

Evaluation Criteria Document	Doc. No. PS-391-001-71-R1	LUSI SUB-SYSTEM XCS
<p>Bid Evaluation Guide for the Procurement of the XCS Diffractometer System</p>		
Prepared by: Aymeric Robert XCS Instrument Scientist	_____	_____
	Signature	Date
Reviewed by: E. Bong XCS Lead Engineer	_____	_____
	Signature	Date
Approved by: David Pindroh LCLS Procurement Manager	_____	_____
	Signature	Date
Approved: Darren Marsh Quality Assurance Manager	_____	_____
	Signature	Date
Approved: Tom Fornek LUSI Project Manager	_____	_____
	Signature	Date

Revision	Date	Description of Changes	Approved
R0	31 Mar 2009	Initial release	
R1	07 May 2009	Changes requested after Procurement Review	

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
2. General Approach.....	3
3. Procedures.....	3
4. Evaluation Criteria.....	4
5. Evaluation Methodology/Standards.....	5
6. Presentations.....	5
7. Evaluation Standards Guide Sheet.....	6
APPENDIX A : Revision 1: Primary Changes Affected Sections.....	7

1. Introduction

This guide is for the use by the members of the Proposal Evaluation Panel (PEP), which will be convened to evaluate proposals submitted in response to the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the XCS diffractometer system at SLAC. The Proposal Evaluation Panel Chairperson, Evaluators and Advisors will use this guide to manage the evaluation effort and control the quality, integrity, and comprehensiveness of the process. This guide will similarly be used to introduce the minimum required checks and balances.

2. General Approach

The Panel members will adhere strictly to the evaluation criteria as established in the RFP and will evaluate proposals against standards in this guide. In no event will evaluators compare one proposal against another for purposes of obtaining a subjective rating. Evaluators must also remember that they need not accept, without question, data presented in a proposal. They are to use expert knowledge and experience to determine the feasibility, logic and reasonableness of the Offeror's response. The basic nature of the source selection process naturally results in the identification of firms for the award of large value subcontracts, and the elimination of other firms from such awards. In order to withstand the post selection scrutiny, which follows this process, it is important that procedures be established which are structured and fair, and that proposals be evaluated on their merits in response to the RFP. It is also important that such procedures be established prior to receipt of proposals, and that they are strictly adhered to in the evaluation process. That is the purpose of this guide.

3. Procedures

Immediately after receipt, the Contract Administrator (CA) in Business Services Division (BSD) will open the proposal packages and distribute the technical proposals to the Technical Panel members for evaluation. Each Panel member is bound by the Confidentiality Certification, which he/she has executed. On the initial reviews, evaluators will first perform a cursory search for major weaknesses. If a reviewer determines that a proposal is so deficient that as to be totally unacceptable on its face, he/she will discuss this concern with the Panel Chairman. The Chairman will then, after consultation with other Panel members, make a determination whether that Offeror should be eliminated from further consideration even before the initial ratings. After performing the cursory search, evaluators will then continue with the evaluations, as defined in the evaluation methods on the following page. Offeror clarifications may be sought by contacting the Panel Chairman.

Evaluators will work independently, but may request specified assistance if required for evaluation of certain areas. Such requests will be made to the Panel Chairman who will make any necessary arrangements. Comparative discussion should not be conducted

between the evaluators during the course of the initial review. Completed Evaluation Worksheets must be submitted to the Panel Chairman. After all evaluators have completed their initial review of all proposals, the Panel Chairman will convene the Panel for the purpose of determining the initial competitive range. For purposes of this determination, individual evaluator subjective ratings, at the factor level for each item, for each Offeror will be tallied. The range of ratings for each Offeror will then be reviewed, and unless there is consensus, the Board will discuss the rationale for individual ratings.

The Panel Chairman, in conjunction with the BSD cost and price analyst will summarize each Offeror's cost proposal and prepare an analysis of any outstanding cost/price related concerns that may require clarification. The technical Panel members will not participate in this part of the evaluation.

The Panel Chairman will insure all correspondence that the Panel intends to send to the Offerors, if there is any, will be sent at the time, with a common date for receipt of answers, and a specified common page limit on responses, as required.

