

**PART V**

**SECTION M**

**EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**

**PART V**

**SECTION M**

**EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

M.1	Evaluation of Proposals .....	1
M.2	Evaluation Criteria.....	1
M.3	Basis For Award .....	4

## PART V

### SECTION M

#### EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

##### M.1 Evaluation of Proposals

- (a) DOE has established a Source Evaluation Board (SEB) to evaluate proposals submitted for this procurement using the criteria in Section M. Proposals will be evaluated by the SEB in accordance with 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 address all 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 Contracting Officer 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.
- (d) Execution of a Performance Guarantee Agreement in accordance with the requirements of the Solicitation's L.6 clause, *DEAR 970.5209-1 Requirement for Guarantee of Performance*, is a condition of award of this Contract.

##### M.2 Evaluation Criteria

The technical and management components of the Offeror's proposal will be evaluated and adjectively rated against the following criteria: Concept for NREL; Strategy and Organizational Structure; Key Personnel; and Past Performance. Sub-criteria are not separately weighted. The cost and fee components of the Offeror's proposal will be evaluated with respect to cost reasonableness and realism only and will not be weighted or scored. Technical and Management criteria are significantly more important than the Cost and Fee criterion.

- (a) Technical and Management Evaluation Criteria
  - (1) Concept for NREL (40%)
    - (i) The Government will evaluate the likelihood that the Offeror's concept for NREL and RDD&D approach will enhance NREL's leadership and impact in global energy technology, policy, and market arenas and create the conditions

necessary to accelerate achievement of national goals, and lead to the successful accomplishment of Mission Performance Goals (C.5 (a)(1)-(4)) contained in Section C.

- (ii) The Government will evaluate the relevance and realism of the major assumptions on which the Offeror's concept for NREL and RDD&D approach are based and the degree to which the success of the concept and approach relies on these assumptions.
- (iii) The Government will evaluate the Offeror's concept for NREL and approach to creating an environment of collaboration, innovation, and entrepreneurship. As part of this evaluation the Government will evaluate the Offeror's concept and approach to the development and use of complementary national and regional resources, the potential benefits to the Government and the region, and the likelihood that the Offeror's approach can realize these resources and benefits.
- (iv) The Government will evaluate the Offeror's relevant experience in developing and implementing a concept and approach for similar missions and RDD&D institutions.
- (v) The Government will evaluate the Offeror's five-year strategic outlook for alignment with its proposed concept for NREL, management strategy, organizational structure, and performance metrics, and its contribution to DOE and EERE's strategic success. The Government will evaluate the dependence of the Offeror's five-year outlook and mission success on any new major capabilities, facilities, or other resources proposed, and likelihood that the Offeror can secure these capabilities in time to support its vision and approach.
- (vi) The Government will evaluate the Offeror's commercialization strategy for alignment with its proposed concept, management strategy, organizational structure, and performance metrics; the feasibility of implementation; the degree to which the conceptual framework for controlling conflicts of interest address the principles; and the likelihood it will result in accelerated commercialization and increased market penetration of renewable energy and energy efficiency technologies.
- (vii) The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror's proposed suite of performance objectives and measures for Mission Performance Goals (C.5 (a)(1)-(4)) link its concept to these Mission Performance Goals, and the potential impact and feasibility of achieving the proposed performance targets.

(2) Strategy and Organizational Structure (30%)

- (i) The Government will evaluate the Offeror's management strategy, organizational structure, and management systems and support functions (e.g., human resources, finance, legal, procurement, etc.) to the degree they align with and support implementation of its concept for NREL, support the efficient and effective achievement of the Operational Performance Goals (C.5 (a)(5)-(8)) and requirements contained in Section C. As part of this evaluation the Government will evaluate the feasibility of the Offeror's approach to:
  - (A) Creating a mission support infrastructure (including critical systems and support functions) that is both dynamic and creates long-term stability at NREL to continuously add value to the nation;

