

of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act [Nov. 30, 1993].”

**§ 2305. Contracts: planning, solicitation, evaluation, and award procedures**

(a)(1)(A) In preparing for the procurement of property or services, the head of an agency shall—

- (i) specify the agency’s needs and solicit bids or proposals in a manner designed to achieve full and open competition for the procurement;
- (ii) use advance procurement planning and market research; and
- (iii) develop specifications in such manner as is necessary to obtain full and open competition with due regard to the nature of the property or services to be acquired.

(B) Each solicitation under this chapter shall include specifications which—

- (i) consistent with the provisions of this chapter, permit full and open competition; and
- (ii) include restrictive provisions or conditions only to the extent necessary to satisfy the needs of the agency or as authorized by law.

(C) For the purposes of subparagraphs (A) and (B), the type of specification included in a solicitation shall depend on the nature of the needs of the agency and the market available to satisfy such needs. Subject to such needs, specifications may be stated in terms of—

- (i) function, so that a variety of products or services may qualify;
- (ii) performance, including specifications of the range of acceptable characteristics or of the minimum acceptable standards; or
- (iii) design requirements.

(2) In addition to the specifications described in paragraph (1), a solicitation for sealed bids or competitive proposals (other than for a procurement for commercial items using special simplified procedures or a purchase for an amount not greater than the simplified acquisition threshold) shall at a minimum include—

(A) a statement of—

- (i) all significant factors and significant subfactors which the head of the agency reasonably expects to consider in evaluating sealed bids (including price) or competitive proposals (including cost or price, cost-related or price-related factors and subfactors, and noncost-related or nonprice-related factors and subfactors); and
- (ii) the relative importance assigned to each of those factors and subfactors; and

(B)(i) in the case of sealed bids—

(I) a statement that sealed bids will be evaluated without discussions with the bidders; and

(II) the time and place for the opening of the sealed bids; or

(ii) in the case of competitive proposals—

(I) either a statement that the proposals are intended to be evaluated with, and award made after, discussions with the offerors, or a statement that the proposals are intended to be evaluated, and award made, without

discussions with the offerors (other than discussions conducted for the purpose of minor clarification) unless discussions are determined to be necessary; and

(II) the time and place for submission of proposals.

(3)(A) In prescribing the evaluation factors to be included in each solicitation for competitive proposals, the head of an agency—

(i) shall (except as provided in subparagraph (C)) clearly establish the relative importance assigned to the evaluation factors and subfactors, including the quality of the product or services to be provided (including technical capability, management capability, prior experience, and past performance of the offeror);

(ii) shall (except as provided in subparagraph (C)) include cost or price to the Federal Government as an evaluation factor that must be considered in the evaluation of proposals; and

(iii) shall disclose to offerors whether all evaluation factors other than cost or price, when combined, are—

- (I) significantly more important than cost or price;
- (II) approximately equal in importance to cost or price; or
- (III) significantly less important than cost or price.

(B) The regulations implementing clause (iii) of subparagraph (A) may not define the terms “significantly more important” and “significantly less important” as specific numeric weights that would be applied uniformly to all solicitations or a class of solicitations.

(C) If the head of an agency issues a solicitation for multiple task or delivery order contracts under section 2304a(d)(1)(B) of this title for the same or similar services and intends to make a contract award to each qualifying offeror—

(i) cost or price to the Federal Government need not, at the Government’s discretion, be considered under clause (ii) of subparagraph (A) as an evaluation factor for the contract award; and

(ii) if, pursuant to clause (i), cost or price to the Federal Government is not considered as an evaluation factor for the contract award—

- (I) the disclosure requirement of clause (iii) of subparagraph (A) shall not apply; and
- (II) cost or price to the Federal Government shall be considered in conjunction with the issuance pursuant to section 2304c(b) of this title of a task or delivery order under any contract resulting from the solicitation.

(D) In subparagraph (C), the term “qualifying offeror” means an offeror that—

- (i) is determined to be a responsible source;
- (ii) submits a proposal that conforms to the requirements of the solicitation; and
- (iii) the contracting officer has no reason to believe would likely offer other than fair and reasonable pricing.

(E) Subparagraph (C) shall not apply to multiple task or delivery order contracts if the solicitation provides for sole source task or delivery order contracts pursuant to section 8(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a)).

(4) Nothing in this subsection prohibits an agency from—

(A) providing additional information in a solicitation, including numeric weights for all evaluation factors and subfactors on a case-by-case basis; or

(B) stating in a solicitation that award will be made to the offeror that meets the solicitation's mandatory requirements at the lowest cost or price.

(5) The head of an agency, in issuing a solicitation for a contract to be awarded using sealed bid procedures, may not include in such solicitation a clause providing for the evaluation of prices for options to purchase additional property or services under the contract unless the head of the agency has determined that there is a reasonable likelihood that the options will be exercised.

(b)(1) The head of an agency shall evaluate sealed bids and competitive proposals and make an award based solely on the factors specified in the solicitation.

(2) All sealed bids or competitive proposals received in response to a solicitation may be rejected if the head of the agency determines that such action is in the public interest.

(3) Sealed bids shall be opened publicly at the time and place stated in the solicitation. The head of the agency shall evaluate the bids in accordance with paragraph (1) without discussions with the bidders and, except as provided in paragraph (2), shall award a contract with reasonable promptness to the responsible bidder whose bid conforms to the solicitation and is most advantageous to the United States, considering only price and the other price-related factors included in the solicitation. The award of a contract shall be made by transmitting, in writing or by electronic means, notice of the award to the successful bidder. Within three days after the date of contract award, the head of the agency shall notify, in writing or by electronic means, each bidder not awarded the contract that the contract has been awarded.

(4)(A) The head of an agency shall evaluate competitive proposals in accordance with paragraph (1) and may award a contract—

(i) after discussions with the offerors, provided that written or oral discussions have been conducted with all responsible offerors who submit proposals within the competitive range; or

(ii) based on the proposals received, without discussions with the offerors (other than discussions conducted for the purpose of minor clarification) provided that the solicitation included a statement that proposals are intended to be evaluated, and award made, without discussions, unless discussions are determined to be necessary.

(B) If the contracting officer determines that the number of offerors that would otherwise be included in the competitive range under subparagraph (A)(i) exceeds the number at which an efficient competition can be conducted, the contracting officer may limit the number of proposals in the competitive range, in accordance with the criteria specified in the solicitation, to the greatest number that will permit an efficient

competition among the offerors rated most highly in accordance with such criteria.

