SECTION M - EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR AWARD 2
M-1. Evaluation of Proposals 2
M-2. Qualification Criteria 2
M-3. Technical and Business Management Evaluation Criteria 3
M-4. Cost Evaluation Criteria 6
M-5. Fee Evaluation Criterion 6
M-6. Relative Importance of Evaluation Criteria 6
M-7. Evaluation Exclusive of Options 7
M-8. Basis for Contract Award 7

PART IV - REPRESENTATIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS

SECTION M - EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR AWARD

M-1. Evaluation of Proposals

(a) Pursuant to regulations contained in the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) and Department of Energy Acquisition Regulation (DEAR), DOE will evaluate the proposals submitted utilizing the qualification and evaluation criteria set forth below. Any selection resulting from this solicitation will be based upon that qualified proposal determined to be the most advantageous to the Government as determined through evaluation in accordance with the evaluation criteria.

(b) Upon receipt of proposals an evaluation will be conducted of the offeror's responses to the qualification criteria set forth in Section M below. Proposals which fail to meet the qualification criteria will receive no further evaluation. All proposals which DOE determines meet the qualification criteria will be evaluated.

(c) DOE may solicit from available sources, including references and clients identified by the offeror, experience and past performance data of an offeror or management team member; and will consider such information in its evaluation.

M-2. Qualification Criteria

Offerors must meet all of the following qualification criteria in order to be evaluated in accordance with the evaluation criteria in M-3. below:

(a) The offeror or its combined parent companies, in the case of a joint venture, teaming arrangement, limited liability company, or other similar entity must have managed an organization which has (1) at least $50 million in average annual research and development (R&D) revenues/costs (R&D includes basic and applied research and exploratory, advanced, and engineering development) over the last three completed/audited fiscal years of the offeror, and (2) been responsible for the operation and maintenance of an industrial/scientific infrastructure (to include a variety of buildings and equipment, including specialized experimental laboratories) of at least 1,000,000 square feet. The offeror shall provide annual financial statements or other documentation, which have been certified by a public accounting firm (may be a part of the offeror's annual report), and validate that the offeror meets these qualification criteria.

(b) The offeror must accept all of the terms and conditions set forth in the intended contract in Sections A through J of the RFP.

M-3. Technical and Business Management Evaluation Criteria

The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent that the offeror demonstrates a thorough understanding of and capability to successfully accomplish the Statement of Work's requirements including the performance expectations. In particular, the proposal will be evaluated on the following criteria.

(a) **Criterion - Management of Science and Technology**

(1) **Subcriterion - Science and Technology Programs**

The proposal will be evaluated on the degree to which the offeror's approach to the management of science and technology demonstrates:

(i) an understanding of the DOE national laboratory system, an understanding of the capabilities and core competencies of the Laboratory, and a vision of the management of the Laboratory's research programs;

(ii) a customer-oriented perspective and a vision for optimization of (A) scientific output which is both consistent with the mission of DOE and will result in enhanced technology utilization, and (B) management and operation of user facilities;

(iii) a capability to integrate scientific endeavors across core competencies within the Laboratory, with other DOE National Laboratories, and with other federal and non-federal research institutions;

(iv) an understanding of technology partnerships and market approaches which maximize technology utilization including the offeror's planned approach for maintaining, enhancing existing, and developing new cooperative and collaborative (local, regional, national, and international) partnerships with particular attention to:

(A) academia, including historically black colleges and universities and minority educational institutions;

(B) industry, including small, small disadvantaged, and women-owned businesses;

(C) DOE national laboratories; and

(D) other federal and nonfederal research institutions.

(v) the ability to maintain and enhance critical skill mixes and resources of the Laboratory.

(2) **Subcriterion - Spallation Neutron Source (SNS)**

The proposal will be evaluated on the degree to which the offeror's management approach assures that the Department's cost, schedule, and technical objectives for the SNS project, and subsequent startup and initial operations are effectively and efficiently accomplished.

(b) **Criterion - Leadership**

(1) **Subcriterion - Management Team**

The proposal will be evaluated on the proposed management team's capability to provide the management, leadership, and vision to effectively accomplish the mission of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. This will include consideration of the management team's:

(i) relevant qualifications and experience;

(ii) demonstrated performance;

(iii) understanding of and capability to perform the Statement of Work;

(iv) ability to work together effectively including providing integrated line management; and

(v) diversity.

The individual proposed as the Laboratory Director is significantly more important than any of the other individual Key Personnel. In addition, the offeror's plan for retention of Key Personnel for at least three (3) years will be evaluated.

(2) **Subcriterion - Organization**

The proposal will be evaluated on the extent to which the offeror's organizational elements and staff are organized to effectively and efficiently plan and implement the Statement of Work and provide integrated line management of the Laboratory.

(3) **Subcriterion - Transition Plan**

The offeror's plan for transition of the work and the workforce from the beginning of the transition period until assumption of contract responsibilities on April 1, 2000, will be evaluated on the extent to which it will provide for an effective and efficient transition.

(c) **Criterion - Laboratory Operations**

The proposal will be evaluated on the degree to which the offeror's approach to Laboratory operations provides integrated line management and enhances the efficiency of operational activities including, but not limited to:

(1) environment, safety and health;

(2) infrastructure;

(3) business management;

(4) reactor operations; and

(5) project management.

(d) **Criterion - Corporate Experience and Past Performance**

(1) The offeror's experience and record of past performance will be evaluated on the extent of the offeror's relevant success in managing work similar to that required by the Statement of Work and other terms and conditions of the Solicitation.

(2) In the case of an offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the offeror will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance.

(e) **Criterion - Corporate Citizenship**

The magnitude of the offeror's commitment and net benefit to the community with respect to it and its employees' involvement and investment (financial and nonfinancial) in local area educational, cultural, civic, health and welfare organizations, etc., will be evaluated

M-4. Cost Evaluation Criteria

Cost data submitted as part of the proposal will be analyzed to establish the reasonableness and appropriateness of the costs proposed. In addition, the cost proposal will be compared to 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 of the clause entitled "Basis for Contract Award" in this Section M.

M-5. Fee Evaluation Criterion

The amount of the fee proposed for the contract period of April 1, 2000, through September 30, 2005 will not be point scored but will be considered consistent with the provisions of the clause entitled "Basis for Contract Award" in this Section M.

M-6. Relative Importance of Evaluation Criteria

(a) The technical and business management proposal will be point scored and the cost and fee proposal will not be point scored. The technical and business management proposal is of significantly greater importance than the cost and fee proposals.

(b) The relative importance of each technical and business management evaluation criterion and subcriterion is based on the relative weights set forth below:

Evaluation Criteria and Relative Weights

(1)	Management of Science and Technology		40
	(i) Science and Technology Programs	25	
	(ii) Spallation Neutron Source	15	
(2)	Leadership		30
	(i) Management Team	20	
	(ii) Organization	5	
	(iii) Transition Plan	5	
(3)	Laboratory Operations		20
(4)	Corporate Experience and Past Performance		5
(5)	Corporate Citizenship		5

M-7. Evaluation Exclusive of Options

The government will evaluate offers for award purposes by including only the cost and the fee for the basic requirement; i.e., options will not be included in the evaluation for award purposes.

M-8. Basis for Contract 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 to the Government will be achieved through a process to select the most advantageous offer by evaluating and comparing proposals in accordance with evaluation criteria in addition to the cost and fee. A best value decision reflects the Government's willingness to accept other than the lowest cost and fee if the perceived benefits of the offer with the higher cost and fee merit the additional cost and fee. The cost and fee could be a determining factor if two or more proposals are determined to be otherwise substantially equal.