

SUPERCONDUCTING
SUPER
COLLIDER

MATERIAL SPECIFICATION

NO. SSC-MAG-M-A-05

TITLE: SUPERCONDUCTOR SUPER COLLIDER SOURCE
SOURCE EVALUATION BOARD
PROCEDURE

ISSUE DATE 6-11-87
REV. NO. _____
REV. DATE _____

- PREPARED BY _____
V. N. Karpenko - SSC Division Head, Magnet Division
- APPROVED BY _____
M. Tigner - SSC - Director

REVISION RECORD

REVISION NO.	DATE	PAGE	SUBJECT	APPROVAL

1. Purpose:

This specification establishes the SSC Project policy and procedures for the control of SSC procurement source evaluations and selections. It provides guidance to SSC personnel and source evaluation boards in the:

- Preparation of requests for proposals
- Proposal evaluations
- Preparation of source evaluation board reports

1.1 Applicability

The provisions of this specification shall apply to only those SSC procurements designated by the SSC Director or Legal Counsel dependent upon cost, complexity or competitive requirements.

2. Applicable Documents

Department of Energy - DOE/PR-0027 - Procurement Regulations Handbook
Source Evaluation Board

3. Requirements

3.1 SSC-Source Evaluation Board (SEB) - Requisites:

Procurements selected to be controlled by the formal requirements of an SEB and this specification shall, as requisites to the establishment of an SEB, have a statement of work and work breakdown structure.

3.2 SSC-SEB Membership and Duties:

SSC-SEB members shall be appointed by the SSC Director with members selected for specific SEBs based on the technical management and cost particulars of each procurement.

The SEB Chairman and Administrative Control per member shall be members of the SSC Project Organization with at least one member from the SSC System Group responsible for the procurement item. The SEB shall include the appropriate number of non-SSC Project personnel representing the applicable procurement or contract organization, and who is expected to negotiate the procurement contract.

3.2.1 SEB Chairman - The SEB Chairman shall direct Board meetings and report activities as well as:

- Schedule and conduct board deliberations
- Designate required advisors and subcommittees
- Assure the documented substantiation of Board conclusions and recommendations and the recording of all Board activities
- Assure adherence to the procedural requirements of this specification.

3.2.2 Administrative Control - The SEB member designated as the Administrative Control person shall be responsible for these tasks directed by the Chairman and the following:

Administrative Control Tasks

- Obtain secure work areas for conduct of Board activity.
- Develop and implement procedures to control access to SEB work areas, to ensure safeguarding of Board proceedings and data.
- Obtain material, supplies and equipment needed by the Board.
- Obtain a signed confidentiality certificate from all Board members, legal member, secretary, committee members and advisors.
- Arrange for the preparation, reproduction, control and distribution of all material relating to the activity of the SEB and its committees. This includes source list, RFPs, information reports, records of preproposal conference proceedings, proposals, oral discussions, rating sheets, press releases, etc.
- Prepare and distribute agenda for Board meetings.
- Obtain and distribute applicable procedures, policies, instructions, etc., to Board members and others involved.
- Follow-up on action items assigned to Board members to ensure the Board's schedule is maintained.
- Summarize Board meetings, obtain the Chairman's approval and distribute copies to all Board members and others as directed by the Chairman. Originals of the summaries will be retained in the official SEB files.
- Assist in preparing and assembling the Board's report and presentation charts and arranging for reproduction and distribution.
- Schedule debriefings and prepare the appropriate record.
- Dispose of all excess material with concurrence of Chairman.
- After the formal selection announcement, accumulate package and forward documentation pertinent to the Board's work to the cognizant procurement office for permanent retention.
- Survey the area where Board activity occurred and arrange for the return of equipment and materials as appropriate.

3.2.3 SEB Advisors - The SSC shall appoint SEB non-voting members or committees necessary to effectively accomplish the SEB task. Non-voting SEB members, including legal counsel as appropriate, shall be subject to the same rules of conduct as voting members.