(C) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the head of the agency shall award a contract with reasonable promptness to the responsible source whose proposal is most advantageous to the United States, considering only cost or price and the other factors included in the solicitation. The head of the agency shall award the contract by transmitting, in writing or by electronic means, notice of the award to such source and, within three days after the date of contract award, shall notify, in writing or by electronic means, all other offerors of the rejection of their proposals. This subparagraph does not apply with respect to the award of a contract for the acquisition of perishable subsistence items.

(5)(A) When a contract is awarded by the head of an agency on the basis of competitive proposals, an unsuccessful offeror, upon written request received by the agency within 3 days after the date on which the unsuccessful offeror receives the notification of the contract award, shall be debriefed and furnished the basis for the selection decision and contract award. The head of the agency shall debrief the offeror within, to the maximum extent practicable, five days after receipt of the request by the agency.

(B) The debriefing shall include, at a minimum—

(i) the agency's evaluation of the significant weak or deficient factors in the offeror's offer;

(ii) the overall evaluated cost and technical rating of the offer of the contractor awarded the contract and the overall evaluated cost and technical rating of the offer of the debriefed offeror;

(iii) the overall ranking of all offers;

(iv) a summary of the rationale for the award;

(v) in the case of a proposal that includes a commercial item that is an end item under the contract, the make and model of the item being provided in accordance with the offer of the contractor awarded the contract;

(vi) reasonable responses to relevant questions posed by the debriefed offeror as to whether source selection procedures set forth in the solicitation, applicable regulations, and other applicable authorities were followed by the agency; and

(vii) an opportunity for a disappointed offeror to submit, within two business days after receiving a post-award debriefing, additional questions related to the debriefing.

(C) The agency shall respond in writing to any additional question submitted under subparagraph (B)(vii) within five business days after receipt of the question. The agency shall not consider the debriefing to be concluded until the agency delivers its written responses to the disappointed offeror.

(D) The debriefing may not include point-by-point comparisons of the debriefed offeror's offer with other offers and may not disclose any information that is exempt from disclosure under section 552(b) of title 5.

(E) Each solicitation for competitive proposals shall include a statement that information described in subparagraph (B) may be disclosed in post-award debriefings.

(F) If, within one year after the date of the contract award and as a result of a successful procurement protest, the agency seeks to fulfill the requirement under the protested contract either on the basis of a new solicitation of offers or on the basis of new best and final offers requested for that contract, the agency shall make available to all offerors—

- (i) the information provided in debriefings under this paragraph regarding the offer of the contractor awarded the contract; and
- (ii) the same information that would have been provided to the original offerors.

(6)(A) When the contracting officer excludes an offeror submitting a competitive proposal from the competitive range (or otherwise excludes such an offeror from further consideration prior to the final source selection decision), the excluded offeror may request in writing, within three days after the date on which the excluded offeror receives notice of its exclusion, a debriefing prior to award. The contracting officer shall make every effort to debrief the unsuccessful offeror as soon as practicable but may refuse the request for a debriefing if it is not in the best interests of the Government to conduct a debriefing at that time.

(B) The contracting officer is required to debrief an excluded offeror in accordance with paragraph (5) only if that offeror requested and was refused a preaward debriefing under subparagraph (A).

(C) The debriefing conducted under subparagraph (A) shall include—

- (i) the executive agency's evaluation of the significant elements in the offeror's offer;
- (ii) a summary of the rationale for the offeror's exclusion; and
- (iii) reasonable responses to relevant questions posed by the debriefed offeror as to whether source selection procedures set forth in the solicitation, applicable regulations, and other applicable authorities were followed by the executive agency.

(D) The debriefing conducted under subparagraph (A) may not disclose the number or identity of other offerors and shall not disclose information about the content, ranking, or evaluation of other offerors' proposals.

(7) The contracting officer shall include a summary of any debriefing conducted under paragraph (5) or (6) in the contract file.

(8) The Federal Acquisition Regulation shall include a provision encouraging the use of alternative dispute resolution techniques to provide informal, expeditious, and inexpensive procedures for an offeror to consider using before filing a protest, prior to the award of a contract, of the exclusion of the offeror from the competitive range (or otherwise from further consideration) for that contract.

(9) If the head of an agency considers that a bid or proposal evidences a violation of the anti-trust laws, he shall refer the bid or proposal to the Attorney General for appropriate action.

(c) The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that before a contract for the delivery of supplies to the Department of Defense is entered into—

- (1) when the appropriate officials of the Department are making an assessment of the

most advantageous source for acquisition of the supplies (considering quality, price, delivery, and other factors), there is a review of the availability and cost of each item of supply—

(A) through the supply system of the Department of Defense; and

(B) under standard Government supply contracts, if the item is in a category of supplies defined under regulations of the Secretary of Defense as being potentially available under a standard Government supply contract; and

(2) there is a review of both the procurement history of the item and a description of the item, including, when necessary for an adequate description of the item, a picture, drawing, diagram, or other graphic representation of the item.

(d)(1)(A) The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that, in preparing a solicitation for the award of a development contract for a major system, the head of an agency consider requiring in the solicitation that an offeror include in its offer proposals described in subparagraph (B). In determining whether to require such proposals, the head of the agency shall give due consideration to the purposes for which the system is being procured and the technology necessary to meet the system's required capabilities. If such proposals are required, the head of the agency shall consider them in evaluating the offeror's price.

(B) Proposals referred to in the first sentence of subparagraph (A) are the following:

(i) Proposals to incorporate in the design of the major system items which are currently available within the supply system of the Federal agency responsible for the major system, available elsewhere in the national supply system, or commercially available from more than one source.

(ii) With respect to items that are likely to be required in substantial quantities during the system's service life, proposals to incorporate in the design of the major system items which the United States will be able to acquire competitively in the future.

(2)(A) The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that, in preparing a solicitation for the award of a production contract for a major system, the head of an agency consider requiring in the solicitation that an offeror include in its offer proposals described in subparagraph (B). In determining whether to require such proposals, the head of the agency shall give due consideration to the purposes for which the system is being procured and the technology necessary to meet the system's required capabilities. If such proposals are required, the head of the agency shall consider them in evaluating the offeror's price.

