

## **APPENDIX BB—SOURCE SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR OTHER THAN MAJOR ACQUISITIONS**

### **PART 1 - GENERAL INFORMATION**

#### **BB-100 Scope.**

This appendix establishes policy, assigns responsibilities, and prescribes implementing procedures for soliciting and evaluating offerors' proposals for major acquisitions conducted by Air Force contracting activities. This appendix implements Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Subpart 15.6[3], Source Selection, and fulfills the responsibilities of the Air Force agency head for source selection contained in FAR 15.604 (a) and FAR 15.612 (b).

#### **BB-101 Applicability.**

This appendix is intended to be used in operational, logistics, environmental, and laboratory environments, as well as for lower dollar systems acquisitions, which are competitive negotiated procurements below the thresholds of AFFARS Appendix AA (see AA-101) or procurements in which the source selection authority decides that use of AFFARS Appendix BB would be more appropriate than AFFARS Appendix AA. This appendix describes procedures for a less complex source selection. If the SSA determines that a Source Selection Advisory Council (SSAC) and a Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) are appropriate, the procedures applicable to the SSAC and SSEB are addressed in AFFARS Appendix AA. Each MAJCOM, FOA, and DRU having contracting authority is encouraged to establish specific procedures implementing this appendix (e.g., establishing lower dollar thresholds) in order to tailor the process for its own individual requirements and organization. The policies and procedures in this appendix need not be applied to acquisitions for basic research, acquisitions under \$5 million, acquisitions for which the Lowest Cost (Price)-Technically Acceptable technique described in 5315.605-90 [FAR 15.101-2] is used, or any other acquisition for which the Head of the Contracting Activity (HCA) determines use of this appendix to be inappropriate. ~~Those acquisitions will use FAR Subpart 15.6 procedures.~~ The use of these procedures for architect-engineer services is prohibited.

#### **BB-102 Objective of the source selection process.**

The objective of the source selection process is to select the source whose proposal has the highest degree of credibility and whose performance can be expected to best meet the Government's requirements at an affordable cost (price). The process must provide an impartial, equitable, and comprehensive evaluation of the competitors' proposals and related capabilities. The process should be accomplished with minimum complexity and maximum efficiency and effectiveness. This process contemplates the use of resources proportional to the less complex nature of the applicable acquisitions. Price analysis techniques should generally be adequate for these requirements; if adequate price competition is anticipated, certified cost and pricing data shall not be required, although data sufficient to accomplish cost realism analysis may be requested. There must be a sufficient number of discriminators to be able to adequately evaluate the proposals. Generally, not as many criteria are needed as in major source selections; however, the individual requirement should be considered when establishing criteria. The source selection should be structured to balance technical, financial, and economic or business considerations consistent with the requirement and business and legal constraints.

#### **BB-103 Definitions.**

"Acquisition Plan (AP)" means a comprehensive plan for fulfilling agency needs in a timely manner and at a reasonable cost (price). The acquisition plan contains the overall strategy for managing the acquisition. (See FAR Part 7.)

APPENDIX BB— SOURCE SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR OTHER THAN MAJOR ACQUISITIONS

---

"Acquisition Strategy Panel (ASP)" means a group of functional experts who serve in an advisory capacity by reviewing and recommending acquisition strategies for a specific product or service.

"Advisors" means Government or non-Government personnel, designated by the SSA, who provide advice to the SSA or Source Selection Evaluation Team (SSET).

"Assessment Criteria" means evaluation criteria which are used by evaluators in performing the technical evaluation by relating certain aspects of an offeror's proposal to specific evaluation criteria.

~~"Best and Final Offer (BAFO)" means a final proposal submission by all offerors in the competitive range submitted at a common cut off date at the request of the contracting officer after conclusion of discussions. (See FAR 15.611.)~~

~~"Best Value" means the most advantageous offer, price and other factors considered, providing the best mix of utility, technical quality, business aspects, risks, and price for a given application. [See FAR 2.101 Definitions, as amended by FAC 97-02 (30 Sep 97)\*.]~~

~~"Clarification" means data, generally of an administrative nature, provided to resolve inadequate proposal content or contradictory statements in the proposal. [See FAR 15.306(a).]~~

"Contract Team" means a group of Government personnel within the Source Selection Evaluation Team (SSET) who are responsible for evaluating cost (price) proposals and negotiating the contract(s).

~~"Deficiency" means, for the purpose of source selection actions, any part of an offeror's proposal which, when compared to a pertinent standard, fails to meet the Government's minimum level of compliance. [See FAR 15.301 Definitions.]~~

"Essential Characteristics or Baseline Requirements" means qualitative/quantitative determinations that establish the minimum level of acceptability for each requirement or effort in the statement of objectives, statement of work, or performance work statement.

"Evaluation Criteria" means the basis for measuring each offeror's ability, as expressed in its proposal, to meet the Government's needs as stated in the solicitation.

**["Evaluation Notice(EN)" means Source Selection Evaluation Team (SSET) inquiries to offerors to better understand offeror proposals, or to notify offerors about deficient aspects of their proposals. ENs issued prior to competitive range determination are for the purpose of enhancing Government understanding of proposals without revisions to those proposals. After the competitive range determination, ENs are also used to identify deficiencies and allow offerors to revise their proposals.]**

"Evaluation Standards" means establishing a uniform baseline against which each offeror's solution is compared to determine its value to the Government. They establish the level an offeror's proposal must meet in any area, factor, subfactor, or element to be judged acceptable ("green"). A standard may be quantitative, qualitative, or some combination of both. **[When possible, evaluation standards should be written as part of the evaluation factors and subfactors. If evaluation standards are written separately, they should be released to offerors.]**

"General Consideration" means an element of evaluation in the source selection that typically relates to proposed contractual terms and conditions, results of preaward surveys, and other surveys or reviews.

AIR FORCE FAR SUPPLEMENT

APPENDIX BB— SOURCE SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR OTHER THAN MAJOR ACQUISITIONS

---

"Minimum Mandatory Requirement" means the absolute lowest threshold acceptable in performance and capability.

"Oral Presentation" ~~means essentially one-way communication from the offerors to the Air Force, with written proposals still required.~~ **[See FAR 15.102, Oral presentations.]**

**[This and subsequent changes to FAR cites are through FAC 97-2 as noted.]**

~~"Oral Proposal" means allowing two-way communication between the Government and the offeror. This may constitute discussions and take the place of a written proposal.~~

"Performance Risk" means the assessment of an offeror's present and past work record to assess confidence in the offeror's ability to successfully perform as proposed.

"Performance Risk Assessment Group (PRAG)" means a group of experienced Government personnel that may be appointed by the SSAC chairperson to assess performance risk.

"Proposal Analysis Report (PAR)" means the report prepared by the source selection evaluation team during the source selection that fully documents the results of the technical evaluation, risk assessment, cost analysis, and contract/business issues resolutions.

"Proposal Risks" means the risks that are identified with an offeror's proposed approach as it relates to accomplishing the requirements of the solicitation.

"Single Acquisition Management Plan (SAMP)" means a concise, comprehensive program document which serves two functions: (1) it is the management plan program managers follow to successfully execute the acquisition of a requirement; (2) it is the supporting documentation which enables a program decision authority to reach a milestone decision.

"Source Selection Authority" (SSA) means the official designated to direct the source selection process and make the source selection decision.

"Source Selection Evaluation Guide" means an optional document tailored to the specific source selection that describes in detail the procedures for how the source selection will be run. It identifies specific responsibilities, duties, schedules, processes, administrative details, and other details for team members to ensure all actions are accomplished in a timely and appropriate manner. It is extremely useful when the source selection team members are not familiar with the formal source selection process. (See Attachment BB-5.)

"Source Selection Evaluation Team (SSET)" means a group of Government personnel representing the various functional and technical disciplines relative to the acquisition that evaluates proposals and reports its findings to the SSA.

"Source Selection Plan (SSP)" means a plan, approved by the SSA, that describes in detail how the SSET is organized, how the proposals will be evaluated and analyzed, and how the source(s) will be selected.

"Specific Criteria" means a subset of evaluation criteria that relate to specific program characteristics. Specific criteria typically are divided into technical and/or management areas. These areas are divided into factors, which

APPENDIX BB— SOURCE SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR OTHER THAN MAJOR ACQUISITIONS

are further divided into subfactors and elements, as necessary, depending on the complexity of the factor being evaluated.

"Strength" means a significant, outstanding, or exceptional aspect of an offeror's proposal that exceeds the evaluation standard and provides a useful capability that will be included in the specification, or statement of objectives or statement of work, or is inherent in the offeror's process.

~~"Weakness" means an aspect of or omission from an offeror's proposal that contributes to a deficiency in meeting an evaluation standard or is otherwise a shortcoming of the proposal that has the potential to degrade contract performance.~~ **[See FAR 15.301, Definitions.]**

**BB-104 Policies.**

The following policies apply:

- (a) It is Air Force policy to provide for full and open competition, or when full and open competition is not possible (see FAR Part 6), to obtain competition to the maximum extent practicable.
- (b) The SSA shall be presented with sufficient in-depth information on each of the competing offerors and their proposals to permit a reasoned, rational selection decision.
- (c) The SSET should include personnel possessing broad experience in specific fields, such as appropriate technical or functional specialties related to the statement of work, finance, logistics, law, and contracting. Only fully qualified personnel possessing the professional skills and knowledge required for an objective evaluation and assessment of offerors' proposals should be selected to participate on the SSET.
- (d) The senior person most knowledgeable about the requirement from the office responsible for the requirement is usually designated the SSET chairperson.
- (e) Early industry involvement, including the use of draft RFPs, is recommended to obtain industry comments. **[See FAR 15.201, Exchanges with industry before receipt of proposals.]** The contracting officer may request industry feedback on such matters as contract type, performance, schedule, Contract Data Requirements Lists (CDRLs), specifications, statement of work, and other requirements that impact cost or restrict technical solutions. Equal access for all potential offerors must be afforded and a cut-off date will be established for receipt of comments to permit Government evaluation and incorporation of accepted changes into the formal solicitation. The personnel responsible for the requirement shall evaluate recommendations, make appropriate changes in conjunction with the contracting officer, and provide industry feedback on disposition of the recommendations.
- (f) The rating system used in evaluating and analyzing proposals shall be described in the SSP. The rating system shall be structured to evaluate whether the offeror's proposal meets the evaluation criteria in Section M of the RFP, as well as the strengths, weaknesses, and risks associated with each proposal. The rating system must, at a minimum, include written narratives at the factor level and subfactor level and descriptive color coding at the factor level. (See BB-304.) The objective of the rating system is to display an assessment of all important aspects of the offeror's proposal as they relate to Section M criteria. Since numerical rating systems do not allow consideration of all possible variables associated with a source selection, they should not be used. The objective of the evaluation is to provide a true assessment of the value of the proposed effort to the Government. If a strength is noted during technical evaluation, the Government must be ensured of receiving the benefits associated with the strength under the contract. If the Government is not going to receive a benefit, it is not a strength.

