Questions and Responses

(Initial Q&R – 9/17/2021)

Question 1 – With the current COVID situation and knowing that DOE is in a maximum telework environment, can the Government confirm that currently all staff under the existing MESA award are teleworking or are any required to be on-site?

Response – At the present time, while NETL is in a maximum telework posture, all MESA staff are teleworking and none are required to be on-site.

Question 2 – Can Offerors submit relevant experience and past performance for subcontractors who are not considered or identified as “major or critical subcontractors”?

Response – No, the instructions to Offerors clearly indicates that relevant experience and past performance are from the Offeror (including team members that make up a Joint Venture as the Offeror) and its major or critical subcontractors.

Question 3 – If a major or critical subcontractor will be performing on a subcontract type that is not a cost reimbursement type vehicle, are they still required to submit costing information as indicated in the Instruction to Offeror’s Cost Proposal?

Response – Yes, for adequate evaluation purposes all major or critical subcontractors are required to provide costing information at the same level of the Offeror as indicated in the Instructions to Offeror.

Question 4 – Can the Government provide information on site location for each Labor Category FTE?

Response – It is up to the Offeror to determine the best location for its staff and how it will ensure that adequate staffing is available for meeting the requirements of the PWS at each of the NETL locations. The Government will not dictate a required location for each Labor Category.

Questions and Responses

(Amendment 2 Q&R – 10/13/2021)

Question 5 – Would NETL consider allowing use of the “prior to MESA” incumbent contracts for Relevant Past Performance given that these contracts are just a few months older than the five-year recency standard and are directly relevant as an indicator of performance at NETL?

Response – NETL will only accept contracts from the past five years for relevant past performance.

Question 6 – Will NETL allow Offerors to include up to three examples of relevant experience from subcontractors that are not major or critical subcontractors? In addition, would NETL allow inclusion of contracts that meet the intent of new capabilities that are requested but may not meet the requirements related to size and period of performance?

Response – All examples of relevant experience must be from major or critical subcontractors. All contracts must meet all requirements outlined in the RFP, which includes size and period of performance.

Question 7 – While NETL has provided historical FTE allocation by labor category, NETL has not provided an overall DPLH or DPLH by labor category, nor has NETL provided any information about how existing staff execute against PWS areas. Was DPLH information inadvertently omitted or does NETL wish Offerors to develop their staffing plans without this information.

Response – The RFP is intended for each Offeror to review the PWS and develop a staffing plan in accordance with their technical approach to execute the requirements of the PWS. This includes the Offeror’s determination on DPLH, labor categories, and locations of staff. Historical information is not provided as a requirement to be followed instead provided to give insight into how similar functions were achieved in the past.

Question 8 – Will NETL provide historical FTE allocation by level for the labor categories?

Response – All historical information related to FTEs is located in the Position Qualifications section of the RFP. It is up to the Offeror to determine the allocation by level based on its proposed technical approach to execute the requirements of the PWS.

Question 9 – Where is the link to the NETL Order 414.1, Quality Management System Program Plan?

Response – Those NETL Orders have been canceled and the references have been removed from the RFP.

Question 10 – Would the Government move the Subcontracting Plan (File 5 of Technical and Management Proposal Volume II) from Volume II Technical and Management Proposal to Volume III Cost proposal for the proposal package? This request is made to remove contractual cost information from the Technical and Management Proposal as it is not permitted per L.7.

Response – The Subcontracting Plan does not provide detailed cost information. It provides goals and calculations based on percentages of planned subcontracting and how those would assist in meeting goals. The Subcontracting Plan is required to be evaluated as part of the technical evaluation and as such will not be moved as suggested in this question.

Question 11 – Would the Government consider removing the Prime Goals from L.7(d) as they do not pertain to this requirement (they are agency goals)?

Response – As indicated in L.7(d) the goals identified are for informational purposes. The intent of providing these goals at both the prime and subcontract level are to give insight to potential Offerors in development of their proposed goals.

Question 12 – The definitions provided in Section L.8 include definitions that appear not to pertain to this requirement, such as those related to Service Contract Act and Wage Determinations. Would the Government considering removing those definitions to avoid confusion?

Response – Section L.8 has been edited to remove references to definitions that do not pertain to this RFP.

Question 13 – Would the Government unhide rows 13, 204 and 47 from Tab B-1 in the cost exhibits and row 5 from Tab B2?

Response – The rows were not hidden intentionally and have been unhidden in the cost exhibits included in this amendment.

Question 14 – Please confirm that the required information for the evaluation of compensation for professional employees should be included in the cost discussion?

Response – The information related to compensation for professional employees is required to be submitted with the cost discussion information along with other compensation information as required in the Section L.8 instructions.

Question 15 – Please confirm that an offeror should develop the NETL on-site rate in accordance with its accounting practices and estimating system?

Response – As indicated in Section L.8, the on-site (NETL specific) rate shall include the entire expected costs of the PMO required for performance on this contract. Since it is expected that each entity provide an on-site (NETL specific) overhead rate for on-site work, there should not be any conflicts with disclosure statements on charging 100% of the PMO expenses to the indirect pool. Exceptions or deviations to the on-site (NETL specific) overhead rate or to the inclusion of the entire PMO costs must be addressed in the Administrative Discussion (File 5) required under Volume I, Offer and Other Documents.

 Questions and Responses

(Amendment 3 Q&R – 10/19/2021)

Question 16 – There are data validation lists included in the provided cost exhibits, are these to be populated or removed? Can lines or rows be added to meet an offeror’s disclosed practices?

Response – A revised cost exhibit has been provided with the data validation areas removed. Please note that the Cost Exhibit is editable by Offerors to add rows and information as needed but you are not to adjust or remove the row headers that have been included.