

# GOVERNMENT CONTRACT AWARDS

---

## **Negotiation & Sealed Bidding**

By  
**Steven W. Feldman**

Revised and Updated By  
**Eve Lyon**

### **Volume 1**

**2025–2026 Edition**  
Issued October 2025



*For Customer Assistance Call 1-800-328-4880*

© 2025 Thomson Reuters

This publication was created to provide you with accurate and authoritative information concerning the subject matter covered; however, this publication was not necessarily prepared by persons licensed to practice law in a particular jurisdiction. The publisher is not engaged in rendering legal or other professional advice and this publication is not a substitute for the advice of an attorney. If you require legal or other expert advice, you should seek the services of a competent attorney or other professional.

## What is New?

Regulations were his year's biggest new in procurement with several significant final and proposed rules, *Loper Bright* overturning the *Cher-von* doctrine, numerous challenges to the validity of regulations, and a change of administration. Also, the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for FY 2025 contains a significant provision that may affect protests before the Comptroller General. And as always, this year saw noteworthy decisions from GAO, COFC, and the Federal Circuit.

- The National Defense Appropriations Act (NDAA) for 2025.
  - Section 885 requires GAO and DoD submit a proposal to Congress for a pilot program involving GAO protests that 1) requires unsuccessful protesters reimburse the federal government for costs incurred in processing the protests, 2) creates an enhanced pleading standard that protesters must meet before accessing administrative procurement records, 3) increases the protest threshold for orders issued under Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity contracts from \$25M to \$35M, and 4) requires unsuccessful protesters reimburse a DoD contract awardee for lost profits during a CICA stay. Section 885 may be a harbinger of future changes since pilot programs within DoD can lead to FAR changes. Next year will define the outline of the pilot program with succeeding years revealing how the pilot program affects DoD's experience with GAO protests. (§ 28:1)
  - Section 876 requires DoD develop a small business bill of rights that (1) authorizes resolution process for conflicts, (2) allows small business to request assistance, and (3) ensures small businesses know their rights under the laws, e.g., the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Act, the Small Business Act. (§ 18:26)
  - Section 888 requires DoD establish a process to track the number and value of awards to small businesses and nontraditional defense contractors using Other Transaction Authority. (§ 25:14)
- Executive Orders.
  - Executive Order No. (EO) 14275 "Restoring Common Sense to Federal Procurement," mandates the Office of Federal Procurement Policy review and retain coverage in the FAR "necessary to support simplicity and usability, strengthen the efficacy of the procurement system, or protect economic or national security interests." The order requires non-statutory clauses build in sunset provisions, expiring after four years unless specifically renewed by the FAR Council. Like section 885 in the NDAA for 2025, EO 14275 highlights changes to come. Decades ago, DoD received mandates to reduce the size of the DFARS. Those earlier mandates produced today's streamlined DFARS as well resulted in the creation of Procedures, Guidance, and

Information (PGI) that accompany the DFARS. No one knows what will emerge from EO 14275. (§ 1:6.)

