

SECTION M  
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

Table of Contents

M.1 EVALUATION GENERAL ..... M-2  
M.2 EVALUATION CRITERIA ..... M-3  
M.3 OVERALL RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF EVALUATION CRITERIA ..... M-6  
M.4 BASIS FOR AWARD ..... M-6

**SECTION M****EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD****M.1 EVALUATION GENERAL**

- (a) In accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) and the Department of Energy Acquisition Regulation (DEAR) proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the evaluation criteria set forth below. Award will be made to the responsible Offeror, whose offer, conforming to this solicitation, is considered the best value to the Government, considering the Evaluation Criteria in this Section M.
- (b) DOE reserves the right to conduct written and/or oral discussions with all Offerors whose offers are in the competitive range. The extent of discussions with the Offerors in the competitive range will depend on the circumstances of the procurement and the Offerors' proposals as submitted. The written and/or oral discussions are intended to assist DOE in accomplishing (1) a full understanding of the offers and their strengths and weaknesses, and (2) assurance that the solicitation provisions have been adequately understood by the offerors. Once discussions have been held with all firms in the competitive range, all will be offered the opportunity to submit a revised proposal by a common cutoff time and date. That is, all firms will be given the opportunity to revise their offer to reflect the results of discussions. If the revised proposal is received after the established common cutoff time or date, it shall be handled in accordance with the clause entitled "Instructions to Offerors - Competitive Acquisition" in Section L. Each revised proposal shall contain the signed contract offer.
- (c) Offerors are advised that DOE Contractor personnel may assist the Government during the Government's evaluation of proposals. These persons shall be authorized access to only those portions of the proposal data and discussions that are necessary to enable them to provide specific technical advice on specialized matters or on particular problems. These individuals will be required to protect the confidentiality of any specifically identified trade secrets and/or privileged or confidential commercial or financial information obtained as a result of their participation in this evaluation. They shall be expressly prohibited from scoring, ranking, or recommending the selection of a source.
- (d) DOE may solicit from available sources, including references and clients identified by the Offeror, experience and past performance data of an Offeror or key personnel; and will consider such information in its evaluation.

[End of Provision]

## M.2 EVALUATION CRITERIA

(a) Technical and Business Management Evaluation Criteria. The Offeror's technical and business management proposal will be evaluated to determine the Offeror's understanding of and capability to perform the requirements of the Statement of Work. The technical and business management proposal will be point scored and will be evaluated in accordance with the following criteria and subcriteria:

### (1) Criterion 1: Technology/Design

- (i) DUF<sub>6</sub> Conversion - The Offeror's DUF<sub>6</sub> conversion technology and design concept, from retrieval of DUF<sub>6</sub> cylinders through packaging of final end product(s)/waste(s), will be evaluated to determine whether it represents a mature, efficient, environmentally acceptable, safe, integrated technical approach. Such areas as simplicity of design, constructability, system reliability and maintainability, management of trace contaminants, and ability to accomplish DUF<sub>6</sub> conversion will be evaluated. Consideration will be given to the extent that viable end product use/reuse is proposed by the Offeror. Offerors will also be evaluated on the effectiveness and thoroughness of their proposed technical approach to transportation of ETTP cylinders to Portsmouth and compliance with regulations and the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation Consent Order.
- (ii) Waste and Conversion Product Disposition - The Offeror's approach to waste and conversion product disposition and waste minimization will be evaluated to determine whether it represents a sound, workable, safe, and efficient approach.

### (2) Criterion 2: Project Management

- (i) Method of Accomplishment. DOE will evaluate the Offeror's proposed project management teaming/subcontract structure and organization for the degree to which it will provide an effective and efficient means to accomplish the multifaceted activities of the Statement of Work such as design, construction, operations, cylinder management, transportation, and product disposition. In particular the proposal will be evaluated on the following: the degree to which the teaming/subcontract structure can function in an integrated manner; its ability to build on individual entities' expertise and resources applicable to the project; its ability to be rapidly implemented and integrated into the project; and its comprehensiveness and reasonableness. Consideration will be given to the extent and degree to which the Offeror can effectively and efficiently accomplish appropriate portions of the work through award of competitive subcontracts, including fixed price subcontracts, when this produces the best value to the Government in meeting technical, cost, and schedule requirements. DOE will also evaluate

the Offeror's approach to the execution of design, procurement, and construction, including the depth and quality of the overall approach and the likelihood that the approach will result in designed and constructed facilities that fully meet all operational requirements.

- (ii) Project Management Systems. DOE will evaluate the Offeror's proposed project management systems and approach for its effectiveness in accomplishing the Statement of Work, including the Offeror's ability to establish and apply processes and systems specific to this project; define, plan, integrate, and effectively administer all diverse activities of the project; execute the project in a disciplined manner; integrate quality into the overall project, and provide effective risk management. The Offeror's approach to establish and maintain technical, schedule and cost baselines and ensure accurate, timely, and properly controlled changes will be evaluated. The Offeror's ability to provide early warning of project problems, resolution of identified problems with least impact to project baselines, and timely, valid, and traceable baseline performance and trend data will be evaluated. The Offeror's proposed project schedule will be evaluated as to its reasonableness and efficiency.

