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)*
188	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: Lisa A. Sehlke
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
	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 2011 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND MEASUREMENT PLAN (PEMP).
THE FY 2011 PEMP IS INCORPORATED INTO PART III, SECTION J, ATTTACHMENT K, EFFECTIVE DATE OCTOBER 1, 2010 (ATTACHED 24 PAGES, 9-16-10 REV 0) .

The FY 2010 PEMP remains in effect through September 30, 2010.
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)*
Lisa A. Sehlke Prime Contract and Performance Management	Suzette M. Olson

15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	16C. DATE SIGNED
Lisa A. Sehlke *(Signature of person authorized to sign)*	9/20/10	Suzette M. Olson *(Signature of Contracting Officer)*	9/20/10

NAME OF OFFEROR OR CONTRACTOR
BATTELLE ENERGY ALLIANCE, LLC

ITEM NO. (A)	SUPPLIES/SERVICES (B)	QUANTITY (C)	UNIT (D)	UNIT PRICE (E)	AMOUNT (F)
	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)*
188	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: Lisa A. Sehlke
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
	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 2011 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND MEASUREMENT PLAN (PEMP).
THE FY 2011 PEMP IS INCORPORATED INTO PART III, SECTION J, ATTTACHMENT K, EFFECTIVE DATE OCTOBER 1, 2010 (ATTACHED 24 PAGES, 9-16-10 REV 0) .

The FY 2010 PEMP remains in effect through September 30, 2010.
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)*	09/20/2010

NAME OF OFFEROR OR CONTRACTOR
BATTELLE ENERGY ALLIANCE, LLC

ITEM NO. (A)	SUPPLIES/SERVICES (B)	QUANTITY (C)	UNIT (D)	UNIT PRICE (E)	AMOUNT (F)
	All other terms and conditions remain unchanged. Period of Performance: 11/09/2004 to 09/30/2014				

FY 2011 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

Table of Contents

FY 2011 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

List of Tables

FY 2011 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) 2011.

The FY 2011 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 2011 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 & 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 2011. 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
- 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 2011 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 2011.

Unless otherwise stated, all PEMP Focus Areas and their associated Results, and Performance Measures are to be completed by September 30, 2011. 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 2011 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 2011 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 & 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 2011 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 2011 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 & 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 strategic impact as measured by progress reports, peer reviews, Program Office review/oversight, 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
	Impact: ▪ Produces high-quality, original, and creative results that advance science and technology; demonstrates sustained scientific and engineering progress and impact; receives appropriate external recognition of accomplishments; and contributes to overall research, development, demonstration, and deployment goals of NE. Vision and Leadership: ▪ Provides technical vision and leadership in core mission areas; strategic planning and development of initiatives; and provides an outstanding research environment, which delivers high-quality, impactful results. Innovation: ▪ Applies novel approaches and delivers innovative solutions to problems. Recognition: ▪ The Laboratory is recognized as the "go to" place for the unique and challenging scientific and engineering problems in their core mission areas, recognized for doing the best work in the field.

FY 2011 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

Results and Performance Measures	Description
	▪ The Laboratory is recognized for the impact it has on the direction and priorities of the nuclear research and development community as a result of its technical approaches and solutions. External Peer Review: ▪ External peer reviews will acknowledge the reputation, recognition, and impact of the laboratory's key mission areas demonstrating progress towards world-class status. Feedback on the effectiveness of the Laboratory Directed R&D (LDRD) project portfolio will also be provided by external peer review. Key mission areas will include Environmental & Energy (E&E), Nuclear Science & Technology (NST), National & Homeland Security (NHS), Advanced Test Reactor (ATR) National Scientific User Facility (NSUF), and Center for Advanced Energy Studies (CAES).

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	Deliver Transformational R&D			100%		
Deliver Transformational R&D Focus Area Score						

FY 2011 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

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.