(B) Proposals referred to in the first sentence of subparagraph (A) are proposals identifying opportunities to ensure that the United States will be able to obtain on a competitive basis items procured in connection with the system that are likely to be reprocedured in substantial quantities during the service life of the system. Proposals submitted in response to such requirement may include the following:

- (i) Proposals to provide to the United States the right to use technical data to be provided

under the contract for competitive reprourement of the item, together with the cost to the United States, if any, of acquiring such technical data and the right to use such data.

(ii) Proposals for the qualification or development of multiple sources of supply for the item.

(3) If the head of an agency is making a non-competitive award of a development contract or a production contract for a major system, the factors specified in paragraphs (1) and (2) to be considered in evaluating an offer for a contract may be considered as objectives in negotiating the contract to be awarded. Such objectives may not impair the rights of prospective contractors or subcontractors otherwise provided by law.

(4)(A) Whenever the head of an agency requires that proposals described in paragraph (1)(B) or (2)(B) be submitted by an offeror in its offer, the offeror shall not be required to provide a proposal that enables the United States to acquire competitively in the future an identical item if the item was developed exclusively at private expense unless the head of the agency determines that—

(i) the original supplier of such item will be unable to satisfy program schedule or delivery requirements; or

(ii) proposals by the original supplier of such item to meet the mobilization requirements are insufficient to meet the agency's mobilization needs.

(B) In considering offers in response to a solicitation requiring proposals described in paragraph (1)(B) or (2)(B), the head of an agency shall base any evaluation of items developed exclusively at private expense on an analysis of the total value, in terms of innovative design, life-cycle costs, and other pertinent factors, of incorporating such items in the system.

(e) PROTEST FILE.—(1) If, in the case of a solicitation for a contract issued by, or an award or proposed award of a contract by, the head of an agency, a protest is filed pursuant to the procedures in subchapter V of chapter 35 of title 31 and an actual or prospective offeror so requests, a file of the protest shall be established by the procuring activity and reasonable access shall be provided to actual or prospective offerors.

(2) Information exempt from disclosure under section 552 of title 5 may be redacted in a file established pursuant to paragraph (1) unless an applicable protective order provides otherwise.

(f) AGENCY ACTIONS ON PROTESTS.—If, in connection with a protest, the head of an agency determines that a solicitation, proposed award, or award does not comply with the requirements of law or regulation, the head of the agency—

(1) may take any action set out in subparagraphs (A) through (F) of subsection (b)(1) of section 3554 of title 31; and

(2) may pay costs described in paragraph (1) of section 3554(c) of title 31 within the limits referred to in paragraph (2) of such section.

(g) PROHIBITION ON RELEASE OF CONTRACTOR PROPOSALS.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), a proposal in the possession or control of an agency named in section 2303 of this title may not be made available to any person under section 552 of title 5.

(2) Paragraph (1) does not apply to any proposal that is set forth or incorporated by reference in a contract entered into between the Department and the contractor that submitted the proposal.

(3) In this subsection, the term “proposal” means any proposal, including a technical, management, or cost proposal, submitted by a contractor in response to the requirements of a solicitation for a competitive proposal.

(Aug. 10, 1956, ch. 1041, 70A Stat. 130; Pub. L. 85–861, §1(44), Sept. 2, 1958, 72 Stat. 1457; Pub. L. 90–268, §3, Mar. 16, 1968, 82 Stat. 49; Pub. L. 98–369, div. B, title VII, §2723(b), July 18, 1984, 98 Stat. 1191; Pub. L. 98–525, title XII, §1213(a), Oct. 19, 1984, 98 Stat. 2591; Pub. L. 99–145, title XIII, §1303(a)(14), Nov. 8, 1985, 99 Stat. 739; Pub. L. 99–500, §101(c) [title X, §924(a), (b)], Oct. 18, 1986, 100 Stat. 1783–82, 1783–153, and Pub. L. 99–591, §101(c) [title X, §924(a), (b)], Oct. 30, 1986, 100 Stat. 3341–82, 3341–153; Pub. L. 99–661, div. A, title III, §313(b), title IX, formerly title IV, §924(a), (b), Nov. 14, 1986, 100 Stat. 3853, 3932, 3933, renumbered title IX, Pub. L. 100–26, §3(5), Apr. 21, 1987, 101 Stat. 273; Pub. L. 100–456, div. A, title VIII, §806, Sept. 29, 1988, 102 Stat. 2010; Pub. L. 101–189, div. A, title VIII, §853(f), Nov. 29, 1989, 103 Stat. 1519; Pub. L. 101–510, div. A, title VIII, §802(a)–(d), Nov. 5, 1990, 104 Stat. 1588, 1589; Pub. L. 103–160, div. A, title XI, §1182(a)(5), Nov. 30, 1993, 107 Stat. 1771; Pub. L. 103–355, title I, §§1011–1016, title IV, §4401(b), Oct. 13, 1994, 108 Stat. 3254–3257, 3347; Pub. L. 104–106, div. D, title XLI, §§4103(a), 4104(a), title XLII, §4202(a)(2), div. E, title LVI, §5601(a), Feb. 10, 1996, 110 Stat. 643, 644, 653, 699; Pub. L. 104–201, div. A, title VIII, §821(a), title X, §1074(a)(11), (b)(4)(A), Sept. 23, 1996, 110 Stat. 2609, 2659, 2660; Pub. L. 106–65, div. A, title VIII, §821, Oct. 5, 1999, 113 Stat. 714; Pub. L. 114–328, div. A, title VIII, §825(a), Dec. 23, 2016, 130 Stat. 2279; Pub. L. 115–91, div. A, title VIII, §818(b), Dec. 12, 2017, 131 Stat. 1463; Pub. L. 115–232, div. A, title VIII, §836(c)(3), Aug. 13, 2018, 132 Stat. 1864.)

AMENDMENT OF SECTION

*Pub. L. 115–232, div. A, title VIII, §836(c)(3), (h), Aug. 13, 2018, 132 Stat. 1864, 1874, provided that, effective Jan. 1, 2020, subject to a savings provision, this section is amended as follows:*

*(1) in subsection (a)(2), by striking “commercial items” and inserting “commercial products or commercial services”; and*

*(2) in subsection (b)(5)(B)(v), by striking “commercial item” and inserting “commercial product”.*

*See 2018 Amendment notes below.*

HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES  
1956 ACT

Revised section	Source (U.S. Code)	Source (Statutes at Large)
2305(a) .....	41:152 (less clause (b)).	Feb. 19, 1948, ch. 65, §2(d), 3, 62 Stat. 22.
2305(b) .....	41:152 (clause (b)).	
2305(c) .....	41:151(d).	

