

**Source Selection Statement for the  
Russian Language and Logistics Services (RLLS) Contract  
NASA Lyndon B. Johnson Space Center  
(Solicitation Number NNJ11401832R)**

On August 22, 2012, along with other senior officials of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's (NASA's) Johnson Space Center (JSC), I met with the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) appointed to evaluate proposals submitted in response to the Russian Language and Logistics Services (RLLS) Solicitation Number NNJ11401832R. The presentation charts represent the final source selection evaluation report and are herein incorporated by reference.

**I. Background**

The Russian Language and Logistics Services (RLLS) contract supports the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and International Space Station (ISS) Program by providing necessary translation, interpretation and language training as well as office management and administration, international travel processing, ground transportation and other related services at the Johnson Space Center (JSC) and other locations within and outside the United States (U.S.) including Russia and Kazakhstan. Additionally, the scope of work provided by the RLLS contract may be performed not only for the ISS Program but for other NASA Programs and Centers as well.

The contract type is Cost-Plus-Award-Fee/Incentive-Fee (CPAF/IF), which includes a completion form baseline and the ability to issue Indefinite Quantity Indefinite Delivery (IDIQ) task orders for unplanned requirements. The procurement was conducted as a full and open competition under North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code 541930 – Translation and Interpretation. The period of performance consists of a 30 day Phase-In from August 31, 2012, to September 30, 2012, and the basic period of performance for this acquisition is 2 years from October 1, 2012, through September 30, 2014. The basic Cost-Plus contract value is \$19.9 million. There are 4 unique length option periods, due to the ISS Program's compliance with the Iran North Korea Syria Nonproliferation Act (INKSNA). The first option, October 1, 2014, through June 30, 2016, provides a \$17.5 million addition to the basic Cost-Plus contract value. The second option, July 1, 2016, through September 30, 2017, provides a \$12.9 million addition to the basic Cost-Plus contract value. The third option, October 1, 2017, through September 30, 2018, provides a \$10.6 million addition to the basic Cost-Plus contract value. The fourth option, October 1, 2018, through September 30, 2020, provides a \$21.9 million addition to the basic Cost-Plus contract value. The minimum IDIQ effort is \$0, while the Not-to-Exceed (NTE) for the IDIQ effort is \$20 million. The options do not increase the IDIQ effort NTE limit.

In accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 5.2, Synopses of Proposed Contract Actions, this proposed contract action was synopsisized on July 29, 2011, via the FedBizOps website and was thereafter placed on the NASA Acquisition Internet Service business opportunities website. NASA issued the draft Statement of Work (SOW) on December 21, 2011, and an industry comment period ensued.

A Future Requirements Day was held on January 24, 2012, over three days (January 24 -26, 2012). The Contracting Officer released the final Request for Proposal (RFP) on February 21, 2012. A Cost and Pricing Pre-Proposal Conference was held on March 6, 2012. Questions regarding the final FRP were due from potential Offerors by March 13, 2012. Answers and other solicitation modifications were posted to the RLLS Acquisition website in Amendment 1 on March 14, 2012; Amendment 2 on April 10, 2012; Amendment 3 on April 11, 2012; and Amendment 4 on April 11, 2012. Amendment 2 also included a change in proposal due date from April 23, 2012, to May 1, 2012.

The RFP stated that the proposals would be evaluated in accordance with the following factors: Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Cost/Price as provided for in Section M of the RFP. Each proposal received a Mission Suitability score based on the following subfactors and associated numerical weights. These weights are intended to be used as a guideline in the source selection decision-making process.

Subfactor 1: Technical Approach	400
Subfactor 2: Management Approach	400
Subfactor 3: Safety and Health Approach	100
Subfactor 4: Small Business Utilization	<u>100</u>
	1000

The Mission Suitability subfactors were evaluated and assigned an adjectival rating using the following scale: Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair and Poor.

In addition to Mission Suitability, the RFP identified and the SEB evaluated Past Performance and Cost/Price factor. However, these were not numerically scored.

