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Source Selection Office (AIR-4.10E) Responsibilities

• Leads, as the SSEB Chair, the high dollar value/complex source selections
  – Supports early acquisition planning and formulates evaluation strategy
    • Shares lessons learned from an integrated technical/engineering, contracts and acquisition perspective
  – Plans the Evaluation
  – Leads and Manages the evaluation
    • Assures traceability, fairness and consistency from the evaluator’s worksheet to the decision memorandum

• Serves, as SSAC Chair/Advisor, on other Source Selections as requested

• Manages NAVAIR Source Selection Process Improvement efforts
  – Co-Chairs the Source Selection IPT with Contract Policy, AIR-2.1

Provides the Command With a Process-centered Resource for Source Selection Program Execution and Continuous Improvement
Source Selection Organization

- **Source Selection Authority (SSA)**
  - The official designated to direct the source selection, approve the SSP, approve release of the RFP, and make the source selection decision

- **Source Selection Advisory Council (SSAC)**
  - An independent group of senior Government Acquisition personnel responsible for:
    - providing recommendations for SSP approval and RFP release
    - conducting a comparative analysis between the Offerors, making a source selection recommendation to SSA and providing advice to the SSEB

- **Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB)**
  - An independent group of Acquisition Professional responsible for:
    - assuring that the evaluation strategy supports the acquisition strategy and goals
    - assuring that the RFP and source selection planning documents provides a sound foundation for the evaluation
    - providing an independent evaluation of the proposals and providing facts and findings to the SSAC
    - provides recommendations when requested by the SSAC or SSA
Source Selection Roadmap

Generic Source Selection Process

- Req’ts Developed
  - SOO
  - P-Spec
- Plan the Approach
  - Acquisition Strategy/Plan
  - SSP
- Market Research & Early Exchanges w/Industry
  - Draft RFPs
  - One-on-ones
  - Industry Days
  - Tech. Library

Receive Proposals

Evaluate Proposals

SSAC
SSA
Evaluation Planning
SSEB Plan

Debrief

Competitive Range
(or SSA Selects Source)

Discussions w/ Offerors
(ENs)
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SSA

Request Final Proposal Revision (FPRs)

Complete Discussions
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# Uniform Contract Format

(FAR 15.204-1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part I – The Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Solicitation/Contract Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Supplies or Services and Prices/Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Description/Specification/Statement of Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Packaging and Marking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Inspection and Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Deliveries or Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Contract Administration Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Special Contract Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part II – Contract Clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Contract Clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part III – List of Document, Exhibits, and Other Attachments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>List of Attachments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part IV – Representations and Instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Representations, Certifications, and other Statements of Offerors or Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Instructions, Conditions, and Notices to Offerors or Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Evaluation Factors for Award</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RFP Development
- Document Linkage -

