

## **AMENDMENT # 2 2025-21001A BULGARIA: SMALL MODULAR REACTOR STUDY**

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

---

Please note that the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the Technical Assistance for the Bulgaria Small Modular Reactor Study is amended, as follows:

### **Section 2.13: Proposal Submission Requirements**

The new submission deadline for bids has been extended to 12:00 PM EDT (19:00 EET, UTC +2 local time in Sofia, Bulgaria) on March 16th, 2026.

**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.

Question #1 and #2:

As a new U.S. company, we have performed technical assistance in line with the description outlined in the RFP for the past 12-18 months. However, all examples are confidential. Our team members have and can share relevant public-facing experience from past positions at other companies. Would examples of past performance at other companies be accepted as "evidence" that we "have relevant past experience and have previously delivered advisory, Technical Assistance and/or other services similar to those required in the TOR, as applicable" as stated on p. 9 of the RFP?

**A1: Please submit all relevant experience.**

If the answer to the prior question is "no," are we able to be listed as a subcontractor for Technical Assistance if the Prime applicant has demonstrated Technical Assistance experience outside of the nuclear realm?

**A2: Please note the answer to the prior question is yes. Please submit all relevant experience.**

Question #3

If selected to perform the Technical Assistance scope under this RFP, would the contractor be precluded from providing additional consulting, engineering, project management, or EPC services related to subsequent phases of SMR development or implementation in Bulgaria? Specifically, we would appreciate clarification on any perceived or contractual conflict-of-interest restrictions that may apply to downstream roles following completion of the study.

**A3: No current legislative legal restrictions exist for a consultant that implemented/participated in the implementation of the Feasibility Study to participate in the engineering design implementation or in the EPC services phase implementation. BEH does not foresee to impose such kind of restrictions. If any result/s from the study seem not fully justified or subjective BEH can always cross check with external specialists if need be.**

Question #4:

Has BEH pre-identified candidate sites for SMR deployment that the awardee will further evaluate, or is the Technical Assistance expected to perform a greenfield site screening across Bulgaria?

A4: Please see Task 4: Site Assessment, Subtask 4.1: BEH has pre-identified two potential SMR Project sites: the Maritsa Iztok coal-fired power plant complex and the Belene nuclear power plant site. Before the Commencement Meeting in Task 1 of the Terms of Reference, BEH will select up to three (3) additional potential SMR sites owned by BEH subsidiaries or affiliates.

Question #5:

What level of site data will BEH provide (e.g., geotechnical, seismic, grid interconnection, environmental constraints), and what level of new analysis is expected from the consultant?

A5: In Subtask 1.1 of the Terms of Reference, the Contractor will request data from BEH including any previously completed BEH site studies and other information for selected sites. The subtasks for Task 4 detail the level of new analysis required from the Contractor.

Question #6:

Will BEH be the sole decision-maker, or will other ministries, regulators, or state entities be involved in reviewing or approving the Technical Assistance outputs?

A6: As the Grantee, BEH will be the entity responsible for reviewing and approving the Deliverables of the Terms of Reference.

Other stakeholders in the Bulgarian government may be involved. Please refer to pages 20-21 of the posted RFP for the full list of Key Stakeholders and potential involvement.

Question #7:

Could you please provide additional information regarding the evaluation and decision-making process for this RFP? We would appreciate guidance on the anticipated date by which BEH expects to announce or communicate the award decision.

A7: Please refer to Section 4: Award Criteria of the RFP for information regarding the evaluation criteria and the award process.

Question #8:

Can USTDA clarify whether a subcontractor or subject matter expert/consultant can support with multiple bidders, and not be exclusive to only one bidder? In other words, can the same firm or individual be included in more than one proposal submitted by different Offerors for this RFP, assuming no conflict of interest and full disclosure?

**A8: Yes, a subcontractor or subject matter expert can support multiple bidders.**

Question #9:

Can USTDA confirm whether the maximum of six (6) project references applies separately to each entity (i.e., up to six for the Offeror and up to six for each subcontractor), rather than a combined total across the Offeror and all subcontractors?

