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Interactive guide created for you!

Filled with acquisition innovation techniques and resources to learn more.

- Explore well tested techniques
- Watch a video
- Open a resource

Acquisition Innovation techniques may be used to:

* Capitalize on flexibilities of FAR! Especially in Part 13 and Subparts 8.4 and 16.505(b)!
Stay in your lane!

Subpart 8.4: Federal Supply Schedules
Orders against GSA schedule contracts, GSA schedule BPAs

Part 13: Simplified Acquisitions
Open market purchase orders <SAT, Simplified BPAs, & purchases against simplified BPAs

Part 15: Source Selection
Open market contracts >SAT

Subpart 16.505(b): Fair Opportunity
Orders placed against multiple-award IDIQ contracts: NASA SEWP, NITAAC, and GSA GWACs

Know your flexibility!

FAR subpart 8.402(a): "...simplified process for obtaining commercial supplies and services"

FAR subpart 13.003(h)(4): "Use innovative approaches, to the maximum extent practicable..."

Part 15: "The contracting officer may exercise broad discretion in developing appropriate order placement procedures...."

FAR subpart 16.505(b)(ii): "...provides guiding principles to other parts of the FAR but not the same requirements."
The evaluators compare one offeror to another when:

- No ratings are assigned!
- No relative importance of evaluation factors
- Factor by factor and then overall at the end
- Selecting the quote offering the best value

Optimal use against multi-award USDAWide BPAs

Ideal use when a low number of Offers are expected

Compare oral presentations and price for an even quicker evaluation!

Not recommended for use in FAR Part 15 or for orders placed under Subpart 16.505(b) exceeding $5.5M.

Sample RFQ Language:
“The Government may perform a comparative evaluation (comparing offers to each other) to select the contractor that is best suited and provides the best value, considering the evaluation factors in this RFQ.”
Step 1: Document Observations
For each non-price factor capture the noteworthy observations for that factor.

Step 2: Compare Observations
For each non-price factor compare the observations of all quotes to determine the most advantageous for that factor. Continue to the next non-price factor.

Step 3: Compare Overall
Enter is the last factor. Remember there is no relative of importance for any of the factors.

Step 4: Trade-Off for Best Value
After comparison, select the quote that offers the best-value:
- Lower price may be traded off for more advantageous offer
- Quote with highest non-price factor merit may not be in the best interest of the Government
- Or, price may be the tie-breaker for equal non-price factors

Non-price observations are used to support best value trade-off decision.
**Oral Presentations**

Allows the Government to hear directly from the vendor and their technical experts about their solutions and create a dialogue.

**Save Evaluation Time**
- Replace or reduce lengthy written submissions
- Conduct On-the-Spot Consensus after each presentation concludes and rate with confidence

**Achieve Better Acquisition Outcome**
- Evaluators get interactive dialogue to truly understand the proposed solution.
- Gives evaluation team greater confidence offerors know the requirement
- Saves time in evaluation by not having to read lengthy written proposals

Use in any part of the FAR!

Best used when a low number of offers are expected

Optimal use with USDA-Wide multi-award BPA

Use as an evaluation factor

May be used in phased down select and demonstrations
Maximize the Experience

- Outline the ground rules in solicitation including logistics, attendance, and format of presentation
- May or may not be accompanied by slides — if so, decide which is evaluated: oral presentation or slides
- DON’T listen to a sales pitch! Specify in the RFQ what the team needs to hear about and from whom (SME/tech expert)

Ask Questions - Lots of Them!

- Questions do not equal entering into discussions!
- Ask the same question to all presenters or individualized based on flow of conversation
- Test knowledge by asking situational based questions
- After presentation concludes the dialog ends

⚠️ Do not ask for or accept quote revisions!

Documentation the Presentation

Keep it Simple and only to what matters!

- FAR does not prescribe required documentation*
- PDF of presentation calendar invite
- Copy of Slides (if applicable)
- Bullets of evaluation team consensus

*for open market buys see FAR 15.102(e)

See the USDA's Oral Presentation Guide for more information

Part 13 allows you to just pick up the phone and get pricing!
Removes non-viable companies for a cleaner trade-off decision at the final phase.

This reduces the amount of documentation for evaluators to review.

