

CHAPTER 3: EVALUATION AND DECISION PROCESS

Parent topic: [APPENDIX - AA ARMY SOURCE SELECTION SUPPLEMENT](#)

3.1 Evaluation Activities

While the specific evaluation processes and tasks will vary between source selections, the basic objective remains constant - **to provide the SSA with the information needed to make an informed and reasoned selection.** Towards this end, the evaluators will identify strengths, weaknesses, deficiencies, risks, and uncertainties applicable to each proposal. The process of identifying these findings is crucial to the competitive range determination, the conduct of meaningful discussions and debriefings, and the tradeoff analysis described in the Source Selection Decision Document (SSDD).

Reminder: The SSEB **shall not** perform comparative analysis of proposals or make source selection recommendations unless requested by the SSA (Reference DOD Source Selection Procedures 1.4.4.4.3).

While the below steps are identified in a linear manner, the process is actually iterative and some of the steps may be taken concurrently. Except where noted, these steps apply to the evaluation of both the cost and non-cost factors. The groups responsible for evaluating past performance, other non-cost factors, and cost/price normally perform their evaluations in parallel. The PCO and SSEB Chairperson shall ensure that the evaluation of each proposal is performed in a fair, integrated and comprehensive manner.

Best Practice: Identify acquisition teams at the requirements development phase and provide comprehensive training on the entire process, from acquisition planning through source selection decision. Provide SSEB training covering the final RFP and SSP approximately one to two weeks prior to receipt of proposals.

Step 1: Conduct SSEB Training - Prior to receipt of proposals, each evaluator must become familiar with all pertinent documents (e.g., the RFP and SSP). Training shall be conducted by the PCO, with the assistance of Legal Counsel, and include an overview of these documents and the source selection process. Training will provide a detailed focus on how to properly document each proposal's strengths, weaknesses, uncertainties, risks, and deficiencies. The training will be based on the contents of the DoD Source Selection Procedures and this supplement, and shall also include ethics / procurement integrity training and protection of source selection information. This training is especially crucial when evaluators do not have prior source selection evaluation experience.

Step 2: Perform Initial Screening of Proposals - Upon receipt of proposals, the PCO or designee shall conduct an initial screening to ensure offerors' proposals comply with the RFP instructions for submission of all required information, including electronic media, in the quantities and format specified in the RFP. Figure 3-1 is an extract of a sample proposal screening checklist that may be used to accomplish this initial screening and should be tailored to match the specific proposal submission requirements of the RFP.

A key aspect of this step is to also screen proposals for any exceptions taken by offerors to the terms and conditions as set forth within the RFP.

TAB	TECHNICAL PROPOSAL	Circle Applicable Response
1: Executive Summary	Does this tab include a brief synopsis of the technical proposal? Does it identify the offeror's proposed teaming partners and/or subcontractors and discuss the nature and extent of their proposed involvement in satisfying the Government's requirements? Is a letter of commitment from each proposed team member and key subcontractor included at this tab?	Y / N Y / N Y / N
2: Matrix	Does this tab include a matrix which cross-references the proposal and Volume 1 RFP paragraphs (at least all titled paragraphs)?	Y / N
3: Exceptions	Are any exceptions identified at this tab?	Y / N
4: Install/ Modify/ Terminate and Restore Service	Does this tab address paragraph 2.1 of the RFP? Is there a description of the format and content of a typical service restoration plan (as required by PWS para 2.1.5.a)?	Y / N
5: Customer Coordination	Does this tab include a detailed description of the proposed customer coordination services....	Y / N

Figure 3-1 : Sample Proposal Screening Checklist (Extract)

Step 3: Sharing of Cost/Price Information - The SSEB Chairperson and PCO, in coordination with the SSA, shall determine whether cost information will be provided to the technical evaluators, when and what information shall be provided, and under what conditions. The SSEB Chairperson and PCO shall ensure the Small Business Participation evaluation team verifies the total proposed price (not individual cost elements), and any subcontracting information with the Cost/Price team. This will ensure the dollar amounts are consistent with what is being proposed in the Small Business Participation Plan.