**A9: Yes, no more than 6 references applies separately to each entity.**

Question #10:

Per APPENDIX 3: USTDA GRANT AGREEMENT, INCLUDING TERMS OF REFERENCE AND MANDATORY CONTRACT CLAUSES, Clause 10 (C), (1) and (2), it is stated that:

*“...any natural person working as (a) a Subcontractor, or (b) an employee of the Contractor or of a Subcontractor, as long as such natural person is either (i) a citizen of the Host Country or a Target Country, or (ii) lawfully authorized to work, or admitted for permanent residence, in the Host Country or a Target Country.”*

We anticipate proposing team members who hold citizenship of Member States of the European Union. In light of the above provision, and without prejudice to any other applicable requirements set forth in Appendix 3 and the RFP as a whole, we kindly request confirmation as to whether individuals holding EU citizenship will be considered as “lawfully authorized to work ... in the Host Country or a Target Country” for the purposes of this engagement, given that EU citizens have the right to seek employment and work in another EU Member State (including Bulgaria) without the need for a separate work permit.

**A10: We anticipate proposing team members who hold citizenship of Member States of the European Union. In light of the above provision, and without prejudice to any other applicable requirements set forth in Appendix 3 and the RFP as a whole, we**

kindly request confirmation as to whether individuals holding EU citizenship will be considered as “lawfully authorized to work ... in the Host Country or a Target Country” for the purposes of this engagement, given that EU citizens have the right to seek employment and work in another EU Member State (including Bulgaria) without the need for a separate work permit.

Question #11:

Amendment #1 states that third country labor should not be used, but that USTDA may grant waivers in very limited situations. Could USDA please clarify:

1. At what stage a waiver request for third country labor must be submitted (proposal stage vs. post-award?)
2. Whether an offeror may conditionally include such labor in its proposal pending waiver approval?

A11: Third country labor should not be used. USTDA may withhold its approval of selection of a Contractor for failure to meet the nationality, source and origin requirements. Waivers requests are only considered in very limited situations, and only after a Contractor is approved.

Question #12:

Under the fixed-price grant structure described in the RFP, can USTDA confirm that the prime contractor retains full responsibility for performance of the Technical Assistance regardless of internal allocation of scope or level of effort among team members, provided all nationality and source requirements are met?

A12: Yes, this is correct.

Question #13:

In addition to the questions below, we would like to request an extension to March 16<sup>th</sup> for the proposal response. This will allow us sufficient time to obtain and condition subcontractor bids and allow time to adjust to question responses. Please let us know asap on the acceptability of this extension request.

Task 6 does not specify which sites the PESIA should consider. Should the contractor assume that only the top preferred site is to be considered, or will more than one site need to be considered under this task?

A13: All sites that are chosen to be studied should be considered in the PESIA (that includes: the two initially selected SMR sites at Maritsa Iztok and Belene and the up to three (3) additional potential SMR sites (owned by BEH subsidiaries or affiliates) selected by BEH before the Commencement Meeting). Please see Task 4 requiring the Contractor to assess the suitability of the sites for SMR deployment, the availability of transmission infrastructure and distance from load centers, and the climate resilience of each site.

Please note that the RFP will be extended by seven business days and will close on Monday, March 16, 2026.

Question #14:

Regarding Task 7, we assume the risk register is to be technology neutral and focus on general SMR deployment project risks by project phase. Please confirm this assumption. Additionally, does the client have their own initial risk register program and set of risk items which will be provided during initial data gathering stages?

A14: The risk register shall focus on general SMR deployment project risks by project phase, but if specific risks for the particular technology/ies are identified they should be considered in the risk register.

Question #15:

Section 3.5 (1st paragraph on RFP p. 13) requires the submission of up to 6 verifiable project references to be submitted (ie. past project information with the complete client contact information for verification by BEH / the evaluators). Selection criteria #4 listed in section 4 (RFP page 14) indicates "Client references from prior work". Please confirm that letters of recommendation from previous clients are not required, and that the contact information for those clients in the past project experience will suffice.

A15: Yes, see Section 3.5, for what is required for references.

Question #16:

While preparing our proposal for the referenced RFP, we identified a few key experts who need to be reallocated to this project. They will require a couple of weeks to wrap up their current assignments. Could the Government/Grantee please consider extending the proposal due date by two weeks?

A16: Please note that the RFP will be extended by seven business days and will close on Monday, March 16, 2026.

Question #17:

Due to company policy, some Offerors in the government sector may be required to submit proposals one business day prior to the published proposal due date (reference FAR 15.208), which would be Friday at 12:00EDT for this RFP. Will USTDA consider an extension of one (1) additional business day to Tuesday, March 10, 2026 at 12:00EDT to allow additional time over the weekend for Offerors to prepare proposals and submit on Monday, March 9?

**A17: Please note that the RFP will be extended by seven business days and will close on Monday, March 16, 2026.**