PART III – SECTION J, ATTACHMENT K

FISCAL YEAR 2026

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND MEASUREMENT PLAN

Effective October 01, 2025 – September 30, 2026

Table of Contents

PART III – SECTION J, ATTACHMENT K 0

I. PERFORMANCE GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND NOTABLE OUTCOMES 3

Background 3

GOAL 1.0 Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment 4

GOAL 2.0 Efficient and Effective Stewardship and Operation of Research Facilities 11

GOAL 3.0 Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory 15

GOAL 4.0 Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health and Environmental Protection 19

GOAL 5.0 Deliver an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission(s) 20

GOAL 6.0 Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs 21

GOAL 7.0 Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM) and Emergency Management Systems 22

II. DETERMINING THE CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE RATING AND PERFORMANCE-BASED FEE AND AWARD TERM ELIGIBILITY (as applicable) 24

Performance Evaluation Methodology 24

Calculating Individual Goal Scores and Letter Grades 29

Determining the Amount of Performance-Based Fee Earned 30

Adjustment to the Letter Grade and/or Performance-Based Fee Determination 34

INTRODUCTION

This document, the Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan (PEMP) primarily serves as Department of Energy's (DOE) Quality Assurance/Surveillance Plan (QASP) for the evaluation of Battelle Energy Alliance's (BEA) (hereafter, "the Contractor") performance of DOE Contract No. DE-AC07-05ID14517 (hereafter, "the Contract") for the management and operations of the Idaho National Laboratory (INL), or "the Laboratory") during the evaluation period from October 1, 2025 through September 30, 2026. This PEMP provides a standard, by which DOE can determine whether the Contractor is managerially and operationally in control of the Laboratory and is meeting the mission requirement and performance expectations/objectives of the Department as stipulated within this contract.

This document also describes the distribution of the total available performance-based fee and the methodology for determining the amount of fee earned by the Contractor as stipulated within Part I Section B – Supplies or Service and Prices/Costs Section B.2 – Fee, and Part II Section I – Contract Clauses, Section I.17 Department of Energy Acquisition Regulation (DEAR) 970.5215-1, Total Available Fee: Base Fee Amount and Performance Fee Amount, Alternate I (DEC 2000) Alternate IV (DEC 2000). In partnership with the Contractor, the DOE Office of Nuclear Energy (NE) and DOE-Idaho Operations Office (DOE-ID) have defined the measurement basis that serves as the Contractor's performance-based evaluation and fee determination.

The Performance Goals (hereafter, "Goals"), Performance Objectives (hereafter referred to as "Objectives"), and Notable Outcomes for meeting the Objectives, described in PEMP Section I, were developed in accordance with expectations set forth within the Contract. The Notable Outcomes have been developed in coordination with DOE-NE program offices and other DOE Program Offices or Federal Agencies as appropriate. Except as otherwise provided for within the Contract, the evaluation and fee determination will rest solely on the Contractor's performance of the PEMP Goals and Objectives.

The Fiscal Year (FY) 2026 INL PEMP includes Performance Goals, which emphasize achievements in support of the DOE Vision/Mission for INL (Section C of the Contract), but do not undervalue the expectation of satisfactory performance levels in other areas of the statement of work. DOE expects INL will continue to implement and integrate environment, safety, and health (ES&H), quality, and security into its programs and operations to enhance overall mission success.

The overall measure of performance against each Objective of this PEMP, to include the evaluation of Notable Outcomes, shall be evaluated in accordance with this PEMP document by DOE-ID and shall include DOE-NE program office and major customer input as appropriate. This review methodology will ensure that the overall evaluation of the Contractor results in a consolidated DOE position considering specific Notable Outcomes as well as all additional information available to the evaluating office. DOE-ID will work with DOE-NE program offices and major customers throughout the year in evaluating the Contractor's performance, and will provide observations regarding programs and projects, as well as other management and operation activities, conducted by the Contractor throughout the year.

This PEMP identifies Performance Goals where INL can impact results supportive of DOE strategic initiatives and, in particular, DOE-NE mission objectives. These Performance Goals provide evaluation of mission achievement with both subjective and objective measures of performance.

I. PERFORMANCE GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND NOTABLE OUTCOMES

Background

The current performance-based management approach to oversight within DOE has established a culture within the Department with emphasis on the customer-supplier partnership between DOE and the Laboratory contractors. It places a greater focus on mission performance, best business practices, cost management, and improved contractor accountability. Under the performance-based management system, DOE provides clear direction to INL and develops annual performance plans (such as this one) to assess the Contractor's performance in meeting that direction in accordance with contract requirements. The DOE policy for implementing performance-based management includes the following guiding principles:

- Performance Objectives are established in partnership with affected organizations and are directly aligned to the DOE strategic goals;
- Resource decisions and budget requests are tied to results; and
- Results are used for management information, establishing accountability, and driving long- term improvements.

The performance-based approach focuses on the evaluation of performance against these Performance Goals. Progress against these Goals is measured using a set of Objectives. The success of each Objective will be measured based on demonstrated performance by the INL, and on a set of Notable Outcomes that focus Laboratory leadership on the specific items that are the most important initiatives and highest risk issues the Laboratory must address during the year.

These Notable Outcomes should be objective, measurable, and results-oriented to allow for a definitive determination of whether or not the specific Outcome was achieved at the end of the year.

In determining the performance of PEMP Goals and Objectives and Notable Outcomes, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider progress reports, program office reviews/oversight, deliveries against milestone dates, etc., in accordance with the described Goals. Each of the Objectives identifies significant activities and/or requirements, including but not limited to the Notable Outcomes that are important to the success of the corresponding PEMP Goal and shall be used as one of the primary means of determining the Contractor's success in meeting the desired Goal. The Goals for the PEMP support the DOE Vision/Mission for INL.

Performance Goals, Objectives and Notable Outcomes

The following sections describe the Performance Goals, their supporting Objectives, and associated Notable Outcomes for FY 2026.

GOAL 1.0 Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment

The science, engineering, technology, and testing programs at the Laboratory produce high-quality, original, and creative results that advance science, engineering, and technology; demonstrate sustained application of scientific progress into deployed solutions having an impact; receive appropriate external recognition of accomplishments; and contribute to overall research, development, and deployment goals of DOE and its customers.

The weight of this Goal is 60%.

Goal 1.0 Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment provides the objectives and rating criteria the DOE evaluator(s) shall use to assess the overall effectiveness and performance of the Laboratory in delivering science and technology programs that produce high-quality, original, and creative results that advance science and technology; demonstrate sustained scientific progress and impact; contribute to and achieve DOE's mission of protecting our national and economic security by providing world-class scientific research capacity; and advancing scientific knowledge, which enhances DOE's mission for INL. INL's mission includes achieving a positive impact on DOE-NE's strategic objective to revive, revitalize, and expand nuclear energy to ensure the reliability and resiliency of baseload power in meeting the Nation's energy needs; providing innovative research that enables a new generation of commercial nuclear power; enabling further national recognition and use of INL as a major national security technology development and demonstration center; enhancing INL's role as a multi-disciplinary research center, contributing to other national goals, and obtaining international recognition in the science and engineering fields, consistent with its missions; and making INL's unique scientific and technical capabilities, resources, and services available to DOE, other Federal agencies, state and local governments, academia, and the private sector.

The following is a sampling of factors to be considered in determining the level of performance for the Laboratory against these mission objectives:

- Impact of research, development, demonstration and deployment (RDD&D) results on the field, as measured primarily by peer review and/or customer/industry/university/national laboratories feedback;
- Effective incorporation of lessons learned from early-stage research and development activities into the scale-up of complex nuclear systems and processes to optimize success and avoid rework;
- Leadership to ensure utilization of, and collaboration with, the best resources of national labs, industry, universities, and stakeholders to carry out laboratory missions, with well-defined roles and responsibilities to effectively leverage expertise inside and/or external to INL;
- Impact of publications on the field, as measured primarily by peer review;
- Impact of RDD&D results outside the field indicating broader interest;
- Impact of RDD&D results on DOE or other customer mission(s);
- Successful stewardship of mission-relevant research areas;
- Delivery on RDD&D plans;
- Significant awards (Nobel Prizes, R&D 100, FLC, etc.);

- Technical leadership through organization of national and international symposia;
- Invited talks, citations, making high-quality data available to the scientific community;
- Development of tools and techniques that become standards or widely-used in the scientific community; and
- Public accessibility of publications and research results as per DOE guidance.

