



**DOCUMENT FOR PUBLIC RELEASE**

The decision issued on the date below was subject to a GAO Protective Order. This redacted version has been approved for public release.

# Decision

**Matter of:** InterImage Inc.

**File:** B-424347; B-424347.2

**Date:** June 15, 2026

---

Olivia L. Lynch, Esq., Cherie J. Owen, Esq., and Adina B. Nelson, Esq., Crowell & Moring LLP, for the protester.

Devon E. Hewitt, Esq., and Matthew L. Nicholson, Esq. Potomac Law Group, for Trillion Trchnology Solutions, Inc., the intervenor.

Erika L. Retta Whelan, Esq., Walker J. Gray, Esq., Robert Depke, Esq., and Aeric Bauman, Esq., Department of the Air Force, for the agency.

Todd C. Culliton, Esq., and Tania Calhoun, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, GAO, participated in the preparation of the decision.

---

## DIGEST

1. Protest alleging that the agency unreasonably evaluated the awardee's technical quotation is denied where the record shows the evaluation was reasonable and consistent with the terms of the solicitation.
  2. Protest alleging that the agency unreasonably conducted the tradeoff analysis is denied where the record shows that the agency qualitatively compared the quotations in accordance with the terms of the solicitation.
- 

## DECISION

InterImage, Inc., of Arlington, Virginia, protests the issuance of a task order to Trillion Technology Solutions, Inc., of Reston, Virginia, under request for quotations (RFQ) No. HTC71125QE151, issued by the United States Transportation Command (USTRANSCOM) for functional management support services. InterImage alleges that the agency unreasonably evaluated Trillion's proposal and improperly made the selection decision.

We deny the protest.

## BACKGROUND

USTRANSCOM provides air, land, and sea transportation for the Department of Defense during both peace and war. Agency Report (AR), Tab 27, RFQ, PWS at 1. Prior to providing transportation, USTRANSCOM conducts transportation feasibility analysis for all military movement requests and provides multi-modal transportation solutions for all federal customers. Contracting Officer's Statement (COS) at 1. To perform this analysis, USTRANSCOM uses the Joint Operation Planning and Execution system (JOPES) and Transportation Visualizer (TransViz) system. PWS at 1.

On September 11, 2025, USTRANSCOM issued the RFQ to procure functional management support services for JOPES and TransViz. AR, Tab 32, Conformed RFQ at 1; COS at 2. As examples, the selected contractor will be required to operate independently and assist USTRANSCOM personnel in using various JOPES functional systems (e.g., Global Decision Support System) and TransViz systems. PWS at 2-4.

The procurement was conducted using the procedures set forth under Federal Acquisition Regulation 8.4. COS at 2. The RFQ contemplated the issuance of a task order against the selected vendor's Federal Supply Schedule contract to be performed over an 8-month base period and four 1-year option periods. RFQ at 3-5. Award would be made on a best-value tradeoff basis considering technical capability, past performance, and price factors. *Id.* at 57-60. When combined, the non-price factors were to be considered more important than the price factor. *Id.* at 57. The technical capability and past performance factors were to be considered equal. *Id.*

The technical capability factor included four subfactors: technical approach, staffing approach, transition plan, and essential contractor services plan. RFQ at 57-58. When evaluating the technical capability subfactors, the agency would assign a high confidence, some confidence, or low confidence adjectival rating. *Id.* The RFQ advised that the subfactors were not of equal importance but rather were separated into two equal tiers. *Id.* at 57. The technical approach and staffing approach subfactors were in the higher tier and the transition plan and essential contractor services plan subfactors were in the lower tier. *Id.*

Prior to November 19, 2025, close of the solicitation period, 13 vendors, including InterImage and Trillion, submitted quotations. AR, Tab 37, Best-Value Decision (BVD) at 1. The agency's evaluation produced the following relevant results:

