



**Fiscal Year 2012  
Performance Evaluation Plan**

**FOR**

**SANDIA CORPORATION**

**MANAGEMENT AND OPERATION  
OF THE  
SANDIA NATIONAL LABORATORIES**

**Contract No. DE-AC04-94AL85000**

**Performance period  
October 01, 2011 through September 30, 2012**

**October 1, 2011**



**Fiscal Year 2012**

**Performance Evaluation Plan**

**FOR**

**SANDIA CORPORATION**

**MANAGEMENT AND OPERATION**

**OF THE**

**SANDIA NATIONAL LABORATORIES**

Paul J. Hommert 9/28/11

Paul J. Hommert                      Date  
President and Laboratories Director  
Sandia Corporation

Patty Wagner 9-28-11

Patty Wagner                      Date  
Manager  
Sandia Site Office  
National Nuclear Security Administration

Jerry L. McDowell 9/28/11

Jerry L. McDowell                      Date  
Deputy Laboratories Director and Executive  
Vice President for National Security Programs  
Sandia Corporation

Kimberly A. Davis 9/28/11

Kimberly A. Davis                      Date  
Deputy Manager  
Sandia Site Office  
National Nuclear Security Administration

Kimberly C. Sawyer 9/28/11

Kimberly C. Sawyer                      Date  
Deputy Laboratories Director and Executive Vice  
President for Mission Support  
Sandia Corporation

Richard F. Sena 9/28/11

Richard F. Sena                      Date  
Deputy Manager  
Sandia Site Office  
National Nuclear Security Administration

## FISCAL YEAR 2012 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PLAN

### DOCUMENT REVISION HISTORY

The Performance Evaluation Plan (PEP) is revised periodically to reflect changes in the agreement that have been approved through the formal PEP modification control process. A history of revisions is listed below.

<u>Revision</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Comment</u>
-----------------	-------------	----------------

## Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION .....	1
PRINCIPLES GUIDE SUCCESSFUL TRANSFORMATION .....	1
Performance Measurement and Oversight .....	1
ORGANIZATION/COMPOSITION .....	2
DEFINITIONS .....	3
Mission Focused Performance Objectives .....	3
Mission Support Performance Objectives .....	3
Performance Based Incentives .....	3
PERFORMANCE STANDARDS/PERFORMANCE EVALUATION .....	4
PERFORMANCE RATING PROCESS .....	4
Table 1: FY 2012 Rating Scale .....	5
MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENT PROCESS .....	6
CHANGE CONTROL .....	7
MISSION FOCUSED PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES .....	8
PO-1: National Security Mission – Nuclear Weapons .....	8
PO-2: National Security Missions – NonNuclear Weapons .....	10
PO-3: Science, Technology & Engineering .....	12
MISSION SUPPORT PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES .....	13
PO-4: Operations .....	13
PO-5: Business Management .....	14
PO-6: Corporate Governance .....	15
PERFORMANCE BASED INCENTIVES .....	16
PBI-1: Nuclear Weapons – Stretch Goals .....	16
PBI-2: Nuclear Weapons Quality Assurance – Stretch Goals .....	18
PBI-3: Management of Materials – Stretch Goals .....	19
PBI-4: Mission Support Efficiencies – Stretch Goals .....	21
PBI-5: FY 2012 Multi-Site Targets .....	23
ACRONYM LIST .....	27



## INTRODUCTION

This Performance Evaluation Plan (PEP) documents the negotiated performance criteria by which the Department of Energy (DOE)/National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) Sandia Site Office (SSO) will appraise Sandia Corporation's (Sandia) performance in its management and operation of Sandia National Laboratories (SNL) from October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012. It will also be used as a basis for establishing PEPs for subsequent fiscal years, which may cover multiple years in the future. It is developed collaboratively between the NNSA and Sandia. Its primary purpose is to establish a framework for assessing performance against contract and programmatic requirements. Special Provision Clause H-10 in the Sandia contract entitled "Performance Based Management" sets forth the annual performance appraisal requirements. This PEP is mission focused and by organizing into mission areas, the management of the entire SNL mission, and the transparency to the government, is improved.

## PRINCIPLES GUIDE SUCCESSFUL TRANSFORMATION

This PEP evaluates and promotes a new Governance and Oversight framework based on prudent management of risk, trust, and accountability. It has been written to implement the collective Governance and Oversight Reform principles as expressed by the Deputy Secretary of Energy and the NNSA Administrator.<sup>1,2,3,4</sup>

### ***Performance Measurement and Oversight***

The contractor is accountable for measuring and credibly assessing its performance against the prescribed objectives and incentives in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract. Accordingly, the model for this PEP is to rely on the contractor's leadership in utilizing appropriate standards based on consideration of risk, its management and assurance systems, and the related measures, metrics, and evidence in assessing its performance. Oversight is primarily conducted by verifying and validating performance against these appropriate measures, metrics, and evidence.

The framework for this PEP is driven by a need to evaluate Sandia's ability to sustain and improve mission performance by remaining an agile, multi-program laboratory that is able to tackle the urgent and complex problems of the nation quickly and effectively. Therefore, the contractor is expected to manage SNL in an efficient, effective, mission driven manner, with appropriate risk management. This must be done with sufficient transparency to allow the contractor and the government to know how risks are managed and what, when and with what degree of rigor performance is evaluated by the contractor and the government. This promotes an "eyes on, hands off" approach by the government, evaluating the reliability of the metrics and other information in the Performance Assurance System (PAS) portion of the Integrated Laboratory Management System (ILMS).

---

<sup>1</sup> *Departmental Elements and Contractors*, Daniel B. Poneman to Departmental Elements and Contractors, December 2, 2009.

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

<sup>3</sup> *Implementation of Governance Reform at the Sandia Site Office and Sandia National Laboratories*, Thomas P. D'Agostino to Manager, Sandia Site Office, February 5, 2010.


<sup>4</sup> NNSA Policy Letter: NAP-21 *Transformational Governance and Oversight*, February 28, 2011.

## FOR FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2012, NNSA'S "GETTING THE JOB DONE" GOALS

### Defense Programs Getting the Job Done in FY 2012!

- Produce and deliver all required limited life components to ensure an effective deterrent.
- Successfully complete surveillance plans and assess the stockpile.
- Execute W76 LEP production recovery schedule to meet Navy deployments
- Execute an NWC approved B61 Life Extension Program.
- Meet or exceed planned dismantlement quantities.
- Implement the Defense Programs Plan for governance reform across the Enterprise to improve mission execution, and safety and security performance.
- Achieve ignition on the NIF.
- Achieve advances in experimental and computational tools used in resolving Significant Finding Investigations and in supporting LEP activities associated with early phase primary implosion.
- Execute the plan for subcritical experiments at U1a.
- Achieve milestones for critical plutonium (CMRR-NF) and uranium (UPF) facilities.
- Achieve Predictive Capability Framework commitments, and populate Component Maturation Framework with technologies required to meet Stockpile Stewardship Management Plan objectives and goals for the stockpile.