EVAL CRITERIA

SECTION M

EVALUATION PLAN

REQUIREMENTS

SPECS & SOO/SOW & CLINs

HOW WE EVALUATE

SECTION L

PROPOSAL INSTRUCTIONS
Notional Factors/Subfactors

**TECHNICAL**
(Rating & Proposal Risk)

- Design Approach

> 

**PAST PERFORMANCE**
(Performance Risk)

**EXPERIENCE**
(Performance Risk)

> 

**COST/PRICE**
($$$)
Sample Cross-Reference Matrix
Technical

Volume: Technical (Partial Cross Reference Matrix Does Not Include ALL Indentures for Capability Subfactor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION L PROPOSAL INSTRUCTIONS</th>
<th>SOO/SOW</th>
<th>SPEC</th>
<th>SECTION M EVALUATION FACTORS *</th>
<th>CLIN/WBS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Technical Volume</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 - Book 1 System Design</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2C(1)</td>
<td>1, 2, 12, 13/1000, 7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1 Acoustic Modeling Design</td>
<td>3.2.1</td>
<td>1; 3</td>
<td>2C(1)</td>
<td>1, 2, 12, 13/1000-7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2 Software Architecture</td>
<td>3.2.2</td>
<td>1; 3</td>
<td>2C(1)</td>
<td>1, 2, 14, 18/1000, 7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.3 Hardware Design</td>
<td>3.2.3; 4.5.3</td>
<td>1.2; 3.1.1</td>
<td>2C(1)</td>
<td>1, 2, 12, 13/1000, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.4 Systems Integration</td>
<td>4.1; 4.2.1; 4.3; 4.5</td>
<td>4.1.1; 4.1.2; 4.2</td>
<td>2C(1)</td>
<td>1, 2, 12, 13/1000; 5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.5 Reliability and Maintainability</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2C(1)</td>
<td>1, 2, 12, 13/1000; 5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.6 Software Development Capabilities &amp; Process/SEI Level Rating</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2C(1)</td>
<td>1, 2, 12, 13/1000; 5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 – Book 2 Test and Evaluation</td>
<td>2.0, 3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2C(2)</td>
<td>1, 2, 12, 13/1000; 5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.1 QC Organization</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2C(2)</td>
<td>1, 2, 12, 13/1000; 5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2 General Test and Evaluation Methodology</td>
<td>3.3, 3.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2C(2)</td>
<td>1, 2, 12, 13/1000; 5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.3 Functional Testing</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2C(2)</td>
<td>1, 2, 12, 13/1000; 5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.4 In-Process Inspections</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2C(2)</td>
<td>1, 2, 12, 13/1000; 5000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 2C = Technical Factor; 2C(1) = System Design Subfactor; 2C(2) = T&E Subfactor
Example Technical Evaluation
L&M Flow

Technical Factor (Section M)
2.0 Technical Volume (Section L)

Technical Approach
SubFactor (Section M)
Book 1 (2.1) (Section L)

Proposal Inst. Para.
-2.1.1 Overall Design
-2.1.2 Arresting Capability
-2.1.3 Shipboard Integration
-2.1.4 Supportability
-2.1.5 Reliability and Maintainability

Program, Schedule, and Capability
SubFactor (Section M)
Book 2 (2.2) (Section L)

Proposal Inst. Para.
-2.2.1 Proposed SOW
-2.2.2 Program Execution Approach
-2.2.3 Schedule
-2.2.4 Risk Assessment and Mitigation
-2.2.5 Test and Evaluation (T&E)
-2.2.6 Software Capability
-2.2.7 Key Personnel
-2.2.8 Transition to SDD and Production
-2.2.9 Small Business Concern Subcontracting Plan and Participation Strategy
Technical Evaluation Grading - Qualitative

Assessment Of Proposals (Technical)

Strengths, Weaknesses, and Deficiencies

- COMPLIANCE -
  Offeror's approach to meeting requirements
  
  Significant Strengths, Significant Weaknesses, and Deficiencies
  
  Compliance Rating
  - Outstanding
  - Highly Satisfactory
  - Satisfactory
  - Marginal
  - Unsatisfactory

- RISK -
  Likelihood of achieving cost, schedule, performance
  
  Significant Strengths, Significant Weaknesses, and Deficiencies
  
  Proposal Risk
  - High
  - Medium
  - Low

Strengths, Weaknesses & Deficiencies can relate to Compliance, Risk or both
Technical Strength Examples

• Strength Examples
  – Exceeds mandatory / minimum requirement with benefit to the Government (Compliance)
  – Approach contains a feature that enhances operational or other program/product capability with benefits to the Government (Compliance)
  – Reduces proposal risk by providing more than sufficient resources in order to respond to unknown conditions/situations (Risk)
  – Reduces proposal risk by providing resources/capabilities that are in-place and ready to be used (Risk)
  – Reduces proposal risk by providing plans that reduce/mitigates risks inherent in the proposed approach and program (Risk)
  – Reduces proposal risk by providing performance margin (Risk)
Technical Deficiency Examples

• Deficiency Examples (Affects Compliance and may also affect Risk, but in any case results in an unawardable proposal)
  – Proposal states exception or deviation
  – Approach is assessed to be unable to meet a requirement
  – Gross lack or critical lack of information
  – Combination of weaknesses that raise the risk of performance to an unacceptable level
Technical Weakness Examples

