

Nevada Site Office – FY 2012 Performance Evaluation Plan

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Nevada Site Office

Performance Evaluation Plan

For

National Security Technologies, LLC

Contract DE-AC52-06NA25946



Performance Period:

October 1, 2011, through September 30, 2012

Nevada Site Office – FY 2012 Performance Evaluation Plan

NSO CONCURRENCE
SIGNATURE PAGE

The Performance Evaluation Plan (PEP) for FY 2012 for National Security Technologies, LLC (NSTec) under Contract No. DE-AC52-06NA25946 has been coordinated and approved.

NSO Approval:

Signature of Darby Dieterich

Darby A. Dieterich, NNSA/NSO
Contracting Officer

9/29/11
Date

Signature of Steven Lawrence

Stephen A. Mellington, Manager
NNSA/NSO

9.29.11
Date

Nevada Site Office – FY 2012 Performance Evaluation Plan

NSTec ACCEPTANCE
SIGNATURE PAGE

Signature of Stephen Younger
Signature of Stephen Younger
Signature of Stephen Younger

Stephen M. Younger, President

9/28/11

Date

Nevada Site Office – FY 2012 Performance Evaluation Plan

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PLAN (PEP) Nevada Site Office

National Security Technologies, LLC Contract DE-AC52-06NA25946
October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012

I. Introduction

This Performance Evaluation Plan (PEP) sets forth the criteria by which the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) Nevada Site Office (NSO) will appraise National Security Technologies, LLC's (NSTec) performance under Contract DE-AC52-06NA25946 for the period October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012.

The PEP is implemented in accordance with Special Contract Requirements H-8, *Award Term*, H-9, *Performance Based Management*, and H-10, *Performance Incentives*. The PEP is composed of subjective (award fee), objective (performance based), and award term performance incentives. All incentives are categorized into five Performance Areas (PAs): Program, Operations, Business and Institutional Management, Multi-Site, and Award Term. This plan does not address fixed fee earned in support of Work-for-Others as outlined within the contract.

II. Performance Measurement and Oversight

The structure of this PEP was developed to support the implementation of the Governance and Oversight Reform Principles expressed by the Deputy Secretary of Energy and the NNSA Administrator.^{1 2 3} This PEP evaluates and promotes a new Governance and Oversight framework based on risk, trust, and accountability. Specifically, the contractor is expected to manage its work under the contract in an efficient, effective, mission-driven manner with the appropriate risk mitigation. The contractor is accountable for measuring and credibly assessing its performance against the prescribed objectives in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract. Accordingly, the model for this PEP is to rely heavily on the contractor's leadership in utilizing its assurance system in assessing its performance while providing sufficient transparency to allow the government to understand how risks are managed and with what degree of rigor performance is evaluated by the contractor.

For some measures, a handshake document will be established to outline the NSO/NSTec agreement on the metrics to be used in evaluating the specific sub-measure(s). These documents will be maintained in the NSO Performance Measurement Database Performance Database.

¹ *Departmental Elements & Contractors*, Daniel B. Poneman to Departmental Elements and Contractors, December 2, 2009.

² *NNSA Enterprise Re-engineering Reform Initiative – LOCAS*, Thomas P. D'Agostino to Distribution, December 22, 2009.

³ *Implementation of Governance Reform at the Nevada Site Office and Nevada Test Site*, Thomas P. D'Agostino to Manager, Nevada Site Office, February 5, 2010.

Nevada Site Office – FY 2012 Performance Evaluation Plan

III. Overview of the FY 2012 PEP

A. The PEP is organized into five broad categories:

- **FY2012 Objectives:**

The FY2012 Objectives address the expectations of the contractor's performance on current year mission execution based on the programmatic requirements established by NNSA. These include nuclear and non-nuclear mission activities and describe the performance expectations to execute the mission in a safe, secure, and environmentally sound manner. Governance activities are also included in this area. (This includes both essential and stretch performance measures.)

- **Sustained Performance Areas (Comprehensive Incentive):**

This measure represents those performance areas under which the contractor has sustained a high level of performance in prior performance periods. The use of a comprehensive incentive (CI) is designed to permit the contractor to focus its resources and contract funds on those areas of critical importance, while at the same time providing the Government with assurance that the general mission, operations, and business management operations are effectively and efficiently executed and managed. These Performance Objectives are included as part of the Essential section of the PEP and will be evaluated as either satisfactory or unsatisfactory based on performance against an established baseline performance level (metrics).

- **General Management:**

This performance measure calls for the contractor to operate as an integrated organization that makes effective use of resources, demonstrated through key metrics, to effect needed improvements and to achieve cost, scope, and schedule efficiencies across all organizational elements while successfully accomplishing NNSA/NSO mission & operational requirements without compromising quality, safety and security. The improvement areas included under this measure are cross-cutting and impact both the program and operations performance areas.

- **Multi-Year Strategic Objectives (MYSO):**

The MYSO performance measures represent those areas where successful contractor focus has the potential to lead to mission growth and/or achievement of cost efficiencies and potential savings.

- **Multi-Site Incentives:**

All multi-site measures will be joint-performance based incentives (PBI) in which all NNSA M&O Contractors will play a role, as applicable. The multi-site measures will be measured on a pass-fail basis based on the achievement of the NNSA M&O contractors as a collective unit rather than on an individual site basis. For each multi-site measure, the collective target must be met in order to earn the fee amount associated with that particular multi-site target, otherwise no fee is earned and the dollars revert to program.

Nevada Site Office – FY 2012 Performance Evaluation Plan

For multi-site performance targets, NNSA will only grade the collective end product – not the individual sites' performance toward that product. The end product must be reached within cost, scope, and schedule for the performance targets to be considered met. If these conditions are not met, the performance target is not achieved and it is immaterial which specific sites may have failed or succeeded as an individual site.

NOTE: The Multi-Site measures identified in Section V of this PEP are not yet complete. Because there are several initiatives related to the BMAC, IT, and line item construction/project management, etc. that are currently being more fully developed by NNSA, the PEP will be re-opened during the first quarter of FY2012 for the purpose of negotiating changes to the Multi-Site measures. This includes distribution of the 10% portion of the Award Fee Pool applicable to the Multi-Site measures.

- **Award Term Incentives:**

The Award Term Incentive (ATI) measures are a suite of five (5) “pass/fail” rated measures selected to determine if the contractor is performing at such a high level that the Prime Contract should be extended for an additional year. These measures are representative of highly challenging performance and will reflect a balance between tactical and strategic, program and enterprise and/or site objectives. ATIs can be in the Program, Operations, or Business/IM categories. At least one ATI will be designated as mandatory.

