Amendment 001 to Final
Request for Proposal – Idaho National Laboratory
July, 2004

PART IV SECTION M

EVALUATION AND SELECTION

PART IV Section M

Evaluation and Selection

Table of Contents

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

Amendment 001 to Final
Request for Proposal – Idaho National Laboratory
July, 2004

Part IV Section M

Evaluation And Selection

M.1 Background

Conduct of Acquisition. This acquisition shall be conducted in accordance with 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 without being rated 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 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. In addition, 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.

Eligibility for Award. An Offeror is eligible for award if it submits an acceptable offer and it is a responsible Offeror. A responsible Offeror (1) meets the requirements of FAR Part 9.1 and DEAR 909.1; (2) does not have an organizational conflict of interest (OCI) or an OCI that cannot be addressed as permitted in FAR Part 9.5; (3) meets foreign ownership, control or influence (FOCI) requirements; and (4) has accepted and signed the Performance Guarantee.

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

M.2 Overall Relative Importance 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 and Capabilities	150
2.	Past Performance	75
3.	Resources Incorporated into INL	50
4.	Technical and Business Management Plan Technical Business	 175 150
5.	Key Personnel Lab Director Other Key Personnel	 130 195
6.	Transition Plan	75
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. Except where noted, 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.

Proposal Consistency. Offerors 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 and Capabilities

The Government shall evaluate -

(a) The strength and relevance to the Statement of Work of the Offerors research, development and demonstration experience; and.

(b) Whether the Offeror's capabilities and experience will contribute to successful long-term management of the INL and its missions.

The Government shall consider the nature and extent of a team member's proposed participation in contract performance and the extent to which that member's relevant experience involves work that is similar in size, complexity and scope with respect to the work it will perform under this contract.

Criterion 2. Past Performance

The Government shall evaluate the relevance of the Offeror's past performance on contracts or other agreements similar in size, complexity, and scope to activities identified in the Statement of Work, including:

(a) Performance in meeting cost, schedule and scope requirements;

(b) Performance in resolving problems and the concerns of customers, regulators and other stakeholders; and

(c) Safety and regulatory compliance record.

In evaluating past performance, the performance of predecessor companies (e.g., a name change, merger, purchase of assets, etc., in which the resources of the current company were owned by the prior company) may be considered if that performance is deemed relevant by the Government.

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).

Information involving more recent relevant performance shall receive greater consideration than information for performance that is less recent. In addition, the Government shall consider the nature and extent 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 for viability, impact, credibility, and quality –

(a) The resources the Offeror commits to incorporate into the INL to enhance nuclear energy, national security, and science and technology programs; and

(b) The Offeror's plan for integrating these resources into the INL.

Offerors shall only receive credit in the evaluation for resources representing new commitments that will be incorporated into the INL during the term of the INL contract. No credit in the evaluation will be given for resources developed and funded by the United States Government unless the Offeror has exclusive rights and control of the resource.

Criterion 4. Technical and Business Management Plan

The technical aspects of the Technical and Business Management Plan shall receive greater consideration in the evaluation than the business aspects of the Technical and Business Management Plan (see Table in M.3). For evaluation purposes, elements that will be evaluated under technical are identified with the word "Technical;" and elements that will be evaluated under business are identified by the word "Business."

The Government shall evaluate:

(a) The Offeror's approach and innovation to creating and leading a multi-program national laboratory with world class nuclear capabilities that fosters an atmosphere of scientific inquiry and international, industrial and academic collaboration **(Technical)**.

(b) The Offeror's proposed organizational structure and management staffing in supporting mission accomplishment and changing laboratory culture **(Business)**.

(c) The Offeror's understanding, approach, and innovation for the following areas in the Statement of Work (Section C):

1. Specific Mission Performance Requirements

   Section C, 2.1.A.2 NGNP, **(Technical)**
   Section C, 2.1.B.1 Nonproliferation, **(Technical)**
   Section C, 2.1.B.2.a Critical infrastructure protection, **(Technical)** and
   Section C, 2.1.A.5.e Center for Advanced Energy Studies in Idaho Falls, Idaho. **(Technical)**

2. Facilities and Operations Requirements

   Section C, 2.2.2 and 2.2.3 – Cost effectiveness in providing mission infrastructure through better utilization of existing facilities, planning for new infrastructure and footprint reduction. **(Technical)**

3. General Management Requirements

   Section C, 2.3.A – Achieving administrative and programmatic efficiency in all aspects of contract performance **(Business)**.

4. Regulatory and Safety Requirements

   Section C, 2.4.B.4 - Integrated Safety Management **(Technical)**.

(d) The extent, variety, and complexity of small business involvement in performing the work **(Business)**.

(e) The realism and benefit of the approach to challenging practices and policies that are barriers to success, and the extent to which the Offeror provides realistic examples and solutions to achieving the vision and requirements of the Statement of Work. **(Business).**

(f) Proposed performance measures and allocation of fee percentage for innovation, aggressiveness, realism, understanding of contract requirements, and consistency with the Offeror's approach to performing the work **(Technical)**.

Criterion 5. Key Personnel

The Government shall evaluate the experience, technical and leadership capabilities, and commitment of the proposed Laboratory Director and other proposed key personnel, including:

(a) Leadership credentials and experience, including the ability to form and lead collaborative relationships (Laboratory Director only);

(b) Recognized professional reputation (e.g., demonstrated recognition and professional standing);

(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 proven ability to promote areas of scientific inquiry and fostering collaborative relationships;

(f) Their performance history in successfully completing major research, development and demonstration projects on time and within budget;

(g) Their understanding of DOE and external requirements (oral presentation);

(h) Their understanding and approach for resolving technical, business management, regulatory, and other barriers affecting accomplishment of the work (oral presentation);

(i) Consistency of their understanding and approach with the written proposal (oral presentation);

(j) Their ability to effectively communicate and work together (oral presentation);

(k) Their ability to recognize when to recruit, retain, remove, or replace key managers, including key personnel (oral presentation) and;

(l) Their approach to merging ANL-W and INEEL cultures into a respected scientific organization (oral presentation).

All of the Offeror's proposed Key Personnel will be evaluated for (b) through (f) above. Only those Key Personnel for the functions listed in Section L.3(d) shall participate in the Oral Presentation and be evaluated for items (g) through (l).

Criterion 6. Transition Plan

The Offeror's Transition Plan shall be evaluated on how it provides for an efficient and effective 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 for selection purposes.

(b) The amount of the fee proposed and the potential of the proposed fee to incentivize the Contractor's performance for the base contract period, and the Maximum Fee for the option period(s), will also be evaluated, and will be considered in the best value determination consistent with the provisions of the below clause M.6 entitled, "Evaluation and Selection."

M.6 Evaluation and 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 to determine which offer provides the greatest overall benefit to the Government in meeting contractual requirements. 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 basic contract period and the option period. Evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).