**Phased Submission Process**

Multiple phases built into the RFQ for submission process:
- Removes non-viable companies for a cleaner trade-off decision at the final phase
- Reduces amount of documentation for evaluators to review

**Advisory**

Government’s recommends offeror to proceed or not to proceed to next RFQ phase.
- Provides time between phases
- Vendors who choose not to proceed are then not entitled to a brief explanation or protest
- Rate with confidence
- Recommend using advisory over firm down selects (less protest risk)

**Two types of down select methods**

**Firm "Go - No Go"**

Government makes the decision who is in or out at each phase of down-select.
- Must have clear and definitive standard to determine the "go-no go"
- No relative order of importance
- Vendors who are eliminated may be entitled to a debriefing, unsuccessful notice, and protest (depending on the FAR part)
- Ideal for FAR 16.505(b) fair opportunity considerations under $10 Million

**Down Select**

Narrow down the number of responses in a phase submission approach from several offers to only a few offerors.

Think about it like using a funnel.
Large number of offers are expected*

Firm or Advisory to narrow number of offerors

*Add flexibility with "The Government reserves the right to bypass down select activity based on number of offerors received." If a low number of offerors are received this allows to rate and move on.

Not optimal use of your time when ordering from BPAs.

The vendor pool is already small!

Down select from several to only the most viable offerors

Best Value trade-off at the end

Learn More
**Prior Experience**

Evaluate offeror’s prior experience instead of their past performance.

For many acquisitions, Prior Experience as an evaluation factor may be easier and more meaningful than Past Performance.

**What is Prior Experience?**
Highlights the proven quality of a company's performance on past projects and tasks.

- Evaluation is based on information within the proposal
- Offeror does not defend any adverse information
- An offeror without relevant, recent, or specialized experience may be rated unfavorably (lowers the confidence)
- Saves time! Allows evaluators to focus in on specific areas

**Adding Prior Experience to RFQ language**
Craft RFQ language to exactly what prior experience appropriate to meet the needs of the requirement

- Use as a non-price factor or sub-factor
- Rate with confidence!

Make sure the RFQ and evaluation make a clear distinction of using Prior Experience. Don’t mix up concepts!
These parts of the FAR are supposed to be Simpler, Easier, and are generally lower risk

May evaluate Prior Experience

Evaluation of Past Performance is not required and adds unnecessary risks

**FAR Subparts 8.4 and 16.505(b) or Part 13**

- These parts of the FAR are supposed to be Simpler, Easier, and are generally lower risk
- May evaluate Prior Experience
- Evaluation of Past Performance is not required and adds unnecessary risks

**FAR Part 15.3, Source Selection**

- Evaluate Past Performance
- Or, waive it – see FAR subpart 15.305(c)(3)(iii)

---

**Did They Really Do It?**

Don’t let the response be a sales-pitch!

Craft language in manner that requires the offeror to self verify their experience

- Written submission of how they have completed x, y, z
- Or, Submit 15 minute you-tube video of xyz
- Or, in the form of an oral presentation and throw in twist to ask details of the “how” or give them a problem scenario to respond to
- Have offeror include point of contact and the Government may call/email to verify (not required to contact)

Are all the vendors anticipated to do well in your Prior Experience evaluation? If so, then it is not good enough– differentiators are needed in the RFQ language!
Evaluator rates their confidence that the offeror understands their requirement and will successfully perform the work.

**When Confidence is Key**
For many of these acquisitions, using Confidence Ratings are easier and faster than 5-tiered rating scheme:
- ✔ Simplified Acquisitions (FAR Part 13)
- ✔ Orders and establishing BPAs under Schedule Contracts (FAR Subpart 8.4)
- ✔ Orders under Multiple Award IDIQ Contracts (FAR Subpart 16.505(b))

**Easier, Faster, and Smarter!**
- Very flexible; looks holistically at the strong points and weak points of an offer
- Is not a counting exercise of strengths and weaknesses for basis of rating!

**Confidence Rating Definitions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confidence Rating Definitions*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Confidence</strong> (low risk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Some Confidence</strong> (moderate risk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Confidence</strong> (high risk)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experience has shown deviation from a 3-tiered rating structure does not produce more effective outcomes.