Award Term eligibility is based on the evaluation of performance against these measures only after passing through additional performance gateways.

B. Method for Determining At-Risk Fee

1. Overall Performance Rating Process:

The NSO and NSTec Senior Management will meet on a monthly basis to discuss overall performance and to ensure performance issues are identified at the earliest opportunity. NSTec will be responsible for reporting progress and assigning an adjectival score against individual sub-measures on a monthly basis using the NSO Performance Measurement Database. While oversight and communication with the contractor will occur at the sub-measure level on an on-going basis throughout the performance period, an adjectival rating will only be provided by the NSO on a quarterly basis. The NSO inputs will include an evaluation of the adequacy and accuracy of the contractor's input.

2. Essential & Stretch Performance Measure Evaluations: The Essential and Stretch performance requirements have been constructed as a set of overarching measures, most with a varying number of sub-measures. The measures/sub-measures can be a combination of CIs, Performance Objectives (PO) and PBIs and will be rated as follows:

- **Comprehensive Incentives:** Each sub-measure within the CI will be evaluated as either satisfactory or unsatisfactory based on performance against an established

Nevada Site Office – FY 2012 Performance Evaluation Plan

baseline performance level (metrics). The score for the overall CI will be determined as follows:

- 11 sub-measures rated as satisfactory = 100%
- 10 sub-measures rated as satisfactory = 75%
- 9 sub-measures rated as satisfactory = 50%
- 8 sub-measures rated as satisfactory = 25%
- < 8 sub-measures rated as satisfactory = 0%

- **Performance Based Incentives:** PBI performance will be evaluated against the objective performance targets set forth under the individual measures/sub-measures. Throughout the evaluation process, the NSO Executive Council (EC) will assign a rating to each PBI consistent with the following rating scale:

GREEN: Performance indicates the performance measure will be successfully completed and meet stated expectations.

YELLOW: Performance indicates there is some question as to the Contractor’s ability to meet stated expectations.

RED: Performance indicates the Contractor’s ability to meet the stated expectations is in doubt.

Upon completion of an individual PBI, the Contractor will complete and submit a written request for the NSO to validate completion of the required work. The Contracting Officer will provide a written determination to the contractor within 45 calendar days of receipt of a valid and complete Contractor PBI validation request package. (Note: No PBIs are currently included in the PEP.)

- **Performance Objectives:** PO performance will be evaluated against the subjective performance objectives set forth under the individual measures. Throughout the evaluation process, the NSO EC will assign an adjectival rating to each of the subjective Award Fee performance measures. The ratings will be consistent with the following rating scale.

Adjectival Rating for Subjective Evaluation	Adjectivally Rated At-Risk Award Fee Pool Available Range to be Earned	Adjectival Rating Common Description
Excellent	91% -100%	Contractor has exceeded almost all of the significant award fee criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract as defined and measured against the criteria in the award fee plan for the award fee evaluation period.
Very Good	76% - 90%	Contractor has exceeded many of the significant award fee criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract as defined and measured against the criteria in the award fee plan for the award fee evaluation period.

Nevada Site Office – FY 2012 Performance Evaluation Plan

Good	51% - 75%	Contractor has exceeded some of the significant award fee criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract as defined and measured against the criteria in the award fee plan for the award fee evaluation period.
Satisfactory	No Greater than 50%	Contractor has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract as defined and measured against the criteria in the award fee plan for the award fee evaluation period.

Unsatisfactory	0%	Contractor has failed to meet overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract as defined and measured against the criteria in the award fee plan for the award fee evaluation period.
----------------	----	--

3. **Multi-Site Incentive Evaluations:** NNSA HQ will provide feedback on the performance against these performance measures.
4. **Award Term Incentive Evaluations:** Throughout the evaluation process, the NSO EC will assign an adjectival rating to each of the ATIs using the adjectival rating scale set forth above for POs.

NOTE: In determining the fee earned, it is inherently implied that the work was performed in a safe, secure, and quality manner and in accordance with the contract terms and conditions and all applicable laws, regulations, and DOE directives.

C. Interrelationship of Measures:

1. **Performance “Essential” to Performance “Stretch” Gateway:** Irrespective of performance against the stretch performance measures, the gateway eligibility requirement for essential work scope performance in order to earn stretch fee is an adjectival rating of “Very Good” for subjectively evaluated work and 80% success in all of the PBIs associated with objectively evaluated work in each of the Mission, Operations, and Institutional & Business Management performance areas. (This is not necessarily 80% success of fee earned for the PBIs in essential work scope.)

Area	STRETCH GATEWAY				
Program Essential Measures	→				
Operations Essential Measures	→	Achieve ≥ 80% Aggregate Essential Rating (Objective Measures)	P L U S	Overall Adjectival Rating ≥ “Very Good” (Subjective Measures)	→ Stretch Eligible

Nevada Site Office – FY 2012 Performance Evaluation Plan

Business Essential Measures	→					
-----------------------------	---	--	--	--	--	--

2. **Award Term Gateway:** The Fee Determining Official (FDO) is the final authority relative to the award of additional contract term. Satisfaction of the following Award Term gateway criteria shall determine eligibility, preserving the final determination to the FDO.

- Achieves an overall adjectival rating of at least “Very Good” for subjective evaluation and an aggregate score of at least 80% success for objective evaluation in the Mission, Operations, and Institutional Management & Business performance areas combined for the Essential At-Risk Fee;
- Successful completion of at least four of the five discrete ATIs; and
- Successful completion of all “mandatory” ATIs.

If the Contractor does not meet all of the above requirements, the Award Term clause becomes inoperable for the associated evaluation period. The award term decision is a unilateral determination of the FDO.

Area	AWARD TERM GATEWAY									
Mission Essential Measures	→	Achieve ≥ 80% Aggregate Essential (Objective Measures)	P L U S	Overall Adjectival ≥ “Very Good” (Subjective Measures)	P L U S	Meet 4 of 5 Award Term Incentives	P L U S	Meet all Mandatory Award Term Incentives	→	Award Term Eligible
Operations Essential Measures	→									
Business Essential Measures	→									

D. Fee Determining Official (FDO) Award Fee Determination: Determination of the amount of Award/Incentive Fee earned is a unilateral determination made by the FDO. The FDO’s decision will be made within 70 days after the end of the evaluation period. Unearned fee cannot be carried over to future performance periods.