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. If the customer provides formal correspondence stating that no negative impact was incurred, then the milestone may be removed from consideration in the evaluation.
2.2	**Other Mission Commitments**
	Meet all other (non-NE) milestone commitments as defined in the contract baseline. The number and impact of missed milestones will be considered in the evaluation of this measure. If the customer provides formal correspondence stating that no negative impact was incurred, then the milestone may be removed from consideration in the evaluation.

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.
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			80%		
2.2	Other Mission Commitments			20%		
Deliver R&D Program Commitments 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. The INL Ten-Year Site Plan (TYSP), *DOE-NE's National Nuclear Capability – Developing and Maintaining the INL Infrastructure* outlines the vision and strategy for transforming the INL to deliver world-class capabilities that enable DOE and INL mission accomplishment. DOE evaluation of INL performance towards achieving the strategy takes into consideration capability development in terms of human capital (talent), facilities, and equipment.

The following performance measures, consistent with the INL TYSP, 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)**
	Enable INL to become the "preeminent, internationally recognized nuclear energy research, development and demonstration laboratory," by maintaining existing core capabilities and developing strategically important capabilities consistent with its core nuclear energy mission areas. These capabilities must include human capital (talent), facilities, and equipment.
3.1.1	Demonstrate progress toward developing world class post irradiation examination (PIE) capabilities at the INL. ▪ INL Material Characterization Laboratory (IMCL) Submit the 90% design package for the IMCL to DOE. The 90% design package includes plans, specifications, preliminary documented safety analysis, and a detailed cost estimate. ▪ Execute FY 2011 activities defined in 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). ▪ Incorporate technical community input regarding functionality of the proposed line-item building. ▪ Given DOE PIE Mission Need approval by November 1, 2010, INL will lead and develop the alternative analysis by **February 28, 2011**.
3.1.2	Demonstrate progress toward developing capabilities to deliver transformational research in the development of fuels for future generations of reactors. ▪ Execute FY 2011 activities identified in the Transient Reactor Experimental and Test Facility (TREAT) strategic plan. Specific milestones/activities from the approved plan will be negotiated **by December 31, 2010**, as the basis for this measure. ▪ Execute FY 2011 activities defined in the FY 2009 Ceramic Fuel Strategic

FY 2011 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

Results and Performance Measures	Description
	Plan, to develop ceramic fuel research capabilities 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. ▪ Extend basic nuclear physics and fuels separate effects testing capabilities.
3.1.3	Demonstrate progress toward developing world class fuel cycle separations R&D capabilities. ▪ Execute FY 2011 activities in the strategic plan for separations R&D. Specific milestones/activities from the approved plan will be negotiated **by December 31, 2010**, as the basis for this measure.
3.1.4	Demonstrate progress toward developing world class research capabilities for non-traditional uses of nuclear energy. ▪ Execute FY 2011 activities as documented in the Hybrid Energy Systems Testing & Demonstration (HYTEST) Implementation Plan. ▪ Develop and implement tools to perform analysis of nuclear hybrid system dynamics, performance, and energy systems integration potential.
3.2	**National and Homeland Security & Clean Energy Capability Development**
3.2.1	Nuclear Nonproliferation - Develop longer standoff distances for active interrogation, detection of signatures from stimulated materials, and application of active interrogation technologies to other missions of high priority to the U.S. (e.g., disarmament treaty verification). Build capabilities in international nuclear safeguards applications and technologies, particularly as applied to electrochemical separations technologies. ▪ Complete work in preparation for operations on a new standoff detection range. ▪ Install equipment in the Fuel Conditioning Facility to demonstrate a safeguards approach for electrochemical processing.

