

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

SOURCE SELECTION EVALUATION PANEL

Proposals will be evaluated by a Source Selection Evaluation Panel that will make its recommendations to a Source Selection Authority (SSA). Only proposals meeting the minimum requirements will be considered. Offerors should be prepared to respond to requests for oral and/or written discussions seeking clarifications or additional information. The evaluation process may involve the establishment of a “Competitive Range” intended to narrow the field of competition to those proposals that, either on their face, or after discussions, have the potential to be selected for contract award. Proposals admitted to the Competitive Range will be subject to further detailed evaluation.

Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) is focused on demonstrating 1) superior system capabilities, 2) commercialization experience, and 3) on-schedule delivery. In addition, the contract price will be a substantial factor in the evaluation of offers. PNNL will not make an award at a significantly higher overall cost to achieve only slightly superior technical features. Award will be made to that Offeror whose proposal contains the combination of the evaluation criteria offering the best overall value to PNNL while deploying the most technically sound units and not necessarily to the Offeror with the lowest price or highest evaluation score. Selection for award will be made by the SSA.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Proposals will be evaluated in accordance with this Evaluation Criteria section. The technical and price criteria specified below will be used in the evaluation of each proposal. The relative weight to be accorded to each criterion is expressed as a percentage of 100 or as a maximum total of 1,000 points.

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL – WEIGHT: 60% (600 points)

The technical criteria listed below will be used in the evaluation and scoring of each proposal and shall comprise 60% (600 points) of the total offer score. At the conclusion of the evaluation, scores for each criterion will be totaled to determine the overall score for each proposal's Technical merit.

Proposals will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

1. Technical System Requirements

This criterion will evaluate the design specifications of the proposed systems relative to the technical systems requires as specified in the Statement of Work. The Offeror should demonstrate their understanding of the technical issues that must be addressed and develop a design that addresses these issues. The design will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

- The level of detail of the design included in the proposal in providing the information requested in the Technical System Requirements section of the Requirements Document.
- System operability based on the preliminary design provided including the fuel cell system, refrigeration unit, and system integration. System durability will also be considered.
- Reasonableness of the refueling approach including addressing operation and safety.
- The system characteristics relative to relevant targets in the Fuel Cell Technologies Program Multi-Year Research, Development and Demonstration Plan¹ and the DOE Revised APU Targets.²
- Ability to provide performance data to PNNL for evaluation.

2. Project Management and Deployment and Demonstration Plans

This criterion will evaluate the proposed plan to demonstrate the capability of a fuel cell powered APU for medium-duty refrigeration truck(s) during regular commercial deliveries of cargo.

- Project management plan: A description of how the work will be performed with multiple phases, key milestones, deliverables and relevant go/no-go decision points.
- Demonstration and Evaluation Plan: The plan for demonstration and evaluation of the system should be described, including the conditions that the equipment will be subjected to and the performance metrics that will be monitored to assess system performance over time. Offeror should submit a detailed list of all operating data that will be provided during the demonstration phase including the frequency of data collection and proposed content and format. The fuel cell usage including APU hours per day for operating, standby, and frequency of cold start-ups should be addressed. Additionally, the truck usage should be estimated including number of miles travelled, frequency of cargo door opening, and operating hours per week. Preference will be given to proposals that evaluate the systems under a variety of conditions including ambient temperature.
- Commercial Partners:

¹ http://www1.eere.energy.gov/hydrogenandfuelcells/mypp/pdfs/fuel_cells.pdf

² http://hydrogen.energy.gov/pdfs/11001_apu_targets.pdf

- The partner that will modify the refrigeration system to incorporate the fuel cell must be identified in the Offeror's proposal along with the details of the fuel-cell system to be used. The capabilities of this partner along with the facilities available to the project should be discussed.
- The partner that will perform commercial deliveries using truck(s) fitted with fuel-cell APU must be identified in the Offeror's proposal, and any requirements related to the required infrastructure (fueling system location, product transported, etc.) should be discussed.
- Commercial viability: Potential for market transformation; i.e., the project continues to operate after the Federal money has been spent (after the project's formal period of performance has ended); the projected cost and performance characteristics that would support future commercial success of the product. Preference will be given to those proposals that can demonstrate potential for follow-on deployments after the demonstration with no DOE funding. Preference will also be given to those proposals that have the potential to leverage their proposed hydrogen infrastructure for other applications, particularly forklifts in the near term and fuel cell vehicles in the long term.

3. Past Performance

This criterion will be evaluated based on the team's experience developing similar technologies. Teams with strong capabilities in each the key technical areas (fuel cells, batteries, and refrigeration systems) will be evaluated higher than offerors with limited expertise in one or more of these areas. This criterion will also be evaluated based on a track record for abiding by intergovernmental, federal, state, and local law. Failure to disclose all previous and pending intergovernmental, federal, state, and local investigations, suspensions, ineligibility for government funds, convictions of civil and/or criminal judgments, violations of intergovernmental, federal, or state antitrust statutes, tax law violations, embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, destruction of records, or indictments will immediately disqualify the applicant.

4. Project Deliverables and Schedule

This criterion will be evaluated based on the proposed project deliverables and schedule for system deployment and demonstration. The proposals will be judged based on their ability to provide the deliverables described in the "Deliverables" section of the Requirements Document. Project duration is between 12 and 24 months. The proposed schedule should convey a high likelihood of success in meeting the required milestones. The schedule should include a cost benefit analysis phase, followed by a go/no-go decision point involving DOE and PNNL and then an integration and demonstration

phase of a single APU. Additional units will be demonstrated after a second go/no-go decision point involving DOE and PNNL once again. Preference will also be given to Offerors (1) continuing independent (past the contract period of performance) monitoring of system data and continuously sharing system performance data with PNNL, (2) performing follow-on deployments without DOE funding, or (3) making infrastructure available for future markets without DOE funding.

COST PROPOSAL – WEIGHT: 40% (400 POINTS)

The cost criteria listed below will be used in the evaluation and scoring of each proposal and shall comprise 40% (400 points) of the total offer score. At the conclusion of the evaluation, scores for each criterion will be totaled to determine the overall score for each proposal's cost merit.

Proposals will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

1. PNNL funded share per demonstration system

The PNNL share of the total project in dollars divided by the number of systems implemented. Smaller values of this parameter are viewed more favorably.

2. PNNL funded share per maximum APU power output

The PNNL share of the total project in dollars divided by the maximum specified power output (kW) of each proposed coolant system. The intent of this parameter is to favor systems with larger power systems.

Partnerships with state and local governments to leverage resources are encouraged. With respect to federal tax credits, Offerors should disclose whether they have received, applied for, or anticipate applying for federal tax credits or subsidies that would apply to the proposed project. Offerors should describe in the application which tax credit is applicable, the status, the value and any other relevant information. Offerors are encouraged to apply for federal and state tax incentives to reduce overall project costs.

Preference will be given to projects that leverage resources and funding. It is anticipated that the value of any tax credit will reduce the total project cost by the same amount. This reduced total project cost (including federal incentives) will be the basis upon which the PNNL cost share will be provided. With greater federal incentives, the total project cost will decline and, as a result the total quantity of cost share provided by PNNL will decline.

Note that other federal grants, including grants in lieu of tax credits, are not allowable as matching/cost share and should be scoped separately from a proposed project under this project.