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1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Strategy Document consolidates the contracting strategy for the overall Darlington Refurbishment Program and the specific strategy developed for the Retube and Feeder Replacement component of that work. The strategies were developed and approved in 2009 by the Contracting Strategy Team including Law, Planning & Controls, Engineering, and Supply Chain.

This document also identifies and documents subsequent implementation actions and developments to from 2009 to July 2011.

The intent of the RFR project is to replace the 480 pressure tubes and associated pipe work for each of the four reactors at the Darlington Nuclear Generating Stations (DNGS). The Contracting Strategy for RFR is based on organizing the work as follows:

- Definition Phase
  - Tooling Development, Testing, Delivery
  - Mock-up Development, Fabrication, Installation
  - Long lead materials procurement
  - Detailed estimates for final contract schedule

- Execution Phase
  - Train trades on Mock-up
  - Procurement of Materials (other than Long Lead)
  - Retube and Feeder Replacement work including waste segregation, reduction, and handling
  - Decontaminate and remove Tooling

- Commissioning Phase
  - Contractor support for OPG commissioning activities
2.0 INTRODUCTION

2.1 Background Information

DNGS in Clarington, Ontario is approaching its mid-life refurbishment. The refurbishment involves outages for the replacement of life-limiting components as well as the maintenance or replacement of other components. The goal of the refurbishment project is to extend the service life of all four Units at the DNGS by an additional 210,000 effective fuel power hours.

The main component of the refurbishment program is the RFR project. The intent of the RFR is to replace the 480 pressure tubes and associated pipe work for each reactor.

The Project work is divided into three phases.

1. Definition Phase:
   - The Contractor will engineer, procure and manufacture the tooling to be used for the work in the reactor Units ("Tooling")
   - The Contractor will construct mock-ups of the reactor Units which will allow the Contractor to train its personnel and test the Tooling prior to the Contractor entering the first reactor vault ("Mock-up")
   - The Contractor will procure long lead materials on OPG’s behalf
   - The Contractor will, with OPG assistance and input, prepare detailed estimates and propose a final contract schedule and target cost for the second phase of the work with OPG ("Execution Phase"). If OPG does not accept these estimates, then OPG will have the right to take the Tooling and proceed with the work independent of the Contractor.

2. Execution Phase:
   - The Contractor will train the trades on the mock-ups
   - The Contractor will procure all materials required to complete the Project
   - The Contractor will commence work inside the reactor vaults after turnover from OPG
   - The Contractor will perform the Retube and Feeder Replacement work on each of the four Units at the DNGS in sequence, including waste segregation, reduction, and handling up to a handoff point to OPG
   - The Contractor will decontaminate and remove the Tooling following completion of the work

3. Commissioning Phase:
   - OPG will commission each Unit and carry out the work required to return the Unit to service.
   - The Contractor will provide any and all commissioning support that OPG may require
Two scopes of work related to RFR have been prepared; RFR scope is set out in Document Numbers NK-38-SOW-31100-10016, and the Mock-up Scope is set out in NK-38-SOW-09701-10002.

Originally RFR and Mock-up scopes were intended to be independent activities but given significant interactions between Tooling and Mock-ups the decision was made to combine the scopes as a single package of work.

2.2 Objectives and Scope of Strategy

The key purpose of this document is to detail the contracting strategy for the delivery of the above scope of work under the Darlington Refurbishment Program as developed and approved in 2009 and subsequent implementation actions and developments to July 2011.

2.3 Contracting Strategy Development Process and Stakeholder Involvement

2.3.1.1 Overall Darlington Refurbishment Procurement and Contracting Strategy 2009

In September 2009 a Contracting Strategy Core Team was established to begin the process of establishing Contracting Strategies for the Darlington Refurbishment Program. The Core Team members included management representatives from Law, Planning & Controls, Engineering, and Supply Chain.