APPENDIX BB— SOURCE SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR OTHER THAN MAJOR ACQUISITIONS

---

(g) Evaluation criteria include cost (price) criterion, specific criteria, and assessment criteria. These criteria should include those things considered important to the customer about the specific requirement, such as quality of service, environmental considerations, manpower, personnel, policies, procedures, and management. General considerations, combined with use of the evaluation criteria, provide an integrated assessment that forms the basis for award. General considerations shall be ranked to describe if the considerations are (1) of equal importance or (2) if one or more are of more importance than any other. Section M of the solicitation shall clearly state how general considerations will be integrated into the evaluation of offerors' proposals. Minimum requirements shall be included in the solicitation and evaluated.

(h) When baseline requirements are used and an offeror does not meet the essential characteristics or baseline requirements, the Government may still consider the offer; however, it will be rated as less technically acceptable than offers that meet the essential characteristics or baseline requirements.

(i) Performance risk is a major aspect in the source selection decision. When the integrated assessment of all aspects of the evaluation is accomplished, it is Air Force policy that the assessment of past performance (1/3) is of equal importance to either factor assessment (1/3) or proposal risk (1/3). This emphasis on past performance as a discriminator in source selection demonstrates the Air Force's commitment to award only to contractors who will carry through with what they promise in their proposals. It is believed that this will lead to improved contractor performance throughout the Air Force, prevent awards to habitually poor performers, and reduce the incidence of associated schedule slips and increased costs. Past performance shall not be used as a general consideration. It shall be treated as a general assessment (see Attachment BB-3).

(j) Except where award without discussions is planned in accordance with FAR 15.610~~[306]~~, it is Air Force policy to conduct written or oral discussions with all offerors in the competitive range. These discussions should lead to submission of BAFOs [final proposal revisions] which will culminate in signed contractual documents representing the firm commitment of each such offeror.

~~(k) The use of auctioning techniques, such as indicating to an offeror a price which must be met to obtain further consideration, or informing an offeror that its price is not low in relation to that of another offeror, are strictly prohibited. This prohibition does not preclude discussing price or cost elements that are not clear or appear to be unreasonable or unjustified. Discussions may encourage offerors to put forward their most favorable price proposals. However, the price elements of any other offeror must not be discussed, disclosed, or compared. Technical leveling and technical transfusion through discussions with offerors are also strictly prohibited.~~

~~(k)~~ (l) The request for BAFO must not be used as either an auctioning technique or to pressure offerors to lower prices. All changes in price at BAFO [final proposal revision] must be substantiated by offerors. The common cut-off date for conclusion of discussions and the request for BAFO [final proposal revision] must be scheduled to ensure that all competitors have an equal opportunity for discussion. [(See FAR 15.307.)]

~~(m)~~ (l) The cognizant Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) and Defense Contract Management Command (DCMC) personnel should be invited to take part, as appropriate, in reviewing the solicitation and assisting in contract negotiation.

APPENDIX BB— SOURCE SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR OTHER THAN MAJOR ACQUISITIONS

~~(a)(m)~~ The techniques in this appendix shall not be used when award will be made to the Lowest Cost (Price)-Technically Acceptable offeror because that acquisition method does not include an integrated assessment (see 5315.605-90).

**BB-105 Source Selection Authority (SSA).**

See Tables A and B below for SSA delegations and Source Selection Plan (SSP) review levels. If the contract action meets AFFARS Appendix AA thresholds as specified in AA-101, AFFARS Appendix AA procedures shall apply. Redlegation may be made on either a case-by-case basis or by blanket delegation and shall be in writing. SSAs should be of sufficient grade and hold positions which enable them to be familiar with the objectives of the work being contracted.

**[Amended per contracting Policy Memo 97-C-16, dated 3 Nov 1997]**  
**Table A - AFMC Source Selection Authority (SSA) Thresholds**

PEO and DAC Programs (non Information Technology)// Other Contracting

<u>Threshold</u>	<u>SSA (Delegable)</u>	<u>SSP Review</u>
\$5M to < \$50M	Single Manager*	BOCO/[/****]
≥ \$50M to < \$500M	PEO or DAC//Center CC	SCCO
≥ \$500M ASAF(A) SSAC		

MAIS Programs and non-MAIS Information Technology Acquisitions

<u>Threshold</u>	<u>SSA (Delegable)</u>	<u>SSP Review</u>
≥ \$15/30M** to < \$120M and non-MAIS	PEO or DAC//Center CC	SCCO
≥ \$120M or MAIS	PDASAF(A&M)	SSAC

\* Single Manager (SM) includes System Program Director, [(SPD)] Product Group Manager (PGM), Materiel Group Manager (MGM), and [Technology Director (TD)]

\*\* \$15/\$30M means \$15M or more in any FY or \$30M or more for all program years.

[\*\*\* For other contracting, the first contracting official in the contract chain subordinate to the SCCO]

**Table B - Other MAJCOMs, FOAs, DRUs Source Selection Authority Thresholds**

(Other Contracting)

<u>Threshold</u>	<u>SSA (Delegable)</u>	<u>SSP Review</u>
< \$500M	Commanders*	Per Command Guidance
≥ \$500M	ASAF(A)	SSAC

MAIS Programs and non-MAIS Information Technology Acquisitions

<u>Threshold</u>	<u>SSA (Delegable)</u>	<u>SSP Review</u>
< \$120M and non-MAIS	Commanders*	Per Command Guidance
≥ \$120M or MAIS	PDASAF(A&M)	SSAC

\* Commanders of MAJCOMs, FOAs and DRUs

APPENDIX BB— SOURCE SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR OTHER THAN MAJOR ACQUISITIONS

TABLE B NOTE: If an acquisition is designated a PEO Program, the PEO is the SSA for thresholds below ASAF(A) (delegable).

**BB-106 Organization.**

When using these procedures, a separate source selection organization and management chain of command (SSA and SSET) shall be established for each source selection. Personnel assigned to source selections will not reveal source selection information to personnel outside of the source selection in their normal chain of command. The organization must be structured to ensure continuity and to provide for active, ongoing involvement of appropriate contracting, technical, logistics, legal, cost, and other functional staff management expertise. See Attachment BB-1 for a diagram of a typical source selection organization. The source selection organization must be consistent with the organization described in the SSP. The SSET is comprised of a technical team and a contract team. Each team may contain as few as one person in AFFARS Appendix BB source selections.

**BB-107 Responsibilities and duties.**

A successful source selection requires teamwork. Members of the SSET from all disciplines must work together to ensure that the SSA is presented an accurate, integrated assessment of each offeror's proposal in accordance with Section M of the RFP. Each member shall be given access to the full range of evaluation tools available, including the advice of personnel in other disciplines who serve as source selection advisors. The list of key responsibilities and duties below is not in chronological order. The sequence can vary widely depending upon the circumstances surrounding a given source selection.

(a) The SSA is responsible for the proper and efficient conduct of the entire source selection process encompassing proposal solicitation, evaluation, selection, and contract award. The SSA has, subject to law and applicable regulations, full responsibility and authority to select source(s) for award and approve the award of the contract(s). The SSA shall:

- (1) Review and approve the SSP;
- (2) Approve members and advisors selected by the SSET chairperson;
- (3) Provide the SSET with guidance and instructions for conducting the source selection, as necessary;
- (4) Caution all involved in the source selection of the consequences of unauthorized disclosure of source selection information;
- (5) Approve the contracting officer's competitive range determination. This approval may be delegated to the SSET chairperson, without further delegation, except that authority to exclude any offeror from the competitive range at any time during the source selection process is not delegable;
- (6) Make selection decisions and document the supporting rationale in the Source Selection Decision Document; and
- ~~(7) Coordinate on any contracting officer decision to request more than one BAFO (see 5315.611).~~

(b) The SSET chairperson shall:

APPENDIX BB— SOURCE SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR OTHER THAN MAJOR ACQUISITIONS

---

- (1) Ensure that personnel resources and time assigned to source selection reflect the complexity of the requirement;
- (2) Appoint members and advisors to the SSET, subject to approval of the SSA;
- (3) Ensure that all persons receiving source selection information are instructed to comply with applicable standards of conduct (see BB-403);
- (4) Designate the chairperson of each SSET Technical Evaluation Team and approve the structure of the SSET Technical Evaluation Teams;
- (5) Review and approve the evaluation standards and rank order of criteria developed by the personnel responsible for the requirement;
- (6) Review and recommend approval of the SSP to the SSA;
- (7) Ensure that the SSET and advisors are briefed on their responsibilities before any proposal is reviewed, including details on how the evaluation will be conducted;
- (8) Convene the SSET to analyze offers and develop the PAR for submission to the SSA;
- (9) Review the contracting officer's competitive range determination and provide comments to the SSA;
- (10) Review and approve issuance of ~~deficiency reports (DRs) and clarification requests (CRs)~~ **[Evaluation Notices.]** (see BB-306 and BB-307).
- (11) Review the assessment of performance risk;
- (12) Provide briefings and consultation at the request of the SSA;
- (13) Offer a recommendation for contract award for the SSA's consideration, but only when requested by the SSA;
- (14) Cause the preparation of a Source Selection Decision Document for the SSA's signature, unless otherwise directed by the SSA;
- (15) Ensure that all source selection team members execute the Source Selection Information Briefing Certificate (see Attachment BB-10);
- (16) When award is made without discussions, review any deficiencies of the other offerors with the SSA; and
- (17) Approve the technical content of the formal contractor debriefing.