In subsection (a), the word “needed” is substituted for the words “necessary to meet the requirements”.

In subsection (b), the words “United States” are substituted for the word “Government”.

## 1958 ACT

Revised section	Source (U.S. Code)	Source (Statutes at Large)
2305 .....	41:152(c).	Aug. 9, 1955, ch. 628, § 15, 69 Stat. 551.

Reference to bids is omitted as surplusage (see opinion of the Judge Advocate General of the Army (JAGT 1956/9122, 21 Dec. 1956)). The word “attachments” is substituted for the words “material required”. The words “the specifications in” are inserted in the second sentence for clarity. The word “available” is omitted as covered by the word “accessible.” The words “no award may be made” are substituted for the words “and any award or awards made to any bidder in such case shall be invalidated and rejected”.

## CODIFICATION

Pub. L. 99-591 is a corrected version of Pub. L. 99-500.

## AMENDMENTS

2018—Subsec. (a)(2). Pub. L. 115-232, § 836(c)(3)(A), substituted “commercial products or commercial services” for “commercial items” in introductory provisions.

Subsec. (b)(5)(B)(v). Pub. L. 115-232, § 836(c)(3)(B), substituted “commercial product” for “commercial item”.

2017—Subsec. (b)(5)(B)(vii). Pub. L. 115-91, § 818(b)(2), added cl. (vii).

Subsec. (b)(5)(C) to (F). Pub. L. 115-91, § 818(b)(1), (3), added subpar. (C) and redesignated former subpars. (C) to (E) as (D) to (F), respectively.

2016—Subsec. (a)(3)(A)(i), (ii). Pub. L. 114-328, § 825(a)(1), inserted “(except as provided in subparagraph (C))” after “shall”.

Subsec. (a)(3)(C) to (E). Pub. L. 114-328, § 825(a)(2), added subpars. (C) to (E).

1999—Subsec. (g)(1). Pub. L. 106-65 substituted “an agency named in section 2303 of this title” for “the Department of Defense”.

1996—Subsec. (a)(2). Pub. L. 104-106, § 4202(a)(2), inserted “a procurement for commercial items using special simplified procedures or” after “(other than for”.

Subsec. (b)(4)(B). Pub. L. 104-106, § 4103(a)(3), added subpar. (B). Former subpar. (B) redesignated (C).

Pub. L. 104-106, § 4103(a)(1), transferred text of subpar. (C) to end of subpar. (B) and substituted “This subparagraph” for “Subparagraph (B)” at beginning of that text.

Subsec. (b)(4)(C). Pub. L. 104-106, § 4103(a)(2), redesignated subpar. (B) as (C).

Pub. L. 104-106, § 4103(a)(1), struck out “(C)” before “Subparagraph (B)” and transferred text of subpar. (C) to end of subpar. (B).

Subsec. (b)(5)(F). Pub. L. 104-106, § 4104(a)(1), struck out subpar. (F) which read as follows: “The contracting officer shall include a summary of the debriefing in the contract file.”

Subsec. (b)(6). Pub. L. 104-106, § 4104(a)(3), added par. (6). Former par. (6) redesignated (9).

Subsec. (b)(6)(B). Pub. L. 104-201, § 1074(a)(11)(A), struck out “of this section” after “paragraph (5)” and “of this paragraph” after “subparagraph (A)”.

Subsec. (b)(6)(C). Pub. L. 104-201, § 1074(a)(11)(B), substituted “subparagraph (A)” for “this subsection” in introductory provisions.

Subsec. (b)(6)(D). Pub. L. 104-201, § 1074(a)(11)(C), substituted “under subparagraph (A)” for “pursuant to this subsection”.

Subsec. (b)(7), (8). Pub. L. 104-106, § 4104(a)(3), added pars. (7) and (8).

Subsec. (b)(9). Pub. L. 104-106, § 4104(a)(2), redesignated par. (6) as (9).

Subsec. (e)(3). Pub. L. 104-106, § 5601(a), as amended by Pub. L. 104-201, § 1074(b)(4)(A), struck out par. (3) which read as follows: “Regulations implementing this subsection shall be consistent with the regulations regarding the preparation and submission of an agency’s protest file (the so-called ‘rule 4 file’) for protests to the General Services Board of Contract Appeals under sec-

tion 111 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 759).”

Subsec. (g). Pub. L. 104-201, § 821(a), added subsec. (g). 1994—Subsec. (a)(2). Pub. L. 103-355, § 4401(b), substituted “a purchase for an amount not greater than the simplified acquisition threshold)” for “small purchases)” in introductory provisions.

Subsec. (a)(2)(A)(i). Pub. L. 103-355, § 1011(a)(1), substituted “and significant subfactors” for “(and significant subfactors)” and “cost-related or price-related factors and subfactors, and noncost-related or nonprice-related factors and subfactors” for “cost- or price-related factors, and noncost- or nonprice-related factors”.

Subsec. (a)(2)(A)(ii). Pub. L. 103-355, § 1011(a)(2), substituted “and subfactors” for “(and subfactors)”.

Subsec. (a)(2)(B)(ii)(I). Pub. L. 103-355, § 1011(a)(3), amended subcl. (I) generally. Prior to amendment, subcl. (I) read as follows: “a statement that the proposals are intended to be evaluated with, and award made after, discussions with the offerors, or a statement that the proposals are intended to be evaluated, and award made, without discussions with the offerors (other than discussions conducted for the purpose of minor clarification), unless discussions are determined to be necessary; and”.

Subsec. (a)(3). Pub. L. 103-355, § 1011(b), added par. (3) and struck out former par. (3), which read as follows: “In prescribing the evaluation factors to be included in each solicitation for competitive proposals, the head of an agency shall clearly establish the relative importance assigned to the evaluation factors and subfactors, including the quality of the product or services to be provided (including technical capability, management capability, and prior experience of the offeror).”

Subsec. (a)(4). Pub. L. 103-355, § 1011(b), added par. (4).

Subsec. (a)(5). Pub. L. 103-355, § 1012, added par. (5).

Subsec. (b)(3). Pub. L. 103-355, § 1013(a), substituted “transmitting, in writing or by electronic means, notice” for “transmitting written notice” and inserted at end “Within three days after the date of contract award, the head of the agency shall notify, in writing or by electronic means, each bidder not awarded the contract that the contract has been awarded.”