The mandate of the Contracting Strategy Team was to:

- Review best practices and lessons learned on Major Projects both within OPG and outside of OPG with a focus on Nuclear Refurbishment projects
- Recommend one or more methods of procurement (single source, competitive, etc) and a plan for implementing the procurement method
- Recommend one or more contracting models (fixed price, target price, partnering) which could vary depending on the work
- Establish Cross Functional Sourcing Team to leverage internal OPG skills
- Build consensus internally for procurement and contracting strategies via CFST forum
- Develop plans and schedules for stakeholder input, ensuring meaningful consultation from internal and key external OPG stakeholders impacted by procurement and contracting strategies
Key Project Assumptions for Darlington Refurbishment included:

- OPG will be the project manager with full control of the project. OPG will not hire a third party to act as the project manager based on:
  - Difficulty of identifying and controlling the details and field conditions of the overall construction scope throughout the entire project
  - Proximity to and required interfaces with ongoing production operations
  - Difficulty in creating a defined work-zone(s) for a contractor to assume and control (See Appendix E: Pickering B Nuclear Generating Station Plant Life Extension Project (PLEP) Phase II and III Contracting Strategy)

- OPG will build up its project management and oversight organization (direct hire, staff augmentation, third party contracts) with sufficient skills and experience to execute the project

- The project site will be divided into islands to reduce interferences with Operations. The reactor core will be de-fuelled and dewatered as much as possible to perform the work. Contractor islanding for different scopes of work will be implemented to the extent possible

- Scope will be well defined and a design freeze targeted for 27 months prior to start of refurbishment outage of the first Unit

- OPG will be the "Constructor" for all purposes under the Occupational Health and Safety Act of Ontario

- OPG will assume all risks except specific risks transferred to contractors

- Only those on the OPG ASL (Approved Supplier List) would be considered. Audits will be performed where required to confirm qualifications

- Appropriate cost recovery processes will be implemented

Other Contracting Considerations included the Ontario Government Procurement Directive principles including:

- Competitive Procurement Process
- Vendor Access
- Transparency and Fairness
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- Value for Money
- Responsible Management
- Geographical Neutrality and Reciprocal Non-Discrimination

The Contracting Strategy Core Team reviewed OPEX. See Appendix E for full details of OPEX reviewed.

The Team met between July and December 2009 to develop contracting strategy options and recommendations. The Team examined project related OPEX from other large projects (both internal OPG and external projects) including PARTS, Darlington VBO, Bruce A Restart, Point Lepreau, Brown's Ferry Restart, and Fort Calhoun Lessons Learned, BAA Terminal 5. Contracting and strategy background from Pickering A Units 1 and 4, contracting options completed for Pickering A Units 2 and 3, and analysis completed for Pickering B prepared by Faithful and Gould were also reviewed (See Appendix E).

In December 2009 the Team recommended strategies to the EVP Refurbishment for Retube and Feeder Replacement, Reactor Mock-Up, Fuel Handling & Turbine Generator Refurbishment, and Balance of Plant Refurbishment.

The Core Team expanded in 2010 to incorporate additional stakeholders including Commercial Strategy, Projects, and Finance. Additionally Faithful & Gould was engaged to provide third party support for contracting development.

As the Contracting Strategy progressed additional stakeholders were engaged including a Cross Functional Sourcing Team, Advisory Team, and Steering Committees.

The Contracting Strategy Team meetings and milestones are documented in Appendix A.

2.3.1.2 Retube and Feeder Replacement Strategy 2009

The contracting strategy recommended by the Contracting Strategy Team included specific strategy recommendations for Retube and Feeders based on the concept of OPG and its contractors working to a common set of goals and incentives. While OPG would retain ultimate control and risk, contractors would have an active role jointly developing methodology, constructability, price and schedule. Selection of contractors would be based on selecting the right partner rather than on price since scope, cost, and schedules at that time would be preliminary subject to a high degree of uncertainty.

Fundamental principles of this type of arrangement would include:

- Integrated co-located team
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- Shared incentives with OPG bearing primary risk
- Clear common vision
- Full transparency – completely open book
- Joint risk register
- Common IT systems
- All parties have access to tools needed to do job (i.e. drawings)

This recommendation approach was premised on a target pricing model with elements potentially fixed or firm prices. OPG would pay Contractors actual costs plus a base profit/fee with the opportunity for enhanced profit (incentives) based on contingency savings. Budget and schedule would be developed jointly after contractor selection.

Scheduling constraints were identified as retube is critical path work that defines the scope of the refurbishment outage. The strategy identified key scheduling constraints:

- Contractors should be ready to support an October 2015 outage start date
- Testing of Tools would take 2.5 years prior to start of outage
- Engineering and procurement of Tools would have to start 1.5 years prior to Tool testing

Based on the above the strategy assumed contractors would have to be in place by October 2011.