- Use consensus and document with bullets

**Learn More**

*NOTE: Procurement Operations Division has established standard definitions (seen above). Unless standard definition exists for your contracting activity, use example above or from examples found on Periodic Table of Acquisition Innovation.*
On-the-Spot Consensus

Evaluation team moves quickly through an offeror's submission and reaches a rating agreement

- Best to use when rating with confidence
- An easy way to assign offeror's ratings!
- Majority rules! Does not require 100% agreement
- Document the observations that support the assigned rating!
- Individual rating sheets not required

The most important thing to remember is in an evaluation is to follow what we said we are going to do in the RFQ.

Steps to Reaching Consensus

1. Each evaluation team member votes their rating
   - There will most likely be outliers of the majority rating
   - If everyone has same vote move to documentation to support rating

   ![Votes](image)

   No majority reached  Consensus!

   ![Results](image)

   - continue with step 2
   - ready to document rating (proceed to next topic)

2. Outliers to the majority of votes are giving an opportunity to speak to the team
   - They may have identified something others missed

3. Team has a final vote
   - Remember the team does not have to be in 100% agreement on rating--only the majority has to agree!
   - Repeat Step 2 if no consensus reached

   ![Team](image)

   ![Team](image)

   - Ready to document rating (proceed to next topic)

DON'T FORGET

Learn More
No more long paragraphs to defend your assigned ratings. Instead, support ratings using bullet statements.

- Use clear, concise, reasonable and rational statements
- Reader can easily distinguish the team’s relevant thoughts
- Each bullets is a stand alone independent judgment
  - Not grouped as good vs. bad
  - Sub-bullets maybe used to expand on observation
- Ensure that all of RFQ's stated criteria is evaluated
- Relative strengths, deficiencies, significant weaknesses, and risks are only required for FAR Part 15.3 Source Selection*

Streamlined documentation

The consensus evaluation report is the record of the evaluation for each received quote's non-price factor and may be used to support best value tradeoff decision.
Resources

Period Table of Acquisition Innovation

DHS Procurement Innovation Lab (PIL)

PIL Primer Videos

Acquisition Gateway, log in & search for “Innovation Hub”

TechFAR Hub (IT Specific)
MODERN TOOLS AND TECHNIQUES

Acquisition Planning

Industry Liaisons & Reverse Industry Days & Strategic Conversation
Vendor Prequalification
Digital Services Trained Contracting Officers
Agile Methodology
Tech FAR & Professional Services Hub
Facilitated Requirements Development Workshops & Structured Peer Reviews
Challenge-based & shared-in-savings contracts

Purchase Request & Solicitation

Leverage BICs
Scenarios in Solicitations
Include Government Estimated Price
Two-Phase Acquisitions &/or Proposal Page Limits
Simplified Procedures for Commercial Item Buys
8(a) Digital Initiative
Broad Agency Announcements & Other Transactions

Proposal Evaluation & Award

Oral Proposals & Presentations
Thorough Offeror Debriefings
Same Day Challenges & Evaluations
Two-Phase Acquisitions &/or Proposal Page Limits
Non-Monetary Incentives (e.g., award term)
Simplified Best Value Analysis
Human Centered Design Evaluations
Prototypes

May be particularly helpful for

- IT
- Services
- R&D/Emerging Technologies
- General
B-412163, Sapient, Jan. 4, 2016—

“Sapient’s protest challenges the following four findings that the TEC documented for the firm’s oral presentation:

• This contractor won’t lead us, push forward.
• Presentation did not provide a complete understanding or feeling of confidence.
• A number of key concepts were not defined, or defined incorrectly.
• Focus on [DELETED] is an important continuous improvement method, but not a substitute for portfolio management.

Sapient claims that these findings are unreasonable, arguing that they allegedly reflect ‘too much impression and too little substance.’ Similarly, Sapient argues that the findings were ‘so vague and subjective’ that they were ‘per se inadequate to permit the SSA to make an intelligent and independent best value determination.’ We disagree.

First, although Sapient argues that the findings are ‘vague,’ each finding references a discrete, identifiable concern that the TEC had about Sapient’s oral presentation. Second, these concerns reasonably relate to the solicitation’s evaluation criteria for the oral presentation—namely, the effect an offeror’s oral presentation had on the TEC’s confidence in the offeror’s ability to successfully perform the task order. Finally, the record reflects that before making the source selection decision, the SSA considered the evaluation results under each nonprice factor ‘on paper and also in discussions with the [TEC],’ and that for Sapient’s oral presentation, the SSA specifically considered ‘the TEC’s explanation for [Sapient’s] rating.’ On this record, we see no merit in Sapient’s challenge to the TEC’s evaluation of the firm’s oral presentation or the SSA’s consideration of the TEC’s evaluation findings.”