Other factors, which also may be considered in determining the level of performance, include, but are not limited to:

- Leadership to advance research and development of nuclear energy systems through public/private partnerships;
- Initiative to reduce the time and costs associated with development and qualification of nuclear materials and fuels;
- The technical support INL provides DOE-NE for the safe and secure storage, transportation, treatment, and/or disposition of existing inventory of civilian and defense spent nuclear fuel (SNF) and high-level radioactive waste (HLW);
- Leadership of key national and international organizations and committees;
- Development of new and transformative technologies and capabilities that enable principal missions;
- Engagement with the Nuclear Industry and Nuclear-Related Companies/Regulators;
- Technology Transfer, Deployment, and Commercialization;
- Regional, National, and International Partnerships; and
- Impact of national user facilities on research programs at other national institutions.

The above factors to consider for measuring performance are neither inclusive nor are they intended to be a checklist for meeting performance expectations of the Objectives under Goal

1.0. The evaluation of each Objective will use a combination of relevant factors.

Objective 1.1: Nuclear Energy

Lead and implement relevant, high impact RDD&D programs. Continue to build on the INL's position as the preeminent, internationally-recognized National Laboratory in nuclear energy technologies (including advanced fuel cycles). The primary focus areas include, but are not limited to the following:

- Engineering driven science-based approach to the development and performance of nuclear fuels and materials applicable to current and future generations of reactors;
- Fuel cycle technologies including advancements in pyro and aqueous processing technologies, nuclear materials management and non-proliferation standards, and transient testing capability enabling the design and qualification of fuels and materials;
- Reactor Safety, Material Science, and Human Performance for Life Extension of Light Water Reactors;
- Advanced reactor design and optimization;
- Advanced modeling and simulation including industry and Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) adoption and use of DOE-NE mod-sim tools;

- Innovative research that supports sustaining the current fleet and demonstration of advanced reactors; and
- Partnerships that advance deployment of nuclear energy and/or the science and engineering required for nuclear energy innovation.

Notable Outcome(s) 1.1 Nuclear Energy:

Notable Outcome 1.1.A – Reactor Project Demonstration/Deployment Support

In direct support of Executive Order 14301, "Reforming Nuclear Reactor Testing at the Department of Energy" signed on May 23, 2025, BEA will deploy a Rapid Response Authorization & Support Framework to accelerate implementation of DOE's newly announced Reactor and Fuel Line Pilot Programs. By delivering a fully operational rapid response framework, BEA will directly enable DOE-ID to fulfill the requirements of the Executive Order. Specifically, BEA will:

- Develop ready-to-use Statements of Work templates for critical disciplines, including site preparation, environmental compliance support, engineering and design review, nuclear safety document preparation, and quality assurance consulting.
- Provide support in the following areas: Nuclear Safety Design Agreements, construction oversight (code compliance and Quality Assurance (QA)), Preliminary Documented Safety Analysis (PDSA), Final Documented Safety Analysis (FDSA) and readiness review.
- Establish partnerships and provide support in instances where outside companies choose to work with BEA.
- Provide support to DOE-ID through Intergovernmental Personnel Act (IPA) assignments and pursue subcontractor support to ensure sufficient resources are available in instances where companies choose not to work with BEA.

This Notable Outcome will assist DOE-ID in fulfilling the requirements of Executive Order 14301 to construct, operate, and achieve criticality of at least three test reactors by July 4, 2026, under DOE's direct authorization authority.

Objective 1.2: National and Homeland Security

Lead and implement relevant, high-impact RDD&D programs. Advance grid security, resiliency and reliability through control systems cyber security innovation and further national recognition and use of INL as a major center for national security technology development and demonstration. The primary focus areas include, but are not limited to the following:

- Critical infrastructure resilience and protection RDD&D in focus areas of industrial control systems cyber security, infrastructure assurance, wireless communications, and grid reliability and security;
- Armor production which meets Department of the Army cost, production schedules, and quality requirements for Specific Manufacturing Capability (SMC) and explosives/blast protection;

- Nuclear nonproliferation and emergency response technology RDD&D and training including work with special nuclear materials;
- Applied solutions to satisfy requirements for Defense, Homeland Security, and Intelligence Community customers;
- Partnerships which advance the above focus areas; and
- Partnerships which increase workforce development and/or provide research and development which support National and Homeland Security Goals.

Notable Outcome(s) 1.2 National and Homeland Security:

Notable Outcome 1.2.A – MORAN Capability Enhancement

BEA will develop and deploy a fuel chopping and de-cladding skid to process Magnox fuel received in FY 2024 as feedstock for the Moran test bed. These tasks support the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation's Office of Research and Development (DNN R&D), Office of Materials Management & Minimization (M3), and Office of Nonproliferation and Arms Control (NPAC). Completion of this milestone will introduce a new capability to the Moran test bed, demonstrate material signature acquisition for advanced reactor fuels, and serve as baseline data for comparison to irradiated advanced reactor fuel in the planned Beartooth testbed.
By the end of FY 2026, BEA will demonstrate completion of the task to DOE-ID and will submit DNN’s acknowledgment of task completion along with project summary reports for DOE’s

assessment of performance.

Objective 1.3: Science and Technology Addressing Broad DOE Missions

Lead and implement relevant, high impact RDD&D programs that support DOE's energy missions. Enhance INL's capabilities as a multi-program National Laboratory with world-class nuclear and associated energy research capabilities. The primary focus areas include, but are not limited to the following:

- Research and development of integrated energy systems, including but not limited to energy storage, bioenergy and other relevant clean energy systems;
- Advanced manufacturing and energy critical materials including research vital to ensuring the long-term competitiveness of U.S. industry;
- Provide basic research to support key areas of DOE's energy missions; and
- Partnerships that advance research, development, demonstration and deployment of clean energy systems and the underlying science and engineering.

Notable Outcome(s) 1.3 Science and Technology Addressing Broad DOE Missions:

Notable Outcome 1.3.A – STREAM (Slurry Transformation into Resources for Energy and Advanced Materials)

In support of multiple Executive Orders, including Executive Order 14241, *"Immediate Measures to Increase American Mineral Production,"* Signed on March 20, 2025, and Executive Order 14272, *"Ensuring National Security and Economic Resilience through Section 232 Actions on Processed Critical Minerals and Derivative Products,"* signed on April 15, 2025, BEA will:

- Valorize and recover graphite precursors (carbonaceous materials) and other value-added critical materials from secondary sources (e.g., coal fines and slurries) versus primary graphite mining, which is currently 100% sourced outside the United States (U.S.)
- Develop methods to reduce costs to treat liquid and slurry wastes with the aim of eliminating associated mining and industrial hazards and liabilities.
- Source a specific coal slurry, characterize it, and employ advanced beneficiation and separations technologies to extract and produce at least 15 kg of carbon product with at least 95% carbonaceous material. This percentage is the target purity level needed for feedstocks that can be graphitized for manufacturing electrodes and refractories needed for steel and alloy production as well as the production of coatings, carbon fibers, cloth, and shapes, rubbers and plastics, brake linings, clutch facings, and many specialty devices used in military, defense, and commercial industry applications.
- Prepare and submit one manuscript to a peer-reviewed scientific journal.

