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# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## Evaluation Factors & Basis for Selection

Evaluation factors are performance features, supplier attributes, and price that the Tri-Laboratory will use to evaluate proposals. The Tri-Laboratory has identified the performance features and supplier attributes listed below, which should be discussed in the proposal. The Offeror may identify and discuss other performance features and supplier attributes it believes may be of value to the Tri-Laboratory. If the Tri-Laboratory agrees, consideration may be given to them in the evaluation process. The Tri-Laboratory’s assessment of each proposal’s evaluation factors will form the basis for selection. The Tri-Laboratory intends to select the responsive and responsible Offeror whose proposal satisfies the mandatory requirements and contains the combination of price, performance features, and supplier attributes offering the best overall value to the Tri-Laboratory. The Tri-Laboratory will determine the best overall value by comparing differences in performance features and supplier attributes offered with differences in price, striking the most advantageous balance between expected performance and the overall price to the Tri-Laboratory. Offerors must, therefore, be persuasive in describing the value of their proposed performance features and supplier attributes in enhancing the likelihood of successful performance or otherwise best achieving the Tri-Laboratory’s objectives. The Tri-Laboratory's selection may be made on the basis of the initial proposals or the Tri-Laboratory may elect to negotiate with any or all Offerors selected as finalists. LLNS desires a single subcontract covering the full scope of this requirement. Offerors are encouraged to submit one proposal (one proposal may offer multiple SU / system configurations such as Plan A, Plan B, etc) for the entire requirement and clearly identify any differences in price. **In preparing proposals, Offerors are strongly advised to read and follow Sections 2-8, below, regarding proposal content and organization, mindful that proposal contents will be evaluated with the criteria set forth in this Section 1**.

## Description of Requirement Categories

Mandatory Requirements (designated MR) in the Draft Statement of Work (SOW) are performance features that are essential to Tri-Laboratory requirements. An Offeror must satisfactorily propose all Mandatory Requirements in order to have its proposal considered responsive.

Target Requirements (designated TR-1, TR-2, or TR-3) in the Draft SOW are features, components, performance characteristics, or other properties that are important to the Tri-Laboratory, but will not result in a nonresponsive determination if omitted from a proposal. Target Requirements add value to a proposal. Target Requirements are prioritized by dash number. TR-1 is most desirable, while TR-2 is more desirable than TR-3. The aggregate of MRs and TR-1s form a baseline system. TR-2s are goals that boost a baseline system, taken together as an aggregate of MRs, TR-1s and TR-2s, into a more useful system. TR-3s are stretch goals that boost a more useful system, taken together as an aggregate of MRs, TR-1s, TR-2s and TR-3s, into a highly useful system. Therefore, the ideal CTS-2 clusters will meet or exceed all MRs, TR-1s, TR-2s and TR-3s.

A listing of MRs and TRs is included in the Draft SOW Table of Contents.

MRs, TRs, and additional features proposed by the successful Offeror and found to be of value to the Tri-Laboratory, will be stated as firm requirements in a negotiated final SOW(s) and a negotiated final configuration list(s) and incorporated in the resulting final CTS-2 Subcontract.

## Performance Features

**Technical Proposal Excellence**

The Tri-Laboratory will validate that an Offeror’s technical proposal satisfies the MRs. The Tri-Laboratory will assess how well an Offeror’s technical proposal addresses the TRs. An Offeror is not solely limited to discussion of these features. An Offeror may propose other features or attributes if the Offeror believes they may be of value to the Tri-Laboratory. If the Tri-Laboratory agrees, consideration may be given to them in the evaluation process. In all cases, the Tri-Laboratory will assess the value of each proposal as submitted.

The Tri-Laboratory will also evaluate the following performance features.

