

National Aeronautics and  
Space Administration

**John H. Glenn Research Center**  
**Lewis Field**  
21000 Brookpark Road  
Cleveland, OH 44135-3191



**SOURCE SELECTION STATEMENT**  
**Technology Transfer Office Support Services**  
**Request for Proposal NNC14ZCH026R**

**Background**

This procurement is to establish an Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contract under which the contractor shall provide support services for the Glenn Research Center Technology Transfer Office. Services provided by the contractor include: Strategic Development, Portfolio Management and Support, Website Development and Maintenance, Publication Development, Outreach Support, New Technology Reporting (NTR), Technology Opportunity Sheets, Technology Assessments & Marketing Strategies, General Marketing, In-Depth Marketing Assessments, Success Story Development, Awards Support, and Special Projects. To accomplish this effort, the Government will award a single award IDIQ contract with fixed-price task orders for a time period of five years.

A Request for Proposal (RFP) was issued on August 7, 2014. It was an Economically Disadvantaged Women Owned Small Business (EDWOSB) Set-Aside. Eight offerors submitted proposals, these offerors were: Absolute Technology Law Group LLC, Connexus Hub, CP2S, Fuentek LLC, InnoVector Tech, Inc., Qwaltec, Secure Technologies LLC and Vision IT.

**Evaluation Results**

Proposals were evaluated in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 15.3 – “Source Selection” and NASA FAR Supplement 1815.3 “Source Selection”. The proposals were evaluated considering three factors: Technical Capability, Past Performance, and Price. Within the Technical Capability factor, there were 3 subfactors: Organizational Structure and Management Plan, Technical Approach and Technical Tasks. As individual factors, Technical Capability, Past Performance, and Price were approximately equal in value.

The evaluation team concluded its evaluation of offers on October 31, 2014. All evaluation team members rated the proposals individually using the rating criteria set forth in section M of the solicitation. All findings were consolidated into one document and the following adjectival ratings and findings reflect the consensus of the evaluation team.

The summary results are indicated below:

**Absolute Technology Law Group**

*A. Technical Capability – Overall Rating “Poor”*

*a. Organizational Structure and Management Plan – Poor*

*b. Technical Approach – Poor*  
*c. Technical Tasks – Poor*

Under Organizational Structure and Management Plan, Absolute Technology Law Group received a “poor” for one significant weakness based upon its proposed organizational structure, which failed to provide acceptable information as to how it would help meet contract requirements and additionally provided inadequate management and control policies. The discussion of the proposed subcontractor, Zizzo, failed to provide completeness of information on how the subcontracting arrangement will be utilized to adequately support the requirements of the contract. The organizational structure and management plan failed to provide any detail of an approach to the reporting methods and financial tracking systems.

Under Technical Approach, Absolute Technology Law Group received a “poor” for one significant weakness and three deficiencies. Absolute Law Technology Group failed to provide a discussion on its approach to schedule/assign work activities from initiation to completion, provided an inconclusive approach to quality control systems in regards to Google Webmaster, and provided a lack of a discussion concerning the approach used to readily accommodate workload fluctuations. Absolute Technology Law Group omitted any discussion on SOW elements 3.1-3.3, 3.5-3.6, 3.7-3.10 and 3.13-3.15. The proposal also omitted any discussion or approach to ensure continual improvement of all contract products, outcomes, or deliverables.

Under Technical Tasks, Absolute Technology Law Group received a “poor” for one significant weakness. Absolute Technology Law Group failed to provide a detailed approach to describe or demonstrate how the three task requirements would be fulfilled. The proposal also does not identify personnel to complete the task order work. Although labor categories are proposed, it does not coincide with key positions addressed earlier in the proposal.

*B. Past Performance – Overall Rating “Neutral”*

Absolute Technology Law Group received an overall rating of Neutral in past performance. Information received in the past performance narrative section of the proposal was considered not relevant in regards to the size and scope of the Technology Transfer Office Support Services Procurement. Although responses were received in Past Performance Questionnaires, the size and scope of the work fell short in relation to its relevancy to the Technology Transfer Office Support Services procurement. An independent search of the Government Past Performance database did not reveal any additional past performance information.