3.2.4 SEB Rule of Conduct

The SEB Chairman shall brief all Board committee members and advisors on the sensitivity of the SEB process, the prohibition against unauthorized disclosure of information and the requirements pertaining to conflict of interest. Each individual involved in the evaluation should inform the Chairman, in writing, whenever an individual's participation in Board activities might cause a

conflict of interest. Whenever conflicts between SEB activities and a participants personal interest are disclosed, that conflict must be jointly resolved by the SEB Chairman and legal member and the SEB file so documented. In the event of disagreement, or for conflicts involving either the Chairman or legal member, the matter should be promptly presented to the General Counsel or designee for resolution. During SEB activities, including written or oral discussions, participants will not reveal any information concerning the evaluation to anyone who is not also participating in the same proceedings, and then only to the extent that such information is required in connection with such proceedings.

3.3 Preparation of Request for Proposals (RFP)

The SEB members representing the SSC Project and Procurement Organizations will be responsible for the preparation of the applicable requests for proposal. Sample RFP contents are provided below as a preparation guide:

RFP Contents Guide

The RFP should contain an Executive Summary Letter transmitting the RFP to prospective offerors.

Part I

- | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| A. Cover | F. Description and Specifications |
| B. Contract Form and Representations, Certifications, and Other Statements of Offeror | G. Packaging and Marking |
| C. Instructions and Conditions, and Notices to Offerors | H. Deliveries or Performance |
| D. Evaluation Factors for Selection and Award | I. Inspection and Acceptance |
| | J. Special Provisions |
| | K. Contract Administration |

Part III

- L. General Provisions

Part IV

- M. List of Documents Exhibits, and Other Attachments

Part II

- E. Supplies or Services and Prices

Detail RFP requirements/provisions shall be adjusted as required by procurement specifics and applicable Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR).

- 3.3.1 Statement of Work (SOW) - This enclosure to the RFP, which should become part of the draft contract, should describe in appropriate detail the work or services to be procured including deliverables. Wherever possible, it should also identify specific objectives, goals and intermediate milestones that will be used to measure the contractor's performance in regard to technical, schedule and cost

aspects. Requirements for work to be performed under the resulting contract must be adequately described in the draft contract (including its statement of work). Any such requirements set forth in other portions of the RFP, e.g., the transmittal letter, instructions, criteria, may not effectively bind the offeror or may be omitted from the resulting contract.

3.3.2 Qualification Criteria - Qualification criteria, if any, should be sparingly employed where there are elements of special experience, capability, facilities, or other factors which are essential to the program performance aspects of the procurement. Qualification criteria must be clearly stated, and restricted to elements which are essential to the successful completion of the contract work. Stated another way, they are go/no go criteria which depict the minimum qualifications for a particular procurement. The purpose of qualification criteria is to discourage unqualified organizations from incurring the time and expense associated with the submission of proposals when they clearly have no opportunity for selection.

3.3.3 RFP Evaluation Criteria - The SEB evaluation criteria will consist of those elements which the Board must examine in each proposal to determine an offeror's:

- Understanding of the work to be performed, including environmental and safety issues;
- Technical, business and management approach;
- Potential for completing the job as specified in the RFP;
- Probable cost based upon offerors approach;
- Relative qualifications and experience of both the proposer and key individuals proposed;
- Comparative competitive status;
- Offerors commitment and assumption of risk;
- Extent and application of energy conservation and energy efficiency criteria.

Each evaluation criterion should be stated clearly and concisely, and tailored to the SSC procurement involved. The discipline of delineating criteria will highlight overlap or redundancy among the several criteria so that the descriptions can be reworked to eliminate overlapping or redundant concepts and double scoring. The criteria set out in the RFP must be used in evaluation and will not be changed without amendment of the RFP.

a) Price/Cost Considerations - This enclosure to the RFP should indicate the relative importance of cost in the evaluation and describe the type of cost information required.

3.4 SEB-Functions/Responsibility

3.4.1 SSC-SEB Formation - Each required SSC-SEB will be established prior to the development of SSC System Procurement Plan, statement of work or RFP. Specific procurement related SEB requirements, duties, evaluation assignments, and criteria shall be detailed by the SEB Chairman and issued as an appendix to this specification for SEB guidance. A sample procurement SEB Appendix is included as Attachment 1.

