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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this plan is to implement the Office of Environmental Management’s National Laboratory Governance Framework (NLGF) as the system that the Federal government and DOE’s contractor partners work within to help assure effective mission performance and operational excellence of Savannah River National Laboratory (SRNL).

Recent reports authored by the Congressionally chartered Commission to Review the Effectiveness of the National Energy Laboratories (CRENEL) and the Secretary of Energy Advisory Board (SEAB) Task Force have made specific recommendations to help strengthen and reinvigorate the relationship between Department of Energy (DOE) and the network of its seventeen National Laboratories. These recommendations are consistent with Federal Policy 48 CFR 35.017, which defines the requirements for Federally Funded Research and Development Centers (FFRDCs) and the nature of their strategic partnership with DOE.

The DOE embraced the recommendations from CRENEL and SEAB and directed that each of the DOE offices responsible for a DOE National Laboratory develop and implement a fully-documented governance framework. In accordance with the direction, the DOE Office of Environmental Management (EM) developed a governance framework for SRNL to define the governance principles, key functions, and management roles and responsibilities that EM uses to oversee and steward the operations, vitality and mission effectiveness of SRNL.

Under the leadership of the Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, the EM Laboratory Policy Office (LPO) has been authorized to proceed with developing and executing a plan to fully implement the NLGF by 30 September 2017.

The LPO established an Integrated Project Team (IPT) with federal (EM and National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) HQ and Sites) and contractor personnel to develop an implementation plan. The IPT held an organizing and scoping meeting where participants built common understanding and alignment around the developing EM Laboratory Governance Framework. Eleven high-level objectives were explored and the basis for an implementation plan to achieve those objectives was discussed. The implementation plan is based on a three-part approach:

**Part 1** defines the EM NLGF. This framework has been completed and includes the principles, key functions, and management roles and responsibilities that the Federal government and contractors will use to oversee and steward the operations, vitality and mission effectiveness of SRNL (Appendix A).

**Part 2** develops the governance operating model based on the EM NLGF. This model has been drafted. It is the mechanism used by DOE-EM and its Managing and Operating (M&O) partners to translate the elements of the governance framework and policies into practices, procedures, and job responsibilities between DOE, its contracting partners and SRNL (Section 2).

**Part 3** develops a plan to implement and institutionalize the governance operating model. The plan defines how success will be measured, maps governance framework requirements to organizational functions and business requirements, assigns responsibility for allocating resources to implementation, (per priorities as requirements and resources permit) and defines a schedule to complete implementation (Section 3).
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. PURPOSE

During FY2016, DOE directed that each of the DOE offices responsible for a DOE National Laboratory develop and implement a fully-documented governance framework. In accordance with this direction, DOE-EM developed a governance framework (Appendix A) for the SRNL to define the governance principles, key functions, and management roles and responsibilities that EM uses to oversee and steward the operations, vitality and mission effectiveness of SRNL (Figure 1).

FIGURE 1 - Framework Governance

Under the leadership of Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, the LPO has been authorized to proceed with developing and executing a plan to fully implement the NLGF by 30 September 2017.

To design and execute an implementation plan for the EM NLGF, DOE-EM established a cooperative initiative with federal and contractor personnel known as the EM Governance Framework Implementation Project (the Project). The Project consists of the following resources: key members of the EM and NNSA’s federal HQ and Site work force and the (M&O) contractor.

This project execution plan (the Plan) is the governing document for executing the Project. The Plan establishes the scope, schedule, and resource baselines for the work to be accomplished. It also defines the organizational elements responsible for performing the work and provides the requirements for baseline management, control, and integration.
The Plan is jointly owned and maintained by the Project. The Project uses the Plan to ensure completion of the executable plan initiatives in meeting the desired end state.

1.2. DIRECTION

The LPO established an IPT with federal (EM and NNSA HQ and Sites) and contractor personnel to develop an implementation plan. The IPT held an organizing and scoping meeting where participants built common understanding and alignment around the developing EM NLGF. Eleven high-level objectives were explored and the basis for an implementation plan to achieve those objectives was discussed. The implementation plan is based on a three-part approach:

**Part 1** defines the EM NLGF. This framework has been completed and includes the principles, key functions, and management roles and responsibilities that the Federal government and contractors will use to oversee and steward the operations, vitality and mission effectiveness of SRNL.

**Part 2** develops the governance operating model based on the EM NLGF. This model is the mechanism used by DOE-EM and its M&O partners to translate the elements of the governance framework and policies into practices, procedures, and job responsibilities between DOE, its contracting partners and SRNL.

**Part 3** develops a plan to implement and institutionalize the governance operating model. The plan defines how success will be measured, maps governance framework requirements to organizational functions and business requirements, assigns responsibility for allocating resources to implementation, (per priorities as requirements and resources permit) and defines a schedule to complete implementation.

1.3. SUMMARY-LEVEL SCOPE

Recent reports authored by the CRENEL and the SEAB Task Force have made specific recommendations to help strengthen and reinvigorate the relationship between DOE and the network of its seventeen National Laboratories. These recommendations are consistent with Federal Policy 48 CFR 35.017, which defines the requirements for FFRDCs and the nature of their strategic partnership with DOE.

DOE embraced the recommendations from CRENEL and SEAB and directed that each of the DOE offices responsible for a DOE National Laboratory develop and implement a fully-documented governance framework. In accordance with the direction, DOE-EM has developed the EM NLGF for SRNL to define the governance principles, key functions, and management roles and responsibilities that EM uses to oversee and steward the operations, vitality and mission effectiveness of SRNL.

This project employs a collaborative team comprised of key stakeholders to implement the EM NLGF.

1.4. KEY OUTCOMES

The following key outcomes are fundamental to the successful implementation and operationalization of the Framework:

- Governance operating model
• Separate, independent laboratory business model
• Laboratory Contractor Assurance System
• Modified Federal and M&O supporting procedures
• Integrated Strategic and Program planning and execution
• Results-oriented, mission-focused Performance Management and Evaluation Plan (PEMP)
• Streamlined approval process
• Communications Plan

2. HISTORY OF SRNL GOVERNANCE

EM issued the M&O contract to Savannah River Nuclear Solutions (SRNS) LLC in 2008. Clause C-1.1 defined SRNL as a FFRDC established in accordance with FAR Part 35 and operated under the M&O contract. Clause C-3.2 defined SRNL’s three-fold mission: to provide technical leadership for future site missions; and to utilize its technical expertise to provide vital national and regional support in achieving the broader goals of DOE and the federal government in a safe manner. In addition, ‘SRNL shall be operated as a defined work activity within the M&O contract structure so that it will be positioned to be responsive to future DOE requirements.’

Since the laboratory is operated under the M&O contract, the implementation plan must be based on a mechanism to translate the EM NLGF into DOE contracting language for Federal and Contractor practices, procedures, and job responsibilities between DOE, its contracting partners and SRNL

Part 2 develops the governance operating model based on the EM NLGF.

2.1. GOVERNANCE OPERATING MODEL

The current organizational relationship and governance operating model (Figure 2) illustrate the DOE and Contractor relationships and direction to SRNL that flows as a result of the M&O contract.
2.2. MODIFIED GOVERNANCE OPERATING MODEL

The modified governance operating model (Figure 3) must address how all aspects of SRNL’s capabilities and operations will be governed by DOE and operated by its managing entity. This involves translating the framework Governance Principles, including key functional responsibilities and federal and contractor roles and responsibilities, into the documents that govern the relationship.
2.3. PARTNER PLANNING

EM is implementing a more cohesive national laboratory planning process across the EM, NNSA and other federal agency mission areas. This approach aligns with the NNSA Site Governance Model and establishes the basis for an integrated system of performance management and assurance.

This new process ensures that SRNL lab leadership works directly with EM and NNSA leadership, and interacts with leadership from across other DOE elements and federal agency sponsors in development of their laboratory strategic and institutional plans. This joint EM/NNSA approach is adapted from the annual laboratory planning guidance by the Office of Science.

