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[Words in italics are intended to reflect the general content of the sections. The document should be written in first person singular to clearly reflect that this is the SSO’s judgment and decision. The guidance in this template is prepared based on the acquisition being a best value selection in which the non-cost evaluation factors are significantly more important than the evaluated price. For other acquisitions under different selection criteria, the approach to preparing the source selection decision document would need to be modified accordingly. This template only reflects the general content and principles that need to be reflected in a source selection document. The actual document must be tailored to fit the circumstances and issues of the individual acquisition.]

[A] Introduction and Background

[Provide general background and introduction, as appropriate. One paragraph may be sufficient. The example below provides the type of information that may be included in this section.]

Example:
I was designated as the Source Selection Official (SSO) by [name of appointing authority] on [date of appointment] to select a contractor for the [title of acquisition]. A Source Evaluation Board (SEB) was established to solicit and evaluate proposals and prepare a report of the SEB’s evaluation results. I have read the SEB report and received a briefing from the SEB. I personally consulted with advisors and ex-officio members of the SEB. This document summarizes the acquisition process, the results of the SEB’s evaluation, and my selection decision based on my independent judgment.

[B] Description of the Acquisition

[Provide a general description of the acquisition. One paragraph may be sufficient. Use excerpts from the SEB report.]

[C] Solicitation and Submission of Proposals
[Provide a brief general description of the acquisition process from the solicitation and receipt of proposals from the first public notification of the acquisition, through the receipt of proposals. One or two paragraphs may be sufficient. Use excerpts from the SEB report and include the following:

- Public notice;
- One-on-one meetings;
- Pre-solicitation conferences;
- Facility tour;
- Draft Request for Proposal (RFP);
- Final RFP;
- RFP amendments; and
- Proposal receipt.]

Example:
This acquisition was conducted on the basis of full and open competition. The acquisition was initially publicized through FedConnect on [date] with subsequent updates of information to FedConnect throughout the acquisition process. A draft RFP was issued to the public on [date] to seek comments and input on the proposed RFP. A pre-solicitation conference and tour of the facility were held on [date], and one-on-one meetings were held with prospective offerors on [date].

The final RFP was issued on [date], and three amendments to the RFP were subsequently issued. No pre-proposal conference was held since a draft RFP was issued and a pre-solicitation conference and facility tours were held. [Number] proposals were received by the due date of [date].

[D] Proposals Received

[List the name of each offeror. If the offeror is a teaming arrangement, provide the name of each teaming member, e.g., subcontractors, each member of a limited liability company. List all offerors submitting proposals, including those that were excluded from the competitive range (if applicable), so the selection statement addresses the complete acquisition process. Use excerpts from the SEB report.]

[E] Evaluation and Selection Criteria

3
[State the evaluation criteria, qualification criteria (if applicable), and the selection criteria from Section M of the RFP. A chart showing the evaluation criteria and their relative importance is a good method in which to present this information. Include the following:

- Non-cost evaluation factors;
- Relative importance among non-cost evaluation factors;
- Basis of rating (adjectival or numerical);
- Cost and fee evaluation factors;
- Relative importance of non-cost evaluation factors to cost and fee evaluation factors;
- Best-value, basis for award; and
- Notification to offerors of intent to award without discussion (if applicable).]

[F] Competitive Range [if applicable]

[Include this section if a competitive range was established and discussions held. This section is intended to be a brief general description of the competitive range determination and the discussions process. Two or three paragraph may be sufficient. Use excerpts from the initial SEB report and the Contracting Officer’s determination of the competitive range. Include the following:

- Government’s intent expressed in the RFP to award with or without discussions;
- If award without discussions, state the Contracting Officer’s basis for determination of the necessity to conduct discussions;
- Contracting Officer’s determination of the competitive range and list of offerors remaining in the competitive range and the general basis for their inclusion;
- Notification to those offerors included in, and excluded from, the competitive range;
- Conduct of discussions with offerors in the competitive range; and
- Receipt of final revised proposals.]

Example:
The RFP stated the Government’s intent to award a contract without discussions, but reserved the right to hold discussions if determined to be necessary by the Contracting Officer. The Contracting Officer determined that discussions were necessary because [provide reason]. The Contracting Officer determined that the following offerors would be included in the competitive range:
The initial proposals from these offerors were judged to be the most highly rated proposals in consideration of the evaluation criteria stated in the RFP. These offerors’ proposals were evaluated as demonstrating the best capability to successfully perform the Statement of Work.