3.4.2 SSC-SEB Task Performance - The performance of SEB tasks shall be accomplished as directed by the Chairman using DOE Handbook PR-0027 as a general guide for the following sequential elements:

a) Procurement Plan/Schedule - The initial SEB task is to review and approve the procurement plan/schedule:

- Brief description of work or services to be procured;
- Period of performance and proposed type of contract;
- Responsible technical office;
- Total estimated amount of the procurement;
- Status of congressional appropriations and authorizations, if applicable;
- Tentative qualification criteria, if any;
- Tentative evaluation criteria - technical, business and management;
- Tentative price/cost considerations;
- Procurement schedule starting with establishment of Board through expected award of contract;
- Special considerations such as determinations to be made by the SSO.

SEB approved procurement plans/schedules are released for RFP and statements of work development.

b) RFP - The draft RFP/SOW package will be submitted for SEB review, generation of qualification and evaluation criteria, determination of evaluation criteria weight factors and overall adequacy.

c) Qualification Criteria - Qualification criteria should be employed only where it is possible for the board to establish qualification criteria which are:

- Demonstrably justified from the nature of the particular procurement objective; and,
- Susceptible to objective application to all potential sources.

Qualification criteria are not intended to restrict competition but to discourage proposal preparation by sources which have no real possibility of receiving the award.

- d) Evaluation Criteria - Evaluation criteria weights and the rating plan selected should be established on a case-by-case basis in order to fit them to the significant factors of the particular procurement. Technical excellence, business//management capability and cost aspects all may be equally important factors in one selection while, in another, because of the conditions under which the selected contractor will perform, one or two may have limited significance. The relative importance of the technical, business/management and cost criteria depends on the nature of the products or services to be procured, with technical considerations having paramount importance in research and development.
- e) Source List - The SSC procurement office and the cognizant program office will develop a draft list of sources based upon the nature of the procurement and the draft RFP. This draft source list will be reviewed and amended as appropriate by the board based upon careful consideration of factors affecting the procurement. Prior to the issuance of the RFP, appropriate notice will be placed in the Commerce Business Daily, in accordance with FPR 1-1.1003. Such notice and any other public announcements should include any qualification criteria that will appear in the RFP.
- f) RFP Rating Plan - The SEB shall, based on procurement scope, complexity, etc., prepare a rating plan using DOE Handbook PR-0027 as a guide.

3.4.3 RFP Issuance - After SEB review and approval, the RFP shall be signed by the Procurement Authority and issued to source list concerns through the Commerce Business Daily process.

3.4.4 Preproposal Conference - A preproposal conference may be held at the discretion of the SEB to provide potential offerors an opportunity to gain a more thorough understanding of the procurement. If a preproposal conference is held, its conduct shall be documented as part of the SEB records.

3.5 Proposal Evaluation Process

3.5.1 Proposal Control - All proposals will be numbered and logged in (date and time of receipt) and held by the executive secretary, unopened, in a secure place, until after the due date and time specified for receipt in the RFP. Normally, the Board will be convened as soon as possible after the due date for receipt of proposals at which time proposals should be distributed and assigned by number to each Board member. The Board should then review the methodology to be followed in evaluating proposals.

3.5.2 Initial Review - The initial phase of the evaluation will be a review by the Board to determine whether or not each proposal satisfied the formal requirements of the RFP and meets the qualification criteria specified. Any proposal not meeting the qualification criteria should be eliminated from further consideration and the offeror should be notified in writing by the SEB Chairman. Such notification should be given promptly and briefly, stating the rationale for elimination of the proposal from further consideration.

