Department of Energy
Pacific Northwest Site Office
P.O. Box 350, K8-50
Richland, Washington 99352

04-MGR-0061

JUN 24 2004

Dr. L. K. Peters, Director
Pacific Northwest National Laboratory
Richland, Washington 99352

Dear Dr. Peters:

CONTRACT NO. DE-AC06-76RL01830 - CONTRACT MODIFICATION M407

This letter transmits an original copy of the executed modification. Questions regarding this matter may be directed to me at (509) 372-4023.

Sincerely,

Ronnie L. Dawson
Contracting Officer

MGR:RLD

Enclosure

cc w/encl:
K. L. Hoewing, PNNL
RL Webmaster

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE	OF	PAGES
	1		1

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO.	3. EFFECTIVE DATE	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.	5. PROJECT NO. *(If applicable)*
M407	See Block 16C		

6. ISSUED BY CODE

U.S. Department of Energy
Pacific Northwest Site Office
P.O. Box 350
Richland, Washington 99352

7. ADMINISTERED BY *(If other than Item 6)* CODE

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR *(No., street, city, county, state and zip code)*

Battelle Memorial Institute
Pacific Northwest Division
Richland, Benton, Washington 99352

DUNS # 032987476

CODE FACILITY CODE

(X) 9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO.

9B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 11)*

x 10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ ORDER NO. DE-AC06-76RL01830

10B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 13)* 12/30/64

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers ☐ is extended, ☐ is not extended.

Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods:

(a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning _____ copies of the amendment, (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA *(If required)*

13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS, IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

(X) A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: *(Specify authority)* THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.

B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES *(such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.)* SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).

X C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF: Mutual agreement of the parties.

D. OTHER *(Specify type of modification and authority)*

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor ☐ is not, ☒ is required to sign this document and return 2 copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION *(Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)*

This modification of Section J, Appendix E, "Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan" is executed to incorporate the changes to Performance Indicator 1.1.5 as approved through the formal change control #04-001. This modification replaces pages J-E-12 through J-E-16 (attached).

This modification results in no other changes.

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER *(Type or print)*		16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER *(Type or print)*	
Karen L. Hoewing, General Counsel		Ronnie L. Dawson, Contracting Officer	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR Karen L. Hoewing *(Signature of person authorized to sign)*	15C. DATE SIGNED 6-22-04	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Ronnie L. Dawson *(Signature of Contracting Officer)*	16C. DATE SIGNED 6/24/04

1.1.5 Demonstrate the support and use of strong technical peer review processes to maintain the quality of R&D programs and processes.

The weight of this indicator is 15%.

Description: This indicator demonstrates the Contractor's support and use of peer review processes to ensure the quality of its R&D programs, projects and initiatives.

Definitions: None.

Assumptions: None.

Performance Evaluation: The Contractor will report progress to the Pacific Northwest Site Office (PNSO) point-of-contact (POC) and the DOE Office of Science Headquarters POC (to be coordinated through the PNSO POC) as described in the indicator. This indicator will be measured by the following:

1. Self-assessment of the current state of reviews across the Laboratory (5 points – Points will be assigned based on how well the self assessment meets the following): The Contractor will perform a self assessment across the Laboratory of FY 2003 and recent-past reviews of internal and external research programs by March 31, 2004. This self-assessment will cover directorate reviews, technical peer reviews, and programmatic reviews. Information covered in this self-assessment will describe the number, types, and timing of the reviews; the most significant benefits seen from the reviews; and identify potential future best practices. The Contractor will provide a written report of this self-assessment to the DOE PNSO POC, who will coordinate it with DOE SC POC for the final evaluation.

2. Develop and deliver by September 30, 2004 (4 points – Points are awarded equally to the following two deliverables):

   a. Appropriate Standards-Based Management System and other materials, which describe the conduct of self-directed and externally directed peer reviews at PNNL (2 points);

   b. A plan for implementing this program in FY 2005 (2 points).

   The PNNL Peer Review program should be designed to enable the Laboratory to realize the full value of peer reviews, integrated into the Laboratory's Integrated Planning and Assessment Management System, and incorporate contractor requirements and relevant best practices, including integration, review and analysis of peer review results as appropriate and useful.

   The Implementation Plan will describe specific actions that the Laboratory will take in FY 2005 to remove gaps between current practice and the desired end-state to achieve "steady state" implementation as well as how the effectiveness of implementation (i.e. Program success) will be measured.

   This effort will utilize findings from the FY 2004 self-assessment of peer review, and the analysis of key FY 2004 internal peer review results (including DRC, LDRD, and lab level initiative reports) and a sample of accessible external peer review results. The final deliverable will include summary information from this analysis.

3. FY 2004 Review Schedule (1 points - points assigned will be based on how well the schedule meets the following): The Contractor will provide the PNSO a list of all known FY 2004 reviews, and provide the PNSO updates of changes and newly scheduled reviews in advance of their scheduled date. This initial review forecast for the year is due January 31, 2004.