	InterImage	Trillion
Technical Capability		
--Technical Approach	High Confidence	High Confidence
--Staffing Approach	High Confidence	High Confidence
--Transition Plan	High Confidence	High Confidence

<b>--Essential Contractor Services Plan</b>	High Confidence	High Confidence
<b>Past Performance</b>	High Confidence	High Confidence
<b>Proposed Price</b>	\$6,304,470	\$5,166,159

*Id.* at 5-8.<sup>1</sup> After comparing proposals, the source selection authority (SSA) determined that Trillion’s proposal represented the best value and issued the task order to the firm. *Id.* at 11. After learning that its quotation was unsuccessful, InterImage filed this protest with our Office.

## DISCUSSION

Principally, InterImage argues that the agency unreasonably evaluated Trillion’s technical proposal because it unreasonably considered Trillion’s experience developing next-generation Joint Planning and Execution Services (JPES) system (*i.e.*, the system replacing JOPES) as advantageous. Supp. Comments at 15-22; Comments and Supp. Protest at 3-13. Additionally, InterImage argues that the agency unreasonably performed the tradeoff analysis because USTRANSCOM improperly concluded that Trillion’s proposal was more advantageous. *Id.* at 3-14.

We have reviewed Interimage’s challenges and find that they do not provide us with a basis to sustain the protest. We discuss the principal arguments below, but note, at the outset, that in reviewing an agency’s evaluation of quotations and selection decision under federal supply schedule procedures, our Office does not reevaluate quotations or substitute our judgment for that of the agency; rather, we review the record to determine whether the evaluation and selection decision were reasonable and consistent with the solicitation’s terms as well as any applicable procurement statutes or regulations.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> During the evaluation period, the agency delayed the start of performance and reduced the contract base period from 8.5 months to 6 months. AR, Tab 37, BVDD at 5. As a result, USTRANSCOM conducted exchanges with InterImage, Trillion, and one other vendor seeking revised prices to account for the shorter base period of performance. *Id.*

<sup>2</sup> InterImage raised and then withdrew multiple allegations during the course of this protest. In its protest, InterImage alleged that USTRANSCOM unreasonably failed to assign multiple strengths to its proposal (*e.g.*, agency failed to recognize benefits associated with its cybersecurity framework and proposed robust testing methodology), but later withdrew these allegations. Protest at 11-19; Comments and Supp. Protest at 5 n.3. In its comments, InterImage alleged as supplemental protest grounds that the agency unreasonably evaluated its past performance but withdrew this allegation in its supplemental comments. Comments and Supp. Protest at 13-16; Supp. Comments at 14 n.6.

*VariQ Corp., B-409114 et al.*, Jan. 27, 2014, at 8, 14-15. To the extent we do not discuss any particular allegation or argument, it is denied.

## Technical Evaluation

InterImage contends that USTRANSCOM unreasonably considered Trillion's JPES experience as beneficial. Supp. Comments at 14. InterImage argues that this evaluation judgment was inconsistent with the solicitation because the PWS does not reference JPES or identify JPES experience as advantageous. *Id.* at 15. InterImage also points out that a question-and-answer to the RFQ stated that "the implementation of the JPES does not impact any of the tasks in the PWS." *Id.* (quoting AR, Tab 29, RFQ, Question and Answer (Q&A) at 5). Additionally, InterImage argues that Trillion's JPES experience is of limited value because its contract for developing the system concluded in September 2025, and the agency is in the midst of conducting another procurement to perform the final development of JPES. *Id.* at 18-21.

USTRANSCOM responds that it reasonably evaluated Trillion's JPES experience as advantageous because the experience demonstrates unique technical understanding of the JOPEs and TransViz systems. Supp. COS/Memorandum of Law (MOL) at 7. In this regard, the agency explains that it identified specific "concrete details" in Trillion's proposal as demonstrating a comprehensive understanding, such as using custom scripts for JOPEs and having intimate knowledge of the essential information systems contained within JOPEs and TransViz. *Id.* at 8.