3.5.3 Committee Review - After review had been made for compliance with the qualification criteria, the Board should start its evaluation of proposals in accordance with the technical and business/management evaluation criteria and cost aspects. The Board Chairman will give each committee an appropriate number of proposals or portions thereof, evaluation criteria or areas to be evaluated, instructions regarding the committee functions and all data considered necessary. The committee Chairman will ordinarily be a Board member and will be responsible for instructing committee members of committee functions, responsibilities and procedures.

a) A committee is a fact-finding arm of the Board. As a general rule, it will function under the same constraints as the Board and will be expected to:

- Examine, in detail, each proposal or portion thereof for the purpose of rating the assigned evaluation criterion in accordance with the rating plan approved by the Board for the committee's use.
- Submit written reports covering committee evaluation as set forth below.

3.5.4 Committee Reports - While oral reports may be given to the Board, the committee function requires the submission of a written report. This report shall include:

- Copies of individual and composite worksheets showing scores or ratings and supporting comments.
- Any strengths of a proposal which significantly affected the rating.
- Any weaknesses of a proposal which significantly affected the rating.
- Any specific information bearing on the assigned ratings which the committee, or any member thereof, desires to bring to the attention of the board.

3.5.5 Early Proposal Elimination - Proposals may be eliminated from further consideration before the initial ratings if the proposal is so grossly and obviously deficient as to be totally unacceptable on its face. Prompt written SEB notification of offeror elimination shall include a brief statement of the disqualification rationale.

3.5.6 Price and Cost Considerations - Proposed cost, for either cost-reimbursement or fixed-price type contracts, is not to be point scored. Proposed cost is a function of the technical approach, the manpower, the facilities, the organization, and the uncertainties of the work and the economy. The Board is to determine, by analysis, its own estimate of what it probably will cost each offeror, given each offeror's approach, experience, organization, personnel, and similar factors including the Board's estimate of what it will cost after correcting correctable deficiencies. Cost and price analysis of proposals should be performed by cost and pricing personnel and their assistance should be requested.

3.5.7 Initial Ranking and Determination of Competitive Range - Following review of committee reports, etc., the Board will complete an evaluation of each proposal and develop tentative strengths and weaknesses in relation to each evaluation criteria. After this has been accomplished, the Board as a whole should meet and discuss in detail the individual strengths and weaknesses, and arrive at a common understanding of the major strengths and weaknesses and the potential correctability of each proposer's weaknesses. The Board will then tentatively rate and rank the proposals remaining in the competition. Generally, and depending on the rating plan employed, ranking will be accomplished by totaling the numerical scores assigned by each voting member to the evaluation criteria and developing an average rating for each offeror.

a) Competitive Range - After the Board has tentatively ranked the proposals remaining in competition, proposals will be reviewed to determine which are within the competitive range, considering the technical and business/management evaluations and price and cost considerations. In making this determination, the Board will evaluate the potential for improving the competitive position of the proposals by written and/or oral discussions. A proposal is in the competitive range unless it is so technically inferior or out of line with regard to price(cost) that meaningful negotiations are precluded. To put it another way, a proposal is in the competitive range unless there is no real possibility, taking into account the other more acceptable proposals, that it can be improved to the point where it becomes the most acceptable. The competitive range should not be reduced to a single offeror without an effort to increase the number of offerors.

b) Competitive Range Eliminations - When proposals are determined not to be in the competitive range, they should be eliminated from further evaluation and the proposers promptly notified in writing by the SEB Chairman. Such notification shall include a brief statement of the board's rationale. The report and presentation to the source selection official requires that each proposal received be commented on by the Board; therefore,

detailed documentation of the reasons for eliminating any proposal from consideration will be prepared by the Board as its evaluation proceeds.

3.5.8 Verification of Offeror's Experience - The source evaluation process requires consideration of other information bearing on the probability of quality and timely performance, the logic of the proposed plan of execution, the realism of estimated costs and the responsibility and cost-consciousness of the offeror's management. Past performance may indicate what an organization may do if awarded a contract. The Board will therefore verify for offers in the competitive range such matter as:

- Management and technical capability of personnel;
- Availability of existing facilities (both Government-owned and contractor-owned);
- Adequacy of the offeror's accounting practices and cost controls;
- Offeror's record in forecasting and meeting program schedules, and;
- Offeror's record of performance on DOE or other projects.

a) Pre-award surveys, facility capability reports, procurement system reviews and audit reports which bear on an offeror's performance and capabilities may be available from other Government offices.