Total value points (10 total points possible) for this performance indicator will be the sum of all the metrics identified above.

Outstanding:	8 - 10 points
Excellent:	6 - 7 points
Good:	4 - 5 points
Marginal:	2 - 3 points
Unsatisfactory:	<2 points

Value points will be pro-rated within the ranges identified above.

1.2 Receive recognition of results that enhance the Laboratory's and DOE's reputation for delivering science-based solutions

The weight of this objective is 20%.

1.2.1 Maximize the impact of the Laboratory's peer-reviewed and other publications

The weight of this indicator is 50%.

Description: This indicator measures the Contractor's progress in maximizing the impact of its peer-reviewed and other publications. The focus will be on optimizing the Contractor's internal culture to achieve significant publication impact.

Definitions: In order to optimize the Laboratory's publication impact, key publication information will be tracked, reported, and evaluated by the Contractor via a Publication Advisory Committee (PAC). The key publication information 'set' utilized by the PAC is below. Other pieces of information and input from the Council of Fellows may also be considered.

- Number of publications:
  - Total number of peer-reviewed publications and total number of journal publications for the Laboratory (see assumption 1).
  - Total Laboratory peer-reviewed publications reported as a function of disciplines as they are defined by ISI.
- Citations (The following can be done as long as the Laboratory publications have enough criteria to fall in the top 1% for that discipline):
  - The average citations per peer reviewed publication per ISI discipline.
  - The number of highly cited peer reviewed publications per ISI discipline.
  - Fraction of highly cited peer reviewed publications per ISI discipline.
  - The number of "hot" papers as defined by ISI.
- Journal rank:
  - Publications according to journal impact factor.
  - Total Top 5 ranked publications (and percentage of journal publications in the Top 5).
  - Total Top 10 ranked publications (and percentage of journal publications in the Top 10).
  - Total (and percentage of) documents with Impact Factor Score listing.

Assumptions:

- Data from ISI will be used in collecting publication information for the Laboratory and other institutions for comparison purposes. ISI tools will also be used to collect data such as journal impact factors and rankings by citation.
- Use of the ISI alert will be considered to determine the total number of peer-reviewed publications for the Laboratory in order to minimize cost. The ISI alert includes peer-reviewed and non-peer reviewed publications; however, the contribution of non-peer reviewed publications to the total amount of publications is reported to be small and should not skew the totals significantly. If it is later determined there is a larger than expected

contribution from non-peer reviewed publications (greater than 5%), this indicator will be modified.

- The Contractor will track, report, and evaluate key publication information to understand the Laboratory's publication impact and to inform possible process changes to maximize that impact.

Performance Evaluation: The Contractor will report progress to the Pacific Northwest Site Office (PNSO) point-of-contact (POC) and the DOE Office of Science Headquarters POC (to be coordinated through the PNSO POC) as described in the indicator. This indicator will be measured by the following:

1. Publication Advisory Committee (2 points - points assigned will be determined by the PNSO and HQ SC POC's based on how well the following is met): The Laboratory will charter and hold the first meeting of the *Publication Advisory Committee* (PAC) by February 13, 2004. This committee will provide recommendations to the Laboratory Director on ways to optimize the Contractor's peer-reviewed publication culture to achieve significant publication impact. The PNSO POC or a delegate will participate in PAC meetings.

2. FY 2003 Retrospective Publication Review (3 points - points assigned will be determined by the PNSO and HQ SC POC's based on how well this review meets the following): The PAC will hold a *retrospective* review of publications for FY 2003 (using the information described in the *Definitions for publications measures* section as well as other input sources such as the Council of Fellows), determine the status of publication impact for FY 2003 to form a baseline for future years comparison and provide a short written report of the review results with recommendations for optimization to the Laboratory Director and the DOE POCs by March 30, 2004.

3. Current-Year Reporting and Review (2 points - points assigned will be determined by the PNSO and HQ SC POC's based on how well the quarterly reports meet the following): The PAC will report quarterly (starting January 30, 2004) to the PNSO POC, the information listed under *Definitions for publications measures*, as appropriate, for FY 2004 publications. This reporting will also be done through the standing process for reporting progress against the PEMP.

4. Year-End Reporting (5 point - points assigned will be determined by the PNSO and HQ SC POCs). At year end, the PAC will prepare a short written status report on FY 2004 publication impact with recommendations for optimizing the peer reviewed publication culture to achieve increased impact in future years.

Total value points (12 total possible) for this Performance Indicator will be the sum of all the metrics identified above.

Outstanding:	10 -12 points
Excellent:	8 - 9 points
Good:	6 - 7 points
Marginal:	4 - 5 points
Unsatisfactory:	<4 points

Value points will be pro-rated within the ranges identified above.