FY 2011 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

Results and Performance Measures	Description
3.2.2	Critical Infrastructure Protection – Build electric grid research capabilities to identify and characterize vulnerabilities, risks, test mitigations and improve resilience. Continue to build wireless test bed capabilities for testing and evaluation of national infrastructure systems tied to energy, defense and public safety. Electric Grid Research: ▪ Develop reliable models through Modeling and Simulation R&D that address interdependencies and conduct corroborative measurements on the existing INL power grid; ▪ Establish schedule and path forward (independent of funding source) for a stand-alone electric grid at the INL for conducting high priority R&D and testing activities and execute FY11 actions; ▪ Begin evaluating potential locations at the INL Site for a new stand-alone grid; and ▪ Develop a conceptual framework for conducting smart grid related reliability, security, and standards related research, development and gain programmatic support for implementing an aspect of the framework. Wireless Communications: ▪ Add fourth generation cellular capabilities in the existing Wireless Communication infrastructure; ▪ Demonstrate leadership in national level technology working groups; ▪ Develop a national level strategic plan for communications Research, Development, Demonstration, & Deployment (RDD&D) smart infrastructure and research. The plan should align with the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and National Telecommunications & Information Administration (NTIA) national broadband plan.
3.2.3	Expand clean energy research capabilities, including: ▪ Expand infrastructure and equipment resources to enhance biofeedstock processing RD&D capabilities, including components of pilot scale process demonstration units and related analyses equipment; and ▪ Expand battery testing infrastructure and equipment resources to assess the performance and fidelity of energy storage devices for vehicles and other systems (such as grid scale energy storage devices).
3.3	**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. Ramping up the development of clean supplies of energy 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

FY 2011 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

Results and Performance Measures	Description
	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:
	▪ 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 will be based on lessons learned and identified gaps. Improvements have a measureable impact on programs as demonstrated by stakeholder advocacy. ▪ Demonstrate the results of a Workforce Development Program that establishes a pipeline of talent in critical skill areas such as ATR and MFC operators and technical support and laboratory engineering staff in support of the requirements of INL's nuclear operations and science and technology programs. ▪ Demonstrate the results of a new Science and Engineering Development Program (SEDP) that accelerates and enhances the development and performance of INL's new scientists and engineers. ▪ 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 or DOE'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 2011 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)			60%		
3.2	National and Homeland Security & Clean Energy Capability Development			20%		
3.3	Workforce Capabilities that Enable Principal Missions			20%		
Develop Capabilities for the Future Focus Area Score						

FY 2011 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	**NSUF Expansion to Include other National Assets**
4.1.1	Experiments process benchmarking: Analyze the effects of the improvements in the new experimental life cycle unified process model developed in FY2010. Using a pilot project and the results of benchmark data, assess the gaps and redundancies in the process model, and incorporate back into the experiment process procedure, as appropriate.
4.1.2	Analysis of Experiments: Perform at least three (3) post-irradiation analyses at a DOE or other national user facility. Expand the use of partner facilities to support rapid turnaround projects and post-irradiation examinations.
4.1.3	Education: Expand User's Week format and student/faculty audience by incorporating new curriculum generated through the INL Energy Frontier Research Center (EFRC), with support from other EFRC institutions. Accomplish an introductory experimenter's course at a non-INL location, such as a partner institution or a national technical meeting.
4.2	**Engagement of the Nuclear Industry and Nuclear-Interested Parties**
	Increase engagement with nuclear entities as measured by substantive partnerships or technology transfer activities, such as: ▪ Leveraging experience with the Light Water Reactor Sustainability (LWRS) Program to establish a broader effort to engage industry; o Increase engagement with the nuclear industry as guided by the LWRS engagement plan; ▪ Implementation of key initiatives in the Nuclear Energy Industry Engagement Plan; o Increase engagement on the DOE NE Roadmap with the nuclear

FY 2011 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

Results and Performance Measures	Description
	industry through a series of workshops; o Establish the Enterprise Advisory Board and conduct the first meeting; ▪ Partner with industry in developing technologies for nuclear applications (e.g., increase the number of R5 licenses; increased engagement with NRC on reactor safety; CRADA to test and develop advanced concepts for multi-module reactor control; CRADA with an oil and petrochemical industry consortium; CRADA to develop, test, and validate a digital Outage Control Center; CRADA to develop and test advanced digital technologies for main control room alarm display and management; industry working group in the areas of instrumentation, information technologies, and control systems).
4.3	**Enhance Regional, National and International Partnerships**
4.3.1	Educational (CAES) Partnerships: ▪ Demonstrate significant partnerships with Idaho Universities through CAES, including joint research partnerships and joint hires as programmatically applicable. ▪ Provide internship opportunities that keep INL as one of the top internship programs in the country as measured by the Vault Guide to Top Internships. ▪ Execute collaborative research and development projects with CAES partners to strengthen graduate students and faculty academic science and engineering programs in areas of key Energy applications (e.g. nuclear science and engineering, bioenergy, carbon management, etc.).
4.3.2	Regional and National Energy Partnerships: ▪ Expand regional energy-related engagement with educational institutions to address DOE clean energy objectives through technology innovation and technology demonstration focused on integrated energy systems and their associated platforms. ▪ Develop 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.)