3.5.9 Verification of Offerors Facilities - Inspections at the facilities of competing offerors may be a valuable part of the Board's evaluation process and could be conducted at the same time as the written and/or oral discussions. Actual visits to the facilities of competing offerors should be made prior to completion of the Board's work unless it is determined by the Chairman, in consultation with the Board members, that such visits would not help the Board determine the relative capabilities of the competitors.

3.5.10 Written and/or Oral Discussions - The Board will conduct written and/or oral discussions with all offerors whose proposals are in the competitive range dependent upon the particulars of the procurement involved. The extent of discussions will depend on the circumstances of the procurement and the proposals submitted. The Board should be careful in its written and/or oral discussions to avoid technical transfusion or technical leveling between offerors. Discussions should be sufficiently probing and detailed to assure the Board's understanding of the proposal. SEB members should employ oral discussions as a means of evaluating the abilities of

personnel proposed by the offeror and their comprehensions of the offeror's proposal. The aims of such discussions are to:

- Assess the project team to be assigned to the project and other key personnel.
- Review, with the offeror and with cognizant Government personnel, experience on related projects, particularly to permit the offeror to explain any adverse aspects of its performance record and any remedial action taken.
- Clarify any aspects of the proposal.
- Gauge the degree of capacity and interest to undertake the project in light of other work planned or in process.

3.5.11 Comparison of Proposals in Competitive Range - Following the common cutoff date for receipt of any clarification, support or revised proposals, the Board will continue its evaluation. Depending on the nature of information received, the Chairman may reconvene the committees to perform additional evaluation of their respective areas in the light of new information received.

- a) In its evaluation, the Board should give careful consideration to information received relating to offeror's experience, financial capabilities, equal employment opportunity programs, and small business and minority business programs.
- b) The tentative strengths and weaknesses developed on those offers in the competitive range should be reviewed in detail and modified as appropriate based upon all information now available to the Board. The rationale for any changes to the tentative strengths and weaknesses should be clearly documented. After full discussion and development of the final strengths and weaknesses, each voting Board member should prepare a final rating sheet for each offeror in the competitive range.

3.5.12 Final Ranking of Proposals - The final evaluation is to arrive at findings and conclusions which will permit the source selection official to select the particular proposal which offers the best promise of achieving the procurement objectives. After determining the Board ratings and/or rankings based on the technical and business/management evaluation criteria, the Board will reevaluate the price/cost information submitted and develop the probably cost to the Government for each offer in the competitive range.

3.6 SEB Report

3.6.1 Preparation of SEB Report - The SSC-SEB will prepare a report of its findings and conclusions. These findings and conclusions shall set forth the consensus of the Board and composite ratings, depending on the rating system used. The report should discuss the proposals in

the descending order of competitive ranking. All members will sign the report as confirmation that it represents their collective opinion. All reports will be serially numbered and controlled by the secretary of the board.

- 3.6.2 Report Format/Contents - Attachment 2 provides guidance on the format and content of the SEB report to the source selection authority. If a specific procurement has peculiarities which cause the proposed format to be impractical, the Chairman may alter it. The format and content, depth of detail, and the use of schedules or other information is governed by the nature and scope of the subject being presented.

ATTACHMENT 1

SSC-SEB Appendix I

**Source Evaluation Board Plan and Requirements
for SSC System Procurement**

The following announcement implementing SSC-MAG-A-05 provides the SSC-SEB schedule, administrative controls, Board membership, duties, procedures, and evaluation criteria for the _____ procurement.