To facilitate timely development and refinement of the recommended contracting strategy a Cross Functional Sourcing Team and an Advisory Committee were established to provide stakeholder input, fulfil OPG’s governance requirements, and provide detailed input into development of the contracting model.

2.3.1.3 Cross Functional Sourcing Team 2010 to 2011

To support contract development in accordance with OPG governance and good business practices a Cross Functional Sourcing Team was established in January 2010 to involve key stakeholders in the contracting process. These key stakeholders were:

- SVP Nuclear Refurbishment
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- VP Refurbishment Execution
- SVP Law & General Counsel
- VP Refurbishment Engineering
- Director Planning & Controls
- Director Supply Chain
- Director Commercial Projects & Facilities
- SVP Darlington
- VP Finance and Chief Controller
- Director Taxation
- SVP Corporate Business Development & Chief Risk Officer
- VP Treasurer
- SVP HR & Chief Ethics Officer
- Director Internal Audit
- VP Corporate Business Development & Investment Planning
- SVP Business Services & Information Technology

The Cross Functional Sourcing Team provided its review and assistance throughout the prequalification and RFP development process providing feedback at each key stage in the development of the contract model and RFP process.

CFST meetings and milestones are documented in Appendix B

2.3.1.4 Advisory Committee 2010 to 2011

In July 2010 an Advisory Committee was established to establish a mechanism to provide more detailed and specific expertise on for development and refinement of the contract model. Members of the Advisory Committee included:

- Director, Projects and Modifications
- Manager Strategic Sourcing
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- Director Nuclear Controllership
- Director Project Risk Management
- Director of Projects, Thermal
- Manager Design Projects
- Counsel, OPG Law
- Assistant General Counsel OPG Law
- Director Commercial Services
- Director Supply Chain, Hydro
- VP Corporate Investment & Asset Planning
- SVP Nuclear Refurbishment
- VP Nuclear Supply Chain
- Director, Refurbishment Supply Chain
- Director Financial Strategies
- VP Projects & Modifications
- Director Commercial Strategy
- VP Darlington Site

The Advisory Committee provided its review and assistance throughout the prequalification process as Key Terms and other strategic contract issues were developed.

Advisory Committee meetings and milestones are documented in Appendix C.

2.3.1.5 Partner Selection Process

The process recommended by the Contracting Strategy Team in 2009 to facilitate selection of the right partner involved the following steps:

1. Stage 1: Prequalification
2. Stage 2: Request for Proposals
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3. Stage 3: Evaluation and Selection

This process was followed and developed through 2010 and 2011.

3.0 STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS

Key Stakeholders were included as members of the Cross Functional Sourcing Team, Advisory Committee, and Evaluation Steering Committee. Each team was consulted as part of Team meetings and individually as issues warranted.

The Executive Vice President Nuclear Refurbishment was briefed at key stages of the strategy development and execution.

4.0 CONTRACTING CONSIDERATIONS

4.1 Business Drivers

Key business drivers for development of the RFR contracting strategy as documented in December 2009 included:

- Meet Regulatory Requirements
- Maintain OPG Control
- Minimize Impact on Existing Units
- Demonstrate Success
- Appropriate Allocation of Risks

4.2 Commercial Principles

These principles and the following Guiding Commercial Principles were considered in evaluating the contracting strategy:

- Accountability
- Value for Money
- Transparency
5.0 VENDOR/MARKETPLACE CAPABILITIES, RESTRICTIONS

The vendor marketplace was canvassed through an Expressions of Interest process to identify vendors capable and willing to entertain Retube and Feeder replacement work. Through the Expression of Interest process the following vendors were considered appropriate to include in a prequalification process:

AECL

GE-Hitachi

SNC-Lavalin

See Darlington Retube & Feeder Mid Term Report #1 dated July 13, 2010 (N-REP-00150-0341007-T20) (See Appendix E)

See Darlington Retube & Feeder Mid Term Report 2 dated 2010-10-18 (NK38-REP-00150-0357473-R001 T 20) (See Appendix E)

6.0 CONTRACTING ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

Contracting options were considered by the Contract Strategy Team in 2009 as follows:

Self-Perform – this was not considered a viable option since the work requires design expertise and significant labour components. OPG would require development of an engineering and construction organization for the project.