• Weakness Examples
  – Marginal resources or capability to accomplish the effort (Risk)
  – Approaches that rely on resources or actions not within the Offeror’s full control (Risk)
  – Approaches that rely heavily on a single action or resource (aka single point failure) (Risk)
  – Untested/unproven approaches (Risk)
  – Lacks substantiation or full description of the approach (Risk)
  – Requirements can only be accomplished by impacting Government operations, capability or resources beyond that which is normal for this effort or system (Compliance)
  – Lacks information to assess requirements capability (Compliance)
  – Lacks information to assess risk (Risk)
### Technical Proposal Ratings Definitions

**Compliance Ratings:** The ratings reflect the Government's assessment of solicitation compliance and the expected results, based on the Offeror's proposed approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outstanding</strong></td>
<td>Proposal significantly exceeds requirements in a way that benefits the Government or meets requirements and contains at least one exceptional enhancing feature, which benefits the Government. Any weakness is minor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highly Sat.</strong></td>
<td>Proposal exceeds requirements in a way that benefits the Government or meets requirements and contains enhancing features, which benefit the Government. Any weakness is minor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfactory</strong></td>
<td>Proposal meets requirements. Any weaknesses are minor and will have little or no impact on contract performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marginal</strong></td>
<td>Proposal contains weaknesses or minor deficiencies, which could have some impact if accepted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unsatisfactory</strong></td>
<td>Proposal does not comply substantially with requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposal Risk Definitions

Proposal Risk: The proposal risk assignments reflect the Government’s assessment of potential impact on schedule, cost, and performance based on implementation of the Offeror’s proposed approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Has little or no potential to cause disruption of schedule, increase in cost, or degradation of performance. Normal contractor effort will probably be able to overcome difficulties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Can potentially cause some disruption of schedule, increase in cost, or degradation of performance. However, special contractor emphasis will probably be able to overcome difficulties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Likely to cause significant serious disruption of schedule, increase in cost, or degradation of performance even with special contractor emphasis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Experience vs. Past Performance

- **Experience** – What you have done
  - “I’ve repaired 100 leaky boats in the past month.”

- **Past Performance** – How well you have done
  - “Ninety leaked!”
Past Performance - Evaluation Concept -

Look Back

• How did Offeror perform on current or past contracts?
  – Review Offerors Past Record, e.g., CPARS, Questionnaires
  – Determine Relevancy / Recency
• Assess each Contact Referenced
• Assess each relevant contract found through an independent Government search
• Roll up each reference assessment into an overall Offeror Assessment

Look Forward

• Based on Offeror’s assessment (Look Back), how do we think they will perform on the program?
• Final product is a determination of the Performance Risk for the Program
Past Performance Information

Primary PPI Sources:
Offerors’ Proposals
PPIRS
Questionnaires
Phone Interviews
DACO/DCMA
Other
Past Performance Evaluation Grading - Qualitative

- PERFORMANCE RISK -
Amount of doubt that the offeror will perform

Significant Strengths and Significant Weaknesses

* Performance Risk
- Very Low
- Low
- Moderate
- High
- Very High
- Unknown (only for Past Performance)

* From NAVAIRINST 4200.39B
## Past Performance and Experience
### Risk Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low (VL)</td>
<td>Based on the offeror's experience or past performance, <strong>no doubt</strong> exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (L)</td>
<td>Based on the offeror's experience or past performance, <strong>little doubt</strong> exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate (M)</td>
<td>Based on the offeror's experience or past performance, <strong>some doubt</strong> exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (H)</td>
<td>Based on the offeror's experience or past performance, <strong>substantial doubt</strong> exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High (VH)</td>
<td>Based on the offeror's experience or past performance, <strong>extreme doubt</strong> exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown (U)</td>
<td>No past performance record identifiable. This applies only to Past Performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Experience Assessment Approach

### Subcontractor: ABC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task/Work</th>
<th>3.1</th>
<th>3.2</th>
<th>3.3</th>
<th>3.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Role</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of entire effort

Recency (yrs from proposal submittal)

% role of that effort

Gap

Limited Experience indicated; depending on assessment of depth and breadth

Indicates **Extensive** Experience; depending on assessment of depth and breadth

No credit given as no role in this effort

---

**Proposal Experience Summary Table** (for Prime and Each Principal Subcontractor, Critical Subcontractor and Team member):