- EO 14271, “Ensuring Commercial, Cost-Effective Solutions in Federal Contracts,” seeks to purchase commercially available products and services “to the maximum extent practicable.” Ironically, FAR Part 12 adroitly avoided using the phrase to “the maximum extent practicable” at the prime contractor level since this phrase allowed DoD to evade the requirement to buy dual use technology. (§ 24:1)
- FAR Regulations.
  - Debarment: The FAR Council issued a final rule to clarify and to better align FAR with the suspension and debarment procedures in the Nonprocurement Common Rule. The rule adds new definitions to FAR 9.403 for “administrative agreement,” “conviction,” “pre-notice letter,” and “voluntary exclusion”; adds seven new aggravating or mitigating factors; expands the definition of “conviction”; and confirms suspending and debarring official may issue pre-notice letters alerting the contractor to potential future action before initiating a proposed suspension or debarment. (18:52)
  - Green procurement: The FAR Council issued a final rule directing agencies to reduce emissions, promote environmental stewardship, support resilient supply chains, drive innovation, and incentivize markets for sustainable products and services by purchasing sustainable products and services. The final rule implements EO 14057, Catalyzing Clean Energy Industries and Jobs Through Federal Sustainability Efficient Federal Operations. On January, 20 2025, President Trump issued EO 14148 revoking EO 14057.
  - Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI): The FAR Council issued a proposed rule on OCI which would: add definitions of OCI from caselaw to Part 2 of the FAR; make conflicts by former, government employees an OCI; allow agencies to accept risk, creating a new method to address OCIs based on impaired objectivity; and add OCI provisions and clauses. EO 14275 may sideline work on this proposed rule. Interestingly, too, the Federal Register only receive eleven public comments on the proposed change. (§ 18:35)
  - Reverse auctioning: The FAR Council issued a final rule to provide a Governmentwide policy on reverse auctions. Among other things, the policy explains when reverse auctioning may be appropriate, identifies when reverse auctions shall not be used, requires reverse auction services be competed amongst commercial reverse auction service providers; and specifies document requirements. Is the final rule on reverse auctioning the type of policy EO 14275 believes is burdensome? (§ 16:21)
- Small Business Regulations.
  - The Small Business Administration (SBA) proposed a rule to apply the Rule of Two to multiple-award contract task and delivery orders. The proposed rule does not apply to orders under the Federal Supply Schedule because “schedules are continually open to new entrants and highly accessible to small

businesses.” The SBA states the proposed rule is consistent with the Court of Federal Claims decision in *The Tolliver Grp, Inc. v. United States*, 151 Fed. Cl. 70 (2020) and the rule eliminates lingering confusion with *ITility, LLC*, B-419167, Dec. 23, 2020, 2020 CPD ¶ 412 by requiring the “application of the Rule of Two to task and delivery orders under multiple-award contracts, with certain exceptions.” (§ 18:31)

- The FAR Council issued an interim rule transferring the verification of small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans or service-disabled veterans from the Department of Veterans Affairs to the Small Business Administration as of Jan. 1, 2023. The interim rule also creates a certification requirement for service-disabled veteran-owned small business (SDVOSB) concerns seeking sole-source and set-aside awards under the Government-wide SDVOSB Program. (§ 18:14)
- The FAR Council proposed amending the FAR to implement a final rule from the SBA that standardizes the limitations on subcontracting and the nonmanufacturer rule across the small business socioeconomic programs and specifies that a similarly situated subcontractor must perform the work with its employees. (§ § 18:18 & 18:30)
- The SBA proposed a rule requiring contractors to notify a contracting officer regarding timely payments to a subcontractor and to cooperate with the contracting officer until the subcontractor receives full payment. The SBA also proposed changes to simplify the subcontracting reporting process. (§ 18:26)
- *Overturn of Chevron.*

*Loper Bright Enterprises v. Raimondo*, 603 U.S. 369 (2024) was one of the biggest news stories in 2024, overturning the *Chervon doctrine* in *Chevron, U.S.A., Inc. v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 467 U.S. 837 (1984). *Loper Bright* replaces the *Chervon* doctrine where the courts deferred to an agency’s reasonable interpretation of ambiguous statute, with a doctrine giving deference to agency interpretations based on persuasiveness of the interpretation, e.g., thoroughness, validity of reasoning, consistency. Future litigation will define the differences between the *Chervon* doctrine and *Loper Bright*. (§ 1:6)