Table 1.1 - Performance Goal 1.0 Letter Grade Definitions

1.0 Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment	
Letter Grade	**Definition**
A+	In addition to satisfying the conditions for B+ • There are *significant research areas for which* the Laboratory *has exceeded the expectations* of the research plans *in significant ways through creative, new, or unconventional methods that allow greater scientific and/or engineering reach than expected*. • RDD&D conducted at the Laboratory *has resolved one of the most critical questions in the field or has changed the way the research community thinks about a particular field through paradigm shifting discoveries*. • RDD&D conducted at the Laboratory *provided major advances that significantly accelerate* DOE or other customer mission(s).
A	In addition to satisfying the conditions for B+ • There are *important examples* where the Laboratory *exceeded the expectations* of the research plans *in significant ways through creative, new, or unconventional methods that allow greater scientific and/or engineering reach than expected*. • *All area*s of RDD&D conducted at the Laboratory are of *exceptional or outstanding* merit and quality. • RDD&D conducted at the Laboratory has *significant positive impact* to DOE or other customer missions.
A-	In addition to satisfying the conditions for B+ • There are *important examples* where the Laboratory *exceeded the expectations* of the research plans. • *Significant areas* of RDD&D conducted at the Laboratory are of *exceptional or outstanding* merit and quality. • RDD&D conducted at the Laboratory *positively impacts* DOE or other customer missions.
B+	The Laboratory has achieved each of the following Objectives: • The Laboratory has successfully executed research plans. • RDD&D conducted at the Laboratory are of *high* scientific merit and quality. • RDD&D conducted at the Laboratory *advance* DOE or other customer missions.
B	• The Laboratory has successfully executed research plans. • RDD&D conducted at the Laboratory *advance* DOE or other customer missions. BUT the Laboratory fails to meet the conditions for B+ for *at least one* of the following reasons: • RDD&D conducted at the Laboratory are *not uniformly of high* merit and quality OR *some areas of research, previously supported, have become uncompetitive* OR *the Laboratory does not produce sufficiently competitive proposals to receive program support at a level commensurate with its unique capabilities*.
B-	The Laboratory fails to meet the conditions for B+ for *at least one* of the following reasons: • The Laboratory has *failed to successfully execute* research plans, *but contingencies were in place such that no funding was or will be terminated*. OR RDD&D conducted at the Laboratory *does little to advance* DOE or other customer missions. • *Significant areas of* RDD&D conducted at the Laboratory are *not of high* merit and quality OR *some areas of research, previously supported, have become uncompetitive* OR *the*

1.0 Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment	
Letter Grade	**Definition**
	Laboratory did not produce sufficiently competitive proposals to receive program support at a level commensurate with its unique capabilities.
C	The Laboratory fails to meet the conditions for B+ for *at least one* of the following reasons: • *In several significant aspects*, the Laboratory *failed to deliver* on research plans *using available resources such that some funding was or will be terminated* OR RDD&D conducted at the Laboratory *failed to contribute to* DOE or other customer missions. • *Significant areas of* RDD&D conducted at the Laboratory are *of poor* merit and quality OR *some areas of research, previously supported, have become uncompetitive* AND *the Laboratory does not produce sufficiently competitive proposals to receive program support at a level commensurate with its unique capabilities*.
D	The Laboratory fails to meet the conditions for B+ for *at least one* of the following reasons: • *Multiple program elements at* the Laboratory *failed to deliver* on research plans *using available resources such that significant funding was or will be terminated*. • *Multiple significant areas of* RDD&D conducted at the Laboratory are *of poor* merit and quality OR *some areas of research, previously supported, have become uncompetitive* AND *the Laboratory does not produce sufficiently competitive proposals to receive program support at a level commensurate with its unique capabilities*. • RDD&D conducted at the Laboratory *failed to contribute to* DOE or other customer missions.
F	The Laboratory fails to meet the conditions for B+ for at least one of the following reasons: • *Multiple program elements at the Laboratory failed to deliver on research plans using available resources resulting in total termination of funding.* • *Multiple significant areas of* RDD&D conducted at the Laboratory are *of poor* merit and quality OR *some areas of research, previously supported, have become uncompetitive* AND *the Laboratory does not produce sufficiently competitive proposals to receive program support at a level commensurate with its unique capabilities* OR *the Laboratory has been found to have engaged in gross scientific incompetence and/or scientific fraud.* • RDD&D conducted at the Laboratory *failed to contribute to* DOE or other customer missions.

Note: Based on the DOE Office of Science model as recommended by the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) report to DOE January 2013, specific grading tables supplying more detail for grading Goals 1.0, 2.0 and 3.0 do not contain grades of C+ and C-.

Table 1.2 – Performance Goal 1.0 Score Development

GOAL 1.0 Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment					
Objectives		**Letter Grade**	**Numerical Score**	**Objective Weight**	**Weighted Score**
1.1	Nuclear Energy			50%	
1.2	National and Homeland Security			35%	
1.3	Science and Technology Addressing Broad DOE Missions			15%	
				Numerical Score for Goal 1.0	

GOAL 2.0 Efficient and Effective Stewardship and Operation of Research Facilities

The Laboratory provides effective and efficient strategic planning; operations, maintenance and construction of Laboratory research facilities; and are responsive to the user community.

The weight of this Goal is 20%.

Goal 2.0 Efficient and Effective Stewardship and Operation of Research Facilities Goal shall measure the overall effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in planning for and delivering leading-edge specialty research and/or user facilities to ensure the required capabilities are present to meet today and tomorrow's complex challenges. It also measures the Contractor's 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 if applicable.

This Goal is applicable to the major research facilities at the INL to include those under the Nuclear Science User Facility (NSUF), ATR, Materials and Fuels Complex (MFC), Biomass Feedstock National User Facility, Energy Innovation Laboratory (EIL), Idaho Research Center, Energy Systems Laboratory, and National Security Test Ranges.

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

- Effectiveness in establishing and demonstrating INL as a national test bed for research, development, and demonstration of advanced nuclear energy systems—enabling Small Modular Reactors (SMR) and/or advanced reactor demonstration or development;
- Delivery of accurate and timely information required to carry out the budget formulation process and critical decision processes associated with the operation of major R&D facilities;
- The Laboratory's ability to meet the intent of DOE Order 413.3B, Program and Project Management for the Acquisition of Capital Assets;
- The extent to which the Laboratory appropriately assesses risks and contingency needs associated with the operation of major R&D facilities;
- The extent to which the Laboratory is effective in its management role and partnership with DOE;
- The availability, reliability, performance, and efficiency of Laboratory major research facility(ies);
- The degree to which relevant facilities are optimally arranged to support the user community;
- The degree to which the Laboratory addresses and advances the disposition of identified environmental liabilities;
- The extent to which Laboratory RDD&D is conducted to develop/expand the capabilities of the facility(ies); and
- The quality of the process used to allocate facility time to users.

Additional elements to be considered in determining the level of performance for the Laboratory against this Goal include, but are not limited to:

- The quality of the mission related and scientific justification of any proposed facilities;
- The technical quality of conceptual and preliminary designs and the credibility of the associated cost estimates;
- The leveraging of existing facilities and capabilities of the DOE laboratory complex in plans for proposed facilities and capabilities; and
- The innovation and potential impact of new technologies embodied in INL facilities.

Objective 2.1: Provide Effective Facility Design(s) and Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components as Required to Support Laboratory Programs

Provide justifications for new R&D facility needs, quality conceptual and pre-conceptual designs, leveraging with existing facilities, and financing options in accordance with the applicable requirements and principles, as set forth in the terms and conditions of the Contract. Provide fabrication of components, meeting of construction schedules and budgets, oversight, and transparent communications.

Notable Outcome(s) 2.1: Provide Effective Facility Design(s) and Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components as Required to Support Laboratory Programs

Notable Outcome 2.1.A – NRIC-DOME Test Bed.

Complete National Reactor Innovation Center (NRIC) Demonstration of Microreactor Experiments (DOME) test bed construction activities necessary to support first advanced reactor installation.

Notable Outcome 2.1.B – Complete key activities in preparation for MARVEL's criticality

Initial criticality is a crucial step in the MARVEL development timeline, providing key insights on physics parameters, reactor performance predictions, and safety metrics. To keep the MARVEL project on track to commence assembly in preparation to reach first criticality for startup, BEA will:

- Complete analyses in preparation for criticality of MARVEL; this includes the calculations necessary to support the safety basis to enable criticality.
- Complete the control software architecture; this includes documentation of the Instrumentation & Controls (I&C) software requirements, the major software operational risks, and software architecture.
- Complete the fabrication of the Reactor Support Frame (RSF) and of the Primary Coolant System (PCS) weldment; this includes distribution plenum, core barrel, and heat exchanger interfaces ready for any final stress relief and machining in preparation for fit-up testing.