* How well the proposed solution(s) addresses overall programmatic objectives expressed in the Draft SOW, including delivered performance on ASC applications.
* Proposed hardware and software support model and how this model will provide at least three years of practical system maintenance (i.e., will the maintenance model work in practice?).
* How well the proposed reliability, availability, serviceability and maintenance plan meets or exceeds the stated requirements.
* How well the Field Replaceable Unit (FRU) diagnostic plan meets or exceeds the stated requirements.
* The MTBF (mean time between failure) calculations on FRUs and each node type and the relationship of these calculations to the proposed on-site parts cache.
* How favorable the proposed power requirements, cooling requirements, floor space requirements, delivery requirements, and siting requirements are.
* How well the technical proposal meets the open source development partnership goals.
* How well the proposal allows the Tri-Laboratory to acquire multiple evolving SUs / system configurations that infuse substantive new technology as it becomes generally available in the marketplace during the projected delivery period (3QCY21 through 3QCY25) of the anticipated CTS-2 subcontract.

**Feasibility and Schedule Credibility**

Feasibility of the proposed solution(s) is of critical importance to the Tri-Laboratory. Schedule is of critical importance to the Tri-Laboratory. The Tri-Laboratory will assess feasibility of the Offeror’s proposed solution, and the proposed delivery schedule, with consideration to the following.

* The likelihood that the Offeror’s SU design will function as a highly productive capacity production resource.
* How well the offeror’s proposed solution represents an optimized SU design that is dense, but still meets each respective laboratory’ facilities for power, cooling, and weight.
* The likelihood that the Offeror’s proposed build, pre-ship, delivery and acceptance activities can actually happen within the required timeframes.
* Realism of the proposed timeline given the Offeror’s manufacturing and testing facilities and the quality of its project plan and management personnel.
* How well the proposed technical approach aligns with the Offeror’s corporate product roadmap.
* Realism and completeness of the project Gantt chart.
* The level of corporate commitment to this effort.
* Assessment of risks associated with the proposed SU solution to both the Offeror and the Tri-Laboratory.

## Supplier Attributes

The Tri-Laboratory will evaluate the following supplier attributes.

Capability

* The Offeror’s experience and past performance in providing large scale (1+ PF/s) Linux clusters for scientific simulation environments and its demonstrated commitment to high-end computing customers.
* The quality and scope of the Offeror’s performance record.
* The Offeror’s demonstrated ability to meet schedule and delivery promises.
* The Offeror’s ability to comply with the required or proposed delivery and performance schedules.
* The Offeror’s ability to diagnose and determine root cause of hardware and software problems in a timely manner.
* The Offeror’s proposed project manager and the level of project management authority delegated by the Offeror to the project manager.
* The Offeror’s manufacturing and testing facilities.

**Financial Condition**

An Offeror’s financial condition is of critical importance to the Tri-Laboratory. The successful Offeror should have sufficient financial resources to perform the subcontract.

* The Offeror’s financial condition (refer to Section 8.0, Volume VI).

**Open Source Position**

Solutions based on Open Source are of critical importance to the Tri-Laboratory.

* The credibility of the Offeror’s Linux cluster strategy.
* Alignment of the proposal with the Offeror’s Linux strategy.
* The Offeror’s development and support resources (i.e., technical personnel with open source skills, knowledge, and abilities) available to the partnership.
* The Offeror’s experience and past performance in providing solutions based on Open Source.