FY 2011 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

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 or DOE'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 2011 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

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	NSUF Expansion to Include Other National Assets			60%		
4.2	Engagement of the Nuclear Industry and Nuclear-Interested Parties			20%		
4.3	Enhance Regional, National and International Partnerships			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	Advanced Test Reactor: ▪ Measurement of ATR's support of the Naval Reactors (NR) program is based on the initial approved FY 2011 ATR Integrated Strategic Operational Plan (ISOP) which includes items specifically related to priority experiments (including experiment margin), as well as items related to the overall NR program execution. If revisions of the ISOP occur during FY 2011 and are directly related to customer requested changes in milestones, the customer requirements form may be subsequently revised with DOE approval. ▪ Probabilistic Risk Assessment (PRA): Provide a peer reviewed PRA per PLN-2047, Appendix A (Rev 1 Released on September 27, 2007) for the ATR in its current physical condition and configuration, ready for implementation and use at the ATR. Included will be a recommendation for incorporation of risk informed decision making using appropriate industry standards (e.g. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Regulatory Guidance (RG) 1.174 "An Approach for Using Probabilistic Risk Assessment in Risk-Informed Decisions on Plant-Specific Changes to the Licensing Basis"). ▪ ATR Distributed Control System (DCS)/Console Display System (CDS) – Complete installation, testing and operations acceptance of the ATR DCS/ CDS. Initiation of installation activities in accordance with the FY 2011 ATR ISOP.

FY 2011 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

Results and Performance Measures	Description
5.1.2	Materials and Fuels Complex: ▪ All MFC Documented Safety Analysis (DSA)s are upgraded to full compliance with 10 CFR 830. This will be accomplished by incorporating DOE comments and submitting final draft of the Fuel Conditioning Facility DSA (Safety Analysis Report (SAR) 403) to DOE for approval by **February 28, 2011**; incorporating DOE comments and submit final draft of the Hot Fuel Examination Facility DSA (SAR 405) to DOE for approval by **March 31, 2011**; and for all other MFC DSAs awaiting upgrade, prepare and submit DSAs to DOE for approval. Upgraded DSAs are implemented within 60 days or per DOE-approved implementation plan, as applicable. ▪ Demonstrate quarterly effectiveness of operational support to R&D Programs as measured by improvements in production control activities or similar indicators of improved performance. The indicators to be measured will be proposed by INL to DOE **by October 30, 2010**, and be reported quarterly throughout FY11 along with an interpretative analysis and corrective measures as appropriate. ▪ Accelerate the treatment of the sodium-bonded spent nuclear fuel – Electro-refine 200 kg of the Fast Flux Test Facility (FFTF) sodium-bonded spent nuclear fuel.
5.1.3	Specific Manufacturing Capability (SMC) Production: ▪ Meet approved front armor production quantities. ▪ Meet approved side armor production quantities. ▪ Cumulative quality of 98% or above.
5.1.4	Nuclear Materials Consolidation: Demonstrate effective Nuclear Materials Consolidation in accordance with the INL Nuclear Materials Consolidation Plan as evidenced by: ▪ Package 75 cans of excess highly enriched uranium (HEU) for offsite shipment. ▪ Ship 50 cans of repackaged excess HEU offsite. ▪ Complete the transfer of Sandia National Laboratory Sodium Debris Bed canisters from the Radioactive Scrap and Waste Facility.
5.1.5	INL Implementation of DOE Strategic Sustainability Performance Plan. Sustainability: ▪ Decrease petroleum–based fuel use in INL fleet by at least 2% from FY 2010, and increase alternative fuel use at least 10% from FY 2010. ▪ Reduce INL water consumption intensity by at least 2% from the FY 2010 levels. ▪ Implement new projects in FY 2011 that will reduce energy intensity by a minimum of 6% by end of calendar year 2015.