Nevada Site Office – FY 2012 Performance Evaluation Plan

- E. Change Control.** The content of the PEP can be revised through mutual agreement between NNSA/NSO and NSTec via a formal change control process. Changes to the PEP can only be made upon approval of the Contracting Officer. The NNSA/NSO organization responsible for monitoring performance must initiate the change using the PEP Change Request Form.
- F.** There are certain instances when changes to program mission, milestones and or requirements may be beyond the control/influence of either NNSA/NSO or NSTec. The contractor will not be held responsible for delays in completion of expected milestones that are beyond its control or influence. When delays are within the contractor's control or influence, assessment of the contractor's performance will be in accordance with the performance targets, performance measures and fee detailed in the PEP.
- G. Summary of Performance Areas/Fee Availability:**

Earning of At-Risk Fee/Stretch Gateway/Fee Allocation

- Essential Performance Objectives/Incentives = \$ TBD or 75 % of Total Available Fee
- Stretch Performance Objectives/Incentives = \$ TBD or 15 % of Total Available Fee
- Multi-Site Performance Incentives = \$ TBD or 10 % of Total Available Fee
- Award Term Incentives: These incentives are not numerically weighted

IV. FY 2012 PERFORMANCE MEASURES SUMMARY

MEASURES	MISSION	OPS	BUSINESS	MEASURE VALUE (E)	MEASURE VALUE (S)
MEASURE 1.0: FY2012 Objectives (E)	23%	5 %	2%	30%	
MEASURE 2.0: FY2012 Objectives (S)	3%	2%	0%		5%
MEASURE 3.0: Sustained Performance Areas (E)	2%	2%	1%	5%	
MEASURE 4.0: General Management (E)	11%	15%	14%	40%	
MEASURE 5.0: Multi-Year Strategic Objectives (S)	5%	3%	2 %		10%
TOTALS	44%	27%	19%	75%	15%

(E) = Essential Measure (S) = Stretch Measure

NOTE: Individual weighting identified in the Mission, Operations, and Business areas for the Essential and Stretch measures above are an approximate distribution. The measures will receive a single score at the end of the performance period and fee awarded against the total measure value.

MULTI-SITE MEASURES	MEASURE VALUE
MEASURE MS-01: TBD	TBD
MEASURE MS-02: TBD	TBD
TOTAL	10%

AWARD TERM INCENTIVE MEASURES
MEASURE ATI-01: Subcritical Experiments (MANDATORY)
MEASURE ATI-02: Line Oversight / Contractor Assurance System (LO/CAS) Affirmation
MEASURE ATI-03: Cyber/IT Refurbishment
MEASURE ATI-04: Functional Area Excellence
MEASURE ATI-05: Quality Grading of Nuclear Facility Safety Structures, Systems & Components

Nevada Site Office – FY 2012 Performance Evaluation Plan

FY 2012 PERFORMANCE MEASURES/SUB-MEASURE SUMMARY

MEASURE 1.0: FY2012 Objectives – ESSENTIAL			
Sub-Measure 1.1	PO	Campaigns / Directed Stockpile Work – MRT Milestones - High Hazard integral experiments at NNSS	PROG
Sub-Measure 1.2	PO	Campaigns / Directed Stockpile Work – Other Experimental Activities	PROG
Sub-Measure 1.3	PO	National Center for Nuclear Security (NCNS)	PROG
Sub-Measure 1.4	PO	Environmental Mgmt – FFAO Milestones	PROG
Sub-Measure 1.5	PO	Nat'l Emergency Response Program Readiness & Effectiveness	PROG
Sub-Measure 1.6	PO	Cyber Security	OPS
Sub-Measure 1.7	PO	DAF Lead-In Piping Project	OPS
Sub-Measure 1.8	PO	Material Control and Accountability (MC&A) Program	OPS
Sub-Measure 1.9	PO	Governance - Requirements Improvements	C/C
MEASURE 2.0: FY2012 Objectives – STRETCH			
Sub-Measure 2.1	PO	BEEF Timing and Firing System and ATLAS	PROG
Sub-Measure 2.2	PO	Advanced JASPER Diagnostics	PROG
Sub-Measure 2.3	PO	Security – Classified Footprint Reduction	OPS
MEASURE 3.0: Sustained Performance Areas – ESSENTIAL			
Sub-Measure 3.1	PO	Stockpile Stewardship Experimental Support	PROG
Sub-Measure 3.2	PO	Nonproliferation Test & Evaluation	PROG
Sub-Measure 3.3	PO	Safety & Health	OPS
Sub-Measure 3.4	PO	Environmental Protection	OPS
Sub-Measure 3.5	PO	Emergency Management	OPS
Sub-Measure 3.6	PO	Facilities and Infrastructure	OPS
Sub-Measure 3.7	PO	Project Management	OPS
Sub-Measure 3.8	PO	Security Operations	OPS
Sub-Measure 3.9	PO	LL/MLL Waste Receipt Capability	OPS
Sub-Measure 3.10	PO	Counterintelligence	OPS
Sub-Measure 3.11	PO	Business Operations	BUS
MEASURE 4.0: General Management – ESSENTIAL			
Sub-Measure 4.1	PO	General Management (including improvement areas) 4.1.1 Institutional Management 4.1.2 Formality of Operations 4.1.3 Management System 4.1.4 DAF Readiness 4.1.5 Facility Maintenance Performance 4.1.6 Nuclear Safety Basis Implementation 4.1.7 Criticality Safety 4.1.8 Quality Assurance 4.1.9 Engineering	C/C
MEASURE 5.0: Multi-Year Strategic Objectives – STRETCH			
Sub-Measure 5.1	PO	Governance Improvements	C/C
Sub-Measure 5.2	PO	Requirements Flow-Down System Sustainment	C/C
Sub-Measure 5.3	PO	Advanced Radiographic Source Development	PROG

C/C = Crosscutting Measure (includes Program, Operations & Business)

Nevada Site Office – FY 2012 Performance Evaluation Plan

AWARD TERM MEASURES	
ATI-01 – Mandatory	Subcritical Experiments
ATI-02	Line Oversight / Contractor Assurance System (LO/CAS) Affirmation
ATI-03	Cyber/IT Refurbishment
ATI-04	Functional Area Excellence
ATI-05	Quality Grading of Nuclear Facility Safety Structures, Systems & Components

