



Matter of: Technology Information Systems, LLC

File: B-424087; B-424088

Date: January 26, 2026

Richard L Porterfield for the protester.

Shelley Brown, Esq., Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, for the agency.

Suresh S. Boodram, Esq., and Evan D. Wesser, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, GAO, participated in the preparation of the decision.

DIGEST

Protests that the agency applied unstated evaluation criteria in its evaluation of the protester's quotation are denied where the challenged evaluation findings were logically encompassed by the stated criteria.

DECISION

Technology Information Systems, LLC (TekInfoSys), a small business of Springfield, Virginia, protests the award of contracts to Adtech, LLC, a small business of McLean, Virginia, and Vanguard Management Solutions, Inc. (VMS), a small business of Fairfax, Virginia, respectively, under request for quotations (RFQ) Nos. 1758361 and 1758314, issued by the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission (OSHRC) for information technology (IT) support services.¹ The protester contends that the agency

¹ Protest B-424087 involves RFQ No. 1758361, which sought quotations for a qualified individual to support efficient operation of IT end user infrastructure and maintain daily operations; award was made to Adtech at a total contract price of \$626,626. Protest B-424088 involves RFQ No. 1758314, which sought quotations for comprehensive IT support services, including the management and maintenance of enterprise infrastructure in a hybrid cloud/on-premises configuration; award was made to VMS at a total contract price of \$712,698.40.

Our Office initially developed these protests separately; however because both RFQs and the protester's arguments are similar, we are issuing this single consolidated decision resolving both protests. The RFQs, agency exhibits, and pleadings across both protests are virtually identical with respect to the relevant facts and legal arguments. To avoid unnecessary redundancy, citations to the RFQ, agency record, and pleadings are to those submitted in connection with B-424087, unless otherwise indicated.

evaluated the protester's quotation unreasonably and on the basis of unstated evaluation criteria.

We deny the protests.

BACKGROUND

On August 12, 2025, the agency issued both of the RFQs at issue for IT-related services to vendors holding Federal Supply Schedule contracts pursuant to the procedures of Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) subpart 8.4. Agency Report (AR), exh. 1, Initial RFQ Section A at 1; exh. 3, RFQ at 13; Memorandum of Law (MOL) at 1. The RFQs, which were amended once respectively, contemplated the issuance of single award fixed-price contracts with 1-year base periods and four 1-year option periods. AR, exh. 3, RFQ at 1. Each RFQ provided that award would be made on a best-value tradeoff basis considering price and two non-price evaluation factors, which are listed in descending order of importance: proposed contractor personnel resume (resume); and past performance. *Id.* at 13. All non-price factors when combined were significantly more important than price. *Id.* Only the resume factor is relevant to the issues presented in this protest.

For the resume factor, the RFQs instructed vendors to submit the resumes of all individuals proposed to provide the services requested within the RFQs. AR, exh. 3, RFQ at 11. As part of its evaluation, the agency provided that it would evaluate resumes "of key personnel to ensure they meet the qualifications in [the statement of work (SOW)]." *Id.* at 13. As relevant to this protest, the SOW of both RFQs required vendors to be proficient with two technologies: Azure Active Directory; and Microsoft Intune for Mobile Device Management. For example, under RFQ 1758361, section 4.2 of the SOW, labelled "Azure Active Directory and Intune Management," the RFQ required vendors to "[p]ossess prior knowledge and experience administering in a hybrid Azure Active Directory environment . . ." and to "[s]upport user and device management using Microsoft Intune for Mobile Device Management. . . ." *Id.* at 3. Similarly, under RFQ 1758314, section 4.1 of the SOW, labelled "Hybrid Azure Active Directory Administration," required vendors to "[a]dminister and maintain Hybrid Azure AD infrastructure . . ." and section 4.2 labelled "Microsoft Intune/MDM Support" required vendors be able to "[c]onfigure and manage Microsoft Intune for mobile device management and application management." AR (B-424088), exh. 3, RFQ at 3.

