FY 2009

Government Performance Evaluation of Iowa State University for the Management and Operations of the Ames Laboratory

I. OVERALL SUMMARY RATING/FEE

Performance-Based Score and Adjectival Rating:

The basis for the evaluation of Iowa State University management and operations of the Ames Laboratory during FY 2009 centered on the Objectives found within the following Performance Goals:

1.0 Provide for Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment (Quality, Productivity, Leadership, & Timeliness of Research and Development)

2.0 Provide for Efficient and Effective Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operations of Research Facilities

3.0 Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Research Project/Program Management

4.0 Provide Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory

5.0 Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection

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

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

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

Each Performance Goal was composed of two or more weighted Objectives and most Objectives had a set of performance measures, which assisted in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each of the performance measures identified significant activities, requirements, and/or milestones important to the success of the corresponding Objective. The following describes the methodology utilized in determining the Contractor performance rating.

Each Objective within a Goal was assigned a numerical score by the evaluating office. Each evaluation measured the degree of effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in meeting the Objective and was based on the Contractor's success in meeting the set of Performance Measures/Targets identified for each Objective as well as other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources to include, but not limited to, the Contractor's self-evaluation report, operational awareness (daily oversight) activities; "For Cause" reviews (if any); other outside agency reviews (OIG, GAO, DCAA, etc.), and the annual 2-week review (if needed). If no performance measures/targets were utilized the description of the general expectations for the success of the objective was utilized as the baseline of the effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in meeting the corresponding Objective and in determining the score assigned. The Goal score was then computed by multiplying the numerical score by the weight of each Objective within a Goal. These values were then added together to develop an overall score for each Goal. This score was then compared to Table A to determine

the overall grade for each Goal. A set of tables is provided at the end of each Performance Goal section of this document to assist in the calculation of Objective scores to the Goal score. The raw score (rounded to the nearest hundredth) from each calculation was carried through to the next stage of the calculation process. The raw score for Science and Technology and Management and Operations was rounded to the nearest tenth of a point for utilization in determining fee as discussed below. A standard rounding convention of x.44 and less rounds down to the nearest tenth (here, x.4), while x.45 and greater rounds up to the nearest tenth (here, x.50).

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**

Table A. FY 2009 Contractor Letter Grade Scale

Based on the evaluation of Iowa State University performance against the Goals and Objectives contained within the FY 2009 Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan (PEMP) the scores and corresponding grades awarded for each are provided within Table B below. Specific information regarding the Contractor's performance in meeting each of the Goals and their corresponding Objectives is provided within Section II of this report.

S&T Performance Goal	**Numerical Score**	**Letter Grade**	**Weight**	**Weighted Score**	**Total Score**
1.0 Mission Accomplishment	**3.4**	**B+**	**65%**	**2.2**	
2.0 Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operations of Facilities	**N/A**		**N/A**		
3.0 Science and Technology Research Project/Program Management	**3.7**	**A-**	**35%**	**1.3**	
Total Score					**3.5**
M&O Performance Goal	**Numerical Score**	**Letter Grade**	**Weight**	**Weighted Score**	**Total Score**
4.0 Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory	**3.3**	**B+**	**20%**	**.66**	
5.0 Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection	**3.4**	**B+**	**30%**	**1.02**	
6.0 Business Systems	**3.4**	**B+**	**20%**	**.68**	
7.0 Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio	**3.5**	**A-**	**20%**	**.70**	
8.0 Integrated Safeguards and Security Management and Emergency Management Systems	**3.4**	**B+**	**10%**	**.34**	
Total Score					**3.4**

Table B. FY 2009 Contractor Evaluation Score Calculation

Performance-Based Fee Earned:
Utilizing Table B, above, the scores for each of the Science and Technology (S&T) Goals and Management and Operations (M&O) Goals were multiplied by the weight assigned and these were summed to provide an overall score for each. The percentage of the available performance-based fee that was earned by the Contractor was determined based on the overall weighted score for the S&T Goals (see Table B.) and then compared to Table C. below. The overall numerical score of the M&O Goals from Table B. was then utilized to determine the final fee multiplier (see Table C.), which was utilized to determine the overall amount of performance-based fee earned for FY 2009 as calculated within Table D. Performance Fee available this period is $335,000. Based on the overall performance within the S&T and M&O Goals the Contractor is awarded $314,900 in performance based fee for FY 2009.