Subsec. (b)(4)(B). Pub. L. 103-355, § 1013(b), substituted “transmitting, in writing or by electronic means, notice” for “transmitting written notice” and “, within three days after the date of contract award, shall notify, in writing or by electronic means,” for “shall promptly notify”.

Subsec. (b)(5), (6). Pub. L. 103-355, § 1014, added par. (5) and redesignated former par. (5) as (6).

Subsec. (e). Pub. L. 103-355, § 1015, added subsec. (e).

Subsec. (f). Pub. L. 103-355, § 1016, added subsec. (f).

1993—Subsec. (b)(4)(A). Pub. L. 103-160 realigned margins of cls. (i) and (ii).

1990—Subsec. (a)(2)(A)(i). Pub. L. 101-510, § 802(a)(1), inserted “(and significant subfactors)” after “significant factors” and substituted “(including cost or price, cost- or price-related factors, and noncost- or nonprice-related factors)” for “(including cost or price)”.

Subsec. (a)(2)(A)(ii). Pub. L. 101-510, § 802(a)(2), inserted “(and subfactors)” after “those factors”.

Subsec. (a)(2)(B)(ii)(I). Pub. L. 101-510, § 802(b), amended subcl. (I) generally. Prior to amendment, subcl. (I) read as follows: “a statement that the proposals are intended to be evaluated with, and awards made after, discussions with the offerors, but might be evaluated and awarded without discussions with the offerors; and”.

Subsec. (a)(3). Pub. L. 101-510, § 802(c), substituted “the evaluation factors and subfactors, including the quality of the product or services” for “the quality of the services”.

Subsec. (b)(1). Pub. L. 101-510, § 802(d)(1), inserted “and make an award” after “competitive proposals”.

Subsec. (b)(3). Pub. L. 101-510, § 802(d)(2), inserted “in accordance with paragraph (1)” after “shall evaluate the bids”.

Subsec. (b)(4)(A). Pub. L. 101-510, § 802(d)(3)(A), substituted “competitive proposals in accordance with

paragraph (1)” for “competitive proposals” in introductory provisions, added cls. (i) and (ii), and struck out former cls. (i) and (ii) which read as follows:

“(i) after discussions conducted with the offerors at any time after receipt of the proposals and before the award of the contract; or

“(ii) without discussions with the offerors (other than discussions conducted for the purpose of minor clarification) when it can be clearly demonstrated from the existence of full and open competition or accurate prior cost experience with the product or service that acceptance of an initial proposal without discussions would result in the lowest overall cost to the United States.”

Subsec. (b)(4)(B) to (E). Pub. L. 101-510, §802(d)(3)(B)–(D), redesignated subpars. (D) and (E) as (B) and (C), respectively, substituted “Subparagraph (B)” for “Subparagraph (D)” in subpar. (C), and struck out former subpars. (B) and (C) which read as follows:

“(B) In the case of award of a contract under subparagraph (A)(i), the head of the agency shall conduct, before such award, written or oral discussions with all responsible sources who submit proposals within the competitive range, considering only cost or price and the other factors included in the solicitation.

“(C) In the case of award of a contract under subparagraph (A)(ii), the head of the agency shall award the contract based on the proposals received (and as clarified, if necessary, in discussions conducted for the purpose of minor clarification).”

1989—Subsec. (b)(4)(D). Pub. L. 101-189 inserted “cost or” after “considering only”.

1988—Subsec. (d)(1)(B). Pub. L. 100-456, §806(b), substituted “Proposals referred to in the first sentence of subparagraph (A) are” for “The proposals that the head of an agency is to consider requiring in a solicitation for the award of a development contract are”.

Subsec. (d)(2)(B). Pub. L. 100-456, §806(b), substituted “Proposals referred to in the first sentence of subparagraph (A) are” for “The proposals that the head of an agency is to consider requiring in a solicitation for the award of a production contract are”.

Subsec. (d)(3). Pub. L. 100-456, §806(a)(2), inserted provision that objectives may not impair the rights of prospective contractors or subcontractors otherwise provided by law.

Subsec. (d)(4). Pub. L. 100-456, §806(a)(1), added par. (4).

1986—Subsec. (a). Pub. L. 99-500 and Pub. L. 99-591, §101(c) [§924(a)], Pub. L. 99-661, §924(a), amended subsec. (a) identically, in par. (2)(A)(i) striking out “(including price)” after “factors” and inserting “(including price)” and “(including cost and price)” and adding par. (3).

Subsec. (b)(4)(B). Pub. L. 99-500 and Pub. L. 99-591, §101(c) [§924(b)], Pub. L. 99-661, §924(b), amended subpar. (B) identically, inserting “cost or”.

Subsec. (b)(4)(E). Pub. L. 99-661, §313(b), added subpar. (E).

1985—Subsec. (b)(5). Pub. L. 99-145 aligned the margin of par. (5).

1984—Subsecs. (c), (d). Pub. L. 98-525 added subsecs. (c) and (d).

Catchline, subsecs. (a) to (d). Pub. L. 98-369 substituted “Contracts: planning, solicitation, evaluation, and award procedures” for “Formal advertisements for bids; time; opening; award; rejection” and completely revised the text to substitute a program using solicitation requirements covering military procurement for former provisions which had used the approach of utilizing formal advertisements, struck out former provisions which had directed that, except in cases where the Secretary of Defense had determined that military requirements necessitated the specification of container size, no advertisement or invitation to bid for the carriage of government property in other than government-owned cargo containers could specify carriage of such property in cargo containers of any stated length, height, or width, and carried forward into new subsecs. (a)(1)(A)(iii), (B)(i), and (b)(2) and (5) the content of former section.

1968—Subsec. (a). Pub. L. 90-268 inserted provision that, except in cases where the Secretary of Defense determines that military requirements necessitate such specification, no advertisement or invitation to bid for the carriage of Government property in other than Government-owned cargo containers shall specify carriage of such property in cargo containers of any stated length, height, or width.

1958—Subsecs. (b) to (d). Pub. L. 85-861 added subsec. (b) and redesignated former subsecs. (b) and (c) as (c) and (d), respectively.

#### EFFECTIVE DATE OF 2018 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 115-232 effective Jan. 1, 2020, subject to a savings provision, see section 836(h) of Pub. L. 115-232, set out as an Effective Date of 2018 Amendment; Savings Provision note under section 453b of Title 6, Domestic Security.

#### EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1996 AMENDMENT

For effective date and applicability of amendment by sections 4103(a), 4104(a), and 4202(a)(2) of Pub. L. 104-106, see section 4401 of Pub. L. 104-106, set out as a note under section 2302 of this title.

Amendment by section 5601(a) of Pub. L. 104-106 effective 180 days after Feb. 10, 1996, see section 5701 of Pub. L. 104-106, Feb. 10, 1996, 110 Stat. 702.

#### EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1994 AMENDMENT

For effective date and applicability of amendment by Pub. L. 103-355, see section 10001 of Pub. L. 103-355, set out as a note under section 2302 of this title.

#### EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1990 AMENDMENT

Pub. L. 101-510, div. A, title VIII, §802(e), Nov. 5, 1990, 104 Stat. 1589, provided that:

“(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section [amending this section] shall apply with respect to solicitations for sealed bids or competitive proposals issued after the end of the 120-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act [Nov. 5, 1990].

“(2) The Secretary of Defense may require the amendments made by this section to apply with respect to solicitations issued before the end of the period referred to in paragraph (1). The Secretary of Defense shall publish in the Federal Register notice of any such earlier effective date.”

#### EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1986 AMENDMENT

Pub. L. 99-500, §101(c) [title X, §924(c)], Oct. 18, 1986, 100 Stat. 1783-82, 1783-153, Pub. L. 99-591, §101(c) [title X, §924(c)], Oct. 30, 1986, 100 Stat. 3341-82, 3341-153, and Pub. L. 99-661, div. A, title IX, formerly title IV, §924(c), Nov. 14, 1986, 100 Stat. 3933, renumbered title IX, Pub. L. 100-26, §3(5), Apr. 21, 1987, 101 Stat. 273, provided that: “The amendments made by this section [amending this section] shall apply with respect to solicitations for sealed bids or competitive proposals issued after the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act [Oct. 18, 1986].”

#### EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1984 AMENDMENTS

Pub. L. 98-525, title XII, §1213(b), Oct. 19, 1984, 98 Stat. 2592, provided that: “The amendment made by subsection (a) [amending this section] shall take effect at the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act [Oct. 19, 1984].”

Amendment by Pub. L. 98-369 applicable with respect to any solicitation for bids or proposals issued after Mar. 31, 1985, see section 2751 of Pub. L. 98-369, set out as a note under section 2302 of this title.

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CONTRACTING DISPUTE MATTERS

Pub. L. 115-232, div. A, title VIII, §822, Aug. 13, 2018, 132 Stat. 1853, provided that:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act [Aug. 13, 2018], the

Secretary of Defense shall carry out a study of the frequency and effects of bid protests involving the same contract award or proposed award that have been filed at both the Government Accountability Office and the United States Court of Federal Claims. The study shall cover Department of Defense contracts and include, at a minimum—

“(1) the number of protests that have been filed with both tribunals and results;

“(2) the number of such protests where the tribunals differed in denying or sustaining the action;

“(3) the length of time, in average time and median time—

“(A) from initial filing at the Government Accountability Office to decision in the United States Court of Federal Claims;

“(B) from filing with each tribunal to decision by such tribunal;

“(C) from the time at which the basis of the protest is known to the time of filing in each tribunal; and

“(D) in the case of an appeal from a decision of the United States Court of Federal Claims, from the date of the initial filing of the appeal to decision in the appeal;

“(4) the number of protests where performance was stayed or enjoined and for how long;

“(5) if performance was stayed or enjoined, whether the requirement was obtained in the interim through another vehicle or in-house, or whether during the period of the stay or enjoining the requirement went unfulfilled;

“(6) separately for each tribunal, the number of protests where performance was stayed or enjoined and monetary damages were awarded, which shall include for how long performance was stayed or enjoined and the amount of monetary damages;

“(7) whether the protestor was a large or small business; and

“(8) whether the protestor was the incumbent in a prior contract for the same or similar product or service.

“(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees [Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives], the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report on the results of the study, along with related recommendations for improving the expediency of the bid protest process. In preparing the report, the Secretary shall consult with the Attorney General of the United States, the Comptroller General of the United States, and the United States Court of Federal Claims.

“(c) ONGOING DATA COLLECTION.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall establish and continuously maintain a data repository to collect on an ongoing basis the information described in subsection (a) and any additional relevant bid protest data the Secretary determines necessary and appropriate to allow the Department of Defense, the Government Accountability Office, and the United States Court of Federal Claims to assess and review bid protests over time.

“(d) ESTABLISHMENT OF EXPEDITED PROCESS FOR SMALL VALUE CONTRACTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 1, 2019, the Secretary of Defense shall develop a plan and schedule for an expedited bid protest process for Department of Defense contracts with a value of less than \$100,000.

“(2) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense may consult with the Government Accountability Office and the United States Court of Federal Claims to the extent such entities may establish a similar process at their election.

“(3) REPORT.—Not later than May 1, 2019, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the plan and schedule

for implementation of the expedited bid protest process, which shall include a request for any additional authorities the Secretary determines appropriate for such efforts.”

INCLUSION OF BEST AVAILABLE INFORMATION REGARDING PAST PERFORMANCE OF SUBCONTRACTORS AND JOINT VENTURE PARTNERS

Pub. L. 115–232, div. A, title VIII, §823, Aug. 13, 2018, 132 Stat. 1855, provided that: “Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act [Aug. 13, 2018], the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council and the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy, shall develop policies for the Department of Defense to ensure the best information regarding past performance of certain subcontractors and joint venture partners is available when awarding Department of Defense contracts. The policies shall include proposed revisions to the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement as follows:

“(1) Required performance evaluations, as part of a government-wide evaluation reporting tool, for first-tier subcontractors on construction and architect-engineer contracts performing a portion of the contract valued at the threshold set forth in section 42.1502(e) of the Federal Acquisition Regulation, or 20 percent of the value of the prime contract, whichever is higher, provided—

“(A) the information included in rating the subcontractor is not inconsistent with the information included in the rating for the prime contractor;

“(B) the subcontractor evaluation is conducted consistent with the provisions of section 42.15 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation;

“(C) negative evaluations of a subcontractor in no way obviate the prime contractor’s responsibility for successful completion of the contract and management of its subcontractors; and

“(D) that in the judgment of the contracting officer, the overall execution of the work is impacted by the performance of the subcontractor or subcontractors.

