GOVERNMENT CONTRACT AWARDS

Negotiation & Sealed Bidding

By
Steven W. Feldman

Revised and Updated By
Eve Lyon

Volume 1

2026–2027 Edition
Issued November 2026



For Customer Assistance Call 1-800-328-4880

Mat #43408659

© 2026 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?

The biggest news this year's involves the Revolutionary FAR Overhaul. Title 800 in the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for FY 2026 also is lengthier than normal. And as always, this year saw noteworthy decisions from GAO, COFC, and the Federal Circuit.

- **Revolutionary FAR Overhaul (RFO)**
  President Trump issued E.O. 14275 "Restoring Common Sense to Federal Procurement," directing the Administrator of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy (OFPP) and the other members of the FAR Council amend the FAR to ensure that the FAR "contains only provisions that are required by statute or that are otherwise necessary to support simplicity and usability, strengthen the efficacy of the procurement system, or protect economic or national security interests."
  OMB issued M-25-26 "Overhauling the Federal Acquisition Regulation" setting forth the process and purpose of the FAR Overhaul, directing the FAR Council to focus on statutory roots and replacing most nonstatutory regulations with OFPP-endorsed buying guides collectively referred to as the Strategic Acquisition Guidance (SAG). Then M-25-26 sets forth a three-step process to overhaul the FAR.
  - Step one: Creating an Revolutionary FAR Oversight (RFO) website where the FAR Council posts revised versions of Parts of the FAR on a rolling basis. The public has 60 days to submit comments when a revised Part of FAR is posted on the RFO website. The FAR Council posted the last revised Parts on September 30, 2025.
  - Step two: Seeking agency deviations based upon the proposed revised FAR posted on the RFO website. Most of the agency deviations are effective until the change is in incorporated in the FAR or the deviation is rescinded.
  - Step three: The OFPP Act at 41 U.S.C.A. § 1707 requires the FAR Council publish each Part of the FAR Overhaul as proposed rule.

    To complement a streamlined FAR, OMB envisions SAGs contain "best practices for applying innovation and streamlining throughout the acquisition lifecycle and on specific categories of the most popular common spend categories." Parts deleted from the FAR have been moved to a guide. Quality guides are essential for the Overhaul to be successful, e.g., contracting officers to use the promised flexibility.

    A theme emerges from the proposed changes. The RFO suggests: 1) reorganizing each Part of the FAR based on the acquisition lifecycle, 2) streamlining coverage with plain language, and 3) moving guidance to a FAR Companion. The RFO also proposes to delete obsolete and redundant coverage. These revisions alone are an improvement, making the FAR

more approachable. Since the RFO applies these changes to each FAR Part, section 1:12 in the book highlights the other significant changes the RFO proposes.

Currently, everything the RFO proposed has been done outside of the regulatory process. As of March 2026, the FAR Council has not published any propose rule on the FAR Overhaul. Will the current RFO coverage form the basis of the proposed rules? The procurement community needs to understand the current proposals to intelligently comment on the tsunami of proposed changes that is coming. (See § § 1:6 and 1:12.)

- **The National Defense Appropriations Act (NDAA) for 2026.**
  - Section 803, Pilot Program for Financing for Covered Activities would allow with certain stipulations, financing costs to be allowable and allocable as a cost for federal contracts and subcontracts.
  - Section 805 requires DOD address perceived gaps in access to technical data and software necessary for the repair and maintenance of "covered systems." Ralph C. Nash, DIGITIZING DATA: A New Requirement, 40 Nash & Cibinic Rep. NL ¶ 10.
  - Section 866, Cybersecurity Regulatory Harmonization requires DOD (1) "harmonize the cybersecurity requirements applicable to the defense industrial base;" and (2) reduce the number of contract or agreement-specific requirements."
  - Section 875, Ability to Withhold Contract Payments During Pendency of a Bid Protest requires procedures to withhold up to 5% of payments from an incumbent contractor under an extension or bridge contract while the contractor's bid protest at the Government Accountability Office (GAO) is pending. The contractor will forfeit the withheld payments if the GAO dismisses the protest for lacking a reasonable legal or factual basis. Section 875 is designed to discourage incumbent DOD contractors from benefiting from the automatic CICA stay by filing meritless GAO bid protests.
  - Section 1802, Establishment of the Role of Portfolio Acquisition Executive creates the "portfolio acquisition executive" (PAE) as "the senior acquisition official designated by the component acquisition executive or the service acquisition executive of the military department concerned … to lead a portfolio of capabilities, with authority for plans, budgets, and execution of programs assigned to the portfolio, including life?cycle management."
  - Section 1804, Adjustments to Certain Acquisition Thresholds after June 30, 2026 raises the threshold for requiring certified cost or pricing data under the Truthful Cost or Pricing Data Act (TINA) from $2,000,000 to $10,000,000.
  - Section 1806, Matters Related to Cost Accounting Standards raises the threshold for full CAS coverage from $50 million to $100 million and increases the Contract-Specific Threshold for Modified CAS on a specific contract from $2.5 million to $35 million.
  - Section 1823, Modifications to Commercial Solutions Openings (CS0) authorizes sole-source follow-on procurements

provided the initial CSO was openly competed, and allows the follow-on contracts to be structured as Other Transaction Authority Agreements (OTAs).