Traditional Design-Bid-Build – this was an option however significant disadvantages were identified in that the installation contractor(s) would not be involved early to perform constructability reviews on the design or assist in the development of the project cost and schedule.

Turnkey – this was not considered a viable option given the nature of the work and potential concealed conditions. There could be significant discovery work and OPG interference therefore the contract approach requires flexibility and adaptability.

EPC Design-Build – Traditional fixed price EPC would not be viable given the uncertainties over scope and discovery work and OPG would be unlikely to be able to transfer risk effectively to contractors given the project’s scope and complexity.

Partnership – A partnership model was considered more effective that the other options above where OPG and the Contractor would jointly develop budgets and schedule with incentives and risk sharing on cost and schedule overruns. The
contracting model could have been a contractual partnership, corporation, or limited partnership with OPG retaining ultimate control and risk.

7.0 RECOMMENDED CONTRACTING STRATEGY

The recommended strategy was a partnering-based model where OPG and its contractor work to a common set of goals and incentives. Essential to the anticipated partnering arrangement is:

- Integrated co-located team
- Shared incentives, with OPG bearing the primary risk
- Clear common vision & project objectives
- Full transparency, based on open-book method
- Joint risk register
- Common IT and project management systems
- Integrated project reporting

The recommended contracting strategy was similar to the approach OPG took on the Lower Mattagami Redevelopment Project which incorporated a design-build target price and fixed fee pool. The base contract for RFR was based on the Lower Mattagami precedent.

In November 2010, Faithful and Gould prepared a report entitled "Benchmarking Report on Contracts Strategy and Overhead & Profit Levels for Large-Scale International Projects" to compare the RFR contracting approach to other large international programs across multiple energy sectors and geographic regions (see Appendix E). This report concluded that the contracting approach for RFR was in line with the overall contracting approach adopted on complex long term projects.

After receipt of the F&G report during the Prequalification process proposed Key Terms were reviewed and discussed with Proponents to gauge market acceptance of the proposed Terms. Some Proponent feedback was incorporated into the strategy and contract model prior to RFP issuance in March 2011.

8.0 CHOICE OF PRICING MODEL

Based on a shared goals and incentives a cost-reimbursable Target Price model incorporating fixed fee and incentive/disincentive components was recommended in December 2009. Specific components would be fixed price and incentives/disincentives would be paid on cost or schedule overruns or under-runs. OPG would pay actual costs (based on negotiated allowed costs) plus a base profit/fee. Contractors would have meaningful fee at risk.

Contractors would have the ability to earn enhanced profit based on contingency savings and would share any cost over-run based on an agreed-to formula. Incentives and disincentives would be assessed at various intervals during the course of the
work. Risks would be identified in a jointly developed contingency except for circumstances where OPG made fundamental changes to project scope.

Throughout 2010 and 2011 discussions took place with internal stakeholders (CFST and Advisory Committee) and potential vendors were engaged in the process:

1. Definition Phase Target Cost
2. Definition Phase Fixed Fee
3. Fixed Price Components (Tooling and Mock Ups)
4. Percentage for calculating Execution Phase Fixed Fee (percentage of Execution Phase Target Cost)
5. Execution Phase Target Cost developed during Definition Phase and agreed to by OPG
6. Commissioning Phase Reimbursable Cost as required by OPG plus 10% fee

If OPG and the Contractor do not agree on Execution Phase Target Cost or Target Schedule, OPG may terminate the Agreement and take possession of the Tools. These disagreements are not subject to arbitration.

9.0 PROCUREMENT PROCESS

1. Contracting Strategy approved by EVP on December 17, 2009

2. Stage 1: Prequalification
   a. Expression of Interest issued to seven Vendors in March 2010
   b. Four vendors responded and assessed
   c. Three vendors were invited to participate in a Prequalification process in October 2010
   d. Prequalification process completed in February 2011 resulting in selection of two vendors to participate in a Request for Proposal process
   e. References:
      i. Darlington Retube & Feeder Mid Term Report #1 dated July 13, 2010 (N-REP-00150-0341007-T20)
      ii. Darlington Retube & Feeder Mid Term Report 2 dated 2010-10-18 (NK38-REP-00150-0357473-R001 T 20)

