**FAIR OPPORTUNITY DECISION DOCUMENT**

**PROGRAM NAME/REQUIREMENT TITLE**

**FOPR NUMBER**

*Note: Informational/directional text/placeholders printed in red text should be deleted.*

1. **DETERMINATION**

This source selection was conducted in accordance with FAR 16.505 and as outlined in the Fair Opportunity Proposal Request (FOPR). I was given complete access to all available documents pertaining to the acquisition, including evaluation briefing slides, offeror proposals, technical subfactor evaluation worksheets, consensus documentation, interchange notices (INs), evaluation reports, technical ratings, cost/price information, and other documentation to support my decision. As the Decision Authority (DA), after extensive review of the documentation and in consultation with Fair Opportunity Evaluation Team, and my advisors *(if used)*, I have determined that the proposal submitted byXXXoffers the best overall value to satisfy the Air Force’s stated requirements for theXXX *(insert program name/requirement title)*. *Discuss mission, scope, contracting approach.* My selection is based upon an integrated assessment of the proposals submitted by the following offerors:

*List offerors, indicating those not in the competitive range and the date they were eliminated from the competitive range*

1. **EVALUATION PROCESS**

*List the factors (and subfactors, when established) as set forth in the FOPR and include their relative importance to one another and when combined, relative to cost or price; explain rating method(s) used - colors, adjectival, etc. If past performance is not included as an evaluation factor, state that the evaluation of past performance was not included.*

The specific criteria against which the competing proposals were evaluated consisted of the following factors and subfactors: *(when subfactors are established)*

**3. PROPOSAL EVALUATION**

*Note: The SSA must provide the level of detail necessary to fully describe the proposal.*

*Discuss the comparative analysis of the Technical rating and Technical Risk rating (tailor as appropriate for the technical evaluation methodology used in the source selection (separate technical and technical risk rating or combined technical/risk rating)).* *Note:* *The analysis is not comparative for LPTA acquisitions because the LPTA process does not permit tradeoffs between price and non-price factors.*

*Discuss the comparative analysis of the Performance Confidence Assessment at the factor level (or, for LPTA, the Past Performance Rating).* *When using LPTA, the past performance rating is not comparative because the LPTA process does not permit tradeoffs between price and non-price factors.*

*Discuss the Cost/Price factor – this is usually just termed “Price” on LPTA acquisitions. Address findings of analysis for reasonableness, realism, and unbalanced pricing, as appropriate for this acquisition.*

*Discuss the Small Business Participation Factor, if applicable.*

**4. AWARD RECOMMENDATION**

*Include rationale for the award recommendation as well as rationale for any minority opinion(s) if there is significant disagreement among the evaluation members. Explain how any minority opinion(s) from the evaluation team were resolved by the DA.*

**5. SUMMARY DETERMINATION**

*If awarding without interchanges, reference the language in the FOPR concerning award without interchanges and briefly describe why the DA determined it appropriate to award without interchanges. Describe the tradeoffs made between the factors/subfactors of each offeror's proposal within the context of the order of importance of the factors/subfactors described in FOPR, if used. Include the rationale for any business judgments and tradeoffs made or relied on by the DA, including benefits associated with additional costs and state why the benefit is in the Government’s best interest. If this is a multiple award situation and the DA has decided to select more or fewer than the target number of awards set forth in the FOPR, the DA must provide the rationale for the number of awards decided upon. Provide justification for the summary statement below.*

In summary, based on my integrated assessment of all proposals in accordance with the evaluation criteria set forth in FOPR XXXX *(insert FOPR number)* for the XXX *(insert program/requirement title)* it is my decision that the proposal submitted by XXX represents the best overall value to the Government. I direct contract award to XXX.

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Name Date**

**Decision Authority**

**FODD ADMINISTRATIVE PREPARATION TIPS**

* Write the FODD in past tense only, other than the Summary Determination paragraph which should be written in present tense.
* Write in first person only.
* Do not make the document look fancy. Do not use (or only minimally use) graphics.
* Do not use attachments.
* Font = Arial or Times New Roman; Size = 12 (suggested); one inch margins all around. Justified margins or regular margins are fine, but do not mix.
* Consider making each offeror appear to have the same name length to prepare for redacting the FODD. An unsuccessful offeror has the right to see how they stacked up against the successful offeror, but not against other unsuccessful offerors. For example, if you have a redacted FODD going to Lockheed Martin\_ and they competed against L-3\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, Northrop Grumman, and Boeing\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, and Boeing\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ won, the number of characters in Northrop Grumman’s name is 16 so all offerors’ names would have 16 spaces, as shown in this sentence.
* Spell out acronyms at first use. This is important in order to ensure a common understanding of the key items in the source selection. Do not assume the reader knows what you are talking about technically or administratively. If necessary, include a very short explanation of the term, especially if it is a key discriminator.
* Check the numbers, percentages, math, etc., at least twice yourself and then have a third party check them one more time. Attention to detail (getting the small things right the first time) is important because it instills confidence in the quality of the workmanship.
* Do not needlessly repeat items within the document except for the summary. Expect that readers can look forward or back for the referenced material.
* Put the ratings in all capital letters (e.g., BLUE) to make them stand out. Put factors and subfactors (e.g., Technical) in first letter capitals to make them stand out as well.
* Add page breaks and use titles to set things off from each other. For example, it should be clear to the reader which factor or subfactor is being detailed.
* Be consistent throughout the document in format and treatment of the offerors and discussions.

**FODD PREPARATION** **CHECKLIST**

* Is the FODD written as a stand-alone document without any references to other reports and analyses used to support the SSA’s decision? All data supporting the decision should be contained within the FODD.
* Does the FODD tell a complete story? Is it clear and concise? Do paragraphs flow logically?
* Are all of the factors and subfactors impacting the decision process identified in the FODD and are they identical to the FOPR? Are those subfactors that did not impact the decision acknowledged? (For example, “negligible differences among the offerors” or “this did not impact my decision.”)
* Do the conclusions for each evaluation factor and award decision link directly to the evaluation factors in the FOPR?
* Does the FODD compare offerors against each other (for example, “I have decided [Offeror ABC’s] approach to the subcontracting plan subfactor was better than [Offeror XYZ’s or all other offerors] because [Offeror ABC] proposed/discussed/resolved/identified/possessed”)?
* If the situation is applicable, does the rationale explain why and how the additional benefits and advantages justify a best value award to someone other than the lowest priced offeror? Does this explanation demonstrate a reasonable, certain, and non-arbitrary rationale?
* Does the FODD explain how the DA resolved any minority opinion(s)?
* If the DA disagreed with the evaluation team recommendations, does the FODD explain why?
* Is the FODD fully traceable to the evaluation briefing charts (if used)? There must be total consistency between the FOPR, the evaluation, the FOER, FODB or a full explanation of any inconsistency.
* Does the FODD clearly state that the DA followed the stated relative order of importance of the evaluation criteria and was it interwoven in the comparative analysis discussion in the FODD? There must be an up-front statement of the relative order of importance of the evaluation criteria in the FODD.
* Did source selection experts, as applicable, the PCO, and Legal Counsel review the FODD?