Nevada Site Office – FY 2012 Performance Evaluation Plan

V. PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS

MEASURE 1.0: FY2012 Objectives – ESSENTIAL		
Sub-Measure 1.1	Campaigns / Directed Stockpile Work – Milestone Reporting Tool Milestones - High Hazard integral experiments at NNSS	PROG
Performance Objectives/Targets	<p>Meet commitments to Stockpile Stewardship National Level 1 and 2 milestones related to Science Campaign and Directed Stockpile Work /Research & Development (DSW/R&D) (Nuclear Experiments) identified in the NNSA Milestone Reporting Tool (MRT) and other NSTec Mission and Projects Division project portfolio description documents in accordance with Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL)/Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL)/Sandia National Laboratory (SNL) requirements.</p> <p>Plan and successfully execute projects and activities related to high-visibility, complex, integral experiments typically involving current or future Pu and/or surrogates capability and utilizing NNSS-based experiment platforms. Projects may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JASPER experiments. • Phoenix experiments. • Subcritical Experiments 	
Sub-Measure 1.2	Campaigns / Directed Stockpile Work – Other Experimental Activities	PROG
Performance Objectives/Targets	<p>Meet commitments to Stockpile Stewardship National Level 1 and 2 milestones related to Science Campaign and DSW/R&D identified in the NNSA MRT and other NSTec Mission and Projects Division project portfolio description documents in accordance with LANL/LLNL/SNL requirements.</p> <p>Plan and successfully execute projects and R&D activities related to diagnostics development, small-scale experiment implementation, and modeling/code development/data analysis that may utilize off-site platforms and resources.</p> <p>Projects may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Radiography and Neutron Source Development • Z Materials Experiments • Shock Wave Related Diagnostics • High Energy Density Physics Diagnostics • Detectors and Instrumentation Development • Nuclear Event Analysis • Stockpile Stewardship Data Analysis 	
Sub-Measure 1.3	National Center for Nuclear Security (NCNS)	PROG
Performance Objectives/Targets	<p>Continue the development of the NCNS and execute the approved experimental program following NNSA NA-22 guidance applying project management principles to manage the cost, scope, and schedule baselines.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Execute SPE-3 2. Support two operational cycles at U12u 3. Prepare Baker site to perform first chain of custody experiment/activity 	

Nevada Site Office – FY 2012 Performance Evaluation Plan

Sub-Measure 1.4	Environmental Mgmt – FFACO Milestones	PROG
<p>Performance Objectives/Targets</p>	<p>Continue cleanup of the environmental legacy of nuclear testing to an extent that will maximize potential future use of the Nevada National Security Site (NNSS) for continued national security missions. Complete approved work authorization baseline/tasks that accomplish or support the completion of Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order (FFACO) requirements/milestones. Complete all work scope with acceptable quality and within work authorization milestones dates. Ensure compliance with Environment, Safety & Health (ES&H) regulatory requirements, and control project risk all within Environmental Management Information Systems (EMIS) cost and schedule thresholds.</p> <p>Meet activity completion milestones as identified in the approved Baseline/Task Plans with acceptable quality while ensuring compliance with Environment, Safety & Health (ES&H) regulatory requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete and submit CAU 547 Closure Report by 7/31/12 • Complete WD&T of two Pahute Mesa Wells (ER-EC-12 & ER-EC-13) by 9/08/12 • Complete drilling of two Frenchman Flat model evaluation wells (ER-5-5 & ER-11-2) and one Pahute Mesa investigation well (ER-20-11) by 09/30/12 • Complete and submit the Pahute Mesa Phase II Geology Analysis and Evaluation by 9/30/12 <p>AND</p> <p>Meet the following cost and schedule metrics to earn percentage of fee specified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 100% if the CPI > 1.05 and SPI > or = 1.0 - 95% if the CPI > 1.03 and SPI > or = 1.0 - 90% if the CPI > 1.0 and SPI > or = 1.0 <p>Fee decreases 4.0% for every 0.01 decrease in CPI/SPI, 1.0>CPI/SPI>0.9 0% if the CPI < 0.9 or SPI < 0.9</p> <p>Data will be taken from the EMIS reports and will be cumulative to date for fiscal year 2012. Authorized tasks for measurement of cost performance indicator/schedule performance indicator (CPI/SPI) will be determined jointly with the Federal Project Director.</p>	
Sub-Measure 1.5	National Emergency Response Program Readiness & Effectiveness	PROG
<p>Performance Objectives/Targets</p>	<p>Ensure the readiness and effectiveness of the National Emergency Response Program at NNSA/NSO in order to meet customer mission requirements to include: AMS, CMRT, SRT, RAP 0, RAP 7, Team 3, NA-45 Disposition, ECN and NRAT.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Effectively execute NA-40 emergency response work scope described in the FY12 NNSA/NSO work authorization Statement and Program Execution Plans within cost and on schedule. 2. Maintain operational readiness consistent with requirements identified by NA-42 for each assigned emergency response asset. This readiness is described in the weekly NA-42 ARMS Readiness Report. 3. Effectively respond to emergencies and exercises consistent with procedures and timelines agreed to by NNSA/NSO and NA-40. 	

Nevada Site Office – FY 2012 Performance Evaluation Plan

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Manage the Technical Integration (TI) program to meet cost, scope, and schedule requirements of NA-42. 5. Effectively execute NA-45 disposition work scope described in the FY12 NNSA/NSO Work Authorization Statement and Program Execution Plans within cost and on schedule. 6. Develop lessons learned and after actions plans for personnel and equipment recovery for the Consequence Management Program as a result of the Japan deployment; provide these recommendations for NNSA approval; develop a plan and implement the approved recommendations in accordance with the approved schedule.
Sub-Measure 1.6	Cyber Security OPS
Performance Objectives/Targets	<p>Plan, resource, and operate an effective and efficient Information Technology(IT) and Cyber Security Program that integrates requirements, resources, and capabilities across all Information Technology and Cyber Security topical areas.</p> <p>Target 1: Ensure the confidentiality, integrity and availability of information and information systems is protected against unauthorized access, modification or denial of service.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Participate in the development and selection of an automated Federal Information System Management Act (FISMA) reporting tool that collects data on: risks, assets, configurations and patch management. 2. Participate in the NNSA Headquarter zero-based review, continuous monitoring program, and Cyber Tracer (TracerFire) activities. 3. Develop an effective risk management framework utilizing National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) guidelines that defines cyber governance processes and ensure acceptable risk is being implemented at the site level. 4. Maintain and utilize a Security Information Event Management (SIEM) System that provides near real-time information used for proactive monitoring of network resources, intrusion detection/prevention, and trend analysis. 5. Provide quarterly status report to the NNSA OCIO CSPM through the NNSA/NSO on the state of cyber security program to include cyber security requirements implementation. 6. Achieve full compliance with OCIO Costing Principles and Budget & Reporting (B&R) categorizations in both budgeting and execution (costing) meeting all Annual Operating Plan (AOP) objectives. Provide all OCIO Planning, Programming, Budgeting and Evaluation (PPBE) deliverables according to NNSA/NSO and OCIO schedule and instructions. 7. Develop an investment strategy to ensure cyber security funds are being spent responsibly; and that the implementation of new security tools and software provides a measurable return on investment whether in reduced costs or program efficiencies.