Since Past Performance can be a significant indicator of performance under the proposed contract, the Past Performance of each Offeror's contract performance, quality performance and key personnel including recent experience was evaluated. The Offeror's Past Performance record was evaluated for recent and relevant experience in order to determine its ability to perform the required work. Contracts were considered recent if performance was within three (3) years from date of the solicitation; contracts with less than 9 months of performance were not considered. Relevancy was based on the size, scope, and complexity of the projects being evaluated for past performance. Contracts that exhibited all specific trades/type of work were considered more relevant than contracts limited to specific trades only. More recent and more relevant performance received greater consideration in the performance confidence assessment than less recent and less relevant performance. The evaluation assessed information from proposal data required by provisions of Section L, information obtained by the SEB team based on communications with listed references and key personnel resumes, as well as data independently obtained from other government and commercial sources, such as the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) and similar systems of other governmental departments and agencies, Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) channels, interviews with client program managers and contracting officers, and other sources known to the Government, including commercial sources. The SEB also considered the number and severity of problems, the effectiveness of corrective actions taken and the overall record of past

performance, and the Offeror's record for adherence to contract schedules, cost control, small business goals, history of commitment to customer satisfaction and the Offeror's past performance record on safety, health, and environmental performance. Past Performance was evaluated and rated using the following scale: Very High Level of Confidence, High Level of Confidence, Moderate Level of Confidence, Low Level of Confidence, Very Low Level of Confidence, and Neutral.

Under the Cost/Price factor, the Government performed a cost and price analysis, including a cost realism analysis, in accordance with FAR 15 and NFS 1815 to ensure the final agreed-to-prices are fair and reasonable. For the Completion Form (CF) effort, the Government performed a cost realism analysis of the proposed direct labor rates, the labor resources and the non-labor resources, and developed a probable cost estimate of the Offeror's proposed approach for the complete period of performance (Contract Years 1-8). For the IDIQ effort, the RFP prescribed Best Estimated Quantity hours by skill mix in order to evaluate the proposed IDIQ rates for all eight years of the period of performance. The proposed and probable cost and fees for the entire period of performance for both the CF and IDIQ efforts were used for selection purposes.

Offerors were notified that the Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible Offeror whose proposal represents the best value to the Government after evaluation in accordance with the factors and subfactors in the solicitation. As provided in the RFP, of the three evaluation factors, Mission Suitability and Past Performance, when combined, are significantly more important than Cost. Mission Suitability is more important than Past Performance. Offerors were notified that the lowest price proposals may not necessarily receive an award; likewise, the highest technically-rated proposals may not necessarily receive an award.

Lastly, as provided for in FAR 52.215-1, Instructions to Offerors – Competitive Acquisitions, the Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions with Offerors (except for clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a)). Therefore, the Offeror's initial proposal should contain the Offeror's best terms. The Government reserves the right to conduct discussion if the Contracting Officer later determines them to be necessary.

## **II. Evaluation of Initial Proposals**

The RFP divided the proposal into eight volumes with separate due dates. Volume V, related to past performance, was requested April 16, 2012, but not officially due until May 1, 2012. Volume I, related to technical approach, Volume II, related to management approach, Volume III, related to the safety and health approach and small business utilization, Volume IV, related to Specific Technical Understanding and Resources, Volume V, related to Past Performance, Volume VI, related to Cost/Price, Volume VII, related to Other Data, and Volume VIII, related to the Model Contract, were due on May 1, 2012.

Proposals were received from four Offerors. However, a proposal received from Offeror Kazi Investment Group (KIG) was received after the proposal due time and was not considered by the Government for evaluation purposes. Offeror KIG submitted an Agency-level protest on May 9,

2012, in response to NASA's decision to not consider their proposal for evaluation purposes. The Agency-level protest was denied on June 11, 2012.

Timely and complete proposals were received from the three following Offerors:

Raytheon Technical Services Company, LLC  
22265 Pacific Boulevard  
Dulles, Virginia 20166-6920

TechTrans International, Inc.  
2200 Space Park Drive, Suite 410  
Houston, TX 77058

Culmen International, LLC  
99 Canal Center Plaza, Suite 410  
Alexandria, VA 22314

After a preliminary review of all proposals, the SEB determined that the three proposals were acceptable. The evaluation process was conducted in accordance with FAR 15.3 "Source Selection" and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) Part 1815 as well as the RFP. The results of the initial evaluation were presented to me, the Source Selection Authority (SSA) on July 13, 2012.