Step 4: Conduct Initial Evaluation - Evaluators will independently read and evaluate the offeror's proposal against the criteria identified in the RFP and SSP, document their initial evaluation findings (e.g., strengths, weaknesses, deficiencies, risks and uncertainties), and draft proposed ENs for each finding to be addressed.

Step 5: Identify and Document Areas of the Proposal That May Be Resolvable

Through Clarifications or Communications - If information is required to enhance the Government's understanding of the proposal, the PCO may request amplification and other information from the offeror by means of the clarification or communication process. The PCO should engage the legal advisor prior to conducting this process. See Figure 3-3 for a detailed

discussion of the differences between clarifications, communications, and discussions.

Step 6 : Assign Ratings for Non -Cost Evaluation Factors When Using the Tradeoff Process

- At this point, the evaluators may or may not individually assign ratings to each evaluation factor or subfactor for which they are responsible. At a minimum, each evaluation team (factor, subfactor) must convene to discuss the offeror's proposal. The purpose of the discussion is to share their views on the offeror's strengths, weaknesses, deficiencies, risks, and uncertainties related to their assigned evaluation factor(s) / subfactor(s), and to reach a team consensus on findings and rating as appropriate.

Note: Ratings must be supported by evaluation findings and narrative statements.

Consensus requires a meeting of the minds on the assigned rating and associated deficiencies, strengths, weaknesses, uncertainties and risks. *Note* : A simple averaging of the individual evaluation results does not constitute consensus.

In exceptional cases where the evaluators are unable to reach consensus without unreasonably delaying the source selection process, the evaluation report shall include the majority conclusion and the dissenting view(s), in the form of a minority opinion, with supporting rationale. The report must be briefed to the SSAC (if used) and the SSA.

Step 7: Finalize ENs - ENs will include deficiencies, significant weaknesses, weaknesses (and any uncertainties not resolved through clarifications or communications) as well as ENs for strengths, if dictated by the SSP.

Step 8: Prepare Summary Evaluation Reports for Each Factor - Each Factor Chair will prepare a summary report for their respective factor which provides a discussion of their associated findings. These reports will help form the Summary SSEB Evaluation Report, and must be prepared at each phase of the process: initial, interim, and final evaluations.

Step 9: Prepare a Summary SSEB Evaluation Report - The final step is for the SSEB Chairperson to prepare a summary report for each proposal that includes the evaluated price, the rating for each evaluation factor and subfactor, and a discussion of the associated findings (strengths, weaknesses, deficiencies, risks, and uncertainties). A Summary SSEB Evaluation Report must be prepared at each stage of the process: initial, interim, and final evaluations.

Cost or Price Evaluation

Figure 3-2 below provides a side-by-side comparison of what price analysis, cost analysis, and cost realism analysis should consist of and when they must be used. For detailed instructions and professional guidance on how to conduct these analyses, refer to FAR 15.4, and the Army Cost and Price Portal on the ODASA(P) Procurement.Army.Mil Knowledge Management Portal.

Price Analysis

Cost Analysis

Cost Realism Analysis

What is it?

The process of examining and evaluating an offeror's proposed price to determine if it is fair and reasonable without evaluating its separate cost elements and proposed profit/fee. Price analysis always involves some type of comparison with other prices; e.g., comparing an offeror's proposed price with the proposed prices of competing offerors or with previously proposed prices for the same or similar items.

The review and evaluation of the separate cost elements in an offeror's proposal and the application of judgment to determine how well the proposed costs represent what the cost of the contract should be, assuming reasonable economy and efficiency.

The process of independently evaluating specific elements of each offeror's cost estimate to determine whether the estimated cost elements are: realistic for the work to be performed; reflect a clear understanding of the requirements; and consistent with the unique methods of performance and materials described in the Offeror's technical proposal. The probable cost estimate is a product of a cost realism analysis.

