

**DECISION**



**THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL  
OF THE UNITED STATES**  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20548

FILE: B-206650

DATE: June 17, 1982

MATTER OF: John H. Green & Associates, Inc.

**DIGEST:**

Protest alleging that agency improperly selected competitor is denied where record shows that selection conformed to RFP evaluation criteria and reflected contracting officer's reasonable belief that awardee's selection was most advantageous to the Government.

John H. Green & Associates, Inc. protests an award by the Forest Service to Tefft, Kelly and Motley, Inc. under Request for Proposals (RFP) R6-5-82-23N. The contractor was to conduct a one week training course at a price of \$6,245. The course was conducted two weeks after award and was completed within two weeks of the date this protest was filed. We deny the protest.

According to the protester, it should have received award because: (1) its price was \$85 less than the awardee's price, (2) price and technical merit should have been given equal weight in evaluating proposals, and (3) technical proposals were essentially equal. The protester minimizes the importance of a higher technical score given the awardee (92 points) vis-a-vis its own score (90 points). The protester says this difference reflects the awardee's prior experience performing a similar contract for the Forest Service, which the protester insists should have been given no weight because it was not identified as an evaluation factor in the RFP. We do not agree.

The issue here is simply whether the agency's technical evaluation was reasonable and consistent with the evaluation criteria. In this respect, we will not evaluate the proposals to make our own determination as to their relative merits. See Space Age Surveyors, B-199634, November 12, 1980, 80-2 CPD 355. In this case, one of the evaluation criteria was the "experience and skill in presenting the subject matter." Assuming all other

matters to be equal between the competing proposals, we think; it is perfectly proper to consider the additional experience offered by one of the competitors. Here the selection official found the two proposals to be extremely close in technical merit and cost. That he chose to spend an additional \$85,00 for the small advantage he perceived in the awardee's proposal seems to us to have been reasonable and consistent with the evaluation criteria. See, Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Inc., B-205581, June 7, 1982, 82-1 CPD \_\_\_\_.

The protest is denied.

*for* *Harry R. Chen*  
Comptroller General  
of the United States