  
DONALD L. COOK  
Deputy Administrator  
For Defense Programs

### ORGANIZATION/COMPOSITION

The PEP is organized into three broad areas:

- Mission Performance - Documents the performance objectives and evaluation criteria of Sandia's programmatic work, which will be performed safely, securely, and in an environmentally sound manner through the use of Mission Focused Performance Objectives (POs).
- Mission Support - Documents the POs and evaluation criteria of critical operations and infrastructure, which support the mission through the use of Mission Support POs.
- Performance Based Incentives (PBIs) - Consists of measures and targets tied to incentive fee.

Mission Focused POs describe the performance expectations to execute the mission of the Laboratory, and to do so in a safe, secure, and environmentally sound manner. They include non-



nuclear and nuclear mission activities. Mission Support POs describe the performance expectations to support the mission of the Laboratory, including that provided by the Operations, Business Management, and Corporate Governance functions. POs are graded on a five-tier system from “Excellent” to “Unsatisfactory”, without percentages assigned, as shown in Table 1: *FY 2012 Rating Scale*.

For the purposes of the overall performance evaluation, both Mission Focused POs and Mission Support POs will be considered collectively. The expected minimum level of performance on POs to be eligible to earn incentive fee is the “Very Good” adjectival rating level.

PBIs incentivize the achievement of stretch goals, new initiatives, problem areas, and Multi-Site performance. PBIs are graded on a five-tier scale from “Excellent” to “Unsatisfactory”, with percentages assigned per adjectival rating, as shown in Table 1: *FY 2012 Rating Scale*.

## DEFINITIONS

### ***Mission Focused Performance Objectives***

Accomplishment of the nuclear and non-nuclear mission work in a safe, secure, efficient, effective, and environmentally sound manner, while managing risk, is a fundamental expectation of this contract. These POs address performance on current year mission execution. These POs are designed to permit the contractor to focus its resources and contract funds on the mission, while at the same time, providing the Government with assurance that the mission is being executed in a safe, secure, and environmentally sound manner, with appropriate risk mitigation.

### ***Mission Support Performance Objectives***

Accomplishment of the mission work, safely, and securely, efficiently and effectively, while managing risk, is a fundamental expectation of this contract. These POs address performance on current year mission support and stewardship of capabilities and systems for long-term success of the NNSA. These POs are 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 site and business management operations are effective and efficiently executed and managed.

### ***Performance Based Incentives***

PBIs are used to meet specific performance areas that represent innovative (stretch) goals, performance areas that are critical and have been identified for performance improvement and new initiatives. Each PBI has associated Performance Measures and Performance Targets. The amount of fee that is available for the contractor to earn is distributed to the contractor commensurate to the contractor’s performance on PBIs. Multi-Site PBIs have associated measures and targets (levels of achievement) that are dependent on the performance of national laboratories and production plants within the Nuclear Security Enterprise (NSE).

Each PBI is rated individually on a five-tier scale shown in Table 1: *FY 2012 Rating Scale*.

## **PERFORMANCE STANDARDS/PERFORMANCE EVALUATION**

The evaluation of Sandia's performance against POs and PBIs will also consider unanticipated barriers (e.g., budget restrictions, rule changes, circumstances outside Sandia's control), accomplishments and other circumstances that may occur during the performance period. Effective Sandia efforts to overcome or mitigate the impact of such barriers or circumstances will be a factor in evaluating performance. If a PBI goal remains unmet at year-end due to extenuating circumstances beyond Sandia's control, the amount of available incentive fee allocated to that particular incentive may be reallocated to the remaining incentives and distributed to the contractor commensurate to the contractor's performance against the remaining incentives.

### **PERFORMANCE RATING PROCESS**

Sandia will provide a self-assessment of its performance against the POs and PBIs and other significant factors as determined by the Contractor and Contracting Officer, in the form of a Performance Evaluation and Assurance Report (PEAR) meeting the requirements of the H-10 "Performance Based Management" clause of the contract. The PEAR will be submitted to SSO no later than October 1, 2012, to allow sufficient time for program management review and release. An overall performance rating for each PO and PBI (five-tiers from "Excellent" to "Unsatisfactory") will be identified by Sandia in the PEAR. These ratings will be based on the descriptors found in the Table 1: *FY 2012 Rating Scale* and the overall rating will consider the Mission and Support groups. The NNSA will consider the PEAR in preparing the Performance Evaluation Report (PER) and when making its final recommendations to the Fee Determining Official on performance ratings and incentive fees for fiscal year performance.

The available fee amounts for FY 2012 are specified in Section B of Contract No. DE-AC04-94AL85000.



**Table 1: FY 2012 Rating Scale**

POs and PBIs will be assessed using the rating scale below. POs will not include the percentage score. Ratings will be communicated to Sandia in accordance with the performance assessment schedule as outlined in Special Provision H-10, "Performance Based Management."

<b>PO / PBI Adjectival Rating</b>	<b>Adjectival Rating Common Definition</b>	<b>Fixed Fee</b>	<b>Award Fee Pool Available to be Earned</b>
Excellent	Contractor has exceeded substantially all of the significant performance criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract as defined and measured against the criteria in the Objectives and Incentives for the evaluation period.	N/A	91 – 100%
Very Good	Contractor has exceeded many of the significant performance criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract as defined and measured against the criteria in the Objectives and Incentives for the evaluation period.	N/A	76 – 90%
Good	Contractor has exceeded some of the significant performance criteria and has met overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract as defined and measured against the criteria in the Objectives and Incentives for the evaluation period.	N/A	51% – 75%
Satisfactory	Contractor has met overall cost, schedule and technical performance requirements of the contract as defined and measured against the criteria in the Objectives and Incentives for the evaluation period.	N/A	No Greater than 50%
Unsatisfactory	Contractor has failed to meet overall cost, schedule, and technical performance requirements of the contract as defined and measured against the criteria in the Objectives and Incentives for the evaluation period.	N/A	0%

Note: The gateway to access at-risk/incentive fee will require achieving an overall "Very Good" in the Performance Objective (PO) space. Any changes to Table 1 will follow the same parameters described in the change control section of this document.

## MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENT PROCESS

Under the principles of Governance transformation, the NNSA monitors Sandia's performance on a continuous basis by relying on Sandia's Integrated Laboratory Management System (ILMS) / Performance Assurance System (PAS), third-party assessments, and conducting operational awareness activities rather than traditional compliance-based assessment to evaluate Sandia's performance. The exception to this method of monitoring Sandia's performance is with high-risk activities, where SSO performs compliance-based oversight including traditional assessments. Central to the PAS are measures, metrics, indicators, and qualitative information that Sandia uses to manage a given performance area, which shall be easily accessible and visible to the NNSA, in order to validate, verify, inquire, and/or provide feedback on Sandia's critical performance data. In addition to compliance-based assessment reports for high-risk oversight, SSO will transmit (usually quarterly) an integrated, comprehensive evaluation of Sandia performance in a Periodic Contractor Performance Report (PCPR). The PCPR includes performance feedback with respect to the PEP.