- Build a table to summarize information; color coding based on years of experience and recency of experience
- Provide supporting data that support the summary table, inclusive of information that demonstrates breadth and depth of experience
Experience Evaluation Grading
- Qualitative -

Assessment Of Experience (Gap Analysis)

Strengths and Weaknesses

- PERFORMANCE RISK -
Amount of doubt that the offeror will perform

Significant Strengths and Significant Weaknesses

*Performance Risk*
- Very Low
- Low
- Moderate
- High
- Very High

* From NAVAIRINST 4200.39B
# Cost And Price Evaluation

## Highlights

### Price Evaluation
- **Focuses on Reasonableness**
  - Comparison of proposed prices received
  - Comparison of previously proposed prices and contract prices with current proposed prices for same or similar items
  - Comparison of proposed prices with independent Government cost estimates
  - Others, see FAR 15.404-1(b)
- **Realism may be assessed but only as risk**
  - No Independent Government Most probable cost, the proposed price is the evaluated price
- **Consistency between Technical and Price**
- **Cost to the Government**

### Cost Evaluation
- **Focuses on Realism**
  - Offerors’ must provide detailed substantiation
  - Gov’t develops independent Most Probable Cost based on offerors’ technical approach
  - Evaluated price is the higher between the proposed and the Gov’t Most Probable Cost
- **Cost to the Government**

## Price Contract
- Widely used on production, maintenance, services contracts
- Limited proposal evaluation, limited data requested
- Overruns absorbed by the Contractor

## Cost Contract
- Cost Reimbursable/Plus, widely used on development contracts
- Detailed proposal evaluation
- Overruns absorbed by the Gov’t

---

Approved for Public Release 9 Sept 09, Tracking Number 09-052

---
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Cost Realism is an Integrated Evaluation

Design Approach

Schedule Assessment

Cost
Price/Cost Proposal Development Effort

Amount of Proposal Information

HIGH <------------------- Technical Risk --------------------------> LOW
Cost Types <----------------- Type of Contract--------------------> Price
Proposal Preparation
- Guidance -

• Demonstrate a **thorough understanding of requirements and inherent risks**

• Demonstrate sufficient **resources** to meet the requirements

• Provide clear and concise descriptions
  – Drawings & diagrams complement narrative, but don't replace it

• Support your statements with facts, analysis and substantiating data to illustrate that you have a **valid and practical solution** for all requirements

• Be consistent from Volume to Volume
Proposal Preparation
- Guidance -

• Be attentive to all parts of the RFP
  – Requirements, SOWs
  – Terms and Conditions
  – Evaluation Criteria and Proposal Instructions

• A Cross Reference Matrix can be a good proposal development tool

• Make appropriate trade-offs to provide the very best value that you can offer
  – Pointing out strengths and benefits
  – Addressing risks with mitigating approaches
  – Showing proper balance between cost and technical benefits while demonstrating realism at an affordable cost
Proposal Preparation Considerations

• **Structure your proposal in accordance with the Proposal Instructions**

• **Can an evaluator quickly find what he/she needs?**
  – Is it clear?
  – Is it well organized?

• **Drawings & diagrams complement narrative, but don't replace it**

• **Substantiate, don't simply make claims**
  – Give us a reason to believe you; provide information to allow an independent assessment
Typical Proposal Shortfalls

- **Proposal Instructions are not followed**
  - Information not provided as requested

- **Statements in the proposal are not well supported**

- **Proposals are not well organized**
  - Does not follow Proposal Instructions structure and makes the evaluator hunt for the information

- **Past Performance POCs are not current**

- **Deficiencies - preclude award**
  - Information provided does not support claims of compliance
  - Proposal is non-compliant to the requirements

- **Not signing RFP**
Special Small Business Concern Considerations

- **Small Business Set Asides**
  - Limitations on Subcontracting:
    - Supplies: Small Business Concern prime must perform at least 50% of the manufacturing costs (not including material costs)
    - Services: Small Business Concern prime must perform at least 50% of the performance costs (personnel/labor)
  - Can improve chances of award through strategic use of subcontracting

- **Small Business Innovative Research**
  - Can be valuable to Large Business’ win-strategies, not because the RFP requests that info, but because it can reduce its cost and improve its solution