**Terms & Conditions Position**

* The Offeror’s proposed exceptions (i.e. quantity and nature) to terms and conditions stated in the Sample Subcontract and its Incorporated Documents. The Tri-Laboratory prefers Offeror proposals that indicate an unqualified acceptance of the terms and conditions in the Sample Subcontract and its Incorporated Documents.
* Refer to the Price Adjustment article in the Sample Subcontract.
  + Offeror’s proposed start date for price adjustment consideration to take effect. The Tri-Laboratory prefers for that date to be at least two years after the date of initial subcontract award, and more strongly prefers a later date.
  + The number and type of Specified Key Components (SKCs) Offeror proposes to be subject to price adjustment. Note that the Tri-Laboratory prefers to limit the number of SKCs subject to price adjustment, and to limit the type of SKCs subject to price adjustment to DDR memory, HBM memory, and possibly NVMe / SSD drives. If proposed by Offeror, the Tri-Laboratory may consider allowing hard disks subject to price adjustment; however, the Tri-Laboratory prefers not to do so. For SKC’s containing integrated memory (e.g. processor module with HBM), the Tri-Laboratories require the Offeror provide the price of the integrated module (processor plus memory) and the price per GB for the memory.
  + Offeror’s proposed interval / frequency between price adjustment request actions. Note that the Tri-Laboratory prefers longer intervals, which will result in fewer system price adjustment administrative actions to process.

## Price

The Tri-Laboratory will evaluate the following price related factors.

**Price Proposal**

* Reasonableness of the proposed SU prices and the prices of proposed components and options.
* Proposed price compared to the perceived value.
* The total cost of ownership of the Offeror’s proposed solution. Total cost of ownership will consider anticipated power consumption, cooling solution, maintenance schedules, anticipated installation costs, and overall system footprint.
* Price trade-offs and options embodied in the Offeror’s proposal.
* How thorough the proposed prices address multiple evolving SUs / system configurations that infuse substantive new technology as it becomes generally available in the marketplace during the projected delivery period (3QCY21 through 3QCY25) of the anticipated CTS-2 subcontract.
* How transparent is an offeror’s proposal, which means does the proposal identify in sufficient detail: (i) proposed unit price / extended prices for each component (i.e., processor, memory, motherboard, chassis, etc) and product (power distribution unit, rack, etc) in each proposed SU / system configuration; (ii) proposed individual service prices for training, installation, transportation and shipping for each proposed SU / system configuration; and (iii) a summation of (i) and (ii) to calculate the total offer price for each proposed SU / system configuration.

## Options

The Draft SOW addresses optional SU configurations. The Tri-Laboratory will evaluate options for award consistent with Sections 1.1 through 1.5 above. The total price of the base bid and the price for all of the options will be evaluated.

# GENERAL PROPOSAL INFORMATION

## Proposal Format

Offerors are not required to submit hardcopy proposals.Offeror must provide one complete copy of its proposal on compact disk (CD-ROM). As an alternative to CD-ROM delivery, Offeror may establish a secure means such as Microsoft dropbox, Google drive, or other mechanism that enables Offeror to give the LLNS Contract Analyst a secure link / password, and allows the LLNS Contract Analyst to download offeror’s complete proposal. If offeror prefers this proposal delivery method, offeror will notify the LLNS Contract Analyst of the secure link / password at least three days prior to the proposal due date / time.

Offerors must submit one complete copy of the proposal to the LLNS Contract Analyst as instructed in the RFP letter. Page limits are based on consecutively numbered pages. The recommended page limit for the Technical Proposal (Volume I) is 150 pages each. The recommended page limit for the Business Proposal (Volume II) is 20 pages. There are no page limits for the Price Proposal (Volume IV), the Other Documents (Volume V), and the Offeror Financial Information (Volume VI) portions of the proposal. At least 12-point font is recommended. Offerors must submit proposal documents electronically in Microsoft Office (i.e., Word, Excel, PowerPoint, Project) formats, PDF format, or Rich Text Format. Submission of your proposal by electronic media (i.e., FAT formatted ISO standard CD-ROM, Microsoft dropbox, Google drive) shall be considered by the Tri-Laboratory to be Certification that the media is virus free.

**Offeror must NOT include any price information in the Technical Proposal. Any / all price information must be included in the Price Proposal and the Future Component Projection in accordance with the following instructions.**

Proposal volumes listed in the following table shall NOT be consolidated. Electronic submissions shall include each volume as a separate file and the file titles shall indicate the corresponding volume number.