Based on the principle of collaborative performance reviews, Performance Assurance Meetings are held to discuss performance regularly and the ongoing results of SSO oversight. Performance Assurance Meetings are any collaborative meeting or review between SSO and Sandia to discuss progress and issues, and to address questions and areas of concern with the performance evidence, or insufficiency of evidence, that is housed in ILMS/PAS.

To ensure full transparency into Laboratory management and operations and to review performance, Sandia conducts quarterly Management Reviews (MR), followed by the Executive Management Review (EMR). The MRs and EMR are held in accordance with Sandia's Corporate Procedure CG100.6.19, *Conduct Management Review*. These reviews provide SSO the opportunity to have transparency into the Sandia Management System that identifies successes and performance issues of concern to the contractor and the government. Participants in the EMR include Sandia's President, Executive Vice Presidents and Vice Presidents, and the SSO Manager, Deputy Managers and other SSO participants, as requested by the SSO Manager. Typically, the EMR will be followed by the transmittal of SSO's PCPR, which provides Sandia with a comprehensive, laboratory-wide evaluation of overall performance.

Approximately two weeks after the EMR a joint meeting may be scheduled between Sandia senior level management and SSO senior level management to discuss performance issues of concern to the government that were not covered in sufficient detail during the EMR, the PCPR, and/or any other oversight concerns. The format for this set of meetings will be determined by Sandia's President and the SSO Manager. In addition, monthly partnering meetings between Sandia and SSO executive management will be utilized to help provide transparency and identify time-sensitive issues and concerns.



## CHANGE CONTROL

It is essential that a baseline of performance expectations and metrics be established at the beginning of the performance period to equitably measure performance, and that changes to that baseline are carefully managed. It is recognized that performance occurs in a dynamic environment and changes in the direction, requirements, funding, and administration of work happen regularly. All changes will be reviewed by the SSO Manager/Contracting Officer (SOM/CO) for consideration and/or final approval. While recognizing the unilateral rights of the NNSA as expressed in contract clauses: (1) H-10 "Performance Based Management," and (2) H-11 "Performance Incentives," bilateral changes are the preferred method of change whenever possible.

- Proposed verbatim language changes to the PEP will be based on a specific need or preferred strategy, to support the need for the proposed change.
- If there is disagreement on any issue that may have a significant impact, the issue should be brought to the EMR meeting for a recommended resolution or direction.
- Administrative changes to the PEP, such as team members' names, will be resolved by the Joint Support Staff, who provide liaison and administrative support to NNSA and Sandia.
- Multi-Site Incentive - The PEP and the associated Program Implementation Plans, and equivalent documents, will be placed on a portal and will be accessible to both the Management and Operating (M&O) Contractors and the Federal community. The SOM/CO will keep NNSA Headquarters informed of any substantial proposed changes to the Multi-Site by Sandia.



## PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

Sandia will provide innovative, science-based, systems-engineering solutions to the most challenging problems that face our nation and the globe. NNSA will take into consideration all major functions contributing to mission success. This PEP seeks to set POs to describe what the government wants and puts in place measures for how the contractor is meeting the those objectives. Specific targets or metrics are established within the contractor's PAS based on programmatic needs and operational goals tempered by risk assessment. Performance indicators, and other evidence, are located within ILMS/PAS. By organizing into Mission and Mission Support areas, the transparency of the management of the entire Laboratory is improved to the government.

### MISSION FOCUSED PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

#### **PO-1: National Security Mission – Nuclear Weapons**

Sandia Corporation (Sandia) will diligently and successfully execute mission work based on the programmatic requirements established by customers in alignment with Multi-Year Performance Expectations as measured through the line organizations. This Objective includes Critical Performance Measures, and other evidence, contributing to the success of the Nuclear Weapons (NW) mission.

- 1.1 Critical Performance Measure 1.1: Demonstrate effective analysis and management of revenue, cost, and resource allocation compared to Mission Area expectations and projections and the NNSA budget process. Demonstrate effective analysis and management of customer satisfaction, as expressed by both Project Customers and Key Customers (biennial), using data from the Sandia External Customer Satisfaction (CSat) Survey process, and DOE/NNSA Headquarters' (HQ) feedback. This measure will be evaluated through the following provisions:
  - 1.1.1 Evidence of monthly financial reporting, evaluating the percent revenue and percent cost relative to projected fiscal year plan, and that the results are used to demonstrate effective management.
  - 1.1.2 Evidence of monthly evaluation of full time equivalent charging for both current month and year-to-date against projected fiscal year plan and that the results are used to demonstrate effective management.
  - 1.1.3 Evidence of effective management of customer relationships demonstrated through quarterly evaluation of anecdotal customer interaction and engagement, DOE/NNSA HQ's feedback, as well as the annual evaluation of SMU feedback provided through the corporate CSat survey.
- 1.2 Critical Performance Measure 1.2: Demonstrate successful performance against Level II Milestones associated with Advanced Simulation and Computing (ASC), Science Campaign

(SC)/Inertial Confinement Fusion (ICF), and Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities (RTBF). This measure will be evaluated through the following provisions:

- 1.2.1 Quarterly assessment of Level II Milestones to ensure schedule and technical performance are met.
- 1.3 Critical Performance Measure 1.3: Demonstrate successful performance against Level II Milestones associated with Directed Stockpile Work (DSW), Engineering Campaign (EC), and Readiness Campaign as well as Task Agreements with Secure Transportation Asset (STA). This measure will be evaluated through the following provisions:
- 1.3.1 Quarterly assessment of Level II Milestones and Task Agreements to ensure schedule and technical performance is met.
- 1.4 Critical Performance Measure 1.4: Demonstrate management assurance of functional requirements in Sandia policy areas such as Integrated Safeguards & Security, Environment, Safety & Health, Finance, and Corporate Governance, and the effective performance and implementation by line organizations performing Strategic Management Unit (SMU) mission work. This measure will be evaluated through the following provisions:
- 1.4.1 Evidence through the management assurance process that line organizations have reviewed performance and implementation of Sandia's policies, processes, and procedures; assessed risk/impact to mission success; appropriately communicated mission impact to programs/SMUs; and appropriately addressed performance and implementation concerns within the line organization.
  - 1.4.2 Evidence through the management assurance process that Executive Management has reviewed line performance and policy implementation issues elevated by either the line, program, or policy areas, and has engaged the line organizations and/or policy areas to address issues that are currently impacting, or have the potential to significantly impact, successful execution of the SMU mission.
- 1.5 Critical Performance Measure 1.5: Demonstrate continuous improvement in NW mission performance through process improvements and other efficiencies. This measure will be evaluated through the following provisions:
- 1.5.1 Critical Performance Indicators and other evidence that demonstrate management review and assessment to ensure efficient, effective, and continually improved performance.