By way of additional background, JPES is a modernized version of JOPEs, which will maintain the same functionality. AR, Tab 29, RFQ, Q&A at 5. While JPES will eventually replace JOPEs during this contract's period of performance, the selected contractor's support duties will not change. *Id.*

When demonstrating their technical capabilities, vendors were instructed to complete a technical approach matrix. RFQ at 54; AR, Tab 28, RFQ, amend. 5, attach. 7, Tech. Approach Matrix at 1-6. The technical approach matrix required vendors to provide a summary statement of their technical approaches and responses describing aspects of their approaches under each of the technical subfactors. AR, Tab 28, RFP, amend. 5, attach. 7, Tech. Approach Matrix at 1. As relevant here, for the technical capability subfactor, the matrix required vendors to explain how they would provide transaction analysis and troubleshooting for JOPEs error processing and system status reports; functional testing; and TransViz training. *Id.* at 2-4.

In evaluating each vendor's technical approach, the RFQ advised that the agency would determine whether each vendor "used concrete details to showcase an understanding and a sound approach to meeting [PWS] requirements" through their responses to the specific prompts. RFQ at 57-58.

As noted above, USTRANSCOM evaluated Trillion's technical proposal as warranting a "high confidence" rating under each of the technical subfactors. AR, Tab 45, Trillion

Tech. Evaluation Worksheet at 1-5. For the technical capability subfactor, USTRANSCOM noted that Trillion's "experience as the developer for the [JPES] system gives them a unique and comprehensive understanding of the data, applications, and interfaces used by USTRANSCOM." *Id.* at 2. The agency noted that Trillion described specific processes for using custom scripts for JOPES Synchronization Process conflict analysis. *Id.*

On this record, we find nothing objectionable about the agency's conclusion that Trillion's experience as the JPES developer was advantageous. After reviewing the protester's quotation, USTRANSCOM reasonably concluded that Trillion demonstrated a sound understanding of JOPES, including the applications and underlying mechanics because it gained familiarity with these systems when it developed the JPES. See AR, Tab 44, Trillion Tech. Proposal at 1. Indeed, with regard to JOPES error processing under PWS ¶ 1.3.2.4, Trillion explained that it has developed and maintains customized scripts to keep JOPES databases synced, as well as to quickly investigate and identify sources of discrepancies. *Id.* at 2. Trillion also explains that it uses these scripts to determine what actions have been taken and what future remedial actions should be undertaken. *Id.*

Although InterImage may argue that this aspect of Trillion's proposal is of limited value because JPES and JOPES are different systems and Trillion's JPES support contract concluded in September 2025, we are unpersuaded. Trillion's proposal demonstrates that the firm has a strong familiarity with and insight into the JOPES synchronization process due to its experience updating and developing the next-generation replacement system. Thus, we deny this protest allegation because our review of the record confirms that Trillion's proposal described how its experience informed a deep understanding of the JOPES, and that the agency recognized this aspect as advantageous consistent with the terms of the solicitation.

#### Tradeoff Analysis

InterImage argues that the SSA unreasonably identified Trillion's proposal as representing the best value. InterImage asserts that the SSA unreasonably concluded that Trillion's JPES past performance was more beneficial than its JOPES past performance because the focus of this procurement was for supporting JOPES. Supp. Comments at 4-8. InterImage also argues that the SSA failed to recognize that it offered significantly more robust past performance than Trillion because each referenced contract involved Department of Defense contracts or a contract supporting JOPES. *Id.* at 12-13. USTRANSCOM responds that it reasonably considered the merits of both proposals when performing the tradeoff analysis. See Supp. COS/MOL at 15-22.

As noted above, when performing the tradeoff analysis, the non-price factors, when combined, were to be considered more important than the price factor. RFQ at 57. The technical capability and past performance factors were to be considered equal.