Notable Outcome 2.1.C – Laboratory for Operations and Testing in the United States (LOTUS) Test Bed

BEA will issue a Request for Proposal (RFP) for LOTUS design and construction, evaluate proposals, and submit a contract award package to DOE-ID for consent by August 31, 2026.

Objective 2.2: Operation and Maintenance of Facilities

- Resources are balanced between facility RDD&D and user support; and a quality process is used to allocate facility time to both internal and external users;
- Optimize facility availability in order to efficiently accomplish the DOE mission(s); coordinate with customers and facility users on program needs and facility availability.
- Ensure efficient use of facilities/capabilities in support of RDD&D activities, utilizing effective use of tools such as the facility Customer Requirements Form, Integrated Strategic Operational Plan (ISOP), MFC Mission Outcome Table development, Long-Term Asset Management (LTAM) at ATR, and the 5-Year Investment Strategy at MFC);
- Ensure efficient operation of nuclear facilities while optimizing availability and minimizing performance detractors such as unplanned outages and excessive deferred maintenance;
- Ensure effective planning, consolidation and disposition of nuclear material across INL; and
- Continue to develop research capabilities that have been identified as strategically important by INL.

Notable Outcome 2.2: Operation and Maintenance of Facilities

Notable Outcome 2.2.A – EBR-II Driver Spent Nuclear Fuel processing and High Assay Low Enriched Uranium (HALEU) production.

This Notable Outcome is consistent with the 2019 Supplemental Agreement with the State of Idaho and supports the DOE Office of Nuclear Energy Strategic plan. BEA's treatment of EBRI-II driver fuel contributes substantially to this goal.

Key tasks to supporting driver fuel treatment and HALEU production in FY 2026 are:

- Complete treatment of at least 280kg of HEU EBR-II spent fuel, by September 30, 2026
- Complete production of 1,000kg of HALEU reguli coming from both legacy and freshly produced fuel by September 30, 2026.

Table 2.1 - Performance Goal 2.0 Letter Grade Definitions

2.0 Efficient and Effective Stewardship and Operation of Research Facilities	
Letter Grade	**Definition**
A+	In addition to satisfying all conditions for B+, the Laboratory *exceeds expectations* in *all* of these categories: • Approaches proposed by the Laboratory are widely regarded as innovative, novel, comprehensive, and potentially cost-effective; • Reviews repeatedly confirm strong potential for scientific and engineering discovery in areas that support the Department's mission, and potential to change a discipline or research area's direction; • The Laboratory identifies, analyzes and champions novel approaches for acquiring the new capability, including leveraging or extending the capability of existing facilities while reducing cost and/or risk while enhancing capability; • Performance of the facility *exceeds* expectations for cost of operations, users served, availability, and capability; • The schedule and the costs associated with steady state operations are *significantly less* than planned and are acknowledged to be 'leadership caliber' by reviews; • Data on environment, safety, and health continues to be exemplary and widely regarded as among the 'best in class'; • The Laboratory took extraordinary means to deliver an extraordinary result for the program and/or users in the performance/review period.
A	In addition to satisfying all conditions for B+, *all* of the following conditions are also met: • The Laboratory takes the initiative to demonstrate the potential for revolutionary scientific advancement working in partnership with HQ; • The Laboratory identifies, analyzes, and champions, to HQ and Idaho Operations Office, novel approaches for acquiring the new capability, including leveraging or extending the capability of existing facilities; • Performance of the facility exceeds expectations in most of these categories: cost of operations, users served, availability, and capability; • The schedule and the costs associated with the ramp-up and/or steady state operations are less than planned and are acknowledged to be 'leadership caliber' by reviews; • Data on environment, safety, and health continues to be exemplary and widely regarded as among the 'best in class'.

2.0 Efficient and Effective Stewardship and Operation of Research Facilities	
Letter Grade	**Definition**
A-	In addition to satisfying all conditions for B+, *all* of the following conditions are also met: • The approaches proposed by the Laboratory are widely regarded as innovative, novel, comprehensive, and potentially cost-effective; • Reviews repeatedly confirm potential for scientific discovery in areas that support the Department's mission, and potential to change a discipline or research area's direction; • Performance of the facility exceeds expectations in any of these categories: cost of operations, users served, availability, and capability; • The schedule and the costs associated with the ramp-up and/or steady state operations are less than planned and are acknowledged to be among the best by reviews.
B+	The Laboratory has achieved each of the following objectives: • The operation and maintenance meet its management performance measures; • The Laboratory provides sustained leadership and commitment to environment, safety and health; • Reviews regularly recognize the Laboratory for being proactive in the management of the execution phase of the operation and maintenance; • To a large extent, problems are identified and corrected by the Laboratory while minimizing impact on scope, cost or schedule. • DOE is kept informed of operation and maintenance status on a regular basis; reviews regularly indicate operation and maintenance is expected to meet its cost/schedule performance baseline.
B	The Laboratory fails to meet expectations in *one* of the areas listed under B+.
B-	The Laboratory fails to meet expectations in several of the areas listed under B+.
C	The Laboratory fails to meet the expectations in several of the areas listed under B+ AND the required analyses and documentation developed by the Laboratory are EITHER not innovative OR reflect a lack of commitment and leadership.
D	The Laboratory fails to meet the expectations in several of the areas listed under B+ AND the Laboratory fails to provide a compelling justification for the acquisition.
F	The Laboratory fails to meet the expectations in several of the areas listed under B+ AND the approaches proposed by the Laboratory are based on fraudulent assumptions; the science case is weak to non-existent, and the business case is seriously flawed.

Note: Based on the DOE Office of Science model as recommended by the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) report to DOE January 2013, specific grading tables supplying more detail for grading goals 1.0, 2.0 and 3.0 do not contain grades of C+ and C-.

Table 2.2 – Performance Goal 2.0 Score Development

GOAL 2.0 Efficient and Effective Stewardship and Operation of Research Facilities					
Objectives		**Letter Grade**	**Numerical Score**	**Objective Weight**	**Weighted Score**
2.1	Provide Effective Facility Design(s) and Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components as Required to Support Laboratory Programs			40%	
2.2	Operation and Maintenance of Facilities			60%	
			Numerical Score for Goal 2.0		

GOAL 3.0 Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory

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

The weight of this Goal is 20%.

In measuring this performance Goal, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider performance trends and outcomes in overall Contractor Leadership's planning for, integration of, responsiveness to and support for the overall success of the Laboratory. This may include, but is not limited to, contractor leadership in support of DOE-NE's strategic objective to revive, revitalize, and expand nuclear energy to ensure the reliability and resiliency of baseload power in meeting the Nation's energy needs; developing a culture of innovation that encourages cutting edge research needed to support Nuclear Energy's long-term goals; the quality of strategic planning and progress in realizing the Laboratory vision/mission; the ability to establish and maintain long-term partnerships/ relationships with the scientific and local communities as well as private industry that advance, expand, and benefit the ongoing Laboratory mission(s) and/or provide new opportunities/ capabilities; utilizing a corporate approach to managing programs, which includes collaborations with other DOE laboratories; implementation of a robust assurance system; Laboratory and Corporate Office Leadership's ability to instill responsibility and accountability down and through the entire organization; overall effectiveness of communications with DOE; understanding, management and allocation of the costs of doing business at the Laboratory commensurate with associated risks and benefits; utilization of corporate resources to establish joint appointments or other programs/projects/activities to strengthen the Laboratory; and advancing excellence in stakeholder relations to include good corporate citizenship within the local community.

