

## **Expression of Interest and One-on-One Meetings Summaries**

Pursuant to Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 15.201, written Expressions of Interest (EOI) were requested by July 18, 2003 and One-on-One meetings were held from July 29 – August 12, 2003 with “interested parties” (parties) relating to the future management and operating of the Idaho National Laboratory. The themes and comments received from interested parties through these medias by DOE are summarized below. DOE appreciates the efforts of all parties who submitted written responses and participated in One-on-One meetings. DOE will endeavor to incorporate the ideas and suggestions into the draft Request For Proposal (RFP) and general procurement process as provided by participants.

There is universal agreement among parties submitting EOI and participating in One-on-One Meetings, that the future vision for the INL is to develop, deploy, commercialize nuclear technology and revitalize nuclear energy for the nation.

Suggestions related to the overall future success of the INL, the RFP and procurement process are identified as follows:

DOE’s commitment to the goal of revitalizing nuclear energy needs to be explicit & credible, especially in ensuring there is sufficient funding requested to ensure a viable program.

The RFP should contain a clear articulation of DOE’s vision and role of lab with respect to:

- Private Sector participation
- Interface roles with other labs
- Policy and societal issues
- Labs role as a catalyst for revitalizing nuclear industry

The primary focus of the INL needs to be the commercializing nuclear technology developed and focusing the lab’s research on such technology.

The contract term should be 10 years or at least long enough to allow the contractor to be able to accomplish initial aspects of the INL vision.

Teaming and collaboration among industry partners, small business, other national labs and academia is essential if DOE goals and vision for the INL are to be accomplished. Having the right leadership is essential to making such collaboration successful. The contract needs flexibility and must have either built in authorities or ability to seek exception to DOE regulations or federal restrictions that may hinder broad collaboration seen as needed to revitalize the nuclear industry. Some examples where special authority (as a pilot program) or other relief may be needed are as follows:

- Ease of getting non DOE funds into the laboratory (WFO, industry or capital investment)
- Effective authority for the INL to enter into a variety of collaborative arrangements
- Resolution of Organizational Conflict of Interest issues
- Efficient mechanisms to allow access to the INL by foreign nationals to encourage international collaboration

- Resolution of FOCI issues to allow for the broadest possible participation in INL programs
- Creative approaches in areas such as intellectual property, infrastructure, requirements tailoring, access to corporate parent resources, access to external funding sources, and changing team make-up as mission progresses.
- Workforce flexibility and the ability of the prime contract team to effect immediate changes in staffing, recruitment/retention of high caliber staff, compensation & benefits, and work rules is a general concern.

With regard to contract incentive and reward systems, most parties felt contractor performance incentives should be performance-based and outcome focused.

In addition to traditional incentive fee payments, other performance incentives to the contractor should be considered for the following:

- Shifting costs from support functions to program outputs
- Sharing cost savings either from operational efficiencies gained or program dollars saved
- Ability to bring outside dollars to the INL

Parties expressed an interest and willingness to consider non-monetary performance incentives in the areas listed below:

- Increased contract term
- Intellectual property
- Peer recognition for academic institutions and scientific effort

There was consensus that specific goals should be required for small business participation. Parties thought there should be minimal breakout of small business as DOE prime contracts, requirements for meaningful technical roles for small business, and a mechanism to ensure that small business shares equitably in fee.

Parties expressed an interest to have as much INL program, infrastructure and funding information with corresponding full time equivalent staff counts and other workforce demographics made available through the web site as early as possible. Several expressed an interest for additional site tours and the ability to hold individual discussions with key INL staff to get a better understanding of current operations and program direction and involvement.

### **One-on-One Participants**

Battelle Memorial Institute
Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC)
Bechtel National, Inc.
BNFL, Inc.
Kellogg Brown & Root Services, Inc. (KBR)
Honeywell International, Inc.
University of Chicago
General Atomics
Fluor Government Group

Dyncorp
Shaw Environmental & Infrastructure
Inland Northwest Research Alliance, Inc. (INRA)
BWX Technologies
Washington Group International
U.S. AREVA Group
Lockheed Martin
Burns & Roe Enterprises, Inc.
Parsons
Qal-Tek Associates/Proxtronics, Inc.
Robbins-Gioia LLC
Science & Engineering Associates, Inc.
Entergy Nuclear Inc.