When must you perform it?

When cost and pricing data is not required to determine if the overall price is fair and reasonable. Price realism may be performed to determine that the price offered is consistent with the effort proposed.

When Certified Cost or Pricing Data has been submitted. When Data Other Than Certified Cost or Pricing Data is submitted if being evaluated for cost reasonableness or cost realism. May also be used when a fair and reasonable price cannot be determined through price alone. (See FAR 15.404-1(a)(4).

When cost-reimbursement contracts are anticipated. Also you may use it on fixed price (FP) incentive contracts or, in exceptional cases, on other competitive FP contracts when the Offerors may not fully understand new requirements, there are quality concerns, or past experience indicates contractors' proposed costs have resulted in quality/service shortfalls. However, when cost realism analysis is performed on FP contracts, proposals shall be evaluated using the criteria in the solicitation, and the offered prices shall not be adjusted as a result of the analysis.

Figure 3-2 : Comparison of Price, Cost, and Cost Realism Analysis

The following are some general evaluation guidelines and recommendations for evaluating cost/price:

The Independent Government Cost Estimate (IGCE) may play a key role in cost/price analysis. It serves as a benchmark for price analysis and in cost realism, it may also serve as a benchmark for individual cost elements. The IGCE must contain a rationale for how it was developed, (e.g., what estimating tools were used and what assumptions were made), in order to properly evaluate cost/price.

With the approval of the SSEB Chairperson and the PCO, the cost/price evaluators should coordinate with the non-cost Factor/Functional Team Leads as necessary to ensure consistency between the proposed costs/prices and other portions of the proposal. This interchange between SSEB factor teams is part of the initial validation exercise and should be continued throughout the evaluation process to ensure that interrelationships are promptly identified and the evaluation findings reflect their recognition. For example, the technical evaluation may reveal areas where each offeror's approach is inadequate or its resourcing unrealistic, given the proposed approach. The technical evaluators and the cost evaluators should crosswalk technical deficiencies and weaknesses and their impact on cost to ensure proper adjustments can be made to the proposed costs.

When conducting price analysis, consider not only the total price, including options, but also the prices for the individual Contract Line Items to ensure they are not unbalanced. Unbalanced pricing exists when the price of one or more contract line items is significantly over or understated as indicated by the application of cost/price analysis techniques. The PCO with concurrence of the SSA (and if permitted by the RFP) may reject the offer if they determine that this poses an unacceptable risk to the Government. For more information on unbalanced pricing, see FAR 15.404-1(g).

For fixed-price contracts, the evaluation can be as simple as consideration of adequate price competition and ensuring prices are fair and reasonable. For cost-reimbursement contracts, you must analyze the offerors' estimated costs for both realism and reasonableness. In a competitive environment, the cost realism analysis enables you to determine each offeror's probable cost of performance. This precludes an award decision based on an overly optimistic cost estimate.

Technical Evaluation

The **Army methodology for evaluating Technical Approach and Related Risk is Methodology 2: Combined Technical/Risk Rating** (Reference DOD Source Selection Procedures 3.1.2. 2). This methodology provides the most flexibility and least complexity in the rating process, in conducting of the comparative analysis, and best value subjective tradeoff analysis process.

Past Performance Evaluation

In past performance evaluations, you examine the offeror's performance record on similar contract efforts, and use the information to predict the probability the offeror will successfully perform under your contract. It is important to understand the difference between an offeror's experience and its past performance - experience is **what** (work) the offeror has done, and past performance is **how well** the offeror did it.

FAR Parts 9, 12, 15, 36 and 42 contain regulatory policies related to the evaluation of past performance. FAR Part 36 provides specific procedures, forms, and thresholds for evaluation of Architect & Engineering and construction acquisitions. Additionally, the Office of Federal

Procurement Policy (OFPP) and DOD have published the following guides that pertain to the evaluation of past performance information:

OFPP Guide: Best Practices for Collecting and Using Current and Past Performance Information

DOD Guide: A Guide to Collection and Use of Past Performance Information

Recency. No Army Text.