Nevada Site Office – FY 2012 Performance Evaluation Plan

	<p>Target 2: Provide a secure Telephone, Classified, and Unclassified Information Technology to all Nevada Enterprise (NvE) entities.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop a 3-year (FY 2012-2014) site IT modernization plan in support of Complex Transformation. 2. Develop a comprehensive plan for on-site server virtualization, data center consolidation, and IT energy management to be carried-out over FY 2011-2016. This plan must also include a current IT energy performance baseline. 3. Support NSTec Cyber Security on closure of all Information Services Department (ISD) related findings and plan of action & milestones (POA&Ms). 4. Conduct quarterly project reviews with the NNSA/NSO that validates cost, scope, and schedule is on target for all IT Projects. 5. Perform maintenance to mitigate or eliminate new vulnerabilities as they are identified in accordance with NNSA/NSO approved NSTec Vulnerability Management Policy. Submit monthly vulnerability scan results to NNSA/NSO.
<p>Sub-Measure 1.7</p>	<p>DAF Lead-in Piping Project OPS</p>
<p>Performance Objectives/Targets</p>	<p>NSTec will accomplish all necessary project planning sufficient to receive NNSA Approval of Critical Decision – 1, <i>Approval of Alternative Selected & Cost Range</i>, by <u>September 30, 2012</u> for the Device Assembly Facility Lead-In Piping Project.</p>
<p>Sub-Measure 1.8</p>	<p>Material Control and Accountability (MC&A) Program OPS</p>
<p>Performance Objectives/Targets</p>	<p>Material Control and Accountability (MC&A) Program elements meet effectiveness and efficiency expectations during contractor self assessments, NNSA/NSO Oversight, and external inspections.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensure MC&A personnel training and qualification requirements are established by the National Training Center (NTC) Training Approval Program (TAP) approved NSTec MC&A Training and Qualification Program. 2. Demonstrate 95% success rate for detecting unauthorized access or actions to Category I and II quantities of SNM (as defined in DOE M 470.4-6 Change 1 (or subsequent update), Nuclear Material Control and Accountability) through performance test of the MC&A access controls and material surveillance program. 3. Demonstrate 99% accuracy for location and identity of Tamper-indicating Devices (TIDs), and 95% proper application (as defined in DOE M 470.4-6, Nuclear Material Control and Accountability) through performance tests of the TID program. 4. Enter LANMAS transactions within the MC&A required timeframes. Validations of the transactions are done within the required timeframes (10 days) 5. Demonstrate 99% accuracy for location and identity (as defined in DOE M 470.4-6, Nuclear Material Control and Accountability) through performance tests of the accounting record system.

Nevada Site Office – FY 2012 Performance Evaluation Plan

	<p>6. Perform MC&A measurements within the timeframes as specified per the Shipper/Receiver Agreement and/or the MC&A Plan and procedures.</p> <p>7. Conduct item counts and physical inventories in accordance with NSO-approved schedules, all items are accounted for upon inventory reconciliation.</p>	
Sub-Measure 1.9	Governance	C/C
Performance Objectives/Targets	<p>1. Transition the following NSO functions to NSTec to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate NSO findings into the NSTec issue screening process. • Convert selected NSO Emergency Response Organization positions to contractor staffing. • Administer execution of the Joint Assessment Schedule and Master Assessment Schedule using NSTec's systems. <p>For all Targets above, provide one combined comprehensive transition plan to NSO by November 30, 2011 to include cost/funding impacts as well as the proposed approach, schedule, R2A2s, etc.</p> <p>2. Provide a quarterly report on additional activities/candidates that can be considered for the year. The report must include cost/funding impact as well as the proposed approach, schedule, R2A2s, etc for each of the candidate activities</p>	

MEASURE 2.0: FY2012 Objectives – STRETCH

Sub-Measure 2.1	BEEF Timing and Firing System and ATLAS	PROG
Performance Objectives/Targets	<p>1. Through facility and program efficiencies and with no impact to NA-10, NA-20, and NA-40 program scope, up-grade the Big Explosives Experimental Facility (BEEF) timing and firing system to a Global Positioning System (GPS) standard.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate planned facility and program work for opportunities for efficiency gains. • Evaluate timing and firing system improvements to meet future program requirements • Complete the upgrade of the BEEF timing and firing system <p>2. Develop a strategy for ATLAS disposition as one of the Continuous Improvement Plan Focus Areas outlined in the FY-12 RTBF Site Execution Plan.</p>	
Sub-Measure 2.2	Advanced Joint Actinide Shock Physics Experimental Research (JASPER) Diagnostics	PROG
Performance Objectives/Targets	<p>Prepare the JASPER experiment platform for advanced diagnostics supporting the FY 2012 Pu experiments: Low Density, Graded Density Impactor, and Hugoniot Series. Diagnostics are to include Photon Doppler Velocimetry and Radiometry. Diagnostics delivery and experiments will be fielded according to a to-be-specified LLNL schedule.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop the criteria for the next generation of JASPER diagnostics and path forward in conjunction with HQ and the Laboratories. • Prepare a Project Execution Plan including cost and schedule to accomplish the agreed work. • Execute the agreed work scope within cost and schedule. 	

Nevada Site Office – FY 2012 Performance Evaluation Plan

Sub-Measure 2.3	Security – Classified Footprint Reduction	OPS
Performance Objectives/Targets	<p>Engage NSTec Program Managers and subcontractors to identify and achieve feasible reductions in classified facilities, classified information and matter including various components such as, surplus materials, documents, etc.</p> <p>Continue to work towards further reductions in the classified footprint for the current mission(s).</p>	

MEASURE 3.0: Sustained Performance Areas (Comprehensive Performance Measure) – ESSENTIAL

