



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: Low Voltage Wiring, Ltd.

File: B-423502.3; B-423502.4

Date: January 30, 2026

Bret S. Wacker, Esq., and Ronald D. Sullivan, Esq., Clark Hill PLC, for the protester. Christopher R. Shiplett, Esq., Randolph Law, PLLC, for the intervenor, TeamGOV, Inc. Robert I. Moore, Esq., Department of the Army, for the agency. Sarah T. Zaffina, Esq., and Heather Weiner, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, GAO, participated in the preparation of the decision.

DIGEST

Protest that the agency's evaluation of the vendor's quotation was unreasonable because the agency reached different evaluation conclusions in a related procurement is denied, where the procurements were conducted under different solicitations and evaluated by different evaluation teams.

DECISION

Low Voltage Wiring, LTD (LVW), a small business of Colorado Springs, Colorado, protests the issuance of a task order to TeamGOV, Inc., a small business of Hyattsville, Maryland, under request for quotations (RFQ) No. W912DY-25-R-0021, issued by the Department of the Army, Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), for preventative and corrective maintenance services for access control points (ACP) at 19 Army installations in the northeast region of the United States. LVW argues that the agency evaluated its technical quotation and past performance information unreasonably and inconsistent with the solicitation's evaluation criteria. LVW also challenges the agency's best-value tradeoff determination.

We deny the protest.

BACKGROUND

The agency issued the solicitation on April 17, 2025, to General Services Administration schedule contract holders under Federal Acquisition Regulation subpart 8.4

procedures.¹ Agency Report (AR), Tab 2, RFQ at 1, 3. The RFQ was set aside for small businesses and contemplated the issuance of a fixed-price task order for a 12-month base period with up to three 12-month options.² RFQ at 5; see also AR, Tab 3C, RFQ amend. 3 at 4 (amending period of performance start date). Our Office sustained two different protests challenging awards made under the previous solicitation, RFQ No. W912DY-24-R-0008 (FY2024 RFQ). This procurement is being conducted under a new solicitation for the agency's requirement.³ Contracting Officer's Statement (COS) at 1-2.

The RFQ advised that the Corps intended to issue an order to the responsible vendor representing the best value to the government considering the following three evaluation factors: (1) technical approach and experience (technical approach); (2) past performance; and (3) price. RFQ amend. 3 at 12. The solicitation indicated that technical approach and past performance were equally important, and that price was the least important factor. The solicitation further advised that the agency's focus was on acquiring services from vendors with superior ratings under the non-price factors instead of issuing a task order at the lowest price. *Id.*

LVW, the incumbent contractor, and three other vendors submitted timely quotations.⁴ AR, Tab 9, Source Selection Decision Document (SSDD) at 1. The source selection evaluation board evaluated the quotations as follows:

¹ The solicitation was amended three times. Citations to the record use the Adobe PDF pagination of documents produced in the agency report.

² While the solicitation is identified as an RFQ, the parties and various documents in the agency report use the terms quotation and proposal interchangeably. The distinction between the terms has no bearing on our analysis of the issues presented; our decision refers to the submission of quotations by vendors for consistency.

³ Additional background regarding the agency's ACP requirement for the northeast region can be found in *Perimeter Sec. Partners, LLC*, B-422666.4, Mar. 11, 2025, 2025 CPD ¶ 72 and *Perimeter Sec. Partners, LLC--Costs*, B-422666.2, Aug. 8, 2025, 2025 CPD ¶ 190.

⁴ A timely pre-award protest was filed with our Office challenging the solicitation terms. *Perimeter Sec. Partners, LP*, B-423502, B-423502.2, May 29, 2025 (unpublished decision). We dismissed the protest because the Corps notified our Office of its intent to take corrective action. *Id.* The Corps amended the solicitation and permitted vendors that had submitted quotations to submit revised quotations by June 11. AR, Tab 9, SSDD at 2; see also AR, Tab 3B, RFQ amend. 2 at 2-4, 11, 16; RFQ amend. 3 at 2-4, 11, 16.