(c) The SSET shall:

- (1) Include a contract team as an integral part of the SSEB. The contracting officer normally will be appointed the head of the contract team;

- (2) Conduct an in-depth review and evaluation of each proposal, any proposal revisions **[including any final proposal revisions]**, and any BAFO against the solicitation requirements, the approved evaluation criteria, and the evaluation standards, generating **[ENs]** CRs/DRs in the process;
  - (3) Provide briefings and consultations concerning the evaluation as required by the SSA or SSET chairperson;
  - (4) Prepare and submit the Proposal Analysis Report to the SSET chairperson for review; and
  - (5) Not recommend an awardee to the SSA, unless specifically requested by the SSA.
- (d) The personnel responsible for the requirement shall:
- (1) Develop the acquisition strategy in conjunction with the contracting officer, initiate ASP proceedings, prepare the AP/SAMP when required in FAR 7.103, and prepare the SSP;
  - (2) Propose the evaluation criteria for SSA approval as part of the SSP;
  - (3) Propose the relative importance of the evaluation criteria in the SSP and, in conjunction with the contracting officer, develop the specific language to be included in Section M of the solicitation;
  - (4) Propose evaluation (if desired or required by regulations) standards that relate to the evaluation criteria in Section M of the RFP;
  - (5) Develop screening criteria for establishing a source list and include the screening criteria in the SSP;
  - (6) Propose the SSP for approval by the SSA after it is coordinated with appropriate senior source selection advisors;
  - (7) Prepare and furnish to the SSET an independent Government assessment of potential proposal risks before receipt of proposals; and
  - (8) Prepare the statement of work or performance work statement with all supporting attachments and documentation.
- (e) The contracting officer shall:
- (1) Chair the contract team and be responsible for all business aspects of the acquisition;
  - (2) Prepare any required requests for delegation;
  - (3) Initiate and schedule the ASP (if used);

APPENDIX BB— SOURCE SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR OTHER THAN MAJOR ACQUISITIONS

- (4) Prepare the RFP, obtain approval of the RFP, the acquisition plan, and Source Selection Plan, and then release the RFP;
- (5) Notify SAF/AQCS that the source selection is in process;
- (6) Ensure that training in source selection matters is provided to source selection team members;
- (7) Ensure that all non-Governmental advisors are covered by an organizational conflict of interest (OCI) clause covering non-disclosure of contractor data in their respective contracts (see FAR Subpart 9.5). If the respective contracts do not contain this clause, the non-Governmental advisors shall not be permitted to participate in the source selection or have access to any source selection data, whatsoever;
- ~~(8) Serve as the sole point of contact between offerors and the Government during the source selection process;~~
- ~~(9)~~**[8]** Issue any required RFP amendments;
- ~~(10)~~ Receive proposals from offerors;
- ~~(11)~~**[10]** Request preaward surveys and audits, as appropriate;
- ~~(12)~~**[11]** Release letters to contractors who are outside the competitive range concurrently with the release of ~~CRs/DRs~~ **[ENs]** to contractors within the competitive range;
- ~~(13)~~**[12]** Receive responses to ~~CRs/DRs~~ **[ENs]**;
- ~~(14)~~**[13]** Chair any discussions with contractors and ensure that the team membership remains consistent for all discussions with offerors;
- ~~(15)~~**[14]** Request, receive, and evaluate any revisions to proposals ~~and BAFOs~~;
- ~~(16)~~**[15]** Prepare the contract(s);
- ~~(17)~~**[16]** Ensure all required business clearances are obtained before awarding without discussions or requesting ~~BAFOs~~ **[final proposal revisions]**. Contract clearance (if required) shall be obtained before announcement of the selection decision;
- ~~(18)~~**[17]** Send DD-LA-(AR) 1279 report to SAF/LLP to announce contract award (see 5305.303-90);
- ~~(19)~~**[18]** Send out-size challenge letters if small business set-aside;
- ~~(20)~~**[19]** Award the contract to the successful offeror, distribute the contract, issue notice of contract award, and notify unsuccessful offerors;
- ~~(21)~~**[20]** Conduct a postaward conference with awardee; and

APPENDIX BB— SOURCE SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR OTHER THAN MAJOR ACQUISITIONS

---

(~~22~~**[21]**) Promptly conduct a frank and open debriefing with any of the offerors at their request (see FAR ~~Subpart[s] 15.40~~**[505 and 15.506]**).

(f) Headquarters MAJCOM, FOA, or DRU Chief of Contracting or Deputy shall:

- (1) Serve as primary advisor to the installation or activity commander on source selection policy and participate as a member of ASPs and as SSEB advisor on source selections;
- (2) Assign appropriate contracting personnel to participate in acquisition strategy panels; and
- (3) Maintain a schedule of key source selection events. Times, dates, and locations for these meetings should be planned and scheduled as far in advance as possible, giving due consideration to potential conflicts and potential consolidations with other significant source selection events. As a minimum, the key events shall include:
  - (i) The solicitation release authorization;
  - (ii) The presentation or briefing of the initial evaluation results including competitive range determinations; and
  - (iii) The presentation or briefing of the final evaluation results.

**BB-108 Advisors.**

- (a) Government and non-Government experts may be called upon to provide advisory assistance to the SSA or SSET. However, non-Government advisors may not be used if a sufficient number of Government personnel having the training and capabilities necessary to perform the evaluation or analysis are readily available. Ensure that this determination is in accordance with any FAR implementing policy letters or supplements. Advisors may objectively review a proposal in a particular functional area and provide comments and recommendations to the Government's decision-makers. They may not determine strengths and weaknesses, establish initial or final assessments of risks, or actually rate or rank offerors' proposals.
- (b) The following additional restrictions are placed on non-Government advisors. Non-Government advisors shall not be:
  - (1) Provided offeror proprietary, confidential, or privileged commercial or financial data unless prior written consent is obtained from the offeror;
  - (2) Allowed to participate in oral presentations, oral proposals, or discussions unless the SSA or SSET chairperson formally requests a deviation to this policy from the senior contracting official; and,
  - (3) Allowed to participate in Government decision-making meetings, such as SSA briefings, unless the SSA or SSET chairperson requests that they be present during a particular portion of the meeting when they may be called upon to provide technical expertise.
- (c) When non-Government advisors are used, the solicitation must include a provision advising offerors that non-Government contractor employees will have access to proposals (see FAR 15.413-2 (~~f~~)**[305(c)]**).

**APPENDIX BB— SOURCE SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR OTHER THAN MAJOR ACQUISITIONS**

---

A provision may be included in the solicitation identifying the non-Government advisors and their employees and advising that any objection to disclosure:

- (1) Should be provided in writing prior to the date set for receipt of proposals; and
- (2) Shall include a detailed statement of the basis for the objection.

(d) An organizational conflict of interest (OCI) clause covering non-disclosure of contractor data shall be included in contracts where the contractor is to participate as a non-Government advisor to a source selection (see FAR Subpart 9.5).

**BB-109 Conflicts of interest.**

All persons involved in the source selection process, including non-Air Force personnel, will be instructed to inform the SSA if their participation in source selection activities might result in a real, apparent, possible, or potential conflict of interest. When so advised, the SSA will disqualify any person whose participation in the source selection process could raise questions regarding real, apparent, possible, or potential conflict of interest.

**BB-110 Solicitation and contract documents.**

Personnel responsible for the requirement will provide, upon request and in a timely manner, copies of the solicitation or other source selection documents to SAF/AQC.

**BB-111 Plant visits.**

If plant visits are contemplated, follow the procedures in AFFARS Appendix AA-111.

**BB-112 Interface with contractors.**

All personnel must be cautioned that only the contracting officer may commit the U.S. Government. Personnel involved in the source selection must avoid any situation or contact with any competing offeror that is not essential or would raise questions of impropriety. The objectivity of the source selection process may be impaired by contacts between Government personnel and prime/subcontractors involved in the competition during the period between the release of the solicitation and announcement of the source selection decision. Contacts with prospective contractors regarding the specific source selection must be avoided, except for personnel directly participating in source selection discussions and contract negotiations.

**BB-113 Foreign Military Sales (FMS).**

For procurements involving Foreign Military Sales, see the guidance at AFFARS Appendix AA-113.

**BB-114 Deviations.**

Deviations to this appendix may be granted only by SAF/AQC when use of this appendix is required. Requests for deviations must be submitted in writing through SAF/AQCP. When use of this appendix is discretionary, the SSA may approve deviations.

**BB-115 Regulatory references.**

A list of key regulatory references pertaining to formal source selection is provided in AFFARS Appendix AA, Attachment AA-2.

**PART 2 - PRE-EVALUATION ACTIVITIES**

**BB-201 Introduction.**

This part explains the major steps in the source selection process that occur before receipt of initial proposals.

**BB-202 Acquisition strategy.**

Comply with 5307.104-91 regarding the use of Acquisition Strategy Panels (ASPs).

**BB-203 Basis of award, evaluation criteria, and general considerations.**

(a) The basis for source selection and award of a contract must be limited to ~~criteria~~ **factors and subfactors** and considerations that are stated in the solicitation. **[All subfactors in Air Force source selections are significant as defined in FAR 15.304.]** Therefore, it is mandatory that the RFP clearly state all characteristics of the requirement that will be considered by the Air Force in making the source selection. Air Force source selection awards are based on an integrated assessment of each offeror's **[proposal using factors and subfactors which include:]** cost (price) criterion, specific criteria, assessment criteria, proposal risk, performance risk, and general considerations. These ~~criteria~~ **factors and subfactors** are stated in a structured manner in Section M of the RFP. This section serves as the "rules of engagement" for the source selection.

(b) Evaluation ~~criteria~~ **factors and subfactors** should be tailored to the characteristics of a requirement and should include only those significant aspects expected to have an impact on the ultimate selection decision. There must be a sufficient number of discriminators to effectively evaluate the offeror's proposal. The number of ~~criteria~~ **factors and subfactors** is ~~is~~ **are** driven by the requirement. Care should be taken to ensure that arbitrary decisions are not made as to how many ~~criteria~~ **factors and subfactors** should be established for a procurement of a given estimated value or given technical application. Evaluation ~~criteria~~ **factors and subfactors** consist of three types: (1) cost (price) criterion, (2) specific criteria, and (3) assessment criteria. The technical and contract team members should work together to develop a list of the key characteristics that distinguish "poor" from "good" performance of a given requirement. This is the list of key discriminators that will be the basis for all evaluation criteria. If a proposed criterion would not prevent award to an offeror with an unacceptable response, then it is not a discriminator and should not be used. These criteria should include those things considered important to the customer about the specific requirement, such as quality of service, environmental considerations, and management. The cost (price) criterion relates to the evaluation of the offeror's proposed cost (price). The assessment criteria serve as a basis for evaluating each offeror's proposal as it relates to the specific criteria. Factors and subfactors may be created to support those criteria. See Attachment BB-3 for an example of the general format of the evaluation matrix.

(1) Cost (price) is a mandatory evaluation criterion that shall be evaluated as a factor in every AFFARS Appendix BB source selection to determine realism, completeness, and reasonableness. The purpose is to ensure that the contractor has appropriately considered all aspects of cost (price). Examples of this factor might be instant contract cost (price) or disposal cost of hazardous material. Do not use color or proposal risk ratings for cost. ~~Use the results of pricing techniques described in FAR Subpart 15.8 or the Armed Services Pricing Manual (ASPM). (See BB-309.)~~

(i) For the cost (price) to be realistic, the overall costs in an offeror's proposal must:

(A) Be realistic for the work to be performed;

(B) Reflect a clear understanding of the requirements; and

(C) Be consistent with the various elements of the offeror's technical proposal.

