

AMENDMENT #1: 2025-31011A, PHILIPPINES: VENDOR-NEUTRAL SMALL MODULAR REACTOR TECHNOLOGY AND DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT

POC: Anna Amaya, USTDA, 1101 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 1100, Arlington, VA 22209-3901, Tel: (703) 875-4357, Email: RFP@ustda.gov.

Please note that the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the Technical Assistance for the Vendor-Neutral Small Modular Reactor Technology and Development Assessment Project is amended, as follows:

Questions, Answers and Clarifications: This amendment consists of clarifying questions and answers submitted by potential Offerors regarding the RFP packet. Responses to submitted questions are attached.

1. Our company is working with some of the SMR vendors listed in the RFP document. We don't have any financial interest in these companies, and we have different teams working on different SMR projects. We are planning to implement internal firewalls between teams to mitigate potential conflict of interest concerns. Would this be an acceptable approach? It would be helpful to understand if we are qualified to work on this project and our current projects with SMR vendors will not be a concern after implementation of internal firewalls.

USTDA recommends disclosing any existing work with Meralco and current clients. USTDA defers to offerors to ensure they are in compliance with any existing legal obligations (e.g. NDAs) and implement internal protocols to mitigate conflict of interest concerns.

2. I am writing in regard to a question on the fixed price aspect of both the Philippines and Bulgaria nuclear technical assistance RFP currently open. I understand both are fixed to price to the amount identified in the RFP, however what is the fee basis? Is the fixed price based on commercial rate or is this a cooperative agreement type fee structure where no profit is allowed?

USTDA does allow reasonable fee and profit for grant activities, but as noted this activity is fixed price. USTDA defers to offerors on how to develop a staffing plan based on the fixed price structure for RFP solicitations.

3. Notification and registration to receive the RFP, inclusion to the offeror's list was all done through USTDA (website). Please confirm that there is no separate registration required from the Client (Meralco PowerGEN or MGEN) in order to be included in the list of offerors.

There is no separate registration process with MGEN, but offerors should submit final bids per the guidance in the RFP document.

4. These sections mentioned of a 'contract' from the Grantee (MGEN) - which may include other terms, conditions, requirements in addition to those included in the USTDA GRANT

AGREEMENT (Appendix 3), TERMS OF REFERENCE (Annex I) and USTDA Mandatory Contract Clauses (Annex II). Requesting a copy of this Grantee's contract (draft) for reference and consideration.

USTDA's website - <https://www.ustda.gov/ustda-document-center/> - has a contract template. A draft Secondary Agreement (contract) will be provided after award.

5. Given the short period to submit the proposal, a short-list of subcontractors (~2 Firms) for a given task maybe identified (as opposed to 1) and included in the proposal (i.e. each will be provided with the required information on experience/expertise and qualifications). Is this acceptable / still compliant?

Given the short timeline for proposal submission, it is acceptable to identify a short-list of subcontractors (e.g., two firms) for a given task, provided this is presented clearly and remains evaluable.

We recommend that the Offeror designate a Primary Subcontractor and an Alternate Subcontractor and specify the conditions or triggers under which the Alternate may be used in place of the Primary. The Offeror should also provide full details on the experience, expertise, and qualifications of both subcontractors.

As noted, the Offeror will be evaluated based on the criteria outlined in the RFP solicitation and on the clarity and completeness of the Work Plan submitted to Meralco.

6. Is it correct to assume that ALL "relevant technical, commercial, financial and environmental data related to the Project from the Client (MGEN) will be provided/transmitted upon award (i.e. within a week after award notification) and are considered 'rely-upon' information? Please also confirm the Client provided information is to include the bulleted items under sub task 1.1.

The Client will provide the Contractor with initial relevant technical, commercial, financial, and environmental documents upon award, in accordance with the timeline set out in the Terms of Reference. However, the complete set of information to be transmitted will depend on the specific list of documents and data that the Contractor identifies as necessary to carry out the scope of work. We request that the Contractor provide a detailed list of required inputs so the Client can confirm availability and prepare the appropriate materials.