EM and NNSA will annually engage SRNL in strategic planning activities that ask the laboratory leadership to define an innovative, yet realistic, long-range vision for the future of the laboratory and the missions conducted on behalf of the Department. This information
provides the starting point for a discussion between DOE, other federal agency and laboratory leadership about the laboratory's future directions, strengths and weaknesses, immediate and long-range challenges, and resource needs.

SRNL’s strategic and institutional planning process ensures integration and alignment with the DOE and NNSA Strategic Plans and DOE-SR/NNSA-SRFO expectations in the PEMP Key Areas. Figure 4 illustrates the expected line-of-sight alignment and consistency from the DOE Strategic Plan through the annual Laboratory Performance Evaluation and Management Plan.

FIGURE 4 - Partner Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOE PLANS &amp; GOALS</th>
<th>SCIENCE AND ENERGY</th>
<th>NATIONAL SECURITY</th>
<th>MANAGEMENT AND PERFORMANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAFTETY CULTURE</td>
<td>REDUCING LIFECYCLE COST</td>
<td>CONTRACT AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT EXCELLENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM Plans &amp; GOALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNSA Plans &amp; WAEP's</td>
<td>MAINTAIN THE STOCKPILE</td>
<td>COUNTER-TERRORISM</td>
<td>EMERGENCY RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRNL Plans &amp; GOALS</td>
<td>Science &amp; Technology</td>
<td>Tritium</td>
<td>National Security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4. LABORATORY STEWARDSHIP

EM, with key input from NNSA and SRNL, developed a fully-documented EM NLGF aligned with Congressional intent and DOE Secretarial direction. A critical element of this Framework recognizes that the Department and its contractor partners have a stewardship responsibility to maintain the enduring scientific vitality of the SRNL, and are jointly accountable for mission success.

A critical enabler of mission success for DOE national laboratories is the ability to operate as a full-fledged FFRDC. In June 2016, EM took the unique step of directing SRNS/SRNL to establish SRNL as a separate, independent business unit within the existing M&O contract. SRNL completed that project in March 2017\(^1\). DOE-SR reviewed the report and agreed with SRNL’s conclusion that the critical enablers for an enduring national laboratory had been addressed (people, organizational structure, infrastructure, procedures and oversight and metrics).

As partners executing DOE missions, EM and SRNL must continue to demonstrate their respective stewardship responsibilities. SRNL is developing systems designed to integrate various business functions that are focused on streamlining the support needed to drive efficiencies, effectiveness and strategic change as outlined in the SRNL Strategic and Institutional Plan. The SRNL Maturity Assessment in the final report highlighted areas within the organization that can serve as models to emulate and those areas that are largely

---

\(^1\) Final Report Of The Savannah River National Laboratory Separate & Independent Business Unit Implementation, 30 March 2017
reliant on the strength of the staff's knowledge, skill, and behavior to sustain a high level of performance.

SRNL plans and executes its mission by integrating their Strategic and Institutional Plan with program plans in Environmental Stewardship, National Security, Nuclear Materials Management, and Clean Energy (Figure 5). Each mission area lead develops and executes a Program Plan that identifies their current and future program objectives. SRNL mission area leads interface with EM, DOE, NNSA, and Strategic Partnerships Program sponsors. The SRNL Strategic and Institutional Plan serves as the laboratory’s compass with which each mission area is aligned, allowing it to both meet the EM and NNSA needs.

The purpose of SRNL Program Plans is three-fold:
- Document the current and proposed portfolio of activities across all mission areas,
- Share detailed program planning with all members of the SRNL Leadership Team and staff, EM and NNSA Site and HQ offices, and
- Assure effective deployment of its Core Competencies against current mission needs and provide feedback regarding enhancement of existing competencies or development of new competencies that will be needed to better support DOE’s future needs.

Each program plan is operationalized through a business plan specific to that mission area.

SRNL now has focused efforts underway to monitor implementation and stewardship of its critical enablers as well as continued development of mission areas. These include development of a set of key performance indicators to inform management decisions, integration of information management systems and continued execution of human capital and infrastructure plans through the application of management judgement and informed by the objective of mission area program plans.

EM, NNSA and SRNL are increasingly conducting joint planning, operational and review activities in accordance with the EM NLGF, NNSA SD 226.1B and NNSA NAP-4.
3. IMPLEMENTATION PLANNING

3.1. WORK BREAKDOWN

A disciplined approach, using a Work Breakdown Structure (WBS), has been established for structuring and defining the total project effort. The WBS approach provides a logical framework for tracing all necessary elements of the effort and ensuring the elements are fully addressed. The WBS is a task-oriented structure that provides the basis for initiating, planning, and performing analyses; implementing improvements; monitoring project performance; providing progress reporting; and validating the effectiveness of improvement implementation.

The underlying philosophy and organization of the Project WBS is to sequence the work into three parts as indicated in Section 1.2 and to subdivide each part into major activities and deliverables (Figure 6).

3.2. WORKFLOW

Two work flows for activity planning and execution (Figure 7) and Federal and M&O directive/procedure modifications (Figure 8) are employed.
FIGURE 7 - Activity Planning and Execution

Each major activity is developed as a Work Package. These are integrated into a master schedule to support integrated project management by the Federal Project Coordinator.

3.3. END-STATE DEFINITION

EM’s NLGF is modeled around the four overlapping functional components illustrated in Figure 1. These functional components are represented through the following entities: EM
Laboratory Policy Office; SRNL Laboratory Director Office; Savannah River EM Operations Office; and the M&O Contractor Board. Each of the organizations has distinct functions, roles, and authorities.

The four organizations will work together to form an integrated and comprehensive governance system that defines expectations, authorities and verifiable performance by utilizing objectives, requirements, metrics, and rewards. Governance invokes trust and confidence, supported by strong management assurance systems that foster clear accountability and appropriate risk-based decision making. Governance promotes improved operations and management effectiveness, increased productivity, decreased costs of operations, and greater support to mission needs.

The desired end state of the executed Plan is met when the following are accomplished:

- The SRNS prime contract supports sustainment of the governance framework and includes a mission-oriented, risk-based PEMP
- EM, DOE-SR and SRNS procedures are in place sufficient to sustain the governance framework
- Federal oversight is updated and streamlined for low and moderate risk, based on a common risk model, in support of the governance framework and is focused on SRNL’s Contractor Assurance System
- Cultural change acceptance has begun within the federal and contractor work forces.
- Positive feedback is received from external entities and stakeholders.
- Increased contractor accountability is enabled.


3.4. PROJECT DRIVERS

3.4.1. PROGRAMMATIC DRIVERS

Recent reports authored by the CRENEL and the SEAB Task Force made specific recommendations to help strengthen and reinvigorate the relationship between DOE and the network of its seventeen National Laboratories.

- Report of the Commission to Review the Effectiveness of the National Energy Laboratories (CRENEL), September 2015
- Final Report of Secretary of Energy Advisory Board Task Force on DOE National Laboratories, June 2015
  Restructure the relationship and interactions between the Department and the national laboratories and sites to ensure the continued status of the national laboratories as world-class research institutions best able to achieve DOE’s mission, maximize the impact of federal R&D investment in the laboratories, accelerate the transfer of technology into the private and government sectors, and better respond to opportunities and challenges.
- DOE-EM FY15/FY16 Performance Agreement – Goal 2
  Develop a plan to characterize the infrastructure needs, facilities and human capital required to maintain the capabilities of EM’s Savannah River National Laboratory. The plan will include strategies to enable the laboratory mission to continue technical support for the EM program and the Nation.

These recommendations are consistent with Federal Policy 48 CFR 35.017, which defines the requirements for Federally Funded Research and Development Centers (FFRDCs) and the nature of their strategic partnership with DOE.

3.4.2. REQUIREMENTS

EM’s NLGF is based on four key functional entities and clearly defined management roles and responsibilities for all of the federal and M&O stakeholders.