3. Stage 2: Request for Proposals

a. RFP issued to two Proponents, March 2011

b. Amended and Restated RFP #2 issued to Proponents, June 2011 (see Appendix E)

c. Proposals received June 20, 2011

4. Stage 3: Evaluation and Selection

a. Evaluation Steering Committee established February 2011

b. RFP submission evaluations completed in accordance with Retube & Feeder Replacement Project RFP Submission Evaluation Plan (NK38-PLAN-09701-10009. This plan established Project Evaluation Team, Pricing Evaluation Team, and Commercial Evaluation Team (see Appendix E).

c. Final Scoring and Proposals’ strengths and weaknesses presented to Evaluation Steering Committee July 15, 2011

d. Negotiations with two Proponents initiated in accordance with Retube & Feeder Replacement Project RFP Submission Negotiation Plan NK38-PLAN-09701-10011-000.

9.1 Next Steps

Evaluations of both Proponents proposals were completed in July 2011. Dual track negotiations were initiated with both Proponents.

10.0 INTERFACE OR INTEGRATION ISSUES WITH OTHER CONTRACTING STRATEGIES/ MAJOR CONTRACTS FOR THE DARLINGTON REFURBISHMENT WORK

Retube and Feeder Replacement is the first major contract for the Darlington Refurbishment Program. Other strategies and contracts will be required to ensure alignment and integration with it.
11.0 **KEY RISKS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION**

Key risks and proposed mitigation are contained in the Darlington Refurbishment Risk Register. These include:

- Acceptance of Pricing Model and Transaction Structure by Proponents. Both Proponents had opportunity to provide feedback on Key Terms during Prequalification stage, and via clarifications during RFP process.

- Incomplete identification of long lead items and costs. OPG may procure Long Lead materials as discussions with RFR Proponents take place.

- Scope development. Scope is being revised based on feedback from Proponents during RFP process and additional internal review.

- Timing of Contract award. Dual track negotiations are underway in which high level principles will be agreed to prior to detailed contract discussions. Competitive pressures and high-level principles agreement should expedite discussions.

12.0 **IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**

See 9.0 Procurement Process above.
Appendix A: Contracting Strategy Core Team Meeting Dates, Milestones, and Materials

July 27, 2009 - Email: "Nuclear Refurbishment PEP"
- Project Execution Plan (NK-PEP-09701-10001-R000 2009-06-30)
- DRAFT – Darlington Refurb Contracting Strategy Framework

September 2, 2009 - Meeting: Contract Strategy Discussion (EVP in attendance)
- Release Strategy to First Unit
- Nuclear Refurbishment Contract Strategy (September 2, 2009)
- DRAFT – Darlington Refurb Contracting Strategy Framework
- Pickering B Nuclear Generating Station Plant Life Extension Project (PLEP) Phase II and III Contracting Strategy (Faithful and Gould) (October 6, 2006)
- Contractual Lessons Learned Pickering A Restart – Units 1 and 4 (draft dated January 25, 2006)
- Models for Contracting and Risk Sharing Relationships with Contractors (draft dated January 24, 2005)