Overall Weighted Score from Table A.	Percent S&T Fee Earned	M&O Fee Multiplier
4.3	100%	100%
4.2		
4.1		
4.0	97%	100%
3.9		
3.8		
3.7	94%	100%
3.6		
3.5		
3.4	91%	100%
3.3		
3.2		
3.1		
3.0	88%	95%
2.9		
2.8		
2.7	85%	90%
2.6		
2.5		
2.4	75%	85%
2.3		
2.2		
2.1		
2.0	50%	75%
1.9		
1.8		
1.7	0%	60%
1.6		
1.5		
1.4		
1.3		
1.2		
1.1		
1.0 to 0.8	0%	0%
0.7 to 0.0	0%	0%

Table C. - Performance-Based Fee Earned Scale

2009 Overall Fee Determination	
Percent S&T Fee Earned from Table C.	**94%**
M&O Fee Multiplier from Table C.	**100%**
Overall Earned Performance-Based Fee	**$314,900**

Table D. – Final Percentage of Performance-Based Fee Earned Determination

II. PERFORMANCE GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND MEASURES/TARGETS

Goal 1.0: Provide for Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment (Quality, Productivity, Leadership, & Timeliness of Research and Development)

This Goal measures the degree to which the Contractor produces high-quality, original, and creative results that advance science and technology; demonstrates sustained scientific progress and impact; receives appropriate external recognition of accomplishments; and contributes to overall research and development goals of the Department and its customers. The weight of this Goal is 65%.

The overall score assigned to Goal 1 is 3.4, which equates to a grade of a high B+. The two evaluating program offices sponsoring research at Ames Laboratory are: Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES); and Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS). BES is the largest sponsor, providing 98.8% of the total funding.

The following Goal 1 summary input was provided by each Program Office:

BES – Weighted Score: 3.4 / B+

Ongoing programs in catalysis science, separations and analysis, and chemical physics were productive and well recognized nationally and internationally. A review of materials sciences programs highlighted the unique strength of the laboratory in materials preparation and crystal growth, while noting issues with specific programs.

- **The program, Extraordinary Responsive Magnetic Rare Earth Materials, reviewed very well with recognition as world-class and the team as world-leading. Other programs reviewed well, while two programs were terminated as reviewers felt that the programs were not sufficiently distinguished compared to similar work around the world.**

- **The senior principal investigators of programs supported by the BES Chemical Sciences, Geosciences, and Biosciences Division have national and international recognition that resulted in strong productivity and significant publications in FY 2009.**

- **Ames Laboratory was not awarded any of the 46 Energy Frontier Research Centers (EFRCs) or 95 Single-Investigator and Small-Group Research (SISGR) projects awarded by BES in FY2009.**

WDTS – Weighted Score: 3.4 / B+

- **Ames uses the WDTS program to provide a high quality science education experience and places research interns and educations where they are capable of assisting the PIs through research contribution.**
- **Ames considers WDTS program as potential pipeline activities where participants are requires to become deeply immersed in their own science experience and become fully aware of the DOE research enterprise and anticipate other opportunities and career choices with DOE.**

- **Ames ensures that all participants have the resources and individual attention required to feel successful in the research experience and are able to communicate research accomplishments through abstracts, posters and or full length papers.**

Ames has focused attention in positioning the undergraduates and as valued part of lab. They encourage participants to inquiry about research among many divisions, to attending a wide variety of lectures and workshops and to be an active communicator about their research and how it fits into a larger research effort.

1.1 Science and Technology Results Provide Meaningful Impact on the Field

The following input for Objective 1.1 was provided by each Program Office:

BES – Score/Grade: 3.4/ B+

Ongoing programs supported by the BES Chemical Sciences, Geosciences, and Biosciences (CSGB) Division in catalysis science, separations and analysis, and chemical physics were not reviewed in FY 2009; they continue to be productive and well recognized nationally and internationally.

Five of the ongoing programs supported by the BES Materials Sciences and Engineering (MSE) Division were reviewed in FY 2009 following a mail review and restructuring in FY 2007. Two programs were terminated as a consequence of the review; in both cases the reviewers felt that the programs were not sufficiently distinguished compared to similar work around the world. The program, Extraordinary Responsive Magnetic Rare Earth Materials, reviewed very well with recognition as world-class and the team as world-leading. Overall, the review participants were impressed with the experimental facilities at Ames Laboratory, particularly in the area of materials preparation. Reviewers praised the unique strength of the laboratory in materials preparation and crystal growth and the strong component of academic activity in training and educating young scientists. The laboratory responded appropriately to reviewer comments on the remaining two programs.