Performance Objectives	<p>Maintain baseline performance levels in each functional area using established metrics.</p> <p>3.1 Stockpile Stewardship Experimental Support (PROG): Provide scientific and technical support to Laboratory Principal Investigators/Scientists in various R&D areas such as diagnostic development, calibration, fielding initiatives, and advanced radiographic and neutron source development and clearly demonstrate that research objectives or desired outcomes are achieved.</p> <p>3.2 Nonproliferation Test & Evaluation (PROG): Ensure the effectiveness of the Nonproliferation Test and Evaluation Program through compliance with NNSA and NSO requirements and support NA-22 strategic planning initiatives.</p> <p>3.3 Safety & Health (OPS): Maintain a safe and healthy work environment through sound work operations performed in an efficient and effective manner in support of mission objectives.</p> <p>3.4 Environmental Protection (OPS): Demonstrate excellence in environmental performance by sustaining an effective Environmental Management System (EMS) that continues to meet applicable laws, standards, and regulations through the implementation and maintenance of the systems, programs, and processes described in the contractor’s approved ISMS/EMS Description documents.</p> <p>3.5 Emergency Management (OPS): Implement an Emergency Management Program consistent with DOE Order 151.1C, Comprehensive Emergency Management System, and DOE Order 150.1 Continuity Programs, Contract Requirements Documents (CRD), and NNSA approved plans and schedules.</p> <p>3.6 Facilities and Infrastructure (OPS): Plan and execute a facility management and infrastructure program, including energy management that maximizes the ability of the site to support existing missions with facility data of sufficient quality to make sound management decisions.</p> <p>3.7 Project Management (OPS): Plan and execute projects in accordance with scope, cost, and schedule baselines. Emphasis will be placed on risk management, resource utilization, cross-functional communication, effective procurement, cost control, quality, and integration of safety into design and construction.</p> <p>3.8 Security Operations (OPS): Maintain an effective and efficient Safeguards and Security Program and manage and operate functions to support successful accomplishment of mission in the areas of Program Management, Information Security, and Personnel Security while protecting the public, the worker, and national security assets.</p>
------------------------	--

Nevada Site Office – FY 2012 Performance Evaluation Plan

	<p>3.9 Low-Level/Mixed Low Level (LL/MLL) Waste Receipt Capability (OPS): Operate and manage the Radioactive Waste Management Complex (RWMC) fully meeting authorization basis requirements and supporting the receipt and disposal requirements of the DOE Waste Generators for low level and mixed low level waste. Comply with waste acceptance criteria, regulatory and programmatic milestones and perform within EMIS cost and schedule thresholds.</p> <p>3.10 Counterintelligence (OPS): Support Counterintelligence objectives.</p> <p>3.11 Business Operations (BUS): Manage and operate the Business functions in an efficient and cost effective manner using the MAS to fully support successful accomplishment of mission, while protecting the public, the worker, the environment, and national security assets in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract. Business functions include: budget formulation & execution, business management, financial management, human capital management, legal management, property management, public affairs, records management, and supply chain management.</p>
--	--

MEASURE 4.0: General Management – ESSENTIAL											
Sub-Measure 4.1	General Management										
Performance Objectives/Targets	Operate as an integrated organization that makes effective use of resources, demonstrated through key metrics, to effect needed improvements and to achieve cost, scope, and schedule efficiencies across all organizational elements while successfully accomplishing NNSA/NSO mission & operational requirements without compromising quality, safety and security.										
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 85%;">4.1.1 Institutional Management</td> <td style="width: 15%; text-align: center;">BUS</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Conduct business using an institutional management approach to meeting contract requirements that is focused on proactive issue identification and resolution, demonstrable efficiency gains, and securing new work to support national security needs to sustain the NNSS as a viable national resource.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 85%;">4.1.2 Formality of Operations</td> <td style="width: 15%; text-align: center;">OPS</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Continue improvements in targeted areas in formality of operations.</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"> <p>1. Configuration Mgmt:</p> <p>Implement a DOE-STD-1073-2003 compliant configuration management process at all nuclear facilities and establish consistency among design requirements, physical configuration, and documentation (including analysis, drawings, system design descriptions, and procedures) for all Safety-Class Structure, System, and Components (SSCs), Safety-Significant SSCs, and those SSCs whose preventive or mitigative functions are considered to be major contributors to defense-in-depth and worker safety.</p> <p>NSO will conduct an independent validation on or after 8/1/12 of configuration management across all nuclear facilities.</p> <p>2. Conduct of Operations:</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">a) Implement DOE O 422.1, Conduct of Operations in accordance with the May 2, 2011 NSO technical direction letter. The Contractor will perform and complete a minimum of six (6) Management Assessments in the Conduct of Operations Functional Area.</p> </td> </tr> </table>	4.1.1 Institutional Management	BUS	Conduct business using an institutional management approach to meeting contract requirements that is focused on proactive issue identification and resolution, demonstrable efficiency gains, and securing new work to support national security needs to sustain the NNSS as a viable national resource.		4.1.2 Formality of Operations	OPS	Continue improvements in targeted areas in formality of operations.		<p>1. Configuration Mgmt:</p> <p>Implement a DOE-STD-1073-2003 compliant configuration management process at all nuclear facilities and establish consistency among design requirements, physical configuration, and documentation (including analysis, drawings, system design descriptions, and procedures) for all Safety-Class Structure, System, and Components (SSCs), Safety-Significant SSCs, and those SSCs whose preventive or mitigative functions are considered to be major contributors to defense-in-depth and worker safety.</p> <p>NSO will conduct an independent validation on or after 8/1/12 of configuration management across all nuclear facilities.</p> <p>2. Conduct of Operations:</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">a) Implement DOE O 422.1, Conduct of Operations in accordance with the May 2, 2011 NSO technical direction letter. The Contractor will perform and complete a minimum of six (6) Management Assessments in the Conduct of Operations Functional Area.</p>	
4.1.1 Institutional Management	BUS										
Conduct business using an institutional management approach to meeting contract requirements that is focused on proactive issue identification and resolution, demonstrable efficiency gains, and securing new work to support national security needs to sustain the NNSS as a viable national resource.											
4.1.2 Formality of Operations	OPS										
Continue improvements in targeted areas in formality of operations.											
<p>1. Configuration Mgmt:</p> <p>Implement a DOE-STD-1073-2003 compliant configuration management process at all nuclear facilities and establish consistency among design requirements, physical configuration, and documentation (including analysis, drawings, system design descriptions, and procedures) for all Safety-Class Structure, System, and Components (SSCs), Safety-Significant SSCs, and those SSCs whose preventive or mitigative functions are considered to be major contributors to defense-in-depth and worker safety.</p> <p>NSO will conduct an independent validation on or after 8/1/12 of configuration management across all nuclear facilities.</p> <p>2. Conduct of Operations:</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">a) Implement DOE O 422.1, Conduct of Operations in accordance with the May 2, 2011 NSO technical direction letter. The Contractor will perform and complete a minimum of six (6) Management Assessments in the Conduct of Operations Functional Area.</p>											