**Performance Team:**

**Sandia**  
Jerry L. McDowell  
Bruce Walker

**DOE/NNSA/SSO**  
Robert Scott



## PO-2: National Security Missions – NonNuclear Weapons

Sandia Corporation (Sandia) will diligently and successfully execute mission work based on the programmatic requirements established by customers as measured through the mission areas. This Objective includes Critical Performance Measures and other evidence contributing to the success of the following missions:

- a. Energy, Climate, and Infrastructure Security (ECIS)
- b. International, Homeland and Nuclear Security (IHNS)
- c. Defense Systems and Assessments (DSA)

2.1 Critical Performance Measure 2.1: Demonstrate effective analysis and management of revenue, cost, and resource allocation compared to Mission Area expectations and projections. Demonstrate effective analysis and management of Customer Satisfaction (CSat), as expressed by both Project Customers and Key Customers (biennial), using data from the Sandia External CSat Survey process. This measure will be evaluated through the following provisions:

2.1.1 Evidence of monthly financial reporting, evaluating the percent revenue and percent cost relative to projected fiscal year plan and that the results are used to demonstrate effective management.

2.1.2 Evidence of monthly evaluation of full time equivalent charging for both current month and year-to-date against projected fiscal year plan and that the results are used to demonstrate effective management.

2.1.3 Evidence of effective management of customer relationships demonstrated through quarterly evaluation of anecdotal customer interaction and engagement as well as annual evaluation of Strategic Management Unit (SMU) feedback provided through the corporate CSat survey.

2.2 Critical Performance Measure 2.2: Demonstrate performance through management review and monitoring of DOE/NNSA Work Authorizations and other customer milestones and deliverables associated with the ECIS, IHNS, and DSA missions. This measure will be evaluated through the following provisions:

2.2.1 Evidence of quarterly review and evaluation of select program/project milestones to ensure deliverables are met.

2.3 Critical Performance Measure 2.3: Demonstrate management assurance of functional requirements in Sandia policy areas such as Integrated Safeguards and Security, Environment, Safety and Health, Finance, and Corporate Governance, and the effective performance and implementation by line organizations performing SMU mission work. This measure will be evaluated through the following provisions:



- 2.3.1 Evidence through the management assurance process that line organizations have reviewed performance and implementation of Sandia's policies, processes, and procedures; assessed risk/impact to mission success; appropriately communicated mission impact to programs/SMUs; and appropriately addressed performance and implementation concerns within the line organization.
  - 2.3.2 Evidence through the management assurance process that Executive Management has reviewed line performance and policy implementation issues elevated by either the line, program or policy areas and has engaged the line organizations and/or policy areas to address issues that are currently impacting or have the potential to significantly impact successful execution of the SMU mission.
- 2.4 Critical Performance Measure 2.4: Demonstrate continuous improvement in ECIS, IHNS, and DSA mission performance through process improvements and other efficiencies. This measure will be evaluated through the following provisions:
- 2.4.1 Critical Performance Indicators and other evidence that demonstrate management review and assessment to ensure efficient, effective, and continually improved performance.

**Performance Team:**

**Sandia**

Jill M. Hruby (IHNS SMU)  
Jeffrey A. Isaacson (DSA SMU)  
Richard H. Stulen (ECIS SMU)  
Dori Ellis

**DOE/NNSA/SSO**

Robert Scott

### PO-3: Science, Technology & Engineering

Sandia Corporation (Sandia) will effectively execute Science, Technology and Engineering (ST&E) to enable and support the Laboratories' national security missions and to advance the frontiers of ST&E. This Objective includes Critical Performance Measures used to assure effective management of ST&E.

3.1 Critical Performance Measure 3.1: Demonstrate the value, technical excellence and impact of ST&E. This measure will be evaluated through the following provisions:

3.1.1 Evidence of quarterly and annual assessment of value, impact, and technical excellence using the Balanced Scorecard System.

3.2 Critical Performance Measure 3.2: Demonstrate effective management and assessment of the Laboratories' technical capabilities in coordination with the Strategic Management Units (SMU). This measure will be evaluated through the following provisions:

3.2.1 Evidence of quarterly and annual assessment of value, impact, and technical excellence using the Balanced Scorecard System.

3.3 Critical Performance Measure 3.3: Demonstrate effective management and successful execution of a Laboratory Directed Research and Development (LDRD) Program that promotes and enables innovation and creates new, differentiating capabilities. This measure will be evaluated through the following provisions:

3.3.1 Evidence of quarterly and annual assessment of value, impact, and technical excellence using the Balanced Scorecard System.

3.4 Critical Performance Measure 3.4: Demonstrate the development and execution of effective partnerships with universities, industry and other laboratories. This measure will be evaluated through the following provisions:

3.4.1 Evidence of quarterly and annual assessment of value, impact, and technical excellence using the Balanced Scorecard System.

3.5 Critical Performance Measure 3.5: Demonstrate continuous improvement in the management and execution of ST&E. This measure will be evaluated through the following provisions:

3.5.1 Evidence that ST&E management is effectively identifying and addressing issues during quarterly and annual assessments, and continuously improving the management and execution of ST&E.

**Performance Team:**

**Sandia**

J. Stephen Rottler

**DOE/NNSA/SSO**

Robert Scott



## MISSION SUPPORT PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES

### **PO-4: Operations**

Sandia Corporation (Sandia) will maintain effective and efficient Environment, Safety, and Health (ES&H), Emergency Management (EM), Integrated Safeguards and Security (IS&S), and Facilities Operations, such that the appropriate infrastructure, tools, training, policies, and guidance are in place to fully support successful accomplishment of the mission.

- 4.1 Critical Performance Measure 4.1: Environment, Safety, and Health -- Maintain effective and efficient ES&H such that the appropriate infrastructure, tools, training, policies, and guidance are in place to fully support successful accomplishment of the mission. This measure will be evaluated through the following provisions:
  - 4.1.1 Critical Performance Indicators and other evidence that demonstrate management review and assessment of ES&H to ensure efficient, effective, and continually improved performance.
  
- 4.2 Critical Performance Measure 4.2: Integrated Safeguards and Security and Emergency Management -- Manage and operate the safeguards and security, counterintelligence and EM functions to fully support successful accomplishment of the mission, while protecting the public, the worker, and national security assets in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract. This measure will be evaluated through the following provisions:
  - 4.2.1 Critical Performance Indicators, including essential elements defined in the Defense Nuclear Security Multi Year Strategic Objectives (MYSO), and other evidence that demonstrate management review and assessment of IS&S and EM to ensure efficient, effective and continually improved performance.
  
- 4.3 Critical Performance Measure 4.3: Facilities Operations -- Manage and operate the Facilities and Fire Protection Programs to fully support successful accomplishment of the mission, while protecting the public, the worker, the environment, and national security assets in accordance with operating and sustainability requirements described in the provisions of the contract as found in the Facilities Management Reporting tool maintained in the Integrated Laboratory Management System (ILMS). This measure will be evaluated through the following provisions:
  - 4.3.1 Critical Performance Indicators and other evidence that demonstrate management review and assessment of Facilities and Fire Protection Programs to ensure efficient, effective and continually improved performance.