WDTS – Score/Grade: 3.4/ B+

The education office continues to pursue raising the visibility of the WDTS program throughout the laboratory by ensuring that all participants meet the required deliverable of quality abstracts of their research and making poster presentations for laboratory and external audiences.
WDTS interns are encouraged to present their research back at their home institution and provide copies of their abstracts to their college/university department chair.

1.2 Provide Quality Leadership in Science and Technology

The following input for Objective 1.2 was provided by each Program Office:

BES – Score/Grade: 3.3/ B+

The senior principal investigators of programs supported by the BES CSGB Division have national and international recognition that resulted in strong productivity and significant publications in FY 2009.

Many of the senior principal investigators of programs supported by the BES MSE Division had national, and in some cases, international recognition for excellence. However, the loss of the senior scientific leadership is a serious concern.

Ames Laboratory was one of the few DOE laboratories not to be awarded any of the 46 Energy Frontier Research Centers (EFRCs) or 95 Single-Investigator and Small-Group Research (SISGR) projects awarded by BES in FY 2009.

WDTS – Score/Grade: 3.4/ B+

The education office ensures a quality intern research experience in the laboratories' core competencies by recruiting participants within those research areas and closely monitoring progress to be sure that they are capable and confident to contribute to the research.

1.3 Provide and sustain Science and Technology Outputs that Advance Program Objectives and Goals

The following input for Objective 1.3 was provided by each Program Office:

BES – Score/Grade: 3.4/ B+

Overall, the quantity and quality of research outputs in peer-reviewed journals for the programs supported by the BES CSGB Division were acceptable.

Though two programs at the laboratory were recently terminated, the output of the remaining programs supported by the BES MSE Division is very good. The laboratory's materials preparation group continues to supply researchers worldwide with quality materials.

WDTS – Score/Grade: 3.4/ B+

The education office recruits well qualified interns and educators. They have well validated review and selection process with a goal of matching applicant and mentor in a research experience where the need of both can be met. Laboratory research mentors are involved in the selection process where both the PI and the division director must agree a potential intern is deserving and capable to work in the division.

1.4 Provide for Effective Delivery of Science and Technology

The following input for Objective 1.4 was provided by each Program Office:

BES – Score/Grade: 3.4/B+

BES CSGB Division supported research programs were effective in meeting scientific objectives and milestones. The programs were responsive to requests from BES for information and research highlights.

BES MSE Division supported research projects were effective in meeting scientific objectives and milestones. The projects were responsive to requests from BES for information and research highlights.

WDTS - Score/Grade: 3.5/ A-

The education office significantly improves the management of the WDTS programs from year to year by disciplined program planning, focusing on incorporating lessons learned, and collaborating with other science education offices in employing best practices.

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Basic Energy Sciences					
1.1 Impact	B+	3.4	50%	1.7	
1.2 Leadership	B+	3.3	20%	.66	
1.3 Output	B+	3.4	15%	.51	
1.4 Delivery	B+	3.4	15%	.51	
Overall BES Total					3.38
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists					
1.1 Impact	B+	3.4	25%	.85	
1.2 Leadership	B+	3.4	30%	1.02	
1.3 Output	B+	3.4	30%	1.02	
1.4 Delivery	A-	3.5	15%	.53	
Overall WDTS Total					3.42

Table 1.1 – SC Program Office Performance Goal 1.0 Score Development

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Basic Energy Sciences	B+	3.38	98.8%	3.34	
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists	B+	3.42	1.2%	.04	
Performance Goal 1.0 Total					3.4

Table 1.2 – SC Program Office Overall Performance Goal 1.0 Score Development

Goal 2.0: Provide for Efficient and Effective Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operations of Facilities

Note: GOAL 2.0 AND CORRESPONDING OBJECTIVES WERE NOT WEIGHTED OR ASSESSED FOR THE FY 2009 RATING PERIOD.

