

TABLE OF CONTENTS

M.1 52.217-5 EVALUATION OF OPTIONS (JUL 1990) ..... M-3

M.2 ORO M01 EVALUATION -- GENERAL (JUNE 1999) ..... M-3

M.3 ORO M03 QUALIFICATION CRITERIA (JUNE 1999) ..... M-4

M.4 EVALUATION CRITERIA (JUNE 1999) ..... M-4

M.5 OVERALL RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF EVALUATION CRITERIA (JUNE 1999) ..... M-8

**This page intentionally blank**

## SECTION M

**EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD****M.1 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 adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement. Evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).

[End of Provision]

**M.2ORO M01 EVALUATION -- GENERAL (JUNE 1999)**

- (a) Proposals will be evaluated in accordance with applicable DOE and Federal acquisition policies and procedures. Award will be made to the responsible Offeror(s), whose offer(s), conforming to this solicitation, is (are) considered the best value to the Government, considering the Qualification Criteria and Evaluation Criteria in this Section M. A proposal will be eliminated from further consideration before the initial review and evaluation if the proposal does not meet the qualification criteria set forth in Clause M.3 or if the proposal is so grossly and obviously deficient as to be totally unacceptable on its face. For example, it 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 that 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.
- (b) The instructions set forth in Section L are designed to provide guidance to the Offeror concerning the preparation of documentation that will be evaluated by the SEB. It is important that adequate and specific information be furnished. Assurances of experience, capability, or qualifications without a clear demonstration to support the claims will adversely influence the evaluation. Offerors should rely exclusively on their written material to convey their proposal. However, Offerors should also be prepared to respond to requests by the SEB for oral and/or written discussions, and other information as may be necessary to assist in the detailed evaluation process.
- (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) The SEB may also seek input from other Government agencies as part of the evaluation process.

[End of Provision]

### **M.3 ORO M03 QUALIFICATION CRITERIA (JUNE 1999)**

#### **Qualification Criteria 1:**

The offeror will certify that their technology proposed for conversion of DUF<sub>6</sub> meets one of the following maturity stages:

- (a) Successfully and reliably operated in production-type plant for at least six months of continuous operation at a DUF<sub>6</sub> throughput rate equivalent to a system-wide 28,000 MT/year (this is equivalent to converting the 700,000 MT DOE inventory in 25 years), or
- (b) Successfully and reliably demonstrated or operated in an operating or test facility in an industrial environment similar to DUF<sub>6</sub> conversion for at least six months. Must be capable of scale-up to a system-wide throughput rate of 28,000 MT/year based on standard engineering practices January 1, 2002, or
- (c) Successfully and reliably demonstrated in a pilot demonstration facility for at least one to three months. Must be capable of scale-up to a system-wide throughput rate of 28,000 MT/year and plant construction may begin by January 1, 2002.

#### **Qualification Criteria 2:**

The Offeror (or its combined member companies in the event of a joint venture or an LLC) must have had at least \$100 million in average annual revenues over the last three (3) company fiscal years.

#### **Qualification Criteria 3:**

The offeror must provide a certification from one or more U.S. Low-Level Waste Disposal Site that the converted DU and associated containers meet the waste acceptance (WAC) of those sites. This certification must also state that the disposal sites have the combined capability to accept the entire converted inventory in the event that the converted DU product use does not encompass the entire converted DU inventory. The certification(s) must be current at the time of proposal submission. The certification(s) shall be consistent with the information in the offeror's technical and business management proposal.

[End of Provision]

### **M.4 EVALUATION CRITERIA (JUNE 1999)**

For purposes of evaluating technical and business management proposals an Offeror shall include all members of a joint venture or LLC, and all subcontractors and teaming partners whose effort comprises 5% or more of the total proposed price for the base period and optional work. For Criteria 1 and 5, the Offeror shall also include parent companies of newly formed subsidiaries. Failure to provide the information requested in Section L as well as providing

inaccurate or incomplete information may be considered by the Government as an indication of lack of competency and may be evaluated as a weakness under the respective Criterion.