Still, disappointed offerors have challenged the validity of the FAR based on *Loper Bright*. The Federal Circuit rejected the argument that *Loper Bright* forbids judicial deference on how an agency treated violations of labor laws as part of selection process. See, *Alisud - Gesac Handling - Servisair 2 Scarl v. United States*, No. 2023-1087, 2024 WL 3452957 (Fed. Cir. July 18, 2024). GAO also rejected an argument based on *Loper Bright* saying even if the SBA’s regulations were ambiguous, the agency’s interpretation of its own ambiguous regulations are entitled to deference under *Auer v. Robbins*, 519 U.S. 452 (1997). See, *Radiance Tech. Inc., Comp. Gen. Dec.*, B-422615, 2024 CPD ¶ 210. Finally, the court cited *Loper Bright* when finding the FAR failed to implement the second waiver in § 889 of the NDAA for FY 2019. However, did the

court need rely on *Loper Bright* to find the FAR Council’s implementation of § 889 was incomplete? See, *QED Grp. LLC v. United States*, 175 Fed. Cl. 349 (2025). (§ 1:6)

- Challenges to Regulations.

Numerous cases challenged the regulation mandating Project Labor Agreements (PLA) required by EO 14063, the regulation raising the minimum wage for federal contractors required by EO 14026, and DOL’s rule changing the classification of employees and independent contractors under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA). These case asserted the regulations:

- Exceeded the scope of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act, 40 U.S.C. § 101 et seq. (“the Procurement Act”),
- Violated non-delegation doctrine in the Constitution, which prohibits Congress from delegating its lawmaking powers to other entities, and/or
- Violated the APA by failing to provide reasoned explanations for the rule. (§ 1:6)

*MVL USA, Inc. v. United States*, 174 Fed. Cl. 437 (2025) ended the challenge about PLAs, holding PLAs violated the Competition in Contracting Act’s requirement to promote “full and open competition.” Then EO rescinded the EO requiring PLAs and the EO increasing the minimum wage to Government contractors. With regard to reclassifying employees and independent contractors, DOL filed a motion on April 16, 2025 requesting to hold the case in abeyance because agency plans to reconsider and possibly rescind the rule. So, although the Trump administration ended the current controversies, the underlying arguments to challenge regulations remain. (§ 1:6)

- The System for Award Management (SAM)

The FAR Council issued an interim rule clarifying SAM registration, stating “offerors are required to be registered at the time of proposal submission and at time of award, rather than continuously in between.” Before this clarification, a lapse in SAM registration made an offeror ineligible for award. The book designated caselaw on those lapses as prior law. Current case law explains how GAO and COFC apply the clarification on SAM registration requirements to an offeror’s eligibility for award. (§ 18:49)

- *UNICA-BPA JV, LLC, Comp. Gen., Dec., B-422580.3*, 2025 CPD ¶ 2, held the agency improperly eliminated an offeror for failure to have an active SAM registration at the time of its Final Proposal Revision (FPR) since an FPR meets the definition of SAM registration at time of offer. Although the agency could have eliminated the offeror at the time of initial proposal for lack of an active SAM registration, the agency elected to include the protester in the competitive range. (§ 18:49)
- *Hanford Tank Disposition All., LLC v. United States*, 173 Fed. Cl. 269 (2024), the Federal Circuit held the awardee complied with the SAM registration requirements because no lapse occurred be-

tween the time of the FPR submission and the time of award. (§ 18:49)

- Other Transactional Authority (OTA).

Protests of OTAs were homeless given a strict interpretation of GAO’s and COFC’s protest jurisdiction. Recently, COFC expanded its jurisdictional to hear certain protests of OTAs while GAO showed a willing to hear certain protests on prizes. A decision from the Federal Circuit would solidify COFC’s jurisdiction. Meanwhile, it is unclear whether GAO can extend its reasoning on prizes to OTAs given GAO’s early decisions that CICA limits GAO’s protest jurisdiction to contracts.