At that time, the Contracting Officer recommended, and I agreed, that it was in the Government's best interest to establish a competitive range with TechTrans International (TTI). TTI's proposal was rated highest in Mission Suitability and in Past Performance. Also, TTI's proposed cost/price was considered reasonable, and had the lowest probable cost/price. However, the SEB raised concerns regarding TTI's Model Contract.

The other two Offerors, Raytheon Technical Services Company, LLC (RTSC), and Culmen International, LLC (Culmen), were not most highly rated when evaluated in accordance with the stated solicitation evaluation criteria. While RTSC was rated as having a "High" Level confidence rating for Past Performance, its proposal had a low Mission Suitability rating and a significantly high cost. Culmen received a "Low" Level Confidence rating for Past Performance as well as a significantly low Mission Suitability rating and concerns were raised regarding their Cost/Price proposal. There was no reasonable chance that the proposals of the above two Offerors could be cured through discussions and be selected for award. Therefore, modifications or revisions to their proposals were not considered and their proposals were eliminated from competitive range.

#### **Raytheon Technical Services Company, LLC (RTSC)**

**Under the Mission Suitability Factor**, RTSC's proposal received a total score of 509 out of 1000 points. RTSC received one significant strength, no strengths, one significant weakness, and six weaknesses.

Under the technical approach subfactor, RTSC received an adjectival rating of "Good," having

one significant strength, one significant weakness, and two weaknesses. RTSC's significant strength was related to their proposed use of machine translation and translation memory; RTSC proposed to implement an adaptive learning system for computer-assisted translation that significantly increases the efficiency in document translation. RTSC's significant weakness under technical approach was based on the lack of details in their implementation strategy for the RLLS Gateway innovation and failed to provide enough information for the Government to determine its feasibility, soundness, effectiveness, and efficiency, which risks performance of contract scope. RTSC's weaknesses were related to not demonstrating a comprehensive understanding of the support necessary to provide physical and logical access provisioning to International Partners and the other weakness was that their technical approach did not demonstrate an efficient implementation of the contract scope resulting in an inefficient use of Government resources.

Under the management approach subfactor, RTSC received an adjectival rating of "Fair," having two weaknesses. One weakness was that RTSC's requirements management and organizational strategy approach did not demonstrate an innovative and efficient approach to implement the contract requirements and did not reflect an efficient and lean concept for implementation of contract scope that was emphasized in the Request for Proposal (RFP). The other weakness was related to RTSC's subcontractor, not providing sufficient information in their total compensation templates to determine whether it was consistent with RTSC's Total Compensation Plan, resulting in a risk that RTSC's subcontractor may not be able to sufficiently attract and retain employees.

Under the safety and health subfactor, RTSC received an adjectival rating of "Good," having one weakness. RTSC's weakness was given due to the Safety and Health (S&H) plan missing details as to how this plan will be implemented in Russia and Kazakhstan and not demonstrated an overall comprehensive understanding of the inherent safety challenges with performing work in Russia and Kazakhstan.

Under the small business utilization subfactor, RTSC received an adjectival rating of "Good," having one weakness. RTSC's Small Business Subcontracting Plan contains incomplete information and discrepancies; therefore, the small business subcontracting goals could not be substantiated. The Government is unable to determine reasonableness and soundness of the proposed plan. The risk to the Government is that RTSC may not achieve the proposed small business goals, which impacts the Government's small business opportunities on this contract.

**Under the Cost/Price Factor**, RTSC's total proposed price of \$134.3 million was evaluated in accordance with Section M of the RFP. A price analysis was performed to determine price reasonableness. RTSC's price proposal was compared to the Government's estimate and to the prices submitted by the other Offerors. RTSC's proposed price was considered reasonable for its approach. In addition, the Government also performed a cost realism analysis of both the CF and IDIQ effort. Adjustments in RTSC's proposed cost were made to align labor rates with the proposal to hire incumbent staff at current rates, and resulted in a decrease in direct labor cost. The adjustment to the incumbent's labor rates also resulted in the decrease in the subcontractors' total costs. In addition, the adjustment in the direct labor cost resulted in a corresponding adjustment in the indirect cost. Consistent with Section M of the RFP, the incentive fee for the

CF effort was adjusted in line with the Offeror's proposal to share a percentage of an underrun or overrun. Since there was no difference between the proposed cost and the most probable cost for the IDIQ effort, no adjustment was made to the incentive fee associated with the IDIQ effort.