**Performance Team:**

**Sandia**  
Michael W. Hazen  
Kimberly C. Sawyer

**DOE/NNSA/SSO**  
Dan Pellegrino  
Eileen Johnston  
Mike McFadden  
Jim Todd



## PO-5: Business Management

Sandia Corporation (Sandia) will maintain effective and efficient infrastructure and business services, ensuring the appropriate tools, training, policies and guidance are in place to fully accomplish the mission.

- 5.1 Critical Performance Measure 5.1: Finance -- Support the mission by managing and operating the Finance Program and policy areas in an effective and efficient manner and in accordance with operating requirements described in the provisions of the contract. This measure will be evaluated through the following provisions:
  - 5.1.1 Critical Performance Indicators and other evidence demonstrating compliance with operating requirements. Performance will primarily be measured through the NNSA Field Financial Management Division's Contractor Performance Measures and Rating Criteria.
- 5.2 Critical Performance Measure 5.2: Human Resources -- Support the mission by managing and operating the Human Resources Program and policy areas in an effective and efficient manner in accordance with operating requirements described in the provisions of the contract. This measure will be evaluated through the following provisions:
  - 5.2.1 Critical Performance Indicators and other evidence, primarily those measures in the Human Resources Objective Matrix, demonstrating compliance with operating requirements.
- 5.3 Critical Performance Measure 5.3: Information Management (IM) -- Support the mission by managing and operating the IM Program and policy areas (Cyber Security, Information Technology (IT) and Records Management) in an effective and efficient manner in accordance with applicable contractual requirements to ensure confidentiality, integrity and availability of information and information systems, guarding against unauthorized access, modification or denial. This measure will be evaluated through the following provisions:
  - 5.3.1 Critical Performance Indicators and other evidence, primarily from the Cyber Security Annual Operating Plan and IT Performance Objectives, demonstrating compliance with operating requirements.
- 5.4 Critical Performance Measure 5.4: Supply Chain Management -- Support the mission by managing and operating the Supply Chain Management Program and policy areas in an effective and efficient manner in accordance with operating requirements within the provisions of the contract. This measure will be evaluated through the following provisions:
  - 5.4.1 Critical Performance Indicators and other evidence primarily found in the Supply Chain Objective Matrix.

**Performance Team:**

**Sandia**  
Matthew J. O'Brien  
Kimberly C. Sawyer

**DOE/NNSA/SSO**  
Lloyd DeSerisy

## PO-6: Corporate Governance

Sandia Corporation (Sandia) will efficiently and effectively operate its quality assurance system, decision-making framework, and implement rules governing employee and business conduct while demonstrating improvement to the Contractor Assurance System (CAS) through formal assessment, causal analysis, and improvement action planning and monitoring supporting NNSA's continued transformation to Governance oversight reform.

- 6.1 Critical Performance Measure 6.1: Demonstrate through objective evidence that the Sandia Corporate Quality Management System (QMS) and supporting Program QMS are being implemented for all elements of DOE Order 414.1D based on the following:
  - 6.1.1 Corporate QMS and supporting Program QMS elements are defined and infrastructures are in place. The evidence are the required Quality Assurance Plans (QAP) and corporate and program specific implementing procedures.
  - 6.1.2 Corporate QMS and supporting Program QMS elements are being implemented. The evidence are the assessments completed by the Corporate and supporting QAP owners on the implementation and effectiveness of their QAPs against the applicable quality criteria (i.e., DOE Order 414.1D or appropriate standards).
- 6.2 Critical Performance Measure 6.2: Demonstrate through critical performance indicators and other evidence measurable improvement to the Sandia CAS.
  - 6.2.1 Completed actions/milestones as defined in the *Assurance Improvement Plan* (revision 1, August 5, 2011) to include development of root and contributing causes, and completion of resulting actions addressing appropriate issues identified in the Sandia CAS Affirmation Readiness Review final report and the Federal Affirmation Review final report.
  - 6.2.2 Sustainable implementation and performance improvement as shown by progress toward established Sandia entity maturity target levels.
- 6.3 Critical Performance Measure 6.3: Legal Management -- Effectively implement and follow a Legal Management Plan that complies with 10 C.F.R. Part 719 and Clause I-91, DEAR 970.5228-1 entitled *Insurance—Litigation and Claims (Deviation)*, dated March 2002, while also incorporating best practices and procedures. These best practices demonstrate effective internal controls and continuous improvement to maintain acceptable legal management designed to reduce the following: litigation costs; outside counsel fees and costs; and cost of judgments, awards, and settlements. Should Sandia's best practices require a deviation from 10 C.F.R. 719.10, Sandia agrees to comply with the procedures for obtaining such a deviation, per 10 C.F.R. 719.7.

**Performance Team:**      **Sandia**  
   Patricia N. Smith  
   Becky Krauss  
   Kimberly C. Sawyer

**DOE/NNSA/SSO**  
Jo Loftis  
Michele Reynolds



## **PERFORMANCE BASED INCENTIVES**

### **PBI-1: Nuclear Weapons – Stretch Goals**

Achieve stretch goals detailed below to demonstrate Sandia Corporation's (Sandia) leadership within the Nuclear Security Enterprise (NSE). Evaluation of these stretch goals will consider the availability of sufficient funding needed to complete such additional work.

- 1.1 **Performance Measure 1.1**: Exceed Level II Milestones associated with Advanced Simulation and Computing (ASC), Science Campaigns, Inertial Confinement Fusion (ICF) Campaigns, and Readiness in Technical Basis and Facilities (RTBF). This measure will be evaluated through the following provisions:
  - 1.1.1 ASC-related stretch goal(s): Provide engineering analysis in support of the B61 consistent with the Verification and Validation (V&V) principles of the ASC program. This includes: 1) Establish baseline Predictive Capability Maturity Model (PCMM) assessment and Phenomena Identification and Ranking Table (PIRT) analysis for major simulation applications (abnormal thermal, electromagnetic, abnormal mechanical, etc.) in support of B61 Life Extension Program (LEP) qualification; and 2) Demonstrate impact of computational simulations on B61 LEP for design and environments definition activities. *(Note: This stretch goal is contingent upon full scope B61 LEP in FY 2012).*
  - 1.1.2 ICF Campaign-related stretch goal(s): Establish plutonium (Pu) dynamic materials shots as routine work on the ZR accelerator as measured by (1) Pu shot per quarter for FY 2012. Continue efforts to develop, test, and certify new capabilities to access the most critical new environmental regimes for these materials, including demonstration and approval of containment for Pu experiments 16 MegaAmps (MA) or greater. Provide results from each Pu test within 30 days to Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) and NNSA Headquarters (HQ). *(Note: This is contingent on timely reception of the needed targets from LANL).*
  - 1.1.3 Science Campaign-related stretch goal: Determine higher pressure Pu experimental conditions needed to address critical long-term Science Campaign needs. This is not necessarily tied to facility pulsed power; Sandia will explicitly evaluate other means of reaching the desired conditions. Document experimental plans to reduce risks and demonstrate feasibility of: (1) diagnostics, (2) drivers (including pulse-shaping accuracy), (3) targets, and (4) containment. The plans will be prepared with the intent of performing a peer review by LANL and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL), and presented to the NNSA HQ Office of Stockpile Stewardship (OSS) Director.
  - 1.1.4 RTBF-related stretch goals: Fire suppression systems that support Documented Safety Analysis are available 98% of the time; Establish a list of process/programmatic equipment that are vital to sustaining capabilities in Mission Critical facilities. Report the percentage of operating days per month that an item of



equipment was available; Begin recapitalization of Silicon Fabrication facility per FY 2011 risk ranked Microsystems and Engineering Sciences Application (MESA) recapitalization study; and begin revitalization activities at the Tonopah Test Range (TTR) per the FY 2011 priority ranked TTR Revitalization Study.