Nevada Site Office – FY 2012 Performance Evaluation Plan

	<p>b) Submit the eight (8) Conduct of Operations Applicability Matrices for NSO approval in accordance with the NSO technical direction letter. All 8 matrices will be approved during the initial review cycle.</p>
	<p>4.1.3 Management System OPS</p>
	<p>Continuously improve a functional and transparent contractor assurance system (CAS) that utilizes risk as a basis for management decision making and assists the federal staff in accurately gauging the health of specific functional and mission activities.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Demonstrate effective analysis of CAS data to identify needed improvement areas and formulate improvement strategies. 2. Implement actions that demonstrate improvement in focus areas identified in the FY11 <i>Annual Analysis Report</i>. 3. Institutionalize assessment criteria and guidelines and perform effectiveness assessments on the incorporation of integrated safety management and quality assurance into activity-level work planning and control. 4. CAS should include assessments to ensure that specific administrative controls (SACs) are properly designed, implemented and maintained.
	<p>4.1.4 Device Assembly Facility (DAF) Readiness PROG</p>
	<p>Develop and implement an integrated, balanced, risk-based plan to address <u>near-term</u> facility issues and meet identified program deliverables while addressing <u>long-term</u> operational deficiencies and supporting future program requirements.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plan and execute <u>near-term</u> projects or initiatives that enable the program directly through providing necessary equipment, personnel and capabilities and indirectly by ensuring basic infrastructure is in place and available for safe, secure and compliant facility operations. 2. Plan and execute <u>long-term</u> projects or initiatives that enable future programs by addressing operational deficiencies and providing an agile, reliable and robust infrastructure. 3. Demonstrate that the projects and activities selected were appropriately derived within a risk-based (program, project and operational) prioritization and projected/available resources.
	<p>4.1.5 Facility Maintenance Performance OPS</p>
	<p>Improve company-wide facility maintenance performance, using the graded approach, in a manner that balances priorities between direct safety systems and general service equipment, resulting in increased reliability.</p>
	<p>4.1.6 Nuclear Safety Basis Implementation OPS</p>
	<p>Develop and implement nuclear facility safety basis documents and safety design basis documents (e.g., SDS, CSDR, PSDR, PDSA, DSA, TSR, USQD, and JCO) using a quality assurance process that promotes efficiency and enables validation of deliverables to ensure regulatory compliance with 10 CFR 830, Subpart B, and consistency with supporting company directives, DOE directives, and associated regulatory standards.</p>

Nevada Site Office – FY 2012 Performance Evaluation Plan

<p>Targets:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nuclear Facility Safety Basis Documents reflect a graded approach that results in cost-effective safety analysis, commensurate level of detail, and appropriate hazard controls to ensure adequate protection of workers, the public, and the environment. The associated Safety Basis Strategy or Safety Design Strategy shall demonstrate how the level of analysis, technical documentation, and actions used to comply with regulatory requirements are commensurate with: (1) the facility hazard category; (2) the magnitude of hazards involved; (3) the importance of safety structures, systems, and components; and (4) the programmatic mission of the facility. Documents contain minimal identified issues that require rework to resolve regulatory or process-specific non-compliant conditions. 2. A Potential Inadequacy of the Safety Analysis (PISA) is declared in a timely manner (i.e., within hours or days) subsequent to performing a reasonable evaluation of the conditions to confirm that the safety basis may not be bounding or may be otherwise inadequate. If it is immediately clear that a PISA exists, then the PISA is declared within 10 hours of discovery.
--

4.1.7 Criticality Safety	OPS
<p>Implement and maintain a fully compliant DOE Order 420.1B criticality safety program (CSP) that prevents criticality accidents by ensuring that fissionable material is handled in such a way that it remains subcritical under all normal and credible abnormal conditions to protect workers, the public, and the environment. The CSP will foster continuous improvement in the implementation of the criticality safety practices at the NNSC which includes, but not limited to, resolution of safety concerns and deficiencies in a prompt manner and practice open and transparent communications of issues to NSO in a timely manner.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Demonstrate that the Nuclear Criticality Safety Program (NCSP) and staff are fully integrated into all aspects of fissionable material operations to include nuclear operations, emergency preparedness, and nuclear facility safety basis. 2. Implement the expectations of DOE-STD-3007-2007, “Guidelines for Preparing Criticality Safety Evaluations at Department of Energy Non-Reactor Nuclear Facilities,” and revise applicable nuclear facility safety basis documents to incorporate applicable criticality safety controls. 3. Foster the implementation of a multi-organizational joint Nuclear Criticality Safety Program (NCSP) through the following initiatives: (1) continued enhancements, as needed, to the NNSA/NSO approved NCSP to streamline Criticality Safety practices for NNSC stakeholders (e.g., no redundant reviews), (2) derivation of a common severity levels for conditions adverse to nuclear criticality safety, and (3) integrated NNSC NCSP performance metrics for multi-organizational reporting. 	

4.1.8 Quality Assurance	OPS
<p>Implement and maintain a compliant and effective Quality Management System (QMS) that meets applicable laws, standards, and regulations through the implementation and maintenance of the systems, programs, and processes described in the contractor’s Quality Assurance program. Demonstrate improvement in personnel's ability to effectively follow procedures, processes and instructions through accomplishment of the following. (Issues identified as an Emerging Concern at the NSTec 6/28/11 Executive Leadership Council Meeting [ELC].)</p>	

Nevada Site Office – FY 2012 Performance Evaluation Plan

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Complete initial analysis of emerging concern by 10/28/11 and report results at subsequent ELC meeting. 2. Based upon analysis results, determine appropriate actions (e.g., development of comprehensive Corrective Action Plan [CAP]) by 11/15/11 and submit to NSO for concurrence. 3. Monitor improvement progress during routine ELC and/or Senior Management Team meetings throughout FY 2012. <p>NSO will validate effectiveness of improvements prior to 9/30/12.</p>				
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="background-color: #ffffcc;">4.1.9 Engineering</td> <td align="right">OPS</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"> <p>Evaluate and enhance Engineering’s ability to develop and control work scope, improve current cost and schedule performance, and explore options for improved design execution.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement and monitor effectiveness of changes necessary to resolve systemic deficiencies identified in internal and external assessments. 2. Evaluate current design execution methods; identify those where improvements would yield the greatest return; implement changes and demonstrate the results. 3. Continue surveying customer satisfaction to gather comments for development of lessons learned to support continuous improvement. </td> </tr> </table>	4.1.9 Engineering	OPS	<p>Evaluate and enhance Engineering’s ability to develop and control work scope, improve current cost and schedule performance, and explore options for improved design execution.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement and monitor effectiveness of changes necessary to resolve systemic deficiencies identified in internal and external assessments. 2. Evaluate current design execution methods; identify those where improvements would yield the greatest return; implement changes and demonstrate the results. 3. Continue surveying customer satisfaction to gather comments for development of lessons learned to support continuous improvement. 	
4.1.9 Engineering	OPS				
<p>Evaluate and enhance Engineering’s ability to develop and control work scope, improve current cost and schedule performance, and explore options for improved design execution.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement and monitor effectiveness of changes necessary to resolve systemic deficiencies identified in internal and external assessments. 2. Evaluate current design execution methods; identify those where improvements would yield the greatest return; implement changes and demonstrate the results. 3. Continue surveying customer satisfaction to gather comments for development of lessons learned to support continuous improvement. 					