**Under the Past Performance Factor**, RTSC was assigned a High Level of Confidence. The SEB determined that RTSC had highly relevant past performance experience in relation to this acquisition. The SEB noted that although the RTSC past performance contracts cover the entire scope of the RLLS contract, the RTSC past performance contract for language training was not as large in magnitude as the RLLS contract. The RTSC past performance contract included only minor language services and RTSC proposes to perform approximately 50% of interpretation and translation scope for the RLLS contract. Additionally, the proposed Program Manager has relevant experience; the proposed alternate Program Manager and Deputy Program Manager have very relevant experience. Overall, RTSC, the proposed subcontractors, and the key personnel demonstrated very effective performance as evidenced by the questionnaires, PPIRS database reports, and phone interviews. Past performance also indicates that RTSC's Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) information and experience modifier rates reflect good prevention of injuries with rates substantially better than industry averages. RTSC also received ratings of Excellent, Good and Not Applicable in the area of small business utilization.

Although the SEB identified a significant strength in RTSC's proposal, it was counterbalanced by the weaknesses and significant weaknesses. RTSC's proposal was clearly separated from the top-ranked proposal by a substantial margin in Mission Suitability score as well as the value their Mission Suitability proposal provided to the Government, particularly in the management subfactor. The SEB identified no performance risks in RTSC's Cost/Price volume proposal; however, RTSC's proposed cost/price was significantly higher than that of the top ranked proposal. There was no reasonable expectation that their proposal could be cured through discussions and substantial modification or revisions to the proposal would be necessary. For these reasons, it was determined that RTSC's proposal did not represent one of the highest-rated proposals and was notified in writing July 19, 2012, that they were eliminated from competition.

### **Culmen International, LLC (Culmen)**

**Under the Mission Suitability Factor**, Culmen received a total score of 270 out of 1000 points. Culmen received one strength, two significant weaknesses, four weaknesses, and two deficiencies.

Under the technical approach subfactor, Culmen received an adjectival rating of "Poor," having one strength, two significant weaknesses, and one weakness. Culmen's strength was proposed the use of translation software which results in an improved overall efficiency of translation during the last two years of the contract. Culmen received two significant weaknesses. The first significant weakness was based on Culmen's proposal not being clear and concise as stated in the RFP. It contains countless grammatical, spelling, and typographical errors. The proposal, as written, demonstrates that Culmen lacks a comprehensive understanding of the quality and accuracy standards required by the contract. The second significant weakness Culmen received was based on their failure to demonstrate a sound technical approach in several areas to include

proposing to perform tasks that are not required, not addressing tasks that are required, and in some areas implementation details are lacking or are not feasible. This indicates a lack of understanding of the contract scope. Additionally, the Basis of Estimates (BOEs) does not support the technical implementation and lacks justification for the skill levels proposed. This could result in a significant disruption in services at contract start and the need for more Government oversight than planned. Lastly, Culmen received one weakness under the technical approach because Culmen did not demonstrate feasibility and effectiveness of the proposed use of the Integrated Data Management System (IDMS), which is a major feature of their proposal. It is also unclear what the benefit is to the Government to use the proposed system versus NASA systems already in place. The impact to the Government is duplication of existing NASA systems capabilities thus leading to inefficiencies. In addition, the Government would have to spend additional resources to interface existing NASA tools to IDMS for no perceived value added.

Under the management approach subfactor, Culmen received an adjectival rating of “Poor.” Culmen received two weaknesses and two deficiencies. Culmen’s first weakness was related to Culmen not demonstrating a comprehensive understanding of the Government’s Information Technology (IT) Management and Security requirements, which could result in a delay in tasks to be performed at contract start. The second weakness is the team’s subcontractor did not submit the required Total Compensation Templates to be used to determine whether their total compensation is consistent with Culmen’s Total Compensation Plan. The risk to the Government is that the subcontractor may not be able to sufficiently attract and retain employees. Culmen received two deficiencies with the first deficiency being the team failed to provide a key personnel approach to identify key positions, personnel, and rationale as required in the RFP. The omission of a key personnel approach represents a material failure and an unacceptable risk to the Government in the performance of this contract. The second deficiency was that the team failed to provide a phase-in plan for the contract as required in the RFP. The omission of a phase-in approach represents a material failure and an unacceptable risk to the Government of a disruption of services at contract start.