Successful completion of EM NLGF (Appendix A) implementation includes the following:

- Establishment and operation of the EM LPO and the Savannah River Laboratory Office (SRLO) to complete the four key functional entities
- Implementation of the EM-assigned functional roles and management roles and responsibilities to specific offices within DOE and, through the M&O prime contract, to SRNS and SRNL.

The execution approach for governance for SRNL will ensure coordination between the EM and NNSA sites and program offices.
3.4.3. ASSUMPTIONS AND CONSTRAINTS

Project planning assumptions and constraints that support the Plan, performance schedule, and resource estimates are identified below by topical order.

3.4.3.1. PROJECT

Assumptions

- The Plan uses project management fundamentals and principles in the development of the executable plan. Progress against the plan will be monitored. Modifications to the plan will follow the established DOE-SR and EM-HQ change-control process.

Constraints

- The project schedule (Section 3.5) is dependent upon receiving required DOE-EM approvals during project execution.

3.4.3.2. COMMUNICATIONS

Assumptions

- EM governance achievements will be communicated to federal and contractor employees so they can see the progress and improvements and will be continuously reminded of the desired end state.

3.4.3.3. CULTURE

Assumptions

- Federal and contractor employees are willing to accept new paradigms for success and failure based on risk and consequence.
- DOE-EM and SRNL will implement through a three part approach that includes measurable progress demonstrating the desired cultural change.

3.4.3.4. CONTRACT

Assumptions

- The SRNS prime contract will be modified, if necessary, to incorporate requirements that implement the governance framework operating model.
- Interpretation of requirements will be consistent among DOE program offices, Site offices and contractors.
- A mission-oriented, risk-based PEMP is fully implemented.
- Compliance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR), Department of Energy Acquisition Regulation (DEAR), Contractor Assurance System (CAS), and any applicable laws is continued, unless formally deviated through applicable delegations.
3.4.3.5. OVERSIGHT

Assumptions
Effective implementation of revised oversight processes is contingent upon the following:

- Successful clarification of the SRNS CAS to allow needed SRNL additions for effective oversight
- Establishment of a consistent set of key definitions addressing laboratory oversight and governance
- Clear roles and responsibilities established for federal and contractor oversight
- Appropriate use of systemic and transactional assessments

3.4.3.6. REQUIREMENTS

Assumptions

- The primary focus of the IPT, led by the Federal Project Coordinator, will be 1) the modification of those DOE policies, processes, procedures and other contractual mechanisms required to implement and sustain the EM NLGF and 2) streamlining of DOE approvals.
- The secondary focus of the Integrated Project Team, led by the SRNL Project Lead, will be 1) the modification of those SRNS policies, processes, procedures required to implement and sustain the EM NLGF and 2) completion of critical business deliverables (e.g., Communications Plan, Strategic and Programmatic Planning/Process, CAS and Continuous Improvement Initiatives.

Constraints

- There may be potential for DOE non-concurrence with proposed changes in roles, responsibilities, authorities or accountabilities.
- There needs to be alignment of directive intent among EM, NNSA, DOE-SR, DOE-SRFO, SRNL, other site offices, and HQ.
- The NNSA Act must be adhered to with regard to the DOE functional objective.

3.4.3.7. REQUIREMENTS IMPLEMENTATION

Assumptions

- There will be a graded approach to procedure evaluation and modification based on direction provided by DOE-EM and the interpretation of the EM NLGF by the federal directive owners and legal counsel.

Constraints

- The resources and schedule needed to modify the federal procedures is subject to assignment by the respective Site office managers and DOE-EM.
- Draft modification of SRNS procedures can proceed based on previous Contracting Officer direction. However implementation may require approval of any related contract changes or Federal Site or HQ operating procedures.
3.4.3.8. GENERAL

Assumptions

- DOE-SR, in coordination with NNSA, will approve SRNL readiness to operate as a separate, independent business unit within the existing M&O (SRNS, LLC)
- EM and SRNL strategic and programmatic planning integration will accelerate as SRNL site presence grows

3.5. PROJECT TIMELINE

The Project high-level timeline (Table 1) incorporates the key milestones for implementation of the EM NLGF.

**TABLE 1 - Schedule and Milestones**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NL Governance Framework (FINAL)</td>
<td>29 AUG 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL Governance Framework (APPROVED)</td>
<td>25 OCT 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance Implementation Plan (DRAFT)</td>
<td>23 OCT 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Governance Model (DESIGN)</td>
<td>25 OCT 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan (APPROVED)</td>
<td>31 MAY 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM Governance Model (Fully Operational)</td>
<td>31 MAY 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These milestones and activities will be tracked and managed to completion by the Integrated Project Team, under the oversight of the Federal Project Coordinator.
3.6. PLANNING APPROACH

3.6.1. PROJECT AUTHORIZATION

The Project was initiated in response to EM-1 direction to develop and implement an EM NLGF for SRNL.

3.6.2. ORGANIZATION AND INDIVIDUAL ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

To ensure the successful execution of the Project, an IPT of senior DOE and contractor managers and staff has been assembled. The project organization is illustrated in Figure 9.

FIGURE 9 - Governance Framework Implementation Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOE Headquarters</th>
<th>Undersecretary for Management &amp; Performance</th>
<th>Undersecretary for NNSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EM-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory Policy Officer</td>
<td>Technology Development</td>
<td>Office of Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>DOE-SR Manager</td>
<td>DOE Field Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SRLO</td>
<td>DOE-SR SME’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;O</td>
<td>SRNS/SRNL Management &amp; SME’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6.2.1. DOE SPONSORS AND SUPPORTERS

The Project is sponsored by EM-1 and the Senior EM Laboratory Policy Officer. These sponsors provide the vision, guidance, and resources necessary to support the project as well as interfaces with other site offices, NNSA, and DOE.

NNSA Office of Policy and the SRFO are supportive of this project and provide stockpile vision and guidance to assure SRNL is fully integrated with the Savannah River Tritium Enterprise.

3.6.2.2. PROJECT MANAGER (PM)

The Director of the DOE-SR Nuclear Material Programs Division (NMPD), in coordination with NNSA, has been assigned the responsibility to manage the successful execution of the Project within established schedule and resource constraints. The PM sets project priorities and is responsible for reviewing and communicating project status.
to all project stakeholders. The PM is responsible for coordinating the timely execution of project tasks and deliverables. In addition to the organizational responsibilities discussed above, the PM is responsible for the following:

- Coordination of the development of the scopes and schedules as defined in the Plan
- Accepting accountability for project planning, performance, and success
- Monitoring performance against the Plan
- Investigating and resolving performance issues
- Establishing/communicating expectations for a disciplined change-control process
- Evaluating proposed project changes for acceptability and evaluating change impacts for thresholds and approval levels
- Ensuring documentation and communication of change-control disposition to the project team
- Participating in the development of presentations and briefings to stakeholders
- Developing and maintaining the WBS
- Interfacing internally between the working teams
- Managing the project’s scope, schedule, performance, resources, and risks within the guidelines of the Plan

3.6.2.3. PROJECT TEAM

Team membership include the functional areas of program and project management, contracts, policies and procedures with additional support from other functional areas such as budget, finance, environmental, quality, security, and operations as required.

All team members share a set of responsibilities that they must fulfill to assure success of the project. Members share the following responsibilities:

- Develops the implementation strategy, as necessary;
- Ensures all project interfaces are identified, completely defined, and managed to completion;
- Identifies and defines appropriate and adequate project business scope, schedule and cost parameters;
- Reviews and comments on project deliverables. Participate in monthly reviews and assessments of project performance and status against established performance parameters, baselines, milestones, and deliverables;
- Plans and participates in project reviews, audits, and appraisals as necessary;
- Reviews change requests (as appropriate) and supports change control boards, as requested;
- Plans and participates in project transition to operations;
- Supports the preparation, review, and approval of project completion and closeout documentation; and
- Adheres to the project schedule for deliverables by providing timely input.