### **(a) Technical and Business Management Criteria**

#### **Criterion 1: Experience and Past Performance**

Experience and past performance shall each be of equal weight and the subcriteria 1 through 4 below shall apply to each. Subcriteria 1, 2, and 3 are of significantly greater weight than subcriteria 4 and 5.

For this Criterion, the Offeror shall also include the parent company of any newly formed subsidiary. The Offeror's relevant experience and past performance completed during the last three (3) years or currently on-going will be evaluated with respect to the degree of experience and level of performance in the following areas:

1. Integrating multi-faceted, large scale projects involving the coordination and execution of different work scopes, interfacing with local governments, regulatory agencies, labor organizations, and other stakeholders while maintaining cost, schedule, and technical baselines. Experience in a fixed priced environment is desirable.
2. Design and construction; construction management; operational start-up; operations; chemical materials management; nuclear materials management; waste management; and transportation of nuclear materials in large quantities in terms of tonnage.
3. Conversion of UF<sub>6</sub> to an oxide or metal, nuclear materials management, storage, and transportation similar to the SOW.
4. Prior labor-management relations experience involving multiple union relationships, and successfully addressing complex and sensitive jurisdictional issues.
5. Prior labor-management relations experience involving efforts to attain a diverse workforce.

Past performance will be evaluated for adherence to contractual requirements including schedule, cost, and the quality of services and technical performance. References other than those identified by the offeror may be contacted by the Government. The Government, in its discretion, may solicit information on contracts other than those identified by the Offeror and may consider an unlimited number of completed questionnaires in its evaluation of past performance. In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on relevant past performance is not available, the Offeror will be evaluated neither favorably nor unfavorably on past performance.

#### **Criterion 2: Technical Approach**

The Offeror's technical approach will be evaluated to determine the extent of the offerors understanding of the requirements of the SOW. The Offeror must demonstrate a thorough understanding of the problems associated with the requirements of the SOW for the entire effort, propose solutions that demonstrate an overarching commitment to safety, and reflect a minimization of the technical risks.

The Offeror must demonstrate that the proposed technology for conversion of the DUF<sub>6</sub> will meet the uranium product specifications in the SOW and will accomplish the DUF<sub>6</sub> conversion

and storage mission no later than the end of 2030. Offeror shall demonstrate a feasible schedule and milestones for accomplishing the work in accordance with the Statement of Work. Offeror's commitment to ensure safeguards and security, and quality assurance will also be evaluated.

### **Criterion 3: Business Management Approach**

Subcriteria 1 and 2 are of significantly greater weight than subcriteria 3, 4 and 5.

1. Organization and Roles. The proposal will be evaluated with respect to the degree to which the Offeror's organizational structure integrates the key functions of the SOW into a cohesive unit and assures that project management authority clearly resides at a single point. The evaluation will consider how the Offeror's placement of key personnel, planned organizational structure, roles and responsibilities appropriately divided among differing organizations, and the interrelationships and communications with all participants and DOE will effectively and efficiently accomplish the requirements of the SOW.

The Offeror's staffing plan will be evaluated with respect to its reflection of the Offeror's ability to ensure performance of the work by qualified personnel whose roles and responsibilities are clearly defined and cohesive. This shall include the Offeror's ability to reassign personnel from corporate wide resources and recruiting approach. This includes the rationale and the benefits for the proposed use of subcontractors and consultants, the methodology and approach to their selection and the subcontract management systems to be employed.