Acquisition Innovation Comments: We can use simple, brief bullets in our technical evaluations — we don’t need lengthy, narrative essays!
GAO Case Study – Oral Presentations

Asking questions does not equal opening discussions when engaging in dialogue during Oral Presentations

B-415891, Vertical Jobs, Apr. 19, 2018 —
“...the solicitation required offerors to submit their technical proposals as a series of presentation slides, and required them to provide the agency with an oral presentation of those slides. The RFP further advised that the agency could ask clarification questions during these presentations...the record shows that the agency did not engage in discussions and the offerors were never afforded an opportunity to submit proposal revisions. Although VJ suggests that the agency’s actions during oral presentations “met the test” for discussions as defined in the Federal Acquisition Regulation, the protester does not explain how this is the case. As noted, offerors were not afforded an opportunity to revise their proposals, which is an essential requisite for the conduct of discussions....”

Acquisition Innovation Comments: We don’t open discussions as-long-as our exchanges at oral presentations don’t allow the offeror to:
(i) revise any part of its previously submitted paper proposal
or
(ii) submit any subsequent proposal revisions

Tremendous flexibility the Government has in conducting oral presentations.

B-412163, Sapient, Jan. 4, 2016—
“Sapient also alleges that discussions occurred during the firm’s oral presentation, and that the discussions were not meaningful. As discussed above, the solicitation provided that during the three-hour oral presentation session, Sapient was to develop a solution to a problem statement that the agency would provide at the outset of the session. The solicitation also provided that after Sapient presented its solution, the agency evaluators would caucus and then pose “any clarifications [they] may require to understand the presentation.” Sapient alleges that the agency’s clarification questions and Sapient’s responses thereto constituted discussions because the firm was permitted to “change, expand, and even reverse” what its representatives initially said in the session.

As described above, the exchange that Sapient characterizes as discussions occurred entirely within the confines of the three-hour oral presentation session. Sapient has not shown, and it is not clear to us, that anything said during the exchange revised some aspect of the firm’s previously-submitted proposal. Further, at the conclusion of the session, Sapient was not permitted to submit anything further to the agency. Thus, following the oral presentation, Sapient was not afforded an opportunity to revise anything that was said during the oral presentation or any part of the firm’s previously-submitted proposal. Under these circumstances, we do not consider the exchange to have been discussions; rather, we view it simply as a component of the oral presentation itself. Sapient’s claim that the agency engaged in nonmeaningful discussions is denied.”

Acquisition Innovation Comments: GAO views exchanges between evaluation team and the presenting company as “Component of the Oral Presentation Itself” as-long-as no opportunity to revise presentation or proposal was offered.

Continue to next page to learn more
If Evaluators Misunderstand Something from an Oral Presentation

**B-415514, Leidos Innovations Corp., Jan. 18, 2018—**

“According to Leidos, DHS misunderstood its approach...... Leidos contends that its presentation fully addressed concerns regarding [DELETED], and provided details as to how its solution would [DELETED].

Here, Leidos’ arguments reflect disagreement with the agency and do not demonstrate that the assignment of this weakness was unreasonable. Additionally, to the extent the agency misunderstood Leidos’ approach, just as the responsibility for submitting a well-written proposal with adequately-detailed information falls squarely on the offeror, the responsibility for providing a thorough, persuasive response to agency questions as part of an oral presentation falls on the offeror.”

Acquisition Innovation Comments: Supports not recording oral presentation sessions. It is not the responsibility of the Government to prove whether an offeror did or did not say something in an oral presentation.
Comparative Evaluation Worksheet
<title>

Non-Price Factor 1: <title>
Quote A’s noteworthy observations: _______________
Quote B’s noteworthy observations: _______________
Quote C’s noteworthy observations: _______________

For Non-Price Factor 1, Quote ______ to be most advantageous because _______.