When conducting the tradeoff analysis, the SSA compared both InterImage's and Trillion's proposals directly. The SSA concluded that Trillion's technical capability was more advantageous than InterImage's technical capability because, in the SSA's view, Trillion's experience as the developer for the JPES system provided a unique and comprehensive understanding of the mission environment. AR, Tab 37, BVD at 11. The SSA also noted that Trillion's staffing plan (*i.e.*, retaining the entire incumbent workforce) provided a significant benefit by ensuring complete continuity support. *Id.*

The SSA also concluded that Trillion's record of past performance was more advantageous because, while InterImage offered experience maintaining legacy systems, Trillion offered direct, hands-on experience modernizing the JPES system. AR, Tab 37, BVD at 11. The SSA noted that "[t]his developer-level experience, which involved building custom tools and managing critical transition interfaces, represents a greater scope and magnitude of complexity." *Id.* Overall, the SSA stated the following:

The combination of Trillion's unique technical insight and their more complex and relevant past performance provides the highest possible confidence of successful performance with little to no Government intervention.

*Id.*

The SSA then considered the proposed prices and noted that Trillion's quoted price was 22.03 percent higher than InterImage's quote price; however, the SSA concluded that the advantages and benefits associated with Trillion's quotation were worth the price premium. AR, Tab 37, BVD at 11. The SSA also noted that Trillion's quoted price was 10.84 percent below the internal government cost estimate. *Id.*

Here, we find no basis to object to the agency's tradeoff analysis for any of the reasons advanced by the protester. First, the record does not support InterImage's argument that the agency unreasonably compared vendors' technical quotations. While InterImage complains that the agency should not have considered Trillion's JPES experience as a distinguishing factor, we have already concluded that this feature was reasonably evaluated since it shows the depth of Trillion's understanding of JOPES and thus could be used as a point of comparison. In this regard, the record shows that the SSA compared Trillion's and InterImage's experiences and understanding of JOPES and concluded that Trillion's developer-level insight into the underlying mechanics of JOPES was more advantageous. AR, Tab 37, BVD at 10. Further, the record shows that the agency compared both vendors' staffing approaches and determined that Trillion's was more advantageous due to its ability to retain the entire incumbent staff. *Id.* Thus, our review of the record shows that the agency compared the qualitative features of both quotations and reasonably determined that Trillion's technical approach was stronger.

Likewise, the record does not support InterImage's assertion that the agency unreasonably compared the vendors' records of past performance. While InterImage

may have performed contracts providing JOPES support, we do not agree that this inherently made InterImage's record of past performance more advantageous. Indeed, the RFQ states that the agency will "give more consideration to a reference with experience with JOPES, TransViz, and/or JOPES and TransViz related applications." RFQ at 59. This is significant because the agency found Trillion's JPES contract to involve a "related application," meaning that the agency could consider both past performance records to be of a similar tier under the express terms of the RFQ. See Supp. COS/MOL at 16 ("As JPES is the modernized replacement for JOPES, it is a 'related application.'").

Additionally, while InterImage argues that its past performance included more Department of Defense contracts, the record shows that the agency recognized this fact but simply concluded that Trillion's referenced performance involved more complex tasks, which provided a higher confidence for successful performance. AR, Tab 37, BVD at 11; Supp. COS/MOL at 20. To the extent InterImage contends that the value of three referenced contracts for sustaining legacy systems is greater than one referenced contract developing and modernizing JPES, such argument merely represents disagreement with the agency's tradeoff determinations and does not provide us with a basis to sustain the protest. *Sigmattech, Inc.*, B-415028.3, B-415028.4, Sept. 11, 2018, at 11 ("As with evaluations of quotations, a protester's disagreement with the agency's tradeoff judgment, without more, does not establish that the award decision was unreasonable."). Accordingly, we deny the protest allegation because our review of the agency's tradeoff determination shows that the SSA compared the competing features and reasonably concluded that Trillion's quotation represented the better value.

The protest is denied.

Edda Emmanuelli Perez  
General Counsel