Relevance. A helpful tool to consider using to assist in determining/verifying the relevancy of a contract reference is to locate and review the contract and requirements in Electronic Document Access (EDA). *Note:* EDA requires user registration within the Wide Area Workflow suite of tools. To ensure your ability to access contract records, complete this process well in advance of SSEB. (Reference DOD Source Selection Procedures 3.1.3.1.2)

Quality of Products or Services. No Army Text.

Sources of Past Performance Information . Where possible, use past performance information available from Government-wide and agency-wide databases. Use of such information will help to expedite and streamline the evaluation process.

If possible, contact two points of contact on each contract effort selected for in-depth review. The PCOs, CORs, Fee Determining Officials, and program management office representatives are often excellent sources of information.

If multiple points of contact are providing past performance information on contract (for example, the PCO and PM), arrange for submission of consolidated input from these sources. This may remove the need for the evaluation team to reconcile variances in past performance information submitted.

In assessing the feedback, pay particular attention to the source of that feedback and their familiarity with the requirements of the contract being assessed. For example, end users may be unfamiliar with the contract requirements or certain issues, and resolution arising from contract performance may not be apparent to them.

The agency has an obligation to consider information that has a bearing on an offeror's past performance, if the SST is aware of (or should have been aware of) the information. For example, an agency may not ignore contract performance by an offeror involving the same agency, the same services, and/or the same PCO, simply because an agency official fails to complete the necessary assessments or documentation. Consult legal counsel on how to address this type of information.

Addressing Adverse Past Performance Information. When adverse past performance is obtained, as appropriate, contact the respective point of contact for that contract to obtain further information about the circumstances surrounding the situation. Additionally, and when practical, contact at least one other individual to get a second perspective on the offeror's performance on the subject acquisition. Consider the context of the performance problems, any mitigating circumstances, the number and severity of the problems, the demonstrated effectiveness of corrective actions taken, and the overall work record.

If there is past performance information that adversely impacts an offeror's proposal assessment, provide the offeror an opportunity to address any such information on which it has not had a previous opportunity to comment. This opportunity may occur during clarifications, communications, or discussions, depending upon whether discussions are anticipated.

When addressing adverse past performance information, identify the contract, but do not identify the name of the individual who provided the information. Summarize the problem(s) with sufficient detail to give the offeror a reasonable opportunity to respond.

NOTE : Past performance is considered a responsibility-type evaluation factor for purposes of SBA's Certificate of Competency (COC) program. FAR 19.602-1(a) requires agencies to refer a finding of non-responsibility to the SBA if the determination would preclude award. Therefore, if the PCO refuses to consider a small business concern for award after evaluating the concern's past performance on a non-comparative basis (e.g., a pass/fail, go/no go, or acceptable/unacceptable), the matter must be referred to the SBA. Alternatively, when using the trade-off process, the government may use traditional responsibility factors such as past performance as technical evaluation factors where a comparative evaluation of those areas will be performed as opposed to a pass/fail basis. In this case SBA referral is not required because the evaluation of past performance is part of a comparative, best value evaluation and not a responsibility determination.

Small Business Evaluation

The Army methodology for rating the Small Business Participation Factor is to utilize the DoD Source Selection Procedures rating scheme for Small Business Participation (see DoD Source Selection Procedures 3.1.4.1.2 - Table 6). Acceptable/ Unacceptable (Pass/Fail) rating schemes are the least preferred method of evaluating small business participation in best value source selections. This rating scheme does not allow evaluators to give higher ratings to offerors that significantly exceed the stated small business goals or submit proof of binding agreements with small businesses, and therefore are discouraged.