September 10, 2009 - Email: Nuclear Refurbishment Reading
- Contractual Lessons Learned Pickering A Restart – Units 1 and 4 (draft dated January 25, 2006)
- Models for Contracting and Risk Sharing Relationships with Contractors (draft dated January 24, 2005)
- Advantages and Disadvantages of Turnkey Contracts
- Point Lepreau Refurbishment Review (April, 2004)
- Pickering B Nuclear Generating Station Plant Life Extension Project (PLEP) Phase II and III Contracting Strategy
- Nuclear Restart Early Lessons Learned – Aeon (July 27, 2007)
- Siemen’s Meeting Notes
- Brown’s Ferry Trip Report (October 29, 2003)
- Partnering as a Contracting Strategy – UK experiences
- Pickering B Refurbishment: Potential Partners (April 25, 2007)
- Phase II 0 Partner Selection
- Unique Industrial Renovation & Revamp Project Risk Issues
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 15, 2009</td>
<td>Email: Darlington Refurbishment due diligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 25, 2009</td>
<td>Meeting: Contracting Team Meeting #1, (EVP in attendance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 29, 2009</td>
<td>Meeting: Contracting Strategy Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 30, 2009</td>
<td>Meeting: Contracting and Procurement Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2, 2009</td>
<td>Meeting: Secondment Presentation &quot;Bruce A Restart&quot; Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 5, 2009</td>
<td>Email: Milestones (10-05-09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 5, 2009</td>
<td>Email: Contracting Strategies for Major Construction Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Guiding Principles: Contracting Strategies for New Generation Facilities, Rebuilt or Refurbished Generation Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Issues Checklist: Contracting Strategies Process Map for Large Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Issues Checklist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Contracting Strategies for Major Construction Projects (October 21, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 7, 2009</td>
<td>Email: Procurement Directive Issues v2 (10-05-09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 13, 2009</td>
<td>Document: Contracting Strategy Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 13, 2009</td>
<td>Email: Contracting Strategies for Major Construction Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 16, 2009</td>
<td>Meeting: Presentation Procurement Options, (EVP in attendance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 20, 2009</td>
<td>Meeting: Contract Team Meeting #2, (EVP in attendance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 27, 2009</td>
<td>Meeting: Discussion Contracting Timeline on Refurbishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 28, 2009</td>
<td>Meeting: Follow-Up Contract Team Mtg, (EVP in attendance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 30, 2009</td>
<td>Email: Notes re: strategic discussions impacting contracting strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2, 2009</td>
<td>Email: Preliminary Contracting Strategy - Draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 4, 2009</td>
<td>Meeting: Darlington Refurbishment Contracting Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 10, 2009</td>
<td>Meeting: Darlington Refurbishment Contracting Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 12, 2009</td>
<td>Meeting: Darlington Refurbishment Contracting Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 16, 2009</td>
<td>Meeting: Contract Team Meeting – Update on Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 18, 2009</td>
<td>Email: Corporation vs. partnership Etc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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November 23, 2009  - Meeting: Contracting Strategy meeting
November 24, 2009  - Email: OPG-GE contracts for Darlington

- Allowable Exceptions to Competitive Procurement of Items and Non-Consulting Services

November 27, 2009  - Email: Refurb Prelim Contracting Strategy v7 (11-23-09)
December 10, 2009  - Meeting: Procurement & Contracting Strategy Meeting
December 17, 2009  - Meeting: Preliminary Contracting Strategy Plan, (EVP in attendance)

- Contracting Strategy Team Recommendations and approval

January 14, 2010  - Meeting: Preliminary Contracting Strategy Plan
April 21, 2010  - Email: Contract Summary for LMP
May 4, 2010  - Email: Refurb – R&FR Draft Term Sht

N-TMP-10010-R010 (Microsoft® 2007)
Appendix B: Cross Functional Sourcing Team Meeting Dates, Milestones, and Materials

January, 2010 - Email: CFST members identified (Ref NK38-REF-09701-0394345)
February 12, 2010 - CFST Team Meeting: (Ref NK38-PEP-09701-10001)
April 21, 2010 - Email: EOI, CFST Delegates List, CFST Division of Responsibility Matrix, List of Firms meeting criteria for R&FR consideration
May 4, 2010 - Email: Refurb – R&FR Draft Term Sheet
May 28, 2010 - CFST Team Meeting: P&C Services RFP
July 26, 2010 - Document: Program level CFST Terms of Reference established (Ref NK38-REF-09701-0394345)
September 14, 2010 - CFST Team Meeting:
- RFR & Reactor Mock-up (Ref NK38-REF-09701-0394340)
- RFR Presentation (Ref NK38-REF-09701-0394342)
November 24, 2010 - CFST Team Meeting: (Ref NK38-REF-09701-0394341)
- Key Terms agreed to by CFST (Ref NK38-REF-09701-0394345)
February 22, 2011 - CFST Team Meeting: (Ref NK38-REF-09701-0394336)
- Email: Contract Terms circulated to key CFST members
March 31, 2011 - Email: RFP Evaluation Criteria circulated to CFST
June 9, 2011 - CFST Team Meeting: (Ref NK38-REF-09701-0394337)
June 22, 2011 - CFST Team Meeting: (Ref NK38-REF-09701-0394338)
July 22, 2011 - CFST Team Meeting: (Ref NK38-REF-09701-0394339)
## Appendix C: Advisory Committee Meeting Dates and Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 14, 2010</td>
<td>Team Meeting: (Ref NK38-REF-09701-0394307)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 30, 2010</td>
<td>Team Meeting: (Ref NK38-REF-09701-0394306)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 9, 2010</td>
<td>Team Meeting: (Ref NK38-REF-09701-0394308)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tools, IP, Fees, Letters of Credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 16, 2010</td>
<td>Team Meeting:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revised RFP process, Pricing Structure, Timelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 20, 2010</td>
<td>Team Meeting: (Ref NK38-REF-09701-0394309)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proponent Feedback, Prequalification, Recommended Key Terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 9, 2010</td>
<td>Team Meeting: (Ref NK38-REF-09701-0394310)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 23, 2010</td>
<td>Team Meeting: (Ref NK38-REF-09701-0394312)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule, Compensation Definition and Execution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incentives and Disincentives, Materials, Change Management, Financial Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 17, 2011</td>
<td>Team Meeting: (Ref NK38-REF-09701-0394313)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proponent feedback on Key Terms, Schedule, Compensation, Incentives and Disincentives, Permanent Materials, Change Management, Financial Security, Warranty Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 15, 2011</td>
<td>Team Meeting: (no materials)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key Terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 19, 2011</td>
<td>Team Meeting: (Ref NK38-REF-09701-0394314)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contract developments, Contracting Timeline, Economic Cost Adjustment, Materials Procurement, Evaluation Criteria and Weightings, Discovery Work, Productivity Gains</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Evaluation Steering Committee Meeting Dates and Milestones