- (B) Structuring, coordinating, and managing the major organizational elements and key persons to implement its concept, and the mechanisms to ensure coordination and management organizational responsibilities, authorities, and accountabilities;
  - (C) Engaging small business in mission and operational activities and the quality and completeness of the Small Business Subcontracting plan;
  - (D) Attracting, retaining, developing, and deploying management, technical, entrepreneurial, analytic, and support personnel to increase and sustain NREL's long-term value to the nation; and
  - (E) Collaboration and partnership with DOE and EERE on mission and operational matters.
- (ii) The Government will evaluate the value of commitments from the Offeror's parent organization(s) and external parties and the likelihood that these commitments will be realized and enforced.
  - (iii) The Government will evaluate the likelihood that the Offeror's strategy and organization can achieve the highest standard of environment, safety, and health performance, minimize the potential for and severity of incidents, and effectively respond to actual incidents.
  - (iv) The Government will evaluate the Offeror's relevant experience in developing and implementing management strategies, organizational structures, and management systems similar to those required to successfully achieve the operational expectations of the Statement of Work.
  - (v) The Government will evaluate the Offeror's transition plan for compliance to the requirements of Sections H, L, and J, and to ensure the continuation of work, an orderly transition of responsibility, and workforce stability.
  - (vi) The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror's proposed suite of performance objectives and measures for Operational Performance Goals (C.5 (a) (5)-(8)) links its management strategy to the Operational Performance Goals, and the potential impact and feasibility of achieving the proposed performance targets.
- (3) Key Personnel (25%)
- (i) The Offeror's proposed Key Personnel will be evaluated as individuals and as a management team for the extent of their qualifications and experience with respect to the functions they are proposed to manage based on the resume, references, oral presentation, and other information available to the Government. This evaluation will include:
    - (A) Depth and breadth of the proposed Director's (or equivalent) and other Key Personnel qualifications and demonstrated experience to lead and manage a complex research, development, demonstration, and deployment institution;
    - (B) Availability and commitment to this effort; and
    - (C) Demonstrated understanding of the statement of work.

(4) Past Performance (5%)

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's past performance to determine the degree to which it demonstrates the likelihood it can successfully perform the Statement of Work. The Government shall evaluate the Offeror's (including all signatories to the Performance Agreement) past performance on recent relevant contracts during the last three years, similar in complexity and scope to activities identified in Section C. For purposes of this evaluation criterion, the use of the term "relevant contract" shall mean where work is/was similar in size, scope, complexity, risk, and relevant to the statement of work.

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, *i.e.*, the Offeror will receive 25 points.

Past performance information that is not similar will be considered for evaluation purposes when the Offeror has no past performance information from contracts for similar efforts.

The Government may evaluate past performance information from sources other than those provided by the Offeror.

(b) Cost and Fee Evaluation Criteria

(1) Cost and Fee

Cost proposals will be evaluated for cost reasonableness and realism in accordance with FAR 15.404. The evaluated price will be the total of the probable cost of the transition period, the Key Personnel's annual total compensation costs for the first two years of contract performance, and the proposed award fee for the five year base period of performance and the five year option period.

### **M.3 Basis for Award**

DOE intends to award one contract to the responsible Offeror whose proposal is responsive to the Solicitation and determined to be the best value to the Government and most advantageous to the Government. Selection of the best value to the Government will be achieved through a process of evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of each Offeror's proposal in accordance with the evaluation factors in the Solicitation and what the differences might mean in terms of anticipated performance.

In determining the best value to the Government, the Technical and Management Criteria are significantly more important than the evaluated price. The Government is more concerned with obtaining a superior Technical and Management proposal than making the lowest evaluated price. However, the Government will not make an award at a price premium it considers disproportionate to the benefits associated with the evaluated superiority of one Technical and Management proposal over another. Thus to the extent that Offeror's Technical and Management proposals are evaluated as close or similar in merit, the evaluated price is more likely to be the determining factor.