- **SBA Regulations**
  The Small Business Administration (SBA) proposes modifying the 8(a) program at 13 CFR 124.103 to change eligibility standards by deleting the concept of rebuttable presumption. The proposed rule replaces the individualized narrative of personal disadvantage with a self-certification, which is accompanied by supporting evidence. SBA recognizes that its proposed test for social disadvantage is a departure from the current regulatory test for establishing social disadvantage. 91 FR 35433 (June 11, 2026), 68 GC ¶ 159. (See § 18:25.)
- **Executive Orders**
  Executive Order 14402, Promoting Efficiency, Accountability, And Performance In Federal Contracting, defaults to fixed price contracts. Agencies must justify using any non-fixed-price contract, including a cost-reimbursement contract, a time-and-material contract, a labor-hour contract, or any other non-fixed-price type of contract under Part 16 of the FAR. However, contracts responding to emergencies, major disasters, or contingency operations, and contracts that involve research and development or pre-production development of "major systems" under FAR Parts 34 and 35, are exempt from the EO. 68 GC ¶ 122. (See § 4:4.)
- **New Caselaw**
  - *New GAO Rules.*
    GAO reinterpreted 4 C.F.R. § 21.1(c)(4) and (f) to require protesters "provide, at a minimum, credible allegations that are supported by evidence and are sufficient, if uncontradicted, to establish the likelihood of the protester's claim of improper agency action." (See § 28:2.)
    - GAO dismissed an allegation the awardee misrepresented its source of supply as not credible without further evidence. Warfighter Focused Logistics, Inc., Comp. Gen. Dec. B-423546, B-423546.2, 2025 CPD ¶ 169, 67 GC ¶ 307. (See § 28:2.)
    - GAO dismissed a protest challenging a sole source contract to provide transportation services due to a lack of proof. Navarre Corp., Comp. Gen. Dec., B-423602, 2025 CPD ¶ 197. (See § 28:2.)
    - GAO dismiss a challenge that the award "constitute[d] government waste" because the allegation did not establish a valid basis for challenging the agency's action. East Coast Flight Services, Inc., Comp. Gen. Dec., B-423977, 2026 WL 64114 (Jan. 2026). See also Ralph C. Nash, WASTE: Not A Protest Issue, 40 Nash & Cibinic Rep. NL ¶ 6 (Feb. 2026). (See § 28:2.)
  - *GAO Sanctions.*
    GAO has an inherent right to dismiss any protest and to impose sanctions against a protester, where a protester's actions undermine the integrity and effectiveness of the process,

which includes citations to non-existent authority. Raven Investigations & Security Consulting, Comp. Gen. Dec., B-423447, 2025 CPD ¶ 81, 67 GC ¶ 127. (See § 32:5)