“(2) Required performance evaluations, as part of a government-wide evaluation reporting tool, of individual partners of joint venture-awarded construction and architect-engineer contracts valued at the threshold set forth in section 42.1502(e) of the Federal Acquisition Regulation, to ensure that past performance on joint venture projects is considered in future awards to individual joint venture partners, provided—

“(A) at a minimum, the rating for joint ventures includes an identification that allows the evaluation to be retrieved for each partner of the joint venture;

“(B) each partner, through the joint venture, is given the same opportunity to submit comments, rebutting statements, or additional information, consistent with the provisions of section 42.15 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation; and

“(C) the rating clearly identifies the responsibilities of joint venture partners for discrete elements of the work where the partners are not jointly and severally responsible for the project.

“(3) Processes to request exceptions from the annual evaluation requirement under section 42.1502(a) of the Federal Acquisition Regulation for construction and architect-engineer contracts where submission of the annual evaluations would not provide the best representation of the performance of a contractor, including subcontractors and joint venture partners, including—

“(A) where no severable element of the work has been completed;

“(B) where the contracting officer determines that—

“(i) an insubstantial portion of the contract work has been completed in the preceding year; and

“(ii) the lack of performance is at no fault to the contractor; or

“(C) where the contracting officer determines that there is an issue in dispute which, until resolved, would likely cause the annual rating to inaccurately reflect the past performance of the contractor.”

ENHANCED POST-AWARD DEBRIEFING RIGHTS; RELEASE OF CONTRACT AWARD INFORMATION

Pub. L. 115-91, div. A, title VIII, §818(a), Dec. 12, 2017, 131 Stat. 1463, provided that: “Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act [Dec. 12, 2017], the Secretary of Defense shall revise the Department of Defense Supplement to the Federal Acquisition Regulation to require that all required post-award debriefings, while protecting the confidential and proprietary information of other offerors, include, at a minimum, the following:

“(1) In the case of a contract award in excess of \$100,000,000, a requirement for disclosure of the agency’s written source selection award determination, redacted to protect the confidential and proprietary information of other offerors for the contract award, and, in the case of a contract award in excess of \$10,000,000 and not in excess of \$100,000,000 with a small business or nontraditional contractor, an option for the small business or nontraditional contractor to request such disclosure.

“(2) A requirement for a written or oral debriefing for all contract awards and task or delivery orders valued at \$10,000,000 or higher.

“(3) Provisions ensuring that both unsuccessful and winning offerors are entitled to the disclosure described in paragraph (1) and the debriefing described in paragraph (2).

“(4) Robust procedures, consistent with section 2305(b)(5)(D) of title 10, United States Code, and provisions implementing that section in the Federal Acquisition Regulation, to protect the confidential and proprietary information of other offerors.”

USE OF LOWEST PRICE TECHNICALLY ACCEPTABLE SOURCE SELECTION PROCESS

Pub. L. 114-328, div. A, title VIII, §813, Dec. 23, 2016, 130 Stat. 2270, as amended by Pub. L. 115-91, div. A, title VIII, §822(a), (b)(1), Dec. 12, 2017, 131 Stat. 1465, provided that:

“(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It shall be the policy of the Department of Defense to avoid using lowest price technically acceptable source selection criteria in circumstances that would deny the Department the benefits of cost and technical tradeoffs in the source selection process.

“(b) REVISION OF DEFENSE FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION SUPPLEMENT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act [Dec. 23, 2016], the Secretary of Defense shall revise the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement to require that, for solicitations issued on or after the date that is 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, lowest price technically acceptable source selection criteria are used only in situations in which—

“(1) the Department of Defense is able to comprehensively and clearly describe the minimum requirements expressed in terms of performance objectives, measures, and standards that will be used to determine acceptability of offers;

“(2) the Department of Defense would realize no, or minimal, value from a contract proposal exceeding the minimum technical or performance requirements set forth in the request for proposal;

“(3) the proposed technical approaches will require no, or minimal, subjective judgment by the source selection authority as to the desirability of one offeror’s proposal versus a competing proposal;

“(4) the source selection authority has a high degree of confidence that a review of technical proposals of offerors other than the lowest bidder would not

result in the identification of factors that could provide value or benefit to the Department;

“(5) the contracting officer has included a justification for the use of a lowest price technically acceptable evaluation methodology in the contract file;

“(6) the Department of Defense has determined that the lowest price reflects full life-cycle costs, including for operations and support;

“(7) the Department of Defense would realize no, or minimal, additional innovation or future technological advantage by using a different methodology; and

“(8) with respect to a contract for procurement of goods, the goods procured are predominantly expendable in nature, nontechnical, or have a short life expectancy or short shelf life.

“(c) AVOIDANCE OF USE OF LOWEST PRICE TECHNICALLY ACCEPTABLE SOURCE SELECTION CRITERIA IN CERTAIN PROCUREMENTS.—To the maximum extent practicable, the use of lowest price technically acceptable source selection criteria shall be avoided in the case of a procurement that is predominately for the acquisition of—

“(1) information technology services, cybersecurity services, systems engineering and technical assistance services, advanced electronic testing, audit or audit readiness services, or other knowledge-based professional services;

“(2) personal protective equipment; or

“(3) knowledge-based training or logistics services in contingency operations or other operations outside the United States, including in Afghanistan or Iraq.

“(d) REPORTING.—Not later than December 1, 2017, and annually thereafter for three years, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional defense committees [Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives] a report on the number of instances in which lowest price technically acceptable source selection criteria is used for a contract exceeding \$5,000,000, including an explanation of how the situations listed in subsection (b) were considered in making a determination to use lowest price technically acceptable source selection criteria.”

[Pub. L. 115-91, div. A, title VIII, §822(b)(2), Dec. 12, 2017, 131 Stat. 1465, provided that: “The amendment made by this subsection [amending section 813 of Pub. L. 114-328, set out above] shall apply with respect to the second, third, and fourth reports submitted under subsection (d) of section 813 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328; 130 Stat 2271; 10 U.S.C. 2305 note).”]