Client-provided information will be treated as “rely-upon” information for the purposes of this engagement. At the same time, the Contractor is expected to perform reasonable secondary research, validation, and a duty to correct—particularly where external data, assumptions, or analytical judgments are required to complete the deliverables. Any discrepancies, gaps, or clarifications identified during the work should be raised with the Client promptly for resolution.

7. How many Sites are considered by MGEN in total, (i.e. Client sites + NEPIO sites) and where are these located ? (i.e. at least general location - Region and/or name of province)

The Client notes that the DOE has previously identified more than ten (10+) candidate sites under their siting initiative. However, the Client does not intend to limit the assessment strictly to these DOE-shortlisted locations.

For the purposes of this engagement, the Client expects the Contractor to take a holistic, nationwide approach to site identification. This means considering the DOE-shortlisted locations, and other potential areas across the country that may be suitable based on technical, environmental, regulatory, and commercial criteria. This approach ensures that the final list of evaluated sites is comprehensive and not restricted to previously identified areas.

8. Please clarify who are the "Internal Stakeholders" referred to in this section.

The "Internal Stakeholders" are defined in the Terms of Reference as the Contractor, the Client, and representatives from Meralco.

9. Is it correct to assume that the Client's (MGEN) Generation plans/approach required as reference to perform Task 7 will be provided/transmitted upon award (i.e. within a week after award notification) and are considered 'rely-upon' information?

The Client will work with the Contractor on delivering the relevant technical, commercial, financial and environmental data related to the Project in a timely manner in accordance with the requirements of the Terms of Reference. It is considered to be 'rely-upon' information.

The Client will provide the Contractor with Generation plans/approach upon award, in accordance with the timeline set out in the Terms of Reference. However, the complete set of information to be transmitted will depend on the specific list of documents and data that the Contractor identifies as necessary to carry out the scope of work. We request that the Contractor provide a detailed list of required inputs so the Client can confirm availability and prepare the appropriate materials.

Client-provided information will be treated as "rely-upon" information for the purposes of this engagement. At the same time, the Contractor is expected to perform reasonable secondary research, validation, and a duty to correct—particularly where external data, assumptions, or analytical judgments are required to complete the deliverables. Any discrepancies, gaps, or clarifications identified during the work should be raised with the Client promptly for resolution.

10. Magnitude of total project investment - Is there an upper limit or financial threshold for the total capital investment in the event that the study selects the 3 SMR technologies deemed technically and commercially viable?

There is no predetermined upper limit or financial threshold set by the Client for the total project investment at this stage. The primary objective of the study is to support the Client in identifying—and ultimately deploying—one (1) SMR technology by developing a comprehensive technical and commercial viability assessment for each of the three (3) shortlisted SMR technologies. This will enable the Client to easily compare the options based on consistent criteria and make an informed selection moving forward.

11. Public and private sector partnerships – if the Project adopts a public-private partnership (PPP) structure, are there preferred sectors, entities, or countries from which partners would be sought, and are there any that would be considered less preferable or excluded?

The Client does not prescribe any preferred or excluded sectors, entities, or countries for potential public-private partnership (PPP) arrangements at this stage. The Client expects the Contractor to provide independent recommendations on suitable partnership models based on global best practices, the local regulatory and market landscape, and the specific requirements of SMR deployment in the Philippines.

12. The Contractor may propose a range of PPP structures and identify prospective partners (public or private) that align with project feasibility, risk allocation, investment requirements, and international experience. Both Tasks includes gathering information and comparing "structuring, execution, procurement, funding and financing of the Project to market practice" with at least 1 southeast Asia country. However, there is currently no actual SMR or Conventional NPP existing/deployed in the region and those in development are on its very early stages. Please confirm if offeror is able to use information from relevant proposals and projects prepared/or executed by offeror in the region.