Under the safety and health subfactor, Culmen received an adjectival rating of “Fair,” having one weakness. The weakness was received because Culmen’s proposed Safety and Health Plan did not demonstrate an effective and complete approach for ensuring safety and health performance in the U.S., Russia, and Kazakhstan, which may represent a risk to contract performance.

Under the small business utilization subfactor, Culmen received an adjectival rating of “Good,” having one weakness. Culmen’s Small Business Subcontracting Plan contains incomplete information and discrepancies; therefore, the small business subcontracting goals could not be substantiated. The Government is unable to determine reasonableness and soundness of the proposed Plan. The risk to the Government is that Culmen Mission Team may not achieve the proposed small business goals, which impacts the Government’s small business opportunities on this contract.

**Under the Cost/Price Factor**, Culmen’s total proposed price of \$103.8 million was evaluated in accordance with Section M of the RFP. A price analysis was performed to determine price reasonableness. Culmen’s price proposal was compared to the Government’s estimate and to the

prices submitted by the other Offerors. Culmen's proposed price was considered reasonable for its approach. In addition, the Government also performed a cost realism analysis of both the CF and IDIQ effort. No adjustment was made to the IDIQ cost. Based on the cost realism analysis, the SEB identified the performance risks that the proposed staffing may not be adequate to successfully perform the entire scope of the contract, and that the non-labor resources proposed were understated based on what was provided in the RFP. Therefore, the SEB determined that the identified performance risks would likely impact providing the services at the proposed cost/price in accordance with the terms of the contract. Adjustments in Culmen's proposed cost/price were made to align labor rates with the proposal to hire incumbent staff at current rates, to correct for technical weaknesses which resulted in an increase to direct labor hours and non-labor resources, and to correct for pricing template errors in Work Year Equivalents (WYEs) between Contract Years 3, 4, 6, and 7. Furthermore, the incentive fee was adjusted in line with the Offeror's proposal to share a percentage of an underrun or overrun cost. Since there was no difference between the proposed cost and the most probable cost for the IDIQ effort, no adjustment was made to the incentive fee associated with the IDIQ effort.

**Under the Past Performance Factor**, Culmen was assigned a "Low" Level of Confidence. The SEB determined that the past performance contracts that were provided for consideration are somewhat relevant to this acquisition. The Culmen has somewhat relevant experience in the program management and international logistics areas of the SOW. However, Culmen has significantly less relevant experience in the language services area of the SOW compared to the size, scope and complexity of RLLS. For the contracts provided, the Culmen Mission Team was rated "Excellent" and "Very Good" for past performance on those contracts in the past performance database, questionnaires and phone interviews. The proposed Program Manager has somewhat relevant experience, while the proposed deputy Program Manager has no relevant experience in terms of program management of a language and logistics contract of this size and complexity. Culmen did not provide Occupational Safety and Health logs but the information that was provided indicates a positive approach to safety, health and environmental issues. Experience modifier rates were provided by one Culmen subcontractor, not Culmen or the other proposed subcontractor. Culmen also did not have past performance as a prime contractor managing a Small Business Program.

Although the SEB identified a strength in Culmen's proposal, it was counterbalanced by the weaknesses, significant weaknesses, and deficiencies. Culmen's proposal was clearly separated from the top ranked proposal by a substantial margin in Mission Suitability score as well as the value their Mission Suitability proposal provided to the Government, particularly in the technical approach, management approach and Safety and Health subfactors. The SEB identified performance risks in Culmen's Cost/Price volume proposal and expected the cost/price to increase if all the issues had been cured. Culmen's proposed cost/price was considerably higher than that of the top ranked proposal. Moreover, Culmen's Past Performance was rated a Low Level of Confidence. There was no reasonable expectation that their proposal could be cured through the discussion process and modification or revisions to the proposal were not considered. For these reasons, it was determined that Culmen's proposal did not represent one of the highest-rated proposals and was notified in writing July 19, 2012, that they were eliminated from competition.



