PHASE 3 - Pre-Award

Type of Feedback	Type of Contract	Feedback Category	Feedback
Best Practice	Commodity (Competitive)	Source Selection	Use of the Bid Evaluation Model (BEM), when validated, is a best practice approach to evaluating competitive, commercial commodities, because it looks at the total delivered price to the consumer. For example, compare to some subsistence buys which do not consider transportation costs.
Lesson Learned	Weapon System Development	Source Selection	The Peer Review Team (PRT) recommended the contracting officer incorporate language into the source selection evaluation board (SSEB) report to explain how the source selection team (SST) determined which weaknesses would be discussed. The recommendation was followed and it proved to be highly beneficial during post award debriefings. Each of the unsuccessful offerors asked for clarification regarding the method the Government applied for bringing forth weaknesses during discussions and the contracting officer was able to quote directly from the SSEB report in response. No protests were filed.
Lesson Learned	Competitive Multiple-Award IDIQ Supplies Contract	Source Selection	The initial production delivery order (IPDO) source selection will use information received during the Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quanity (ID/IQ) competition. As a lesson learned from other source selections, evaluators must reaffirm any analysis or assessments done for the award of the IDIQ contracts is still valid and appropriately applies to the Fair Opportunity evaluation. The team recommends the documentation package for the IPDO award not bring forward existing documentation but rather recreate a new stand alone document.
Recommendation	Design/Build Construction Contract	Source Selection	Compliance Statement in the Request for Proposal (RFP): The Peer Review Team (PRT) noted that if an offeror was "silent" regarding a particular RFP requirement, the evaluation team was relying upon the compliance statement in the RFP to assume the proposal complied with the RFP. The PRT advised the evaluation team not to rely too heavily on the compliance statement. This could be problematic for significant issues that are required to be addressed in order to properly complete the evaluation. The PRT recognized that in a design/build procurement, the offerors are not required to address every element of an RFP. The PRT suggested alternative language for the source selection evaluation documents.
Recommendation	Competitive Services Contract	Terms & Conditions	Defense Acquisition Regulations (DFARS) 252.209-7002(c) requires the offeror to disclose any interest a foreign government has in the offeror when that interest constitutes control by a foreign government. If the offeror is a subsidiary, it must also disclose any reportable interest a foreign interest has in any entity that owns and controls the subsidiary.
Recommendation	Competitive Multiple Award Services Contract	Source Selection	Recommend reviewing the Source Selection Evaluation Team (SSET) source selection documents and adding language to “Section III – Evaluation Results” that summarizes the SSET’s assessment of each offeror’s proposal against each subfactor evaluation criteria, discussing in more detail explaining how specific information in the proposal is perceived as a strength or weakness.
Recommendation	Competitive Multiple Award Services Contract	Source Selection	The requirement provides specific small business participation/subcontracting goals. One offeror's proposal had a general statement that they will achieve or surpass small business participation/subcontracting specifically outlined in the Request for Proposal (RFP). This is insufficient information to conclude compliance with the requirement. Recommend adding detail from the contractors' proposal to the evaluation documentation to include proposed percentages of dollars in each period and discuss the mixture of small businesses with technical roles of performance.

Recommendation	Competitive Multiple Award Services Contract	Requirements/ PWS/SOW	The Request for Proposal (RFP) calls for a proposed cost and fixed fee for a "Transition Out" effort. Nothing in the statement of work (SOW) appears to address what effort is included in Transition Out (TO). As written, the TO effort could be read as an entitlement of the contractor to be reimbursed for all reasonable, allowable, and allocable shut down costs, without regard to the benefit to the government. The Peer Review Team (PRT) recommended amending the RFP to include a clear description of the required effort and deliverables (e.g., certain data to be provided to incoming contractor) in section C. The PRT also believed that further thought should be given to whether the solicited cost should include a not-to-exceed amount to protect the government from an unfunded, unlimited liability. Alternatively, a fixed price incentive (FPI) contract may be appropriate.
Recommendation	Competitive Multiple Award Services Contract	Source Selection	The contracting officer (CO) indicates that award will not be made by having the offerors sign the SF-30 with their final proposal revisions. The Peer Review Team (PRT) was concerned that this does not meet the requirements of FAR 15.307, which requires that offerors be informed that final proposal revisions must be in writing and the Government intends to award without obtaining further revisions.
Recommendation	Competitive Multiple Award Services Contract	Source Selection	With regard to an approved accounting system, the solicitation requires an approved system at time of award. Some of the offerors were identified as not having an adequate system during evaluation. If there was no discussion of the adequacy of their accounting systems during the discussion period, is there any possibility that their status has changed?
Recommendation	Competitive Multiple Award Services Contract	Source Selection	The Source Selection Decision Document (SSDD) states that "comparatively all proposals offer equal technical merit." Recommend that language be added to the effect that the Source Selection Authority (SSA) agrees with the Source Selection Advisory Council (SSAC) or based on his own comparison of the offeror's strengths, there is no meaningful distinction or benefit between the non-cost price portions of the proposals and therefore, all are considered "technically equal" or offer "equal technical merit."
Recommendation	Competitive Multiple Award Services Contract	Source Selection	Recommend the Source Selection Authority (SSA) address the number of awards being made as being the appropriate number of awardees based upon the criteria set forth in the Request for Proposal (RFP) and tie it to the overall best value to the government. For instance, large number of awards ensures increased competition at the task order level.
Recommendation	Commodity (Competitive)	Pricing	For this competitive procurement, only one offer was received. As such, the acquisition team was advised of the Director, DPAP, memorandum "Improving Competition in Defense Procurement," dated Nov 24, 2010.
Recommendation	Competitive Multiple Award Services Contract	Source Selection	When discussing price in the Proposal Analysis Report (PAR), point out price was the least important factor and that actual prices and cost to the government will be determined at the task order level where significant competition is anticipated both at the component and system level.
Recommendation	Competitive Multiple Award Services Contract	Source Selection	The Peer Review Team (PRT) recommended stating whether or not each weakness was discussed with the offeror. If all weaknesses were discussed, then a short sentence at the start of each report would suffice. If a weakness was not discussed, then recommend explaining why.