As the project progresses, the Director, NMPD may modify team membership as necessary to incorporate additional necessary skills and expertise. Team membership may be either full- or part-time, depending on the scope and complexity of the tasks.
TABLE 2 - Project Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Name/Position</th>
<th>Telephone/Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EM Champion</td>
<td>Sue Cange, Acting Assistant Secretary, EM-1 202-586-5216; <a href="mailto:susan.cange@hq.doe.gov">susan.cange@hq.doe.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNSA Champion</td>
<td>Steven C. Erhart, Director, Office of Policy 865-576-0511; <a href="mailto:steven.erhart@nnsa.doe.gov">steven.erhart@nnsa.doe.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM Lab Policy Office</td>
<td>Mark A. Gilbertson, Senior Laboratory Policy Officer 202-586-5042; <a href="mailto:mark.gilbertson@em.doe.gov">mark.gilbertson@em.doe.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM Chief Engineer</td>
<td>John E. Marra, Chief Engineer 240-252-0253; <a href="mailto:john.marra@em.doe.gov">john.marra@em.doe.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM Tech Dev</td>
<td>Rodrigo V. Rimando, Jr., Director, Tech Dev 240-676-6470; <a href="mailto:rodrigo.rimando@em.doe.gov">rodrigo.rimando@em.doe.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNSA Matl Mgmt</td>
<td>Jeffrey M. Allison, Senior Program Advisor 803-952-6337; <a href="mailto:jeffrey.allison@nnsa.srs.gov">jeffrey.allison@nnsa.srs.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM SR Site Manager</td>
<td>Jackie R. Craig Jr, Manager, Savannah River OO 803-952-7243; <a href="mailto:jack.craig@srs.gov">jack.craig@srs.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM ORP Manager</td>
<td>Kevin W. Smith, Manager, ORP, Richland 509-372-2315; <a href="mailto:kevin_w_smith@orp.doe.gov">kevin_w_smith@orp.doe.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNSA SR Site Mgr</td>
<td>Douglas J. Dearolph, Manager, Savannah River FO 803-646-3784, <a href="mailto:douglas.dearolph@nnsa.srs.gov">douglas.dearolph@nnsa.srs.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed. Proj. Coordinator</td>
<td>Phillip A. Polk, Director, NMPD 803-208-2854; <a href="mailto:tony.polk@srs.gov">tony.polk@srs.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR Implementation</td>
<td>Patrick R. Jackson, Physical Scientist 803-725-1226; <a href="mailto:patrick.jackson@srs.gov">patrick.jackson@srs.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNSA Contracts</td>
<td>Margaret R. Duncan, AM for Contract Admin 803-208-1140; <a href="mailto:margaret-r.duncan@nnsa.srs.gov">margaret-r.duncan@nnsa.srs.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRNL Project Lead</td>
<td>Charles E. Meyers, Director, Special Assignment 803-725-3020, <a href="mailto:chuck.meyers@srs.gov">chuck.meyers@srs.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRNL Impl Mgr</td>
<td>Jeannette Hyatt, SRNL Opportunity &amp; Risk Officer 803-725-1341; <a href="mailto:jeannette.hyatt@srs.gov">jeannette.hyatt@srs.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Federal/M&O Management/SME’s as identified in the Work Packages and required for project execution.

3.6.2.4. INTEGRATED WORKING TEAMS

The following seven integrated DOE/SRNL working teams have been formed to support the objectives of the Project and achieve assigned project deliverables:

- Project Management
- Contract & DOE Procedures
- Federal Oversight & PEMP
- Contractor Assurance System
- Planning
- Independent Business Model
- Communications

Working-team leaders, or their designees, are responsible for aggressively assessing the existing systems and practices in order to develop recommendations and complete work packages to fully implement the EM NLGF. These teams are accountable to the DOE and SRNS/SRNL senior leadership for meeting their commitments.

3.6.3. RISK MANAGEMENT

3.6.3.1. RISK-INFORMED METHODOLOGY

As stated in the Office of Environmental Management Mission and Functions Statement:

“EM-1’s first priority is to ensure the safety and health of the public and EM’s workforce while continuing to protect the environment. The AS carries out the mission using sound business practices, innovative management approaches, and science and technology to reduce risks and costs within the EM regulatory framework.”

A key principle in the implementation of the EM NLGF is the evaluation and acceptance of appropriate performance and operational risk.
The project team will use DOE’s Enterprise Risk Management approach (A Proposed path Forward on Enterprise Risk Management, US DOE, June 2016) during the work package planning process to assess the impact of framework implementation on mission and enterprise risks.

**FIGURE 10 - Integrated Risk Management**

3.6.3.2. PROJECT RISK

Project risk identification, analysis, and handling processes will occur during planning and implementation phase. Each work package team documents an initial qualitative risk analysis in Work Package Section 1.C.

3.6.4. PROJECT FILES

Records generated by the Project will be maintained in accordance with the DOE-SR Records Management Program: SRIP200, Chapter 243.1.

3.6.5. STAKEHOLDER COMMUNICATIONS

Communications must address organizational structure alignment, needed cultural changes and supporting actions, and enhanced two-way communications of mission performance, risks and resource needs. Structural and cultural messages will discuss the Governance Framework and operating model, how it works, short and longer term goals, and benefits.

Key stakeholders include the following:

- SRNL/SRNS
- DOE-SR
- NNSA-SRFO
- SRS
- Other EM Sites and M&O’s
- EM
- NNSA
- Other DOE
- Parent oversight organizations
- External regulators
- Unions
- Customers
- Other external audiences (e.g., congressional, media)

EM-HQ, DOE-SR and SRNL will use their existing communications procedures and venues to create, deliver and track communications.

### 3.6.6. CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

Operating experiences will be used throughout this Project to streamline and continuously improve implementation of the Framework, and to expand the sharing of good work practices and lessons learned. During the Project, this knowledge will be obtained from various sources. Applicable lessons learned, best practices and other management insights will be shared within the DOE complex.

### 3.7. EXECUTION APPROACH

The execution approach for the Project is described in this section and includes discussions on the management approach used to execute the Project. The Project Responsibility Assignment Matrix (RAM) and an initial execution strategy discussion by WBS Level-3 element are provided in Sections 5.6 and 5.7.

#### 3.7.1. PROJECT MANAGEMENT APPROACH

The Project will be managed consistent with the DOE-SR Program Management System Description Manual for Planning, Budgeting, Work Authorization and Control, SRM 130.2.1B.

#### 3.7.2. PROJECT BASELINE

Scope, schedule, and resource baselines for the Project are established for each Work Package. The Project Working Team is responsible for tracking progress against the baselines and facilitating implementation of timely changes as needed to ensure the project’s baseline scope is completed to the baseline schedule utilizing defined resources.

Baseline management will be accomplished by identifying, analyzing, and managing schedule variances.

Management, control, and integration of scope, schedule, and resources of the project baseline will be consistent with DOE-SR and EM-HQ procedures and will meet the requirements for configuration management and change control. The integrity of the
baseline is maintained through change control as scope and schedule baseline changes are identified, opportunities are identified, or assumptions change. Techniques and actions, as outlined in DOE-SR and EM-HQ project management processes and procedures, will be implemented for baseline management and control.

The project baseline will be managed consistent with DOE-SR Program Management System Description Manual for Planning, Budgeting, Work Authorization and Control, SRM 130.2.1B.

For the Project, executive approval is required for the following:

- Changes in scope that affect governance framework implementation
- Changes in schedule milestones involving commitments external to the project

Approved baseline changes will be reflected in a revised Plan as part of the baseline change-control process.

### 3.7.3. MONITORING AND CONTROLLING PROCESS

Project performance will be monitored, tracked, and evaluated. The Team will periodically assess the overall status of the project relative to the baseline.