**Table 1**

**Proposal Format**

| **VOLUME—SECTION NUMBER** |
| --- |
| **Volume I Technical Proposal** *(150 page limit total is recommended)*  Section 1. Overall Background and Objectives  Section 2. CTS-2 Architecture and Scalable Unit Strategy  Section 3. CTS-2 Technical Requirements  Section 4. Reliability, Availability, Serviceability and Maintenance  Section 5. Tri-Laboratory Simulation Environment  Section 6. Project Management |
| **Volume II Business Proposal** *(20 page limit total is recommended)*  Section 1. Supplier Attributes  Section 2. Linux Product Roadmap  Section 3. Proposed Open Source Development Partnership  Section 4. Offeror Terms & Conditions Position |
| **Volume III** *–* Information Subject to U.S. Export Control |
| **Volume IV Price Proposal** (*no page limit*)  Section 1. System Prices / Offeror Price Schedule(s)  Section 2. Tri-Laboratory and Offeror Defined Options Prices  Section 3. Lower-Tier Subcontractor Price Information  Section 4. Offeror Price Adjustment Position  Section 5. Offeror Blackhole Maintenance Price Increase Table  Section 6. Offeror Labor Rate Schedule |
| **Volume V Other Documents** *(no page limit)*  Section 1. Software Branding and Licensing, if applicable  Section 2. System Warranty Information  Section 3. Representations and Certifications Form  Section 4. EEO Pre-Award Compliance Certification Form  Section 5. Royalty Information  Section 6. Offeror Future Component Projection  Section 7. Offeror Benchmark Tests Document  Section 8. Offeror Example Machine Configuration Check List |
| **Volume VI Offeror Financial Information** (*no page limit*) |

# TECHNICAL PROPOSAL (VOLUME I)

**In the Technical Proposal, the Offeror shall not include information subject to U.S. export control laws and regulations.** If Offeror believes such information is necessary to clarify / supplement its Technical Proposal, then Offeror shall include information subject to U.S. export control laws and regulations in its proposal Volume III. Refer to Section 5.0 below.

In the Technical Proposal, the Offeror shall describe the SUs proposed. This shall be written in the form of an integrated narrative **and shall include a point-by-point response to the technical requirements contained in the Draft SOW with the same numbering scheme as the Draft SOW**. Offeror proposed features shall also be described. In the interest of reducing both the RFP response time and the time to build, deliver and integrate SUs, the Tri-Laboratory has specified (non-mandatory) specific solutions to many requirements. If these solutions are proposed, then the response can be much simplified. This narrative shall include a description of each of the SUs proposed. The Technical Proposal shall be divided into the following tabbed sections.

## Section 1. Overall Background and Objectives

Discuss the Offeror’s approach to responding to this RFP and meeting the ASC programmatic CTS computing objectives. Discuss the overall software and hardware build strategy for the SU and clusters built from multiple SUs and how the SU will evolve over time. Provide a complete summary of what will be delivered and when it will be delivered. Include precise details about what SU components will be delivered initially and how these components will evolve over time and the full impacts of that evolution to the delivered SUs and SU architecture. Avoid vague or incomplete information. .

## Section 2. CTS-2 Architecture and Scalable Unit Strategy

The CTS-2 architecture and scalable unit strategy section of the Technical Proposal should contain the following information.

* Architecture – An executive summary that provides an architecture (series of block diagrams indicating all speeds and feeds) of the proposed SU and how those SUs can be combined to form larger clusters. The architecture should cover the following areas: 1) node; 2) blade chassis (if applicable); 3) SU; 4) High speed network for the SU and recommended combinations of SU (e.g., 2xSU, 4xSU, 8xSU, 12xSU); and 5) management software architecture.
* Deliverables – A list of hardware and software items to be delivered with each SU and the delivery dates, and quantities. This information should be provided for items one level below the subsystem level.
* Definitions and Acronyms – A definition of terms, acronyms, and abbreviations used in the document.