1.2.2 Determine science and technology impact through awards and recognition

The weight of this indicator is 50%.

Description: This indicator will be measured based on the overall sum of the weighted scores of awards won (see listing below). Weightings (value points) were based on the S&T reputation of the award(s).

Measures:

Award and Recognition	Value/Each
National/International Academies	
National Academy of Science membership	40
National Academy of Engineering membership	40
American Academy of Arts and Sciences membership	30
Other (as mutually agreed to by the Contractor & PNSO)	5/10
Professional Society Awards	
National Awards and Fellowships	5
Regional	3
Other (as mutually agreed to by the Contractor & PNSO)	1/3/5
Government Awards	
E.O. Lawrence (DOE)	25
Presidential Early Career Science and Engineering (DOE-SC)	15
Homer H. Lowry (DOE-FE)	15
FLC	5
Other (as mutually agreed to by the Contractor & PNSO)	1/3/5
Industry Awards	
R&D 100	5
Other prestigious awards (TR 100, Scientific American 50, Best of Small Tech, others)	3
Other (as mutually agreed to by the Contractor & PNSO)	1/3/5

Performance Evaluation:

Outstanding:	105 - 125
Excellent:	85 - 104
Good:	65 - 84
Marginal:	45 - 64
Unsatisfactory:	≤ 44

Value points will be pro-rated within the ranges identified above.

1.3 Customer evaluation of quality of science and technology

The weight of this Objective is 50%.

Objective 1.3 shall provide a subjective measure of the overall effectiveness/performance in quality of science and technology as viewed by the DOE HQ Office of Science's (SC), other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and major customers for programs/projects. Program/project activities objectively measured by other indicators within this outcome, shall be evaluated as appropriate under each indicator and may also be evaluated here to provide an overall (objective and subjective) evaluation of that program/project activity. The evaluations under this objective may also cover other program/project activities not otherwise evaluated via specific indicators within this outcome. It should be noted that the appropriate HQ program office's or major customer's will be consulted and shall contribute as appropriate to the ratings assigned to the specific program/project indicators identified under objectives 1.1 and 1.2 within this outcome.

The PNSO shall work closely with each HQ program office or major customer throughout the year and at year-end in evaluating the Contractor's performance and will provide PNSO observations regarding programs and projects conducted by the Contractor throughout the year. The contribution to the overall rating from each of the HQ Program Offices and major customers identified below has been weighted as follows.

- Office of Science (SC)[1] (30%)
- Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation (DNN) (20%)
- Office of Intelligence (IN) (5%)
- Office of Counterintelligence (CN) (5%)
- Department of Homeland Security (DHS) (10%)
- Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) (10%)
- Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy (FE) (10%)
- Department of Environmental Management (10%)

Measures: HQ Program Office or Customer reviewers will evaluate the overall quality of the research performed. Depending on the nature of the program, reviewers should consider the following.

Science: Success in producing original, creative scientific output that advances fundamental science and opens important new areas of inquiry; success in achieving sustained progress and impact on the field; and recognition from the scientific community, including awards, peer-reviewed publications, citations, and invited talks.

Technology: Whether there is a solid technical base for the work; the intrinsic technical innovativeness of the research; the importance of contributions made to the scientific and engineering knowledge base underpinning the technology program; and recognition from the technical community.

Performance Evaluation: The overall performance rating for this objective will be determined by multiplying the overall value points assigned by each of the program offices/major customers identified above by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 1.2). Each HQ office will be asked to provide both an adjectival rating and rating value points as outlined within Table 1.3. Should a HQ office only provide an adjectival rating for overall performance (no rating value points provided), the value point scale outlined in Figure I-1 shall apply. The summed value points earned will then compared to Table 1.3 to determine the adjectival rating for this objective. If one or more of the HQ Offices chooses to not provide an evaluation for this objective, then the weighting assigned to those HQ Offices shall be proportionately distributed among the remaining HQ office weights.

[1] Note: In order to provide the Office of Science sufficient information for making an informed decision of the Laboratory's performance, the following supplementary summary information will be required from the Contractor for all SC funded research:

- The executive summaries from all retrospective peer reviews during the rating period for Office of Science funded research.
- The total number of invention report filings (or expected filings) for project work done during the rating period for Office of Science funded research.
- The total number of technical awards during the rating period for Office of Science funded research, *or* the Contractor may optionally choose to identify significant awards received during the rating period from SC funded research.
- The total number of presentations of scientific results to national or international audiences during the rating period for Office of Science funded research, *or* the Contractor may optionally choose to identify the most significant presentations to national or international audiences during the rating period for Office of Science funded research.
- Summary publication information as described in metric 1.2.1 for Office of Science funded research.
- Total number and identity of collaborations for Office of Science funded research, *or* the Contractor may optionally choose to identify significant institutional collaborations for Office of Science funded research.