### 3.7.4. REPORTING

Progress against the Plan will be reported weekly by the Team and will include current status, schedules, issues, and upcoming activities. Key elements in the performance monitoring process are as follows:

- Management of project scope – Ability to complete all scheduled tasks, including the completion of all project documentation
- Management of the project schedule – Reflected in the schedule baseline versus actual schedule performance
- Management of project resources – access to key personnel resources and decision makers

### 3.8. RESPONSIBILITY ASSIGNMENT MATRIX (RAM)

Table 3 presents the Project RAM. The RAM integrates the project organization structure with the WBS. This integration identifies key control points where levels of the WBS are assigned as responsibility control points to elements of the organization. These key control points facilitate the linkage between the planning, scheduling, resourcing, performance measurement, and configuration control.
3.9. EXECUTION STRATEGY

The execution strategy and implementation used to accomplish each work package is described in the individual Work Packages. Project Management execution is summarized below. A task element schedule is maintained by SRLO and is controlled by the Team as a stand-alone document (see Table 1).

The project is managed and executed to plan. The Project consists of the seven WBS elements identified in Table 3, Section 3.8. Each element follows the Activity and Planning process (Figure 7, Section 3.2). Work involving contract or procedure modification follows the Directive/Procedures Modification process (Figure 8, Section 3.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WBS Element</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Responsible Org/Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>SRLO, SRNL ORO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Contract &amp; DOE Procedures</td>
<td>SRLO, SRNL Contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Federal Oversight &amp; PEMP</td>
<td>SRLO, SRNL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Contractor Assurance System</td>
<td>DOE-SR, SRLO, SRNL ORO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>EM LPO, SRLO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>Independent Business Unit</td>
<td>SRNL ORO, SRLO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>SRLO, SRNL Communications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3 - Project Responsibility Assignment Matrix

4. PROJECT CLOSEOUT

Completion of all project deliverables and verification activities will confirm that the Project has met its objectives. The PM will close the project in accordance with DOE-SR Program Management System Description Manual for Planning, Budgeting, Work Authorization and Control, SRM 130.2.1B.

In addition to the above, the effective completion of this project will require interaction with NNSA-SRFO and NNSA-HQ.
APPENDIX A. Environmental Management's National Laboratory Governance Framework

MEMORANDUM FOR DISTRIBUTION

FROM:            MONICA C. REGALBUTO  
Assistant Secretary  
For Environmental Management

SUBJECT: Savannah River National Laboratory, “EM’s National Laboratory”

Recently I took the first steps toward implementing the Department’s initiatives to strengthen and invigorate the relationship between the Department of Energy (DOE) and its network of National Laboratories by creating the Laboratory Policy Office (LPO), and generating the attached National Laboratory Governance Framework (Framework).

The Savannah River National Laboratory (SRNL) is the DOE Office of Environmental Management (EM) national laboratory and I expect its resources to be used to assist in the cleanup of the Cold War legacy waste for which EM is accountable. As outlined in the EM Mission & Functions Document, SRNL is:

“the applied research and development laboratory at the EM Savannah River Site (SRS). SRNL works to provide solutions for application to assist the EM mission across the complex. The laboratory employs state-of-the-art science to provide practical, high-value, cost-effective solutions to EM’s cleanup activities. SRNL works collaboratively with other DOE laboratories to deploy technologies critical to environmental remediation and risk reduction; nuclear materials processing and disposition; nuclear detection, characterization and assessments; and gas processing, storage, and transfer systems.”

The attached Framework was developed to describe the functions and responsibilities for stewarding and utilizing SRNL resources in accomplishing this mission. The Framework articulates the collaborative partnerships required to develop and implement the planning options and requirements that support efficient achievement of the EM mission.

The Field Offices, the EM Chief Engineer Office, and the EM Technology Development Office shall engage SRNL to identify National Laboratory science and engineering capabilities that can assist with technical issues affecting EM missions.

I have asked Mr. Mark Gilbertson, in his role as Senior Laboratory Policy Officer, to immediately implement this Framework across the EM Program. Please assist him by institutionalizing the Framework in the management of your offices.

Attachment
Distribution

Doug S. Shoop, Manager, Richland Operations Office
Kevin Smith, Manager, Office of River Protection
Jack Craig, Manager, Savannah River Operations Office
Todd A. Shreden, Manager, Carlsbad Field Office
Robert E. Edwards III, Manager, Portsmouth/Paducah Project Office
Ralph E. Holland, Director, Environmental Management Consolidated Business Center
Steven Feinberg, Manager, Separations Process Research Unit
Bryan Bower, Director, West Valley Demonstration Project Office
Donald Metzler, Director, Moab Federal Project Office
John P. Zimmerman, Deputy Manager for Idaho Cleanup Project
Scott Wade, Assistant Manager for Environmental Management, Nevada Site Office
John A. Mullis II, Acting Manager, Oak Ridge Office of Environmental Management
John Jones, Director, Energy Technology Engineering Center
Douglas E. Hintze, Manager for Environmental Management, Los Alamos Field Office
Monica C. Regalbuto, Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management
Susan M. Cange, Acting Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management
Elizabeth A. Connell, Chief of Staff
Joceline Nahgian, Acting Deputy Chief of Staff
Stacy Charbonneau, Associate Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Field Operations
Frank Marcincowski, Associate Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Regulatory and Policy Affairs
Candice Trumell, Associate Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Corporate Services
James Hutton, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Safety, Security, and Quality Assurance
Oversight/Chief of Nuclear Security
Rodrigo Rimando, Director for Technology Development
John Marin, Chief Engineer
Barton V. Barnhart, Director for Infrastructure Management and Disposition Policy
Mark Senderling, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Waste and Materials Management
Robert Seifert, Acting Director for Regulatory, Intergovernmental, and Stakeholder Engagement
Connie Flohr, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Resource Management
Melody C. Bell, Associate Deputy Assistant Secretary for Resource Management
Ralph E. Holland, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Acquisition and Project Management
Norbert Doyle, Acting Associate Deputy Assistant Secretary for Acquisition and Project Management
Kristen Ellis, Acting Director for Communications
Environmental Management's National Laboratory Governance Framework

Purpose

Recent reports authored by the Congressionally chartered Commission to Review the Effectiveness of the National Energy Laboratories (CRENEL) and the Secretary of Energy Advisory Board (SEAB) Task Force have made specific recommendations to help strengthen and reinvigorate the relationship between DOE and the network of its seventeen National Laboratories. These recommendations are consistent with Federal Policy 48 CFR 35.017, which defines the requirements for Federally Funded Research and Development Centers (FFRDCs) and the nature of their strategic partnership with DOE.

The Department of Energy (DOE) embraced the recommendations from CRENEL and SEAB and directed that each of the DOE offices responsible for a DOE National Laboratory develop and implement a fully-documented governance framework. In accordance with the direction, the DOE Office of Environmental Management (EM) has developed this governance framework for the Savannah River National Laboratory (SRNL) to define the governance principles, key functions, and management roles and responsibilities that EM uses to oversee and steward the operations, vitality and mission effectiveness of SRNL.

Savannah River National Laboratory

Savannah River National Laboratory is the EM National Laboratory. SRNL is a government-owned, contractor-operated (GOCO) FFRDC currently operated by Savannah River Nuclear Solutions, LLC through a Management and Operating (M&O) contract with the DOE.

As an FFRDC, SRNL operates in strategic partnership with DOE to apply unique and specialized capabilities to assist our Nation in mitigating the hazards associated with Cold War legacy waste and contamination; sustaining and improving our Nation's nuclear security; and advancing our Nation's ability to provide a clean and sustainable energy future.

SRNL's principal mission is to apply its scientific and technical competencies to help EM achieve the Nation's legacy nuclear waste and contamination cleanup objectives. This mission spans across the EM complex and includes sixteen sites that remain the focus of ongoing cleanup efforts. SRNL has an important and strategic role in supporting EM with achieving its objectives at SRS and at other cleanup sites.