Objective 3.1: Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory

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

- Define an exciting yet realistic scientific vision/mission for the RDD&D future of the Laboratory;
- Make progress in realizing the DOE Vision/Mission for the Laboratory; and
- Develop and leverage appropriate relations with stakeholders to the benefit of the Laboratory and the U.S. taxpayer;
- Broadly deploy Laboratory capabilities, intellectual property, and technologies to support industry and other key non-DOE customers; and
- Corporate involvement/contributions to deal with challenges at the Laboratory, including using corporate resources to establish programs/projects/ activities that strengthen the Laboratory; and providing other contributions to support the community.

Notable Outcome(s) 3.1 Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory:

None.

Objective 3.2: Management and Operation of the Laboratory

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

- Implement a robust contractor assurance system per DOE O 226.1B, Implementation of Department of Energy Oversight Policy and demonstrates BEA corporate oversight of the INL;
- Understand the costs of doing business at the Laboratory and prioritize the management and allocation of these costs commensurate with their associated risks and benefits;
- Instill a culture of accountability and responsibility down and through the entire organization;
- Execute robust, efficient, and effective internal audit and Quality programs.
- Ensure good and timely communication among the Laboratory, DOE-NE and Idaho Operations Office so DOE can deal effectively with both internal and external constituencies; and
- Demonstrated accountability for senior leadership toward safety.
- Identify and implement process improvements to increase operational efficiency across the Laboratory.
- Champion the integration and utility of enterprise access to cutting-edge frontier AI models across the laboratory R&D efforts to further establish INL as the world leader in accelerating innovation in nuclear technology.

Notable Outcome(s) 3.2 Management and Operation of the Laboratory:

None.

Table 3.1 - Performance Goal 3.0 Letter Grade Definitions

3.0 Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory	
Letter Grade	**Definition**
A+	The Senior Leadership Management Team of the Laboratory has made outstanding progress (on an order of magnitude scale) over the previous year in realizing their vision for the Laboratory, and has had a demonstrable impact on the Department and the Nation. Strategic plans are of outstanding quality, have been externally recognized and referenced for their excellence, and have an impact on the vision/plans of other national laboratories. The Senior Leadership Management Team of the Laboratory may have been faced with very difficult challenges and plotted, successfully, its own course through difficulty. Partners in the scientific and local communities applaud the Laboratory in national forums, and the Department is strengthened by this.
A	The Senior Leadership Management Team of the Laboratory has made significant progress over the previous year in realizing their vision for the Laboratory, and through this has had a demonstrable positive impact on the Department and the Nation. Strategic plans are of outstanding quality, and recognize and reflect the vision/plans of other national laboratories. Faced with difficult challenges, actions were taken by the Senior Leadership Management Team of the Laboratory to redirect Laboratory activities to enhance the long-term future of the Laboratory. Partners in the scientific and local communities applaud the Laboratory in national forums, and the Department is strengthened by this.
A-	The Laboratory Senior Leadership Management Team performs better than expected (B+ grade) in almost all the areas described for a B+.
B+	The Senior Leadership Management Team of the Laboratory has made significant progress over the previous year in realizing their vision for the Laboratory. Strategic plans present long range goals that are both exciting and realistic. Decisions and actions taken by the Laboratory leadership align work, facilities, equipment and technical capabilities with the Laboratory vision and plan. The Senior Leadership Management Team of the Laboratory faced difficult challenges and successfully plotted its own course through the difficulty, with help from the Department. Partners in the scientific and local communities are supportive of the Laboratory.
B	The Senior Leadership Management Team of the Laboratory has made little progress over the previous year in realizing their vision for the Laboratory. Strategic plans present long range goals that are exciting and realistic; however, DOE is not fully confident that the Laboratory is taking the actions necessary for the goals to be achieved. The Laboratory is not fully engaged with its partners/relationships in the scientific and local communities to maximize the potential benefits these relations have for the Laboratory.
B-	The Senior Leadership Management Team of the Laboratory has made very little progress over the previous year in realizing their vision for the Laboratory. Strategic plans present long range goals that are realistic if routine; however, DOE is not fully confident that the Laboratory is taking the actions necessary for the goals to be achieved. The Laboratory is not fully engaged with its partners/relationships in the scientific and local communities to maximize the potential benefits these relations have for the Laboratory.

3.0 Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory	
Letter Grade	**Definition**
C	The Senior Leadership Management Team of the Laboratory has made no progress over the previous year in realizing their vision for the Laboratory or aligning work, facilities, equipment and technical capabilities with the Laboratory vision and plan. Strategic plans present long range goals that are either unexciting or unrealistic. Business plans exist, but they are not linked to the strategic plan and do not inspire DOE's confidence that the strategic goals will be achieved. Partnerships with the scientific and local communities with potential to advance the Laboratory exist, but they may not always be consistent with the mission of or vision for the Laboratory. Affected communities and stakeholders are mostly supportive of the Laboratory and aligned with the management's vision for the Laboratory.
D	The Senior Leadership Management Team of the Laboratory has made no progress or has back-slid over the previous year in realizing their vision for the Laboratory or in aligning work, facilities, equipment and technical capabilities with the Laboratory vision and plan. Strategic plans present long range goals that are neither exciting nor realistic. Partnerships that may advance the Laboratory towards strategic goals are inappropriate, unidentified, or unlikely. Affected communities and stakeholders are not adequately engaged with the Laboratory and indicate non-alignment with DOE priorities.
F	The Senior Leadership Management Team of the Laboratory has made no progress or has back-slid over the previous year in realizing their vision for the Laboratory or in aligning work, facilities, equipment and technical capabilities with the Laboratory vision and plan. Strategic plans present long range goals that are not aligned with DOE priorities or the mission of the Laboratory. Partnerships that may advance the Laboratory towards strategic goals are inappropriate, unidentified, and unlikely, and/or the Senior Leadership Management Team does not demonstrate a concerted effort to develop, leverage, and maintain relations with the scientific and local communities to assist the Laboratory in achieving a successful future. Affected communities and stakeholders are openly non-supportive of the Laboratory and DOE priorities.

Note: Based on the DOE Office of Science model as recommended by the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) report to DOE January 2013, specific grading tables supplying more detail for grading goals 1.0, 2.0 and 3.0 do not contain grades of C+ and C-.

Table 3.2 – Performance Goal 3.0 Score Development

3.0 Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory					
Objectives		**Letter Grade**	**Numerical Score**	**Objective Weight**	**Weighted Score**
3.1	Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory			60%	
3.2	Management and Operation of the Laboratory			40%	
				Numerical Score for Goal 3.0	

GOAL 4.0 Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health and Environmental Protection
The weight of this Goal is 30%.

This Goal evaluates the Contractor's overall success in deploying, implementing, and improving integrated Environment, Safety, and Health systems that protects workers, the public, and the environment and efficiently and effectively support the mission(s) of the Laboratory.

Objective 4.1: Provide an Efficient and Effective Worker Health and Safety Program

Objective 4.2: Provide Efficient and Effective Environmental Management System

In measuring the performance of the above Objectives, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider performance trends and outcomes in protecting workers, the public, and the environment. This may include, but is not limited to, minimizing the occurrence of environment, safety, and health incidents; effectiveness of the Integrated Safety Management (ISM) system; effectiveness of work planning, feedback, and improvement processes; the strength of the safety culture throughout the Laboratory; the effective development, implementation and maintenance of an efficient and effective Environmental Management System; and the effectiveness of responses to identified hazards and/or incidents.

Notable Outcome(s) 4.0 Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health and Environmental Protection:

None.

Table 4.1 – Performance Goal 4.0 Score Development

Objectives		Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Weighted Score
4.1	Provide an Efficient and Effective Worker Health and Safety Program			60%	
4.2	Provide an Efficient and Effective Environmental Management System			40%	
Numerical Score for Goal 4.0					

Note: The Objectives and Notable Outcomes for Performance Goal 4.0 will be evaluated using the criteria in Figure 3, General Letter Grade, Adjectival Rating, Numeric Range, Definition, and Award-Fee Pool Available To Be Earned.

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

The weight of this Goal is 25%.

This Goal evaluates the Contractor's overall success in deploying, implementing, and improving integrated business systems that efficiently and effectively support the mission(s) of the Laboratory.

