**SOURCE SELECTION DECISION DOCUMENT**

Subject: Source Selection Decision under Solicitation ***[solicitation # and title of solicitation]***

Date: ***[date]***

1. **Background**

* The subject solicitation was issued on ***[date]*** and closed on ***[date]***
* Number of amendments issued: ***[number of amendments issued]***
* Number of timely proposals received: ***[number]***
* Source selection process: **[*either “Lowest price technically acceptable” OR “Tradeoffs”]***
* The Independent Government Cost Estimate (IGCE) was: ***[amount]***

1. **Evaluation**

The **[*name of team, panel or board, e.g., Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB)]*** briefed me on this competition and the related evaluation materials and provided me with access to all of the solicitation and evaluation materials including without limitation, **[List SIR and Evaluation Materials: the SIR, the Evaluation Plan, Technical Evaluation Report Technical Evaluation Team (TET) Worksheets, and the Price Evaluation Report.]** I reviewed the evaluation and competition materials provided, and agree with the Teams’ findings. Each of the proposals as summarized in the matrix below ***[Add, if applicable, “except as noted” and explain the basis for any disagreement]***:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sub-factor | Offeror 1 | Offeror 2 | Offeror 3 |
| ***[Titles of sub-factors if tradeoffs used or acceptability requirements if LPTA]*** | ***[ratings]*** |  | ***[Add columns as needed]*** |
| ***[Add rows as needed]*** | ***[ratings]*** |  | ***[Add columns as needed]*** |
| ***[“Cost” OR “Price”]*** | $ | $ | $ |

1. **Award Decision**

***[Provide narrative description of the Source Selection Official’s comparative assessment of proposals against all source selection criteria in the solicitation. Include the rationale for any business judgments].***

***[Note that tradeoffs are not permitted under the lowest price technically acceptable process].***

***[If using a tradeoff process, provide a cost/technical tradeoff analysis that logically leads to the award decision. The tradeoff analysis should be documented with detailed narrative explaining the relevant facts and supporting rationale. Statements of conclusion based on ratings alone are not acceptable. The tradeoff analysis must explicitly justify a price premium based on the superiority of the selected offeror’s technical or non-cost rating. This justification is required even when the solicitation indicates that non-cost factors are more important than cost/price. The justification must clearly state what benefits or advantages the government will receive for the added cost/price and why it is in the government’s best interest to expend the additional funds. Where it is determined that the non-cost benefits offered by the higher priced offeror are not worth the price premium, an explicit justification is also necessary. In this case, the analysis must show why it is reasonable in light of the significance of the differences to pay less money for a proposal of lesser technical merit].***

***See the following sample language. In all cases, ensure that your narrative fits the facts of your procurement action.***

Example 1: Lowest Price Technically Acceptable Process

*In accordance with the lowest priced technically acceptable selection process, I hereby select* ***[Offeror’s Name]*** *for award.* ***[Offeror’s name]*** *is the lowest evaluated proposal price. The technical proposal meets or exceeds the acceptability standards for non-cost factors.*

Example 2: Tradeoff Process

1. ***Independent Analysis***

*I have accomplished an independent analysis of the information provided in order to accomplish an integrated assessment of the findings of my SSEB. My findings, by factor and sub-factor, are as follows:*

* *Factor 1:* ***[Factor name]***
* *Sub-factor 1:* ***[Sub-factor title]***

*In this, the most important sub-factor of Factor 1,* ***[Offeror’s name]*** *was rated as Excellent and determined to have the highest rating of all Offerors.* ***[Offeror’s name]*** *documented a detailed and in-depth description of their* ***[description]****.* ***[Offeror’s name]*** *also identified their ability to respond promptly to* ***[relevant information]****. I also have Significant Confidence in their ability to perform as required under this sub-factor.* ***[Offeror’s name]*** *received an Acceptable rating, and I have Confidence in their ability to meet the requirements of this sub-factor.* ***[Offeror’s name]*** *was rated as Unacceptable due to their* ***[reason]****.* ***[Offeror’s name]*** *was rated Unacceptable because* ***[Offeror’s name]*** *did not* ***[reason]****, which resulted in an Unacceptable rating.* ***[Offeror’s name]*** *was rated as Unacceptable because* ***[reason]****. As these four offerors were rated unacceptable, I have Low Confidence in their ability meet our requirements without changes to their proposed solutions. Accordingly, for this sub-factor I find* ***[Offeror’s name]*** *to offer the more exceptional capabilities.*