1.2 Performance Measure 1.2: Exceed Level II Milestones associated with Directed Stockpile Work (DSW) and Engineering Campaigns. This measure will be evaluated through the following provisions:

- 1.2.1 Implement the NNSA 3-point cost estimating approach on the W88 Alteration (ALT).
- 1.2.2 Utilize existing resources within the stockpile systems to conduct Engineering Evaluation for hardware and testers per the requalification activity plans derived by the NNSA/Sandia/Kansas City Plant Kansas City Responsive Infrastructure Manufacturing and Sourcing (KCRIMS) Steering Committee and summarize impacts to the stockpile systems at the end of FY 2012.
- 1.2.3 Lower B61 LEP technical risk by meeting all criteria to increase Technical Readiness Level (TRL) (goal of TRL-5) for the following key items by end of FY 2012: (items to be negotiated post Nuclear Weapons Complex option down-select).

**Performance Team:**

**Sandia**  
Jerry L. McDowell

**DOE/NNSA/SSO**  
Robert Scott

## **PBI-2: Nuclear Weapons Quality Assurance – Stretch Goals**

Sandia Corporation (Sandia) will continue to improve its quality assurance (QA) methods and focus on the identified opportunities for improvement, as identified below. These areas, if successfully addressed, would significantly benefit product realization and product quality delivery at Sandia and its Nuclear Security Enterprise (NSE) partners (Kansas City Plant, Pantex, suppliers, etc).

- 2.1 Performance Measure 2.1: Execute a quality improvement plan to improve the effectiveness of the Sandia Nuclear Weapons (NW) Quality Management System (QMS) that incorporates prevention of weapon product defects, addresses recurring quality deficiencies, and leads to cost-effective quality assurance. This measure will be evaluated through Critical Performance Indicators within the following provisions:
- 2.1.1 Address and resolve the following systemic NW Supplier Management issues: Major gaps and weaknesses in Sandia's approach to NW Supplier Quality Management. Major gaps, weaknesses, and corrective action plan will be identified and implemented from the Sandia-led Self- Assessment conducted in FY 2011/FY 2012.
  - 2.1.2 Address each Supplier's QMS capability to meet DOE/NNSA Weapons Quality Policy (QC-1) requirements and demonstrate that gaps are mitigated by Sandia for the completion/on-time and on-budget delivery of quality products for Directed Stockpile Work (DSW).
  - 2.1.3 Identify and implement improvements in Sandia's NW QMS for product realization around but not limited to improving the Realize Product Subsystem (RPSS), and demonstrate accountabilities for management assurance of product realization have improved.
  - 2.1.4 Perform additional quality improvements in NW processes associated with: 1) Improvements to processes to ensure Sandia designs are sufficiently mature prior to entering into full-scale production at the NSE manufacturing facilities; 2) Improvements in executing Sandia processes so that Sandia QA and Nuclear Safety (NS) subject matter expert's inputs are acted upon by Sandia management to resolution. Track both QA and NS concerns, and document timely management resolution decisions; 3) Demonstrate that targeted NW Members of the Workforce are fully trained and qualified; and 4) Implement a cross-cutting methodology that leads to the effective prevention of quality-related production defects that at the minimum causes scrap and rework.

**Performance Team:**

**Sandia**  
Carolyn Hart  
Jerry L. McDowell

**DOE/NNSA/SSO**  
Jo Loftis



### **PBI-3: Management of Materials – Stretch Goals**

Sandia Corporation (Sandia) will safely and efficiently manage materials that pose inherent risks at National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) / Sandia National Laboratories (SNL) sites.

- 3.1 Performance Measure 3.1: Safely and efficiently remove No Defined Use (NDU) nuclear materials from NNSA/SNL sites. This measure will be evaluated through the following provisions:
  - 3.1.1 Complete the removal of a minimum of six Hazard Category 3 or remote-handled, non-MOX NDU items.
  - 3.1.2 Significant progress toward 1) disposal of Sodium bonded Uranium, 2) separation of MOX from Uranium in container C-00210010 and disposal of that Uranium, and 3) sampling/analysis of Enriched Uranium Kerf/residues for FY 2013 shipment.
  - 3.1.3 Complete the characterization and proceed with preparations for the removal of classified radioactive materials stored in Building 927 at SNL/California.
  - 3.1.4 Repackage the NDU LRRRI Curium 244 and complete all required preparations for removal/shipment of this material.
- 3.2 Performance Measure 3.2: Safely and efficiently remove excess explosive/energetic material and unneeded chemicals from SNL sites. This measure will be evaluated through the following provisions:
  - 3.2.1 Remove at least 40,000 pounds gross weight of explosives or energetic materials before the end of FY 2012.
  - 3.2.2 Update the Rocket Motor Inventory Management Plan and provide the updated plan to the Sandia Site Office before the end of April 2012.
  - 3.2.3 Reduce the number of containers of chemicals that have been on site over 10 years by 1,650 focusing on those that are shock sensitive.
- 3.3 Performance Measure 3.3: Complete removal of non-certified Co-60 sources from the Gamma Irradiation Facility (GIF). This measure will be evaluated through the following provisions:
  - 3.3.1 Downgrade the GIF to a radiological facility.
  - 3.3.2 Complete the removal of the GIF non-certified Co-60 sources from the SNL/New Mexico (NM) site.
- 3.4 Performance Measure 3.4: Reduce the Nuclear Facility footprint and enhance the management of nuclear materials.
  - 3.4.1 Provide a feasibility study, by March 2012, that develops, analyzes, assesses, and ranks options for reducing the need for Hazard Category 2 or 3 nuclear facilities, without reducing mission effectiveness, at NNSA/SNL/NM beyond FY 2015.



3.4.2 Formalize the processes and controls governing the acceptance of accountable nuclear materials onto NNSA/SNL sites.