I found that the SEB's scoring was supported by detailed narratives describing the relative strengths and weaknesses of the Offerors under each of the evaluation factors and consistent with the evaluation criteria. I performed my own rigorous assessment and concurred with the SEB's findings and determination that Raytheon Technical Services Company, LLC, and Culmen International, LLC, were not among the most highly-rated. Their proposals were in need of major revisions to make them viable, and I agreed that neither proposal had a reasonable chance of being selected for award. Therefore, I determined that their proposals be excluded from the competitive range.

### **TechTrans International, Inc. (TTI)**

**Under the Mission Suitability Factor**, TTI received a total score of 827 out of 1000 points. TTI received two significant strengths, three strengths, and three weaknesses.

Under the technical approach subfactor, TTI received an adjectival rating of "Very Good," having one significant strength, two strengths, and two weaknesses. TTI's significant strength was based on their proposed web-based service request system that demonstrates an innovative approach to efficiently deliver language and logistics services. This comprehensive solution will greatly improve contractor and Government efficiency over the life of the contract. The first of TTI's strengths was based on their proposed use of computer-aided translation (CAT). This technology, used in conjunction with a linguist, results in improved overall efficiency and consistency of translation products during the life of the contract. The second of TTI's strengths was based on the thorough and comprehensive language training program proposed for ISS Astronauts and Cosmonauts. TTI's proactive approach allows NASA to benefit from an effective training program that assures ISS crews achieve required and specialized language skills.

The first weakness given for TTI's technical approach was based on the failure to demonstrate feasibility and soundness in meeting the Government's Physical and Logical Access Provisioning requirements which may have a disruption in physical and logical access to International Space Station (ISS) Program resources during contract performance. The second weakness was based on proposed reductions in staffing and assumptions Government-provided resources, which are not substantiated, resulting in an understatement of resources required. The risk to the Government is that TTI may not have the staff or resources to successfully perform the entire contract scope.

Under the management approach subfactor, TTI received an adjectival rating of "Excellent," having one significant strength. TTI's proposal demonstrates a highly efficient management approach to implementing contract requirements and includes several "innovations and efficiencies" as requested in the RFP. This approach will lead to an increase in efficiencies that will result in less NASA oversight during the life of the contract.

Under the safety and health subfactor, TTI received an adjectival rating of "Good," having one strength. TTI's proposal includes a "Safe Driver Program" which is an effective approach to reducing accidents related to transportation services in Russia; thereby, reducing vehicle-related

injuries and property damage on the RLLS contract.

Under the small business utilization subfactor, TTI received an adjectival rating of “Good,” having one weakness. TTI’s Small Business Subcontracting Plan contains incomplete information and discrepancies; therefore, the small business subcontracting goals could not be substantiated. The Government is unable to determine reasonableness and soundness of the proposed plan. The risk to the Government is that TTI may not achieve the proposed small business goals, which impacts the Government’s small business opportunities on this contract.

**Under the Cost/Price Factor**, TTI’s total proposed price of \$85.0 million was evaluated in accordance with Section M of the RFP. A price analysis was performed to determine price reasonableness. TTI’s price proposal was compared to the Government’s estimate and to the prices submitted by the other Offerors. TTI’s proposed resources and price were considered reasonable for its approach. In addition, the Government also performed a cost realism analysis of both the CF and IDIQ effort. No adjustment was made to the IDIQ. Based on the cost realism analysis, the SEB identified the performance risks that the proposed staffing may not be adequate to successfully perform the entire scope of the contract, and that the non-labor resources proposed were understated based on what was provided in the RFP. Therefore, the SEB determined that the identified performance risks would likely impact providing the services at the proposed cost/price in accordance with the terms of the contract. Adjustments in TTI’s proposed cost/price were made to align labor rates with the proposal to hire incumbent staff at current rates, and to correct for technical weaknesses which resulted in an increase to direct labor hours and non-labor resources. Furthermore, the incentive fee was adjusted in line with the Offeror’s proposal to share a percentage of an underrun or overrun cost. Since there was no difference between the proposed cost and the most probable cost for the IDIQ effort, no adjustment was made to the incentive fee associated with the IDIQ effort.