SRNL plays an equally important role to support the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) mission to maintain a safe, secure, and reliable nuclear deterrent for our Nation's defense. SRNL is the recognized center of excellence for the tritium technical processing, storage, and gas transfer systems necessary as part of our Nation's nuclear arsenal. SRNL is also responsible for developing, validating, and implementing chemical processing and purification approaches to meet current and future tritium stockpile needs, assessing and ensuring the functional capability of new gas transfer systems, and evaluating the condition and operational capability of gas transfer systems currently in our Nation's nuclear stockpile.

As an FFRDC National Laboratory, SRNL has transformed to anticipate and meet the evolving needs of the Nation, while successfully helping DOE and NNSA with their critical mission needs by providing highly reliable, cost-effective, and innovative solutions to the most difficult technical challenges. SRNL's
foundational core competencies, evolved during a time of global crisis, remain today. SRNL is shaped around science and technology for nuclear chemical manufacturing that provides practical outcomes with an unwavering commitment to the safety of its employees and protection of the environment. What also remains constant is SRNL’s assurance to stay at the cutting edge of science, technology and innovation in order to anticipate new challenges and deliver cost-effective solutions to benefit the mission needs.

In fulfilling the National Laboratory charter as an FFRDC, SRNL works strategically with a broad set of government and private-sector partners to fully understand their mission needs. This thorough understanding of mission needs allows SRNL, through its multiple programs, to devise innovative solutions that provide enhanced value to the Nation via leveraging DOE’s investment in the foundational competencies of SRNL. The nuclear-based scientific and engineering competencies that SRNL maintains for its principal missions also provide unique value to a wider range of government and private-sector programs associated with enhancing environmental sustainability, strengthening national security, and advancing the Nation’s clean energy objectives.

**National Laboratory Governance Principles**

The Department of Energy recognizes the National Laboratories are “key to mission success across the broad spectrum of DOE’s responsibilities.” The mission of DOE is to ensure America’s security and prosperity by addressing its energy, environmental, and nuclear challenges through transformative science and technology solutions. The Department’s seventeen National Laboratories have occupied a central place in the landscape of American science for more than 50 years and are an integral part of the Department. The DOE National Laboratories are the core asset for applying science and technology to meet the Department’s missions—from basic research in the physical sciences, to roles in the life sciences, energy (including the development of clean energy technology), nuclear security (responsibilities for the nuclear stockpile and also for nonproliferation), and environmental stewardship including remediation of Cold War-era production sites. The DOE National Laboratories are essential to the execution of the DOE mission, which includes research and development (R&D) capabilities, scientific and technical work, and significant physical assets.

Almost exclusively, the DOE operates its National Laboratories using a GOCO model. The DOE-laboratory-contractor relationship is critical to the success of the enterprise. The illustration in Figure-1 shows the relationships between DOE, the National Laboratory, and the Contractor that ensure the appropriate level of oversight and assurance of laboratory performance. Expectations are set and the performance measured by three primary mechanisms: Performance Evaluation Measurement Plan (PEMP), which provides the means to define DOE’s work expectations and measures the laboratory’s performance against those expectations; the M&O Contract that defines the formal partnership; the M&O Contractor Board that reviews lab operations and provides the mechanism for assurance of Contractor performance.

**Key Functional Responsibilities**

EM’s governance framework is modeled around the four overlapping functional components illustrated in Figure-1. These functional components are represented through the following entities: EM Laboratory Policy Office; SRNL Laboratory Director Office; Savannah River EM Operations Office; and the M&O Contractor Board. Each of the organizations has distinct functions, roles, and authorities. Through the interrelationship among the four organizations, they work together to form a single and comprehensive governance system to ensure efficient and effective use of resources that help achieve reliable mission delivery.
The functions for these four entities can best be summarized as the following:

1. **EM Laboratory Policy Office** – Operating on behalf of the EM Program Office (EM-1), the EM Laboratory Policy Office (LPO), in coordination and partnership with the NNSA Policy Office, stewards SRNL by assuring the enduring scientific vitality of laboratory resources and facilities and ensuring the laboratory is aligned with the strategic priorities of DOE. It is accountable for safe, efficient and effective mission success.

2. **Laboratory Director Office** – Executes the planning and operation of the laboratory in accordance with the direction of DOE; evaluates and manages enterprise risk in order to demonstrate a safe, efficient, and effective use of laboratory resources.

3. **Savannah River EM Operations Office through its Savannah River Laboratory Office** – On behalf of the EM Program Office and in coordination and partnership with the NNSA SR Field Office (NNSA NA-SV), the Savannah River Laboratory Office (SRLO) is the line organization responsible for executing the Savannah River Operations Office (SR) role of integrating and balancing contract requirements and risk (safety, security, mission, etc.) and assessing the laboratory’s ability to safely, efficiently, and effectively operate to successfully achieve mission success. SRLO also provides oversight for sustainability of the laboratory (Ex., infrastructure, budget, security, operations, and safety programs) on behalf of SR.
4. **M&O Contractor Board** - Fulfills the laboratory management and operating requirements of the DOE M&O contract for the National Laboratory.

**Management Roles and Responsibilities**

In order to execute the key functions associated with laboratory governance, EM assigns authorities and management roles to specific offices within its organization. In addition, specific management roles and responsibilities are also identified for NNSA Offices. The NNSA management roles and responsibilities recognize the critical mission role that SRNL plays in nuclear security missions, and the close partnership between EM and NNSA in stewarding the scientific vitality of SRNL. While the governance principles and key functional responsibilities provide an enduring framework, the management roles and responsibilities must be flexible and able to change in response to changing demands and priorities. The following summarizes the management roles and responsibilities that are used to execute the successful stewardship and operation of SRNL.

**EM Program Office (Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management)**

EM is the Responsible Line Organization (RLO) for mission performance of the Savannah River National Laboratory. The Program Office:

- Sponsors SRNL and is the authority for the full range of activities required to fund, plan and implement sustainability programs of SRNL and the Field Offices requiring SRNL support.
- Consults with the SRNL Laboratory Director on technical issues and strategies to improve EM mission results.

**EM Laboratory Policy Office (LPO)**

The Laboratory Policy office is responsible on behalf of the Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management for leading oversight and management of the National Laboratory. The LPO:

- Sponsors SRNL strategic planning; ensuring that the laboratory strategic planning is aligned with Department mission needs and requirements and addresses the elements of human capital, infrastructure, business systems, etc.
- Works with DOE program offices and field offices to promote effective engagement of SRNL as a resource for meeting DOE mission and National Security objectives; advises and assists with resolution of issues.
- Provides expert strategic advice to the Assistant Secretary for EM and EM leadership on all aspects of SRNL activities and areas of potential laboratory impact, including but not limited to: sustainability, alternative financing, conference management, contractor human resource management, laboratory-directed research and development (LDRD), M&O contracts, technology transfer, and Strategic Partnership Programs (SPP).
- Coordinates and partners with the NNSA Policy Office (NNSA PO) on matters related to NNSA missions and SRNL.
- Leads the periodic evaluation of the National Laboratory’s performance, coordinating with SRLO, EM Technology Development and Chief Engineer offices, EM Field offices, NNSA PO, and NNSA NA-SV.
- Approves the annual SRNL Performance Evaluation Measurement Plan (PEMP).
- Approves all SRNL documents supporting DOE mission objectives. (Ex., Laboratory Directed Research and Development Program Plan)
- Supports the EM Head of Contracting Activity (HCA) on all matters related to the National Laboratory.
- Represents EM on the Laboratory Operations Board in developing and coordinating policy with other laboratory RLs.
• Represents EM on DOE and inter-agency working groups and councils whose focus relates to the general health, utilization, and vitality of the National Laboratory system.