*Sub-factor 2 –* ***[Sub-factor title]***

*[Repeat as shown in the example above for each remaining sub-factor].*

1. ***Factor 2: Past Performance***

*For Past Performance, both* ***[Offeror’s Name]*** *and* ***[Offeror’s Name]*** *were found to be the highest rated by their previous customers, resulting in my having High Confidence in their ability to perform.* ***[Major findings that drove the rating]****.* ***[Offeror’s name]*** *and* ***[Offeror’s name]******[major findings that drove the rating]****, earning a rating of Significant Confidence. I have Confidence in both* ***[Offeror’s name]*** *and* ***[Offeror’s name]*** *abilities to perform, but expect that some government intervention would be necessary.* ***[major findings******that drove the rating]****. Accordingly, for this factor, I find both* ***[Offeror’s name]*** *and* ***[Offeror’s name]*** *be above the other Offerors as they provide the highest of confidence in their ability to perform based on successful past performance.*

1. ***Factor 3: Cost/Price***

*All proposals were considered complete, reasonable, and realistic.* ***[Offeror’s name]*** *evaluated price was found to be the lowest, at* ***$[amount]****.* ***[Offeror’s name]*** *was evaluated at $* ***[amount]****, approximately.9% higher than* ***[Offeror’s name]****. At an evaluated price of $* ***[amount]****,* ***[Offeror’s name]*** *was found to be 1.1% higher than the next lowest priced Offeror* ***[Offeror’s name]*** *and approximately 2% higher than the lowest priced Offeror* ***[Offeror’s******name]****.* ***[Offeror’s name]*** *evaluated price of $* ***[amount]*** *is approximately 5.1% higher than the next lowest* ***[Offeror’s name]*** *and 7.2% higher than the lowest priced Offeror.* ***[Offeror’s name]*** *evaluated price of $* ***[amount]*** *was 7.2% higher than the next lowest* ***[Offeror’s name]*** *and 14.9% higher than the lowest evaluated price.* ***[Offeror’s name]*** *provided the highest evaluated price, at $* ***[amount]****. This is 30.4% higher than the next lowest Offeror* ***[Offeror’s name]*** *and approximately 49.8% higher than the lowest evaluated price.* ***[Note: Using******percentages may not be the best way for your particular evaluation to express the differences between the offerors. Use the method utilized in the evaluation and briefing].***

1. ***Integrated Assessment and Source Selection***

*After consideration of the information provided to me by the SSEB and after accomplishing an integrated assessment, it is my determination that* ***[Offeror’s name]*** *clearly offers the "best value" proposal for fulfilling our requirements for the* ***[Procurement Title]****. Taking into consideration the established and stated order of importance,* ***[Offeror’s name]*** *attained the highest overall rating in the most* ***[number]*** *important sub-factors under* ***[Factor Title]****. Furthermore, they attained the highest rating possible in the past performance factor. I found the remaining Offeror,* ***[Offeror’s name]****, to be rated lower than* ***[Offeror’s name]*** *in the three most important sub-factors of Factor 1, and lower in Factor 2.* ***[Offeror’s name]*** *was also evaluated as having a significantly higher cost than* ***[Offeror’s name]****. Therefore, of the Offerors eligible to receive this award,* ***[Offeror’s name]*** *was rated higher overall and had the lowest evaluated price.*

*In my integrated assessment, I looked closely at both the merit and confidence ratings achieved by the offerors across the spectrum of evaluation factors and sub-factors to select, with certainty, the most highly rated and qualified offeror for this project.*

*This source selection decision briefing utilized a “blind” format, meaning that the identities of all offerors were masked to me at all times until after my decision was completed. Offerors were identified only by randomly assigned letters, to prevent any chance for systematic indication. At no time during my decision-making process did I request a recommendation from the SSEB.* ***[Use if the SSO is other than the CO].***

*In summary, my integrated assessment of all offerors revealed that* ***[Offeror’s Name]*** *provided a proposal that generated the best overall value to the Government and yielded the greatest level of confidence that successful performance of the* ***[Procurement Title]*** *will be realized.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| Signature |  | Date |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *[Contracting Officer or “Source Selection Official,” if someone other than the CO is designated as the SSO]* |  |
| Title |  |

Number of Enclosures: 5 ***[Include as appropriate]***

1. Competitive Range Determination
2. Cost/Price Analysis of Initial Proposals
3. Cost/Price Analysis of Final Proposal Revision
4. Evaluation Report of Final Proposal Revisions
5. Technical Evaluation Report of Initial Proposals