*C. Cost/Price*

Pricing from Absolute Technology Law Group was reviewed in accordance with FAR 15.4 “Contract Pricing”. The Absolute Technology Law Group offer was approximately 23% higher than the Independent Government Cost Estimate. The Absolute Technology Law Group offer is the highest priced offer received in response to this solicitation.

**Connexus Hub**

*A. Technical Capability – Overall Rating “Poor”*

- a. Organizational Structure and Management Plan– Poor*
- b. Technical Approach – Poor*
- c. Technical Tasks – Fair*

Under Organizational Structure and Management Plan, Connexus Hub received a “poor” for one significant weakness based upon the discussion of its organizational structure, which lacked insight as to how its organizational structure will interact with the GRC Technology Transfer Office to successfully perform the contract requirements. Additionally, the proposal failed to provide details of a financial tracking system and failed to discuss how management tools and control policies will be used to successfully meet contract requirements.

Under Technical Approach, Connexus Hub received a “poor” for four significant weaknesses based on the lack of completeness on the technical approach to be utilized on Task Elements 3.1-3.6. Specifically, Task 3.3 and 3.6 failed to provide an approach to the methods and techniques to be utilized in the completion of the tasks. Task 3.4 provided no approach of leveraging industry experts, which appeared necessary due to limited proposed disciplines. The offeror simply restated the task order requirements for Task Elements 3.7-3.15. Additionally, Connexus Hub failed to provide a detailed discussion of tracking work activity, quality control methods, and providing no approach to ensure continual improvement of contract products.

Under Technical Tasks, Connexus Hub received a “fair” for one weakness based on its proposal’s lack of completeness regarding the approach to effectively meet the task requirements. While the proposal met the technical requirements of the three tasks, the proposal failed to identify key technical personnel and only described proposed positions, which lacked detail in regards to the qualifications and skills of these positions.

#### *B. Past Performance – Overall Rating “Neutral”*

Connexus Hub received an overall rating of Neutral in past performance. Information received in the past performance narrative section of the proposal was considered not relevant in regards to the size and scope of the Technology Transfer Office Support Services Procurement. Although responses were received in Past Performance Questionnaires, the size and scope of the work fell short in relation to its relevancy to the Technology Transfer Office Support Services procurement. An independent search of the Government Past Performance database did not reveal any additional past performance information.

#### *C. Cost/Price*

Pricing from Connexus Hub was reviewed in accordance with FAR 15.4 “Contract Pricing”. The Connexus Hub offer was approximately 25% lower than the Independent Government Cost Estimate. The Connexus Hub offer is the fourth lowest priced offer received in response to this solicitation.

### **CP2S**

#### *A. Technical Capability – Overall Rating “Fair”*

- a. Organizational Structure and Management Plan– Fair*

- b. Technical Approach – Poor*
- c. Technical Tasks – Fair*

Under Organizational Structure and Management Plan, CP2S received a fair for one weakness, based upon the proposal's lack of detail describing how the proposed organizational structure, key positions, teaming relationship and management/control policies will assist to successfully meet contract requirements. While key positions are proposed, these positions lack evidence of technical or engineering background to support the requirements of the contract. The proposed organizational structure and teaming arrangement with subcontractors, Booz-Allen Hamilton and Solartis lacked completeness of information to determine how the teaming arrangement would operate to provide an integrated work effort to successfully perform the contract requirements. Also, proposed management tools were not applicable for this type of contract.

Under Technical Approach, CP2S received a "poor" for two weaknesses and two significant weaknesses. Weaknesses were assessed to CP2S for proposing a quality assurance approach which was not realistic for a contract of this size and lacked completeness in its approach to ensure continual improvement of all contract requirements. Significant weaknesses were assessed to CP2S due to the proposal failing to provide a realistic technical approach to accomplish the requirements of the statement of work. The proposal failed to provide a discussion of critical steps in Licensing Support (task 3.2) and In-Depth Marketing Assessment (task 3.6), and failed to provide a discussion of the technical approach for Technical Assessments and Marketing Strategies (task 3.4). The offeror proposed performing work which is not a part of the New Technology Reporting process for this contract (task 3.10), and numerous restated the Statement of Work Task Requirements (tasks 3.7-3.15).

Under Technical Tasks, CP2S received a "fair" for one weakness. A weakness was assessed due to the minimal technical detail and excessive staffing provided in the task plan for Technical Assessments and Marketing Strategies.

