

**Department of Homeland Security
United States Citizenship and Immigration Services**



Travel Documents Production Services II (TDPS II)

Source Selection Official Decision

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION

This document contains source selection information related to the conduct of a Federal agency procurement, the disclosure of which is restricted by Section 27 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 423). The unauthorized disclosure of such information may subject both the discloser and recipient of the information to contractual, civil, and/or criminal penalties as provided by law.

Travel Documents Production Services II (TDPS II)
Source Selection Decision Document

I. Decision Statement

I have determined that the Travel Documents Production Services II (TDPS II) quote by [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) provides the best overall value to the government. This selection was made based upon the factors established in the solicitation and a comparative evaluation completed by the TEC. This memorandum documents the basis for my independent decision.

II. Introduction

The TDPS II acquisition was conducted as a phased evaluation using a combined synopsis and solicitation on FedBizOpps.gov (FBO), with no small business set-aside, pursuant to FAR 13.5. U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) Document Management Division (DMD) intends to replace its existing TDPS personalization equipment in order to enhance the security, durability and quality of the I-327 and I-571 (travel document booklets). This procurement includes the personalization printers, printer consumable materials, software, and maintenance services required to ensure that the equipment continues to perform reliably, minimize downtime, and ensure uninterrupted production of USCIS travel documents. The procurement also includes support during the installation of the printers at the USCIS Card Production Facilities. The Contractor shall coordinate with USCIS Office of Information Technology (OIT) for the integration of the printers with existing computerized document issuance systems, and technical support services for reliable operations of the current and evolving TDPS system. Any solution proposed by the Contractor must be compatible with USCIS' current Information Technology systems and be capable of personalizing the data/bio page using the layout that is currently in use for travel document booklet personalization.

The source selection organization consists of a four (4) person Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC), one (1) Office of Information Technology advisor (non-voting member) and a one (1) person Business Evaluation Committee (BEC). I served as the contracting officer and as the Source Selection Official (SSO).

The stated period of performance is one (1) 12-month base period, and four (4) 12-month options for maintenance and personalization printer consumables. Additionally, FAR 52.217-8, Option to Extend Services is included. This allows for a total extension of performance not to exceed six months.

III. Procurement Sequence of Events

This procurement was solicited to all interested vendors on FBO on November 21, 2018 with a quotation due date of December 6, 2018. The anticipated award is a single contract issued on a Firm Fixed Price (FFP) basis to the quoter determined to provide best value to the government.

Three (3) amendments were made to the solicitation. The first amendment, sent to the vendors on December 3, 2018, made edits to the solicitation and provided answers to vendor questions submitted. The second amendment was sent on December 6, 2018 to extend the due date to

Travel Documents Production Services II (TDPS II)
Source Selection Decision Document

December 12, 2018 and remove section 6.6.4 from the Statement of Work (SOW). The second amendment was sent on December 6, 2018 to identify that in accordance with FAR 52.213-3(k)(1), this requirement is exempt from the Service Contract Labor Standards.

The 3 initial quotations submitted provided sufficient information to evaluate on a pass/fail basis in Phase One, and ultimately a best value determination in Phase Two, without discussions.

Technical evaluation and procurement integrity training were conducted prior to the commencement of the source selection. The training was attended by all members of the TEC and technical advisors.

Upon completion of the training, a Non-Disclosure of Information/Conflict-of-Interest Agreement (NDA) was sent to each attendee. The NDA contained a list of all quoters involved with the procurement. Each TEC member was asked to review the list and sign a statement certifying they had no conflicts of interest with any of the quoters. No conflicts of interest were identified.

The TEC adjourned and the consensus report detailing the Phase One technical evaluation was provided to the contracting office on December 20, 2018. All three quoters passed Phase One and moved onto Phase Two of the evaluation. The consensus report for Phase Two was provided to the contracting office on December 31, 2018. The BEC completed its report on December 31, 2018. After reviewing the TEC report and BEC report, in my role as the SSO, I identified one quoter to offer the best value to the government with a fair and reasonable price.