**Performance Team:**

**Sandia**  
Michael W. Hazen  
Jerry L. McDowell

**DOE/NNSA/SSO**  
Jim Todd  
Dan Pellegrino

## PBI-4: Mission Support Efficiencies – Stretch Goals

Establish enduring Sandia Corporation (Sandia) practices that achieve operational efficiency, while sustaining effectiveness, through reform of Laboratory-wide processes and the implementation of Governance.

- 4.1 Performance Measure 4.1: Use management techniques and methodologies to reduce and/or avoid costs. Sustainable cost efficiencies create both savings (reduction in actual expenditures) and avoidance (decreased or prevented future costs). This measure will be evaluated through the following provisions:
  - 4.1.1 Use risk-based decision-making, Lean Six Sigma tools/techniques, and other business operations improvements that result in sustainable process improvement savings equivalent to \$16 million (including savings from PBI-4.1.2). Reported cost savings/avoidance from implemented process improvements will be in accordance with Sandia CPS FIN100.2.RPRT.2: *Document Efficiency & Cost Savings* or as estimated and documented through Lean Six Sigma methodology. Generally, cost savings/avoidance will only be reported for a 12-month period, starting with the date of implementation.
  - 4.1.2 Capture and report all cost savings and avoidances realized through Governance implementations.
  - 4.1.3 Identify how cost/resource and savings/avoidance were redirected.
- 4.2 Performance Measure 4.2: Undertake and implement a strategy in FY 2012 to address workforce planning to identify and maintain core capability while ensuring seamless operations. This measure will be evaluated through the following provisions:
  - 4.2.1 Develop a workforce strategy to articulate future workforce requirements in accordance with Sandia HR 100.1.6, *Implement an Integrated Workforce Management Approach*. Progress to plan will be monitored and reported quarterly through the Management Assurance process. Reaching 80% or more of the planned hires by the close of FY 2012 defines success for the entire corporation.
- 4.3 Performance Measure 4.3: Increase efficiencies, sustain reasonable costs for customers, and create pools for recapitalization/investments as identified in Objective #3 in Sandia's *Strategic Plan for FY 2012 through FY 2016*. Additionally, implement the objectives outlined in the joint SSO/Sandia initiative that evaluates Sandia's indirect cost drivers, with the goal of vectoring costs downward towards best business practices over the next three years.
  - 4.3.1 Realize \$70 million or more of indirect cost savings in FY 2012. The savings will be reinvested by Sandia to help meet the objectives in Sandia's Strategic Plan.
  - 4.3.2 Identify and benchmark three indirect cost pool elements and identify changes that can be implemented to vector indirect rates downward towards best business practices.
  - 4.3.3 Continue and expand on the indirect program transparency efforts. Provide details on the processes for the establishment and management the FY 2012 indirect cost pools and rates. Provide visibility to the change control process, including benefits

and risks associated with FY 2012 funding change decisions, and mitigation of those risks. On a quarterly basis, provide a status to plan, summary of significant changes, and real-time notification of those funding changes.

4.4 Performance Measure 4.4: To improve the efficiency and effectiveness of SNL/NM's mission planning, SNL/NM will provide technical support to DOE and the DOE/National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) efforts.

4.4.1 Through effective management techniques, allocate funds for the updated Site-Wide Environmental Impact Statement (SWEIS) effort.

4.4.2 Sandia will respond to data calls and will provide Site Wide Environmental Impact Statement (SWEIS) development support of high quality to the DOE and the DOE SWEIS Contractor in a timely manner.

**Performance Team:**

**Sandia**

Matthew J. O'Brien  
Kimberly C. Sawyer

**DOE/NNSA/SSO**

Lloyd DeSerisy  
Jo Loftis  
Dan Pellegrino



**PBI-5: FY 2012 Multi-Site Targets**

DRAFT NNSA Headquarters (HQ) NA10.2 Version

Item	FY 2012 Multi-Site Target	HQ NNSA Champion	FY12 Contractor Success Criteria	NNSA Owners	M&O Lead & Primary Participating Sites
1.1	<p><b>Stockpile (25% minimum of Multi-Site total)</b></p>	S. Goodrum	<p><b>1.1 Execute the defined Surveillance Program. Implementing Criteria:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1.1 Each site will execute the surveillance program, according to the PCD and specific design agency requirements.</li> <li>1.1.2 Develop and implement methods of improving programmatic performance and efficiencies as identified in the value stream analysis.</li> </ul> <p><b>Exit Criteria:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1.3 Complete FY12 surveillance activities in accordance with the PCD per design agency requirements.</li> <li>1.1.4 Provide complete cycle reports to design agencies.</li> <li>1.1.5 Report FY12 surveillance activities to QERTS.</li> </ul>		<p><b>Lead:</b></p> <p><b>Participating Sites:</b> PX, KCP, Y-12, LANL, SNL, LLNL &amp; SRS</p>
1.2	<p><b>Stockpile</b></p>	S. Goodrum	<p><b>1.2 Ensure W76-1 LEP production for subassemblies (except the MC4700 Arming, Fuzing, and Firing Assembly) remains on schedule as identified in the W76-01 PCD. The MC4700 AF&amp;Fs are available for Pantex assembly and W76-1/Mk4A Reentry Bodies are available for delivery to the U.S. Navy in accordance with the FPM recovery schedules.</b></p> <p><b>Implementing Criteria:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.2.1 Meet quarterly production targets.</li> <li>1.2.2 Interface with the U.S. Navy to confirm requirements.</li> </ul> <p><b>Exit Criteria:</b></p>		<p><b>Lead:</b></p> <p><b>Participating Sites:</b> SNL, LANL, KCP, PX, Y-12, SNL &amp; SRS</p>

Item	FY 2012 Multi-Site Target	HQ NNSA Champion	FY12 Contractor Success Criteria	NNSA Owners	M&O Lead & Primary Participating Sites
1.3	Stockpile	S. Goodrum	<p><b>1.3 Complete FY12 B61 Phase 6.3 Development Engineering activities that enable a 2017 FPU.</b></p> <p><b>Implementing Criteria:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.3.1 Complete component design reviews, IPG component Gate A &amp; B and issue ESR Stage I for B61 ship level entities IAW B61 Phase 6.4-6.6 integrated master schedule (IMS).</li> <li>1.3.2 Provide hardware, assembly and conduct environmental flight testing (IMTU &amp; VFA) to define STS environments IAW the B61 Phase 6.3-6.6 IMS.</li> <li>1.3.3 Continue component development builds to ensure readiness for a 2017 FPU IAW B61 Phase 6.3-6.6 IMS.</li> <li>1.3.4 Finalize and issue life of program buy requirements for vendor components IAW B61 Phase 6.3-6.6 IMS.</li> </ul> <p><b>Exit Criteria:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.3.5 Conduct System Conceptual Design Review.</li> <li>1.3.6 Achieve FPM approved TRL/MRL targets.</li> </ul>		<p><b>Lead:</b></p> <p><b>Participating Sites:</b> SNL, LANL, LLNL, PX, Y-12, KCP &amp; SRS</p>