VENDOR	Technical Approach	Past Performance	Price
Vendor 1	Acceptable	Neutral	\$42,719,609 (not fair and reasonable)
LVW	Good	Satisfactory Confidence	\$36,785,559 (fair and reasonable)
Vendor 2	Good	Satisfactory Confidence	\$36,725,177 (fair and reasonable)
TeamGOV	Outstanding	Substantial Confidence	\$35,691,300 (fair and reasonable)

Id. at 4.

As relevant here, LVW's quotation received a rating of good for the technical approach factor; it was assessed one significant strength for proposing key personnel having demonstrated experience with ACP maintenance and services, which "exceeds specified performance or capability requirements" in an appreciably advantageous way for the government.⁵ AR, Tab 7, Technical Approach Evaluation at 1-2, 7. The Corps assigned a rating of outstanding to TeamGOV's quotation under the technical approach factor and noted two significant strengths.⁶ *Id.* at 2. The agency assessed the first significant strength because TeamGOV's proposed key personnel demonstrated experience with ACP maintenance and services in a way that would be appreciably advantageous to the government. *Id.* at 9-10. The second significant strength TeamGOV received was for its response time. TeamGOV's quotation included a "chart showing all locations are within 3 hours of a contractor's facility." *Id.* at 11. The agency found that this allowed the vendor to have a substantially shorter response time as compared to the solicitation's required 12-hour response time and "exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be appreciably advantageous to the Government during contract performance by reducing time to repair, increasing operability, and limiting cost." *Id.* at 11.

The evaluators determined that TeamGOV's quotation provided the best value to the government because it received a rating of outstanding for technical approach, a rating of substantial confidence for past performance, and TeamGOV submitted the lowest-price quotation that was also fair and reasonable. AR, Tab 9, SSDD at 2. The contracting officer, who was also the source selection authority (SSA), reviewed the evaluation findings and concurred with the source selection evaluation board that TeamGOV's quotation provided the best value to the government at a fair and

⁵ The solicitation described a rating of good as a quotation that "indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements and contains at least one strength, and the risk of unsuccessful performance is low to moderate." RFQ amend. 3 at 13.

⁶ A rating of outstanding was defined as a quotation that "indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple strengths and the risk of unsuccessful performance is low." *Id.*

reasonable price. *Id.* at 4. The Corps notified LVW of its decision to issue the task order to TeamGOV on September 5, 2025, in the amount of \$35,691,300. AR, Tab 10, Notice of Unsuccessful Vendor. The agency provided LVW with a brief explanation of the basis for its award decision and LVW timely filed the instant protest. AR, Tab 12, Brief Explanation at 1.

DISCUSSION

LVW challenges multiple aspects of the Corps's evaluation of quotations. The protester argues that the agency unreasonably evaluated its quotation under the technical approach factor because the evaluation was not consistent with the agency's evaluations under the FY2024 RFQ and other prior solicitations for the ACP maintenance requirements in other regions of the United States. Protest at 14-18; Supp. Protest at 9-10. The protester also challenges the agency's evaluation of its past performance, arguing that the agency failed to recognize its performance as the incumbent contractor and failed to consider past performance information about its recent work for the Corps on ACPs in the northeast region. Protest at 18-20; Supp. Protest at 6-9. Finally, LVW contends that the Corps's best-value tradeoff determination was unreasonably based on its flawed technical and past performance evaluations and that LVW suffered competitive prejudice because LVW had a substantial chance of being issued the task order if the agency's evaluation had been proper. *Id.* at 20-21. While our decision here does not discuss every argument raised, we have considered all of the protester's allegations and find that none provide a basis to sustain the protest.⁷ We discuss our conclusions below.

The evaluation of quotations is matter within the discretion of the procuring agency. *eKuber Ventures, Inc.*, B-420877, B-420877.2, Oct. 13, 2022, 2022 CPD ¶ 256 at 4. Our Office does not independently evaluate quotations; rather, we review the agency's evaluation to ensure that it is consistent with the terms of the solicitation and applicable statutes and regulations. *Id.* A protester's disagreement with the agency's judgment, by itself, is not sufficient to establish that an agency acted unreasonably. *Id.*

⁷ For example, LVW alleged that the Corps failed to properly evaluate TeamGOV's proposed price. Protest at 20. According to LVW, based solely on TeamGOV's proposed price, the only way TeamGOV could propose such a low price is if it discounted its labor rates by more than 30 percent and omitted pricing for other required labor categories, which the protester asserted, "highly suggest[ed] a 'buy-in' strategy" prohibited by the solicitation. *Id.* We dismissed these allegations because they were based on speculation as to the contents of TeamGOV's quotation, which did not provide a sufficient factual basis for a protest ground. *Warfighter Focused Logistics, Inc.*, B-423546, B-423546.2, Aug. 5, 2025, 2025 CPD ¶ 169 at 4.