## Section 3. CTS-2 Technical Requirements

This section should contain a detailed description of the proposed SU. This includes a detailed response to each requirement in Section 3 of the SOW. The response should include the requirement number and text with Offeror’s response below. If alternative approaches are chosen rather than those given as examples, then the alternative approach should be outlined in the same fashion as the example requirements.

## Section 4. Reliability, Availability, Serviceability and Maintenance

This section should contain a detailed description of all relevant facts relating to the reliability, availability, serviceability, and maintenance of the SU. In particular, provide the Mean Time Between Failures (MTBF) calculation. This calculation should be performed using a recognized standard. Examples of such standards are Military Standard (Mil Std) 756, Reliability Modeling and Prediction, which can be found in Military Handbook 217F, and the Sum of Parts Method outlined in Bellcore Technical Reference Manual 332.

This section should describe in detail the proposed hardware and software maintenance strategy throughout the life of the subcontract. Include the level of service to be provided at various points during the subcontract period (i.e., system build, system installation, acceptance testing, post acceptance, etc.). For hardware maintenance, specify the length of time (from initial purchase of parts for build) that replacement parts will be IDENTICAL (e.g., same speed, same motherboards, etc.). In addition, delineate replacement parts policy once proposed commodity components reach end of life until the end of the required three years of hardware maintenance.

Specific hardware maintenance roles and responsibilities for Tri-Laboratory receiving sites, Offeror, and subcontractors should be delineated. Specific elements of the spare parts cache and on-site hot spares should be itemized. Failed hardware Return Material Authorization (RMA) mechanism and parts cache refresh policy should be discussed. Software maintenance procedures should be delineated for provided software components including, but not limited to, how software patches will be provided to Tri-Laboratory community and how they will be tested.

## Section 5. Tri-Laboratory Simulation Environments

Because of the essential requirement for rapid deployment of the SUs into productive usage at the Tri-Laboratory receiving sites, these site computer facilities must be adequately prepared prior to SU delivery. In order to meet the overall “Total Cost of Ownership” (TCO) reduction objectives, the Tri-Laboratory community is willing to consider proposals with slightly higher initial cost and facilities modifications (e.g., chilled water) to site, power, and cool SUs to lower overall TCO. Proposed facilities modifications to Tri-Laboratory computer facilities should be detailed sufficiently so that we can estimate the feasibility, cost, and time required for these modifications.

In addition, the Offeror should also provide a detailed proposed single SU and multiple SU aggregation (e.g., 2xSU, 4xSU, 8xSU, 12xSU) cluster layouts. This information is vital to determine the feasibility of the high speed networking (i.e., cable lengths) and power/cooling for multiple SU clusters. See Section 5 of the SOW. The floor plan should include a diagram of asset placement, as well as floor-loading information, under-floor clearance requirements, and placement and type of required electrical outlets.

Provide the estimated total amount of power in kW (kilowatts) required for the SU configurations proposed, including any subsystems (e.g., disks, cabling, external networking). The plan should also include the estimated total amount of cooling in BTU (British Thermal Units) or Tons Air Conditioning (AC) required for the SU configurations proposed. Provide all power, cooling, and facilities information for liquid cooled solutions. List any other facilities requirements such as door clearances (height and width) and elevator clearances and maximum capacities (minimum weight that can be transported per elevator trip and time to make an elevator round trip).

## Section 6. Project Management

The following Project Management information should be provided as part of the Offeror’s proposal.

### Open Source Collaboration

This section should discuss how the partnership will collaborate, over the term of the subcontract and beyond, on open source development. Describe how the open source development efforts feed into the delivery of SUs and their support and enhancement over the term of the subcontract.

### Project Manager

This section should name a project manager who will provide supervision within the corporation for the building, testing, delivery and acceptance of the proposed cluster. Provide the resume of this individual and a description of the roles and responsibilities in the format shown in Appendix A. Also indicate the level of authority this individual will carry within the corporation for the management of this activity.