---

**APPENDIX BB— SOURCE SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR OTHER THAN MAJOR ACQUISITIONS**

---

(ii) For the cost (price) data to be complete, the offeror must provide all the data that is necessary to support the offer. The amount of data needed will vary depending on the requirement. If using price analysis, information about the catalog price or the price at which the item has been sold in the recent past may be sufficient. If buying something that is being specially made for the Government, information on the cost of raw materials, labor, scrap rates, etc. is necessary. To reduce the burden on the Government and the offeror, the amount of detail needed in this area should be carefully tailored to the requirement.

(iii) For the cost (price) to be reasonable, it must represent a cost (price) that provides best value to the Government when consideration is given to prices in the market, technical and functional capabilities of the offeror, risk, and the current source selection situation. It is distinct from a "fair" cost (price) which is a cost (price) that ensures the offeror a reasonable profit commensurate with the offeror's performance.

(2) Specific criteria relate to requirement characteristics. They relate to what the offeror has proposed to do. The specific criteria are typically divided into technical and/or management evaluation areas. Examples of specific criteria might include major areas of performance, general facility maintenance, control of Government assets, and management. These areas may be further subdivided into factors, subfactors, and, in some instances, elements. The level of subdivision depends on the complexity of the area being evaluated. Factors should be related to characteristics which are important to successful contract performance. Any minimum requirements shall be included in the solicitation and evaluated. The SSP and Section M will state the level at which color/adjectival ratings will be assigned.

(i) A source selection may have essential characteristics or baseline requirements or a combination of minimum mandatory requirements and essential characteristics or baseline requirements.

(ii) Not all source selections will use minimum mandatory requirements. If used, minimum mandatory requirements shall be completely described in the solicitation and evaluated as such. When used, they become a "pass/fail" or "go/no go" decision. They are displayed in the SSA briefing as a "green" if the offeror passes or a "red" if the offeror fails.

(3) Assessment criteria form the basis for evaluating each offeror's proposal in regards to the relevant evaluation criteria. They relate to how the contractor will perform the effort or satisfy the requirement. Evaluators use assessment criteria in conjunction with evaluation standards to judge how well an offeror's proposal satisfies each of the relevant evaluation criteria. Soundness of approach, completeness, and compliance are common assessment criteria. Did the offeror propose an effective and efficient method to perform the effort? Did the proposal adequately describe how the factor, subfactor, and/or element (as appropriate) will be performed? Did the proposal offer to perform what was requested in the solicitation?

(c) General considerations relate to proposed contractual terms and conditions, results of preaward surveys, and other surveys or reviews.

(d) Proposal risks are assessments associated with schedule and performance or technical aspects of the program.

(e) Performance risks relate to cost and specific criteria. Performance risk may be assessed for each area or as an overall general assessment of performance.

**BB-204 Source Selection Plan (SSP).**

(a) The SSP is a key document in conducting the source selection. It should contain the elements described below to ensure timely review and SSA approval. The SSP should be jointly developed by the contracting personnel and personnel responsible for the requirement. See the table in BB-105 for SSP review and approval levels.

(1) The SSP must be submitted sufficiently in advance of the planned acquisition action to facilitate review and approval by the SSA and early establishment of the source selection organization.

(2) When changes in acquisition strategy require a revision to the SSP, personnel responsible for the requirement will send the proposed revision through source selection channels to the SSA.

(b) ~~The SSP will conform with FAR Subpart 15.6. It~~ will address the issues below and other things that are important or unusual about a given acquisition. The SSP should contain a concise description of the acquisition situation. If an extended discussion of any issue is required, supporting details may be provided in separate documents attached to the SSP. Ideally, the wording used in much of the SSP should be identical to the wording used in other documents related to this effort, such as the acquisition plan, acquisition strategy panel minutes, or the solicitation.

(c) The plan shall include the following:

(1) INTRODUCTION. Describe briefly what is being acquired.

(2) SOURCE SELECTION ORGANIZATION. Describe the proposed SSA and SSET organizations (including Government and non-Government advisors). List recommended key members by name, by position title, or by functional area. The plan must identify other Government organizations that will be represented on the SSET.

(3) PROPOSED PRESOLICITATION ACTIVITIES. Describe the activities leading up to release of the solicitation, including market survey, draft solicitations, synopsis, and solicitation release meeting. For the market survey, discuss how it was used to achieve competition, including a discussion of screening criteria, if applicable.

(4) EVALUATION PROCEDURES. This section discusses the process that will be used by the SSET to evaluate offerors' proposals and develop a Proposal Analysis Report. In other words, it describes what the SSET will do and how they will document what they did. Describe how the proposals will be evaluated and how they will be rated. Describe how the Government estimate was developed including any cost drivers that have been identified. Describe how those cost drivers will be treated by the pricing team during proposal evaluation. Although the cost (price) criterion will not be given a color or a risk rating during proposal evaluation, the process that will be used to evaluate offerors' proposals must be described in this section. NOTE: When the plan adopts something verbatim from this regulation, simply cite the regulation instead of quoting verbatim in the plan. This includes the color coding and risk definitions.

---

**APPENDIX BB— SOURCE SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR OTHER THAN MAJOR ACQUISITIONS**


---

(5) **EVALUATION CRITERIA.** Describe the cost (price) criterion and specific criteria including factors and, when appropriate, subfactors and elements. The information in this section must be exactly duplicated in Section M of the RFP. Describe the assessment criteria and how they apply to the evaluation. The relative importance of the cost (price) criterion, specific criteria, and general considerations will be stated. Assessment criteria must also be ranked in relative order of importance or identified as of equal importance. Describe general considerations and how they relate to the evaluation of the offeror's proposal.

(6) **ACQUISITION STRATEGY.** The SSP will include a summary of the acquisition strategy, including type of contract(s) proposed, the incentives contemplated, special contract clauses, etc. The SSP acquisition strategy must reflect the strategy developed in the AP/SAMP.

(7) **SCHEDULE OF EVENTS.** Identify and establish the schedule for significant source selection activities in sufficient detail to allow the reviewing authorities to assess the practicality of the schedule. The schedule of events in Attachment BB-2 may be used as a guide.

(8) **NON-GOVERNMENT ADVISORS.** The source selection plan shall address the use of non-Government advisors (see FAR 15.413-2 (f) [305(c)] and AFFARS Appendix BB-108).

(d) The SSP shall be approved by the SSA before issuing the solicitation.

(e) Only include tailored information; otherwise, cite the appropriate paragraph of this regulation.

**BB-205 Evaluation standards.**

(a) The SSET conducts its evaluation by measuring each proposal against objective standards established at the lowest level of subdivision. The SSET shall *not* compare proposals against each other.

(b) A standard establishes a baseline to measure how well an offeror's proposal satisfies the evaluation criteria. It establishes the level an offeror's proposal must meet in any factor, subfactor, or element to be judged acceptable ("green") as stated in BB-304. Standards shall not be used to create a new or unstated requirement. A standard may be either quantitative, qualitative, or both, depending on the criteria it addresses (see Attachment BB-6 for examples).

(c) As a matter of practice, standards should be established and documented prior to the release of the solicitation and must be approved by the SSA before beginning the evaluation of proposals. They shall not be changed once an offeror's proposal is opened. The release of standards is situational; it may or may not be appropriate to a given acquisition. However, release of standards is encouraged to ensure more open communication with industry and a better understanding of the Government's approach to making a best value source selection decision.

(d) The SSA is responsible for approving the inclusion of the standards in the solicitation when it is deemed appropriate or beneficial to do so.

**BB-206 Solicitation.**

The contracting officer is responsible for preparing the solicitation. Personnel responsible for the requirement are responsible for preparing key portions of the RFP, such as the statement of objectives or statement of work and the data requirements. The solicitation must accurately convey to offerors the technical, schedule, cost, and contractual requirements of the acquisition. In addition:

APPENDIX BB— SOURCE SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR OTHER THAN MAJOR ACQUISITIONS

---

- (1) The solicitation should be kept short and uncomplicated. Most applicable regulations may be referenced rather than reprinted. Personnel responsible for the requirement, in conjunction with the contracting officer, may establish a technical library that potential offerors can visit, rather than include voluminous descriptions in the RFP. How or where the technical library or other referenced documents can be accessed should be included in the RFP.
- (2) A major cause of lengthy source selections is a proliferation of evaluation ~~areas~~, factors, subfactors, and elements which, in turn, results in lengthy proposals and evaluation sessions. Too often, these evaluations involve ~~areas~~, factors, subfactors, and elements which are not source selection discriminators. The choice of evaluation ~~areas~~, factors, subfactors, and elements should be tailored to that which is essential to the selection of the best offeror. In some instances, this may be done by combining a number of similar factors into one overall factor. Sufficient time must be provided for evaluation consistent with the nature of the acquisition. This requires planning by the SSET chairperson to optimize the number of ~~areas~~, factors, subfactors, and elements to fit within the time allotted for evaluation. Acquisitions for unusual requirements or those likely to result in many proposals may require more evaluation time.
- (3) The evaluation ~~criteria~~ **[factors and subfactors]** and general considerations must be stated in the solicitation as they appear in the approved SSP. The solicitation shall indicate the relative importance among cost (price) criterion, specific evaluation criteria (including ~~areas~~, factors, and ~~any significant~~ subfactors), and general considerations. Additionally, the solicitation shall state whether all evaluation factors other than cost or price, when combined, are significantly more important than cost or price, approximately equal to cost or price, or significantly less important than cost or price. If requirements or conditions significantly change so as to negate or modify the evaluation criteria originally established in the solicitation, each offeror shall be informed by a solicitation amendment of the adjusted criteria and basis for award. Offerors shall then be given a reasonable time to revise their proposals. After proposals have been received, a change in evaluation criteria or requirements may require resolicitation (see FAR 15.606~~6~~**[206(e)]**).
- (4) Section L of the solicitation should state how the Government wants the offerors to structure their proposals. This includes guidance concerning the type and content of volumes required, cross-referencing SOW/PWS paragraph requirements to the proposal, page limitations, what is excluded from the page count, suggested level of detail in the proposal, etc. The offerors should also be asked to provide past performance information and references as part of their proposal.
- (5) The solicitation should contain a matrix which correlates the evaluation criteria with the information to be submitted in the proposal. The offerors should prepare and submit their proposal in sections aligned with and cross-indexed to the evaluation criteria to facilitate Government review and evaluation. Offerors should be asked to identify technical, cost, schedule, manufacturing, and proposal risks associated with their proposals, together with their approaches for resolving or avoiding the identified risks.
- (6) Section M of the solicitation shall include a notice stating that unrealistically low proposed costs or prices may be grounds for eliminating a proposal from competition either on the basis that the offeror does not understand the requirement or the offeror has made an unrealistic proposal. This includes both original submissions and ~~BAFOs~~ **final proposal revision**[. Offerors should be sufficiently detailed to demonstrate their cost (price) realism, completeness, and reasonableness and that offeror's estimates that are unrealistically low may cause the offer to be eliminated from the competition (subject to the requirements in FAR 15.608~~8~~**[305]** and FAR 15.610~~10~~**[306]**).