USE OF COMMERCIAL OR NON-GOVERNMENT STANDARDS IN LIEU OF MILITARY SPECIFICATIONS AND STANDARDS

Pub. L. 114-328, div. A, title VIII, §875, Dec. 23, 2016, 130 Stat. 2310, provided that:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the Department of Defense uses commercial or non-Government specifications and standards in lieu of military specifications and standards, including for procuring new systems, major modifications, upgrades to current systems, non-developmental and commercial items, and programs in all acquisition categories, unless no practical alternative exists to meet user needs. If it is not practicable to use a commercial or non-Government standard, a Government-unique specification may be used.

“(b) LIMITED USE OF MILITARY SPECIFICATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Military specifications shall be used in procurements only to define an exact design solution when there is no acceptable commercial or non-Government standard or when the use of a commercial or non-Government standard is not cost effective.

“(2) WAIVER.—A waiver for the use of military specifications in accordance with paragraph (1) shall be approved by either the appropriate milestone decision authority, the appropriate service acquisition executive, or the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics.



“(c) REVISION TO DFARS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act [Dec. 23, 2016], the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall revise the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement to encourage contractors to propose commercial or non-Government standards and industry-wide practices that meet the intent of the military specifications and standards.

“(d) DEVELOPMENT OF NON-GOVERNMENT STANDARDS.—The Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall form partnerships with appropriate industry associations to develop commercial or non-Government standards for replacement of military specifications and standards where practicable.

“(e) EDUCATION, TRAINING, AND GUIDANCE.—The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall ensure that training, education, and guidance programs throughout the Department are revised to incorporate specifications and standards reform.

“(f) LICENSES.—The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall negotiate licenses for standards to be used across the Department of Defense and shall maintain an inventory of such licenses that is accessible to other Department of Defense organizations.”

REQUIREMENT AND REVIEW RELATING TO USE OF BRAND NAMES OR BRAND-NAME OR EQUIVALENT DESCRIPTIONS IN SOLICITATIONS

Pub. L. 114-328, div. A, title VIII, §888, Dec. 23, 2016, 130 Stat. 2322, provided that:

“(a) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that competition in Department of Defense contracts is not limited through the use of specifying brand names or brand-name or equivalent descriptions, or proprietary specifications or standards, in solicitations unless a justification for such specification is provided and approved in accordance with section 2304(f) of title 10, United States Code.

“(b) REVIEW OF ANTI-COMPETITIVE SPECIFICATIONS IN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ACQUISITIONS.—

“(1) REVIEW REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act [Dec. 23, 2016], the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall conduct a review of the policy, guidance, regulations, and training related to specifications included in information technology acquisitions to ensure current policies eliminate the unjustified use of potentially anti-competitive specifications. In conducting the review, the Under Secretary shall examine the use of brand names or proprietary specifications or standards in solicitations for procurements of goods and services, as well as the current acquisition training curriculum related to those areas.

“(2) BRIEFING REQUIRED.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary shall provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives on the results of the review required by paragraph (1).

“(3) ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary shall revise policies, guidance, and training to incorporate such recommendations as the Under Secretary considers appropriate from the review required by paragraph (1).”

GUIDANCE ON USE OF TIERED EVALUATIONS OF OFFERS FOR CONTRACTS AND TASK ORDERS UNDER CONTRACTS

Pub. L. 109-163, div. A, title VIII, §816, Jan. 6, 2006, 119 Stat. 3382, provided that:

“(a) GUIDANCE REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe guidance for the military departments and the Defense Agencies on the use of tiered evaluations of offers for contracts and for task or delivery orders under contracts.

“(b) ELEMENTS.—The guidance prescribed under subsection (a) shall include a prohibition on the initiation

by a contracting officer of a tiered evaluation of an offer for a contract or for a task or delivery order under a contract unless the contracting officer—

“(1) has conducted market research in accordance with part 10 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation in order to determine whether or not a sufficient number of qualified small businesses are available to justify limiting competition for the award of such contract or task or delivery order under applicable law and regulations;

“(2) is unable, after conducting market research under paragraph (1), to make the determination described in that paragraph; and

“(3) includes in the contract file a written explanation of why such contracting officer was unable to make such determination.”

AUTHORIZATION OF EVALUATION FACTOR FOR DEFENSE CONTRACTORS EMPLOYING OR SUBCONTRACTING WITH MEMBERS OF THE SELECTED RESERVE OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Pub. L. 109-163, div. A, title VIII, §819, Jan. 6, 2006, 119 Stat. 3385, provided that:

“(a) DEFENSE CONTRACTS.—In awarding any contract for the procurement of goods or services to an entity, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to use as an evaluation factor whether the entity intends to carry out the contract using employees or individual subcontractors who are members of the Selected Reserve of the reserve components of the Armed Forces.

“(b) DOCUMENTATION OF SELECTED RESERVE-RELATED EVALUATION FACTOR.—Any entity claiming intent to carry out a contract using employees or individual subcontractors who are members of the Selected Reserve of the reserve components of the Armed Forces shall submit proof of the use of such employees or subcontractors for the Department of Defense to consider in carrying out subsection (a) with respect to that contract.

“(c) REGULATIONS.—The Federal Acquisition Regulation shall be revised as necessary to implement this section.”

CERTIFICATE OF COMPETENCY REQUIREMENTS

Pub. L. 102-484, div. A, title VIII, §804, Oct. 23, 1992, 106 Stat. 2447, provided that, in case of contract to be entered into pursuant to this chapter, other than pursuant to simplified procedures under section 2304(g) of this title, solicitation was to contain notice of right of bidding small business concern, in case of determination by contracting officer that concern was nonresponsible, to request Small Business Administration to make determination of responsibility under section 637(b)(7) of Title 15, Commerce and Trade, that if contracting officer determined that concern was nonresponsible, such officer was to notify concern in writing, of such determination, that concern had right to request Small Business Administration to make determination, and that, if concern desired to request such determination, concern was to inform officer in writing, within 14 days after receipt of notice, of such desire, and that, after being so informed, officer was to transmit request to Administration, or, if not so informed, officer was to proceed with award of contract, and contained provisions relating to effective and termination dates and report to be submitted to Congress, prior to repeal by Pub. L. 103-355, title VII, §7101(b), Oct. 13, 1994, 108 Stat. 3367.

CONSTRUCTION OF 1984 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 98-369 as not superseding or affecting the provisions of section 637(a) of Title 15, Commerce and Trade, see section 2723(c) of Pub. L. 98-369, set out as a note under section 2304 of this title.

§ 2305a. Design-build selection procedures

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Unless the traditional acquisition approach of design-bid-build estab-