- *Indep. Rough Terrain Ctr., LLC v. U.S.*, 172 Fed. Cl. 250 (2024) extended the court’s protest jurisdiction to a solicitation for a OT follow-on production contract, finding the OTA agreement was “in connection with” a procurement because the agreement had the potential to lead to a follow-on procurement deal. *Indep. Rough Terrain* notes that nothing in the “OT statutes expressly removes OT follow-on contracts from the purview of this Court’s jurisdiction” and holds the court “has jurisdiction to review a follow-on production contract that seeks to acquire property or services for the Government, whether the agency issued the follow-on solicitation under OT authority or under FAR authority.” *Indep. Rough Terrain* at 260. (§ 25:14)
- *Raytheon Co. v. United States*, 175 Fed. Cl. 281 (2025) reviewed the spectrum opinions whether Tucker Act jurisdiction includes Other Transaction (OTs). *Raytheon* concluded *SpaceX Corp. v. U.S.*, 144 Fed. Cl. 433 (2019) was at one end of the spectrum and opinions like *MD Helicopters Inc. v. United States*, 435 F. Supp. 3d 1003 (D. Ariz. 2020); *Kinometrics, Inc. v. United States*, 155 Fed. Cl. 777 (2021); *Hydraulics Int’l, Inc. v. United States*, 161 Fed. Cl. 167 (2022); and *Indep. Rough Terrain Ctr., LLC v. United States*, 172 Fed. Cl. 250 (2024) were at the other end of the spectrum. According *Raytheon*, the decision in *SpaceX* involved the development of technology for both public and private sectors while the other decisions “charted a more direct and interlinked path from research, to development, to production, to government purchase.” Based on its analysis of past decisions, *Raytheon* concluded the court was the *de facto* forum for bid protests involving OTs and “other transaction agreements” (OTAs) awarded under 10 U.S.C. §§ 4021–22 when providing the government with a direct benefit in the form of products or services. The court said “this definition satisfies the jurisdictional hook of ‘procurement solicitations and contracts’ required under the Tucker Act.” *Raytheon* at 11. (§ 25:14)
- ARiA, Comp. Gen. Dec., B-422365; B-422365.2; B-422365.3, 2024 CPD ¶ 104 took jurisdiction in a protest involving nonselection for a cash prize since the prize was the initial phase of a three-phase competition that was a prerequisite in a small business innovation research solicitation for phase II contract awards. Compare with *David Frankel, Comp. Gen. Dec. B?408319*, 2013 CPD ¶ 144 where GAO dismissed protest challenging an agency’s selection of winners in a prize contest because the transaction did not involve the award or proposed award of a contract. (§ 28:3)

- *Oak Grove Tech, LLC v. U.S.*, 116 F.4th 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2024) overturned the lower court’s findings on discussions and conflicts by former employees; however, the Federal Circuit failed to resolve the split between GAO and COFC on whether “should” in the DFARS requires discussions.
  - Discussions: Until *Oak Grove*, COFC held that “should” in DFARS 215.306(c) requires discussions while GAO interpreted “should” in DFARS 215.306(c) as discretionary. Then, the Federal Circuit in *Oak Grove* sidestepped a challenge that DFARS 215.306(c) required discussions by applying *Blue & Gold* where the solicitation put the plaintiff on notice that the agency did not intend to conduct discussions. Therefore, *Oak Grove* prevents disappointed offerors from alleging DFARS 215.306(c) requires discussions since all solicitations are required to state whether the agency intends to conduct discussions. Nevertheless, *Oak Grove* does not resolve the split between COFC and GAO; offerors still can allege DFARS 215.306(c) requires discussions in pre-award protests at COFC. (§ 16:11)
  - Misconduct by Federal Employee: The lower court cited FAR 1.602-2 that “contracting officers shall ... ensure that contractors receive impartial, fair, and equitable treatment” and FAR 3.101-1 that “[t]he general rule is to avoid strictly any conflict of interest or even the appearance of a conflict of interest in Government-contractor relationships” as authority to find a conflict by a Government employee. *Oak Grove Techs., LLC v. United States*, 155 Fed. Cl. 84, 115 (2021). The Federal Circuit overturned the trial court’s holding, saying the trial court failed to acknowledge twin layers of deference: 1) the FAR provides a contracting officer with considerable discretion to conduct fact-specific inquiries of acquisition proposals to identify potential conflicts, and 2) the “strong presumption” that government officials actions are consistent with their duties. *Oak Grove* at 1380. (§ 3:79)  
*Loyal Source Gov’t Servs., LLC v. U.S.*, 175 Fed. Cl. 779 (2025) followed *Oak Grove* when the court found that an agency’s failure to make the impact determination required Procurement Integrity Act (PIA), was harmless error. Instead, citing *Oak Grove*’s twin layers of deference, the court found no basis to question the agency’s action because after the agency’s remedial actions, the plaintiff failed to show harm, and failed to show how other bidders received an unfair competitive advantage. (§ 3:83)
- Percipient. As reported last year, *Percipient.ai, Inc. v. United States*, 104 F.4th 839 (Fed. Cir. 2024), overturned the lower court, finding the FASA bar on protesting orders did not apply since the plaintiff asserted the agency violated 10 U.S.C. § 3453. The Federal Circuit explained challenges alleging the violations of statute or regulation fell within the third prong of the Tucker Act (28 U.S.C. § 1491(b)(1)), thus giving COFC jurisdiction to hear any “any alleged violation of statute or regulation in connection with a procurement or a proposed procurement.” The Federal Circuit declined to rely on the Competition in Contracting Act (CICA) to define “interested party” because the CICA definition does not