- *Recommendations by GAO.*
  When an agency failed to implement GAO's recommendation, the Comptroller General recommended Congress "enact a private bill directing the Air Force to reimburse the protester its reasonable proposal preparation costs, a remedy that the Air Force itself proposed as part of their request to modify our recommended remedy, but which they no longer intend to perform." 68 GC¶ 25, U.S. Gov't Accountability Off., GAO-26-900695 (B-158766), GAO Bid Protest Annual Report To Congress For Fiscal Year 2025 (2025). (See § 1:16.)
- *COFC Jurisdiction.*
  The court granted a rehearing *en banc* in the *Percipient* litigation where a split Federal Circuit held that the FASA task order bar does not preclude jurisdiction when claims do not challenge the issuance of a task order. Then, the *en banc* court overturned an earlier Federal Circuit opinion about Competition in Contracting Act's (CICA) definition of the "interested party." The *en banc* court held CICA's definition of "interested party" applied to all protests brought under Administrative Dispute Resolution Act (ADRA), including protests alleging a violation of statute or regulation. The dissent argued that under the Tucker Act and prior Federal Circuit case law, "a party with an interest in any alleged violation of statute or regulation in connection with a procurement or proposed procurement" is an interested party, even if that party was not an actual or potential bidder or offeror. Percipient.ai, Inc. v. United States, CACI, Inc.-Fed., 104 F.4th 839, 853 (Fed. Cir.), reh'g en banc granted, opinion vacated sub nom. Percipient.ai, Inc. v. United States, 121 F.4th 1311 (Fed. Cir. 2024), and on reh'g en banc sub nom. Percipient.AI, Inc. v. United States, 153 F.4th 1226 (Fed. Cir. 2025), cert. denied, No. 25-428, 2026. (See § 1:17 and § 4:25.)
- *COFC Corrective Action.*
  The Federal Circuit denied a protest based upon agency corrective action, holding agencies have the inherent authority to reconsider their decisions, subject to certain limitations, which include: following procedures for reconsideration in relevant statutes, giving notice of the intent to reconsider within a reasonable time, and not abusing discretion or acting in arbitrarily or capriciously. Syneren Techs. Corp. v. United States, 166 F.4th 1040 (Fed. Cir. 2026) (See § 1:17.).
- *CICA Stay.*
  The Competition in Contracting Act's (CICA) automatic stay of performance, can be equitably tolled when, a party establishes (1) it pursued its rights diligently and (2) extraordinary circumstances prevented timely filing. Equitable tolling does not require evidence of trickery or deception. Starside Sec. & Investigation, Inc. v. United States, 177 Fed. Cl. 28 (2025), 67 GC ¶ 175. (See § 31:3.)
- *Override CICA Stay*

The Federal Circuit granted declaratory relief holding protesters do not need to satisfy the judge-made four-factor test required for traditional equitable relief when challenging CICA overrides. Instead, the automatic stay is reimposed when a court determines the government's override is arbitrary and capricious. Life Sci. Logistics, LLC v. United States, 172 F.4th 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2026), 68 GC¶ 101.

But see, Active Deployment Sys., LLC v. United States, No. 26-510, (Fed. Cl. Apr. 15, 2026) where COFC upheld a CICA override after applying the four-factor test to determine whether the override decision was arbitrary and capricious. COFC interprets precedential opinion in Life Sci. Logistics, LLC v. United States, 172 F.4th 1357 (Fed. Cir. 2026), as retaining the four-factor test to resolve a motion for a preliminary injunction, but eliminating the four-factor test when a protester requests declaratory judgment. (See § 31:3.)

- *Discussions.*

No improper discussions occurred with the awardee about a required certification during the initial round of corrective action since neither FAR Part 16 nor the solicitation provided all offerors with an opportunity to submit final proposal revisions. Centuria Corp., Comp. Gen. Dec., B-422245.6, 2025 CPD ¶ 183. (See § 4:25.)

An agency did not improperly reopened discussions when the disappointed offeror forfeited its right to make the claim. Additionally, COFC denied a claim the agency wrongfully included an offeror with an unacceptable proposal in discussions, saying "although an unacceptable proposal is not eligible for award, unacceptability is sometimes simply a step to discussions and revisions." Red River Sci. & Tech., LLC v. United States, 176 Fed. Cl. 641, 653 (2025), 67 GC ¶ 167, Ralph C. Nash, DISCRETION RUN RAMPANT: It's There To Be Used, 39 Nash & Cibinic Rep. NL ¶ 48 (Sept. 2025). (See § 15:8.)

An agency breached its duty to provide a "fair opportunity" where the agency removed a core component of the requirement for one offeror without giving other offerors the ability to revised their proposals. Although CICA procedures do not apply to issuing orders under IDIQ contracts, FASA requires contract holders receive "a fair opportunity to be considered for issuance of task orders, including notice of a task order that includes a clear statement of the agency's requirements." Alliant Health Solutions, Inc., Comp. Gen. Dec. B-423598, et al., 2025 CPD ¶ 216, 67 GC 283. (See § 4:25.)

A parties' behavior determines whether an exchange is a clarification or discussion. GAO concluded a question whether an offeror "would be fully functional at the end of the transition-in period" was a clarification where the agency asked the offeror to confirm, not revise or modify its proposal. The fact the offeror provided more expansive response than a "yes/no" response did not convert the question to discussions where the record supported the agency's contention that it did not consider the unsolicited information. Tech Systems, Inc.,

Comp. Gen. Dec., B-423547 et al., 2025 CPD ¶191. (See § 16.7.)

