

**Tri-Laboratory Linux Capacity Cluster 2
(TLCC2)**

Advanced Simulation and Computing (ASC)

**Proposal Evaluation and
Proposal Preparation Instructions**

**B590550
Attachment 3**

**Version 4
December 7, 2010**



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	PROPOSAL EVALUATION	3
1.1	Evaluation Factors & Basis for Selection.....	3
1.2	Description of Requirement Categories	3
1.3	Performance Features	4
1.4	Supplier Attributes.....	5
1.5	Price.....	6
1.6	Options	6
1.7	Alternate Proposals.....	6
2.0	GENERAL PROPOSAL INFORMATION.....	6
2.1	Proposal Format.....	6
3.0	TECHNICAL PROPOSAL (VOLUME I).....	7
3.1	Section 1. Overall Approach and Objectives	8
3.2	Section 2. Scalable Unit Architecture and Overview	8
3.3	Section 3. Scalable Unit Description.....	8
3.4	Section 4. Reliability, Availability, Serviceability and Maintenance.....	8
3.5	Section 5. Facilities Information	9
3.6	Section 6. Project Management.....	9
3.6.1	Open Source Collaboration	10
3.6.2	Project Manager.....	10
3.6.3	Project Milestones	10
4.0	BUSINESS PROPOSALS (VOLUME II).....	10
4.1	Section 1. Supplier Attributes.....	10
4.2	Section 2. Linux Product Roadmap.....	11
4.3	Section 3. Proposed Open Source Development Partnership.....	11
5.0	ALTERNATE PROPOSALS (VOLUME III).....	11
5.1	Alternate Proposal(s) Format	11
5.2	Alternate Option(s) Format	12
6.0	PRICE PROPOSAL (VOLUME IV).....	12
6.1	Section 1. System Prices.....	12
6.2	Section 2. Tri-Laboratory and Offeror Defined Options Prices.....	12
6.3	Section 3. Lower-Tier Subcontractor Price Information.....	12
6.4	Section 4. Offeror Price and Milestone Payment Schedule Proposal	13
7.0	OTHER DOCUMENTS (VOLUME V).....	13
7.1	Section 1. Software Branding and Licensing	13
7.2	Section 2. System Warranty Information	13
7.3	Section 3. Representations and Certifications	13
7.4	Section 4. Reserved	13
7.5	Section 5. Royalty Information	13
8.0	OFFEROR FINANCIAL INFORMATION (VOLUME VI).....	14

1.0 PROPOSAL EVALUATION

1.1 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; however, LLNS reserves the right to award multiple Subcontracts as a result of this RFP. Offerors are encouraged to submit one proposal for the entire requirement and clearly identify any differences in price should LLNS elect to make multiple awards.

1.2 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.

Mandatory Option Requirement (designated MOR) in the Draft SOW reflects a particular Scalable Unit (SU) configuration required by LANL. LANL needs the ability to acquire this SU configuration as an option. An Offeror must satisfactorily propose all MORs in order to have its proposal considered eligible for award of a subcontract for LANL SUs.

Target Requirements (designated TR-1, TR-2, or TR-3), identified throughout the Draft SOW, are features, components, performance characteristics, or other properties that are important to the Tri-Laboratory. However, omission of a response for a Target Requirement will not render a proposal non-responsive. Target Requirements add value to a proposal. Target Requirements are prioritized by dash number. TR-1 is most desirable to the Tri-Laboratory, while TR-2 is more desirable than TR-3. Target Requirement responses will be considered as part of the proposal evaluation process.

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

MRs, MORs, TRs, and additional features proposed by the successful Offeror found to be of value to the Tri-Laboratory, will be stated as firm requirements in a final negotiated SOW and incorporated in the resulting TLCC2 Subcontract.

1.3 Performance Features

Technical Proposal Excellence

The Tri-Laboratory will validate that an Offeror's technical proposal satisfies the MRs and MORs. The Tri-Laboratory will assess how well an Offeror's technical proposal addresses the Target Requirements. An Offeror is not solely limited to discussion of these features. An Offeror may propose other features or attributes (as described in Section 1.4 below) 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 evaluate the following performance features.