February 10, 2011 - Committee Meeting: (Ref NK38-REF-09701-0394315)
February 18, 2011 - Committee Meeting: (no material)
March 16, 2011 - Committee Meeting: (Ref NK38-REF-09701-0394316)
March 30, 2011 - Committee Meeting: (Ref NK38-REF-09701-0394317)
- Endorsement of Evaluation Criteria, Weightings, & Methodology
May 25, 2011 - Committee Meeting: (Ref NK38-REF-09701-0394318)
- Review draft RFP Evaluation and Negotiation Plans
June 17, 2011 - Committee Meeting: (Ref NK38-REF-09701-0394319)
June 28, 2011 - Committee Meeting: (Ref NK38-REF-09701-0394320)
July 8, 2011 - Committee Meeting: (Ref NK38-REF-09701-0394321)
July 15, 2011 - Committee Meeting: (Ref NK38-REF-09701-0394322)
- Final Scoring, Proposal strengths and weaknesses
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Bid Invitation Specifications for Nuclear Power Plants, A Guidebook – IAEA 1987

Models for Contracting and Risk Sharing Relationships with Contractors – January 24, 2005

Darlington Refurb Lessons Learned (OPEX) Binders 1, 2, and 3

Index of Relevant Articles about the Heathrow Terminal 5 (T5) Agreement

Preliminary Procurement and Contracting Strategy – Darlington Refurbishment (December 17, 2009) (NK38-REF-09701-0394307)

Darlington Retube & Feeder Mid Term Report #1 dated July 13, 2010 (N-REP-00150-0341007-T20)

Darlington Retube & Feeder Mid Term Report 2 dated 2010-10-18 (NK38-REP-00150-0357473-R001 T 20)

Benchmarking Report on Contracts Strategy and Overhead & Profit Levels for Large-Scale International Projects – November 17, 2010


Darlington Refurbishment Program Commercial Strategy dated 2011-03-15 (NK38-REP-00150-10001)

RFR Scope of Work (NK-38-SOW-31100-10016)

Mock-up Scope of Work (NK38-SOW-09701-10002)

Request for Proposals for Retube and Feeder Replacement Project (Darlington Nuclear Generating Station Refurbishment Program) dated March 7, 2011

Darlington NGS Retube and Feeder Replacement Project Initial Proponents Meeting Material dated March 24, 2011

Request for Proposals for Retube and Feeder Replacement Project (Darlington Nuclear Generating Station Refurbishment Program) Second Amended & Restated dated June 3, 2011

RFR Project RFP Submission Evaluation Plan (NK38-PLAN-09701-10009)

RFR RFP Submission Negotiation Plan (NK38-09701-10011)
CONTRACTING STRATEGY FOR RETUBE AND FEEDER REPLACEMENT