

**PART IV – REPRESENTATIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS**

**SECTION M**

**EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**

**M-1 Evaluation of Proposals**

- (a) DOE has established a Source Evaluation Board (SEB) to evaluate the proposals submitted for this procurement using the criteria in Section M. Proposals will be evaluated by the SEB in accordance with the policies and procedures contained in the Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) Part 15 and DEAR Part 915. The Source Selection Official (SSO) will select an Offeror for contract award using the best value analysis described in Section M.
- (b) The Offeror must furnish adequate and specific information in its response. A proposal will be eliminated from further consideration before the evaluation if the proposal is so grossly and obviously deficient as to be totally unacceptable on its face. For example, a proposal will be deemed unacceptable if it does not represent a reasonable effort to address itself to the essential requirements of the RFP, or if it clearly demonstrates that the Offeror does not understand the requirements of the RFP. In the event a proposal is rejected, a notice will be sent to the Offeror stating the reason(s) that the proposal will not be considered for further evaluation under this solicitation.
- (c) In accordance with L-1, Instructions to Offerors-Competitive Acquisition, the Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a Contract without discussions with Offerors. The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the CO later determines discussions to be necessary. Any exceptions or deviations by the Offeror to the terms and conditions stated in this solicitation for inclusion in the resulting 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 exception to the terms and conditions of the Contract.
- (d) As part of the evaluation process, a finding will be made whether any possible Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) exists with respect to each Offeror or whether there is little or no likelihood that such conflict exists. In making this determination, the CO will consider the Offeror's representation and disclosure statement required by the Section K provision entitled "DEAR 952.209-8 Organizational Conflicts of Interest Disclosure-Advisory and Assistance Services." Subparagraph (c)(1) of DEAR 952.209-8 requires a statement, if applicable, from the Offeror of any past, present, or currently planned financial, contractual, organizational, or other interests relating to the SOW. The Offeror should note that

subparagraph (c)(1) requires that the Offeror provide enough information in the statement to allow a meaningful evaluation by the Government of the potential effect of the interest on the performance of the SOW. For any actual or significant potential organizational conflict of interest, the Offeror shall also submit a plan of actions/activities to avoid, neutralize, or mitigate such conflict. An Offeror with no OCI or OCI which can be appropriately avoided, mitigated, or neutralized, will be considered for award.

- (e) Federal Law prohibits the award of a contract under a national security program to a company owned by an entity controlled by a foreign government unless the Secretary of Energy grants a waiver. In making this determination, the Government will consider the Offeror’s certification required by the Section K provision entitled “Certificate Pertaining to Foreign Interest.”
- (f) A Performance Guarantee Agreement in accordance with the requirements of the Solicitation’s Section L provision entitled “Requirement for Guarantee of Performance” will be a condition of award of this Contract.

**M-2 Evaluation Criteria**

Each Offeror’s proposal will be evaluated against the following technical evaluation criteria: Key Personnel, Organizational Structure and Management Approach, Technical Management Approach, ES&H, Past Performance, Relevant Experience, and Transition Plan. All technical criteria will be adjectivally rated. The technical evaluation criteria combined are significantly more important than the cost and fee. The cost and fee will not be adjectivally rated, but will be evaluated with respect to cost reasonableness and realism.

The relative weight of the technical evaluation criteria is depicted in the following table.

<b>Technical Evaluation Criteria</b>	
Key Personnel	25%
Organizational Structure and Management Approach	20%
Technical Management Approach	20%
ES&H	15%
Relevant Experience	10%
Past Performance	5%
Transition Plan	5%

The evaluation criteria are:

**(a) Key Personnel**

The following sub-criteria are not separately weighted.

- (1) Written: The Offeror's proposed Key Personnel, as identified in Section L-4, paragraph (a), will be evaluated for the extent of their qualifications and experience with respect to the functions they are proposed to manage. Demonstrated performance of the proposed Key Personnel will be evaluated to determine their ability to successfully perform the Work Statement relevant to their proposed positions. The Key Personnel will be evaluated based on the submitted resumes and reference checks. DOE may perform additional reference checks from others not identified.

Evaluation of the Chief Executive will also include the depth and breadth of his/her qualifications in the management of large technology-based commercial or government industrial complexes and management of complex multidisciplinary professional teams and projects. Evaluation of the proposed National Laboratory Director will also include his/her recognition for scientific or engineering accomplishments and recognition for successfully managing a multidisciplinary research and development organization.

Offeror shall provide a Letter of Commitment from each proposed Key Person to accept employment on the contract, relocate to the local area, and remain at SRS for at least two years. Failure to submit the foregoing required Letter of Commitment for any Key Person may result in the Offeror receiving a lower rating for this criterion.

- (2) Oral: The Government will evaluate and assess the Offeror's response to three managerial problems. In evaluating the Offeror's response to each problem during the Oral Presentation, DOE will consider:
  - Whether the Offeror's management team understands the management challenges created in the problems;
  - The observed interaction and participation of the Offeror's Key Personnel in dealing with the presented problems as an integrated management team;
  - The degree to which the Offeror's oral response is consistent with the Offeror's written proposal; and
  - The quality and effectiveness of communicating the response and proposing logical and feasible solutions to the presented problems.

