consistently deliver timely and efficient projects. This includes the following:	
5.3.1	Provide timely and accurate project information to BEA and DOE-ID management for designated capital asset projects via a single reporting mechanism.
5.3.2	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.
5.3.3	Meet OECM EVMS certification requirements supporting a July 2012 on-site review.
5.3.4	Implement Line Item Construction Project (LICP) EVMS requirements on the Materials Security & Consolidation Project (MSCP).
5.4	**Progress Towards Achieving Sustainability Goals**
INL Implementation of DOE Strategic Sustainability Performance Plan. INL will be evaluated on an overall approach that uses available funding to prioritize projects or upgrades with the greatest overall impact to the following goals:	
5.4.1	Sustainability: • Decrease petroleum–based fuel use in INL fleet by at least 2% from FY 2011, and increase alternative fuel use at least 5% from FY 2011. • Reduce INL water consumption intensity by at least 1% from the FY 2010 levels. • Reduce energy intensity by a minimum of 3%.
5.4.2	Infrastructure: • Plan for and establish in the FIMs system and Portfolio Manager that at least two additional INL buildings >5000 gsf become compliant with the Guiding Principles. • Complete projects in FY 2012 at four additional buildings to support meeting the Guiding Principles at those same four buildings in FY 2013. • Incorporate Cool Roof concept into all INL roof replacements. For FY

FY 2012 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

Results and Performance Measures	Description
	2012: o Utilize the DOE-NNSA Roof Asset Management Program (RAMP) to install 20,000 ft2 of roofing that meets the DOE "Cool Roof" requirements. o Incorporate cool roof requirements into non RAMP roof replacements done in-house by INL.
5.4.3	Waste Diversion: • Fulfill waste diversion interim goals as found in the Strategic Sustainability Performance Plan by diverting at least 30% of the non hazardous solid. • Divert at least 20% of the construction and demolition waste from landfills.
5.4.4	Program Planning: Revise the INL Site Sustainability Plan (SSP) to include the strategies developed in FY 2011 for Sustainability goals.
5.4.5	Sustainable Procurement: Identify and modify INL processes as necessary to measure and report performance, by August 2012, against the Sustainable Procurement Goal from the DOE Strategic Sustainability Performance Plan and Executive Order (EO) 13514. The Sustainable Procurement goal requires 95% of all new contract actions, including task and delivery orders, under new contracts and existing contracts, to require the supply or use of products and services that are energy efficient (Energy Star or FEMP designated), water efficient, bio-based, environmentally preferable (including EPEAT-registered products), non-ozone depleting, recycled content, or are non-toxic or less toxic alternatives.
5.4.6	ATR Pilot Project: Complete a feasibility study of the beneficial use of waste heat from the Advanced Test Reactor. The study must also address ways to reduce water usage at the ATR.
5.5	**Safeguards & Security Threat Reductions**
Assist the Department in the development of the Graded Security Protection threat policy Point-based Methodology. Evaluate the new methodology for implementation within the INL/Office of Nuclear Energy environment.	
5.5.1	Complete assistance in the development of the Point-based Methodology
5.5.2	Review the new policy for implementation in the INL/Office of Nuclear Energy Environment
5.5.3	Develop INL/NE specific implementation Plan
5.5.4	Update INL Site Safeguards and Security Plan and Vulnerability Assessment to reflect the new policy and accepted risks.

FY 2012 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

Table P. 5.0 Safety, Operations, and Stewardship – Grading Definitions

Letter Grade	Definition
A+	Progress made toward realizing strategic objectives with significant positive impact on INL's mission. 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.
A	Progress that exceeds expectations made toward realizing strategic objectives with positive impact on INL's or DOE's mission. 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 noted are more than offset by the positive performance within the purview of the overall result being evaluated and have no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
A-	Progress that exceeds expectations made toward realizing strategic objectives. Meets expectations of performance as set within performance measures identified for each desired result with some notable areas of increased performance identified. Deficiencies noted are offset by the positive performance within the purview of the overall result being evaluated with little or no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
B+	Meets expectations of performance as set by the performance measures identified for each desired result with no notable areas of increased or diminished performance identified. Minor deficiencies identified are offset by other exceptional performance and have little to no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
B	Most expectations of performance as set by the performance measures identified for each desired result are met. 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 Laboratory.
B-	One or two expectations of performance set by the performance measures are not met and /or minor deficiencies are identified, and although they may be offset by other positive performance, they may have the potential to negatively impact the result or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment
C+	Some expectations of performance set by the performance measures are not met and /or other deficiencies are identified, and although they may be offset by other positive performance, they may have the potential to negatively impact the desired result or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
-	No grade if measure is not achieved

FY 2012 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

Table Q. 5.0 Safety, Operations, and Stewardship – Scoring.

5.0	Safety, Operations, and Stewardship	Letter Grade	Numeric Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Total Score
5.1	Operations Performance in Support of Programs			35%		
5.2	Validation of INL Operational Assurance Activities			20%		
5.3	Project Management Improvements			10%		
5.4	Progress Towards Achieving Sustainability Goals			25%		
5.5	Safeguards & Security Threat Reductions			10%		
Safety, Operations, 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 subjective evaluation of INL performance will be based upon oversight reports, peer review, etc. The following characteristics will be considered in the evaluation:

Table R. 6.0 Leadership of the INL – Performance Measures

Results and Performance Measures	Description
6.1	**Quality Leadership in Management and Operations**
6.1.1	• Provides sound and competent leadership and stewardship of the Laboratory as measured by execution of INL strategies that further the achievement of the INL and DOE missions. Effective implementation is characterized by support for nuclear energy objectives through strong partnerships, responsive and accountable leadership throughout the organization, and efficient and effective corporate office support as appropriate. • Provides innovative operational and programmatic means for implementation of systems that ensures the availability, reliability, and efficiency of these facilities; and the appropriate balance between RDD&D and user support. Successfully deploys, implements, and continuously improves management systems that efficiently and effectively support the mission(s) of the Laboratory, including reducing/eliminating legacy software applications. • INL will continue to pursue cost efficiencies in order to maintain Laboratory investments. INL will implement the new business model and continue to revise and adjust as needed, including submitting to DOE-ID by

FY 2012 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

Results and Performance Measures	Description
	no later than January 31, 2012 a business case for adoption of Standard Labor Rates for implementation in March 2012 to support FY2014 budget formulation. • Laboratory leadership is committed to diversity as an important consideration in management of the INL, including recruitment, hiring and community involvement. • Provide strategic leadership in cyber security/information technology (IT) through formally establishing a Laboratory Risk Management Approach (RMA) consistent with DOE requirements; integrate cyber security/IT risk management and overall performance into the existing Contractor Assurance System; and ensure all information systems operate within processes defined through the RMA and approved by the federal Authorizing Official.

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

Letter Grade	Definition
A+	Progress towards realizing management and operational objectives with significant positive impact on INL's, DOE and national multi-program objectives/mission/vision.
A	Positive impact on INL and DOE's management and operational objectives/mission/vision.
A-	Positive impact on INL's management and operational objectives/mission/vision.
-	No grade if management and operational impact is not achieved

Table T. 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						