Technical Approach Evaluation

LVW complains that the agency's evaluation under the technical approach factor is unreasonable because the agency failed to evaluate LVW's quotation under the instant RFQ consistent with the agency's evaluations under the prior FY2024 RFQ or the other competitions of the ACP requirements for other regions in the United States. Protest at 14-18. The agency responds that this procurement was conducted under a solicitation separate from the FY2024 RFQ and the solicitations for the ACP requirements for the other three regions. Memorandum of Law (MOL) at 13-21. The agency also maintains that the source selection evaluation board and the SSA here are different from the other competitions, and therefore, the agency is not required to reconcile evaluations. *Id.* We agree.

It is well established that each procurement stands on its own, and an agency's evaluation ratings under another solicitation are not probative of the alleged unreasonableness of the evaluation ratings under the solicitation at issue. *Parmatic Filter Corp.*, B-285288, B-285288.2, Aug. 14, 2000, 2000 CPD ¶ 185 at 7. Moreover, as we have repeatedly explained, it is not unusual for individual evaluators, or groups of evaluators, to reach different conclusions and assign different scores or ratings when evaluating quotations, since both objective and subjective judgments are involved. See, e.g., *Fisher Sand & Gravel Co.*, B-419238, Jan. 7, 2021, 2021 CPD ¶ 49 at 5; *AdvanceMed Corp.*, B-415360 *et al.*, Dec. 19, 2017, 2018 CPD ¶ 4 at 4-7; *National Gov't Servs., Inc.*, B-401063.2 *et al.*, Jan. 30, 2012, 2012 CPD ¶ 59 at 4-7; *but see CIGNA Gov't Servs., LLC*, B-401062.2, B-401062.3, May 6, 2009, 2010 CPD ¶ 283 at 13-14 (recognizing a limited exception in situations involving evaluations of identical proposals under a single solicitation by a common source selection board and SSA).

LVW maintains that the prior solicitations for the ACP requirements for the northeast, northwest, southeast, and southwest regions are "substantively equivalent" to each other and the instant solicitation. Protest at 14. In this connection, LVW asserts that the Corps's evaluations of its previously submitted quotations for the ACP requirements in the northwest, southeast, and southwest regions were nearly identical and that the Corps assessed each quotation with the same two significant strengths and one strength under the technical approach factor in each of the different competitions. *Id.* at 14-17.

Based on the purported equivalence of the prior solicitations and the agency's evaluation of the protester's quotations thereunder, LVW asserts that the agency unreasonably evaluated its quotation under the instant RFQ for the northeast region because the agency assessed its quotation with only one significant strength under the technical approach factor, whereas under the FY2024 RFQ, the agency assessed two significant strengths and a strength. *Id.* at 17-18. In this context, LVW argues that the "only substantive change" between the FY2024 RFQ and the instant RFQ is the period of performance. *Id.* at 10. LVW contends it submitted the exact same quotation here as

it did for the FY2024 RFQ.⁸ *Id.* at 18. On this basis, the protester argues that if the agency evaluated LVW's quotation consistent with the other procurements, it would have assigned the two significant strengths from the FY2024 RFQ plus the significant strength assigned in this procurement. LVW argues that with three significant strengths, its quotation would have merited a rating of outstanding.⁹ *Id.* at 18. In LVW's view, rather than a "subjective difference of opinion among evaluators," the inconsistent ratings reveal that the agency unreasonably evaluated LVW's quotation using undisclosed materially different evaluation criteria. *Id.* at 18.