**(3) Criterion 3: Business Management**

The Offeror's business management approach will be evaluated for its effectiveness in accomplishing the Statement of Work. The Offeror's approach to organizing in an efficient manner will be evaluated including thoroughness and completeness of assigning roles and responsibilities, staffing, and communications. The Offeror's key personnel will be evaluated on their experience, qualifications, and demonstrated performance on work similar to that described in the Statement of Work. The Offeror's proposed approach to labor relations management, diversity (including subcontractors), and employee compensation and transition will be evaluated on the extent to which it will provide a positive and productive work environment throughout performance of the contract.

**(4) Criterion 4: Environment, Safety, and Health**

The proposal will be evaluated on the degree to which the Offeror's approach to planning and executing work complies with laws, regulations, and contract requirements and fully integrates safety to ensure adequate protection for employees, the public, and the environment, including effective strategies for tailoring of standards and strong accountability provisions which establish processes for assuring ownership, sufficient authority, and incentives for achievement by accountable parties at all levels.

**(5) Criterion 5: Experience**

DOE will evaluate the amount and quality of the Offeror's relevant experience in performing major projects similar in technology, scope, complexity, duration, and risk to that in the Statement of Work. For purposes of the experience evaluation, DOE will evaluate the experience of the Offeror and its major subcontractors. In the case of a newly formed joint venture, limited liability company, limited liability partnership, or other similar entity formed for the purpose of competing for this contract, DOE will evaluate the past performance of the entities that comprise the newly formed entity.

**(6) Criterion 6: Past Performance**

The Offeror's past performance will be evaluated on the basis of information furnished by the Offeror's customers on contracts (including current contracts) similar in size, scope and complexity to the work described in the Statement of Work. References other than those identified by the Offeror may also be contacted by the Government. DOE may evaluate past performance on fewer than the total number of contracts if all the completed questionnaires are not returned. If the Offeror does not have a record of relevant past performance information or if such information is not available, the Offeror will be evaluated neither favorably nor unfavorably. In the case of a newly formed joint venture, limited liability company, limited liability partnership, or other similar entity formed for the purpose of competing for this contract, DOE will evaluate the past performance of the entities that comprise the newly formed entity.

**(b) Cost Evaluation Criteria**

The cost proposal will be evaluated for cost reasonableness and realism. Based on its review DOE will determine a most probable cost to the Government, which may include applicable life-cycle costs through disposition, to use for the evaluated cost. In addition the cost proposal will be compared to the applicable portions of the technical and business management proposal for consistency and understanding of the Statement of Work. The cost proposal will not be point scored, but it will be considered consistent with the provisions entitled Basis for Award in this Section M.

**(c) Fee Evaluation Criteria**

The amount of the proposed fee, including fixed fee; minimum, maximum and target fee; and award fee will be evaluated but will not be point scored. Fee will be evaluated on (1) its amount in accordance with DEAR Subpart 915.4, (2) the degree to which the offeror is willing to put fee at risk with respect to the incentive fee for construction, and (3) the degree to which the offeror is willing to put fee at risk with respect to specific performance requirements proposed under award fee. Fee will be considered consistent with the provisions of the clause entitled "Basis for Award"

in Section M.

[End of Provision]

### **M.3 OVERALL RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF EVALUATION CRITERIA**

- (a) The relative weight of each technical and business management criterion and subcriterion is shown below.

#### TECHNICAL AND BUSINESS MANAGEMENT CRITERIA

Criterion 1	Technology/Design	30%
	(i) DUF <sub>6</sub> Conversion	20%
	(ii) Waste and Conversion Product Disposition	10%
Criterion 2	Project Management	25%
	(i) Method of Accomplishment	15%
	(ii) Project Management Systems	10%
Criterion 3	Business Management	15%
Criterion 4	Environment, Safety, and Health	15%
Criterion 5	Experience	10%
Criterion 6	Past Performance	5%

- (b) The Technical and Business Management Proposal is significantly more important than the Cost and Fee Proposal. However, cost and fee are a substantial element of the evaluation.

[End of Provision]

### **M.4 BASIS FOR AWARD**

The Government intends to award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible Offeror whose proposal is responsive to the solicitation and is determined to be the best value to the Government. Selection of the best value will be achieved through a process of evaluating strengths and weaknesses of each Offeror's proposal in accordance with the evaluation criteria stated in the solicitation. The evaluated cost and fee may become more important if the technical and business proposal of one or more competing Offerors are evaluated as equivalent. The Government will assess whether the strengths and weaknesses between or among competing technical and business proposals indicates a superiority from the standpoint of: (1) what the difference might mean in terms of anticipated performance; and (2) what the evaluated cost and fee to the Government would be to take advantage of the difference.

[End of Provision]