### Project Milestones

This section should provide a Gantt chart and work-breakdown structure (WBS), including milestones, for the project in the form of a Microsoft Project data file with the proposal submission. Indicate which items are being subcontracted to third parties and which items are on the critical path. Also, include a draft pre-ship test plan and a draft acceptance test plan in Microsoft Word format. The Tri-Laboratory may accept the draft pre-ship test plan and draft acceptance test plan as submitted by the successful Offeror, or negotiate these plans commensurate with Tri-Laboratory requirements.

# BUSINESS PROPOSALS (VOLUME II)

## Section 1. Supplier Attributes

Provide the following background information on those contracts during the past two years that the Offeror considers the most comparable to the requirements of this RFP in terms of providing high-end computing systems and working with high-end customers and partners to advance the high-end computing state-of-the-art:

* customer name
* contract number
* contract type
* contract value
* contract effective date and term
* place of performance
* client contacts (include the name and phone number of contractual contact and the name and phone number of technical contact)
* similarities to Tri-Laboratory requirements.

Discuss your company’s experience (i.e., how many times your company delivered similar high-end computing, state-of-the-art systems and related information) and past performance (i.e., how well your company satisfied customer requirements for similar high-end computing, state-of-the-art systems) over the past two years, including lessons learned. In particular, Offeror should indicate how they helped the customer overcome hardware and software problems with systems of this scale and complexity including successful techniques and tools to determine root cause of hardware, software and driver or firmware bugs and/or systematic problems.

Discuss your company’s manufacturing and testing facilities.

Discuss the expertise and skill level of your company’s key personnel who will work on this project.

Offeror financial information is considered a Supplier Attribute. However, Offerors shall submit financial information in Volume VI, Offeror Financial Information.

## Section 2. Linux Product Roadmap

Describe the Offeror’s corporate Linux product roadmap for the next two years. Include hardware and software offerings. Provide information that will give an indication of the depth and scope of the product roadmap as well as the products targeted specifically at high-performance Linux clustering. Indicate the open source partnerships the corporation is involved in and how the results of these efforts factor into future products.

## Section 3. Proposed Open Source Development Partnership

The Offeror may provide information on the capabilities of its corporation to engage in an open source development partnership and meet the goals set out in Draft SOW Section 6.1. This information should include the Offeror’s qualifications as a cluster provider; the Offeror’s qualifications as an open source development organization; cluster product roadmap and comparison to the overall strategy; the willingness of the Offeror to participate in the open source development, with other partners, of key missing High Performance Technical Computing (HPTC) cluster technology components such as scalable parallel file systems and cluster resource scheduling. If the Offeror has technology, such as a scalable parallel file system or cluster management tools or cluster resource scheduling, that could be contributed to the overall software effort, please indicate that as well.

## Section 4. Offeror Terms & Conditions Position

Offeror shall complete the RFP’s Offeror Terms & Conditions Position and include it in the Business Proposal (Volume II).

# Information Subject to U.S. Export Control (VOLUME III)

In the its proposal Volume III, the Offeror shall include information subject to U.S. export control laws and regulations it believes is necessary to clarify / supplement its Technical Proposal.

# PRICE PROPOSAL (VOLUME IV)

## Section 1. System Prices / Offeror Price Schedule(s)

The attached Price Schedule (contained in the file “*CTS-2\_Price\_Schedule.xls*”) shall be completed. If Offeror proposes multiple SU / system configurations (e.g., Plan A, Plan B, etc), then a separate Price Schedule shall be completed for each particular SU / system configuration. Each Price Schedule must separately price (e.g., one tab per system size / scale) the proposed SU / system configuration in scales / increments of 1SU, 2SU, 4SU, 6SU, 8SU, 12SU, 16SU, and 24SU. Individual prices (i.e. unit and extended prices) for each item / component / service listed are required. Offerors shall separately price: (i) services performed in the State of New Mexico and services performed in the State of California; and (ii) training service, and hardware and software maintenance service to be performed in the State of New Mexico at SNL and LANL (NM) sites. Offerors shall separately price options to extend annual maintenance service (per system) for Year 4 and Year 5. Refer to sample subcontract Article 5 for related information.