All offerors were notified as either being included in, or excluded from, the competitive range. Discussions were held with those offerors in the competitive range, and these offerors were given the opportunity to submit final revised proposals. Final revised proposals were received from both offerors. The SEB evaluated the final revised proposals, and the results of the SEB’s evaluations are summarized below.

[G] SEB’s Evaluation of Proposals

[Summarize the results of the SEB’s evaluation contained in the final SEB report. This section should focus on information that can be briefly presented since the next section, SSO’s Comparative Assessment of Proposals, addresses the SSO’s assessment of each proposal by criterion in greater detail. Further, depending on the circumstances, the SSO’s comparative assessment of proposals will relate to the information in this section, e.g., agree with SEB’s evaluation or disagree with SEB’s evaluation. Tables with some narrative introduction for each table can be most effective in summarizing information. This section should be no more than one to two pages unless unusual circumstances exist related to the SEB’s evaluation. Use excerpts from the SEB report and address at a minimum the following:

- Ratings table (adjectival or numerical score) for each non-cost evaluation factor/sub-factor and the relative importance among the non-cost evaluation factors;
- Identification of the highest rated proposal based on all non-cost evaluation factors (If proposals are numerically scored, this is evident from the information in the table. If adjectival ratings are used, the highest rated proposal based on the non-cost evaluation factors is identified only if the Source Selection Plan required the SEB to identify the most highly rated proposal.);
- Significant findings or issues related to the non-cost evaluation factors (This is not intended to be a narrative summary of the evaluation results that are reflected in the ratings table listed above. Rather, this should be included if there are significant issues that should be explained related to the SEB’s evaluation that have a significant impact on the selection decision. There may or may not be any issues of this nature that need to be addressed in this section of the document).]
Cost and fee table, including total proposed cost, total proposed fee, total probable cost, and total evaluated price for each offeror; and

Significant findings or issues related to the cost and fee.

Example:
The SEB reviewed and evaluated the proposals and prepared an extensive and detailed SEB report dated [date]. The report included information concerning the strengths, weaknesses, and deficiencies (if applicable) of each offeror’s proposal relative to the technical proposal evaluation criteria set forth in the solicitation. The report included the consensus rating (scores or adjectival ratings) for each of the technical proposal evaluation factors (and sub factors). The report also set forth the analysis of the proposed cost and fee and recommended a probable cost and evaluated price for each proposal. I am satisfied that the SEB’s evaluation was rigorous, thorough, and consistent with the evaluation criteria stated in the solicitation. The results of the SEB’s evaluation of the technical proposal, cost, and fee are summarized below:

TABLE - Technical Proposal Evaluation Results
Include all non-cost evaluation factors, relative importance, and rating (score or adjectival) for each offeror by evaluation factor. Identify the ranking of technical proposals, if applicable.

[Significant findings or issues related to technical proposal, if applicable.]

TABLE – Cost and Fee Evaluation Results
Include proposed and probable cost, proposed and probable fee (if cost plus incentive fee), and total evaluated price for each offeror.

[Significant findings or issues related to cost and fee proposal, if applicable.]

[SSO’s Comparative Assessment of Proposals]

[Up to this point in the document, the information is mostly background and general support to the SSO’s decision. This section begins the discussion of the basis for the SSO’s decision and reflects the findings and analysis of the SSO. This section would normally be the most important and extensive section of the document, followed by the section for the SSO’s tradeoff rationale.]
Depending on the specific circumstances of the acquisition and the SSO’s judgment, the comparative assessment may generally fall into one of two categories as follows:

- **The SSO agrees with all of the SEB’s evaluation of each non-cost evaluation factor of each offeror and the SEB’s evaluated prices,** or
- **The SSO agrees with most, but disagrees with some, of the SEB’s evaluation of individual non-cost evaluation factors of individual offerors and/or the evaluated prices.**

In either case, a general rationale for agreement or disagreement must be presented. The SSO should also address instances where there was not a consensus agreement within the SEB and where a minority report was presented.

For both of the two categories above, address the following:

- **The SSO’s comparative assessment of all proposals against each non-cost evaluation factor (Focus on the key discriminators between proposals and address each evaluation factor and sub-factor. One or two paragraphs would be expected for each criterion, depending on the complexity.);**

  **Example:**
  - Under the criterion for [provide criterion] the SEB’s evaluation found [provide finding].
  - I agree with the SEB’s evaluation because [provide reason] or I do not agree with the SEB’s evaluation because [provide reason].
  - I find the proposal of offeror A for criterion [provide criterion] to be better than the proposal of offer B because [provide reason] or I find the proposals of offeror A and offeror B to be substantially equal because [provide reason].