The following phases, as stated in the solicitation, were adhered to.

- a. For Phase One of the evaluation the government will evaluate all quotes for Factors 1, 2 and 3 on a Pass/Fail basis. If a quote receives a fail in this phase, the quote will not be considered for award in Phase Two, as the quote will be considered not technically acceptable. All three factors were evaluated to determine if the proposed solution meets the minimum requirements outlined in the SOW.
- b. For Phase Two of the evaluation the government will evaluate all quotes that received a “Pass” in Phase One. During this phase, Factors 4, 5, 6 and 7 will be evaluated. A comparative evaluation will be performed by the government (comparing quotes to each other) to select the contractor that is best suited and provides the best value, considering the evaluations factors. The government intends to select the best value quote based on a tradeoff considering Factors 4, 5, 6 and 7. Factors 4, 5, and 6 are of relatively equal importance to each other, and when combined, are significantly more important than Factor 7. The government will evaluate the proposed price in Factor 7, which includes the base and all options, for reasonableness.

III. Evaluation Criteria

Travel Documents Production Services II (TDPS II)
Source Selection Decision Document

The TEC performed a comparative evaluation to select the quoter that is best suited and provides the best value for the government. The evaluation criteria for all factors as stated in the solicitation is listed below.

(1) Factor 1: Printing Equipment. The government will evaluate if the proposed solution meets the minimum requirements outlined in the SOW.

(2) Factor 2: Equipment Consumables. The government will evaluate if the proposed solution meets the minimum requirements outlined in the SOW.

(3) Factor 3: Equipment Maintenance. The government will evaluate if the proposed solution meets the minimum requirements outlined in the SOW.

(4) Factor 4: Betterment Promises. The government will evaluate the value to the Government of any betterments that are promised in the solution. A betterment is any instance where the proposed solution exceeds the Government's requirement in a way that is meaningful for the Government.

(5) Factor 5: Experience. The government will assess its confidence that the quoting contractor understands the requirement and will be successful in performing the work based on the quoting contractor's experience in developing/delivering complex equipment for precision purposes. The government may contact the POCs for the described projects to verify the information provided.

(6) Factor 6: Usability/Suitability. The government will assess its confidence that the proposed solution is entirely usable by the Government in meeting its mission needs and that the proposed solution is entirely suitable for its intended purpose. The Government may use any information from any source in this evaluation.

(7) Factor 7: Price. The government will evaluate the proposed price, which includes the base and all options, for reasonableness. The government will evaluate the total proposed price, which will include the option under FAR Clause 52.217-8. The government will calculate the option under FAR Clause 52.217-8 by utilizing the monthly pricing of the last optional period for six months of continued performance.

IV. Evaluation Results

Quote Comparison Matrix

Quoter	Phase One: Factors 1, 2 & 3	Factor 7: Price (Not including 52.217-8)	Factor 7: Price (Including 52.217-8)
[REDACTED]	Pass	\$[REDACTED]	\$412,730.20
[REDACTED]	Pass	\$1,777,118.32	\$1,881,645.04
[REDACTED]	Pass	\$1,825,000.00	\$1,963,942.83
Independent Government Cost Estimate (IGCE)	-	\$2,050,843.16	\$2,236,840.62

Travel Documents Production Services II (TDPS II)
Source Selection Decision Document

I have reviewed the technical evaluation report and I adopt the evaluation team's findings as my own. The check marks in the table below show the quotes that are the most advantageous for each factor:

Factor			
Factor 4 – Betterment Promises	✓		
Factor 5 – Experience		✓	
Factor 6 – Usability/ Suitability	✓		

✓ = most advantageous for that factor

In my opinion, [REDACTED] provides the best value for the government. For Factor 4, [REDACTED] offered three (3) betterments to include continuous on-site maintenance, introduction of biometric Quick Response (QR) and the inclusion into USCIS' existing Card Personalization System Technology Refreshment (CPSTR) ecosystem. Alone, continuous on-site maintenance provides great value for the government. Immediate response to repairs and/or replacements means less system downtime which can also lead to cost savings. Also, introduction of the biometric QR assists USCIS with expanding their use of e-filing and electronic platforms. Additional value is being offered by [REDACTED] with utilizing the existing CPSTR system. This betterment is cost saving and also reduces the risks associated with schedule, performance, interoperability, interface and systems connectivity. The betterments offered by [REDACTED] provide the best value for the government when compared to the betterments offered by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].