Additionally, Small Business Past Performance should be considered, and in some cases is required (see FAR 15.304(c)(3)(ii) DOD Deviation). In looking at Small Business Past Performance, the Government evaluates how well the offeror has performed on achieving its small business goals. Remember that this should only be evaluated against large businesses in their compliance of FAR 52.219-9. *For example, the Government may request e lectronic Subcontracting Reporting System (eSRS) information.*

Note: Although DFARS PGI 215.304 provides an example that indicates evaluation of Past Performance compliance within a separate Small Business Participation Factor, it may be evaluated instead under the Past Performance Factor, ***but not in both factors*** .

Small Business offerors proposing on unrestricted requirements are not held to the requirements of FAR 52.219-14 Limitations on Subcontracting because the clause is applicable to small business set-aside procurements only. However, small business offerors should meet the small business participation factor goals through performance as a prime small business or a combination of performance and small business subcontracting.

Types of Exchanges

After receipt of proposals, there are three types of exchanges that may occur between the Government and offerors -- clarifications, communications and negotiations / discussions. They differ on when they occur, their purpose and scope, and whether offerors are allowed to revise their proposals as a result of the exchanges. ***All SSEB exchanges must be accomplished through the use of ENs*** .

Clarifications

Communications

Negotiations/Discussions

<p>When They Occur</p>	<p>Limited exchanges, between the Government and offerors when award WITHOUT discussions is contemplated NOTE: Award may be made without discussions if the solicitation announces that the government intends to evaluate proposals and make award without discussions.</p>	<p>After receipt of proposals, leading to the establishment of the competitive range of offerors with which the government intends to conduct discussions May only be held with those offerors (other than offerors under FAR 15.306 (b)(1)(i)) whose exclusion from the competitive range is uncertain.</p>	<p>After establishing the competitive range NOTE: The term “negotiations” applies to both competitive and non-competitive acquisitions. In competitive acquisitions, negotiations are also called discussions.</p>
<p>Scope of the Exchanges</p>	<p>Most limited of the three types of exchanges. Clarifications are not required to be held with all offerors.</p>	<p>Limited; similar to fact finding</p>	<p>Most detailed and extensive. When conducting discussions with one offeror must conduct with all offerors in the competitive range.</p>
<p>Purpose</p>	<p>To clarify certain aspects of proposals</p>	<p>To enhance the Government’s understanding of the proposal by addressing issues that must be explored to allow a reasonable interpretation of the offeror’s proposal to determine whether a proposal should be placed in the competitive range</p>	<p>To allow the offeror an opportunity to revise its proposal so that the Government obtains the best value, based on the requirement and applicable evaluation factors</p>

Examples of Topics of Exchanges	Relevance of an offeror's past performance Adverse past performance information Resolution of minor or clerical errors	Address issues that must be explored to determine whether a proposal should be placed in the competitive range Ambiguities or other concerns (e.g., perceived deficiencies, weaknesses, errors, omissions, or mistakes) Relevance of an offeror's past performance Adverse past performance information	Examples of potential discussion topics include the identification of all evaluated deficiencies, significant weaknesses, and any adverse past performance information to which the offeror has not yet had an opportunity to respond. Additionally, it is a best practice to identify strengths and significant strengths to ensure that the offeror does not remove when submitting the FPR. Finally, the PCO may inform the Offeror that its price is too low or too high with the basis of these conclusions.
Are Resultant Proposal Revisions Allowed?	No	No	Yes

Figure 3-3: Comparison of Types of Exchanges (After Receipt of Proposals)

Conducting Exchanges with Offerors

The PCO controls all exchanges with Offerors. Before participating in any exchanges, the PCO shall review the ground rules with the team members. During exchanges with offerors, the Government may not:

Favor one offeror over another;

Reveal an offeror's technical solution to another offeror;

Reveal an offeror's price to another offeror without that offeror's permission;

Knowingly disclose source selection information, or reveal the name of individuals providing past performance information;

Reveal source selection information in violation of statutory and regulatory requirements.

3.2 Documentation of Initial Evaluation Results

Visit the ODASA(P) Procurement.Army.Mil Knowledge Management Portal for Army Source Selection evaluation / report templates and samples.