- 1.0 Announcement Release Date
- 2.0 Proposal Due/Cutoff Date
- 3.0 SEB Administrative Control Responsibilities
- 4.0 Opening of Proposals
- 5.0 SEB Membership/Responsibility
- 6.0 SEB Charter
- 7.0 SEB Committee
- 8.0 Methodology
- 9.0 Evaluation Criteria and Weights
- 10.0 Scoring/Ranking
- 11.0 Cost Risk Calculation Method
- 12.0 Options

ATTACHMENT 2

SSC-SEB Appendix II

SEB Report Outline

A. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Description of Procurement and RFP - Briefly describe the work of services being procured, the qualification criteria, evaluation criteria and price/cost considerations.
2. Proposals Received - Indicate number of organizations that were sent an RFP and list in alphabetical order each of the organizations that submitted a proposal.
3. Determination of Competitive Range - Indicate rationale followed by the Board in determining the competitive range. List of offerors by technical and business/management ranking, indicating ratings and price/cost considerations in relation to each proposal.
4. Final Ranking - Indicate major reasons for final technical and business/management rankings. Include the final technical and business/management ratings and price/cost considerations in relation to each proposal.
5. Special Considerations - Include any areas that would be of special interest to the source selection official, i.e., significant objections or complaints received during SEB process, time constraints on contract award, potential organizational conflicts of interest, determinations to be made by the SSO, legislative authorizations, etc.

B. DESCRIPTION OF THE WORK OR SERVICES

1. The Procurement - Provide a narrative description of the work or services being procured together with the objectives. Explain any procurement history and follow-on effort which has been programmed or for which program approval is to be requested. Describe relationship with other efforts in process or planned. Explain any particular technical complexities which had an important effect on the solicitation of sources or the evaluation of proposals.
2. Program Approval - Identify the approval document which authorized the procurement, showing title and numerical identification, date approved and title of approving official.
3. Funding - State the funding applicable to the effort as follows:
 - a. Total estimated amount of the contract.
 - b. Estimated amount to be initially obligated in the contract.
 - c. Estimated cost of follow-on effort to be procured under a separate contract.
 - d. Specific appropriations, if applicable.

4. Procurement Approach - Discuss any special procurement considerations which applied to the procurement. Give reasons for proposed contract type.

C. BOARD MEMBERSHIP AND CHRONOLOGY

1. Board Membership - Provide the name, functional title and organizational assignment of the Chairman, members, legal member (non-voting), and an committee members and advisors used by the Board.
2. Chronology - Provide a chronology of major events connected with the source evaluation, such as:
 - a. Date of establishment of Board by selection official.
 - b. Date or dates the Board approved the evaluation criteria, criteria definitions, weights, source list and RFP.
 - c. Date RFP was issued.
 - d. Date and place of preproposal conference.
 - e. Closing date for submission of original proposals.
 - f. Date of beginning of proposal evaluation by the Board.
 - g. Date or dates and disposition of any late proposals or late modifications received.
 - h. Date of initial rating of proposals.
 - i. Date of determination of competitive range.
 - j. Date or dates of verification of offerors' experience and record of past performance.
 - k. Date or dates and place of discussions with offerors.
 - l. Common cutoff date for receipt of any clarification, support or revised proposals.
 - m. Date Board completed its evaluation and arrived at final rating of proposals.
 - n. Date of completion of SEB report.

D. REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

1. Qualification Criteria - State the specific qualification criteria included in the RFP and explain why each was necessary.
2. Evaluation Criteria - State the technical and business/management evaluation criteria, their definitions and the relative importance of each. Explain the rationale for the relative importance assigned to each criterion. Set forth excerpts from the RFP which describe the evaluation criteria and their relative importance.
3. Price and Cost Considerations - Include excerpts from the RFP dealing with price and cost factors and any cost sharing arrangements. Indicate relative importance of cost in the evaluation.
4. Amendments to RFP - Describe each amendment to the RFP and the reasons therefore.

5. Development of Source List - Indicate the methodology and rationale used in the development of the source list. Include the date of the CBD announcement and the total number of firms that were sent an RFP.
6. Preproposal Conference - If held state the date and place held and number of organizations represented.