For Factor 5, [REDACTED] offered the most advantageous quote. [REDACTED] provided a wide range of experience related to passport/ID document production. This includes experience with the DOS NextGen Passport booklets, Canadian passport personalization hardware and software and the installation and integration of Mauritius passport printers which included training, consumables and support. The experience provided by [REDACTED] provides the best value for the government when compared to the experience of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].

For Factor 6, [REDACTED] offered the most advantageous quote. [REDACTED]'s proposed solution includes no hassle consumable replacement, continuous on-site maintenance and equipment design simplicity through the use of a modular system. No hassle consumable replacement includes both printer and lamination consumables that do not meet quality standards. [REDACTED] will replace these consumables without dispute or additional cost which offers both cost and time savings for USCIS. Also, continuous on-site maintenance will enhance the proposed solution being offered by [REDACTED]. Additional value is being offered by the use of a modular system for print and lamination equipment which minimizes the complexity of the equipment for the operator. A modular system will also minimize downtime in case of a malfunction and improves the overall maintainability of the system. The proposed solution by [REDACTED] provides the best value for the

Travel Documents Production Services II (TDPS II)
Source Selection Decision Document

government when compared to the solutions proposed by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

V. Best Value Analysis and Tradeoffs Consideration

Between the three (3) quoters being considered for award, [REDACTED] has the lowest evaluated price (inclusive of 6 months of performance under FAR 52.217-8) of \$412,730.20. [REDACTED]'s evaluated price is \$1,881,645.04, which is 355.9% higher than [REDACTED]'s price. Also, [REDACTED]'s evaluated price is \$1,963,942.83, which is 375.8% higher than [REDACTED]'s price.

As stated in E-10 (d) of the solicitation, "The government intends to select the best value quote based on a tradeoff considering Factors 4, 5, 6 and 7. Factors 4, 5, and 6 are of relatively equal importance to each other, and when combined, are significantly more important than Factor 7."

Following the completion of the comparative evaluation of Factors 4, 5 and 6, the quote provided by [REDACTED] is the best suited and provides the best value for the government. When compared to the other quoters, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], [REDACTED]'s quote is most advantageous. This decision is discussed in detail in the TEC Report and in section IV of this document. While each quoter proposed noteworthy betterments, related experience and solutions related to usability and suitability, I believe that [REDACTED]'s quote provides USCIS with the technical superior solution to meet the government's needs. [REDACTED] was considered most advantageous in Factors 4 and 6, whereas [REDACTED] was considered most advantageous in Factor 5 only. Each non-price factor (Factor 4, 5 and 6) are of relatively equal importance, therefore [REDACTED] received a higher rating in two (2) of the three (3) Factors. Additionally, [REDACTED]'s quote is the lowest priced quote, therefore a trade-off between non-price and price factors is not necessary. USCIS will be obtaining the technically superior solution for the lowest price, considered to be the best value, by awarding to [REDACTED].

In accordance with FAR 13.106-3(a)(1), based on adequate price competition in response to the solicitation, [REDACTED]'s total price is found to be fair and reasonable.

The System for Award Management (SAM) and the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIS) have been checked and there are no active exclusions for [REDACTED], and [REDACTED] is considered responsible. Therefore, it is my determination to award a contract to [REDACTED], whose quote, I find, offers the best value to the government.

Signature: _____

[REDACTED]

Contracting Officer

Date: _____