include the third prong of § 1491(b)(1) of COFC’s jurisdiction.

Subsequently, the Federal Circuit agreed to rehear the case en banc. The order also vacated the Federal Circuit’s earlier decision in *Percipient*, and reinstated the appeal. See, *Percipient.ai, Inc. v. United States, CACI, Inc.-Fed.*, 104 F.4th 839 (Fed. Cir.), reh’g en banc granted, opinion vacated sub nom. *Percipient.ai, Inc. v. United States*, 121 F.4th 1311 (Fed. Cir. 2024). The issues before the court include:

- Do subcontractors have standing in post-award protests?
- Does CICA define interested party for purposes of COFC, e.g., is an offeror required to submit a proposal to have standing in a post-award protest?
- How does the third prong of the Tucker Act affect COFC’s jurisdiction particularly when the government does not dispute the violation of law?

The answers to these questions will define the extent to which COFC’s protest jurisdiction differs from GAO’s protest jurisdiction. (§ 1:16)

Revision to Protest Before COFC Particularly and Clarification of the Protest Fora.

This edition revises § 1:16 on protests before the Court of Federal Claims, breaking the coverage into:

**I. General**

- a. History.
- b. Rules, General Practices, APA Review.

**II. Subject Matter Jurisdiction**

- a. What is an Agency?
- b. “In Connection with a Procurement.”
- c. Violations of Statute or Regulation.
- d. Implied Contracts.
  - i. Implied-in-fact.
  - ii. Implied-in-law.

**III. Case or Controversy**

- a. Pleadings.
- b. Standing/Interested Party.
- c. Intervenors.
- d. Ripeness.
- e. Mootness.
  - i. General.
  - ii. Effect of *Blue & Gold* on Pre-Award Protests.
- f. Laches.

**IV. Scope of Review**

- a. General.
- b. Burden of Proof.
- c. Prejudice to Prevail on Merits.
- d. Military Discretion.

- e. Limited to the Agency Record.
- V. Agency Record**
  - a. What is the Record?
  - b. Supplementing the Record.
  - c. Discovery and Depositions.
- VI. Preliminary Injunctions and TROs**
- VII. Final Relief**
  - a. Bid and Proposal Costs.
  - b. Attorney's Fees.
  - c. Permanent Injunction.
  - d. Declaratory Relief.
  - e. Remand.
  - f. Limits on Relief.