- **The ranking of technical proposals in consideration of all non-cost evaluation factors; and**

  **Example:**
  - The SEB found [provide ranking] [if the SEB evaluation’s produced a ranking of the technical proposals].
  - I agree with the SEB’s evaluation or I do not agree with the SEB’s evaluation because [provide reason] [if applicable].
  - I find that the ranking of the technical proposals based on all non-cost evaluation factors, to be [provide ranking of offerors] or I find the technical proposal from offeror A to be the highest rated because [provide reason].

- **The SSO’s assessment of the probable cost and the evaluated price for each offeror.**
Example:
- The SEB found [provide the SEB’s assessment of probable cost and evaluated price for each offeror].
- I agree with the SEB’s evaluation or I do not agree with the SEB’s evaluation because [provide reason].

[1] **SSO’s Technical/Cost Tradeoff Rationale** [if applicable]

[Use this section if the proposal selected is other than the highest rated technical proposal and lowest evaluated price and a technical/cost tradeoff is required.]

[A technical/cost, best value tradeoff analysis is necessary if the offeror selected is not the highest rated technical proposal (in consideration of all non-cost evaluation factors combined) and the lowest evaluated price. A technical/cost tradeoff analysis and rationale is necessary for each proposal whose (1) rating for all non-cost evaluation factors combined is higher than the selected offeror evaluated and/or (2) price is lower than the selected offeror. The tradeoff rationale should summarize the reasons that other than the highest rated and/or lowest evaluated price proposal is being selected. For example, the SSO’s comparative assessment might reflect the following:]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offerors</th>
<th>SSO Ranking (all non-cost factors)</th>
<th>Evaluated Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>$80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>$110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If offeror A is selected:
- A technical/cost tradeoff must be made between A and B and A and C to address why A is worth the differential in price in comparison to the lower price of B and C.
- D does not have to be addressed in the tradeoff since it is both higher priced than all of the other proposals and its rating is equal (or lower) than all of the other offerors.

If offeror B is selected:
- A technical/cost tradeoff must be made between B and A and B and C to address:
  - Why A is not worth the differential in price with B even though A has the highest technical rating; and
Why B is worth the differential in price in comparison to the lower price of C.

D does not have to be addressed for reasons stated above.

If C is selected:

- A technical/cost tradeoff must be made between C and A, and C and B to address why A and B are not worth the differential in price in comparison to the lower price of C even though A and C are higher rated technically.
- D does not have to be addressed for reasons stated above.

**[J1] SSO’s Selection Decision**

*Use this section if the proposal selected is other than the highest rated technical proposal and lowest evaluated price and a technical/cost tradeoff is required.*

[Name the offeror selected and state the basis for the selection as representing the best value to the Government in consideration of both technical and price factors. This should be drafted as a closing summary with little detail since the tradeoff rationale above provides the substance and detail to justify the decision. The example below demonstrates two possible scenarios – high technical/high price, and low technical/low price – but there are other combinations between these two scenarios that may be applicable.]

**Example:**
Based on the evaluation conducted by the SEB and my independent review and judgment, I select [name of offeror] for award of a contract for the [title of acquisition]. The proposal submitted by [name of offeror] represents the best value to the Government. [High technical/high price] - Its technical proposal is superior to those of the other offerors. Notwithstanding its higher evaluated price, it represents the best value to the Government over the lower rated technical proposals with lower evaluated prices. [Low technical/low price] - Notwithstanding its lower rated technical proposal, its evaluated price is lower and the added value of the higher rated technical proposals is not worth the differential in the evaluated price.

**[J2] SSO’s Selection Decision**

*Use this section if the proposal selected is the highest rated technical proposal and lowest evaluated price and a technical/cost tradeoff is not required.*

[Name the offeror selected and briefly state the basis for the selection as representing the best value to the Government since it is the highest rated technical proposal and the lowest evaluated price. Since the selection is high tech/low cost, the basis for the decision should be very brief.]

Example:
Based on the evaluation conducted by the SEB and my independent review and judgment, I select [name of offeror] for award of a contract for the [title of acquisition]. The proposal submitted by [name of offeror] represents the best value to the Government, since it is the highest rated technical proposal and the lowest evaluated price [lowest “proposed price” may be added if the selected offer is the also the lowest proposed price].

______________________________________________  ______________
[SSO Name]                                      [Date]
Source Selection Official
[SSO Title]