- How well the proposed solution 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 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 and delivery requirements are.
- How well the technical proposal meets the open source development partnership goals.

Feasibility and Schedule Credibility

Feasibility of the proposed solution 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.
- 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.

1.4 Supplier Attributes

The Tri-Laboratory will evaluate the following supplier attributes.

Capability

- The Offeror's experience and past performance in providing large scale (10-25 TF/s) capacity 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.

1.5 Price

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

Price Proposal

- Reasonableness of the SU proposed 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, maintenance schedules, anticipated installation costs, and overall system footprint.
- Price trade-offs and options embodied in the Offeror's proposal.

1.6 Options

The Draft SOW addresses Phase 1 and Phase 3 options, as well as options for a LANL specific GPU Enhanced SU configuration. 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.

1.7 Alternate Proposals

The Tri-Laboratory may evaluate alternate proposals for award consistent with the preceding information, or as otherwise deemed necessary by the Tri-Laboratory.

2.0 GENERAL PROPOSAL INFORMATION

2.1 Proposal Format

Offeror must provide one complete copy of its proposal on compact disk (CD-ROM). Offerors are not required to submit hardcopy proposals. Offerors may also submit one complete copy of the proposal via email to the LLNS Contract Administrator at ward31@llnl.gov. Page limits are based on consecutively numbered pages. The page limit for the Technical Proposal (Volume I) and Alternate Proposals (Volume III) is 100 pages. The 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 shall be used. 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., e-mail or FAT formatted ISO standard CD-ROM) shall be considered by the Tri-Laboratory to be Certification that the media is virus free.

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
<p>Volume I Technical Proposal <i>(100 page limit total)</i></p> <p>Section 1. Overall Approach and Objectives</p> <p>Section 2. Scalable Unit Architecture and Overview</p> <p>Section 3. Scalable Unit Description</p> <p>Section 4. Reliability, Availability, Serviceability and Maintenance</p> <p>Section 5. Facilities Information</p> <p>Section 6. Project Management</p>
<p>Volume II Business Proposal <i>(20 page limit total)</i></p> <p>Section 1. Supplier Attributes</p> <p>Section 2. Linux Product Roadmap</p> <p>Section 3. Proposed Open Source Development Partnership</p>
<p>Volume III Alternate Proposals <i>(100 page limit total)</i></p> <p>Section 1. Overall Approach and Objectives</p> <p>Section 2. Scalable Unit Architecture and Overview</p> <p>Section 3. Scalable Unit Description</p> <p>Section 4. Reliability, Availability, Serviceability and Maintenance</p> <p>Section 5. Facilities Information</p>
<p>Volume IV Price Proposal <i>(no page limit)</i></p> <p>Section 1. System Prices</p> <p>Section 2. Tri-Laboratory and Offeror Defined Options Prices</p> <p>Section 3. Lower-Tier Subcontractor Price Information</p> <p>Section 4. Offeror Price and Milestone Payment Schedule Proposal</p>
<p>Volume V Other Documents <i>(no page limit)</i></p> <p>Section 1. Software Branding and Licensing, if applicable</p> <p>Section 2. System Warranty Information</p> <p>Section 3. Representations and Certifications Form</p> <p>Section 4. Reserved.</p> <p>Section 5. Royalty Information</p>
<p>Volume VI Offeror Financial Information <i>(no page limit)</i></p>

3.0 TECHNICAL PROPOSAL (VOLUME I)

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.

3.1 Section 1. Overall Approach and Objectives

Discuss the Offeror's approach to responding to this RFP and meeting the ASC programmatic capacity 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. It is vitally important that Offeror's response be very precise about what SU components will be delivered initially and how these components will evolve over time and the impacts of that evolution to the delivered SUs. The evaluation committee may be forced to make pessimistic judgments if the response is vague or incomplete. That is, if the technical review committee cannot ascertain within a reasonable doubt what SU evolution the Offeror is proposing and the full impact of those SU component changes to the SU architecture and when those SU changes will be delivered, then the evaluation committee will view the proposal as lacking in value.