Protests at the COFC started as an asterisk in protest statistics, but have reached near parity with GAO. While GAO decides more protests, the court ultimately decides important protests such as the JEDI litigation. Additionally the number of protests COFC increases yearly. The revisions to § 1:16 treat protests at COFC similar to, but not as extensive as §§ 28 – 35 protests at GAO.

## **About the Author**

Eve Lyon, B.S., J.D., is an attorney who was employed at NASA and the Naval Air Systems Command (NAVAIR) specializing in procurement policy and major systems acquisition. Policy highlights include implementing Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994, writing Part 12 of the FAR, and working on the rewrite of FAR 9.5. Highlights in major systems acquisition at NASA include writing the contract with the Russian Space Agency for space activities; drafting the OTA that created Commercial space; and working with the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, the International Space Station, and the Shuttle. Highlights from NAVAIR include writing the multiyear contract for the C-2 aircraft, writing the fixed price development contract for the F-14D aircraft, defaulting the P7 contract, and managing a billion dollars in claims. Eve started her legal career with the Department of the Treasury in the Fiscal Law Section of Main Treasury. In addition to writing articles on government procurement, Eve has spoken at numerous ABA Conferences and Nash & Cibinic Round Tables, and given webinars on Organizational Conflicts of Interest. Currently, Eve is a Professorial Lecturer in Law at the George Washington Law school.

Steven W. Feldman, B.A., J.D., was an attorney for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in Huntsville, Alabama, where he specialized in federal acquisition law. He has published numerous law review articles on federal procurement and has been an Associate Editor of the American Bar Association's Public Contract Law Journal. Steve also authored the Government Contract Guidebook and was co-author, with Professor Ralph Nash, of Government Contract Changes, both published by Thomson Reuters. He was also a co-author of West's Federal Administrative Practice, with responsibility for various chapters on federal practice. Prior to the Army Corps of Engineers, Steve served as a civilian attorney at Fort Gordon, Georgia and as a captain in the U.S. Army Judge Advocate General's Corps.



## **Acknowledgments**

Eve Lyon wishes to express her love and appreciation to her husband, Geoff, and to her father, David Long. I am also indebted to my mentor, Bud Nelson, the former Deputy Counsel at the Naval Air Systems Command (NAVAIR), as well as to my co-workers and clients at NAVAIR, NASA, and the Federal Acquisition Regulations System. I must also thank Ralph Nash, whom I strongly suspect recommended me to Thomson Reuters.



## Preface

As the new author of *Government Contract Awards*, I update the book annually to keep the material relevant. More importantly, my role as author allows me to revise parts of the book, major revisions that share and document my experience in procurement policy and major system acquisitions. My revisions build upon Steven Feldman's work, while reflecting my experience. Every attorney has different experiences; different experiences form different perspectives. I hope that combining my experience with Steven Feldman's experience strengthens *Government Contract Awards*.

This year's include revising and reorganizing the section on protests at the Court of Federal Claims into General, Subject Matter Jurisdiction, Case or Controversy, Scope of Review, Agency Record, Preliminary Injunctions and TROs, and Final Relief. This revision makes § 1:16 on protests at COFC similar to, but not as extensive as coverage in §§ 28 – 35 on protests before GAO. Additionally, this revision includes § 1:19 on the interplay between the three protest fora.

Last year's updates included revised and reorganized coverage of Small Business. The revised sections on Small Business, which could be viewed as a book within a book, are organized into: *General Overview* containing sections on Policy and Statutes, Size, Status, and Representation and Certifications; *Set-Asides* containing sections on Policy, Price Evaluation, Limitations on Subcontracting, Parity, and Set-Aside Withdrawal; *Challenges to Set-Asides; the 8(a) Program; Subcontracting; Certificates of Competence (COC)*; and *other Small Business Programs* containing sections on the Mentor Protégé Program, the Nonmanufacturer Rule, the Discretionary Set-Aside of Orders, and Bundling and Consolidation.