Non-Price Factor 2: <title>
Quote A’s noteworthy observations: _______________
Quote B’s noteworthy observations: _______________
Quote C’s noteworthy observations: _______________

For Non-Price Factor II, Quote ______ to be most advantageous because _______.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>QUOTE A</th>
<th>QUOTE B</th>
<th>QUOTE C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Price Factor One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Price Factor Two</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRICE</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✔ = Most advantageous for that factor

The evaluation team finds that ..... 

Scenarios Examples: Continue to next page for sample trade-off language
Sample trade-off language:

In the evaluation team’s opinion, Quote A provides the best value. Quote A provides greater technical merit than either Quote B or Quote C, and Quote B provides greater technical merit than Quote C. The benefit of Quote A’s <because......> for Non-Price Factor 1 and Non-Price Factor 3 <because...> exceeds the benefit of Quote B’s <because......> for Non-Price for Factor 2. The non-price benefit of Quote A merits the higher price over both lower priced quotes of Quote B and Quote C. The evaluation team recommends award to Quote A.

-or-

In the evaluation team’s opinion, Quote B provides the best value. Quote A provides greater technical merit than either Quote B or Quote C, and Quote B provides greater technical merit than Quote C. Quote A’s premium price is not in the best interest of the USDA. Quote B’s noteworthy observations of technical merit include <key observations> for Non-Price Factor 1 and < key observations> for Non-Price Factor 3 than Quote C. Quote B’s <because......> for Non-Price for Factor 2 exceeded that of Quote A and Quote C. For these reasons, Quote B is in the best interest of the USDA. The evaluation team recommends award to Quote B.

-or-

In the evaluation team’s opinion, Quote C provides the best value. Quote A provides greater technical merit than either Quote B or Quote C, and Quote B provides greater technical merit than Quote C. The evaluation team has considered higher price for the greater technical merits of both Quote A and Quote B and has found that the premium price offered by both is not in the best interest of the USDA. The evaluation team has determined that Quote C’s <key observations> represents of the minimum needs of the requirement. For these reasons, Quote C is in the best interest of the USDA. The evaluation team recommends award to Quote C.
Title: ______________
RFQ No: ____________
Non-Price Factor __ – __________
(paste in this area the factor’s information from the RFQ. What did you ask for the vendors to submit or present for this factor? This area will help with keep focus on the factor being evaluating.)

Available Confidence Ratings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confidence Rating</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Confidence (Low Risk)</td>
<td>The Government has <strong>high confidence</strong> the vendor understands the requirement, proposes a sound approach, and will be successful in performing the contract with <strong>little or no</strong> Government intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Confidence (Moderate Risk)</td>
<td>The Government has <strong>some confidence</strong> the vendor understands the requirement, proposes a sound approach, and will be successful in performing the contract with <strong>some</strong> Government intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Confidence (High Risk)</td>
<td>The Government has <strong>low confidence</strong> the vendor understands the requirement, proposes a sound approach, or will be successful in performing the contract <strong>even with</strong> Government intervention.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Offeror: ______________

Assigned Confidence Rating: ____________

- Remember in consensus only the majority of the evaluation team must agree on the assigned rating. If an evaluation team member does not agree give the opportunity to discuss their observations and reasoning for disagreeing. Maybe they observed something that would raise or lower the rating that was not observed by the other team members.
- Enter here the Evaluation team’s observations to support the assigned rating highlighting highlight important benefits and/or concerns of each offeror.
- Bullets allows the evaluators to highlight important benefits and/or concerns of each offeror
  - What raises confidence (if applicable)?
  - What lowers confidence (if applicable)?
- Support ratings with clear, concise, reasonable, and rational bullet statements
- Strong bullets to support ratings:
  - Address all the criteria for the non-price factor
  - Not grouped as good vs. bad
  - Should be standalone independent judgments
  - Reader can easily distinguish the team’s relevant thoughts
- If individual notes or worksheets were used, these are no longer needed after team has reached agreement and are to be deleted when rating is assigned.
- Remember when using confidence ratings, the of relative strengths, deficiencies, significant weaknesses, and risks is only required for FAR Part 15.3 Source Selections.

**Bullets statements may reiterated in the best-value determination to support trade-off decision.**
Oral presentations allow the Government to hear directly from the vendor and their technical experts about their solutions, technical approach, prior experience, or even technical capabilities and create a dialogue. The information provided in this worksheet is helpful information for evaluator’s preparing to participate in the presentation evaluation.