---

**APPENDIX BB— SOURCE SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR OTHER THAN MAJOR ACQUISITIONS**


---

(7) An executive summary that briefly describes and highlights the salient aspects of the solicitation may be included as a cover sheet for the solicitation. The executive summary shall not contain any new information or requirements not already discussed in the solicitation. A DD Form 1707 may be used in lieu of an executive summary letter.

**BB-207 Notice of source selection action.**

It is the responsibility of the MAJCOM to establish parameters for which source selection action notification will be made. Regardless of dollar value, all acquisitions of aircraft or efforts which have generated Congressional interest shall follow these reporting procedures. When the solicitation is released, the SSET chairperson and contracting officer shall ensure that a notice of source selection action in progress is forwarded to all affected Air Force Commands, SAF/AQCS, and the potential offerors. The notification will identify the requirement involved, any current contracts in that area, the anticipated period of the source selection activities, and include statements to the effect that:

- (1) Contacts regarding, or briefings concerning, the requirement by participating offerors are not allowed;
- (2) The contracting officer is the only person authorized to contact offerors; and
- (3) The SSA is the only person with authority to release information regarding an ongoing source selection.

**PART 3 - PROPOSAL EVALUATION AND SOURCE SELECTION DECISION****BB-301 General.**

This part explains the major steps in the source selection process from receipt of initial proposals through the source selection decision including discussions with offerors. Proposals shall be evaluated in a fair, comprehensive, and impartial manner.

**BB-302 Offerors' oral presentations.**

- (a) Although oral presentations are the exception to the rule, the SSET should consider having oral presentations if the requirement is unusual or if one or more of the offerors have not been awarded contracts in the past by the acquisition activity. In these instances, oral presentations help ensure the Government fully understands the proposals.
- (b) If oral presentations are deemed appropriate:
  - (1) Presentations should be conducted ~~before proposals are evaluated to provide an overview of the entire proposal before the evaluation of its specific parts~~ **in accordance with FAR 15.102**;
  - (2) Each offeror shall be given an opportunity to make an oral presentation so that no offeror will have a competitive advantage. Every offeror who chooses to make an oral presentation shall be given the same time constraint and they shall be notified that only their written submittals, such as the proposal, responses to **ENs** ~~CR/DRs~~, and **final proposal revisions** ~~BAFOs~~ will form the basis of the Government's evaluation;
  - (3) To ensure objectivity during the evaluation process, all Government participants in the evaluation must attend either all or none of the oral presentations; and

APPENDIX BB— SOURCE SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR OTHER THAN MAJOR ACQUISITIONS

---

(4) The SSET chairperson shall ensure that minutes are taken of each oral presentation and included in the source selection file. When page limits are included in the solicitation, additional documentation may not be provided to the SSET at the oral presentation.

**BB-303 Technical evaluation.**

(a) Technical as well as cost (price) proposals will be submitted to the contracting officer who will provide technical proposals to the technical evaluators. The technical evaluation will be conducted independent of the cost (price) evaluation. Technical evaluators will not have access to cost data any time prior to the decision briefing. In this context, cost data does not include information required for types and quantities analyses such as labor hours, personnel qualifications, equipment and material lists, and other non-rate related information. Technical personnel may examine such data upon the request of the contract team, even if it is extracted from the cost proposal. However, they may not be given access to the complete cost proposal.

(b) Technical approach and ability to meet stated minimum performance requirements are of major importance in proposal evaluation. The term "technical" in this context is not limited to scientific or engineering concepts or principles, but may include any performance skills.

(c) The SSET technical team accomplishes a technical evaluation of each of the initial offers using the assessment criteria to analyze each proposal which match the evaluation criteria in Section M of the RFP.

(d) Evaluators shall indicate the value of each proposal in relation to the evaluation standards which were established before the receipt of proposals. The SSET shall *not* compare the proposals against each other.

(e) Evaluators must understand the requirement of the solicitation, the evaluation criteria, and the evaluation standards. Evaluators are encouraged to engage in discussions with advisors or other SSET members when it is necessary to verify certain aspects of proposals under their review.

(f) The technical evaluation results in the following ~~four distinct~~ products that are included in the Proposal Analysis Report (PAR):

- (1) Proposal ratings;
- (2) Proposal risk assessments;
- (3) Performance risk assessments;
- (4) Narrative assessments (which identify strengths and weaknesses and support ratings and risk assessments); and
- (5) Recommended evaluation notices ~~deficiency reports and clarification requests.~~

**BB-304 Use of rating techniques.**

a) After assessing the offerors' data, the evaluator shall apply the rating system prescribed by the SSP and rate each proposal in relation to the evaluation standards.

APPENDIX BB— SOURCE SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR OTHER THAN MAJOR ACQUISITIONS

(b) Color ratings are used. Color ratings are mandatory at the factor and subfactor level. Colors may also be used at the element level, although symbols may be used as an alternative at these lower levels. The color rating depicts how well each offeror meets the evaluation standards. Color ratings are not summarized above the factor level. However, if the SSA requires a summary rating at the area level in the SSP, color ratings shall be used. To provide for a standard color scheme, the spectrum below shall be used (see Attachment BB-3 for an example). Ratings must be accompanied by a consistent narrative assessment (inclusive of strengths and weaknesses) of the basis for the rating. The definitions stated below shall be followed any time color ratings are used. Deviations from these definitions can only be obtained by forwarding a request through SAF/AQCP.

The following ratings shall be used when evaluating essential characteristics:

<u>Color</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Definition</u>
Blue	Exceptional	Exceeds specified performance or capability in a beneficial way to the Air Force and has no significant weakness.
Green	Acceptable	Meets evaluation standards and any weaknesses are readily corrected.
Yellow	Marginal	Fails to meet evaluation standards; however, any significant deficiencies are correctable.
Red	Unacceptable	Fails to meet a minimum requirement of the RFP and the deficiency is uncorrectable without a major revision of the proposal.

The following ratings shall be used when evaluating those segments of a proposal that reflect minimum mandatory requirements:

<u>Color</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Definition</u>
Green	Acceptable	Passes (or meets) minimum mandatory requirements.
Red	Unacceptable	Fails to meet minimum mandatory requirements.

(c) Use of numerical weights is discouraged because it implies that the technical team can differentiate between small differences in technical merit. Such determinations may be extremely difficult to support. Therefore, numerical weighting of evaluation criterion should not be used.

(d) If an offeror’s proposal is evaluated as unacceptable at any level of the evaluation criteria, this fact must be included in the rating and narrative assessment at that level and each higher evaluation criteria level. Therefore, a "red" or unacceptable rating at any level must be carried to the highest rated level.

(e) Symbols may be used to indicate proposal ratings at the element level. For example, a plus (+) sign may be used to indicate that the offeror has exceeded the standard; a check to indicate that the offeror has met the standard; and a minus (-) sign to indicate that the standard has not been met for the element evaluated.

APPENDIX BB— SOURCE SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR OTHER THAN MAJOR ACQUISITIONS

---

(f) The following subjects are not color rated (although they still are considered by the SSET as part of the integrated assessment):

- (1) Financial capability, Production Readiness Reviews, and preaward surveys;
- (2) Cost (price); and
- (3) Risk (proposal and performance).

(g) Proposals are normally rated twice:

(1) Upon completion of the evaluation of the initial proposal; and

(2) At the end of discussions after ENsBAFOs are received, if discussions are held.

NOTE: Both ratings will be maintained and submitted to the SSAC.

(h) When displayed graphically in briefings or reports, changes in the initial color rating shall be displayed by showing the new color and superimposing one or more arrows in the color block. The number and direction of the arrows used in each block on the chart indicates the extent and direction of change (i.e., one arrow upward indicates an improvement of one color rating). Any changes from the original proposal should be identified in the discussion of strengths, weaknesses, and risk, and analyzed for the SSA in the PAR and the SSA briefing.

(i) If a source selection has a mix of minimum mandatory requirements and essential characteristics or baseline requirements, most likely an initial competitive range will be determined on the basis of cost (price) and other factors that were stated in the solicitation and shall include all proposals that have a reasonable chance of being selected for award. The minimum mandatory portion need not be color rated; however, if it is, it shall be displayed as "green" for meeting the requirement or "red" for not meeting the minimum mandatory requirement. A narrative identifying the deficiencies is sufficient. The essential characteristics or baseline requirements are usually then evaluated and color rated. This minimizes the work of the technical team by not requiring them to evaluate the essential characteristics or baseline requirements for offerors which did not meet the minimum mandatory requirements.

**BB-305 Assessment of risk.**

(a) There are two types of risk assessment. Proposal risk relates to the identification and assessment of the risks associated with an offeror's proposed approach as it relates to accomplishing the requirements of the solicitation. Performance risk relates to the assessment of an offeror's present and past work record to assess confidence in the offeror's ability to successfully perform as proposed. Proposal risk assessments will always be reflected in the evaluation matrix (see Attachments BB-3). Proposal risk ratings shall not be rolled up to the area level. Performance risk will be reflected in the evaluation matrix (see Attachments BB-3). Performance risk will be evaluated equally with factors assessments and proposal risk (i.e., conceptually, not numerically, 1/3, 1/3, 1/3).

(1) Use the following definitions when assessing proposal risks:

(i) HIGH (H) — Likely to cause significant serious disruption of schedule, increase in cost, or degradation of performance even with special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring;

---

**APPENDIX BB— SOURCE SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR OTHER THAN MAJOR ACQUISITIONS**

---

(ii) MODERATE (M) — Can potentially cause some disruption of schedule, increase in cost, or degradation of performance. However, special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring will probably be able to overcome difficulties; and

(iii) LOW (L) — Has little potential to cause disruption of schedule, increase in cost, or degradation of performance. Normal contractor effort and normal Government monitoring will probably be able to overcome difficulties.

