



# VANGUARD

DOE Technical Advisory Team Information  
SNL, LANL, LLNL, ANL, ORNL, LBL  
[vanguard-tat@software.sandia.gov](mailto:vanguard-tat@software.sandia.gov)

# Technical Advisory Teams

## Systems Architecture and Software

### LEADS:

Kevin Pedretti (SNL)  
Scott Hemmert (SNL)

### Members:

Ryan Grant (SNL)  
Andrew Younge (SNL)  
Trent D'Hooze (LLNL)  
Doug Doerfler (LBL)  
Ross Miller (ORNL)  
Mike Lang (LANL)

## Application Performance and Tools

### LEAD:

Si Hammond (SNL)

### Members:

Clay Hughes (SNL)  
Gwen Voskuilen (SNL)  
Mike Glass (SNL)  
Jeremy Wilke (SNL)  
Pat McCormick (LANL)  
Gabe Rockefeller (LANL)  
Mike McKay (LANL)  
Rob Neely (LLNL)  
Paul Hovland (ANL)

# Technical Advisory Teams

## Operations and Systems Management

### LEADS:

Steve Monk (SNL)

### Members:

Randy Scott (SNL)

Jeff Ogden (SNL)

Dave Martinez (SNL)

Paul Peltz (LANL)

## Storage

### LEAD:

Lee Ward (SNL)

### Members:

Ruth Klundt (SNL)

Jay Lofstead (SNL)

Matthew Curry (SNL)

Brad Settlemyer (LANL)

Dominic Manno (LANL)

Robin Goldstone (LLNL)

# Technical Advisory Teams

## Floaters

### Members:

James Laros (SNL)  
Ken Alvin (SNL)  
Rob Hoekstra (SNL)  
Ron Brightwell (SNL)  
James Ang (SNL)  
Tom Klitsner (SNL)  
Bronis de Supinski (LLNL)  
Gary Grider (LANL)  
Bill Archer (LANL)

## Source Selection

### Members:

James Laros (SNL)  
Ken Alvin (SNL)  
Rob Hoekstra (SNL)  
Tom Klitsner (SNL)  
Kevin Pedretti (SNL)  
Si Hammond (SNL)  
Steve Monk (SNL)

### Observers:

Mike Lang (LANL)  
Rob Neely (LLNL)

# TAT Group Assignments

## **Systems Architecture and Software**

- Sections: 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 10\*

## **Application Performance and Tools**

- Sections: 5, 7

## **Operations and Systems Management**

- Sections: 9, 10\*, 11, 12, 13

## **Storage**

- Section: 6

***\*Note: intentional overlap***

# Important Dates



- February 8<sup>th</sup>
  - Proposals due
- February 9<sup>th</sup>
  - Distribution of Technical portion of proposals to teams
- February 9<sup>th</sup> – February 21<sup>st</sup>
  - Team reviews conducted
- February 20<sup>th</sup>
  - Rooms available at SNL (CSRI) for group meetings if needed
- February 21<sup>st</sup>
  - Group roll-ups due.
  - Face-2-face TAT review meeting, group brief out presentations at SNL (CSRI/90)
  - Source selection meeting



# TAT Responsibilities (ALL)

- Read and understand entire proposal
  - This applies to Floaters also!
- Evaluate proposal based on desired attributes
  - Generically we call these requirements
- Follow Group-lead guidance
- Come to Face-2-face prepared to report and discuss your findings
- Work as a TEAM!



# Handling Information (ALL)

- You are responsible for protecting NDA, company proprietary information
  - Do not leave hard copies of responses on un-attended printers
  - Do not transmit (email) any documents related to the evaluation without password protection
  - Do not discuss any aspects of this procurement process with anyone outside of the TAT members
    - Including where you may be overheard!