Goal 3: Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Research Project/ Program Management

This goal measures the degree to which the Contractor provides effective program vision and leadership; strategic planning and development of initiatives; recruits and retains a quality scientific workforce; and provides outstanding research processes, which improve research productivity. The weight of this Goal is 33%.

The overall score assigned to Goal 3 is 3.7, which equates to a grade of a high A-. The two evaluating program offices sponsoring research at Ames Laboratory are: Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES); and Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS). BES is the largest sponsor, providing over 98% of the total funding.

The following Goal 3 summary input was provided by each Program Office:

BES – Weighted Score: 3.7/ A-

The overall vision for sponsored research in catalysis science, separations and analysis, and chemical physics at Ames Laboratory is reasonable, given its relatively limited scope. The scientific vision for materials sciences sponsored research at Ames Laboratory is still being developed following the recent change in Laboratory Director and the loss of the leader of the Ames Science and Technology Division from senior management.

- **Ames has presented a strong management plan for materials sciences supported programs that were recently restructured. In particular, Ames is moving forward with strong coupling of their highly visible materials preparation capability with their research on new materials.**

- **The laboratory drafted a Scientific Strategic Plan, including a vision statement, but it has not been presented to BES in final form.**

- **Ames management presented BES with a reasonable plan for the future of the Analysis program. The program has been a traditional strength at Ames Laboratory but is undergoing a significant change in scientific leadership.**

WDTS – Weighted Score: 3.6/A-

- **The staff at Ames's education program office is a highly motivated, collaborative, well managed team that works continually to integrate workforce development into the goals of the laboratory. They are clear in communicating the roles/ responsibilities, and deliverable to the interns, the research division, and the PIs. They work successfully with each party to ensure each are fully contributing to a quality research experience.**

- **The WDTS supported programs are gaining prestige within the laboratory as a result of effective management, commitment of the staff, and continuing to seek opportunities for program improvement.**
- **The Ames education office is a very visible community partner and advocate for science education at the middle/high school level and manages an excellent regional Science Bowl.**

Science knowledge transfer from mentor to mentee is validated by coauthored peer reviewed abstracts required of all interns. Interns are provided an excellent laboratory experience with technical support to accomplish their research, technical writing support to complete publishable research papers, and fully integrate into the laboratory culture. Ames has goal is to encourage and prepare students to pursue a career at a DOE.

3.1 Provide Effective and Efficient Stewardship of Scientific Capabilities and Program Vision

BES – Score/Grade: 3.6/ B+

The overall vision for the BES CSGB Division sponsored research at Ames Laboratory is reasonable, given its relatively limited scope.
The overall vision for the BES MSE Division sponsored research at Ames Laboratory is still being developed following the recent change in Laboratory Director and the loss of the leader of the Ames Science and Technology Division from senior management. The laboratory drafted a Scientific Strategic Plan, including a vision statement, but it has not been presented to BES in final form.

WDTS – Score/Grade: 3.4/ B+

Ames research interns are recognized for their accomplishments by having papers accepted by scientific journals, by presenting at AAAS, and by having posters presented at the Science & Energy Research Challenge (SERCh), which features 100 top science students from colleges and universities around the country, including historically black colleges and universities and minority education institutions.

3.2 Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Project/Program Planning and Management

BES – Score/Grade: 3.7/ A-

Ames management presented the BES CSGB Division with a reasonable plan for the future of the Analysis program. The program has been a traditional strength at Ames Laboratory but is undergoing a significant change in scientific leadership.

The departure of the Division Director for Science and Technology is a serious loss for the senior management at the laboratory. It is recognized that a search is underway for a replacement.

Ames has presented a strong management plan for BES MSE Division supported programs that were recently restructured. In particular, Ames is moving forward with strong coupling of their highly visible materials preparation capability with their research on new materials.

WDTS – Score/Grade: 3.6 A-

The education office does a complete self-assessment each year as required by WDTS. They are very credible in listing their strengths and weaknesses and then focus resources on eliminating weak spots. They use the results of both mentor and participant survey as the bases for program improvement and monitor improvement.

3.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Communications and Responsiveness to Customer Needs

BES – Score/Grade: 3.7 A-

Programs supported by BES CSGB and MSE Divisions were generally responsive and communicate well.