An entry should be made for each line item. If the price of a line item is being offered at “No Charge” to the Tri-Laboratory, insert “NC” for that entry. If a line item cannot be separately priced, insert "NSP" for that entry. For that line item, the Offeror should also insert the entry "Note \_\_" directing the Tri-Laboratory to the "Note" that provides a narrative explanation for all “NSP” entries, identifying which line item includes that price. All accompanying notes should be included at the end of the Price Schedule.

Offerors shall propose firm fixed prices.

Maintenance prices shall be based on next business day 8:00AM-5:00PM, Pacific Time (for SUs delivered to LLNL or SNL Livermore) or Mountain Time (for SUs delivered to LANL or SNL Albuquerque), service for all systems proposed for the duration of the subcontract.

## Section 2. Tri-Laboratory and Offeror Defined Options Prices

Offeror shall fully complete the Optional Equipment Pricing table contained in the Price Schedule. Pricing should be for a single additional node rack. An entry must be made for each line item. Offeror may include additional options that it thinks would be of interest to the Tri-Laboratory. Offeror-defined options should include relevant technical, business, and price information in the appropriate proposal volume.

## Section 3. Lower-Tier Subcontractor Price Information

If the Offeror is proposing to use lower-tier subcontractors, price information for each subcontractor shall be furnished in the same format and level of detail as prescribed for the Offeror.

## Section 4. Offeror Price Adjustment Position

Offeror shall complete the RFP’s Offeror Price Adjustment Position and include it in the Price Proposal (Volume IV). Offeror should first review the RFP’s sample subcontract Article 6 ‘Price Adjustment’.

## Section 5. Offeror BMS Price Increase Table

Offeror shall complete the RFP’s Offeror Blackhole Maintenance Service (BMS) Price Increase Table and include it in the Price Proposal (Volume IV). Offeror should first review the RFP’s sample subcontract Article 5 Paragraph E ‘BMS Options’.

## Section 6. Offeror Labor Rate Schedule

Offeror shall complete the RFP’s Offeror Labor Rate Schedule and include it in the Price Proposal (Volume IV). This form will serve as a pricing basis for the Tri-Laboratory to acquire additional CTS-2 service, if necessary, after initial subcontract award. Offeror should identify / insert all of its labor categories and corresponding fully burdened hourly labor rates for CY20, CY21, CY22, CY23, CY24, and CY25.

# OTHER DOCUMENTS (VOLUME V)

## Section 1. Software Branding and Licensing

Submit all branding or certification of software standards adherence required in Section 2.

Submit licensing policies for all categories of software (compilers, libraries, application development tools, etc.) being provided under the subcontract. Identify all third-party software. Include policies for cluster-wide right-to-use licenses for an unlimited number of users for all software delivered under the contemplated subcontract. Include any required Software License or Maintenance Agreements as well as any licensing requirements for source code. The following conditions must be incorporated in any resulting Software License or Maintenance Agreement:

* The right of assignment of any agreement to the Department of Energy/National Nuclear Security Administration (DOE/NNSA) for assignment to any succeeding respective Tri-Laboratory prime contractor.

An Offeror's proposal may be eliminated from consideration for award in the event the Offeror and LLNS cannot mutually agree to terms and conditions contained in any Software License or Maintenance Agreement.

## Section 2. System Warranty Information

Provide warranty information for all Offeror-provided items as well as any lower-tier subcontractor items.

## Section 3. Representations and Certifications

Offeror shall complete, sign, and submit the Representations and Certifications Form.

## Section 4. EEO Pre-Award Compliance Certification Form

Offeror shall complete, sign, and submit the EEO Pre-Award Compliance Certification Form, unless otherwise exempt from this requirement. Additional information is included in the RFP letter.