# TAT Group Lead Responsibilities

- Coordinate how you will conduct your reviews with your group members
  - Its your call as long as you complete your reviews by the required date
  - Face-2-face
  - Over the phone
  - Mixture
  - Rooms available February 20<sup>th</sup>, let Jim know in advance!
- Deliver roll-up spreadsheet reflecting your groups consensus by due date
  - One overall sheet
  - One rating per desired attribute per proposal
- Complete and present your high-level findings at the TAT face-2-face meeting
  - Presentation for, a template will be provided

# Ratings Choices (and definitions)

- **Excellent**

- The offeror's qualifications are **superior** and are indicative of **high ability to exceed** the requirements (desired attributes) stated in the RFQ. The proposal demonstrates considerable high past performance in the same or similar work as described in the proposal. The firm clearly has ample resources available to support the project.

- **Good**

- The offeror's qualifications are **above average** but fall short of the level of "Excellent"; qualifications are indicative of a **high ability to meet** the requirements (desired attributes) stated in the RFQ. The firm has sufficient existing resources available to support the project and has demonstrated good past performance in same or similar work.

- **Satisfactory**

- The offeror's qualifications are **average** and are indicative of an ability to **satisfy the basic requirements** (desired attributes) of the RFQ. Qualifications are relevant to the work described in the RFQ. The firm has an acceptable level of resources to support the project and has demonstrated satisfactory past performance in same or similar work.

- **Marginal**

- The offeror's qualifications are **below average and raise doubts about the offeror's ability to satisfy the basic requirements** (desired attributes) of the RFQ. Qualifications bear little relevance to the work described in the RFQ. It is unclear whether the firm can provide adequate resources to support the project. Past performance in the same or similar work is unclear, was below average, or less than satisfactory.

- **Unsatisfactory**

- The offeror's qualifications are **far below the standard for a qualified Subcontractor, and are not indicative of an ability to meet the requirements** (desired attributes) of the RFQ. Qualifications bear no relevance at all to the work described in the RFQ. The firm does not have resources to support the project adequately, and does not appear to have a viable plan to acquire such resources. Offeror does not demonstrate past performance in the same or similar work, or such performance was unsatisfactory.

# Procedural Notes

- Spreadsheets
  - Example will be distributed prior to proposal due date
  - Final sheets distributed along with proposals
    - Once we know who you are evaluating
- 3 part evaluation
- Ratings (see definitions)
  - Each desired attribute must be rated
    - This includes sub-components of a single desired attribute
    - Rating of desired attribute MUST be reflective of sub-component ratings
    - Don't rate a sub-component Marginal and the overall desired attribute Excellent
- Comment
  - Comment is optional if rating is Satisfactory
  - Comment is REQUIRED if rating is otherwise
- Strength/Weakness
  - Provided to assist you in developing your out-brief

# Schedule – Past and Projected

- ~~September 22<sup>nd</sup> – 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft RFI released~~
  - Note: We are releasing the RFI via the procurement vehicle more frequently, possibly weekly, to maintain equality in the communication process.
- ~~Week of September 25<sup>th</sup> – Prime F2F presentations~~
- ~~RFP release no later than January 12<sup>th</sup>~~
  - Possibly before Christmas holidays **RFP to be released December 20<sup>th</sup>**
- ~~RFP responses due no later than February 8<sup>th</sup>~~
  - ~~Hopefully worse case scenario~~ **Vendors now have ample time, extensions won't be entertained.**
- ~~January 11<sup>th</sup> – Vendor pre-proposal brief at Sandia NM (9-12 CSRI/90)~~
  - RFP responses distributed to technical team members February 9<sup>th</sup>
  - **February 20<sup>th</sup> – Opportunity for groups to meet Face to Face (up to group lead and teams)**
  - February 21<sup>st</sup> – Technical review (SNL Albuquerque)
  - February 21<sup>st</sup> – Source Selection (with Tri-lab members to minimize travel)
  - February 22<sup>nd</sup> – Follow on Source Selection only if necessary
  - February/March 2018 – Negotiations and SOW development
  - March/April 2018 – SOW development and contract placement
  - July/August 2018 – Phase 1 platform delivery begins