

Management and Operating Contractor for the Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory (FNAL)

Solicitation Number: 89243123RSC000083

Questions and Answers (47 - 50)

47. Question: What is the composition of the Source Evaluation Board (SEB)?

Answer: The Source Evaluation Board is comprised of all DOE employees.

48. Question: Can Fermilab employees be members of the Source Evaluation Board (SEB)?

Answer: No.

49. Question: Does Fermilab participate in DOE's Non-Federal Agreements for Commercializing Technology (ACT) program? Section H, Clause H.37 mentions it, but it was not obvious from Section C if it is an active program.

Answer: FNAL does not currently have an authorized ACT program. The successful Offeror may establish an ACT program and participate in ACT, subject to the conditions in Clauses H.37 and H.46, after the contract award. The ACT program is one mechanism DOE M&O contractors may use in facilitating technology transfer and access to DOE's expertise and capabilities, consistent with subparagraph C.4 (b)(1)(iii) of the SOW and other terms of the contract.

50. Question: For past performance of the proposing team, Section L.5 of the final RFP made a change from the draft RFP to only allow three past performance information forms per entity and defines "relevance" as "in excess of \$50 million in average annual research and development costs". While this appears to be in recognition of wanting contracts of similar size to the full Fermilab contract, this has the unintended consequence of disadvantaging firms whose funding agencies split awards into multiple smaller pieces (even though the full project is well over \$50 million annually), and also disadvantages teams where a partner brings a key qualification in an important area (e.g., worker safety, quality assurance, cybersecurity, etc.) but under a contract less than \$50 million, and teams that have partnered with a small business with important expertise. As an alternative, would DOE consider allowing one of the three past performance awards per entity to be of a smaller size, either \$5 million or \$10 million? This would still ensure firms capable of handling larger contracts, without precluding information on key capabilities or knocking out or disadvantaging small business partners. It would also still allow reviewers to evaluate relevance based on their own expertise instead of using a single number for all past awards.

Answer: Notwithstanding the dollar amount, only Past Performance Information Forms from the Offeror or those individual entities comprising the Offeror will be evaluated. The capabilities and strengths of team members other than those individual entities comprising the Offeror who bring key qualifications to an important area or who are small business partners may be evaluated under other evaluation factors in which they are proposed. As such, no change will be made to the RFP.