**Under the Past Performance Factor**, TTI was assigned a High Level of Confidence. The SEB determined that TTI’s past performance is highly relevant to this acquisition. They are the major subcontractor incumbent providing language and logistics services for a contract of the same scope, complexity and magnitude as RLLS. However, TTI has limited experience as a NASA prime contractor and has no recent evidence as a prime contractor on a contract with the size, scope, and type as RLLS. The proposed Program Manager has very relevant experience as does the proposed Deputy Program Manager as evidenced through their past performance questionnaires, PPIRS database reports, and phone interviews. TTI does not have past performance as a prime contractor managing a Small Business Program. TTI has reported having no OSHA or Environmental Protection Agency violations during the past 3 years.

### **III. Discussions and Evaluation of Final Proposal Revisions (FPRs)**

A report was provided to TTI, the Offeror remaining in the competitive range listing the weaknesses, deficiencies, and clarifications for Mission Suitability, Model Contract and other data clarifications, Cost/Price clarifications, and Past Performance feedback identified by the SEB during the initial evaluation phase. Included with the report was Amendment 5 to the RFP dated July 19, 2012, which invited the Offeror to propose a Phase-In period of 90 days or less as

well as an update to Attachment J-10, Installation Accountable Government Property. TTI was invited to provide a written interim response, which included a proposal revision in accordance with FAR 15.307, to address their weaknesses and clarifications and participate in oral discussions, if required. The proposal revision included an updated Volume VIII – Model Contract and cost templates from Volume VI – Cost and Price Factor. TTI submitted proposal revision and written responses to the weakness and clarifications report on July 26, 2012. The SEB reviewed the Offeror’s proposal revision and interim written response and determined that oral discussions were not required. A letter was provided to the Offeror to notify the Offeror that discussions were closed along with Amendment 6 to the RFP dated August 6, 2012, which updated the J-2 Wage Determination with the latest information available from the Department of Labor.

TTI submitted their Final Proposal Revision (FPR) on August 10, 2012. The corrections included in TTI’s interim data submittal were incorporated into their FPR and their two weaknesses under the technical approach subfactor, one weakness under the small business utilization subfactor, and Model Contract concerns were resolved.

Under the technical approach subfactor, TTI’s weakness related to Physical and Logical Access Provisioning approach was resolved by providing additional information to demonstrate that their technical approach meets the contract requirements. TTI also resolved the weakness related to their labor and non-labor resources by removing assumptions in their technical approach that were not specified in the RFP.

Under the small business utilization subfactor, TTI’s weakness related to their small business subcontracting plan was resolved by providing additional information to substantiate their small business goals.

TTI resolved the Model Contract concerns by removing all of their proposed clause changes and stating their acceptance of the contract terms and conditions incorporated in the RFP and resultant contract.

The final result of the Offeror included in competitive range is summarized below:

### **TechTrans International, Inc (TTI)**

#### **Mission Suitability**

The SEB gave TTI’s proposal an overall Mission Suitability score of 888 out of a maximum 1000 points. TTI received two significant strengths, four strengths, and no weaknesses.

Under the technical approach subfactor, TTI resolved their two weaknesses, one of which was turned into a strength, and received an adjectival rating of “Excellent.” TTI received one significant strength, three strengths, and no weaknesses. TTI’s significant strength was related to their web-based service request system that integrates linked language and logistics services into event-driven workflows, referred to as the TTI RLLS Portal. TTI’s implementation of the RLLS

Portal demonstrates an innovative approach to efficiently deliver language and logistics services. This comprehensive solution will greatly improve Contractor and Government efficiency over the life of the contract. The first of TTI's strengths was based on their proposed use of computer-aided translation (CAT). This technology, used in conjunction with a linguist, will result in improved overall efficiency and consistency of translation products during the life of the contract. The second of TTI's strengths was based on the thorough and comprehensive language training program proposed for ISS Astronauts and Cosmonauts. TTI's proactive approach allows NASA to benefit from an effective training program that assures ISS crews achieve required and specialized language skills. The third strength was TTI's proposal demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of the Government's requirements for Physical and Logical Access Provisioning. TTI's proactive and effective approach ensures that our IPs and NASA personnel have the required physical and logical access to ISS Program resources throughout the life of the contract.

