

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY LABORATORY PERFORMANCE REPORT

] Final

[X] Interim Period Report: From 7/06 To 7/07

9/17/07

1. Laboratory Name and Address:
(Identify Division)Sandia National Laboratory
Materials Transportation Testing + Analysis
P.O. Box 5800
Albuquerque, NM 871852. Agreement Number: J55463. Agreement Value (Base Plus Options):
1,230,0004. Agreement Award Date:
6/23/05Agreement Completion Date:
9/30/08

5. Type of agreement: - [X] stand alone [] task ordering

6. Description of Requirement:

Technical assistance with updating spent fuel shipment risk assessments and obtaining materials to enhance NRC's outreach efforts.

7. Ratings. Summarize laboratory performance and circle in the column on the right the number which corresponds to the performance rating for each rating category. Please see page three for explanation of rating scale.

Quality	Comments: High quality draft visualization / website products. Available components of risk assessment also appear technically excellent.	0 1 2 3 ④ +
Cost Control	Comments: Project underfunding in FY 07 resulted in project start cycling that has hampered cost control. Difficulties in achieving bolt closure modeling have also contributed to over target costs.	0 1 ② 3 4 +
Timeliness of Performance	Comments: Project underfunding resulted in reduced expend. time rates and delayed schedule. Difficulties in achieving bolt closure modeling have also delayed schedule.	0 1 2 ③ 4+
Business Relations	Comments: Response to inquiries is usually effective & responsive. Promptness in notification of problems could be improved.	0 1 2 ③ 4 +
Customer Satisfaction (End Users)	Comments: Satisfied with project quality. Project cost control and timeliness (subject to availability funding) and notification of problems could be improved.	0 1 2 ③ 4 +

8. Final Score (Add the ratings above and divide by the number of areas rated):

E-38

11/15/07 17:04 FAX

0001
P.03

NGU-15-2007 11:38

8 Key Personnel

Project Manager Name: Douglas Ammerman Employment Dates _____

Comments/Rating _____

Name _____ Employment Dates _____
Comments/Rating _____

Name _____ Employment Dates _____
Comments/Ratings _____

Name _____ Employment Dates _____
Comments/Ratings _____

Would you use this laboratory again? Please explain.

N/A Interim

NRC Project Manager Name: <u>John Cook</u>	Signature: <u>John R Cook</u>
Phone/FAX/Internet Address <u>01 492-3318 Fax 301 492-3345</u>	Date: <u>9/17/07</u>

Lab's Review. Were comments, rebuttals, or additional information provided?
☐ No ☐ Yes. Please attach comments.

Laboratory Contact Name <u>Doug Ammerman</u>	Signature: <u>Doug Ammerman</u>
Phone/FAX/Internet Address <u>05 845-8158 Fax 505 844-0244</u>	Date: <u>11/15/07</u>

Agency Review. Were lab comments reviewed at a level above the contracting officer? ☐ No ☐ Yes. Please attach comments. Number of _____

Final Ratings. Re-assess the Block 7 ratings based on lab comments and agency review. Revise block 7 rating, if appropriate.

_____	Cost Control _____	Timeliness _____	Customer Satisfaction CA Team _____ End User _____
-------	--------------------	------------------	--

Score (Add the ratings above and divide by the number of areas rated)

Contracting Officer Name: _____	Signature: _____
Phone/FAX/Internet Address _____	Date: _____

Rating Guidelines

Summarize laboratory performance in each of the rating areas. Assign each area a rating of 0 (Unsatisfactory), 1 (Poor), 2 (Fair), 3 (Good), 4 (Excellent), or + (Plus). Use the following instructions as guidance in making these evaluations.

<u>Quality of Product/Service</u>	<u>Cost Control</u>	<u>Timeliness of Performance</u>	<u>Business Relations</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Compliance with statement of work requirements -Accuracy of reports -Appropriateness of personnel -Technical excellence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Within budget (over/under target costs) -Current, accurate, and complete billings -Relationship of negotiated costs to actuals -Cost efficiencies -Change orders issue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Met interim milestones -Reliable -Responsive to technical direction -Completed on time, including wrap-up and agreement administration -No deductions assessed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Effective management -Businesslike correspondence -Responsive to statement of work requirements -Prompt notification of problems -Reasonable/cooperative -Flexible -Pro-active -Effective lab-recommended solutions
<p>0. Unsatisfactory</p> <p>Non-conformances are compromising the achievement of agreement requirements, despite use of Agency resources</p>	<p>Cost issues are compromising performances of agreement requirements</p>	<p>Delays are compromising the achievement of agreement requirements, despite use of Agency resources</p>	<p>Response to inquiries, technical/service/administrative issues is not effective and responsive</p>
<p>1. Poor</p> <p>Non-conformances require major agency resources to ensure achievement of agreement requirements</p>	<p>Cost issues require major Agency resources to ensure achievement of agreement requirements</p>	<p>Delays require major Agency resources to ensure achievement of agreement requirements</p>	<p>Response to inquiries, technical/service/administrative issues is marginally effective and responsive</p>
<p>2. Fair</p> <p>Non-conformances require minor agency resources to ensure achievement of agreement requirements</p>	<p>Cost issues require minor Agency resources to ensure achievement of agreement requirements</p>	<p>Delays require minor Agency resources to ensure achievement of agreement requirements</p>	<p>Response to inquiries, technical/service/administrative issues is somewhat effective and responsive</p>
<p>3. Good</p> <p>Non-conformances do not impact achievement of agreement requirements</p>	<p>Cost issues do not impact achievement of agreement requirements</p>	<p>Delays do not impact achievement of agreement requirements</p>	<p>Response to inquiries, technical/service/administrative issues is usually effective and responsive</p>
<p>4. Excellent</p> <p>There are no quality problems</p>	<p>There are no cost issues</p>	<p>There are no delays</p>	<p>Response to inquiries, technical/service/administrative issues is effective and responsive</p>

5 - The laboratory has demonstrated an exceptional performance level in any of the above four categories that justifies adding a point to the scope. It is noted that this rating will be used in those rare circumstances when performance already exceeds the performance levels described as "Excellent".