WDTS – Score/Grade: 3.7/ A-

DTS has very efficient and effective communication interactions with the education office. Their program managers seek and offer suggested guidance frequently. They use the formal reporting requirements, which are always timely, and the frequent request for feedback on program milestone to ensure HQ and laboratory are in agreement on the high quality of deliverables.

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Basic Energy Sciences					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship	**A-**	**3.6**	**40%**	**1.44**	
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management	**A-**	**3.7**	**30%**	**1.11**	
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness	**A-**	**3.7**	**30%**	**1.11**	
Overall BES Total					**3.66**
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship	**B+**	**3.4**	**20%**	**.68**	
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management	**A-**	**3.6**	**40%**	**1.44**	
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness	**A-**	**3.7**	**40%**	**1.48**	
Overall WDTS Total					**3.6**

Table 3.1 – 3.0 SC Program Office Performance Goal 3.0 Score Development

Science Program Office	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Basic Energy Sciences	**A-**	**3.66**	**98.8**	**3.62**	
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists	**A-**	**3.6**	**1.2%**	**.04**	
Performance Goal 1.0 Total					**3.7**

Table 3.2 – SC Program Office Overall Performance Goal 3.0 Score Development

Goal 4.0 Provide Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory

The Contractor's Leadership provides effective and efficient direction in strategic planning to meet the mission and vision of the overall Laboratory; is accountable and responsive to specific issues and needs when required; and corporate office leadership provides appropriate levels of resources and support for the overall success of the Laboratory. The weight of this Goal is 20%.

The overall score assigned to Goal 4 is 3.3, which equates to a letter grade of B+.

As in the previous year, no specific and quantifiable targets were established for Goal 4.0 due to the subjective nature of this goal and the uniqueness and originality of leadership, strategic planning, and management activities. This Goal is shared and evaluated by both the Program offices and the Site Office. No specific written comments were received from the Program office, however some of the comments written above in Goals 1 & 3 reflect the views of the Program office that carry over to this Goal.

Ames Laboratory met the Objectives of this Goal and the following are highlights of their accomplishments:

- **Ames Laboratory Oversight Board (with its external members) has been effective in providing guidance and advice to Laboratory management (e.g. input at the mid-term reviews and on the beryllium contamination issue.) At the time of the new contract in 2006, SC requested that the Contractor establish a Laboratory Oversight Board to provide "external" guidance and expertise. This Board is up and functioning now, with regular meetings.**

- **The Scientific Planning committee developed and released the scientific Strategic Plan, including the new vision and mission statement for the Laboratory, which was well accepted. The Laboratory was responsive to comments in previous years that the Laboratory lacked a clear concise Strategic vision and plan, and responsive to the request to have the senior leadership strengthen the strategic vision of the laboratory. Also they were asked to better align their organizations with the Science missions, which was accomplished with a re-organization. The Lab Director was instrumental in getting these tasks completed with team players from all parts of the organization.**

- **Laboratory has initiated many opportunities in 2009 to build partnerships. Has conducted meetings with Argonne, Princeton, Brookhaven, NREL, EERE, and State Agencies. The results of such partnerships should be seen in the next years.**

- **Efforts by management and an increase in DOE calls resulted in a significant increase in non-programmatic white papers and proposals submitted by the Ames Laboratory during the year. The increase in proposals submitted should lead to an increase in new work coming into the Lab.**

- **The Laboratory and ISU continued to pursue joint appointments in support of selected research areas, including materials synthesis and catalysis.**

- **Laboratory processes allow for complete review of major risks in order to provide the Management Assurance Letter from the Director.**

- **ISU, the Contractor, continues to their honor commitments made in the contract proposal in an outstanding manner.**

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
4.0 Effectiveness and Efficiency of Contractor Leadership and Stewardship					
4.1 Provide a Distinctive Vision for the Laboratory and an Effective Plan for Accomplishment of the Vision to Include Strong Partnerships Required to Carry Out those Plans	B+	3.3	35%	1.16	
4.2 Provide for Responsive and Accountable Leadership throughout the Organization	B+	3.3	30%	.99	
4.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Contractor Support	B+	3.3	35%	1.16	
Performance Goal 4.0 Total					3.3

Table 4.1: 4.0 Goal Performance Rating Development

Goal 5.0: <u>Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection</u>

The Contractor sustains and enhances the effectiveness of integrated safety, health and environmental protection through a strong and well deployed system. The weight of this Goal is 30%.