E. EVALUATION PROCESS

1. Proposals Received - List in alphabetical order the offerors submitting proposals indicating the name and address of each offeror and major subcontractors.
2. Methodology Used to Evaluate Proposals - Describe the methodology used by the Board to evaluate proposals indicating the role of the Board members, committees, and advisors, and any other individuals or reorganizations that participated in the evaluation process. Describe the rating plan and techniques used by the Board in relation to the evaluation criteria.
3. Basis for Elimination of Proposals Before Initial Ratings - Indicate the reasons for elimination of any proposals before the initial ratings such as late proposals, proposals not meeting the qualification criteria, totally unacceptable proposals, etc.
4. Description of Technical Aspects of Proposals - Briefly describe the technical aspects of each proposal still in the competition.
5. Initial Ranking of Proposals - Describe the approach used in arriving at the initial technical and business/management ratings and rankings indicating the ratings and major strengths and weaknesses identified at this stage of the process for each offeror in descending order of competitive ranking. In addition, describe the evaluation of price and cost information.
6. Determination of Competitive Range - Describe the rationale used to determine the competitive range. Indicate the consideration given to strengths and weaknesses, potential for improving the competitive position of proposals by written and/or oral discussions, technical and business/management ratings and price/cost information. Also provide the basis for not including proposals in the competitive range especially at the break point (in the competitive range vis-a-vis outside the competitive range).
7. Verification of Offeror's Experience - For each offeror in the competitive range, describe method used to verify experience and record of performance and results of such verification. Provide comments in regard to technical, schedule and cost performance on major contracts performed for the Government.

8. Changes to Initial Ranking of Proposals - Indicate the rationale for any changes to the technical or business/management ratings and rankings or price/cost considerations as a result of written/oral discussions, clarification and support, revisions, etc. Provide a summary of the primary points covered during written and/or oral discussions.
9. Final Ranking of Proposals - Provide the final Board technical and business/management ratings and or rankings in the descending order of competitive ranking and major price and cost considerations in regard to each proposal in the competitive range. Indicate the relative rankings by technical and business/management criteria. In addition, provide in summary form the significant differences among proposals.
10. Description of Final Revised Proposals in Competitive Range - Provide in narrative form in the descending order of competitive ranking:
 - a. An expanded description of the technical and business/management aspects of each final revised proposal in the competitive range in order to present an overview and understanding of each proposers approach.
 - b. The major strengths and weaknesses for each offeror in the competitive range relating each strength or weakness to the appropriate criterion. Estimate the potential for correction of the major weaknesses identified. State the Board's estimate of any significant change in price/cost that would result from the correction of weaknesses during negotiations after selection.
 - c. Each offeror's estimated price/cost in the traditional breakdown (material, labor, overhead, general and administrative, fee, etc.) and provide the Board's evaluation of each final revised proposal in the competitive range. Comment on the validity of the proposed price and cost, describe the differences among offerors and their causes.
11. Limited Cost Considerations - In those procurements where only limited cost information is requested due to the nature of the procurement, e.g., operating contracts, the report should describe the cost information requested and obtained. This description should comment, as appropriate, on the validity of the proposed cost, the differences among offerors, the probable cost of each proposal and the probable cost differences among offerors and their causes. Comments should also be provided in regard to the important of this area in the evaluation process, as stated in the RFP.

12. Objections or Complaints Received - Describe in detail any objections or complaints received during the SEB process, e.g., RFP, proposal due date, cutoff date for clarification, possible or actual protests, etc. Describe any procedural irregularities or special problems faced by the Board.
13. Organizational Conflicts of Interest - If the RFP included coverage of organizational conflicts of interest matters, describe the manner in which the Board discharged its responsibilities and discuss any relevant information obtained.

F. ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR OFFERORS IN COMPETITIVE RANGE

1. Offerors' Financial Capabilities - Provide information to reflect the offerors' financial capabilities as needed to perform under the proposed contract, e.g., describe financing arrangements, comment on offerors' balance sheet, profit and loss experience, cash flow, etc.
2. Offerors' EEO, Small Business Concerns Owned and Controlled by Socially and Economically Disadvantaged Individuals Programs - Provide comments in regard to each of the above areas based upon information received in proposals and from other sources.
3. Special Areas of Concern - Provide any information that is of special concern or may be helpful to the source selecting official, e.g., organizational conflict of interest.

G. ATTACHMENTS

1. Fact sheet on each offeror in the competitive range.
2. Briefing charts.