Under the management approach subfactor, TTI received an adjectival rating of "Excellent." TTI received one significant strength. TTI's proposal demonstrates a highly efficient management approach to implementing contract requirements and includes several "innovations and efficiencies" as requested in the RFP. This approach will lead to an increase in efficiencies that will result in less NASA oversight during the life of the contract.

Under the safety and health subfactor, TTI received an adjectival rating of "Good." TTI received one strength. TTI proposal includes a "Safe Driver Program" which is an effective approach to reducing accidents related to transportation services in Russia; thereby, reducing vehicle related injuries and property damage on the RLLS contract.

Under the small business utilization subfactor, TTI resolved their weakness by providing an updated Small Business Subcontracting Plan and received an adjectival rating of "Good." TTI's Plan was determined adequate for award.

### **Past Performance Factor**

Having completed my analysis under the Mission Suitability factor, I next considered Past Performance. The SEB rated TTI's Past Performance as "High."

TTI's past performance is highly relevant to this acquisition. They are the major subcontractor incumbent providing language and logistic services under a contract of the same scope, complexity and magnitude as RLLS. However, TTI has limited experience as a NASA prime contractor and has no recent evidence as a prime contractor on a contract with the size, scope, and type as RLLS. The proposed Program Manager has very relevant experience as does the proposed Deputy Program Manager based on information gleaned from past performance questionnaires, PPIRS database reports, and phone interviews. TTI does not have past performance as a prime contractor managing a Small Business Program. TTI has demonstrates acceptable rates for injury prevention in the area of safety and health. Based on TTI's total Past Performance record in concert with their OSHA ratings the SEB found, I concurred with an

overall high level of confidence that TTI will successfully perform the effort required under the RLLS contract.

### **Cost/Price Factor**

TTI's final total proposed price of \$89.8M was evaluated in accordance with Section M of the RFP. I specifically asked whether TTI adequately addressed all initial cost/price concerns during discussions. The SEB stated that the initial concerns regarding cost/price were adequately addressed, were corrected in their interim proposal submittal, and the corrections were incorporated into TTI's Final Proposal Revision (FPR), which reflected a competitive environment. A Cost Realism Evaluation was performed by the SEB. I also inquired about the status of TTI's Disclosure Statement and the adequacy of its accounting system. The SEB reported that the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) issued an audit report dated July 11, 2012, on TTI's Disclosure Statement (DS) which indicated that the DS was adequate. The Contracting Officer, using the results of the DCAA audit, determined that the DS was adequate for award. Regarding the accounting system status, the Contracting Officer also determined that TTI's accounting system was adequate for award. Therefore, it was determined, and I agreed, that there were no performance risks that would impact providing the services at the proposed cost/price in accordance with the terms of the contract. Overall, TTI submitted a realistic Cost/Price proposal that is very close to the Government's initial and final probable Cost/Price. I determined that the Cost/Price proposal submitted by TTI is fair and reasonable.

### **IV. Decision**

Following the presentation by the SEB and the vigorous questioning of the SEB by me and my advisors, I fully considered the findings the SEB presented to me. I commended the SEB on their comprehensive and detailed evaluation of the proposals. I requested and received the opinions of the advisors present, and asked for their comments, objections or concerns with the materials presented to us. I accepted the findings of the SEB as they were presented to me. Following this discussion, I made a comparative assessment of the proposal based upon the evaluation factors in the solicitation – Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Cost/Price.

As provided for in the RFP, the Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible Offeror whose proposal represents the best value to the Government. The procurement was conducted utilizing a combination of Mission Suitability, Past Performance and Cost/Price evaluation factors. Of the three evaluation factors, Mission Suitability and Past Performance, when combined, are significantly more important than Cost. Mission Suitability is more important than Past Performance. The lowest price proposal may not necessarily receive an award; likewise, the highest technically-rated proposals may not necessarily receive an award.

I reviewed and accepted the evaluation of the SEB. My decision recognized and was fully consistent with the weight given to Mission Suitability in the selection criteria of the RFP. Based on my assessment of TechTrans International, Inc.'s proposal in accordance with the specified evaluation criteria, it is my decision that the proposal submitted by TechTrans

International, Inc. represents the best value to the Government to fulfill the needs for the RLLS RFP.

I, therefore, select TechTrans International, Inc. for award.

Kirk a Shireman  
Kirk Shireman  
Source Selection Authority

28 August 2012  
Date