FY 2011 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

Results and Performance Measures	Description
	Infrastructure: ▪ Plan for and achieve at least 5000 gsf additional existing building space to become compliant with the Guiding Principles (sustainability principles). Demonstrate measurable progress toward ensuring that 15% of INL's enduring infrastructure is compliant with the Guiding Principles by FY 2015. Implement Guiding Principles through facility lease renegotiations and DOE-owned facility renovations. ▪ Incorporate "Cool Roofs" concept into roof replacements. Waste Diversion: ▪ Fulfill waste diversion interim goals as found in the Strategic Sustainability Performance Plan by diverting at least 20% of the non hazardous solid and at least 20% of the construction and demolition waste from landfills. Program Planning: ▪ Develop greenhouse gas (GHG) Reduction Strategy for Scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions through FY 2020 based on projected lab growth, footprint increases and reductions, including TYSP and lab mission forecasts. ▪ Identify opportunities, costs, and feasibility of projects to reduce water usage throughout INL existing infrastructure to achieve the 16% water use intensity reduction goal by end of calendar year 2015.
5.2	**Contractor Assurance System (CAS) Implementation and Operational/Safety Assurance**
	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 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. ▪ The effectiveness of safety management programs, including those credited in the safety bases for nuclear facilities, are adequately assessed. ▪ Continuous improvement in the implementation of a high volume, low threshold issues management system is evident in accordance with an implementation plan adopted by the pilot working group. ▪ Operational events are adequately critiqued, reported, and investigated, with appropriate and timely corrective actions. 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.

FY 2011 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

Results and Performance Measures	Description
5.3	**Project Management Improvements**
	▪ Complete a tailored Self Certification review of INL's Earned Value Management System (EVMS). The self certification will be performed prior to the PMSO/Office of Engineering & Construction Management (OECM) RH-LLW On - Site review. The Self Certification will assess the capability of INL's system to provide project planning consistent with EVMS disciplines, reliable measures of project progress, and ensure the effective use of the system for project management purposes. The INL tailored Self Certification process will include sampling of two (2) projects which are sufficiently mature to provide representative samples of EVMS implementation. Contingent on continued execution as currently scheduled, these two (2) projects are the Remote Handled Low Level Waste Facility, and Irradiated Materials Characterization Laboratory. ▪ Demonstrate effective management of projects as evidenced by measured performance in selected projects consistent with the DOE Root Cause Analysis Corrective Action Plan (CAP) CPI/SPI criteria. The projects to be measured will have established baselines and be proposed by INL to DOE **by October 30, 2010**. ▪ Demonstrate effective management and configuration control of the TYSP. ▪ Develop a single project controls system/tool for NE to use in the execution and reporting of its programs to be fully operational (testing complete and ready to initiate planning for FY2012) by May 1, 2011.The tool is to be used initially for the NE R&D programs.

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 or DOE'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 2011 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 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			60%		
5.2	Contractor Assurance System Implementation and Operational/Safety Assurance			20%		
5.3	Project Management Improvements			20%		
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

FY 2011 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

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**
	▪ 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 R&D and user support. For example, performance of failed power systems identified during the FY 2010 fire has been appropriately addressed. ▪ Successfully deploys, implements, and continuously improves management systems that efficiently and effectively support the mission(s) of the Laboratory. For example, following the Technology Deployment (TD) transformation roadmap, demonstrate substantial improvement and alignment of TD processes, awareness, and impact. ▪ Laboratory leadership is committed to diversity as an important consideration in management of the INL, including recruitment, hiring and community involvement.

Table S. 6.0 Leadership of 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

FY 2011 INL Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan

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						