project exists or can be developed, particularly in the case of a new, highly specialized/unique Government program mandate.

(iii) It is necessary to test the marketplace to determine if there are questions or concerns regarding the use of a new or innovative acquisition strategy or instrument previously untried to accomplish a potential or planned project.

(iv) It is necessary to determine the general effort or time (estimate or rough order of magnitude) that may be required to accomplish a potential or planned project.

NOTE: This type of information may be requested, only if it is necessary, broad in scope, and required for planning purposes. Detailed estimates must not be requested.

(v) It is necessary to ensure that unduly restrictive technical or business/acquisition requirements are not made part of any resultant solicitation so that maximum competition is generated.

(2) When using an RFI, an OPDIV shall not request that potential sources provide more than the minimum information necessary—see FAR 10.001(b), to obtain the input required. The notice and the information received shall not be used to determine how well respondents can perform a requirement, which can only be evaluated in response to a solicitation. Accordingly, the notice shall not be used to—

(i) Obtain capability statements that are evaluated and determined acceptable or unacceptable;

(ii) Require cost/price proposals or detailed technical solutions;

(iii) Identify a prospective sole source; or

(iv) Exclude small business concerns.

(3) While not the primary intent of an RFI, an OPDIV may additionally request that respondents provide information regarding their organizational size classification and capabilities when the OPDIV is uncertain whether any organization, acting individually or in partnership with others, can satisfy the requirement. For example, the notice may ask respondents to identify whether they are small businesses; HUBZone small businesses; service-disabled, veteran-owned small businesses; 8(a) small businesses; veteran-owned small businesses; woman-owned small businesses; or a small disadvantaged businesses. However, an RFI shall not be used solely to determine the availability of qualified sources for a proposed project or to determine their size classification. In such instances, as applicable, an R & D Sources Sought notice, Sources Sought notice, or Small Business Sources Sought notice may be used—see HHSAR 305.205, 310.001, and 319.202–2.

(4) OPDIVs shall follow the standard HHS instructions for completing an RFI. The template for an RFI is available on the ASPR/OGAPA/DA Internet Web site. The Contracting Officer shall post the notice in FedBizOpps by selecting and completing a Special Notice, accessible on the FedBizOpps ‘‘Notices’’ page at: http://www.fedbizopps.gov. RFIs must be published, at a minimum, in FedBizOpps—see FAR 10.002(b)(2)(iii) and 15.201(d). Additional information may be included in an RFI in accordance with OPDIV procedures. The Contracting Officer shall document, in the form of a memorandum to the file, the results of the review by technical personnel of information submitted in response to the notice, including whether each respondent appears to be capable of performing the requirement. The Contracting Officer shall attach a copy of the analysis provided by the technical personnel to the memorandum.

315.204–5 Part IV—Representations and instructions.

(c) Section M, Evaluation factors for award.

(1) General.

(i) The Project Officer shall develop technical evaluation factors and submit them to the Contracting Officer as part of the acquisition plan or other acquisition request documentation for inclusion in a solicitation. The Project Officer shall indicate the relative importance or weight of the evaluation factors based on the requirements of an individual acquisition. Since the evaluation factors will serve as the standard for proposal evaluation, they require careful selection.

(ii) Only a formal amendment to a solicitation can change the evaluation factors. Evaluation of proposals shall
(2) Review of evaluation factors.
   (i) The Contracting Officer shall review evaluation factors to ensure they are consistent with the SOW/PWS. This review is not intended to dictate technical requirements to the program office or Project Officer, but rather to ensure that the evaluation factors are clear, concise, and fair, so that all potential offerors are fully aware of the bases for proposal evaluation and are given an equal opportunity to compete.
   (ii) The Project Officer and the Contracting Officer shall review the evaluation factors to ascertain the following:
      (A) The factors address the key programmatic concerns which the offerors must be aware of in preparing proposals.
      (B) The factors are specifically applicable to the current acquisition and are not restatements of factors from previous acquisitions which are not relevant.
      (C) The factors represent only the significant areas of importance, rather than a multitude of factors. (Note: All factors tend to lose importance, if too many are included; and using too many factors may prove as detrimental as using too few.)

(3) Examples of topics that form a basis for evaluation factors. Typical examples of topics that form a basis for the development of evaluation factors are listed in the following paragraphs. These examples may assist in the development of actual evaluation factors for a specific acquisition, as appropriate.
   (i) Understanding of the SOW/PWS.
   (ii) Method of accomplishing the objectives and intent of the SOW/PWS.
   (iii) Soundness of the scientific or technical approach for executing the requirements of the SOW/PWS, including, when applicable, preliminary layouts, sketches, diagrams, other graphic representations, calculations, curves, and other data necessary for presentation, substantiation, justification, or understanding of the approach.
   (iv) Special technical factors, such as experience or pertinent novel ideas in the specific branch of science or technology involved.
   (v) Feasibility or practicality of successfully accomplishing the requirements (including a statement and discussion of anticipated major difficulties and problem areas, and recommended approaches for their resolution).
   (vi) Availability of required special research, test, and other equipment or facilities.
   (vii) Managerial capability (ability to achieve delivery or performance requirements as demonstrated by the proposed use of management and other personnel resources, and to successfully manage the project, including subcontractor and/or consultant efforts, if applicable, as evidenced by the management plan and demonstrated by previous experience).
   (viii) Availability, qualifications, experience, education, and competence of professional, technical, and other personnel, including proposed subcontractors and consultants (as evidenced by resumes, endorsements, and explanations of previous efforts).
   (ix) Soundness of the proposed staff time or labor hours, propriety of personnel classifications (professional, technical, others), necessity for type and quantity of material and facilities proposed, validity of proposed sub-contracting, and necessity of proposed travel.
   (x) Quality of offeror’s past performance on recent projects of similar size and scope.
   (xi) Extent of proposed participation of small disadvantaged business concerns in performance of the contract.

315.208 Submission, modification, revision, and withdrawal of proposals.

(b) In addition to the provision in FAR 52.215–1, Instructions to Offerors—Competitive Acquisition, if an HCA determines that certain classes of biomedical or behavioral R & D acquisitions are subject to conditions other than those specified in FAR 52.215–1(c)(3), the HCA may authorize for use in competitive solicitations for R & D, valued at more than the simplified acquisition threshold, the use of the provision in 352.215–70, Late Proposals and Revisions. This is an authorized FAR deviation.