## Section 5. Royalty Information & Patents

If the offer in response to this solicitation contains costs or charges for royalties totaling more than $250, the following information shall be included in the response relating to each separate item of royalty or license fee: name and address of licensor; date of license agreement; patent numbers, patent application serial numbers, or other basis on which the royalty is payable; brief description, including any part or model numbers of each item or component on which the royalty is payable; percentage or dollar rate of royalty per unit; unit price of item; number of units; and total dollar amount of royalties.

In addition, if specifically requested by the LLNS Contract Analyst before award, the Offeror shall furnish a copy of the current license agreement and an identification of applicable claims of specific patents or other basis upon which the royalty may be payable.

If the Offeror intends to use a product or process in which there is a proprietary or background patent position, please indicate and list patent applications and/or patents granted (including dates, numbers, and descriptions), and whether the Government has rights to the patents.

## Section 6. Offeror Future Component Projection

Offeror shall complete the RFP’s Offeror Future Component Projection and include it in the Other Documents Proposal (Volume V).

The Offeror Future Component Projection will identify non-GA / projected future technology offeror recommends the Tri-Lab consider for potential future upgrade to / incorporation within the subcontract’s (selected) SU / system architecture / configuration. The Offeror Future Component Projection will identify (grouped by OEM) projected future components, projected availability periods, and projected prices.

The Offeror Future Component Projection is intended for offerors to inform the Tri-Laboratory of projected future technology that is considered worthwhile, but too uncertain / unknown (at the time of initial proposal submission) for offerors to be confident to commit to (from a capability / price / delivery perspective) in the Price Schedule(s). The Offeror Future Component Projection is informational in nature, and is not a firm and binding part of an offeror’s proposal.

## Section 7. Offeror Benchmark Tests Document

The Benchmark Tests Document is intended to provide in a single place for the offeror to document system and run configuration details for their benchmark runs. While not required it is strongly recommended that offeror’s use this document to provide the requested information as it will centralize information needed to evaluate benchmarks data.

## Section 8. Offeror Example Machine Configuration Checklist

The Offeror Example Machine Configuration Checklist is intended for offerors to inform the Tri-Laboratory of the platform and siting details for each specific machine into its Tri-Laboratory data center location. The Offeror will use the example of an 8 SU system meeting the requirements in the CTS-2 Draft SOW. The Offeror Example Machine Configuration Checklist is informational in nature, and is not a firm and binding part of the offeror’s proposal.

# OFFEROR FINANCIAL INFORMATION (VOLUME VI)

To assist the Tri-Laboratory in assessing the financial capability of an Offeror, the Offeror shall provide statements with its proposal that fully describe the Offeror’s current financial condition and its financial ability to support LLNS requirements during performance. Include a recent company history of sales and a growth profile. The statements should consist of either: (1) audited and certified year-end financial statements for a minimum of the last two years (balance sheet, income statement, statement of cash flows, and other financial statements or reports as necessary); (2) financial statements reviewed or compiled by a certified public accountant or other accounting professional (include the accounting firm’s cover letter); or (3) other information acceptable to LLNS. LLNS reserves the right to request additional financial statements.

END OF PROPOSAL EVALUATION AND PROPOSAL PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS.

**Appendix A**

**Resume Format**

**Name:**

**Proposed Title/Assignment on Contract:**

**Experience Summary:** (A succinct summary of overall experience and capabilities including the name and phone number of the client that may be used for reference checking):

**Current Assignment** (Include description and from/to dates):

**Current Client/Customer (**Include current address and telephone number):

**Education:**

**Technical Qualifications:**

**Description(s) of Experience relevant to Proposed Contract Assignment:**

**Provide Three Business Related References:**

**List Awards/Honors/Publications:**

*RESUMES MUST NOT EXCEED FOUR (4) PAGES IN LENGTH*

References listed in the resumes may be contacted to verify relevant experience as part of the evaluation process.