3.3 Award Without Discussions

Reminder: Discussions should be conducted for all acquisitions with an estimated value of \$100 million or more. ***Award without discussions on complex, large procurements is discouraged and seldom in the Government's best interest.*** (Reference DFARS 215.306 and DOD Source Selection Procedures 3.2.3)

3.4 Competitive Range Decision Document - No Army Text

3.5 Discussion Process

Competitive Range

If the competitive range is further reduced for purposes of efficiency, the basis for this reduction must be adequately documented. Considerations for further restricting competition may include expected dollar value of the award, complexity of the acquisition and solutions proposed, and extent of available resources.

Note: Predetermined cut-off ratings (e.g., setting a minimum rating) or identifying a predetermined number of offerors that will be included in the competitive range must not be established. The government may not limit a competitive range for the purposes of efficiency on the basis of technical scores alone.

The PCO, with approval of the SSA, should continually reassess the competitive range as discussions and evaluations continue to ensure neither the Government nor the offerors waste resources by keeping proposals in that are no longer contenders for award.

Discussions

The Government's objectives shall be fully documented in the prenegotiation objective memorandum (POM) prior to entering into discussions (see FAR 15.406-1, DFARS PGI 215.406-1).

Meaningful discussions do not include advising the individual offerors on how to revise their proposal nor does it include information on how their proposal compares to other offerors' proposals.

Additionally, discussions must not be misleading. An agency may not inadvertently mislead an offeror, through the framing of a discussion question, into responding in a manner that does not address the agency's concerns; or that misinforms the offeror concerning its proposal weaknesses or deficiencies; or the government's requirements.

3.6 Final Proposal Revisions - No Army Text

3.7 Documentation of Final Evaluation Results

At the request of the SSA, the SSAC and/or SSEB members may also present the evaluation results by means of one or more briefings. Figure 3-4 illustrates a sample format for the briefing. The documentation should be clear and concise and should cross-reference, rather than repeat, information in existing documents as much as possible (e.g., the SSP, evaluation team reports, etc.). In rare occasions, if the SSA identifies concerns with the evaluation findings and/or analysis, the SSA may require the SSEB and/or SSAC to conduct a re-evaluation and/or analysis to address these concerns. ***The evaluation results shall clearly be documented in the Price Negotiation Memorandum (PNM). (See FAR 15.406-3, DFARS PGI 215.406-3)***

OFFEROR	TECHNICAL EVALUATION	PAST PERFORMANCE CONFIDENCE	SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION	TOTAL EVALUATED PRICE
A	Outstanding	Substantial Confidence	Good	\$171,503,971
B	Outstanding	Limited Confidence	Good	\$134,983,305
C	Good	Limited Confidence	Outstanding	\$120,976,836
D	Outstanding	Limited Confidence	Outstanding	\$150,840,308
E	Acceptable	Substantial Confidence	Acceptable	\$115,751,933

Figure 3-4: Sample Proposal Evaluation Matrix

3.8 Conduct and Document the Comparative Analysis

When performing the comparative analysis, the SSAC will consider each offeror’s total evaluated price and the discriminators in the non-cost ratings as indicated by the SSEB’s evaluation findings for each offeror. Consider these differences in light of the ***relative importance(or weight)assigned to each evaluation factor*** .

3.9 Best-Value Decision - No Army Text

3.10 Source Selection Decision Document - No Army Text

3.11 Debriefings - See Appendix A

3.12 Integrating Proposal into the Contract

When planning the acquisition/source selection, coordinate closely with legal counsel to select the best method to incorporate beneficial aspects or above-threshold performance. The following methods may be considered:

Use of Attachment. Beneficial aspects can be captured in a separate document attached to the PWS which clearly defines the changes to requirements based on specific beneficial aspects but leaves the original PWS untouched. This is particularly true for those items cited to or emphasized in the SSDD and reflects the benefit(s) provided and supports a price premium paid by the Government.