(2) Use the following definitions when assessing performance risk:

(i) HIGH (H) — Significant doubt exists, based on the offeror's performance record, that the offeror can perform the proposed effort;

(ii) MODERATE (M) — Some doubt exists, based on the offeror's performance record, that the offeror can perform the proposed effort;

(iii) LOW (L) — Little doubt exists, based on the offeror's performance record, that the offeror can perform the proposed effort; and

(iv) NOT APPLICABLE — No significant performance record is identifiable.

(b) Each proposal and performance risk assessment will consider the number and severity of problems, the effectiveness of corrective actions taken, and the overall work record. Consider also the offeror's demonstrated ability to effectively identify and take actions to abate requirement risks. The assessment of performance risk is not intended to be a simple arithmetic function of an offeror's performance on a list of contracts. The evaluation team should place the greatest consideration on the information deemed most relevant and significant. In the cost area, more consideration should be given to efforts for similar end items, efforts during a similar phase of the acquisition cycle, and efforts with similar contract types.

(c) For unusual or complex requirements, offerors may be required to submit, as part of their proposal, a proposal risk analysis which identifies proposal risk areas and the recommended approaches to minimize the impact of those risks on the overall success of the requirement.

(d) Proposal risks associated with cost, schedule, and performance or technical aspects of the requirement must be assessed. Risks may be inherent in a proposed approach by virtue of its relationship to the state-of-the-art. Risks may occur as a result of a particular technical approach, manufacturing plan, the selection of certain materials, processes, equipment, etc., or as a result of the cost, schedule, and economic impacts associated with these approaches. Risk may also occur from the impact that these will have on the offeror's ability to perform in view of its technical approach. The prime's proposed subcontract arrangements may also impact proposal risk. For instance, a proposed fixed-price subcontract for a high technical risk effort, or one with an unrealistic delivery schedule, can be expected to impact the overall effort and should be assessed in the proposal risk for that area or factor.

(e) In evaluating proposal risks, the evaluators must consider the assessment prepared by personnel responsible for the requirement and the offeror's assessment and make an independent judgment of the probability of success, the impact of failure, and the alternatives available to meet the requirements.

APPENDIX BB— SOURCE SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR OTHER THAN MAJOR ACQUISITIONS

---

(f) Proposal risk assessments shall be discussed in evaluation narratives along with strengths and weaknesses and shall be depicted in briefings with the color ratings for each factor, subfactor, or element other than cost (price) as specified in Section M of the RFP. A proposal risk assessment rating and discussion is mandatory for each subfactor at the subfactor summary level.

(g) The performance risk assessment will focus on cost and specific criteria. Performance risk shall also be separately discussed in evaluation narratives in addition to strengths and weaknesses and depicted in briefings.

(h) The risk assessment and color rating assigned to any factor or subfactor are independent of each other. Any risk assessment rating may be used with any color rating to reflect evaluation results.

(i) It is the responsibility of the specific criteria evaluation teams to ensure that the cost team is informed of the identified proposal risks and the potential cost impact. For example, the cost team should be informed if the proposed method of performance does not reflect the same level of effort identified in the manpower hours proposed.

**BB-306 ~~Deficiency reports (DRs).~~ [Exchanges with offerors.]**

~~(a) During the initial evaluation of proposals, the SSET must record separately and in addition to the narrative analysis, the deficiencies found in each offeror's proposal. It is important that deficiency reports be prepared at the time the deficiency is discovered. Late preparation often results in poorly substantiated reports. It is important that the evaluator document the effect the uncorrected deficiency would have on the program (see Attachment BB-7). The deficiency report will be provided to the contract team which will, in turn, provide the offeror with the opportunity to amend its proposal to correct the deficiency. The release of deficiency reports (which constitutes discussions) will not begin until after the initial competitive range is determined and approval to release the reports is received from the SSET chairperson. Award shall not be made without discussion until the SSET chairperson has reviewed the~~

~~(b) Examples of deficiency reports are:~~

- ~~(1) A proposed approach which poses an unacceptable risk;~~
- ~~(2) An omission of data which makes it impossible to assess compliance with the standard for that requirement;~~
- ~~(3) An approach taken by an offeror which is expected to yield undesirable performance; or~~
- ~~(4) A failure of the offeror to meet a minimum mandatory requirement.~~

~~(c) Identified deficiencies shall be derived only from the evaluation of each offeror's proposal against evaluation standards, and then only when the proposal fails to meet the Government's specified minimum level of performance or essential characteristics of the requirement. Deficiencies must not be derived from a comparative evaluation of the relative strengths and weaknesses of competing offerors' proposals.~~

~~(d) The offeror's response to the deficiency report is as important as the original proposal. The contract team must transmit each offeror's response to the evaluation team for a technical analysis.~~

~~(e) Each deficiency report, which is a part of the overall PAR, must address significant changes which have an impact on the original proposal. All DRs will be addressed in the PAR.~~

## APPENDIX BB— SOURCE SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR OTHER THAN MAJOR ACQUISITIONS

(f) Deficiency reports may serve as a guide for debriefing offerors after contract award.

**BB-307 Clarification requests (CRs).**

(a) Evaluators must identify those aspects of the proposal which require clarification. If data provided in the proposal is inadequate for evaluation or contradictory statements are found, a clarification request should be issued. Two categories of clarification requests exist:

(1) Significant clarification requests (SCRs) will specifically identify the aspect of the offeror's proposal for which clarification is required and require that discussions with offerors be opened. Whenever performance risk assessment results in a possible rating of moderate or high, SCRs should be developed. All clarification requests (see Attachment BB-7) are sent to the contract team and submitted to the offerors in the same way as deficiency reports. As with DRs, the SSET chairperson will review and approve all CRs before providing them to offerors and before any decision is made to award without discussions; and

(2) Minor clarification requests (MCRs) are for the purpose of eliminating minor irregularities, informalities, or apparent clerical mistakes. MCRs do not give the offeror an opportunity to revise or modify its proposal and do not constitute discussions. Subject to the concurrence of legal counsel, MCRs may be sent prior to the initial competitive range determination.

(b) Release of any SCRs to an offeror constitutes discussions and shall not be sent before the initial competitive range determination.

**[(a) Exchanges with offerors after receipt of proposals are conducted in accordance with FAR 15.306. Evaluation Notices (ENs) may be issued for purposes of clarification, to enhance government understanding of offeror proposals, and to notify offerors of deficiencies or weaknesses in their proposals. When such exchanges occur prior to establishment of competitive range, offerors shall not be permitted to revise their proposals in response to the ENs; however, corrections of a minor nature may be permitted and offerors may be given the opportunity to clarify certain aspects of their proposals if the government intends to award without discussions.]**

**[(b) Subsequent to the competitive range determination, offerors determined to be in competitive range may revise their proposals as necessary in response to ENs, to correct deficiencies, clarify the government's understanding of their proposals, and enhance their proposals in accordance with FAR 15.306(d). These exchanges with offerors after establishment of competitive range constitute discussions.]**

**BB-308[7] Narrative assessments.**

(a) Preparing the results of the evaluation in narrative form is an important aspect of the evaluation process. In preparing the written narrative, the evaluator should be aware that it will be the principle means available to the SSA to perform a comparative analysis of the offers.

(b) The evaluator must indicate in the narrative, as a minimum: what is offered, whether it meets or fails to meet the evaluation standard, any strengths or weaknesses, the impact of any deficiencies, what can be

APPENDIX BB— SOURCE SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR OTHER THAN MAJOR ACQUISITIONS

---

done to remedy each deficiency, and a risk assessment of the offeror's proposal approach and ability to perform. Clarity and brevity are the keys to successfully prepared narratives.

**BB-309[8] Cost (price) evaluation.**

(a) The purpose of cost (price) evaluation is to determine whether an offeror's proposed costs are realistic and complete in relation to the solicitation and the technical and management proposals and to provide an assessment of the reasonableness of the proposed price.

(1) Realism is evaluated by assessing the compatibility of proposed costs with proposal scope and effort. For the cost (price) to be realistic, it must reflect what it would cost the offeror to perform the effort if the offeror operates with reasonable economy and efficiency. The cost (price) should not put the offeror in a situation where, in order to earn profit, the offeror not only must perform perfectly, but everything else on the contract must be perfect as well, including the specifications, statement of work, performance work statement, etc. Allow room for some rework and corrections to occur—after all, in most cases, this is what really happens during contract performance.

(2) Completeness is evaluated by assessing the level of detail the offeror provided in cost data for all RFP requirements in the statement of objectives or statement of work and assessing the traceability of estimates. For the cost (price) data to be complete, the offeror must provide all the data that is necessary to support the offer. The amount of data needed will vary depending on the requirement. If using price analysis, information about the catalog price or the price at which the item has been sold in the recent past may be sufficient. If buying something that is being specially made for the Government, information on the cost of raw materials, labor, scrap rates, etc. is necessary.

(3) Reasonableness of an offeror's proposal is evaluated through cost or price analysis techniques as **describe[d]** in FAR Subpart 15.6[305(a)(1)] and [(4)]FAR Subpart 15.8. For the cost (price) to be reasonable, it must represent a cost (price) that provides best value to the Government when consideration is given to prices in the market, technical and functional capabilities of the offeror, risk, and the current source selection situation. It is distinct from a "fair" cost (price) which is a cost (price) that ensures the offeror a reasonable profit commensurate with the offeror's performance. Therefore, "fair and reasonable" should be considered in three dimensions: (1) fair under current market conditions, (2) reasonable to the seller, and (3) reasonable to the buyer.

---

~~(b) In order to avoid influencing their judgment, the bottom line of the competing offerors' cost (price) proposals shall not be made available to technical evaluators. During the evaluation, cost (price) evaluators, however, should discuss the details of technical proposals with the technical evaluators (and may generally discuss specific cost elements/areas) to aid in their evaluation of costs associated with labor categories and hours, materials, manufacturing processes, and other elements of cost (price) as appropriate. Labor hour and material breakouts may be included in technical volumes of the proposal to aid in this process. Cost (price) evaluators should also use the DCAA audit report and the contract administration office field price analysis report. However, after the BAFO and the technical evaluation are complete, it is acceptable to release the overall cost (price) information to the technical evaluators.~~

~~(e)[b]~~-Evaluation of the cost (price) realism of each proposal will be made without regard to any proposed ceiling on the Government's obligation.

## APPENDIX BB— SOURCE SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR OTHER THAN MAJOR ACQUISITIONS

~~(d)(c)~~ Consideration must be given to variations in amount of Government-furnished property (GFP) requested or the use of Government-owned facilities and tooling and all other disparities before the offeror's proposal can be equitably evaluated. The evaluated costs shall be adjusted to account for these variations.