Dialogue:

Evaluators may ask questions to the vendors technical experts and key personal while also engaging in interactive dialogue to truly understand the proposed solution. Dialogue exchanges are to only be conducted with in the confines of the oral presentation. GAO views exchanges between evaluation team and the presenting company as “Component of the oral presentation itself”.

GAO ruling has confirmed that asking questions during oral presentations does not constitute opening discussions as long as we **DO NOT ask for or accept offeror’s revision for any part of previously submitted paper proposal or any subsequent proposal revisions.** If vendor offers revisions, decline acceptance. This action would open discussions and open the evaluation to protest risk. If, during an oral presentation, the evaluation team decides to conducts discussions (see [FAR 15.306(d)](https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2020/06/04/2020-12785/569)), they must comply with FAR 15.306 and FAR 15.307.

The responsibility for providing a through, persuasive response to agency questions as part of the oral presentation falls on the offeror.

Question Format:

Standard Questions (asked to all vendors)
- May Provided initial questions in the solicitation
- Or, provided an hour or so before the oral presentation
- Or, include on-the-spot questions asked during the presentation
- Evaluators may ask scenario-based question to gauge knowledge and situational response

Individualized Questions (Not asked to all vendors)
- Questions may be asked based on information shared by the offeror in their oral presentation
- Individualized questions are not provided to all offerors
- This is not an opportunity to challenge offeror’s approach but to ensure that evaluators fully understand offeror’s approach/capability/prior experience (what is being evaluated)
- **Don’t ask leading questions.** This may be confused as discussions. “Tell me more” would be a generalized way to get near the topic without leading them.

Documentation:

FAR does not prescribe required documentation for record of oral presentation. Recording or transcript of presentation is not required. Suggest formats for record:
- PDF of presentation calendar invite
- Copy of presentation slides (if requested in solicitation)
Evaluation:

Conduct an On-the-Spot Consensus immediately following at conclusion of presentation. If virtual presentation, switch to other bridge or other conference platform to ensure privacy.

- The evaluation team evaluates immediately and makes decision in real time before starting the next presentation
- The evaluation team members do not separately document their individual positions (although they may have made observation notes)
- Document the rationale for the decision using bullet format
- The [team consensus worksheet](#) documents the rating and team’s observations

Tips for Success:

Recommendations based on feedback from previous requirement’s oral presentations sessions:

- Follow your solicitation’s establish ground rules for the oral presentation
- [Individual notes](#) are helpful to annotate observations but do not become part of the file
- Focus on content of information and not necessarily on performance of presenters:
  - Technical experts most likely will not be polished presenters and may be nervous. Don’t dismiss what they say! They may have great understanding of the requirement.
  - Polished presenters may captivate their audience with their presentation skills and not provide depth to establish their full understanding of the requirement. Pay close attention.
- Observing the presenter’s team dynamics is acceptable. If they obviously don’t work together for a presentation how would the performance be on your requirement?
- CO should facilitate session and feel free to interject if presentation content or evaluators questions are not focused on factor being evaluated
- Conduct a dry run of government team. Go over the introduction and flow of events and talk out standard questions (if applicable) to present to the offerors an organized team. Perfect time to discuss the information in this document and answer questions the team may have
- Clear your schedule and participate in all scheduled oral presentation sessions and evaluations
- Evaluation team may hold caucus prior to the conclusion of offeror’s presentation. This is time to do a quick team huddle to see if there were any additional questions to ask before concluding:
  - In virtual presentations, the evaluation team may leave the presentation and re-join on separate conference platform (bridge line/teams/zoom) before returning with final questions. Ensure you have successfully muted or completely left the offeror’s conference.
  - In person, have another conference room reserved away from presentation.
- Hard stops on time may not be necessary (if schedule allows) for a small amount of additional time for conclusion of dialogue. Use good judgement
- Once the presentation ends, the dialogue stops

Resources:

- FAR 15.102
- [POD Procurement Innovation Effort’s Training on Oral Presentation](#)
- [PIL Primer Video](#)
- [Periodic Table of Acquisition Innovation](#), Solicitation column, click on Oral Presentations box
- GAO cases: [B-415891, Vertical Jobs, Apr. 19, 2018](#) & [B-412163, Sapient, Jan. 4, 2016](#)