The protester and awardees submitted timely quotations by the RFQs' due date of August 14, 2025. See, AR, exh. 8, TekInfoSys Scoring Sheet at 1; AR, exh. 9, AdTech Scoring Sheet at 1. For the resume factor, evaluators assigned a rating between 1 and 10 based on the vendor's proposed personnel's capability to perform under the RFQ. AR, exh. 9, AdTech Scoring Sheet at 1. To create each quotation's total score, the

agency summed each quotation's resume and total price scores.² *Id.* The agency's evaluation results for each RFQ were as follows:

RFQ1758361 End User Support IT		
	AdTech	TekInfoSys
Past Performance	Passed	Passed
Resume	9/10	3/10
Total Price	\$626,626 (5 points)	\$824,780 (4 points)
Total Score	14 Points	7 Points

AR, exh. 8, TekInfoSys Scoring Sheet at 1; AR, exh. 9, AdTech Scoring Sheet at 1.

RFQ1758314 Infrastructure Support		
	Vanguard	TekInfoSys
Past Performance	Passed	Passed
Resume	9/10	2/10
Total Price	\$712,698 (5 points)	\$824,780 (4 points)
Total Score	14 Points	6 Points

AR (B-424088), exh. 8, TekInfoSys Scoring Sheet at 1; AR (B-424088), exh. 9, Vanguard Scoring Sheet at 1 (price rounded to nearest whole dollar).

On September 12, 2025, the agency awarded contracts to Adtech and Vanguard. MOL at 2. On September 19, the protester filed agency-level protests challenging both awards. *Id.* On November 17, the agency denied both protests. *Id.* at 3. On the same day, the protester filed separate bid protests challenging both awards with our Office.

DISCUSSION

The protester principally argues that the agency applied unstated evaluation criteria when evaluating the protester's quotation under the resume factor.³ Specifically, the

² As to the price factor, evaluators used each vendor's total price, which the agency calculated as the vendor's proposed rate for each service category multiplied by the estimated annual number of hours for each service--2000 hours--which the agency then multiplied by the total number of ordering periods. AR, exh. 3, RFQ at 13. To evaluate the price factor, the agency assigned each quotation a score between 1 and 5 based on what percentage each vendor's total price represented of "the maximum allowable bid." AR, exh. 8, TekInfoSys Scoring Sheet at 1. The percentages system was as follows: (1) 0-79% = 5 points; (2) 80-84% = 4 points; (3) 85-89% = 3 points; (4) 90-94% = 2 points; and (5) 95+% = 1 point. *Id.* The agency did not define "maximum allowable bid" or provide a further explanation of how points were assigned.

³ TekInfoSys also initially alleged that the agency unreasonably evaluated the protester's quotation under the resume and past performance factors. Protest at 2-3. In
(continued...)

protester contends that the agency evaluated its quotation using two unstated requirements. Comments at 4-5. First, the protester asserts that the agency unreasonably used an “explicit mention requirement” when the agency rated the protester’s quotations less favorably because the resumes of the protester’s proposed key personnel did not mention either the Azure or Intune technologies. *Id.* at 1. Second, the protester asserts that the agency applied an unstated “advanced education criterion” because the agency rated the awardees’ quotations higher than the protester’s quotations, in part, because the awardees’ resumes demonstrated additional advanced education in information technology.⁴ *Id.* at 3-4.

The agency maintains that it reasonably evaluated quotations in accordance with the standards outlined in the RFQs. Agency Supp. Briefing at 2. To the extent the protester challenges certain aspects of the agency’s evaluation, the agency argues that those aspects are reasonably related to or encompassed in the evaluation standards as stated within the RFQs. *Id.*

(...continued)

particular, the protester asserted that, as the incumbent contractor, the protester should have received higher ratings under both of the non-price factors than the awardees. *Id.* The agency provided a detailed response to these allegations in its agency report. See MOL at 3, 6. The protester did not substantively address these arguments in its comments, stating instead that its protest was limited only to its unstated evaluation criteria argument. Resp. to Supp. Briefing at 1; see *also* Comments at 6. Accordingly, we consider the protester to have abandoned its argument that the agency unreasonably rated the protester’s quotations lower than the awardees’ under each of the non-price factors despite the protester’s incumbent status.

⁴ The protester raises other collateral arguments. While this decision does not specifically address all of the protester’s arguments, we find that none provides a basis on which to sustain the protests. As one example, the protester argues that the agency failed to disclose in the RFQs that the agency would evaluate quotations using a “comparative, margin-based scoring methodology,” that applied a numerical rating to determine which quotation provided the best value to the government. Resp. to Supp. Briefing at 4-5. We find no merit to this argument.

