

must be addressed in the initial acquisition strategy planning and documented in the acquisition plan or ASM minutes.

(b) If there is no direct link between successful performance in the preceding phase and successful performance in a subsequent phase, down-selection is inappropriate. In this case, the phases should be contracted for separately without a down-selection.

(c) With one exception, both the initial and subsequent phase(s) of an acquisition down-selection process are considered to be full and open competition if the procedures in 1817.7301-4 and 1817.7301-5 (if using the progressive competition technique) are followed. If only one contractor successfully completed a given phase and no other offers are solicited for the subsequent phase, award of the subsequent phase may be made only if justified by one of the exceptions in FAR 6.302 or one of the exclusions in FAR 6.2, and only after compliance with the synopsis requirements of FAR 5.202 and 5.205 and 1804.570-2.

1817.7301-2 Evaluation factors.

A separate set of evaluation factors must be developed for each phase in a down-selection competition. Since these competitive down-selection strategies anticipate that a preceding phase contractor will be the subsequent phase contractor, the evaluation factors for initial phase award must specifically include evaluation of the offerors' abilities to perform all phases.

1817.7301-3 Down-selection milestones.

(a) When sufficient programmatic and technical information is available to all potential offerors, proposal evaluation and source selection activities need not be delayed until completion of a given phase. These activities should commence as early as practicable. The initial phase contracts should be structured to allow for down-selection at a discrete performance milestone (e.g., a significant design review or at contract completion) of a design maturity sufficient to allow for an informed selection decision. This will avoid time gaps between phases and eliminate unnecessary duplication of effort.

(b) The appropriate contract structure must reflect program technical objectives as well as schedule considerations. For example, if a two-phased acquisition strategy calls for formal completion of initial phase effort at Preliminary Design Review (PDR), but it is not financially practical or technically necessary for subsequent phase award and performance to carry all initial phase contractors through PDR, the initial phase contracts should be structured with a basic period of performance through a significant, discrete milestone before PDR with a priced option for effort from that milestone to PDR. The down-selection would occur at the earlier milestone, the PDR option exercised only for the down-selection winner, and the subsequent phase performance begun at the completion of the PDR option.

1817.7301-4 Synopsis.

(a) Each phase of a phased acquisition not performed in-house must be synopsisized in accordance with FAR 5.201 and must include all the information required by FAR 5.207. Time gaps between phases should be minimized by early synopsis of subsequent phase competition. The synopsis for the initial competitive phase should also state the following:

(1) The Government plans to conduct a phased acquisition involving a competitive down-selection process. (Include a description of the process and the phases involved.)

(2) Competitions for identified subsequent phases will build on the results of previous phases.

(3) The award criteria for subsequent phases will include demonstrated completion of specified previous phase requirements.

(4) The Government expects that only the initial phase contractors will be capable of successfully competing for the subsequent phase(s). Proposals for the subsequent phase(s) will be requested from these contractors.

(5) The Government intends to issue (or not issue) a new, formal solicitation(s) for subsequent phase(s). If new solicitations are not planned, the acquisition must be identified as a "progressive competition" (see

1817.7301-5), and the mechanism for providing pertinent subsequent phase proposal information (e.g., statements of work, specifications, proposal preparation instructions, and evaluation factors for award) must be described.

(6) Each subsequent phase of the acquisition will be synopsisized in accordance with FAR 5.201 and 5.203.

(7) Notwithstanding the expectation that only the initial phase contractors will be capable of successfully competing for the subsequent phase(s), proposals from all responsible sources submitted by the specified due date will be considered. In order to contend for subsequent phase awards, however, such prospective offerors must demonstrate a design maturity equivalent to that of the prior phase contractors. Failure to fully and completely demonstrate the appropriate level of design maturity may render the proposal unacceptable with no further consideration for contract award.

(b) In addition to the information in paragraph (a) of this section, the synopsis for the subsequent phase(s) must identify the current phase contractors.

1817.7301-5 Progressive competition.

(a) To streamline the acquisition process, the preferred approach for NASA phased acquisitions is the "progressive competition" down-selection technique in which new, formal solicitations are not issued for phases subsequent to the initial phase. Subsequent phase proposals are requested by less formal means, normally by a letter accompanied by the appropriate proposal preparation and evaluation information.

(b) When using the progressive competition technique, if a prospective offeror other than one of the preceding phase contractors responds to the synopsis for a subsequent phase and indicates an intention to submit a proposal, the contracting officer shall provide to that offeror all the material furnished to the preceding phase contractors necessary to submit a proposal. This information includes the preceding phase solicitation, contracts, and system performance and design requirements, as well as all proposal preparation instructions and evaluation factors. In addition, the prospec-

tive offeror must be advised of all requirements necessary for demonstration of a design maturity equivalent to that of the preceding phase contractors.

(c) A key feature of the progressive competition technique is that a formal solicitation is normally not required. However, when the Government requirements or evaluation procedures change so significantly after release of the initial phase solicitation that a substantial portion of the information provided in the initial phase synopsis, solicitation, or contracts is no longer valid, a new solicitation shall be issued for the next phase.

(d) Subsequent phase proposals should be requested by a letter including the following:

(1) A specified due date for the proposals along with a statement that the late proposal information in paragraph (c)(3) of FAR 52.215-1, Instructions to Offerors—Competitive Acquisition, applies to the due date.

(2) Complete instructions for proposal preparation, including page limitations, if any.

(3) Final evaluation factors.

(4) Any statement of work, specifications, or other contract requirements that have changed since the initial solicitation.

(5) All required clause changes applicable to new work effective since the preceding phase award.

(6) Any representations or certifications, if required.

(7) Any other required contract updates (e.g., small and small disadvantaged business goals).

(e) Certain factors may clearly dictate that the progressive competition technique should not be used. For example, if it is likely that NASA may introduce a design concept independent of those explored by the preceding phase contractors, it is also likely that a new, formal solicitation is necessary for the subsequent phase and all potential offerors should be solicited. In this circumstance, progressive competition is inappropriate.

1817.7302 Contract clauses.

(a) The contracting officer shall insert the clause at 1852.217-71, Phased