**NNSA Policy Office (NNSA PO)**

The NNSA Policy Office is responsible on behalf of the Under Secretary for Nuclear Security, the NNSA Administrator, for implementing governance and management improvements, annual strategic planning and stewardship of NNSA National Laboratories (including stewardship interests at SRNL). The NNSA PO:

• Leads NNSA engagement in SRNL strategic planning; coordinating with LPO in ensuring laboratory strategic planning is aligned with NNSA mission needs and requirements.
• Promotes effective engagement of SRNL’s unique capabilities in planning for Defense Programs.
• Serves as liaison to NNSA HQ program offices. Coordinates with NNSA NA-SV, with respect to SRNL NNSA mission support and stewardship. Coordinates and partners with LPO on matters related to NNSA missions and SRNL.
• Works with NNSA NA-SV, LPO, and SRLO to support the development of the SRNL PEMP and the evaluation of the National Laboratory’s performance. Supports LPO by advising and assisting with resolution of issues involving NNSA missions and SRNL.
• Represents NNSA on the Laboratory Operations Board in developing and coordinating policy with other laboratory RLOs.
• Represents NNSA on inter-agency working groups and councils whose focus relates to the general health, utilization, and vitality of the National Laboratory system.

**Savannah River Operations Office (SR)**

SR is responsible for oversight of the full range of activities necessary to sustain operations, research and development, safety, security and infrastructure of SRNL. The SR Manager serves as the Fee Determining Official (FDO) for SRNL per the PEMP in the M&O contract.

The Operations Office:

• Establishes and administers the Savannah River Laboratory Office (SRLO) to provide effective line organization oversight of SRNL and support LPO.
• Works with LPO, NNSA NA-SV and LDO through the SRLO to establish SRNL work scope.
• Directs preparation of the Laboratory PEMP.
• Oversees and validates a comprehensive and effective CAS consistent with the National Laboratory’s structure and focused on mission outcomes. Maintains a mission-focused, risk-informed field presence to verify effectiveness and accuracy of contractor assurance and performance systems.
• Assists LPO in working with DOE programs and offices to promote effective engagement of SRNL as a resource for meeting DOE mission and National Security objectives.

**NNSA Savannah River Field Office (NNSA NA-SV)**

NNSA NA-SV is responsible for contract administration and technical oversight of the NNSA programmatic work at the Savannah River Site and safe, secure and effective mission performance. The office:

• Assures day-to-day implementation of NNSA strategic and policy directions that involve SRNL.
• Coordinates with SR in the regulation and oversight of SRNL operations in support of NNSA programs.
• Works with SR to establish the SRNL PEMP.
• Evaluates contractor performance of NNSA activities in the PEMP and coordinates with SR regarding fee determination.
Savannah River Laboratory Office (SRLO)

SRLO is SR’s line organization responsible for oversight of SRNL nuclear and non-nuclear facilities and Research and Development operations. It supports the accountabilities of the SR Manager and assists the LPO in fulfillment of its mission. SRLO is responsible for oversight of activities necessary to sustain operations, research and development, safety, security and infrastructure. The office:

- Assures day-to-day implementation of LPO strategic and policy directions.
- Serves as the LPO liaison to EM Field Offices, NNSA-NA-SV, and SRNL with respect to mission programs, assisting in the development of requirements and performance expectations.
- Works with SR program managers, NNSA NA-SV program managers and SRNL’s management to ensure risk-informed oversight of laboratory work.
- Provides oversight for the development and execution of the annual SRNL PEMP.
- Works with the LPO, NNSA PO, NNSA NA-SV, EM Field Offices and SPP customers to provide input into the evaluation of laboratory performance.

EM Field Offices

EM Field Offices are responsible on behalf of the Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management for day-to-day contract management and safe, secure and effective mission performance. Each Field Office Manager:

- Is responsible for identifying the SRNL competencies that can enhance their cleanup mission(s) or make them more efficient.
- Engages SRNL to identify National Laboratory science and engineering capabilities that can assist with technical issues affecting field office missions.
- Works with LPO, EM program offices, SRNL, other applicable National Laboratories, and their Field Office contractors to identify and plan for needed National Laboratory work scope.
- Sets performance expectations, for execution of assigned SRNL work so as to accomplish assigned missions, ensure security of operations and protect the environment, and ensure safety and health of workers and the public.
- Provides input into evaluation of laboratory performance through the LPO and SRLO.
- Works with LPO and SRLO to establish a gateway for accessing laboratory capabilities.

EM Technology Development Office and Chief Engineer Office

The Offices are responsible for developing strategy, policy and guidance for the key EM program areas of Technology Development and Engineering. These offices:

- Identify programmatic needs for the application of SRNL capabilities in support of the EM mission.
- Coordinate with LPO on the development of work scope for SRNL support of mission needs.
- Provide input to LPO, SRLO and the laboratory on SRNL work performance.

Savannah River National Laboratory Director Office (LDO)

The SRNL Laboratory Director works in partnership with DOE to support national missions utilizing a base of robust science, technology and engineering tools and capabilities. As a multi-program National Laboratory, with a central focus on environmental stewardship, national security and clean energy, SRNL maintains and provides the Department with a unique combination of infrastructure and capabilities in environmental and nuclear sciences, and nuclear chemical manufacturing. The SRNL Laboratory Director Office:

- Directs laboratory planning in alignment with the EM vision and DOE/NNSA mission objectives.
- Directs development of laboratory plans for managing its competencies, workforce, business systems, Laboratory Directed Research and Development program, and infrastructure to address current and future mission needs.
• Leads laboratory execution of assigned scope in support of DOE/NNSA mission needs and priorities.
• Ensures that all laboratory work activities are conducted in a safe, compliant and cost-effective manner consistent with applicable DOE Orders and Directives.
• Implements and executes a comprehensive, effective and sound performance assurance program.
• Informs NNSA PO regarding unique Defense Program responsibilities and capabilities.
• Educates EM Field, Technology Development, and Engineering Offices regarding SRNL core competencies and capabilities that can be utilized to address mission issues.

**M&O Contractor Board**

The M&O Contractor Board is responsible for fulfilling the laboratory management and operating requirements of the DOE M&O contract for the National Laboratory. The Board:
• Provides the systems and structures that support laboratory operation.
• Reviews and oversees the management and operations of the Laboratory to assure that these are meeting contract requirements.
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Appendix

Governance Stakeholder Perspectives

It is worth noting that in EM's governance framework, EM and NNSA are sponsors of projects currently executed at SRNL that directly support their specific mission areas. EM and NNSA also partner with the M&O Contractor to successfully operate SRNL in accordance with the prime contract. Additionally, EM will work closely with the Laboratory Director and NNSA to steward the competencies and infrastructure to assure the health and future vitality of the National Laboratory for current and future missions and fulfillment of the laboratory's FFRDC role.

As illustrated in Figure-1, EM and SR in partnership with NNSA, the SRNL Laboratory Director and the Contractor Board play integrating roles in managing the overall operations, strategic planning, and performance of DOE's National Laboratory. The strategic vision and associated program strategies that support DOE and NNSA's mission areas are documented in the National Laboratory director's Strategic and Institutional Plan (SIP). The SIP further describes the underlying programmatic drivers for the National Laboratory as well as the institutional management principles of various stakeholders. The development and review of the SIP serves to ensure that the execution of SRNL is consistent with the DOE and NNSA management principles and objectives. The EM and NNSA LPO representatives are responsible for successful implementation of this governance framework. Key to this successful implementation is the partnering relationship that the EM owner, NNSA-LPO, other sponsors, and the Contractor establish to effectuate the mission of the DOE through the work of SRNL.

National Laboratory Sponsor

In the governance framework, mission direction flows from the Energy Secretary’s National Laboratory sponsor’s strategic objectives and is translated into actionable program plans in the EM or NNSA Program Offices and is executed at SRNL. The National Laboratory works directly with EM and NNSA Program Offices to fully understand their respective objectives and to develop work scope appropriate to the National Laboratory’s competencies, while aligned to advance EM and NNSA particular program mission objectives. For EM’s programs, the cleanup contractors are also important stakeholders in mission success and must be included in the management and utilization of the National Laboratory. As an FFRDC, the National Laboratory would be expected to work with Program Offices in other parts of DOE as well as other federal and non-federal entities to apply their competencies against important national needs. The PEMP and the Annual Laboratory Planning are the primary federal mechanisms that will be used to define and measure the National Laboratory’s strategic planning and performance against the sponsor’s mission and program expectations.