Answers to correspondence, (if any), will be scheduled for receipt at SLAC by the Panel Chairman. The Panel will then reconvene to review responses and to re-evaluate proposals from information in responses. Each member will individually revisit each proposal and develop his final rating as a delta (up or down) from his initial rating. These ratings for each Offeror will then be tallied. The range of ratings for each Offeror will then be reviewed, and unless there is consensus, the Board will discuss the rationale for individual ratings. The full collection of these ratings will then become the basis for the final presentation to the Source Selection Official (SSO). This discussion will show changes in evaluation since initial competitive range determination, including discussion of the disposition or status of strong/weak points.

The Panel Chairman shall provide the SSO with a summary rating and cost proposal analysis for each proposal.

4. Evaluation Criteria

The specific criteria to be used in the evaluation are presented in the procurement specification document of the Request for Proposal package. As stated in the RFP, the technical evaluation will be subjective. Only the technical area will be point rated; the cost data will not be point rated but will be part of the overall integrated assessment. Within the technical area, the items are listed on the attached evaluation worksheets. Each of the specific criteria is to be evaluated, using the evaluation criteria given on the worksheets. The standards given in this guide will be used.

5. Evaluation Methodology/Standards

It is recommended that each evaluator evaluate one proposal at a time. Read the proposal in its entirety first and then independently do your evaluation of the specific Areas, Items and Factors that you are to evaluate. Then go on to the next proposal. This will make it less likely for you to evaluate one proposal against another. You will use the appropriate standards listed below for the particular Area, Item or Factor that you are evaluating. This is obviously one of the most important parts of the evaluation, so be critical but fair. There are five (5) subjective ratings that you can award. These are indicated on the worksheet and are explained below:

When completing the Evaluation Worksheet, evaluators must provide a narrative on Strong/Weak points on the supplied evaluation worksheets. These write-ups must be very carefully thought out, must be succinct and to the point. Please separate fact from judgment in the narrative to make it clear to other reviewers, which is the case for an alleged strong or weak point. You may assess "degrees" of strength or weakness by assigning narrative comments, as below:

Strong Point	Weak Point
Merit above minimum standard	Correctable weakness, small impact
Significant merit	Significant weakness but correctable
Outstanding merit	Serious weakness, difficult to correct

BSD will analyze the costs of the Offeror in the competitive range to determine the Offeror's understanding of the work to be performed, and the validity of the proposed cost.

6. Presentations

The Proposal Evaluation Panel will prepare a briefing for the SSO. This briefing will be a decision briefing for the purpose of providing the SSO the final results of the evaluation so he can decide which firms will be selected for final consideration and negotiation of the contract. This briefing will include a final adjusted rating for each Offeror in the competitive range that takes into consideration the results of the Offeror responses to correspondence. In addition, the Panel will be required to provide a final report, summarize the evaluation results, and will prepare a decision document for the Source Selection Official to announce the results of the SSO decision.

7. Evaluation Standards Guide Sheet

Criteria	Max	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Unacceptable
Compliance With Technical Requirements & Specifications	45	40-45	30-39	20-29	11-19	0-10
Delivery and milestone schedule	10	9-10	7-8	4-6	2-3	0-1
Personnel, Experience, Facilities	25	21-25	16-20	11-15	6-10	0-4
Quality Plan	10	9-10	7-8	4-6	2-3	0-1
Financial Solvency	10	9-10	7-8	4-6	2-3	0-1
	100					

Excellent - comprehensive and complete; meets or exceeds all RFP requirements; exemplifies complete understanding of the requirements; and demonstrates in detail how to accomplish the task.

Good - generally meets or exceeds RFP requirements; omissions are of minor consequence or small; would be likely to produce an acceptable end item.

Fair - omissions are of significance; but are correctable; substantiation of points is weak or lacking; probability of successful effort is marginal.

Poor - gross omissions; failure to understand problem areas; failure to respond to requirements; little or no chance of success in completing the end item.

Unacceptable - does not meet the specifications.

N.B. If a vendor offers an "Unacceptable" solution for any of the evaluation criteria, then the vendor's proposal should be disqualified.

APPENDIX A : Revision 1: Primary Changes Affected Sections

These changes are the result of the outcome of the XCS Advanced Procurement Review, held on April 23, 2009.

- Modification of the released date : 31 MAR 2009
- Include a Table of Content on the first second page.
- The use of the rating “unacceptable” in 7, should disqualify a vendor as suggested in the review report. Section 7 has thus be updated to incorporate this recommendation.