- **Small Business Concern Experience**
  - Can fill in a Prime’s “gap”
  - Can gain experience through subcontracting opportunities

- **Bottom-line:**
  - Take opportunities to improve your experience, hence marketability
  - Find ways of being valuable to Large Businesses when pursuing opportunities as a subcontractor,
  - Leverage other subcontractor’s capabilities to create a winning package when pursuing opportunities as a prime
Summary

• The Source Selection process will assure that your proposal will receive a fair and consistent evaluation and selection

• L&M is intended to help you provide us with your best value solution and instruct you in preparing a proposal that will facilitate our evaluation

• Keys to Developing a Good Proposal
  – Understand the RFP requirements
  – Understanding the Evaluation Criteria will help you know where to place emphasis in your proposal
  – Follow the Proposal Instructions – Provide material where requested, i.e., keep Past Performance and Experience material out of Technical Volume

• Ensure that your proposal
  – Helps the evaluator evaluate - don’t make us have to guess or search for answers
  – Follows the exact numerical outline provided by Section L
  – Provides substantiation for what you propose – give us a reason to believe you
Bottom-Line

• Propose your best value solution, making the Technical and Price Trade-Offs that are in the best interest of the Government

• Propose a realistic proposal with a high performing team, providing an executable contract that is likely to perform as proposed

• Provide a proposal that helps the Government perform its independent analysis and provides high confidence in the proposed solution and contract performance plan
BACK-UPS
Source Selection Office History

- In 1921 Navy’s Bureau of Aeronautics (BuAer) was formed to be responsible for naval aviation materials and operations
  - Within the Engineering Department the forerunner of the Source Selection Office was included in the Design Coordination (DC) desk
  - DC responsible for conducting all aircraft design competitions with participation from other technical desks
  - Over 100 design competitions conducted between 1930 and 1970

- By the 1970’s, DC was renamed Evaluation Division
  - The Division Director and his Proposals Branch led evaluations
  - Role expanded to include all system/component ACAT I, ACAT II and other highly visible/complex programs, e.g. missiles, UAVs, avionics

- In 1990, renamed Source Selection Office
  - Role expanded to include highly visible/complex non hardware/systems programs such as maintenance, CLS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Selection Classification Level</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure</strong></td>
<td>SSA-SSAC-SSEB-Evaluators</td>
<td>SSA-SSEB-Evaluators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TYPICAL Assignment</strong></td>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>ASN (RDA), AIR-00, PEO, AIR-1.0</td>
<td>Contracting Officer (per FAR 15.303(a))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAC Chair</td>
<td>AIR-1.0/1.0A</td>
<td>AIR-2.0 competency personnel</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSEB Chair</td>
<td>Personnel with Knowledge/Experience Level determined by the SSA (AIR-4.10E is typically the SSEB Chair for Level A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Considerations for Determining SSCL</strong></td>
<td>ACAT I, IA, II programs. ACAT I SSA authority not delegable; ACAT IA and II SSA authority delegable to FLAG/SES. Any other program whose complexity/sensitivity is deemed to warrant an SSA designation other than the Contracting Officer (as determined by AIR-00, PEOs, AIR-1.0 or AIR-2.0)</td>
<td>Appropriate for all programs other than ACAT I, IA and II</td>
<td>Non-SSCL A &amp; B Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source Selection Information
Rules Continued

• Each Participant in Source Selection Must Sign a
  Certificate of Non-disclosure And Financial Interest

• Certifies That:
  – You have or will submit a current OF Form 450 or SF 278 (or are not required to submit one).
  – You are aware that unauthorized disclosure of source selection or proprietary information could subject you to prosecution under procurement integrity and other laws.
  – You will make no unauthorized disclosure or release of source selection information.
  – You will not discuss source selection information with any unauthorized person.
  – You will report immediately any real, apparent, possible or potential conflicts of interest.
FAR Guiding Principles

FAR 1.102-2(c)(3)

“The Government shall exercise discretion, use sound business judgment, and comply with applicable laws and regulations in dealing with contractors and prospective contractors. All contractors and prospective contractors shall be treated fairly and impartially, but need not be treated the same.”
Reasonableness

Even if the offeror can substantiate the estimate, does it make sense to buy the product/service for the proposed amount?