My third set of updates included revisions to the chapter on Evaluations to separate Technical Evaluations from Past Performance Evaluations. Also, recent trends in caselaw prompted a new section on Source Selection Statements explaining why agencies are required to meaningfully analyze the contemporaneous record to document and justify the award decision. Additionally, I wrote a new section entitled the Well Written Finding, containing the keys to successfully justifying award selections.

My second set of updates included a new chapter on Commercial Acquisitions based on my experience writing Part 12 of the FAR. This chapter discusses the threshold decisions made in drafting Part 12, policies for Commercial Acquisitions, unique clauses for Commercial Acquisitions, difficulties with Commercial Pricing, Commercially Available-off-the-Shelf (COTS) Items, subcontracting for Commercial Items, and the

simplified procedures for Commercial Items.

My first set of updates included revisions to Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCIs) and Indefinite Quantity/Indefinite Delivery (IDIQ) contracts. The revised chapter on OCIs focuses on the two duties of a contracting officer – to identify and then to resolve conflicts. The OCI chapter 1) blends the guidance in FAR 9.5 with caselaw and 2) defines the four methods of resolution, information missing from FAR 9.5. Likewise, the revised chapter on IDIQ contracts explains the differences created by applying the Competition in Contracting Act (CICA) to IDIQ contracts, but not to orders issued under IDIQ contracts.

EVE LYON

## Table of Abbreviations

ACO .....	Administrative Contracting Officer
ADP.....	Automatic Data Processing
ADPE.....	Automatic Data Processing Equipment
A-E .....	Architect-Engineer
AFARS .....	Army Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement
AFFARS.....	Air Force Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement
AFR.....	Air Force Regulation
AGAR.....	Agriculture Acquisition Regulation
AIDAR .....	Agency for International Development Acquisition Regulation
APA .....	Administrative Procedure Act
APR.....	Agency Procurement Request
ASBCA.....	Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals
ASPA.....	Armed Services Procurement Act
BA .....	Basic Agreement
BAA.....	Broad Agency Announcement
BAFO.....	Best and Final Offer (now final proposal revision)
BEQ .....	Best Estimated Quantity
BOA .....	Basic Ordering Agreement
CAR.....	Commerce Acquisition Regulation
CBD .....	Commerce Business Daily
CFR.....	Code of Federal Regulations
CIA.....	Central Intelligence Agency
CICA .....	Competition in Contracting Act
CIPD .....	Certificate of Independent Price Determination
CLIN .....	Contract Line Item Number
CO .....	Contracting Officer
COC .....	Certificate of Competency
Comp. Gen.....	Comptroller General
COR .....	Contracting Officer's Representative
CPAF.....	Cost Plus Award Fee
CPFF.....	Cost Plus Fixed Fee
CPIF.....	Cost Plus Incentive Fee
CPPC .....	Cost Plus Percentage of Cost
DAR .....	Defense Acquisition Regulation
DBA .....	Davis Bacon Act
DCAA.....	Defense Contract Audit Agency
DEAR.....	Department of Energy Acquisition Regulation
DFARS.....	Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement
D&F .....	Determination and Finding