#### *B. Past Performance – Overall Rating "Neutral"*

CP2S received an overall rating of Neutral in past performance. Information received in the past performance narrative section of the proposal was considered not relevant in regards to the size and scope of the Technology Transfer Office Support Services Procurement. Although responses were received in Past Performance Questionnaires, the size and scope of the work fell short in relation to its relevancy to the Technology Transfer Office Support Services procurement. An independent search of the Government Past Performance database did not reveal any additional relevant past performance.

#### *C. Cost/Price*

Pricing from CP2S was reviewed in accordance with FAR 15.4 "Contract Pricing". The CP2S offer was approximately 40% lower than the Independent Government Cost Estimate. The CP2S offer is the third lowest priced offer received in response to this solicitation.

*Technical Capability – Overall Rating “Very Good”*

*a. Organizational Structure and Management Plan– Very Good*

*b. Technical Approach – Good*

*c. Technical Tasks – Excellent*

Under Organizational Structure and Management Plan, Fuentek LLC received a “very good” for one strength based upon the proposed lean organizational structure with clearly defined points of contact for the specific task at hand, and provided extensive detail of key positions’ education, qualifications, and experience in regards to aligning with each SOW task element.

Under Technical Approach, Fuentek LLC received a “good” for two strengths and one weakness. Fuentek provided a comprehensive technical approach to SOW task elements 3.1-3.6 and a thorough technical approach describing the management tool used to assigning and tracking work activities as well as a detailed quality control process. However, Fuentek failed to provide a detailed approach to accomplish the requirements of the statement of work task elements 3.7-3.15.

Under Technical Tasks, Fuentek LLC received an “excellent” for one significant strength based upon its completeness and realistic approach to the proposed task plans, which provided a comprehensive and thorough technical approach to complete the tasks and provided highly qualified personnel within the technical fields of expertise.

*B. Past Performance – Overall Rating “Very High Level of Confidence”*

Fuentek LLC received three Significant Strengths related to past performance. Significant strengths were assessed for Fuentek LLC’s submission of information for four contracts similar in size and scope, which were considered highly relevant in the Technology Transfer Office Support Services contract and also received ratings of Very Good to Excellent for multiple highly relevant past performance questionnaires. A significant strength was also assessed from an independent search through the Government past performance database which revealed exceptional ratings for a number of contracts, which were considered highly relevant to the Technology Transfer Office Support Services contract.

*C. Cost/Price*

Pricing from Fuentek LLC was reviewed in accordance with FAR 15.4 “Contract Pricing”. The Fuentek LLC offer was approximately 4% higher than the Independent Government Cost Estimate. The Fuentek LLC offer is the second highest priced offer received in response to this solicitation.

**InnoVector Tech, Inc.**

*A. Technical Capability – Overall Rating “Excellent”*

*a. Organizational Structure and Management Plan– Very Good*

*b. Technical Approach – Excellent*

*c. Technical Tasks – Excellent*

Under Organizational Structure and Management Plan, InnoVector Tech, Inc. received a “very good” for one strength for its proposed organizational structure having defined roles and responsibilities of key positions and identifying key positions with extensive background in the technology transfer field.

Under Technical Approach, InnoVector Tech, Inc. received an “excellent” for three significant strengths and one strength. A significant strength was assessed for the providing highly detailed and comprehensive technical approach to the SOW elements 3.1-3.6. InnoVector Tech was assessed a second significant strength for providing extensive detail and discussion as to the methods, approaches, and techniques to be used in accomplishing task elements 3.7-3.15. A significant strength was also assessed for the proposed highly effective project management tool to track, assign and monitor contract work and the assigning of personnel to specific technologies through its lifecycle. Additionally, InnoVector Tech, Inc. received a strength for the proposed innovative and realistic approach for continual improvement of all contract products.

Under Technical Tasks, InnoVector Tech, Inc. received an “excellent” for one significant strength for its comprehensive and detailed discussion of the technical approaches to accomplishing the required tasks. The task plans proposed highly qualified personnel to complete the task requirements.

*B. Past Performance – Overall Rating “Neutral”*

InnoVector Tech, Inc. received an overall rating of Neutral in past performance. Although excellent responses were received in Past Performance Questionnaires, the size and scope of the work fell short in relation to its relevancy to the Technology Transfer Office Support Services procurement. An independent search of the Government Past Performance database did not reveal any past performance information.