Objective 5.1: Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Financial Management System

Provide an assessment annually of the Laboratory cost performance including evaluations of spending and budgeting including Laboratory cost effectiveness. This assessment should include cost management efforts performed throughout the fiscal year and cost management improvement plans for the following fiscal year. BEA's current Financial Management System Assurance Portfolio Status Report may be used to demonstrate the cost management efforts of this requirement. Effectively coordinate with other Site Contractors to support and implement cost effective provided services.

Objective 5.2: Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition and Property Management System

The Contractor must demonstrate effective subcontract management, including award of subcontracts as scheduled, inclusion of all requirements, subcontractor audits, and subcontract administration. Contractor will monitor subcontractor performance to ensure compliance with all requirements including small business subcontracting plans, Buy American Act, and applicable labor statutes. The Laboratory will also execute an effective and responsive property management system, including training for staff.

Objective 5.3: Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Human Resources Management System

Notable Outcome(s) 5.0 Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission(s):

None.

Table 5.1 – Performance Goal 5.0 Score Development

Objectives		Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Weighted Score
5.1	Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Financial Management System			40%	
5.2	Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition and Property Management System			30%	
5.3	Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Human Resources Management System			30%	
			Numerical Score for Goal 5.0		

Note: The Objectives and Notable Outcomes for Performance Goal 5.0 will be evaluated using the criteria in Figure 3, General Letter Grade, Adjectival Rating, Numeric Range, Definition, and Award-Fee Pool Available to Be Earned.

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

The weight of this Goal is 20%.

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

Objective 6.1: Sustain Excellence in Real Property Asset Management

Conduct effective real property asset life-cycle management in alignment with DOE mission needs and requirements, and including management of assets in a safe, secure, cost-effective, and sustainable manner to ensure real property assets are available, utilized, and in a condition to support efficient mission execution (e.g. achieving a reduction in Deferred Maintenance/Repair Needs (DM/RN) across the INL enterprise, demonstrated action to minimize life-cycle costs).

Notable Outcome(s) 6.0 Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs:

None.

Table 6.1 – Performance Goal 6.0 Score Development

Objectives		Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Weighted Score
6.1	Sustain Excellence in Real Property Asset Management			100%	
			Numerical Score for Goal 6.0		

Note: The Objectives and Notable Outcomes for Performance Goal 6.0 will be evaluated using the criteria in Figure 3, General Letter Grade, Adjectival Rating, Numeric Range, Definition, and Award-Fee Pool Available To Be Earned.

GOAL 7.0 Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM) and Emergency Management Systems

The weight of this Goal is 25%.

This Goal evaluates the Contractor's overall success in safeguarding and securing Laboratory assets that supports the mission(s) of the Laboratory in an efficient and effective manner and provides an effective emergency management program.

Objective 7.1: Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System

Objective 7.2: Provide an Efficient and Effective Cybersecurity and Information Technology System for the Protection of Classified and Unclassified Information

INL will consistently meet DOE cybersecurity requirements through effective management and execution of sound Information Management, Information Technology and operations, and cybersecurity programs. This includes the integration of these systems into the culture of the Laboratory and appropriate utilization of system processes and procedures by Contractor management and staff. The Laboratory will manage the security of both systems and information, and promptly report all events, incidents, and the mitigation of such events.

INL will deliver efficient, effective, and responsive information technology and cybersecurity solutions to support mission needs. The Laboratory will comply with all applicable federal regulations and contract requirements. This includes, but is not limited to, considering performance enhancements, trends and outcomes in the development, deployment, and integration of information systems across the Laboratory and to include their partners. Other key factors include best in class cybersecurity to minimize incidents and the protection of system performance metrics, trends, artificial intelligence capabilities, and necessary system logs and forensics supporting incident response. The INL will continue to focus on improvements driven by the results of new executive orders, audits, reviews, assessments, and other performance information processes/procedures by Contractor management, staff, benchmarking, and performance trending analysis.

Objective 7.3: Provide an Efficient and Effective Physical Security Program for the Protection of Special Nuclear Materials, Classified Matter, Classified Information, Sensitive Information, and Property

In measuring the performance of the above Objectives, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider performance trends and outcomes in the safeguards and security, cyber security and emergency management program systems. This may include, but is not limited to, the commitment of leadership to strong safeguards and security, cyber security and emergency management systems; the integration of these systems into the culture of the Laboratory; the degree of knowledge and appropriate utilization of established system processes/procedures by Contractor management and staff; maintenance and the appropriate utilization of Safeguards, Security, and Cyber risk identification, prevention, and control processes/activities; and the prevention and management controls and prompt reporting and mitigation of events as necessary.

Notable Outcome(s) 7.0 Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM) and Emergency Management Systems:

None.

Table 7.1 – Performance Goal 7.0 Score Development

Objectives		Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Weighted Score
7.1	Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System			15%	
7.2	Provide an Efficient and Effective Cyber Security and Information Technology System for the Protection of Classified and Unclassified Information			35%	
7.3	Provide an Efficient and Effective Physical Security Program for the Protection of Special Nuclear Materials, Classified Matter, Classified Information, Sensitive Information, and Property			50%	
Numerical Score for Goal 7.0					

II. DETERMINING THE CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE RATING AND PERFORMANCE-BASED FEE AND AWARD TERM ELIGIBILITY (as applicable)

The FY 2026 Contractor performance grades for each Goal will be determined based on the weighted sum of the individual scores earned for each of the Objectives described within this document. Each Goal is composed of weighted Objectives. Additionally, a set of Notable Outcomes have been identified to highlight key aspects/areas of performance deserving special attention by the Contractor for the upcoming fiscal year.

Each Notable Outcome is linked to one or more Objective(s). Failure to meet expectations against any Notable Outcome could result in a grade less than B+ for that Objective(s). To achieve an Objective grade above B+, the established Notable Outcome(s) must be met. If a Notable Outcome is not met, performance against the Objective will consider the level of progress and contribution towards achievement of the Notable Outcome(s). This may result in a downward adjustment in the final grade for that Objective.

Performance above expectations against a Notable Outcome will be considered in the context of the Contractor's entire performance with respect to the relevant Objective. The following section describes DOE-ID's methodology for determining the Contractor's grades at the Objective level.

Performance Evaluation Methodology

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

Figure 1. Summary of FAR Table 16-1 Contractor Adjectival Rating and Award-Fee Available Scale

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

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

Figure 2. Letter Grade Scale

Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F
Total Score	4.3-4.1	4.0-3.8	3.7-3.5	3.4-3.1	3.0-2.8	2.7-2.5	2.4-2.1	2.0-1.8	1.7-1.1	1.0-0.8	0.7-0

The Contractor shall be evaluated against the defined levels of performance provided for each Objective based on a specific grading table in each Performance Goal. The specific grading tables are based on the general grading table in Figure 3 (General Letter Grade, Adjectival Rating, Numeric Range, Definition, and Award-Fee Pool Available To Be Earned) and each specific grading table describes in more detail the grading criteria for these Goals. As per FAR subpart 16.4, the adjectival rating description has been supplemented and is included in Figure 3. Goals 1.0, 2.0 and 3.0 each have a specific grading table in each Performance Goal section. Goals 4.0, 5.0, 6.0 and 7.0 will be graded according to the general table in Figure 3 (General Letter Grade, Adjectival Rating, Numeric Range, Definition, and Award-Fee Pool Available To Be Earned).

It is the DOE's expectation that the Contractor provides for and maintains M&O systems that

efficiently and effectively support the current mission(s) of the Laboratory and assure the Laboratory's ability to deliver against DOE's future needs. In evaluating the Contractor's performance for Goals 1.0, 2.0 and 3.0, DOE shall assess the degree of effectiveness and performance in meeting each of the Objectives provided under each of the Goals. For Performance Goals 4.0, 5.0, 6.0 and 7.0, DOE will rely on a combination of the information through the Contractor's own assurance systems, the ability of the Contractor to demonstrate the validity of this information, and DOE's own independent assessment of the Contractor's performance across the spectrum of its responsibilities. The latter might include, but is not limited to, operational awareness (daily oversight) activities; formal assessments conducted; "For Cause" reviews (if any); and other outside agency reviews (Office of the Inspector General (OIG), Government Accountability Office (GAO), Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA), etc.).