GOVERNMENT CONTRACT AWARDS

DIAR.....	Department of Interior Acquisition Regulation
DLAR.....	Defense Logistics Acquisition Regulation
DOD.....	Department of Defense
DODISS.....	Department of Defense Index of Specifications and Standards
DOE.....	Department of Energy
DOL.....	Department of Labor
DOLAR.....	Department of Labor Acquisition Regulation
DOSAR.....	Department of State Acquisition Regulation
DPA.....	Delegation of Procurement Authority
DSO.....	Designated Senior Official
EFARS.....	Engineer Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement
EPA.....	Environmental Protection Agency
EPAAR.....	Environmental Protection Agency Acquisition Regulation
FACNET.....	Federal Acquisition Computer Network
FAR.....	Federal Acquisition Regulation
FEMAR.....	Federal Energy Management Agency Regulation
FFRDC.....	Federally Funded Research and Development Center
FIP.....	Federal Information Processing
FIRMR.....	Federal Information Resources Management Regulation
FMS.....	Foreign Military Sales
FOIA.....	Freedom of Information Act
FPASA.....	Federal Property and Administrative Services Act
FPI.....	Federal Prison Industries
FPR.....	Federal Procurement Regulation
FSS.....	Federal Supply Schedules
GAO.....	General Accounting Office
GSA.....	General Services Administration
GSAR.....	General Services Acquisition Regulation
GSBCA.....	General Services Administration Board of Contract Appeals
HCA.....	Head of the Contracting Activity
HHSAR.....	Health and Human Services Acquisition Regulation
HUDAR.....	Housing and Urban Development Acquisition Regulation
IAAR.....	United States Information Agency Acquisition Regulation
ID.....	Indefinite Delivery
IFB.....	Invitation for Bids
IGE.....	Independent Government Estimate
IQ.....	Indefinite Quantity
J&A.....	Justification and Approval
LTD.....	Live Test Demonstration
MA.....	Master Agreement
MEO.....	Most Efficient Organization
MOL.....	Maximum Order Limitations
NAICS.....	North American Industry Classification System

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS

NAPS .....	Navy Acquisition Procedures Supplement
NASA .....	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
NAVSUP .....	Navy Acquisition Procedures Supplement
NFS .....	NASA FAR Supplement
OCD .....	Operational Capability Demonstration
OFPP .....	Office of Procurement Policy
OMB .....	Office of Management and Budget
PAR .....	Panama Canal Commission Acquisition Regulation
PCO .....	Procuring Contracting Officer
PWS .....	Performance Work Statement
RFP .....	Request for Proposals
RFQ .....	Request for Quotations
RFTP .....	Request for Technical Proposal
RIF .....	Reduction in Force
SBA .....	Small Business Administration
SCA .....	Service Contract Act
SDB .....	Small Disadvantaged Business
SECNAVINST .....	Secretary of Navy Instruction
SIC .....	Standard Industrial Classification
SOW .....	Statement of Work
TAR .....	Transportation Acquisition Regulation
TCO .....	Termination Contracting Officer
T&M .....	Time and Materials
TVA .....	Tennessee Valley Authority
UCA .....	Un definitized Contract Action
UCF .....	Uniform Contract Format
USCA .....	United States Code Annotated
VAAR .....	Veterans Affairs Acquisition Regulation





**THOMSON REUTERS**  
**WESTLAW™**

**MOST PREFERRED ONLINE LEGAL RESEARCH SERVICE**

Thomson Reuters Westlaw has been voted the #1 Best Online Legal Research vendor year-after-year by industry professionals. That's because we continually invest more than any other online legal research provider in our people and technology where it matters most. As a result, you find exactly what you need quickly and confidently.

- Build the strongest argument with the most comprehensive collection of legal content
- Deliver better results confidently with WestSearch®, the only search engine designed specifically for the law
- Rely on the most current version of the law with proprietary editorial enhancements
- Access your legal research anytime, anywhere with the free Westlaw apps

---

LEARN MORE: [legal.thomsonreuters.com](http://legal.thomsonreuters.com)  
SIGN ON: [westlaw.com](http://westlaw.com)  
24/7 REFERENCE ATTORNEYS: 1-800-REF-ATTY (733-2889)

## THOMSON REUTERS PROVIEW™

**This title is one of many now available on your tablet as an eBook.**

Take your research mobile. Powered by the Thomson Reuters ProView™ app, our eBooks deliver the same trusted content as your print resources, but in a compact, on-the-go format.

ProView eBooks are designed for the way you work. You can add your own notes and highlights to the text, and all of your annotations will transfer electronically to every new edition of your eBook.

You can also instantly verify primary authority with built-in links to WestlawNext® and KeyCite®, so you can be confident that you're accessing the most current and accurate information.

**To find out more about ProView eBooks and available discounts, call 1-800-328-9352.**