*C. Cost/Price*

Pricing from InnoVector Tech, Inc. was reviewed in accordance with FAR 15.4 “Contract Pricing”. The InnoVector Tech, Inc. offer was approximately 22% lower than the Independent Government Cost Estimate. The InnoVector Tech, Inc. offer is the fifth lowest priced offer received in response to this solicitation.

**Qwaltec**

*A. Technical Capability – Overall Rating “Poor”*

- a. Organizational Structure and Management Plan– Poor*
- b. Technical Approach – Poor*
- c. Technical Tasks – Good*

Under Organizational Structure and Management Plan, Qwaltec received a “poor” for one significant weakness for the lack of adequacy provided in describing the teaming relationship with the proposed subcontractor, The Tauri Group, and the proposed management and control policies to successfully meet contract requirements. While the proposal stated The Tauri Group would be

the subcontractor, the proposal fell short in providing adequate and effective information to describe how this teaming relationship would operate to provide an integrated work effort. The proposal also was incomplete in describing details regarding the proposed financial tracking system and management/control policies in terms of how these will assist in effectively meeting the contract requirements.

Under Technical Approach, Qwaltec received a “poor” for three significant weaknesses. Qwaltec failed to provide a detailed technical approach to the statement of work elements 3.1-3.6. A discussion of SOW element 3.1 provided methods that were too broad and high level and not focusing on the individual technology level. SOW element 3.2 failed to provide an effective approach and the skills summary chart lacked any information identifying licensing expertise. SOW element 3.3 provided an incorrect approach to accomplish this requirement. Qwaltec lacked completeness in describing methods, skills and techniques, which would be used in successfully accomplishing statement of work task elements 3.7-3.15. The offeror failed to address scheduling/assigning/tracking work activity, provided minimal information regarding technical quality standards in terms of how a technical task outside of the proposed disciplines would be assigned, and failed to provide an approach to deal with workload fluctuations.

Under Technical Tasks, Qwaltec met all requirements and received no findings. Based on the designated evaluation process, the evaluation team determined an overall rating of “Good” for Qwaltec’s Technical Tasks.

#### *B. Past Performance – Overall Rating “Moderate Level of Confidence”*

Qwaltec received two strengths and one neutral related to past performance. A strength was assessed to Qwaltec for submitted information for one contract which was considered somewhat relevant in terms of size and scope to the Technology Transfer Office Support Services Contract. Information submitted for Qwaltec’s subcontractor, The Tauri Group, included three contracts which were considered highly relevant in terms of size and scope to the Technology Transfer Office Support Services contract. A second strength was assessed from an independent search through the Government past performance database which revealed exceptional ratings for one contract of the Tauri Group, which was considered highly relevant to the Technology Transfer Office Support Services contract. A neutral was assessed due to not receiving any Past Performance Questionnaires for Qwaltec or The Tauri Group.

#### *C. Cost/Price*

Pricing from Qwaltec was reviewed in accordance with FAR 15.4 “Contract Pricing”. The Qwaltec offer was approximately 21% lower than the Independent Government Cost Estimate. The Qwaltec offer is the third highest priced offer received in response to this solicitation.

### **Secure Technologies LLC**

#### *Technical Capability – Overall Rating “Poor”*

- a. Organizational Structure and Management Plan– Poor*
- b. Technical Approach – Poor*
- c. Technical Tasks – Poor*

Under Organizational Structure and Management Plan, Secure Technologies LLC received a “poor” for one significant weakness due to the proposal lacking completeness in key positions with no proposed arrangement of reach back to obtain the required skills and Technical or Engineer SME’s, which are key to successfully meeting the contract requirements.

Under Technical Approach, Secure Technologies LLC received a “poor” for three significant weaknesses and one deficiency. Secure Technology LLC incorrectly described the processes for SOW element 3.1 and provided minimal detail of the techniques and skills planned to be used to meet the technical requirements of task elements 3.2-3.6. The proposal lacked discussion regarding how the proposed management system would be used to schedule, assign and track work activities and provided a quality assurance process which lacked detail describing how this would be used to successfully accomplish the requirements of the contract. Secure Technologies failed to provide any discussion regarding the innovations, efficiencies or continual process improvements as they relate to the contract products, outcomes or deliverables. The offeror failed to provide an approach to accomplish the requirements of task elements 3.7-3.15. Task elements 3.7-3.10 and 3.13 lacked detail in the techniques or skills to meet the task requirements, task elements 3.11-3.12 restated the SOW requirements and provided no discussion of the techniques or skills necessary to meet or exceed the task requirements for task elements 3.14-3.15.