MEASURE 5.0: Multi-Year Strategic Objectives – STRETCH		
Sub-Measure 5.1	Governance Improvements	C/C
Performance Objectives/Targets	<p>Demonstrate cost savings and efficiencies through further governance reform effort (effective CAS, reduced Federal oversight, & requirements reform).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Complete requirements improvement and implementation for areas such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Back Office implementation & Process Improvements (could include Fed functions such as IT, Records Mgmt, etc.) • New Business Development • Reduction of North Las Vegas Campus Cost (Needs to be accomplished at a net reduction not just a shifting of costs) 2. Report accomplishments achieved through the governance reform effort (effective CAS, reduced Federal oversight, and requirements reform) including information on cost savings and efficiencies, where available. Efficiency gains and/or cost-savings will be validated by NSO. 	C/C

Nevada Site Office – FY 2012 Performance Evaluation Plan

Sub-Measure 5.2	Requirements Management System Sustainment	C/C
Performance Objectives/Targets	<p>Sustain a NSTec enterprise requirement flow-down system that provides traceability from requirements to implementing procedures.</p> <p>Targets:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Close gaps identified in FY11 2. Institute change management process 3. Validate flow-down identified in FY11 4. Incorporate applicable Contracting Officer/Contracting Officer Representative direction letters 5. Identify all procedures/documents not tied to contractual requirements 	
Sub-Measure 5.3	Advanced Radiographic Source Development	PROG
Performance Objectives/Targets	<p>Team with SNL in conducting research and development of X-ray diodes for application to an advanced underground radiographic source for Focused Subcritical Experiment application. Initiatives on the Radiographic Integrated Test Stand to be implemented by 4QFY12 may involve: a) development and characterization of a small spot diode that strives to meet Subcritical Experiment X-ray source requirements, and b) engineering and development of a small front end for the X-ray source that is consistent with downhole (U1a) operations. Initiatives involving Linear Transformer Driver technology may involve: a) studies in coupling LTD modules to X-ray diodes to optimize energy transfer, b) evaluation tests of lifetimes for components as candidates for use in an advanced radiographic source</p> <p>A technical comparison to radiographic requirements and machine design parameters will be used to assess pulsed power performance improvements. R&D progress in X-ray source performance to be documented in an FY2012 report submitted to SNL and HQ for assessment.</p>	

Nevada Site Office – FY 2012 Performance Evaluation Plan

NOTE: The numbering within the Multi-Site (MS) templates below represent the numbering included in the NNSA HQ document. As such, the HQ MS 2.0 requirements for will be contained in our Measure MS-1.0. The HQ MS 3.0 requirements for will be contained in our Measure MS-2.0.

MULTI-SITE MEASURES	
Measure MS-1.0	Science
Performance Objective/Targets	<p>2.2 Achieve advances in experimental and computational tools used in resolving Significant Finding Investigations (SFIs) and in supporting LEP activities associated with early phase primary implosion.</p> <p>Implementing Criteria: 2.2.1 Refine experimental and computational tools that could enable the assessment of a future SFI.</p> <p>Completion criteria: 2.2.2 Meet the completion criteria for the associated L1 milestone for initial boost conditions including pre-shot predictions for the Pollux experiment.</p> <p>2.3 Execute the plan for subcritical experiment at U1a.</p> <p>Implementing Criteria: 2.3.1 Carry out a subcritical experiment at U1a with appropriate diagnostics to enable comprehensive data analysis.</p> <p>Completion criteria: 2.3.2 Conduct the Leda experiment in FY 2012.</p>
Measure MS-2.0	TBD – See NOTE on page 6
Performance Objective/Targets	

Nevada Site Office – FY 2012 Performance Evaluation Plan

AWARD TERM MEASURES	
ATI-01 Mandatory	<p>Subcritical Experiments All required actions to procure and prepare the vessel, the experimental package, U1a complex, and diagnostics will be completed in accordance with the approved integrated schedule, which will be maintained under baseline change control.</p>
ATI-02	<p>Line Oversight / Contractor Assurance System (LO/CAS) Affirmation</p> <p>Successful LO/CAS Affirmation Review</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Perform a self-assessment of for CAS affirmation and accomplish corrective actions. 2. Obtain the recommendation from the NNSA Affirmation Review Team for the Site Office LO/CAS affirmation during FY12 2nd Quarter.
ATI-03	<p>Cyber/IT Refurbishment</p> <p>Implement a standards-based IT Governance Model that balances technical, organizational, and business risk to ensure that the investment choices taken by executive management evaluate the long term consequences for NvE customers. This will include an IT system in which all stakeholders, including the board, executive management, customers, and staff have clear accountability for their respective responsibilities in the decision making process affecting IT. The required result must be an integrated system that is effective, efficient, secure, transparent, and integrates NSO IT processes, where appropriate. All actions to accomplish this objective will be codified in a comprehensive baseline that utilizes a risk-based approach to define expected cost, scope and schedule outcomes.</p>
ATI-04	<p>Functional Area Excellence</p> <p>Refine and improve the use of metrics to develop a culture of continuous improvement.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Continue the use of the NSTec Dashboard and Contractor Assurance System to exhibit performance status in the mission and functional areas. b. Evaluate the FY12 metrics development, gathering techniques, and feedback communication. Produce an FY12 <i>Annual Analysis Report</i> by <u>July 13, 2012</u>. c. Based upon the FY12 <i>Annual Analysis Report</i>, identify any new measurements to be added to the existing FY12 Metrics Plan for incorporation into the FY13 Metrics Plan through an established configuration management process. d. Obtain internal and external customer feedback and incorporate into FY13 planning.
ATI-05	<p>Quality Grading of Nuclear Facility Safety SSCs Demonstrate the ability to effectively perform quality grading of nuclear facility SSCs based on the importance of the SSCs to safety, mission, and /or operations. Quality grades will include clearly defined attributes that specify increasingly rigorous requirements and associated documentation that ensures effective application of resources to the most important equipment in the most important, high hazard facilities.</p>