

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
56.	Section L, Attachment L-2	Resume Format	L-48	The following note was included in Attachment L-3. Would you please amend Attachment L-2 to include equivalent instructions: “Note: The Offeror may amend the format for Attachment L-2, Key Personnel Standard Resume Format, as long as the exact information, font and size, and page limitations are followed.”	Yes, as long as the Offeror complies with all instructions including those in L.10. The RFP will be amended.

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
57.	L.10 (a) (2) and Section L.15(e) (6)	Critical Subcontractors	L-5 and L-26	<p>The definition of critical subcontractors is still causing issues with small businesses being included in teams. RFP Section L.10 (a) (2) states: “A ‘Critical Subcontractor’ is any subcontractor that will perform work that is incorporated into the Offeror's Technical Approach and that the prime Offeror considers critical to enhance its team’s technical approach, experience, or ability to meet delivery requirements.”</p> <p>RFP Section L.15(e) (6) states: “Identify any proposed critical subcontractor(s)”...The offeror shall describe the rationale for the proposed performance of work by the identified subcontractors, as opposed to the Offeror’s own employees...”</p> <p>Some prime contractors are interpreting this statement to mean that, to add a critical subcontractor, the prime must demonstrate that their own employees cannot do this work; i.e., that the critical subcontractor must be filling a gap. This interpretation is preventing small businesses from being added as critical subcontractors. We interpret these statements to mean that the prime needs to explain the rationale for subcontracting vs. self-performing, which can include several reasons, such as it is more efficient, no learning curve, cost effectiveness, unique capabilities, enhances technical approach in other ways, etc. in accordance to the prime’s technical approach. Can you please confirm if our interpretation is correct?</p>	<p>It really depends on the Offeror’s Technical and Management Proposal. The Prime Offeror does not have to demonstrate its employees cannot do the work designated for critical subs. Rather, the proposal just needs to explain why the selected critical subs enhance the proposed technical approach (i.e. the value proposition of the designation of critical subs).</p>

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
58.	C/C.3	Program Management and General Requirements	C-9	<p>The Final RFP requires the allocation of Program Management, Project management, document controls, records management, project controls, interfaces, etc. at the Level 2 of the PWS (e.g. C.6, C.7, C.8). However, there is no clear Level 3 PWS element where the scope within the element aligns with the support resources. Would the DOE consider adding a Level 3 to each of the Level 2 PWS elements listed below to allow for the allocation of project management and support costs but also ensure that the support costs are accounted for in the correct CLIN.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) C.5 2) C.6 3) C.7 4) C.8 5) C.9 6) C.10 7) C.11 8) C.12 	<p>DOE will not add a level 3 to the WBS/PWS. The Offeror may propose how it is going to distribute support to individual project activities in the Basis of Estimates; however, the Offeror may not change the L-6 or L-7 Worksheets.</p> <p>See Section L, L.18 l(iii) for more pricing instructions.</p>

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
59.	L.18(b)	Proposal Preparation Instructions, Volume III – Cost/Price Proposal	L-34	Under Instructions – Cost and Fee Proposal, paragraph (b) it states that the offeror shall not propose its own WBS structure (including adding to or aggregating PWS elements). Would the DOE allow for additional lower level WBS elements to the PWS lowest levels within the schedule if they were necessary to provide clarity and additional cost control options? We believe further definition of the WBS levels will assist the DOE in reviewing the information and assist in organization for execution.	See response at Q&A #58.
60.	Section L, Attachment L-8	Assumptions	L-59 to L-76	To provide clarity in communication, could DOE add columns to this table to clearly state whether a service from the NNSA M&O is a MANDATORY service (meaning we must purchase that service from the M&O) or an OPTIONAL service (meaning we may purchase it from the NNSA M&O or we may self perform or otherwise subcontract, etc.) and another column that clarifies if a provided \$ value in Attachment L-8 is a \$ value for reimbursement to the NNSA M&O or a \$ value for the EM Contractor to include as a plugged number in its cost estimate for services it will perform. The addition of these two columns would make it completely clear to all Offerors such that the bids are consistently developed.	See Attachment J-6 Interfaces with NNSA Management and Operating Contractor Systems and Services for identification of those mandatory systems, services and shared facilities. The RFP, Section L, Attachment L-8, Cost Assumptions, will be amended to provide clarification as a result of other questions asked. However, columns will not be added.

Q&A #	RFP Section/ Sub-Section	Subject/Title	Page Number	Contractor Comment/Question	DOE Response
61.	L.17 (h) Attachment L-4	Proposal Preparation Instructions, Volume II – Past Performance and Past Performance Questionnaire	L-30-31; L-51	<p>We are submitting relevant DOE projects for work performed through subcontracts with companies on other offering teams. In order for DOE to receive fair and bona fide performance evaluations for relevant DOE projects, thereby enabling you to review an accurate performance evaluation, it may be appropriate for DOE personnel familiar with the work performed to serve as a neutral reference. Some DOE personnel who are willing to respond to a PPQ have been instructed that they cannot respond to a PPQ for this procurement.</p> <p>Will DOE allow personnel with knowledge of the contract performance to serve as a reference and complete the PPQ?</p>	<p>The individual identified in Block 6 of Section L Attachment L-3 <i>Offeror Past Performance and Relevant Experience Reference Information Form</i> need to complete a PPQ for the reference contract/project. DOE may also consider past performance information from DOE personnel with direct knowledge of the contract/project performance in accordance with L.17(i). Any “Client” that has concerns with completing a PPQ should contact the Procuring Contracting Officer for guidance.</p>
62.	L-18 (g)	Funding profile	L-33	<p>Is the funding profile included in Section L inclusive or exclusive of funding for IDIQ scope?</p>	<p>Inclusive. Section L.18.g. states, “The provided funding profile covers the total estimated cost and fee described in Section B”. See RFP Table B-2.2.</p>
63.	Section L, Attachment L-8	PWS allocation of the Radiation Protection Program	L-59	<p>PWS C.3.3.5 includes the Radiation Protection Program (pages C-24 and C-25). The second assumption on page L-59, Radiation Protection Program, references PWS C.3.3.2. The third assumption, Radiation Protection Program, references C.3.3.5. Please change the reference on the second assumption to C.3.3.25.</p>	<p>The RFP will be amended to correct the references in Section L, Attachment L-8 to C.3.3.5.</p>