The overall score assigned to Goal 5 is 3.4, which equates to a letter grade of a high B+. Ames Laboratory has met the Objectives/Targets of this Goal and the following are highlights of their accomplishments:

- **Support from upper management is the cornerstone of the Ames Laboratory's successful safety culture as demonstrated in the handling of the Beryllium issue. Ensuring that workers are not being exposed and has bringing in expertise to assist in the analysis and determination of the direction needed to resolve the issues.**

- **The strength of Ames Laboratory's Readiness Review process is that it fosters open communication amongst laboratory personnel. Line management, workers and safety professionals works closely together in developing standard safe operating procedures.**

- **Ames conducts a thorough analysis of all accidents, injuries and near miss events is responsible for the low DART and TRC rates and lack of repeated events. Due to the relatively small size of its workforce, Ames cannot experience more than a single**

DART case or two TRCs before they are above the SC thresholds for these statistics. They have been successfully below or near these thresholds for the last four years.

- **The many opportunities for worker feedback and interactions with professionals have resulted in a high level of safety in the performance of work.**

- **The quality and consistency of the Ames Laboratory's internal topical appraisals continues to improve and have resulted in a significant reduction the number of Level 2 findings from external reviews.**

- **Ames Laboratory's readiness review process has successfully reduced the quantity of hazardous wastes generated.**

- **TCAP review (5/2009) Overall, the structure of Ames Laboratory's packaging and transportation program is good. Ames Laboratory's use of excepted and limited quantity shipments is well done and is consistent with the DOE regulations related to shipping materials using the lowest cost alternative when possible. In addition, staff demonstrated competence and an overall understanding of packaging and transportation requirements as related to their day-to-day activities.**

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
5.0 Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection					
5.1 Provide a Work Environment that Protects Workers and the Environment	A-	3.6	35%	1.26	
5.2 Provide Efficient and Effective Implementation of Integrated Safety, Health and Environment Management	B+	3.4	35%	1.19	
5.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Waste Management, Minimization, and Pollution Prevention	B+	3.3	30%	.99	
Performance Goal 5.0 Total					3.44

Table 5.1 – Goal 5.0 Performance Rating Development

Goal 6.0: <u>Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission(s) Goal.</u>

The Contractor sustains and enhances core business systems that provide efficient and effective support to Laboratory programs and its mission(s). The weight of this Goal is 20%.

The overall score assigned to Goal 6 is 3.4, which equates to a grade of high B+. Ames Laboratory met the Objectives of this Goal and the following are highlights of their accomplishments (which cover many business areas):

• All Integrated Contractor Summary of Collections have been submitted early and successfully before noon on the first workday of the month to DOE HQ.

• All STARS reports for FY 2009 have been submitted early and successfully on the first day of the month to DOE headquarters.

• The Laboratory submitted adequate cost or pricing data and prepared its budget IAW the Contract terms and conditions.

• No issues regarding the Laboratory's budget formulation. The Laboratory's FY 2011 budget submission was submitted in a timely manner. With respect to the Laboratory's FY 2011 budget validation, through sampling, we are satisfied that overall the FY 2011 budget was submitted in a professional manner and adequately documented.

• The Laboratory had no cost overruns or material suspense items in STARS and did not exceed available funds at the detail reporting level.

• The IG conducted an audit of the payroll systems and related information systems as a subset of the audit of DOE's financial statements for FY2008 and no material weaknesses were noted. Corrective actions for audit findings have been completed within agreed upon schedules.

• Joint review of WFO ledger balances by CH Field Office and the Laboratory revealed no material differences

• The Purchasing Department regularly meets with customers, interacts with local business, and management to assure that products purchased meet the necessary levels of quality. The surveys verified nearly a 100% customer satisfaction in the services and products ordered.

• The Procurement Office has shown a high degree of cooperation with DOE. The Procurement staff has consistently presented timely and accurate documentation. The Procurement Office has shown great proficiency in supplying large amounts of data request to the DOE HQ office and the Ames Site Office.

• A major accomplishment completed this year was the DOE approval of all ISU - specific subcontract clause sets. The work that went into reviewing, correcting and finally approval the clause set showed and tremendous amount of teamwork and created a clause set that is particular for ISU.

• Ames Lab exceeded FY 2009 Procurement Balance Scorecard (PBS) target levels. The Laboratory successfully met 12 of the 14 core measures within the PBS.