National Laboratory Public-Private Partnership

DOE operates its National Laboratories as GOCO facilities. As an FFRDC, the National Laboratory operates as a public-private partnership conducting research to meet special long-term research and development needs of the U.S. Government (USG). In order to discharge its responsibilities to the sponsoring agency, the FFRDC has access, beyond that which is common to the normal contractual relationship, to the USG and supplier data, including sensitive and proprietary data, and to employees, installations, equipment and real property. The FFRDC is required to conduct its business in a manner
befitting its special relationship with the USG, to operate in the public interest with objectivity and independence, to be free from organizational conflicts of interest, and to have full disclosure of its affairs to the sponsoring agency. The definition of this special relationship is rooted in DOE’s acquisition and operating policies. DOE’s laboratory operating policy is coordinated across the DOE National Laboratory network by the Laboratory Operations Board (LOB), which is further, translated into operating requirements for SRNL via its M&O contract and managed by DOE-SR. The M&O Contractor works closely with DOE-SR to assure that the National Laboratory’s operations are consistent with the M&O contract requirements. The Contract Assurance System (CAS) would also serve as a key mechanism to set effective and efficient operational expectations and performance assessment.

National Laboratory Stewardship

DOE steward its National Laboratories through the Laboratory Policy Council that is chaired by the Energy Secretary with representation from each DOE Undersecretary and the National Laboratory Directors’ Council (NLDC). The DOE stewardship role recognizes that National Labs are important not only for accomplishing current mission objectives, but they also serve as the science and technology engines that drive DOE’s ability to address evolving National challenges. EM-1, working through the LPO, works closely with the SRNL Laboratory Director to ensure that SRNL’s vision, strategy, program plans and current activities are consistent with EM’s long-term mission needs. Due to the special role that SRNL competencies play in the success of NNSA missions, the LPO partners with NNSA’s LPO to assure that the long-term needs of NNSA missions are fully represented and accounted for in EM’s SRNL stewardship decisions.

Laboratory Policy Offices

The LPO plays a central role in SRNL’s stewardship, which includes involvement and responsibility across all aspects of the EM, NNSA, and M&O Contractor Interrelationships. While the LPO does not direct individual program activities, it oversees the portfolio of mission work done at SRNL to assure both effective utilization of the laboratory competencies and appropriate alignment of its resources with EM or NNSA program mission priorities. The LPO works in close partnership with the NNSA PO to ensure NNSA’s mission priorities are effectively aligned and properly addressed by SRNL. The LPO also works with SRLD to assure that the overall M&O contract, including specific directives, are consistent with the successful application of the laboratory’s competencies against existing program needs and/or long-term mission objectives. The primary mechanism for setting the National Laboratory’s stewardship expectations and measuring performance is through Annual Laboratory Planning.

SRNL’s SIP communicates the Laboratory Director’s strategic vision and plan that integrates all components of EM, NNSA, and M&O Contractor’s Interrelationships. The development of the SIP is the responsibility of the Laboratory Director and is used to drive the alignment between EM’s vision and the National Laboratory’s strategies to meet the scientific and technological needs of EM, NNSA, and Strategic Partnership Project missions. At the top level, the SIP provides a summary of the National Laboratory’s responsibilities, priorities and objectives as developed through their partnership. The SIP highlights SRNL’s national roles and outlines strategies for addressing key strategic mission objectives for EM, NNSA and other DOE offices and federal agency programs. The SIP also describes SRNL’s plans for managing its competencies, workforce, business systems, Laboratory Directed Research and
Development program, and infrastructure to address current and future mission needs. The SIP is developed with a 5-year vision, but is updated annually to reflect changes in key planning inputs.

**National Laboratory Planning and Assessment Tools**

The PEMP, EM’s oversight assessments, Annual Laboratory Planning, and CAS are the primary mechanisms EM will use to set expectations and measure performance of SRNL and the M&O Contractor. The PEMP is an annually negotiated agreement between EMSR, NNSA NA-SV and the Contractor, and it is the scorecard for SRNL performance. It will include clear definition of the desired outcomes and goals, completion criteria, as well as acceptance criteria. Performance-Based Incentives will be included in the PEMP to support mission strategies for the fiscal year and measure all work to be performed by the National Laboratory during the evaluation period. EM and NNSA incentives established under the M&O contract will be contained in the PEMP as attachments through contract modification. EM assesses contractor performance against requirements and outcomes documented in the PEMP.

EM-1, through the EM-LPO, is responsible for the effective stewardship of SRNL. As such, the LPO develops, manages, and coordinates implementation of the SRNL’s annual laboratory strategic planning process on behalf of EM and NNSA. Evaluation of the SRNL SIP will occur through the annual laboratory planning process, including evaluation of the long-range vision for the laboratory, current capabilities, infrastructure readiness, human resources and strategies for future initiatives.

The final key assessment tool will involve the CAS conducted by the laboratory M&O Contractor. The CAS will enable the corporate parent to assess performance, provide data and information to the contractor’s management decision-making processes and allow the M&O Contractor to more efficiently and effectively manage processes, resources, and outcomes. The CAS will also provide DOE with a set of reviews of laboratory performance and is intended to enable DOE to determine the appropriate level of Federal oversight.

**Other Federal Agency Programs (OFA)**

SRNL may support a broad range of programs of critical national importance for OFAs. Mission and program direction, work scope, requirements and performance expectations, and the evaluation of laboratory performance for OFA programs at the National Laboratory would continue to be handled as currently configured.

**National Laboratory M&O Contractor**

SRNL’s M&O Contractor through its contract vehicle would work in partnership with DOE to support national missions utilizing the DOE National Laboratory network base of robust science, technology and engineering tools and capabilities. SRNL’s M&O contractor will ensure that all work activities are conducted in accordance with applicable DOE directives and contract requirements.
APPENDIX B. Applicable Directives, Regulations, and Standards

The EM Governance Framework Implementation Project existing requirement set includes the following directives, regulations and standards documented in:

2. Management and Operating Contract DE-AC09-08SR22470, with Savannah River Nuclear Solutions, LLC (SRNS)
3. DOE Policies and Orders
   a. P 226.1B, Policy for Federal Oversight and Contractor Assurance Systems
   b. O 226.1B, Implementation of DOE Oversight Policy
   c. O 227.1A, Independent Oversight Program
   d. O 251.1c, Departmental Directives Program
   e. O 412.1A, Work Authorization System
   f. O 413.3B, Program and Project Management for the Acquisition of Capital Assets
   g. O 414.1D, Quality Assurance
   h. O470.4B, Safeguards and Security Program
4. NNSA SD’s and BOPP’s
   a. SD 226.1-1A, Headquarters Biennial Review of Nuclear Safety Performance
   b. SD 226.1B, NNSA Site Governance
   c. SD 251.1, Admin Change 1, Policy Letters: NNSA Policies, Supplemental Directives, and Business Operating Procedures
   d. SD 450.2, Admin Change 1, Functions, Responsibilities and Authorities Document for Safety Management
   e. BOP-001.331, Budget Execution Headquarters Approved Funding program (HQ AFP) and Work Authorization (WA) Business Operation Policy
   f. BOP-10.003, Site Integrated Assessment Plan (SIAP) Development, Updating, and Reporting
5. EM S OPP’s
   a. EM SOPP#4, Management of EM-HQ SOPPs
6. DOE-SR Directives
   a. Implementing Procedures
   b. Manuals
   c. Notices
   d. Policies
   e. Site Policy Manual
   f. FRAP
7. DOE-SR SRNS Contract Management Plan 27 MAR 2009
8. SRNL Separate Independent Business Unit
9. SRNS M&O CAS, SRNS-RP-2016-00352
10. SRNL CAS, L1 Procedure 8.03 (DRAFT)
APPENDIX D. NNSA Organization Charts