Justification for an Exception to Fair Opportunity or to Use Brand-Name Restriction

Is this a brand-name justification? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Please provide the product title and description. [FAR16.505(a)(4)(i)]

Brand-Name Product Title: NiftyLift SD64 4x4x4 Diesel Self Drive Work Platform

Brand-Name Product Description: Self-Driving Articulated Boom Lift

Is this a Bridge Action as defined in the AF Bridge Action Reduction Plan? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Contracting Activity: Contracting AFLCMC/PZIB

Purchase Request / Local ID Number: [redacted]

Program Name (and Program Element, if applicable): NBSFS Articulating Lift

Estimated Cost/Price of the Order (including options): [redacted]

Type Program (see AFFARS 5302.101 for definitions): ☐ PEO Program ☒ Operational ☐ Enterprise

Type of Determination: ☒ Individual ☐ Class Expires: [click and select]

Click here for instructions to complete the boxes below.

(1) Contracting Activity:
The Air Force Life Cycle Management Center (AFLCMC) (PZIB) is the the contracting office at Hanscom AFB, Massachusetts responsible for this proposed procurement in support of New Boston Space Force Station (NBSFS).

(2) Nature and/or description of the action being approved:
This proposed action supported by this Brand-Name Restriction is to award a new firm fixed priced contract for the purchase of NiftyLift SD64 4x4x4 Diesel Self Drive Work Platform and accessories in accordance with the Statement of Work (SOW).

(3) Description of the supplies/services required to meet the agency's needs:
This justification supports the brand-name purchase of the NiftyLift SD64 4x4x4 Diesel Self-Drive Work Platform and associated accessories. The procurement of this specific brand and model is required to ensure compatibility with the existing fleet of NiftyLift articulating boom lift equipment currently in use at NBSFS. Standardizing on the same brand and model is critical to maintaining seamless interoperability, operational efficiency, and safety for personnel who utilize this equipment. The NiftyLift SD64 4x4x4 meets all technical and operational requirements as outlined in the SOW which align with the agency's mission-critical needs. Additionally, the purchase of this specific brand ensures standardization and compatibility with existing accessories and spare parts inventory, eliminating the need for duplicative inventory and reducing long-term maintenance costs. The requirement for this specific brand-name item ensures the agency's ability to maintain consistent operations, reduce downtime, and mitigate potential safety risks associated with introducing incompatible or unfamiliar equipment. Furthermore, no installation services are required as the equipment will seamlessly integrate with the existing infrastructure and operational processes of NBSFS.

(4) Justification for restricting consideration to a brand-name item:
The NiftyLift brand of articulating lift and associated accessories are currently utilized at NBSFS to support operations. This procurement is intended to supplement the existing system to expand coverage to higher and more challenging-to-reach locations on the installation. Selecting the same brand ensures full compatibility with the current equipment and accessories,

Justification for an Exception to Fair Opportunity or to Use Brand-Name Restriction

eliminating the need to purchase additional or replacement components that would otherwise be required for interoperability with a different brand.

Personnel at NBSFS are already trained and proficient in the operation of this specific brand and model, reducing the risk of user error and minimizing additional training requirements. The immediate integration of this equipment into the existing operational infrastructure at NBSFS ensures continuity of operations and avoids unnecessary delays or disruptions. Furthermore, technicians are familiar with the maintenance procedures and requirements for this brand, which further minimizes the potential for maintenance errors and reduces downtime.

Restricting this procurement to the NiftyLift brand also avoids additional costs associated with purchasing new accessories, retraining personnel, or stocking replacement parts for a different brand. By maintaining compatibility with the existing inventory of parts and supplies, this acquisition will yield long-term cost savings and enhance operational efficiency. The use of the same brand ensures consistency and reliability, which are critical to the success of NBSFS operations and the safety of personnel.

(5) Contracting Officer's determination that the anticipated cost to the Government will be fair and reasonable:

The Contracting Officer has determined that the anticipated cost for this acquisition will be fair and reasonable based on comprehensive market research, including a review of pricing available through GSA Advantage, responses to the GSA eBuy RFI/RFQ, and pricing data from SAM.gov. The gathered data provides a robust basis for evaluating the vendor's proposed pricing against current market rates for comparable items.

Additionally, the Contracting Officer will conduct a formal price analysis prior to award in accordance with RFO 15.103-2 to ensure the proposed price is fair and reasonable. By leveraging these market research findings and conducting independent price analysis, the Government is positioned to make a sound and fiscally responsible award decision.

(6) Other facts supporting the justification:

The NiftyLift brand and model are already in use at NBSFS, and this procurement is intended to match the existing equipment currently in operation. Procuring the same brand and model ensures full compatibility with the current inventory of equipment and accessories, eliminating the need for additional purchases of auxiliary components or replacement parts. This consistency also reduces operational disruptions and avoids incurring unnecessary costs associated with modifying existing systems to accommodate a different brand.

Moreover, NBSFS personnel are already trained and proficient in the operation and maintenance of this specific brand and model. Acquiring the same equipment ensures that no additional training is necessary, allowing staff to immediately and effectively operate the new equipment. This continuity minimizes the risk of operator error, ensures safety, and sustains the efficiency of ongoing operations. By standardizing on this brand and model, NBSFS can also leverage cost savings from maintaining a single inventory of replacement parts and accessories, further justifying the procurement of this specific brand-name item.