The mission of the Laboratory is to deliver the science and technology needed to support Departmental missions and other sponsor's needs. Operational performance at the Laboratory meets DOE's expectations (defined as the grade of B+) for each Objective if the Contractor is performing at a level that fully supports the Laboratory's current and future science and technology mission(s). Performance that has, or has the potential to, 1) adversely impact the delivery of the current and/or future DOE/Laboratory mission(s), 2) adversely impact the DOE and/or the Laboratory's reputation, or 3) does not provide the competent people, necessary facilities and robust systems necessary to ensure sustainable performance, shall be graded below expectations as defined in Figure 3 (General Letter Grade, Adjectival Rating, Numeric Range, Definition, and Award-Fee Pool Available To Be Earned), below.

The Department sets high expectations and expects performance at that level to optimize the efficient and effective operation of the Laboratory. Thus, the Department does not expect routine Contractor performance above expectations against Goals 4.0, 5.0, 6.0 or 7.0. Performance that might merit grades above B+ would need to reflect the Contractor's significant contributions to the management and operations at the INL, or recognition by external, independent entities as exemplary performance. Notable Outcomes will be considered against Goals, as applicable.

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

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

A-	Excellent	3.7-3.5	Contractor has exceeded almost all of the significant award-fee Goals and Objectives and has met overall cost, schedule and technical requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured in the PEMP for the award-fee evaluation period. Contractor performance exceeds expectations made toward realizing strategic objectives. Contractor performance exceeds expectations of performance as set within Performance Objectives identified for each Goal or within other areas within the purview of the Goal, with some notable areas of increased performance identified. Minor deficiencies, if any, noted are offset by the positive performance within the purview of the Goal being evaluated with little or no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.	94%
B+	Very Good	3.4-3.1	Contractor has exceeded many of the significant award-fee Goals and Objectives and has met overall cost, schedule and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured in the PEMP for the award-fee evaluation period. Contractor performance exceeds many expectations of performance as set within Performance Objectives identified for the Goal. Contractor performance that does not meet expectations is identified, but is offset by positive performance within the purview of the Goal and has little to no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.	90%
B	Very Good	3.0-2.8	Contractor has exceeded many of the significant award-fee Goals and Objectives and has met overall cost, schedule and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured in the PEMP for the award-fee evaluation period. Contractor performance meets most identified expectations as set within Performance Objectives identified for the Goal. Minor deficiencies, if any, identified are offset by other exceptional performance within the Goal being evaluated and have little to no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.	84%

Letter Grade	Adjectival Rating	Numeric Range	Definition	Award-Fee Pool Available To Be Earned
B-	Very Good	2.7-2.5	Contractor has exceeded many of the significant award-fee Goals and Objectives and has met overall cost, schedule and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured in the PEMP for the award-fee evaluation period. However, one or two expectations of performance within the Performance Objectives identified for some desired Goals are not met and/or minor deficiencies are identified, and although they may be offset by other positive performance, they have some potential to adversely impact the Goal or the mission of the Laboratory.	76%
C+	Good	2.4-2.1	Contractor has exceeded some of the significant award-fee Goals and Objectives and has met overall cost, schedule and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured in the PEMP for the award-fee evaluation period. However, some expectations of performance set within Performance Objectives identified for some desired Goals are not met and/or other deficiencies are identified, and although they may be offset by other positive performance, they have the potential to adversely impact the desired Goal or the mission of the Laboratory.	51-75%
C	Satisfactory	2.0-1.8	Contractor has met overall cost, schedule and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured in the PEMP for the award-fee evaluation period. Either there are little or no areas of notable contractor performance or the areas of notable performance are offset by the performance that does not meet expectations, and/or several other deficiencies are identified. Deficiencies have the potential to adversely impact the desired Goal or mission of the Laboratory.	No Greater than 50%
C-	Unsatisfactory	1.7-1.1	Contractor has failed to meet Goals and Objectives and overall cost, schedule and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured in the PEMP for the award-fee evaluation period. Many expectations as set within Performance Objectives identified for Goals are not met and/or other significant deficiencies are identified that have or will have an adverse impact on the Goal or the mission of the Laboratory if not immediately corrected.	0%

Letter Grade	Adjectival Rating	Numeric Range	Definition	Award-Fee Pool Available To Be Earned
D	Unsatisfactory	1.0-0.8	Contractor has failed to meet Goals and Objectives and overall cost, schedule and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured in the PEMP for the award-fee evaluation period. Most or all expectations as set within Performance Objectives identified for Goals are not met and/or other major deficiencies are identified that have adversely impacted the Goal or the mission of the Laboratory.	0%
F	Unsatisfactory	0.7-0	Contractor has failed to meet Goals and Objectives and overall cost, schedule and technical performance requirements of the contract in the aggregate as defined and measured in the PEMP for the award-fee evaluation period. However, most or all expectations as set within Performance Objectives identified for Goals are not met and/or other major deficiencies are identified that have a significant, adverse impact on both the Goal and the mission of the Laboratory.	0%

Calculating Individual Goal Scores and Letter Grades

The scoring system used to arrive at the fee determination for INL performance is described below.

- Each PEMP Performance Goal contains a number of PEMP Objectives and associated Notable Outcomes. PEMP Objectives are graded by evaluating the criteria for each and assigning each of the Objectives a letter grade.
- In accordance with Figure 2: Letter Grade Scale, each Objective is given a Numerical Score from the corresponding range.
- The Numerical Score is then multiplied by the corresponding weight of the Objective to reach a Weighted Score for the Objective.
- The Weighted Scores for each Objective are then rounded to the nearest hundredth. The rounded scores are then summed to reach a Numerical Score for the Goal. (Example: See Table 1.2 below)

Table 1.2 Example

GOAL 1.0 Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment					
Objectives		Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Weighted Score
1.1	Nuclear Energy	A	3.9	50%	1.95

GOAL 1.0 Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment					
Objectives		**Letter Grade**	**Numerical Score**	**Objective Weight**	**Weighted Score**
1.2	National and Homeland Security	A	3.9	35%	1.37
1.3	Science and Technology Addressing Broad DOE Missions	A-	3.6	15%	0.54
				Numerical Score for Goal 1.0	**3.86**

After a Numerical Score is calculated for each PEMP Goal, the scores are then transferred to Figure 4 (see example below). The Numerical Score for each Goal is multiplied by its corresponding weight to determine the Weighted Score for each Goal. The Weighted Scores are rounded to the nearest hundredth and summed to reach Total Numerical Scores for Goals 1.0 – 3.0 and for Goals 4.0 – 7.0.

Figure 4. Performance Goal Calculations

Performance Goals		**Numerical Score**	**Weight**	**Weighted Score**
1.0	Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment	3.86	60%	2.32
2.0	Efficient and Effective Stewardship and Operation of Research Facilities	3.67	20%	0.73
3.0	Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory	3.75	20%	0.75
			Total Numerical Score (1.0, 2.0, 3.0)	**3.8**
4.0	Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health and Environmental Protection	3.60	30%	1.08
5.0	Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission(s)	3.80	25%	0.95
6.0	Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs	3.62	20%	0.72
7.0	Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM) and Emergency Management Systems	3.71	25%	0.93
			Total Numerical Score (4.0, 5.0, 6.0, 7.0)	**3.68**

Determining the Amount of Performance-Based Fee Earned

In order to determine the amount fee earned, Figure 5 (below) is completed, which provides a summary of the fee determination results.

