

DRAFT
Request for Proposal – Idaho National Laboratory
February, 2004

PART IV SECTION M
EVALUATION AND SELECTION

DRAFT
Request for Proposal – Idaho National Laboratory
February, 2004

PART IV Section M

Evaluation and Selection

Table of Contents

M.1	Background.....	1
M.2	Significance of Evaluation Criteria	2
M.3	Evaluation Methodology.....	2
M.4	Capabilities and Approach Criteria	2
	Criterion 1. Relevant Experience	2
	Criterion 2. Past Performance.....	3
	Criterion 3. Resources Incorporated into the INL.....	4
	Criterion 4. Technical and Business Management Approach	4
	Criterion 5. Key Personnel	5
	Criterion 6. Transition Plan.....	6
M.5	Cost and Fee Criteria	6
M.6	Selection	6
M.7	FAR 52.217-5 – Evaluation of Options (JUL 1990).....	6

DRAFT
Request for Proposal – Idaho National Laboratory
February, 2004

Part IV Section M

Evaluation And Selection

M.1 Background

Conduct of Acquisition. This acquisition shall be conducted using the policies and procedures in Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 15 and Department of Energy Acquisition Regulation (DEAR) Part 915. A Source Evaluation Board (SEB) shall evaluate proposals using the criteria in Section M. A Source Selection Official (SSO) shall select an Offeror for contract award using the best value analysis in M.6.

Content of Proposal. A proposal shall be eliminated from further consideration before the initial ratings if the proposal is so grossly and obviously deficient as to be totally unacceptable on its face. For example, a proposal shall be deemed unacceptable if it does not represent a reasonable initial effort to address the essential requirements of the RFP, or if it clearly demonstrates that the Offeror does not understand the requirements of the RFP. Any exceptions or deviations to the terms and conditions of the contract may make the offer unacceptable for award without discussions. If an Offeror proposes exceptions to the terms and conditions of the contract, the Government may make an award without discussions to another Offeror that did not take exceptions to the terms and conditions of the contract.

Award Without Discussions. The Government intends to award a contract without discussions. The Government may seek clarifications (defined in FAR 15.306(a)) without holding discussions. If in the Government's best interest, it will establish a competitive range and conduct discussions. If a competitive range is established, the Government may (1) communicate with Offerors before the competitive range is established for information allowed by FAR 15.306(b); and (2) limit the number of offers in the competitive range to the greatest number that will permit an efficient competition among the most highly rated proposals. Since the Government intends to award without discussions, the initial offer shall contain the Offeror's best terms.

Evaluation and Eligibility for Award. Evaluation and selection shall involve a process of evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal using the evaluation and selection criteria described in Section M. In considering the overall merit of a proposal, the Government may identify discriminators that describe a proposal's overall advantages and disadvantages. An Offeror is eligible for award if it submits an acceptable offer and it is a responsible Offeror. Responsible Offerors (1) meet the requirements of FAR Part 9.1 and DEAR 909.1; (2) do not have an organizational conflict of interest (OCI) or an OCI that cannot be mitigated or avoided (see Section K.16); (3) meet foreign ownership, control or influence (FOCI) requirements (see Section K.15); and (4) have accepted and signed the Performance Guarantee.

DRAFT
Request for Proposal – Idaho National Laboratory
February, 2004

Number of Awards. The Government intends to award a single contract.

M.2 Significance of Evaluation Criteria

The Capabilities and Approach Criteria combined are significantly more important than Cost and Fee Criteria.

M.3 Evaluation Methodology

Capabilities and Approach. The Capabilities and Approach Proposal (CAP) shall be point scored using the criteria in M.4. Total available points for each criterion are as follows:

CAPABILITIES and APPROACH PROPOSAL		
1.	Relevant Experience	150
2.	Past Performance	50
3.	Resources Incorporated into INL	50
4.	Technical and Business Management Plan	325
5.	Key Personnel	325
6.	Transition Plan	100
Total Available Points		1,000

Each criterion is further broken into areas that identify those aspects of the CAP that shall be emphasized in the evaluation. Those areas are not listed in order of importance and shall not be individually point scored. Instead, they shall be considered in the overall evaluation for that particular criterion.

Cost and Fee Criteria. The Cost and Fee Proposal shall not be point scored, but shall be evaluated as described in M.5 and M.6.

Evaluation of Risk. The Government's evaluation of M.4 and M.5 below may include an assessment of the performance and cost risk associated with the Offeror's proposal. Risk is defined as proposal attributes or proposal omissions or weaknesses that may affect, in either a positive or a negative way, performance or cost.

Proposal Consistency. Offeror's are cautioned to make sure there is consistency in proposal content both within individual criterion and across multiple criteria. Proposals that are not internally consistent may be downgraded.

M.4 Capabilities and Approach Criteria

Criterion 1. Relevant Experience

The Government shall evaluate -

DRAFT
Request for Proposal – Idaho National Laboratory
February, 2004

- (a) The strength and relevance of the Offeror's research and development credentials, including:
 - Recent experience in managing science and technology organizations similar to the INL in size, complexity, and scope;
 - Recent experience in negotiating and executing multi-lateral agreements; and
 - Experience in developing and transitioning complex systems from conception to commercial application.
- (b) The Offeror's recent experience to:
 - Plan and manage multiple facility sites with nuclear and non-nuclear laboratory operations.
 - Integrate and transform multiple, complex operations and business lines into a single unified organization.
- (c) How the Offeror's identified experience fits into its proposed management of the INL, and how it will apply this experience to execute the work.

