Sole Source Documentation Form Instructions
For use with Form 3201 FR.06 Revised 3/15/2019

Section 1: Sole Source Justification

- Enter Supplier name and PO Number
- Check all boxes that apply, and fully explain in the text box below why competitive procurement is not possible, or alternatively, why competitive procurement is not in the University’s best interest.
  For example:
  - Only one acceptable product or service, and only available from this vendor.
  - Constraints prevent competitive bidding.
  - Benefits of product or service justify the known price premium over available alternatives. If the price premium is not known, the relative costs should be determined via competitive bidding, with the award based upon a cost/benefit analysis. Assertions of value are not justification to waive the University’s competitive bidding process.

Example justifications for the Section 1 text box:
(Examples of associated explanations to support Section 2 are included in parentheses.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check Box Text</th>
<th>Bad Explanation</th>
<th>Good Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supplier owns a proprietary process or license</td>
<td>The vendor’s process was developed in-house and is proprietary.</td>
<td>The vendor has developed proprietary products and processes for removing stains from limestone. In side-by-side tests demonstrated results far superior to other market-leading stone cleaning products. Only this vendor’s sample was accepted by the evaluation committee. (The cost per square foot is in line with preliminary pricing provided for the other four alternatives tested.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problem: There is no explanation of the process, how it is superior to other alternatives and why it is deemed to be the only acceptable option. There is no discussion of the cost compared to other alternatives or how the reasonableness of the cost was evaluated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item requires compatibility with existing equipment or services</td>
<td>Vendor has installed the same materials in the building before.</td>
<td>Two labs are being combined, requiring existing casework modifications and new matching casework. This manufacturer’s casework was installed in the building in 2012 and is still available. Other manufacturers contacted were unable to provide a matching product, and custom production is prohibitively expensive. Investigation summary is in the project file. Vendor is the manufacturer’s exclusive local representative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problem: Does not explain the compatibility requirement, or why this is the only solution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Supplier is a designated exclusive distributor for this product or service | Vendor is the only Connecticut distributor for this product.  
*Problem: Does not explain why this is the only acceptable product, and does not address price.* | Vendor is the only Connecticut distributor for this product. Although other similar products are more cost effective (cost premium is approximately $2,000), this product was chosen due to the sensitivity of the equipment (there is a known tendency for equipment to malfunction when anything but this product is used). |
|---|---|---|
| Supplier maintains consistency of products during research testing | Vendor is supplying the same units that are currently in the research facility.  
*Problem: Does not explain how product impacts research, or compare to other available options.* | The professor has requested that the gas chromatography units to be purchased be identical to his existing equipment. Due to the sensitivity of the professor’s work, even the slightest variation in the equipment may skew his research results. (Price variation, after negotiating a 15% price reduction for this product, is minor compared to other similar available products.) |
| Supplier is the only one who can meet the required tolerance and/or timeline | Contractor selected due to schedule.  
*Problem: Schedule constraints and impacts of delay not explained. No explanation of why this vendor is the only vendor that can meet the schedule requirements, or of efforts to find other vendors.* | A flood occurred in the basement of the building due to a burst pipe and cleaning services were needed to immediately remedy the situation to prevent further damage and return the kitchen to service. The Contractor was the only company available on short notice of the 5 companies contacted and has provided similar services in past emergency situations. (Vendor charges rates for cleaning services that are competitive with other area companies for similar services.) |
| Start-up and orientation for new supplier is not cost effective given requirements | This Consultant has done other work in the building.  
*Problem: There is no analysis of the impacts of changing vendors.  
(If the situation is not clear-cut, competitive proposals should be obtained to verify presumptions.)* | The work is a direct continuation of a recent prior study. The Consultant’s knowledge gained is directly applicable to the current effort, which is expected to only take 70 hours. Another consultant would have to review the existing 800 page existing conditions survey report and perform due diligence confirmation testing (estimated to take up to 30 hours) before proceeding with the preparation of documents for the recommended remediation. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other:______________</th>
<th>The Contractor is already working in this building.</th>
<th>The Contractor is currently performing work in the same location and it is not feasible to have another Contractor come in at this point due to limited points of access and lack of space.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example: Additional work in the same location as ongoing work</td>
<td><em>Problem:</em> There is no explanation of why it is not feasible to use other contractors, or the benefits of using this contractor.</td>
<td>The cost is based on detailed labor and material breakdowns, with 10% OH&amp;P and no additional supervision cost (which is covered by the existing project).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 2: Price Reasonableness
- Check all boxes that apply or check “Other”.

  - Check “Other”, if you choose to provide, for example:
    - A comparison to historical pricing data from multiple vendors, or to industry metrics.
    - Documentation of search for alternative vendors and products/services.
    - Evaluation of detailed breakdown of the proposed price.
    - Documentation of price negotiation.

### Section 3: Conflict of Interest Attestation
- You must complete this section.

### Section 4: For PSCA only
- Skip this section.

**Sign, print and attach the completed form to your Contract Request.**