USTDA recommends disclosing any existing work with Meralco and current clients. USTDA defers to offeror's to ensure they are in compliance with any existing legal obligations (e.g. NDAs) and implement internal protocols to mitigate conflict of interest concerns. Otherwise, the Offeror's are able to use existing internal information at their discretion.

13. Offeror intends to include data/information/experiences on previous 'conventional' NPP project execution as SMR is relatively new/recent technology in the conduct of the Risk Assessment/Lessons Learned. Is this acceptable?

Including data/information/experiences on previous 'conventional' NPP project execution is acceptable.

14. Given the short turnaround for clarifications, Is the Client able to accommodate follow-up questions and set clarification meetings prior to the submission of the proposal?

No follow-up questions or offeror specific meetings are allowed as part of the RFP solicitation process.

15. Please confirm that the use of publicly available data is considered acceptable for completing this activity if we are unable to obtain the requested information from the technology vendors in a timely manner.

Publicly available data is considered acceptable to complete the Terms of Reference, unless otherwise specified.

16. We propose to complete technology siting assessment under Task 4 only for the recommended designs per Task 5. This will allow for a more comprehensive assessment of the recommended technologies. Please confirm if this approach will be acceptable.

The expectation based on the Terms of Reference is that Task 4 will be completed for all vendors listed in Subtask 2.1.

17. Are there maximum or minimum MWe expectations for the project? This will be useful for determining the technologies to be considered under Subtask 2.1.

Task 14 – Development Impact Assessment specifies 300 MW for the Project, but the specific use cases and vendor designs will have implications for project size. The vendor designs considered under Subtask 2.1 is considered final. Any proposed change to the list of reactor designs will require approval by each of the Client, Contractor, and USTDA.

18. What file format for source data and working files do we expect to receive? What classification levels apply to Meralco/NEPIO/DOE documents? Are there any export control information (ECI) that will be provided by Meralco to the offeror?

File formats to be provided will mostly be in the form of PowerPoint, Excel, Word, and PDF documents, depending on the nature of the source data. Data classifications will be Confidential Information, For Official Use Only, and Public Information.

It is not expected that export control information will be included as part of the Technical Assistance.

19. Will the Contractor be given direct access to NGCP/Meralco technical teams for clarifications on site-specific grid data? What GIS file formats are required for submission, if any?

The Contractor will be given access to the Meralco and MGen technical teams, but the Terms of Reference does not require direct interaction with NGCP. The Client does not prescribe any specific GIS file formats for submission at this stage. The Contractor may use its standard GIS formats as long as they are in commonly used, open, and accessible formats (i.e., KMZ)

20. What redaction standards apply for the public-facing version, if any? Is there a prescribed template (section headings, style guide) and document ID/naming convention for the Interim Report?

The cover page of every Final Report shall contain the name of the Grantee, the name of the Contactor/U.S. Firm who prepared the report, a report title, USTDA's logo, and USTDA's address. If the Final Report contains confidential information, the Contractor/U.S. Firm shall be responsible for labeling the front cover of that version of the Final Report with the term "Confidential Version". The Contractor/U.S. Firm shall be responsible for labeling the front cover of the Public Version of the Final Report with the term "Public Version." All business confidential information should be removed from the Public Version of the Final Report. No Task reports will be made public until the Final Report.

For the public-facing version of the report, the Client does not prescribe a specific redaction standard at this stage. However, the Client and the Contractor are expected to jointly identify which information should be treated as confidential throughout the engagement.

The Client will review the Contractor's proposed redactions and may provide additional guidance during the drafting process as needed. There is no prescribed template, section heading structure, style guide, or document naming convention for the Interim Report at this time

21. Are there specific templates, formatting standards, or file types (Word, PDF, Excel, PowerPoint) required for each Deliverable?

The Client does not prescribe specific templates or formatting standards for the Deliverables at this stage.

22. Will the Contractor be granted access to required energy system data or any historical operational records of the Client as minimum to be able to perform the task/TA?

The Client request that the Contractor provide a detailed list of required inputs so the Client can confirm availability and prepare the appropriate materials.