3.2 Section 2. Scalable Unit Architecture and Overview

The SU system architecture and overview 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) IBA network for SU and recommended combinations of SU (e.g., 2xSU, 4xSU, 8xSU); 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.

3.3 Section 3. Scalable Unit Description

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.

3.4 Section 4. Reliability, Availability, Serviceability and Maintenance

This section should contain a detailed description of all facts relating to the reliability, availability and serviceability 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. In the absence of relevant technical

information in the proposal, the Tri-Laboratory may be forced to make pessimistic reliability, availability and serviceability assumptions in evaluating the proposal

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.

3.5 Section 5. Facilities Information

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 and 8xSU) cluster layouts. This information is vital to determine the feasibility of the IBA 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., I/O cabinets, disks, cabling, external networking). The plan should also include the estimated total amount of cooling in BTU (British Thermal Units) or Tons AC required for the SU configurations proposed. 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).

3.6 Section 6. Project Management

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

3.6.1 Open Source Collaboration

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

3.6.2 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.

3.6.3 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.

4.0 BUSINESS PROPOSALS (VOLUME II)

4.1 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); and 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.

4.2 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.

4.3 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.

5.0 ALTERNATE PROPOSALS (VOLUME III)

An "alternate proposal" is defined as an additional proposal presenting a different approach to meeting the general TLCC2 programmatic objectives with other innovative architectures. In addition to a primary proposal, Offerors are encouraged to provide alternate proposals if your organization thinks more than one technical solution is viable, as well as any third party or value added solutions that would be in the best interest of its company and the Tri-Laboratory. Any risk-reduction suggestions Offeror has that would increase the company's ability to successfully meet Tri-Laboratory requirements should also be included in this section.

5.1 Alternate Proposal(s) Format

A separate Technical Proposal (Volume I) and separate Price Proposal (Volume IV) shall be submitted for each Alternate proposal. Cover page titles must clearly correlate alternate proposals and their respective price proposals. The same format indicated in Table 1 should be followed for each Alternate proposal submitted. If a majority of the alternate proposal is the same as the main proposal, duplicate information does not need to be reiterated. In such case, identify the differences between the two. If, however, a significant portion of the alternate proposal is different from the main proposal, the alternate proposal should stand alone. That is, it should follow the same format identified in Table 1 and have sufficient information to allow

the Tri-Laboratory to evaluate it as a stand-alone proposal. Alternate proposals may include pointers to the main proposal.

5.2 Alternate Option(s) Format

Offeror is also encouraged to include alternate options it thinks may be of interest to the Tri-Laboratory. These alternate options should be included in Alternate Proposals (Volume III) of the proposal and priced separately in Price Proposal (Volume IV, section 2). For the purposes of this solicitation, an “option” is defined as additional equipment or services offered by the Offeror that the Tri-Laboratory has the unilateral right to purchase.

6.0 PRICE PROPOSAL (VOLUME IV)

6.1 Section 1. System Prices

The attached Price Schedule (contained in the file “*TLCC2_Price_Schedule.xls*”) shall be completed. Note that this Excel file includes multiple tabs, each tab corresponding with a particular quarter. Individual prices for each item listed are required. Offerors shall separately price services performed in the State of New Mexico and performed in the State of California.

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.

6.2 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.

6.3 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.

6.4 Section 4. Offeror Price and Milestone Payment Schedule Proposal

Offeror shall complete the RFP's Offeror Price and Milestone Payment Proposal and include it in the Price Proposal (Volume IV).

7.0 OTHER DOCUMENTS (VOLUME V)

7.1 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 governing laws of the State of California shall apply.
- The right of assignment of any agreement to the Department of Energy/National Nuclear Security Administration (DOE/NNSA) for assignment to any succeeding prime contractor to Lawrence Livermore National Security, LLC, Los Alamos National Security, LLC, or Sandia Corporation.

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.

7.2 Section 2. System Warranty Information

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

7.3 Section 3. Representations and Certifications

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

7.4 Section 4. Reserved

7.5 Section 5. Royalty Information

If the offer in response to this RFP 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 Administrator 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.

8.0 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.

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.