~~(ed)~~ Price analysis is generally favored over cost analysis in source selection. Price analysis will generally be sufficient to support source selection decisions on relatively easy, simple, uncomplicated, competitive procurements. Price analysis is used to keep attention focused on value. It is best used in procurements for commercial-off-the-shelf-items, commercial services, competitive requirements, and standard parts or services.

~~(fe)~~ The cost team will initiate and maintain a cost baseline for each proposal to facilitate an understanding of the changes leading to the final cost (price). A summary of this baseline and all changes through BAFQ-final proposal revision shall be included in the PAR.

~~(gf)~~ Following completion of the cost (price) evaluation, the SSA will be provided with the cost team's findings as to the reasonableness, completeness, and realism of each offeror's proposal. If a proposal is determined to be unrealistic, incomplete, or unreasonable, the reasons for this conclusion must be stated. The SSA will also be given visibility into the build-up of the evaluated Government amount for each proposal through BAFQ-final proposal revision in the cost analysis included in the PAR and presented at the decision briefing.

**BB-310[09] Establish consensus on strengths and weaknesses within the Source Selection Evaluation Team (SSET).**

After individual evaluations have been completed within a team, the strengths and weaknesses determined by individual team members are combined into an integrated, team consensus, preferably by group discussion, to ensure that the strengths and weaknesses relate to the established standards. After achieving intra-team consensus, team leaders must reach a consensus on the factor rating. The SSET chairperson's fundamental responsibility is to ensure that the SSA briefing fairly and accurately reflects an overall evaluation of each offeror's proposal. Discussions among team chiefs (including the cost team) are an integral tool to making this a reality.

**BB-314[0] Determination of competitive range.**

(a) When written or oral discussions are conducted, they must be conducted with all responsible offerors who submit proposals within the competitive range. The determination as to which proposals are not in the competitive range, and the exclusion of offerors either before or as a result of written or oral discussions, will be made by the contracting officer, subject to approval by the SSA.

(b) After evaluation of all proposals received, the competitive range must be determined on the basis of cost (price) technical, and other salient factors including proposal deficiencies and their potential for correction. Before including or excluding a proposal from within the competitive range, the possibility of its selection for award should be assessed. The objective is not to eliminate proposals from the competitive range, but to establish a competitive range comprised of all the most highly rated proposals unless the range is further reduced for purposes of efficiency. ~~facilitate competition by conducting written and oral discussions with those offerors who have a reasonable chance of being selected for an award.~~

(c) The determination of competitive range is based on informed judgment and is complex in nature. All such decisions must be completely and adequately documented for the record. A proposal may be determined outside the competitive range if:

APPENDIX BB— SOURCE SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR OTHER THAN MAJOR ACQUISITIONS

---

- (1) It does not reasonably address the essential requirements of the solicitation;
- (2) A substantial technical drawback is apparent in the proposal and sufficient correction or improvement to consider the proposal further would require virtually an entirely new technical proposal;
- (3) The proposal contains major technical or business deficiencies or omissions or out-of-line costs which initial or continuing discussions with the offeror could not reasonably be expected to cure. Before eliminating an offeror from the competitive range based on unrealistic costs or prices, it will be necessary, to the extent possible, and without discussions with the offeror, to assess the reason for the out-of-line costs or prices. For example, the costs might be attributable to a unique design approach, a technical breakthrough, or an accelerated delivery. These may be legitimate reasons for the apparent out-of-line costs or prices; or
- (4) The proposal does not meet a minimum mandatory requirement at the time of the request for BAFQ **final proposal revision**.

**[(5) It is above the greatest number permitting an efficient competition among the most highly rated proposals.]**

- (d) Multiple competitive range determinations before BAFQ **final proposal revisions** are acceptable. For example, a second competitive range determination may be appropriate after responses to ~~clarification requests and deficiency reports~~ **ENs** have been received.
- (e) Exclusion of an offeror from the competitive range at any time during the source selection process must be approved by the SSA.
- (f) Offerors whose proposals are determined to be outside the competitive range and with whom initial or continuing discussions are not to be conducted must be notified promptly in accordance with FAR 15.609 **503**.

**BB-312[1] Conducting written or oral discussions.**

- (a) Written or oral discussions with offerors shall be led *only* by members of the contract team with other SSET members' support. The team will negotiate definitive contracts with all offerors determined to be within the competitive range. The team is the only point of contact between the SSET and the offerors **[(See FAR 15.306(d))]**.
- (b) All offerors determined to be in the competitive range shall be advised of any deficiencies in their proposals or portions of their proposals that require clarification and be given a reasonable opportunity to correct or resolve the deficiencies and to provide clarifications. Any deficiency or weakness in an offeror's proposal which drives a color rating less than acceptable (i.e., "green") must be discussed with the offeror if discussions have been opened. Additionally, it is strongly advised that any weakness documented in the narrative description of strengths and weaknesses be discussed with the offeror if discussions have been opened prior to the decision briefing **[(see FAR 15.306(d)(3))]**. This will ensure that offerors who request debriefings after contract award and are provided with their respective color ratings, risk assessments, and narrative descriptions have been given adequate opportunity to address their weaknesses during discussions. Offerors may submit cost (price), technical, or other proposal revisions as a result of the discussions.

## APPENDIX BB— SOURCE SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR OTHER THAN MAJOR ACQUISITIONS

(c) Discussions with each offeror must be confined exclusively to that offeror's proposal. Discussions must be conducted in a way that scrupulously avoids disclosure of the relative strengths and weaknesses of competing offerors, technical information or ideas, or cost (price) data from any other offeror's proposal.

(d) At the conclusion of written or oral discussions, a final common cut-off date which allows a reasonable opportunity for submission of ~~best and final offers~~ **[final proposal revisions]** must be established and all remaining participants notified in writing. The notifications shall:

(1) State that discussions have been concluded and specify the date, time, and location for receipt of ~~BAFOs~~ **[final proposal revisions]**;

(2) Identify to each offeror any remaining deficiencies in its proposal;

(3) Advise the offerors that any ~~BAFO~~ **[final proposal revisions]** received after the final cut-off date will be considered a late modification in accordance with FAR 15.412-208;

(4) Advise the offerors that if a ~~BAFO~~ **[final proposal revision]** is not received prior to the common cut-off date for an offeror, that offeror's current proposal, reflecting any clarifications or revisions to date, will be evaluated as its ~~best and final offer~~ **[final proposal revision]**; and,

(5) Caution the offerors against buying-in and submitting unsupported changes to their prior offers.

~~(e) Contracting officers shall not call for BAFOs more than once unless fully justified and approved in accordance with DFARS 215.611.~~

~~(f)~~ **(e)** All proposal revisions and information provided by the offerors during the conduct of discussions and received prior to the common cut-off will be considered in the final source selection decision.

**BB-313[2]-The Proposal Analysis Report and presentation.**

(a) The final technical team and contract team reports (less cost data) will be used by the entire SSET for preparation of a Proposal Analysis Report (PAR) (see Attachment BB-8). The SSET, under the guidance of the chairperson, shall prepare a PAR summarizing the strengths, weaknesses, and risks of each proposal and their resultant ratings (color coded or narrative). This summary, together with the technical team report and the contract team report, will be sent to the SSA for the final source selection decision.

(b) The PAR shall include the following:

(1) A narrative assessment of the technical evaluation. Narrative assessments shall be provided at the factor summary level or other levels as necessary. Each factor assessment must be precise and identify the color rating and proposal risk. It will highlight the significant strengths and weaknesses of each evaluated aspect of the proposal. (See Attachment BB-3 for examples of graphically displaying matrix information.);

(2) An analysis of the offeror's cost (price) (prepared by the contract team);

APPENDIX BB— SOURCE SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR OTHER THAN MAJOR ACQUISITIONS

---

- (3) Results of evaluating contractual considerations and any other general considerations that were evaluated by the SSET; and
  - (4) An overall performance risk assessment.
- (c) The objective of the PAR is to present a summary of the evaluation of each proposal against solicitation requirements based on established evaluation criteria and evaluation standards and provide an analysis of relevant information resulting from the evaluation of proposals and other considerations to support a final selection decision by the SSA. As a minimum, the information described in Attachment BB-8 shall be included in every PAR.
- (d) The PAR encompasses information derived from the results of the evaluation of the proposals as well as the results of final discussions, ~~BAFO~~**[final proposal revision]**; and other considerations. It is an official record of the evaluation of proposals and supporting rationale. A cost evaluation summary track shall be provided from initial proposals through ~~BAFO~~**[final proposal revision]**.
- (e) The contracting officer shall advise the SSA when the responsibility of any offeror is questioned. The PAR shall include this information.
- (f) Supporting documentation for the PAR shall be organized in accordance with MAJCOM procedures. An audit trail from the highest to the lowest elements of the evaluation shall be provided by the supporting reports and documentation.

**BB-314~~3~~**[3] Source selection briefings.****

The SSET chairperson is responsible for having the results of the evaluation briefed to the SSA. The recipients and the scope of the briefings depend on the organizational level at which the SSA has been established. All in attendance must complete a certification (see Attachment BB-10) in which they agree to safeguard source selection information (see BB-403). When appropriate, the SSA may waive the requirement for a formal briefing and use the PAR during discussions with the SSET.

**BB-315~~4~~**[4] Selection and contract award.****

The SSET chairperson is responsible for having prepared the Source Selection Decision Document for the SSA's signature. The assigned legal advisor and the senior contracting advisor shall coordinate on the Source Selection Decision Document. If the Source Selection Decision Document contains proprietary or source selection information, it shall be marked accordingly. The SSA's signature on the decision document is authority for the contracting officer to award a contract to the selected offeror(s) subject to the necessary administrative approvals. This document contains:

- (a) The source selection decision;
- b) Clear rationale for the source selection decision. When award is made ~~on a best value basis~~**[to other than the low offeror]**, the SSA should make a specific determination that the superiority of the higher priced proposal warrants the additional cost involved **[(see FAR 15.308)]**; merely stating a proposal's superiority is not acceptable. The cost/technical trade-off must indicate the value to the Government associated with the added costs and justify why it is in the Government's interest to expend additional funds, regardless of the superiority of the technical rating; and
- (c) Direction to accomplish award of a contract.

## APPENDIX BB— SOURCE SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR OTHER THAN MAJOR ACQUISITIONS

## NOTE:

(1) The Source Selection Decision Document is a releasable document under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).