(7) Actions the agency may take to remove or overcome any barriers to decreasing the use of brand-name items before any subsequent acquisition of the supplies or services:

The agency is committed to promoting competition and reducing reliance on brand-name specifications wherever feasible. To achieve this, continual and robust market research will be conducted to identify potential alternative products or manufacturers that meet the agency's requirements without compromising quality, safety, or operational efficiency.

(8) Program Manager's certification that supporting data is accurate and complete:

As evidenced by my signature below, I certify that any supporting data contained herein, which is my responsibility, is both accurate and complete.

Justification for an Exception to Fair Opportunity or to Use Brand-Name Restriction

(9) Contracting Officer's certification that the justification is accurate and complete:
As evidenced by my signature below, I certify that the justification is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief.

(10) Approving Official's determination that FAR16.505(a)(4)(i) applies to the order:
As evidenced by my signature below, I hereby determine that the use of brand-name restriction applies.

Date	Defense Force Director	Signature
01 Apr 2026	[redacted]	[redacted]
Date	Contracting Officer	Signature
29 May 2026	[redacted]	[redacted]

Justification for an Exception to Fair Opportunity or to Use Brand-Name Restriction

Instructions for Completing the Template IAW FAR 16.505(b)(2)(ii)(B)

(2) State whether the action is a new order or a modification to an existing order. Identify the basic multiple award contract number and the order number for the current action. Also identify the type of the order/line items on the order (e.g., Firm Fixed price, Cost Plus Fixed Fee, etc.).

(3) Specifically describe the supplies/services to be acquired including the price/cost and quantity of each item in the order and the total estimated value of the order. For services, state whether services are performance-based, and if not, provide rationale for not being performance based. State the delivery/performance schedule/period for the items under the order. Explain how the requirement/order fits under the scope of the basic multiple award contracts. (Note: The Contracting Officer must ensure that the order is issued within the period of performance and within the maximum value of the contract).

(4) Include the appropriate exception from FAR 16.505 (b)(2) and the supporting rationale. FAR16.505(b)(1)(i) requires the Contracting Officer to provide each awardee under a multiple award contract, a fair opportunity to be considered for each order exceeding $3,000 unless a statutory exception applies. The specific exception that precludes the fair opportunity process for this acquisition is FAR 16.505(b)(2)(i)(__) [Insert A,B, C, D, or E]. If a brand name product description is being justified, use this section to explain why the particular brand name, product, or feature is essential to the Government's requirements and why other companies' similar products/services do not meet, or cannot be modified to meet, the agency's needs.

FAR 16.505(b)(2)(i)(A): "The agency need for the supplies or services is so urgent that providing a fair opportunity would result in unacceptable delays". When using this exception provide a detailed justification with supporting documentation that explains the exact urgency of the requirement and the mission impact if awarded to any other contractor. The user/customer typically provides this supporting information. Recommend attaching supporting documentation to the back of the document. General statements of urgency are not acceptable.

FAR 16.505(b)(2)(i)(B): "Only one awardee is capable of providing the supplies or services required at the level at the level of quality required because the supplies or services ordered are unique or highly specialized". When using this exception provide a detailed justification, with supporting documentation, as evidence of the "unique or highly specialized" nature of the procurement. The user/customer typically provides this supporting information. Supporting documentation may be attached to the back of the document. General statements are not acceptable.

FAR 16.505(b)(2)(i)(C): "The order must be issued on a sole-source basis in the interest of economy and efficiency as a logical follow-on to an order already issued under the contract, provided that all awardees were given a fair opportunity to be considered for the original order". When using this exception provide information on the previously competed order under this contract and detail the economies and efficiencies that will be obtained by going sole source for the follow-on order. The user/customer typically provides this supporting information. General statements are not acceptable.

FAR 16.505(b)(2)(i)(D): "It is necessary to place an order to satisfy a minimum guarantee."

FAR 16.505(b)(2)(i)(E): "For orders exceeding the simplified acquisition threshold, a statute expressly authorizes or requires that the purchase be made from a specified source."

Discuss the market research that was conducted by the user/technical team/contracting officer among the supplies/services of all awardees that resulted in the conclusion that a fair opportunity exception applied. The narrative in this section should provide a high level of confidence that the requirements of FAR 16.505(b)(1) and DFARS 216.505-70 could not be met. If no market research was conducted, state so and provide the rationale. If any other awardee expressed interest in fulfilling the requirement, but was not considered a potential source, explain why that awardee cannot provide the required supplies/perform the service.

Justification for an Exception to Fair Opportunity or to Use Brand-Name Restriction

If the use of a brand name purchase description is being justified, the market research should include an analysis of any industry proposed alternative products or approaches to meeting the requirements. Additionally, the Government's efforts to identify as many potential sources as practicable offering the required brand name item(s) should be addressed.

(5) This paragraph needs to be tailored based on the types of CLINs in the order and the pricing arrangements on the basic multiple award contract. If the contract did not establish the price for the supply or service, the Contracting Officer must establish prices for each order IAW FAR 15.4. The paragraph needs to describe the steps that will ensure that the prices/estimated cost of the order will be fair and reasonable. For example, even if firm-fixed prices were obtained under adequate price competition in the award of the multiple award contract, the Contracting Officer still needs to consider market conditions and other factors that may have changed since contract award and explain the basis in the determination that prices/costs are fair and reasonable prior to award of the order.

(6) Provide any other facts supporting the use of exceptions to the fair opportunity process.

(7) Include a statement of the actions, if any, to be to be taken to remove or overcome any barriers that led to the exception to fair opportunity before any subsequent acquisition for the supplies or services is made. If no actions are planned, so state and provide reasons.