Criterion 2. Past Performance

The Government shall evaluate past performance on relevant contracts similar in size, complexity, and scope to activities identified in the Statement of Work, including:

- (a) Performance in meeting both large individual project and broad institutional cost, schedule, and scope requirements;
- (b) Safety and environmental compliance record; and
- (c) Performance in resolving problems and the concerns of customers, regulators and stakeholders.

Notes on Past Performance Evaluation:

1. In evaluating past performance, the performance of predecessor companies may be considered if that performance is deemed relevant.
2. If an Offeror does not have any record of relevant past performance, then it shall not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance (i.e., it shall receive 50% of the available points for this criterion).
3. Information involving more recent relevant performance shall receive greater consideration than information for performance

DRAFT
Request for Proposal – Idaho National Laboratory
February, 2004

that is less recent. In addition, the Government shall consider the magnitude of a team member's proposed participation in contract performance and the extent to which that member's past performance involves work that is the same or similar to the work it will perform under this contract.

Criterion 3. Resources Incorporated into the INL

The Government shall evaluate –

- (a) The facilities, programs, and other resources the Offeror plans to incorporate into the INL to enhance the national program to develop nuclear energy and national security, science, and technology, including resources from:

Parent companies and affiliated companies;
Industry;
Universities; and
Other institutions.

Note: The Offeror shall only receive credit for resources that represent new commitments to the INL during the term of the INL contract. No credit will be given for resources made available or funded under any U. S. Government contract.

- (b) The Offeror's plan for integrating these resources, including how they will be managed, funded, and made available to support the INL. The Government shall determine the significance of proposed resources in meeting the INL vision.

Criterion 4. Technical and Business Management Approach

The Government shall evaluate –

- (a) The Offeror's understanding, approach, and innovation for the following areas in the Statement of Work:
1. Specific Mission Performance Requirements
 - 2.1.A.2 NGNP,
 - 2.1.B.1 Nonproliferation,
 - 2.1.B.1.2.a Critical infrastructure protection, and
 - 2.1.A.5 Nuclear engineering education.
 2. Facilities and Operations Requirements
 - 2.2.3 Reduce the cost of providing mission infrastructure including footprint reduction.
 3. General Management Requirements

DRAFT
Request for Proposal – Idaho National Laboratory
February, 2004

2.3 Effectiveness of proposed organizational structure in supporting mission accomplishment and changing laboratory culture.

2.3.A Efficiency in all aspects of contract performance.

4. Regulatory and Safety Requirements

2.4.13 Integrated Safety Management.

- (b) The extent, variety, and complexity of small business involvement in performing the work.
- (c) The approach to challenging practices and policies that are barriers to success and the extent to which the Offeror provides practical solutions.
- (d) Proposed performance measures and allocation of fee percentage for innovation, aggressiveness, reasonableness, understanding of contract requirements, and consistency with the Offeror's approach to performing the work.

Criterion 5. Key Personnel

The Government shall evaluate the strengths, technical and leadership capabilities, and commitment of proposed key personnel, including:

- (a) Leadership, including the ability to form and lead partnerships (Laboratory Director only);
- (b) Technical reputation (laboratory director only);
- (c) The extent, depth, and relevance of their education and leadership experience;
- (d) The extent of their commitment to the INL for the long term;
- (e) Their performance history and reputation in successfully completing major projects on time and within budget;
- (f) Their understanding of DOE and external requirements (oral presentation);
- (g) Their understanding of technical, business management, regulatory, and other barriers affecting accomplishment of the work (oral presentation);
- (h) Consistency of their understanding and approach with the written proposal (oral presentation); and
- (i) Their ability to effectively communicate and work together (oral presentation).

DRAFT
Request for Proposal – Idaho National Laboratory
February, 2004

- (j) Their ability to recognize when to recruit, retain, remove, or replace key managers, including key personnel (oral presentation).

Criterion 6. Transition Plan

The Offeror's Transition Plan shall be evaluated on how it provides for a smooth and orderly transition.

M.5 Cost and Fee Criteria

- (a) The cost proposal, consisting of transition and key personnel costs, shall be evaluated for cost reasonableness and realism in accordance with FAR 15.404. Based on that evaluation, the Government shall determine a most probable cost to the Government.
- (b) The amount of the fee proposed and the potential of the proposed fee to incentivize the Contractor's performance, for both the base contract period and the option period, will be considered consistent with the provisions of the below clause entitled "M.6 Selection."

M.6 Selection

A contract shall be awarded to the responsible Offeror whose offer (1) meets the requirements of the RFP, and (2) is determined to be the best value to the Government.

Selection of the best value shall be determined through the process of evaluating strengths and weaknesses of each Offeror's Capabilities and Approach Proposal (CAP) in accordance with the evaluation criteria stated in Section M. In making the best value determination, the Government is more concerned with obtaining a superior CAP than making award to the Offeror with the lowest evaluated price consisting of the most probable cost and fee.

The government shall assess whether the strengths and weaknesses between or among competing CAPs indicate a superiority from the standpoint of (1) what the difference might mean in terms of anticipated performance; and (2) what the evaluated price to the Government would be to take advantage of that difference. Thus to the extent that Offerors' CAPs are close or similar in merit, the evaluated price is more likely to be a determining factor.

M.7 FAR 52.217-5 – Evaluation of Options (JUL 1990)

Except when it is determined in accordance with FAR 17.206(b) not to be in the Government's best interests, the Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by evaluating both the five-year basic contract and the option period. Evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).