(2) An example of the format of a Source Selection Decision Document is at Attachment BB-9. The attachment provides a format only. The actual decision document must include a detailed discussion of the rationale for each source selected.

**BB-316[5] Announcement of source selection decision.**

The SSA shall ensure that:

- (a) Advance information of the source selection decision is provided, if required in the delegation of source selection authority;
- (b) Information needed for Congressional announcement is provided to SAF/LLP at the preestablished time (see 5305.303); and
- (c) Information needed for press releases is provided to the local public affairs office at the pre-established time.

**BB-317[6] Notification and debriefings.**

(a) *Notifications.* The contracting officer shall notify unsuccessful offerors in accordance with FAR 15.4002[503].

(b) *Debriefings.* Debriefings shall be conducted in accordance with FAR 15.4004[505 and FAR 15.506]. Comparisons shall not be made to other unsuccessful offerors' proposals:

- (1) Debriefings will be with only one offeror at a time ~~and will not be conducted until after contract award~~;
- (2) Debriefings will be conducted promptly and frankly. When discussions were held, any weaknesses discussed during the debriefing should have already been discussed with the offeror in the form of a ~~an [EN]CR or a DR~~ with the exception of weaknesses identified as a result of the ~~BAFO [final proposal revision] response~~. The strengths and weaknesses identified in the debriefing should parallel those identified and documented by the SSET;
- (3) A formal briefing (charts and, if necessary, a script) will be prepared, coordinated with legal counsel and contracting staff, and approved by the SSEB chairperson. A copy of the briefing charts and script will be provided to the offeror on request. The offeror should be encouraged to submit written questions in advance. If written questions are received, every effort should be made to either incorporate answers into the debriefing charts and script or provide written answers at the time of the debriefings;
- (4) Open discussions are permitted on any aspect of the debriefings, including answers to written questions. Discussions regarding the validity of either the requirement or the evaluation process shall be avoided;
- (5) Offerors may ask oral questions during debriefings in addition to written questions submitted prior to the debriefing. Government personnel shall attempt to answer all questions. However, the debriefing team should caucus before providing answers to any questions not provided in advance which are complex,

APPENDIX BB— SOURCE SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR OTHER THAN MAJOR ACQUISITIONS

---

unclear, or may potentially lead to the release of proprietary or classified information. All answers provided must be consistent with the information presented to the SSA and correspond to the areas evaluated during source selection. Occasionally, it may be necessary to provide the offeror with a written response after the debriefing. A written record of the debriefing presentation shall be made part of the official source selection file. A written summary of all questions and answers shall also be retained in the source selection file and may be provided to the offeror; and

(6) A written debriefing may be conducted by providing the unsuccessful offeror with copies of the source selection decision document and those portions of the PAR that relate to the offeror's proposal. The contracting officer may then permit the offeror to submit written questions. When written questions are permitted, they shall be answered promptly.

**BB-318[7] Lessons learned.**

Following contract award, personnel responsible for the requirement shall determine if publishing a lessons learned report would benefit the source selection process. These reports should contain no source selection or proprietary information, no reference to the specific program involved, and be limited to pertinent issues that may be beneficial to future source selection actions and planning. The report (if prepared) should be provided to SAF/AQCP through the MAJCOM within eight weeks after the source selection decision is announced.

**BB-319[8] Security requirements.**

The SSET shall develop security procedures covering the entire source selection process (i.e., locking containers and safes for classified, personnel clearances when required, telephone usage, storage and disposal of source selection generated data which include proposals, etc.).

**PART 4 - SOURCE SELECTION DOCUMENTATION AND RELEASE OF INFORMATION**

**BB-401 General.**

This part provides guidance on the treatment of source selection documentation and the release of source selection information.

- (a) FAR 3.104 implements Section 27 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 423) as amended by subsequent National Defense Authorization Acts.
- (b) FAR Subpart 4.8 prescribes requirements for establishing, maintaining, and disposing of contract files, including source selection related documentation.
- (c) DODD 5500.7, Standards of Conduct, sets forth standards of conduct for Air Force personnel, including circumstances relating to business relationships.

**BB-402 Source selection records.**

(a) Source selection records include source selection information, as defined in FAR 3.104, and other documents that have a direct relationship to the source selection. Source selection information must be protected and appropriately marked in accordance with FAR 3.104. Instructions for protecting source selection information are provided in BB-403. Source selection records include, but are not limited to, the following documents:

- (1) Any directions from headquarters regarding the requirement;

APPENDIX BB— SOURCE SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR OTHER THAN MAJOR ACQUISITIONS

- (2) If held, Acquisition Strategy Panel presentations (view graphs and text) and minutes;
- (3) Source list screening criteria and the results of the screening, including justification(s) for not issuing a solicitation to specific sources;
- (4) The approved Source Selection Plan;
- (5) SSA delegation request and SSET chairperson nomination request;
- (6) Evaluation criteria (as contained in the RFP);
- \*(7) Numerical weights assigned to the evaluation criteria (if used) and evaluation standards;
- \*(8) All orders or other documentation formally establishing SSET members and amendments to these documents;
- (9) Messages and other notices notifying SSET and other source selection personnel of meetings;
- (10) Record of attendance and a summary of proceedings of any pre-proposal conference;
- (11) Request for proposal;
- \*(12) All proposals and amendments or alternative proposals submitted by each offeror, including a summary of any oral presentation made directly to the SSET;
- \*(13) Evaluation reports including narrative assessments and cost (price) analysis;
- \*(14) **Evaluation Notices (ENs)** Deficiency reports, clarification requests, and offerors' responses;
- \*(15) Any correspondence sent to offerors by the SSET during the evaluation and the responses to the correspondence;
- \*(16) Company specific past performance information;
- (17) All performance data and documentation used to arrive at performance risk assessment;
- (18) The Proposal Analysis Report and attachments;
- \*(19) All source selection presentations (view graphs and text);
- (20) Source Selection Decision Document;
- (21) Lessons learned report;
- (22) Records of attendance at source selection decision briefings;
- (23) Schedules of source selection meetings; and

APPENDIX BB— SOURCE SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR OTHER THAN MAJOR ACQUISITIONS

---

(24) Source Selection Information Briefing Certificates (see Attachment BB-10).

\* Normally will require continued protection after contract award.

(b) The establishment of source selection records does not eliminate the requirement for maintaining official contract files required in FAR Subpart 4.8. It is always necessary to protect source selection sensitive records to prevent unauthorized access or release to the public. Because there are separate tables and rules for each category in AFI 37-122, Air Force Records Management Program, the location of all documents shall be noted by use of a cross-reference index in the official contract file.

**BB-403 Protecting source selection records.**

(a) In order to maintain the effectiveness and integrity of the source selection process, all information related to the source selection must be handled with the utmost discretion to avoid any compromise.

(b) While the source selection is in process, disclosure of source selection information is the exclusive responsibility of the SSA and the contracting officer (see FAR 3.104). After contract award, this authority is vested in the responsible PEO, DAC, or contracting activity commander for the specific contract or records involved. The responsible official may delegate authority to grant access *but*, authority to release source selection information is nondelegable. Requests for access to or release of source selection information and the authorizations granting access or release must be in writing.

(1) Access is defined as receiving a source selection record or the information in a source selection record or being permitted to view a source selection record if the record is not physically retained by the requester.

(2) Release is defined as permitting a copy of a source selection document to be physically retained by the requester.

(c) In addition to the marking requirements in FAR 3.104, source selection information must also be protected and marked "For Official Use Only (FOUO)." The cover sheet format in Attachment BB-11 may be reproduced and used as appropriate. The cover sheet should be printed on yellow paper when available. Classified source selection documents must also be marked and protected as required by DODI 5200.1-R/AFPDPD 31-4, Information Security Program.

(d) All persons involved in the source selection process (including non-Government advisors and administrative personnel) will be required to execute a "Source Selection Information Briefing Certificate" before they are given access to source selection information. The SSET chairperson shall ensure that the certificates from all source selection team members, including SSET members, are collected and filed with the source selection records. (See Attachment BB-10 for the certificate format.)

(1) Only individuals who have a strict need-to-know and have signed the proper certification may have access to source selection information. Need-to-know must be clearly established before any individual or activity is afforded access to or release of source selection information while the source selection is in process or for a specific record after contract award.

(2) Under no circumstances will any advisor or member of the SSET or any other person having access to source selection information discuss the proceedings with any individual not a member of the source selection organization, except as authorized in this appendix.

APPENDIX BB— SOURCE SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR OTHER THAN MAJOR ACQUISITIONS

---

(3) Any unauthorized disclosure or release of source selection information will be investigated and, as appropriate, treated under disciplinary procedures authorized by law or administrative procedures.

(e) Access to source selection sensitive information must be strictly controlled at all organizational levels. Access does not automatically extend to other individuals in the organizational chain of command of the individuals who are involved in the source selection.

(1) If the SSA desires to provide information to persons at higher organizational levels, each of those individuals must complete the certificate (see Attachment BB-10) and send it to the contracting officer to include in the source selection records.

(2) At the MAJCOM level, the MAJCOM Chief of Contracting is responsible for controlling access to source selection information.

(f) Even when source selection information falls within the categories of materials that may be withheld from public disclosure (i.e., a Proposal Analysis Report), each document, or portion of each document, must have an independent basis for exemption.

(1) Any questions regarding public disclosure of information should be considered on a case-by-case basis and should be referred to the appropriate Freedom of Information Act advisors.

(2) Documents that would otherwise be exempt from disclosure may be subject to disclosure when incorporated by reference in a nonexempt document (i.e., when a source selection document is incorporated by reference in the resulting contract). Such data normally is releasable following contract award unless there is a compelling reason to deny release (i.e., if it contains classified information).

(g) When a protest, before or after contract award, has been lodged to the General Accounting Office (GAO), General Services Board of Contract Appeals (GSBCA), or other level in which the Secretariat or HQ USAF is involved, any and all pertinent source selection documents shall be forwarded to SAF/AQCX in accordance with Subpart 5333.1.

(h) Requests for source selection information by Congress or the General Accounting Office (GAO) will be processed under AFPD 90-21/AFI 90-201, Air Force Relations with Congress, and AFI 65-401, Air Force Relations with the General Accounting Office (GAO). These activities must be informed of the restriction against public disclosure of confidential or proprietary information provided by offerors. DOD and Air Force activities, such as the Inspector General (IG), auditor, and other specially appointed activities must also obtain written authority for access or release in accordance with this appendix.

**NOTE: Attachments have not been revised to reflect the new FAR 15 Rewrite. The attachments are intended for use as samples only, and may be modified as necessary to comply with FAR 15 and the revised text contained within this Appendix.**