§ 1706.9 Examples.

The examples in this section illustrate situations in which questions concerning OCIs may arise. The examples are not all inclusive, but are intended to provide offerors and contractors with guidance on how this subpart will be applied.

(a) Circumstances—(1) Facts. A Board contractor for technical assistance in the review of a safety aspect of a particular defense nuclear facility proposes to use the services of an expert who also serves on an oversight committee for a contractor of other defense nuclear facilities.

(2) Guidance. Assuming the work of the oversight committee has no direct or indirect relationship with the work at the facility that is the subject of the Board’s contract, there would not be an OCI associated with the use of this expert in the performance of the Board contract.

(b) Circumstances—(1) Facts. A Board contractor studying the potential for a chemical explosion in waste tanks at a defense nuclear facility advises the Board that it has been offered a contract with DOE to study the chemical composition of the waste in the same tanks.

(2) Guidance. The contractor would be advised that accepting the DOE contract would result in termination of its performance under its contract with the Board.

(c) Circumstances—(1) Facts. The Board issues a task order under an existing contract for the evaluation of the adequacy of fire protection systems at a defense nuclear facility. The contractor then advises the Board that it is considering making an offer on a solicitation by DOE to evaluate the same matter.

(2) Guidance. The contractor would be advised that entering into a contract with DOE on that solicitation could result in the contract with the Board being terminated.

(d) Circumstances—(1) Facts. A firm responding to a formal Board solicitation for technical assistance provides information regarding a contract it currently has with DOE. The effort under the DOE contract is for technical assistance work at DOE facilities not subject to Board oversight and outside its jurisdiction.

(2) Guidance. The Board would analyze the work being performed for DOE to ensure no potential or actual conflict of interest would be created through award of the Board contract. Should the Board determine that no potential or actual conflict of interest exists, the contractor would be eligible for award. If the Board determines that a potential or actual conflict of interest would arise through a contract award, it may disqualify the firm or, if the Board determines that such action is in the best interests of the Government, the Board may waive the conflict or the rules and procedures and proceed with the award.

(e) Circumstances—(1) Facts. The Board discovers that a firm competing for a contract has a number of existing agreements with DOE in technical areas which are unrelated to the Board’s oversight authority. While these contracts may not represent a potential or actual conflict of interest regarding the substance of the technical effort, their total value constitutes a significant portion of the firm’s gross revenues.

(2) Guidance. A conflict of interest may exist due to the firm’s substantial pecuniary dependence upon DOE. Consequently, the Board may question the likelihood that the contractor would provide unbiased opinions, conclusions, and work products because of this extensive financial relationship. The Board will review and consider the extent of the firm’s financial dependence on DOE, the nature of the proposed Board contract, the need by the Board for the services and expertise to be provided by the firm and the availability of such services and expertise elsewhere, and whether the likelihood of the firm’s providing objective technical evaluations and opinions to the Board could be influenced in view of its DOE relationship. Based on this analysis, the Board may either determine that there is no conflict and make the award, waive the conflict if one is identified and establish procedures to mitigate it where possible, or disqualify the offeror.

(f) Circumstances—(1) Facts. The Board discovers that a firm competing
§ 1706.11 Organizational conflicts of interest certificate—Advisory or assistance services.

As prescribed in or permitted by §1706.6(a), insert the following provision in Board solicitations:

ORGANIZATIONAL AND CONSULTANT CONFLICTS OF INTEREST CERTIFICATE—ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES (OCT. 1990)

(a) An organizational or consultant conflict of interest means that because of other activities or relationships with other persons, a person is unable or potentially unable to render impartial assistance or advice to the Government, or the person's objectivity in performing the contract work is or might be otherwise impaired, or a person has an unfair competitive advantage.

(b) In order to comply with the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Letter 89–1, Conflict of Interest Policies Applicable to Consultants, the offeror shall provide the certificate described in paragraph (c) of this provision.

(c) The certificate must contain the following:

(1) Name of the agency and the number of the solicitation in question.

(2) The name, address, telephone number, and federal taxpayer identification number of the offeror.

(3) A description of the nature of the services rendered by or to be rendered on the instant contract.

(4) The name, address, and telephone number of the client or clients, a description of the services rendered to the previous client(s), and the name of a responsible officer

[57 FR 44652, Sept. 29, 1992; 58 FR 13684, Mar. 12, 1993]

§ 1706.10 Remedies.

The refusal to provide the certificate, or upon request of the contracting officer the additional written statement, required by §§1706.6 and 1706.7 in connection with an award shall result in disqualification of the offeror for that award. The nondisclosure or misrepresentation of any relevant information may also result in the disqualification of the offeror for that award. If such nondisclosure or misrepresentation by an offeror or contractor is discovered or occurs after award, or in the event of breach of any of the restrictions contained in this part, the Board may terminate the contract for convenience or default, and the offeror or contractor may also be disqualified by the Board from consideration for subsequent Board contracts and be subject to such other remedial actions as provided by law or the contract.
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