• The Property Balanced Scorecard successfully met 92.3% of its targets.

• A five person committee of Professional and Scientific personnel, which included the HR Director, reviewed the current HR policies and procedures and found them acceptable with form change, which has been in place for several years. The Lab continues to use a somewhat unique approach that requires narrative evaluation at the measure level without a roll-up to an overall rating. Recommendations will be provided

to Laboratory Management in the near future with implementation of recommendations to occur for the 7/1/09 0 6/30/10 rating period. Additionally, 91% of P&S staff received formal ratings. This exceeded the target of 75%. Since ISU does not approach rating the same as the Ames Laboratory, and several employees are joint appointments with the University, this was a significant accomplishment and reflects the Senior Leadership support of documenting performance and linking pay decisions to it.

• The Ames Laboratory management provided sound and acceptable justification to ISU/State of Iowa on the need to provide salary increases linked to performance, although the State froze salaries due for budgetary concerns. Since the Laboratory's pay is lined up with the University this is a noteworthy accomplishment that reflected the Laboratory's ability to deviate from existing ISU/State pay policies and procedures.

• The HR 25% target for the review of position descriptions was slightly exceeded in that 28% were reviewed during the rating period.

• The Laboratory prepared its Communications plan on schedule and then executed it very well. The quantity and quality of focused. media interactions increased and its communication with DOE was exceeded expectations.

• Also worthy of special note in Public Affairs and Communications, is the creation and implementation of the Lab's Brand Council, which was completed at a fraction of the cost of other branding efforts. In addition, the Laboratory Director's effort to keep internal audiences apprised worked very effectively.

• The Technology Transfer Office (TTO) designed its customer service survey in accordance with DOE's customer survey under DOE G 481.1-1. TTO sent out seven (7) surveys and received two (2) responses from its customers. TTO also sent out follow-up e-mails but still received no response. Overall, the customer surveys rated the Laboratory highly on the administrative as well as the technical performed.

• Continual improvement of services by reviewing customer surveys is an effective approach to maintaining existing customers and winning new ones, especially if your goal is to create a strong word-of-mouth following. According to the self-assessment, TTO distributed the surveys as they did last year by e-mail. They also followed-up to non-responsive survey request by mail and did not receive a response.

• The Director of TT worked with other members of the TTWG Industrial Interactions Committee to design a web-based customer survey that will be implemented on a trial basis (5 Laboratory's including Ames) beginning FY2010 and will report back to the DOE TT Coordinator or the TT Policy Board as to its effectiveness.

• The total WFO level of non DOE funding for FY2009 was over $3.M. Achieving back to back non-DOE funding over $3M indicates a large effort by the Laboratory's proposal efforts. The timely submission and accurate supporting documentation submitted by TTO to the Ames site office and Intellectual Property Law (IPL) resulted in unprecedented completion rates for Technology Transfer approvals from DOE.

• TTO continues to utilize their approved standard CRADA and WFO agreements and works with CH-IPL to resolve IP issues early in the process when non-standard terms are contemplated.

• The contractor managed and reported 16 invention reports and 7 patent applications during the fiscal year. DOE-CH-IPL commends the contractor for keeping IPL appraised of prosecution developments in filed patent applications and providing recommendations for DOE action on those inventions and cases in which the contractor no longer has an interest. The Lab continues to be very responsive to IPL's needs relating to patent applications filed by DOE which have one or more laboratory inventors. All invention disclosures submitted through the I-Edison system continue to be accurate and complete and IPL concludes that the Contractor is providing DOE all intellectual property reports under the Prime Contract. The Contractor continues to exceed expectations by consistently submitting significantly more invention disclosures (and filing more patent applications) than other similarly sized DOE laboratories. The Contractor should be commended on its new streamlined Patent Clearance process that has significantly increased the efficiency of the clearance process.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
6.0 Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission(s)					
6.1 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Financial Management System(s)	A-	3.5	25%	.88	
6.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition	B+	3.3	10%	.33	
6.3 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Property Management System	B+	3.3	10%	.33	
6.4 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Human Resources Management System	A-	3.5	10%	.35	
6.5 Provide Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Management Systems for Internal Audit and Oversight; Quality; Information Management; and Other Administrative Support Services as Appropriate	B+	3.4	25%	.85	
6.6 Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Technology and Commercialization of Intellectual Assets	A-	3.5	20%	.7	
Performance Goal 6.0 Total					3.44

Table 6.1 – 6.0 Goal Performance Rating Development

Goal 7.0: Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs

The Contractor provides appropriate planning for, construction and management of Laboratory facilities and infrastructures required to efficiently and effectively carry out current and future S&T programs. The weight of this Goal is 20%.