Under Technical Tasks, Secure Technologies LLC received a “poor” for one significant weakness. The task plans for Technical Assessments and Marketing Strategies, Listings and TOPS failed to provide detail regarding a technical approach to successfully meet task requirements and did not identify key personnel to meet task requirements.

#### *B. Past Performance – Overall Rating “Neutral”*

Secure Technologies LLC received a Neutral in past performance. No past performance information was received.

#### *C. Cost/Price*

Pricing from Secure Technologies LLC was reviewed in accordance with FAR 15.4 “Contract Pricing”. The Secure Technologies LLC offer was approximately 65% lower than the Independent Government Cost Estimate. The Secure Technologies LLC offer is the lowest priced offer received in response to this solicitation.

### **Vision IT**

#### *A. Technical Capability – Overall Rating “Fair”*

- a. Organizational Structure and Management Plan– Fair*
- b. Technical Approach – Fair*
- c. Technical Tasks – Good*

Under Organizational Structure and Management Plan, Vision IT received a “fair” for one weakness for providing an organizational structure which lacked clarity as to who is the point of contact for the Glenn Technology Transfer Office technical representative.

Under Technical Approach, Vision IT received a “fair” for two weaknesses and one significant weakness. The offeror received a weakness for the proposed method of scheduling, assigning and tracking work activities due to the method being unclear as to how it would be accomplished. The proposed quality assurance process would be too time consuming for this contract. Vision IT was also assessed a weakness for the proposed list of innovations, efficiencies and continual improvement techniques used to successfully complete the requirements of the contract, which were lacking completeness in detail. Additionally, Vision IT received a significant weakness for failing to provide detail or discussion as to the methods, approaches or techniques planned to be utilized on Task Elements 3.7-3.15. Task 3.10 restated the SOW, no approach or method was described for task 3.14 and minimal detail was provided regarding how the proposed collaboration system relates to task element 3.15.

Under Technical Tasks, Vision IT met all requirements and received no findings. Based on the designated evaluation process, the evaluation team determined an overall rating of “Good” for Vision IT’s Technical Approach.

#### *B. Past Performance – Overall Rating “Neutral”*

Vision IT received an overall rating of Neutral in past performance. Information received in the past performance narrative section of the proposal was considered not relevant in regards to the size and scope of the Technology Transfer Office Support Services Procurement. Although responses were received in Past Performance Questionnaires, the size and scope of the work fell short in relation to its relevancy to the Technology Transfer Office Support Services procurement. An independent search of the Government Past Performance database did not reveal any additional past performance information.

#### *C. Cost/Price*

Pricing from Vision IT was reviewed in accordance with FAR 15.4 “Contract Pricing”. The Vision IT offer was approximately 40% lower than the Independent Government Cost Estimate. The Vision IT offer is the second lowest priced offer received in response to this solicitation.

#### **Selection Review**

On November 5, 2014, a Source Selection Review was made to me in my capacity as the Source Selection Official (SSO), which detailed the findings of the Source Evaluation Committee (SEC). In addition to myself, the Source Selection Review was attended by members of the SEC, including the Contracting Officer and Contract Task Manager. During the meeting, the overall evaluation process and findings on Technical Capability, Past Performance, and Price were presented and discussed. Additionally, during the review, I provided the SEC with my independent judgment relative to the findings and asked questions regarding the information presented. The review concluded with my decision, which is detailed in this Source Selection Statement.

#### **Selection Decision**

I have reviewed the information presented by the SEC. I understand the evaluation process undertaken and the findings presented. I agree with the findings as presented as well as the approach to derive the findings. I understand that the solicitation required Technical Capability, Past Performance, and Pricing Information. I further understand that these factors are approximately equal in importance.