**(b) Organizational Structure and Management Approach**

The proposed management approach (functional organization, lines of authority, roles and responsibilities, and interface with DOE and NNSA) to seamlessly perform the statement of work described in Section C of the RFP to achieve the safe and efficient accomplishment of SRS missions will be evaluated. The approach will be evaluated for the extent to which it provides an efficient and realistic approach ensuring critical skills and qualifications are maintained by the workforce. The Government will also evaluate the Offeror's strategy and approach towards involving small businesses, particularly small disadvantaged businesses, in meaningful Contract performance, including the extent, variety, and complexity of the work to be performed.

**(c) Technical Management Approach**

DOE will evaluate the Offeror's approach to managing and operating the activities at SRS, including current site operations, SRNL, and NNSA operations as specified below. The following sub-criteria are equally weighted.

- (1) EM Closure Activities. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's project and risk management approach to ensuring that current EM closure activities are conducted in a safe, secure, environmentally sound, and economical manner, consistent with the SRS regulatory commitments and budget constraints. The Government will also evaluate the identified innovative approaches and/or technologies, their associated benefits, and the potential impact and feasibility of the regulatory strategy as proposed for the EM closure activities.
- (2) SRNL. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed technical approach to ensure Laboratory operations and R&D are conducted safely and in a disciplined manner.

The Government will evaluate the completeness, balance, and feasibility of the Offeror's proposal to develop SRNL, as the EM Corporate laboratory, into a multi-program world class National Laboratory while operating safely and maintaining the technical expertise to address emerging DOE scientific challenges. This will include the Offeror's proposed approach to positioning SRNL for transition into a distinct business unit, strengthening of core competencies and capabilities, building external collaborations, and employing innovative or best-in-class approaches.

The Government will also evaluate the Offeror's proposal to establish SRNL as a leader in solving the science and technology needs in order to reduce risk and support EM activities across DOE.

- (3) NNSA Activities. The Government will evaluate the feasibility of the Offeror's planned approach to establish NNSA Tritium Operations, as described in

Section C-3.3(a) of the Statement of Work, as a defined, severable work activity within the M&O contract structure. In addition, the Government will evaluate the effectiveness of the Offeror's overall planned approach to support current and future NNSA Nuclear Nonproliferation Program activities at SRS, including methods of interface with NNSA contractors.

- (4) Landlord Services and Site Support (excluding ES&H). The Government will evaluate the comprehensiveness and feasibility of the Offeror's proposed plan to interface with other site contractors and tenant site entities both as it performs its own work and as it provides landlord services to others in accordance with Section C-5 of the Statement of Work.

(d) **ES&H**

The Offeror's proposed approach (including management accountability, flowdown of requirements, subcontractor oversight) to enhance the existing ISMS for all work on the SRS and ensure continual improvement in ES&H performance will be evaluated. The proposed approach will be evaluated to ensure consistent implementation of ES&H requirements across SRS. The Offeror's approach to the implementation of the contractor assurance requirements of DOE Order 226.1, Implementation of DOE Oversight Policy will be evaluated.

The Offeror's plan for the development and maintenance of safety documentation required by 10 CFR 830 will also be evaluated to ensure that this work is continued without interruption or reduction of quality.

(e) **Relevant Experience**

Relevant experience is the measure of the (1) similarity of previous work performed by the Offeror to that required in this solicitation and (2) extent to which the Offeror has performed such work. The Government will evaluate the experience data to determine the degree to which the similarity and extent of that experience demonstrates the ability to successfully perform the SOW. The Government may use information within the Offeror's proposal and other information, including reference checks, as part of this evaluation.

(f) **Past Performance**

Past performance is the measure of how well the Offeror has performed work similar to that required in this solicitation. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's past performance data to determine the degree to which the quality of the past performance demonstrates its ability to successfully perform the SOW. The Government may use Past Performance Information Forms, reference checks and federal databases. Accordingly, the Government may contact any or all references in the proposals, as well as other references, as part of its evaluation. Offerors without

a record of relevant past performance on work similar in size, scope and complexity will be evaluated neither favorably nor unfavorably.

**(g) Transition Plan**

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's Transition Plan with respect to the extent that it provides for an orderly transition, minimizes impacts on continuity of operations, defines an effective approach for overcoming barriers, and identifies key issues, milestones, and commitments.

**(h) Cost and Fee**

Cost proposals will be evaluated for cost reasonableness and realism in accordance with FAR 15.404. The evaluation will include analysis of the Offeror's proposed transition costs and the Key Personnel's annual total compensation costs for the first two years of contract performance beginning at the end of the transition period. The cost proposal will be compared to the Management and Business proposal for consistency and understanding of the Statement of Work. The Government will determine the probable cost of both of the above costs. The probable cost will not be point scored or adjectively rated.

For purposes of determining the best value, the evaluated price will be the total of the proposed fee for the five year base term and the five year option, along with the probable cost for (a) transition and (b) Key Personnel's total compensation costs for the first two years of contract performance. The evaluated price will be considered in accordance with M.3, Basis for Award.

**M-3 Basis for Award**

The Government anticipates the award of a contract as a result of this solicitation to the responsible Offeror whose proposal is responsive to the solicitation and is determined to be the best value and most advantageous to the Government. Selection of the best value is determined through the process of evaluating strengths and weaknesses of each Offeror's Management and Business proposal 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 Management and Business proposal than making award to the Offeror with the lowest evaluated price. The Government shall assess whether the strengths and weaknesses of the Management and Business proposals indicate superiority from the standpoint of what the difference might mean in terms of anticipated performance. However, to the extent that Offerors' Management and Business proposals are evaluated as close or similar in merit, the evaluated price is likely to be a determining factor.