2. Project Management. The evaluation of the proposed project management plan will consider the Offeror's project management approach, systems and risk management approach, and ability to define and organize work to ensure that all necessary tasks are considered in planning work. 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 extent to which the offeror has proposed practical and meaningful performance indicators to provide early warnings of project problems, and timely, valid, and traceable baseline performance and trend data will be evaluated.
3. Labor Relations Plan. The Labor Relations Plan submitted with the proposal will be evaluated with regard to the Offeror's ability to implement "best-in-class" labor relations practices that establish a positive and productive work environment at all work sites during the various phases of the project. Due diligence shall be given to the utilization of the existing workforce, as well as to the sensitive jurisdictional issues, in order to facilitate the timely and cost effective accomplishment of the work.
4. Diversity. The Offeror's proposal will be evaluated with regard to its approach to increasing opportunities to fully use the talents and capabilities of a diverse work force in areas such as the Offeror's work force, community involvement and outreach, subcontracting, economic development, environmental justice, policies and practices, recruitment strategies, and employee concerns.
5. Participation of Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB) Concerns. The extent of participation of SDB concerns in performance of the contract will be evaluated with respect to the commitments of the Offeror to utilize SDB concerns, the extent to which SDB concerns are specifically identified, the complexity and variety of the work to be performed by SDB concerns, and the extent of participation in terms of the value of the total acquisition.

### **Criterion 4: Key Personnel**

The key personnel identified for the functional areas listed in Section L, Clause L.27, Criterion 3, as well as other key personnel proposed by the Offeror, will be evaluated with respect to the following: depth of relevant work experience, demonstrated performance on similar projects, experience with multi-firm project integration, education, professional credentials, accomplishments, qualifications, availability, and commitment. In addition, key personnel will be evaluated for compliance to the requirements for Export Controlled Information.

#### **Criterion 5: Environment, Safety and Health (ES&H)**

For this criterion, the Offeror shall include the parent company of any newly formed subsidiary.

1. The Offeror's proposed management and technical approaches to assuring sound personnel and environmental, safety and health performance in a compliant manner will be evaluated. The Offeror's proposed Integrated Safety Management System (ISMS) Plan will be evaluated to determine whether the approach is realistic and achieves fully compliant ES&H protection as well as reflecting a commitment to personnel and environmental, safety and health.
2. The degree to which Offeror's past record and experience indicates sound compliant personnel and ES&H performance and a commitment to ES&H will be evaluated.
3. In reference to the National Environmental Policy Act, the Offeror's proposed conversion processes and associated activities must not have an unacceptable adverse environmental impact. If the evaluated impact is anything less than acceptable, the entire proposal is unacceptable.

#### **(b) Price Criteria**

Financial information as identified in Section L will be evaluated to determine the offeror's financial responsibility. The total proposed price for the base and all priced options will be evaluated to determine whether the price is fair and reasonable, and the offeror understands and is able to complete the contract requirements. The evaluation will include consideration of the probable price, including disposal, to the Government of doing business with the offeror. As part of the price evaluation, DOE will consider life cycle cost impacts to the overall DOE Nuclear Energy program above and beyond the work covered under this contract.

[End of Provision]

#### **M.5 OVERALL RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF EVALUATION CRITERIA (JUNE 1999)**

The technical and business management proposal will be assigned weights and point scored based on the five criteria in Section M.4 ; the price proposal will not be point scored. Subcriteria, unless otherwise noted, are of equal weight.

The evaluation criteria below are listed in descending order of importance:

- Business Approach (Criterion 3)
- Experience and Past Performance (Criterion 1)
- Environment, Safety and Health (Criterion 5)

Technical Approach (Criterion 2)  
Key Personnel (Criterion 4)

The Government intends to award contracts resulting from this solicitation to the responsible offeror(s) whose proposal conforms to the solicitation and is evaluated as the best value to the Government. The Technical and Business Management Proposal is slightly more important than the Price Proposal. The price as evaluated in accordance with M-4(a) may become increasingly more important as the technical proposals of the offerors are evaluated as more equivalent. The Government will assess whether the strengths and weaknesses between or among competing technical proposals indicates 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 the difference.

The Government will also evaluate the technical, environmental, schedule, financial capability, and cost risks associated with each proposal. A risk associated with any given proposal that is evaluated as being unusually high to the Government may cause that proposal to be eliminated from further consideration or may rank it lower than a competing proposal with lower evaluated risk(s).

[End of Provision]