Item	FY 2012 Multi-Site Target	HQ NNSA Champion	FY12 Contractor Success Criteria	NNSA Owners	M&O Lead & Primary Participating Sites
1.4	Stockpile	S. Goodrum	<p><b>1.4 Conduct Phase 6.X activities for the W78 LEP.</b></p> <p><b>Implementing Criteria:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.4.1 Coordinate with the Air Force on LEP requirements to develop conceptual designs</li> <li>1.4.2 Propose a design option sub-set to be carried into Phase 6.2/2a.</li> <li>1.4.3 Initiate feasibility studies among the option sub-set.</li> </ul> <p><b>Exit Criteria:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.4.4 Phase 6.1 briefing to NWCSSC that requests entry into Phase 6.2/2A.</li> <li>1.4.5 Matrix of design options to be carried into Phase 6.2/2A.</li> <li>1.4.6 Documentation of analysis activities to determine option feasibility.</li> </ul>		<p><b>Lead:</b></p> <p><b>Participating Sites:</b> PX, KCP, Y-12, LANL, SNL, LLNL &amp; SRS</p>
2.1	Science (25% minimum of Multi-Site total)	C. Deeney	<p><b>2.1. Achieve ignition on the NIF.</b></p> <p><b>Implementing Criteria:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.1.1 Execute DT implosion experiments with shaped laser pulse to reach ignition conditions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Completion Criteria:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.1.2 Gain &gt; 1 demonstrated in a NIF DT implosion experiment: capsule output energy is greater than the laser energy delivered to the hohlraum.</li> </ul>		<p><b>Lead:</b></p> <p><b>Participating Sites:</b> LLNL LANL SNL</p>
2.2	Science	C. Deeney	<p><b>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.</b></p> <p><b>Implementing Criteria:</b></p>		<p><b>Lead:</b></p> <p><b>Participating Sites:</b> LANL LLNL NNS SNL</p>

Item	FY 2012 Multi-Site Target	HQ NNSA Champion	FY12 Contractor Success Criteria	NNSA Owners	M&O Lead & Primary Participating Sites
2.2	Science	C. Deeney	<p>2.2.1 Refine experimental and computational tools that could enable the assessment of a future SFI.</p> <p><b>Completion Criteria:</b></p> <p>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>		
2.2	Science	C. Deeney	<p><b>2.3 Execute the plan for subcritical experiment at U1a.</b></p> <p><b>Implementing Criteria:</b></p> <p>2.3.1 Carry out a subcritical experiment at U1a with appropriate diagnostics to enable comprehensive data analysis.</p> <p><b>Completion Criteria:</b></p> <p>2.3.2 Conduct the Leda experiment in FY 2012.</p>		<p><b>Lead:</b></p> <p><b>Participating Sites:</b> LANL LLNL NNS SNL</p>
<p><b>Guidance:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum percentage fee structure: 25% for Stockpile; 25% for Science &amp; Engineering; and remaining 50% allocated per Site Office Manager's discretion.</li> <li>• Sites not participating in a multi-site target will have their fee rolled up within the same major category (items 1, or 2).</li> <li>• Sites not participating in a major category (item) will have their fee distributed within remaining major categories (item) at the Site Office Manager's discretion.</li> </ul> <p>The HQ "Champion" shall evaluate quarterly whether the multi-site target was achieved on a pass/fail basis taking into account inputs from the "Owners." At completion of 4<sup>th</sup> FY Quarter, NA-10 shall sign a Memo to Site Office Managers that contains the final evaluation ratings for each Multi-site Target; this Memo is used by the FDO for ultimate fee determination.</p>					

**Performance Team:** Sandia Jerry L. McDowell  
DOE/NNSA/SSO Robert Scott



## ACRONYM LIST

ALT	Alteration
ASC	Advanced Scientific Computing
CAS	Contractor Assurance System
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CPS	Corporate Policy System
CSat	Customer Satisfaction
DEAR	Department of Energy Acquisition Regulation
DOD	Department of Defense
DOE	Department of Energy
DSA	Defense Systems and Assessments
DSW	Directed Stockpile Work
EC	Engineering Campaign
ECIS	Energy, Climate, and Infrastructure Security
EM	Emergency Management
EMR	Executive Management Review
ES&H	Environment, Safety, and Health
FPM	Federal Program Manager
FTE	Full Time Equivalent
FY	Fiscal Year
GIF	Gamma Irradiation Facility
HQ	Headquarters
ICF	Inertial Confinement Fusion
IHNS	International, Homeland and Nuclear Security
ILMS	Integrated Laboratory Management System
IM	Information Management
IPG	Integrated Phase Gate
IPR	Independent Project Review
IS&S	Integrated Safeguards and Security
IT	Information Technology
JPAITs	Joint Performance Review Assurance Integration Teams
KCP	Kansas City Plant
L1	Level 1
LANL	Los Alamos National Laboratory
LDRD	Laboratory Directed Research and Development
LEP	Life Extension Program
LLNL	Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
LRRI	Lovelace Respiratory Research Institute
MA	MegaAmp
MESA	Microsystems and Engineering Sciences Application
M&O	Management and Operation
MOW	Members of Workforce
MOX	Mixed Oxide
MYSO	Multi Year Strategic Objectives
NIC	National Ignition Campaign
NDU	No Defined Use
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NLT	No Later Than
NNSA	National Nuclear Security Administration
NNSS	Nevada National Security Site

NS	Nuclear Safety
NSE	Nuclear Security Enterprise
NW	Nuclear Weapons
NWC	Nuclear Weapons Complex
OSS	Office of Stockpile Stewardship
PAS	Performance Assurance System
PBI	Performance Based Incentive
P-Card	Purchase Card
PCD	Program Control Document
PCMM	Predictive Capability Maturity Model
PEAR	Performance Evaluation and Assurance Report
PEP	Performance Evaluation Plan
PER	Performance Evaluation Report
PIRT	Phenomena Identification and Ranking Table
PO	Performance Objective
Pu	Plutonium
PX	Pantex Facility
QA	Quality Assurance
QAP	Quality Assurance Program
QMS	Quality Management System
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RPSS	Realize Product Subsystem
RTBF	Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities
Sandia	Sandia Corporation
SC	Science Campaign
SMU	Strategic Management Unit
SNL	Sandia National Laboratories
SNL/CA	Sandia National Laboratories/California
SNL/NM	Sandia National Laboratories/New Mexico
SNM	Special Nuclear Material
SRS	Savannah River Site
SSMP	Stockpile Stewardship & Management Plan
SSO	Sandia Site Office
ST&E	Science, Technology & Engineering
STA	Secure Transportation Asset
SWEIS	Site Wide Environmental Impact Statement
TRL	Technical Readiness Level
TTR	Tonopah Test Range
U1a	Nevada Test Site underground tunnel complex
UGT	Under Ground Test (nuclear)
V&V	Verification and Validation
WDCR	Weapon Design & Cost Report
WFO	Work for Others
WIPP	Waste Isolation Pilot Plant
Y-12	Y-12 National Security Complex