Section C PWS/S tatement of Work (S OW) , System Specifications, Section H - Special Contract Requirements, or Other. Above-threshold performance may be captured within the PWS/SOW, System Specifications, Section H - Special Contract Requirements, or otherwise captured in the contract document, depending upon what is proposed. If using this method, care must be executed not to permanently increase the Government's requirements in future RFPs unless it is an intentional decision on the part of the organization to do so.

Best Practice: Use of the foregoing methodology which points to the above-threshold performance or significant strength vice a PWS addendum may be preferred due to the possibility of inadvertent inclusion in subsequent contracts (causing requirements creep). The intent is not to increase the Government's minimum requirements, but to hold a particular Offeror to their proposal. *(The Government may later determine that the minimum requirement should include the higher performance and include it at time of re -compete).*

Model Contract Process. The RFP should discuss the model contract process (if used) in Section L (or equivalent), to ensure that offerors know that they will be contractually-bound to their proposed above-threshold performance. Include language in the RFP describing how the Government will capture the promised above-threshold performance prior to award. Above-threshold performance and significant strengths the Government expects to capture in the contract should be addressed with the offerors during the discussions process. When used, model contracts are typically sent to offerors prior to closing discussions and submission of Final Proposal Revisions (FPRs) to include the above-threshold performance that will be captured upon contract award, thereby ensuring that all parties are aware of what is expected of the prospective awardee. Caution must be exercised that the correct proposed above-threshold performance is carefully assigned per each model contract, by offeror. Ensure final narrative is consistent with the letter to the offeror requesting the FPR.

Incorporation of Portions of Offeror's Technical Proposal by Reference. The RFP should advise offerors that any part of their proposal can be incorporated by reference. Only incorporate those portions of an offeror's technical proposal that provide benefit to the Government.

Awarding the Contract(s)

After the SSA has signed the source selection decision document, the PCO will execute and distribute the contract(s). Congressional notification may be required IAW FAR 5.303 and AFARS 5105.303 , Announcement of Contract Awards . For Section 8(A) Set-Asides, the SBA shall be notified IAW FAR 19.804. For Small Business Programs, the apparent unsuccessful offerors shall be provided the preaward notice required by FAR 15.503.

Notification to Unsuccessful Offerors

The PCO must notify unsuccessful offerors in writing after contract award or whenever their proposals are eliminated from the competition within the timeframe identified in Figure 3-5 below. This chart provides a side-by-side comparison of the differences between preaward and postaward notices. The type of information that must be included in the notice will depend upon whether it is sent before or after contract award.

	PREAWARD NOTICE FAR 15.503(a)	POSTAWARD NOTICE FAR 15.503(b)
Who Must be Notified?	Any offeror whose proposal was excluded from the competitive range or otherwise eliminated from the competition before contract award.	Any offeror whose proposal was in the competitive range but was not selected for award or who had not received a preaward notice.
When Must it be Sent?	Promptly after the offeror’s proposal was eliminated from the competition.	Within three days after the date of contract award.
What is Included in the Notice?	<p>A summary of the basis for the determination</p> <p>A statement that the Government will not consider any further proposal revisions from the offeror.</p> <p>NOTE: Small business offerors are entitled to additional information as well as the timelines associated with small business offerors as described at FAR Part 15.503(a)(2) and FAR Part 19.302(d).</p> <p>After contract award and upon request from an offeror who previously received a preaward notice, the PCO must provide the Offeror the information normally provided as part of a postaward notice.</p>	<p>Number of offerors solicited;</p> <p>Number of proposals received;</p> <p>Name(s) and address(s) of awardee(s)</p> <p>Items, quantities, and unit prices of each awardee. However, unit prices may not be freely releasable under Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Therefore, PCOs should always consult legal counsel prior to disclosing unit prices.</p> <p>A summary of the reason(s) the Offeror’s proposal was not selected, unless the price information readily reveals the reason.</p> <p>Notice of right to request a debriefing.</p>

Figure 3-5: Comparison of Preaward and Postaward Notices