Ames Laboratory has met or exceeded the Objectives/Targets of this Goal and the overall score assigned to Goal 7 is 3.5, which equates to a letter grade of A-. The following are highlights of their accomplishments:

- **Ames has accomplished an internal mission readiness evaluation and is prepping for their Peer Review Mission Readiness assessment for FY2011.**
- **Ames exceeded their FY2009 Energy requirements that are outlined in their Comprehensive Energy Plan.**
- **Completed a small ARRA funded General Plant Project (Records Storage Area) under budget and ahead of schedule.**
- **Supported the ESCO on-site proposal activities in a high quality manner. Due to trace beryllium found in the stacks the process has been put on hold.**
- **Ames has done an excellent job with limited funding maintaining their aging facilities by substantially reducing their deferred maintenance and maintaining their facilities at an Asset Condition Index (ACI) of .98**
- **Relatively small (<$1M) annual GPP budget has been managed well to accomplish larger projects over multi-years such as the HVAC project.**

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
7.0 Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs					
7.1 Manage Facilities and Infrastructure in an Efficient and Effective Manner that Optimizes Usage and Minimizes Life Cycle Costs	A-	3.6	80%	2.88	
7.2 Provide Planning for and Acquire the Facilities and Infrastructure Required to support Future Laboratory Programs	B+	3.3	20%	..66	
Performance Goal 7.0 Total					3.5

Table 7.1 – 7.0 Goal Performance Rating Development

Goal 8.0: Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM) and Emergency Management Systems

The Contractor sustains and enhances the effectiveness of integrated safeguards and security and emergency management through a strong and well deployed system. The weight of this Goal is 10%.

Ames Laboratory has met (a few exceeded) the Objectives/Targets of this Goal. The overall score assigned to Goal 8 is 3.4, which equates to a letter grade of a high B+. and the following are highlights of their accomplishments

- **Ames Laboratory met all of the specific measures and targets in the 2009 PEMP.**
- **No major security or emergency management issues are evident at the Laboratory.**
- **The effectiveness of the Lab's ISSM System was verified through the FY 2009 Safeguards & Security Survey, with only one minor finding, a significant improvement from previous external reviews.**
- **Annual walkthroughs continue to be performed to ensure that cyber controls are effectively implemented across programs and departments.**
- **Special Nuclear Materials are maintained at a minimum level.**
-
- **100% of employees received annual cyber security awareness training**
- **Incidents of Concern are identified and processed through the Lab's revised Event Reporting Program.**
- **100% of Foreign Travel trip reports were submitted on time.**
- **A review of the FY-2009 interaction between the Ames Laboratory and the Chicago Field Office (CFO), Office of Intelligence and Counterintelligence has revealed a pattern of consistent adherence to the Counterintelligence Site Support Plan, and a high level of support to our Counterintelligence Officers and the CFO mission. The Laboratory has been critical to successful CI support by coordinating interview requests, supporting CI Awareness, and advocating additional host training for the Unclassified Foreign Visits and Assignments program.**
- **The lab's support to the DOE CI Program has been high across the spectrum of our responsibilities, including incidents of particular note such as early involvement of the CFO when considering a T4 nation visit, a high level of responsiveness in support of the CI cyber program, fostering Ames lab scientist reports of CI concern to the CFO, and encouraging prompt reporting of unsolicited contacts. The Laboratory has fully supported the DOE CI mission during this reporting period.**

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
8.0 Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM)					
8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System	B+	3.4	35%	1.19	
8.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for Cyber-Security	B+	3.4	45%	1.53	
8.3 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Special Nuclear Materials, Classified Matter, and Property	B+	3.4	10%	.34	
8.4 Provide an Efficient and Effective CI System for the Protection of Classified and Sensitive Information	B+	3.4	10%	..34	
Performance Goal 8.0 Total					3.4

Table 8.1 – 8.0 Goal Performance Rating Development