- *Unequal Discussions Permitted by solicitation.*
  An agency did not conduct unequal discussion where solicitation provided for separate discussions for proposed betterments, and the agency conducted an extra round of discussions in accordance with the solicitation. Karna, LLC File, Comp. Gen. Dec., B-424039 et al., 2026 WL 621546 (Feb., 2026). (See § 16.19.)
- *Unequal Discussions during corrective action.*
  An agency was not required to reopen discussions during corrective action to address a fault the protester failed to raise in the initial protest. Also, discussions do not required agencies inform an offeror its price is too high when the contracting officer does not consider the price excessive or unreasonable. The Mission Essential Group, LLC, Comp. Gen. Dec., B-421745.4, 2025 CPD ¶ 78, 67 GC ¶ 105. (See § 34.2.)
- *Reasonableness of the Record.*
  GAO sustained a challenge where the record contained heavily redacted documents that provided little to no information to determine the reasonableness of the agency's evaluation. GAO determined an evaluator's declaration involved post hoc arguments or analyses, which receive a lesser weight than the contemporaneous record. Tiger Natural Gas, Inc. Comp. Gen. Dec., B-423744, et al., 2025 WL 3655168 68 GC¶ 15. (See § 10:21.)
- *Award.*
  Active Deployment Sys., LLC v. United States, 178 Fed. Cl. 556 (2025), 42 GC ¶ 300 (solicitation language that "five (5) or more" would be awarded was unambiguous and plain, supporting the ultimate award of 42 contracts). (See § 6:23.)
- *Organizational Conflicts of Interests (OCI) or Violations by Former Employees.*
  The court denied Plaintiff's request to set aside it's disqualification. A rational basis does not requires evidence that an actual Organizational Conflict Interest (OCI) exists; the appearance of an OCI is sufficient. "Hard facts" showed 1) a potential OCI might result from improper retention, 2) the potential use of protected information, and 3) misrepresentations to the agency. Marathon Targets, Inc. v. United States, 175 Fed. Cl. 725 (2025) (See § 3:64.)
  An OCI based upon the awardee's prior work providing acquisition-support existed where the agency failed to explain: 1) what the contracting officer considered; 2) what factors formed the basis of the OCI determination; or 3) how the mitigation affected other potential conflicts such as contract administration and other subsequent activities like task order negotiations. Castro & Co., LLC, Comp. Gen. Dec. B-423689, 2025 CPD ¶ 230, 67 GC ¶ 315. (See § 18:36.)
  No an unfair competitive advantage by hiring former Government employees occurred where the protester failed to show how non-public information that was more than four years

old, remained competitively useful for a different solicitation. This decision signals no OCI exists when former employees leaves the agency before the planning of the second solicitation. Peraton Inc., Comp. Gen. Comp. B-423639 et al, 2025 CPD ¶ 223, 67 GC ¶ 301. (See 3:79.)

- *Commercial.*
  COFC denied a pre-award protest alleging the agency violated a preference to commercial products and services where the agency's requirement was more comprehensive than the protester could fulfill. IntelliBridge, LLC v. United States, 174 Fed. Cl. 793 (2025), reconsideration denied, No. 24-1204, 2025 WL 2231985 (Fed. Cl. Apr. 16, 2025). Also see, Ralph C. Nash, POSTSCRIPT II: MANDATORY CONSIDERATION OF COMMMERCIAL PRODUCTS, 39 Nash & Cibinic Rep. NL ¶ 28 (June 2025). (See § 24:2.)
- *OTA jurisdiction.*
  Acknowledging the Federal Circuit had not settled the COFC's jurisdiction over OTAs, the court held 28 U.S.C. § 1491(b)(1) limits OTA jurisdiction to 1) the decision to use prototype OTA authority initiating the prototype stage of a program, 2) compliance with OTA statutes and regulations, and 3) other generally applicable laws. No jurisdiction existed to hear allegations about the agency's actions conducting a prototype OTA; however, the court would have jurisdiction when the prototyping phase ended and the agency decided to proceed with a proposed procurement. Telesto Grp., LLC v. United States, 176 Fed. Cl. 711 (2025), 67 GC ¶ 149. (See § 25:14.)
- *Trade Agreements Act.*
  COFC overturned an award a to non-Trade Agreements Act (TAA) company where an agency ignored an offer from a TAA compliant country, finding 1) the TAA applies to all procurements except when the Buy American Act preference applies, 2) a nonmanufacturing waiver permits awarding a contract to a business that did not make the drug domestically, 3) although a nonavailability waiver allows an agency to obtain supplies from a foreign country, a nonavailability a waiver does not overrule the TAA. Davinci Co., LLC v. United States, 178 Fed. Cl. 63 (2025). (See § 11:9.)

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

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 ProcurementAuthority
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

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	Undefinitized 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
SIGN ON: 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.