Our Office has recognized that to ensure intelligent competition, agencies must disclose the evaluation factors to be used and the relative importance of those factors. *ASRC Fed. Data Network Techs., LLC; Ekagra Partners, LLC*, B-418085.4 *et al.*, May 5, 2020, 2020 CPD ¶ 164 at 11. However, agencies are not required to inform offerors of their specific evaluation or rating methodology. *Id.* Here, the RFQ clearly stated that the agency would make award on a best-value basis considering three factors--resume, past performance, and price--as well as the basis for evaluation and relative weighting of the three factors. AR, exh. 3, RFQ at 13. Thus, to the extent that the protester objects to the agency’s utilization of a specific point scoring methodology, such allegation provides no basis on which to sustain the protest.

As noted above, our Office will not reevaluate quotations but will instead examine the record to determine whether the agency's judgment was reasonable and consistent with the stated evaluation criteria and applicable procurement statutes and regulations. See *Alion Sci. & Tech. Corp.*, B-422664, Sept. 10, 2024, 2024 CPD ¶ 216 at 5. Moreover, although agencies are required to identify in a solicitation all major evaluation factors, they are not required to specifically identify each and every element an agency considers during an evaluation. *UDC USA, Inc.*, B-419671, June 21, 2021, 2021 CPD ¶ 242 at 5. Further, while agencies are not permitted to use unstated evaluation factors, an agency properly may take into account specific matters that are logically encompassed by, or related to, the stated evaluation criteria, even when they are not expressly identified as evaluation criteria. *Advanced Alliant Sols. Team, LLC*, B-417334, Apr. 10, 2019, 2019 CPD ¶ 144 at 5. We find no basis to question the agency's evaluation of quotations.

First, we disagree with the protester's contention that the agency instituted an unstated requirement that quotations must explicitly mention the Azure or Intune technologies. Here, the RFQ explicitly required submitted resumes to clearly demonstrate the vendor's key personnel's experience and proficiency with the specified technologies. As mentioned above, under RFQ 1758361, section 4.2 of the SOW required personnel to "[p]ossess prior knowledge and experience administering in a hybrid Azure Active Directory environment," and to be able to support user and device management using Intune. AR, exh. 3, RFQ at 3. Similarly, under RFQ 1758314, section 4.1 of the SOW required personnel to be able to administer and maintain Azure and section 4.2 required personnel to be able to configure and manage Intune for mobile device management and application management. AR (B-424088), exh. 3, RFQ at 4. In other words, the plain language of the RFQ clearly advised vendors that the resume factor would be evaluated, in part, based on how experienced and proficient the key personnel was with the Azure and Intune technologies.

We conclude that the agency reasonably rated the protester's quotations lower than the awardees' quotations based on the protester's failure to demonstrate experience and capability with the Azure and Intune technologies. The agency's concern with the protester's quotations was that TekInfoSys did not discuss or demonstrate proficiency or experience with the specific required technologies identified in the RFQs. Indeed, the record reflects that the protester's submitted resumes did not even mention the technologies. See Protest, exh. 6, TekInfoSys Quotation at 5. On this record, we find that the assignment of lower ratings to the protester's quotations, in part, because of the lack of demonstrated experience with the required technologies, was reasonable and consistent with the RFQs' evaluation criteria.

We find the protester's second argument to be similarly unavailing. The protester argues that the agency unreasonably implemented an unstated advanced education criterion when it rated the awardees' quotations higher than the protester's quotation. Resp. to Supp. Briefing at 4. On this point, the protester argues that the agency's evaluation criteria only provided that resumes would be evaluated based on how well the proposed personnel met the qualifications listed in the SOW. *Id.* The agency

maintains that it did not institute an advanced education requirement but instead considered educational attainment as far as it was reasonably related to its evaluation of key personnel's qualifications to perform the work required under the RFQs. Agency Supp. Briefing at 2.

We agree with the agency. Here, the RFQs required key personnel to be qualified and capable of providing comprehensive IT-related services. AR, exh. 3, RFQ at 3. We read the RFQ's qualification requirement as the type of evaluation factor that would include more favorable consideration for the relevant, advanced educational attainment of the personnel assigned to perform the contract. Accordingly, we find no basis to question the agency's consideration of the proposed personnel's educational attainment, and we reject TekInfoSys's assertion that the agency's assessment constituted application of unstated evaluation criteria.

The protests are denied.

Edda Emmanuelli Perez
General Counsel