

**SC Restructuring Questions and Answers  
December, 2002**

Q. We understand that SC, EM and NNSA are simultaneously proposing restructuring. How are the SC, NNSA and EM restructuring efforts being coordinated within DOE, particularly regarding their combined potential impact on traditional field office responsibilities for corporate DOE business functions such as legal, procurement, public affairs, accounting, allotment control etc.? Has the DOE MBE office been asked to participate in the realignment activities and are there any corporate MBE concerns regarding implementation of these three restructuring activities particularly as they relate to the field offices?

A. **The Office of Human Resource Management (ME-50) chaired a series of information exchange meetings in Headquarters during the summer at which SC, EM and NNSA provided information on their restructuring plans and efforts to a cross section of managers in the MBE organization. NNSA was well underway with its efforts and the potential impact on traditional field responsibilities was generally clear. That is, NNSA had adopted the idea of a Service Center that would have the historic responsibilities of an Operations Office for business and administrative functions but not have line authority relative to program execution at the NNSA laboratories and plant sites.**

**NNSA provided information in the form of a Functions & Activities Matrix that showed which office (Site Office or Service Center) had “lead” and which office had “support” responsibilities for the full range of services associated with execution of their mission. NNSA had not yet decided whether it would have a single service center or multiple centers. Science reported that it was preparing a project plan and shared that plan when it was approved by Dr. Orbach in late July. In the Plan it was clear that SC was pursuing a similar arrangement for business and administrative functions but detailed data collection and analysis only began in August. The EM intentions were not clear until late in the summer when EM announced its plan to establish a Business Center, at a yet to be determined location, to provide business and administrative support to its closure sites.**

**The meetings were suspended in September by MBE after a request to SC and EM for each office to submit a Functions & Activities Matrix, using the format developed by NNSA. SC replied that its Project Team was not in a position to provide that data in September but would do so at the end of Phase 1 of the Project.**

**The matter of ongoing competitive sourcing studies was discussed at several meetings. The conclusion was always the same. Nothing that NNSA, SC or EM was doing could or was intended to influence those studies. It was acknowledged that the competitive sourcing studies were focused at services from a DOE-wide perspective and that the outcome would be incorporated into future plans as appropriate.**

**On the question of MBE concerns regarding implementation of multiple restructuring activities, the OneSC Project Manager met with Dr. Carnes who said that while he was supportive of the intentions of each of the restructurings, he was concerned that, in the end, they needed to demonstrate to him that they were not mutually exclusive within the context of DOE as a corporate entity. He did not, at that time, express a concern for any particular aspect of the SC plan.**

**Finally, in order to share experience and avoid unnecessary complexity, the OneSC Project has maintained a relationship with its counterparts in NNSA, including inviting NNSA representatives to present their status at the Project Review co-chaired by Marvin Gunn and Dan Lehman in late October. Given the multiprogram nature of some DOE National Laboratories, it is clear that SC and NNSA need to have a compatible, though not necessarily fully consistent, approach to contract management of the labs.**