In the area of Technical Capability, I found that InnoVector Tech, Inc.'s proposal was technically qualitatively superior to all of the other Offerors. InnoVector Tech, Inc. had a number of significant strengths and strengths. I particularly found impressive its highly detailed organizational structure, which clearly delineated who would lead each aspect of the organization and how NASA would interface into its organization to successfully complete contract task requirements. InnoVector's Key Positions had exceptional experience in the Technology Transfer field. Additionally, InnoVector Tech, Inc. received significant strengths for its proposed technical approach for meeting or exceeding all task requirements of the statement of work. InnoVector's comprehensive technical approach to all of the SOW task elements clearly demonstrates its full understanding of the contract requirements. I note that Fuentek LLC had an overall rating in Technical Capability of Very Good. Fuentek proposed an effective organizational structure and provided thorough detail of key positions with extensive experience and qualifications to align with each SOW task element. Fuentek provided a comprehensive technical approach to SOW task elements 3.1-3.6 and a thorough technical approach describing the management tool used to assigning and tracking work activities as well as a detailed quality control process. However, Fuentek LLC failed to provide a detailed technical approach in each SOW task elements, specifically task elements 3.7-3.15, which concerned me as to Fuentek's understanding of contract requirements and lessened my confidence that Fuentek could perform the contract without risk to the Government. Therefore, I find that InnoVector Tech, Inc. has an advantage in Technical Capability.

I have also reviewed the evaluation findings for the proposals from Connexus Hub, CP2S, Qwaltec, and Vision IT and note the prevalence of weaknesses and/or significant weaknesses throughout each of their proposals. Such prevalence of significant weaknesses and/or weaknesses depreciablely lessened my degree of confidence that these offerors could successfully perform the contract without risk to the Government and therefore could not provide the best value to the Government.

Additionally, I have also reviewed the evaluation findings for the proposals from Secure Technologies LLC and Absolute Technology Law and note that both offerors received deficiencies. These material failures of their proposals to meet the contract requirements significantly lessened my degree of confidence that these offerors could successfully perform the contract and therefore absolutely could not provide the best value to the Government.

In the area of Past Performance, I note that InnoVector Tech, Inc. as a company has received a Neutral rating. Fuentek LLC has received significant strengths in three facets of the past performance evaluation, which cumulate into a confidence rating of "Very High Level of Confidence." Fuentek LLC's past performance records included multiple contracts which were considered highly relevant in terms of size and scope to the GRC Technology Transfer Office Support Services. 90% of responses received for the Past Performance Questionnaires were rated Very Good to Excellent. Due to Fuentek's rating of "Very High Level of Confidence" I find that Fuentek LLC has an advantage in this area.

There was a noticeable difference in price, with InnoVector Tech, Inc.'s proposed price being approximately 26% lower than Fuentek LLC's proposed price. While it is noted that the proposed price from InnoVector Tech, Inc. was not the lowest price received, when compared to Fuentek LLC's proposed price as the next highest rated in Technically Capability, InnoVector Tech, Inc. was lower. I reviewed with the evaluation team whether they considered the offer from InnoVector Tech, Inc. to be unrealistic due to the price difference. The evaluation team indicated that while InnoVector Tech, Inc.'s price was lower than the Independent Government Cost Estimate, the pricing breakdown within the cost portion of the proposal, which included an annual breakout of deliverables as well as a plan to provide more interaction with the NASA Technology Transfer Office provided more than sufficient information for the evaluation team to believe there is a minimal amount of risk to the Government. Due to InnoVector Tech Inc.'s lower proposed price than Fuentek LLC, I find that InnoVector Tech, Inc. has an advantage in this area.

The source selection methodology specified in the RFP indicates that the three evaluation factors of Technical Capability, Past Performance and Price are approximately equal in value. In this case, I find that the offer from InnoVector Tech, Inc. is superior above all other offerors in its Technical Capability and additionally provides the lower price when compared to the other offeror whom was the next highly rated in Technical Capability. Although InnoVector was rated neutral on Past Performance, I find that its performance in Technical Capability of being the only offeror with an overall rating of "Excellent" combined with InnoVector Tech, Inc.'s lower price outweigh its neutral in past performance and ultimately provides the Government with the best value. I therefore find that the InnoVector Tech, Inc. proposal for award represents the best value to the Government, and I select InnoVector Tech, Inc. to perform the contract requirements as stated in the RFP.



Kurt A. Straub  
Chief, Research and Space Operations Branch  
Source Selection Official