- The Total Numerical Score for Goals 1.0 – 3.0 (rounded to the nearest tenth) is entered into Figure 5 (see example below).
- The corresponding Fee Percentage is derived from Figure 6 below, utilizing the Total Numerical Score.
- The Fee Multiplier is derived from Figure 6 below utilizing the Total Numerical Score for Goals 4.0 – 7.0.
- The Overall Earned Performance-Based Fee percentage is calculated by multiplying the Fee Percentage by the Fee Multiplier.
- The Overall Earned Performance-Based Fee dollar value is calculated by multiplying the Overall Earned Performance-Base Fee percentage by the total available fee pool of $20M.
- The Final Letter Grade is derived from Figure 3 utilizing the Overall Earned Performance-Base Fee percentage.
- The Final FAR 16 Adjectival Rating is derived from Figure 1 utilizing the Overall Earned Performance-Based Fee percentage.

Figure 5. Overall Fee Earned and Final Grade Determination

Total Numerical Score (Goals 1.0, 2.0 and 3.0) from Figure 4	3.8
Fee Percentage (Goals 1.0, 2.0 and 3.0) from Figure 6	97%
Fee Multiplier (Goals 4.0, 5.0, 6.0 and 7.0) from Figure 6	x 100%
Overall Earned Performance-Based Fee %	97%
Overall Earned Performance-Based Fee $ (overall earned fee % x total available fee pool)	$19,400,000
Final Letter Grade (Figure 3. General Letter Grade, Adjectival Rating, Numeric Range, Definition, and Award-Fee Pool Available To Be Earned)	A
Final FAR 16 Adjectival Rating (Figure 1. FAR 61-1 Contractor Adjectival Rating and Award-Fee Available Scale)	Excellent

Figure 6. Performance-Based Fee Earned and Multiplier Scale

Overall Weighted Score from Figure 4.	Percent Fee Earned (1.0, 2.0 and 3.0)	Fee Multiplier (4.0, 5.0, 6.0 and 7.0)
4.3	100%	100%
4.2		
4.1		
4.0	97%	100%
3.9		
3.8		
3.7	94%	100%
3.6		
3.5		
3.4	90%	100%
3.3		
3.2		
3.1		
3.0	88%	95%
2.9		
2.8		
2.7	85%	90%
2.6		
2.5		
2.4	75%	85%
2.3		
2.2		
2.1		
2.0	50%	75%
1.9		
1.8		

Overall Weighted Score from Figure 4.	Percent Fee Earned (1.0, 2.0 and 3.0)	Fee Multiplier (4.0, 5.0, 6.0 and 7.0)
1.7	0%	60%
1.6		
1.5		
1.4		
1.3		
1.2		
1.1		
1.0 to 0.8	0%	0%
0.7 to 0.0	0%	0%

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

Although evaluation of Performance Goal 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 an Objective, operational awareness (daily oversight) activities, "For Cause" reviews (if any), peer reviews, and other outside agency reviews (OIG and the GAO, etc.) may be used in determining INL's overall success in meeting an Objective. In addition, DOE will adjust performance scores in areas where external factors prevent INL from meeting established Objectives and Notable Outcomes that are beyond the control of INL.

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

The lack of Performance Objectives and Notable Outcomes in this plan, do not diminish the need to comply with minimum contractual requirements. Although the Performance-based Goals and their corresponding Objectives shall be the primary means utilized in determining the Contractor's performance grade and/or amount of performance-based fee earned, the Contracting Officer may unilaterally adjust the rating and/or reduce the otherwise earned fee based on the Contractor's performance against all contract requirements as set forth in the Prime Contract.

While reductions may be based on performance against any contract requirement, specific note should be made to contract clauses which address reduction of fee including, Standards of Contractor Performance Evaluation, DEAR 970.5215-1 – Total Available Fee: Base Fee Amount and Performance Fee Amount, and DEAR 970.5215-3 Conditional Payment of Fee, Profit, and Other Incentives – Facility Management Contracts. Data to support rating and/or fee adjustments may be derived from other sources to include, but not limited to, operational awareness (daily oversight) activities; "For Cause" reviews (if any); and other outside agency reviews (OIG, GAO, DCAA, etc.), as needed.

The adjustment of a grade and/or reduction of otherwise earned fee will be determined by the severity of the performance failure and consideration of mitigating factors. DEAR 970.5215-3 Conditional Payment of Fee, Profit, and Other Incentives – Facility Management Contracts is the mechanism used for reduction of fee as it relates to performance failures related to safeguarding of classified information and to adequate protection of environment, health, and safety. Its guidance can also serve as an example for reduction of fee in other areas.

The final Contractor performance-based grades for each Goal and fee earned determination will be contained within a year-end report, documenting the results from the DOE review. The report will identify areas where performance improvement is necessary and, if required, provide the basis for any performance-based rating and/or fee adjustments made from the otherwise earned rating/fee based on Performance Goal achievements.

Performance Status Reporting and Evaluation Process

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

Status of performance will be provided by both DOE and INL on a monthly, bi-monthly, quarterly and/or semi-annual basis as required. Areas of disagreement will be highlighted and addressed. Performance Status Reviews will be conducted periodically as agreed upon by DOE and INL and may be held in lieu of a monthly report. INL is responsible for defining and coordinating the process for conducting the reviews and to ensure the involvement of appropriate DOE and INL counterparts. Reviews will focus on PEMP Objectives and Notable Outcomes as well as other performance expectations.

On an annual basis, INL may conduct a formal self-evaluation of its performance relative to each Performance Goal, PEMP Objective, and associated Notable Outcomes. If INL decides to provide DOE with a written report documenting the self-evaluation, it should be provided to DOE within ten (10) calendar days after the end of the performance period.

In addition to monthly reporting, DOE will perform and document a final evaluation of INL's performance relative to each Performance Goal, PEMP Objective, and Notable Outcome and will provide a final fee determination.

The absence of specific Performance Objectives in this plan does not diminish the need to comply with contractual requirements. The Fee Determination Official (FDO) may unilaterally adjust the fee earned based on the contractor's performance against all contract requirements. It is recognized that at the discretion of the FDO, fee earned may be adjusted upward (not to exceed total eligible fee) based on the Contractor delivering strategic value for real and relevant performance not otherwise specified in the PEMP. Data to support downward fee adjustments may be derived from other sources to include, but not limited to, operational awareness (daily oversight) activities; "For Cause" reviews (if any); other outside agency reviews (OIG, GAO, DCAA, etc.), significant events or incidents within the control of the contractor, or other reviews as appropriate. The FDO may utilize, as appropriate, the definitions to assist in making unilateral adjustment decisions.

Definitions:

PEMP Performance Goals: These are the seven topical areas that are used to group the PEMP Objectives. They are:

GOAL 1.0 Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment;
GOAL 2.0 Efficient and Effective Stewardship and Operation of Research Facilities;
GOAL 3.0 Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory;
GOAL 4.0 Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health and Environmental Protection;
GOAL 5.0 Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission(s);
GOAL 6.0 Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs; and
GOAL 7.0 Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM) and Emergency Management Systems.

PEMP Objectives: Objectives that have been agreed upon by INL and DOE for encouraging Contractor performance. PEMP Objectives are part of and make up the PEMP Goals. The grade and numerical score for each Objective will be determined using the definitions in the grading table assigned for each Performance Goal. Performance that meets DOE's expectations is defined as the grade of B+ for each Objective. Grades for Objectives range between A+ and F.

Notable Outcome: A Notable Outcome is intended to focus INL on the specific items that DOE identifies as the most important initiative and/or highest risk issues the INL must address in the coming year. To develop Notable Outcomes, DOE should consider critical priorities and commitments and/or other high-priority site documents and plans. Notable Outcomes must be clearly linked to one or more Objectives but are not required for all Objectives. Notable Outcomes should be objective, measurable, and results-oriented to allow for a definitive determination at the end of the year of whether or not the specific Outcome was achieved.

Notable Outcomes should not re-state general expectations already described in the Objective and subjective wording should be avoided. Notable Outcomes shall not be weighted. Notable Outcomes are either met, or not met; they are not given a numerical score or a letter grade at the end of the fiscal year.

Change Control:

The FY 2026 PEMP was developed with the understanding that both parties engaged in good faith to define meaningful and challenging outcomes for success. It is also recognized that circumstances may arise in the course of the execution year that warrant a revisit of the agreed upon Performance Objectives. 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.