The agency responds that the instant RFQ is substantially different from the FY2024 RFQ and the solicitations for the other regions. Specifically, the agency explains that the instant RFQ required different submissions than the prior solicitations. MOL at 13. For example, the instant solicitation streamlined submittals under the management plan, which was part of the technical approach factor, and eliminated the requirement for vendors to submit information about document control and the work management system, which were present in the FY2024 RFQ. *Id.* at 17-18; *compare* RFQ amend. 3 at 9, *with* AR, Tab 21, FY2024 RFQ at 8. The instant RFQ also required vendors to "[i]nclude statement that all administrative personnel have been included in proposal to effectively manage Preventative Maintenance and Corrective Maintenance programs as defined in the [Performance Work Statement] and appendices" that the FY2024 RFQ did not. MOL at 17-18; *compare* RFQ amend. 3 at 9, *with* AR, Tab 21, FY2024 RFQ at 8. In addition, the agency explains that "the prior solicitations promised 'significant strengths' in areas the new solicitation did not[.]" MOL at 13. The agency also notes that the solicitations to which LVW cites were "administered by different personnel, contained different periods of performance, and encompassed different regional areas of the United States." *Id.* The contracting officer, who was the SSA for the instant RFQ, also states that she was not the SSA for the FY2024 RFQ. COS at 2. In addition, the contracting officer explains that the source selection evaluation board for the instant RFQ is different from the source selection evaluation board of the FY2024 RFQ because two of the four individuals on the source selection evaluation board were replaced for this competition. *Id.*

⁸ Despite LVW's representations, the record is unclear as to whether LVW submitted the "exact same [quotation]" for the FY2024 RFQ as it did for the instant RFQ. For example, in the same paragraph that LVW states it submitted the exact same quotation, LVW also represents that it submitted an "improved" technical approach that removed any uncertainties based on the agency's feedback in the other regions and "incorporated into its [quotation] the previously identified [s]ignificant [s]trengths and [s]trength." Protest at 18.

⁹ We note that under the FY2024 RFQ, the agency assigned LVW a strength for its key personnel's demonstrated experience, and in its evaluation for this procurement, the Corps assessed LVW's quotation with a significant strength for its key personnel's demonstrated experience with ACP maintenance and services.

In response, despite the fact that there were different SSAs for the procurements, as well as the other articulated differences between the solicitations, the protester contends that it was unreasonable for the agency to not evaluate LVW's quotation under the instant RFQ consistent with the agency's evaluation under the prior FY2024 RFQ because the evaluation boards "are not cleanly wholly different" in that "two [of four] individuals who served on the source selection board" for the "previous procurement also served on the evaluation board for the instant procurement." Comments at 10.

On this record, we reject LVW's assertion that the Corps was required to evaluate its quotation under the instant RFQ consistent with the Corps's prior evaluation under the FY2024 RFQ or the other solicitations for the other regions for the ACPs requirement. The record reflects that the instant RFQ, the FY2024 RFQ, and the solicitations for the northwest, southwest, and southeast regions for the ACPs requirements were conducted under separate solicitations and each procurement had its own source selection evaluators and SSA.¹⁰ The record also shows that the instant RFQ was issued on April 17, 2025, which is more than a year after the FY2024 RFQ.¹¹ Compare RFQ at 1, with FY2024 RFQ at 1. In addition, the instant RFQ's performance period of four years including option periods, is also shorter than the FY2024 RFQ's five-year period of performance. Compare RFQ amend. 3 at 4, with FY2024 RFQ at 4.¹²

As referenced above, each procurement stands on its own, and an agency's evaluation ratings under another solicitation are not probative of the alleged unreasonableness of the evaluation ratings under the solicitation here. *Parmatic Filter Corp.*, *supra*. While the protester disputes the agency's assertion that the source selection evaluation board

¹⁰ FY2024 RFQ (issued November 28, 2023 for the northeast ACP requirement); AR, Tab 22, RFQ No. W912DY-24-R-0020 (issued January 19, 2024 for the southwest region); AR, Tab 23, RFQ No. W912DY-24-R-0021 (issued January 11, 2024 for the northwest region); AR, Tab 24, RFQ No. W912DY-24-R-0007 (issued December 21, 2023 for the southeast region).

¹¹ In this section, we only compare the instant RFQ to the FY2024 RFQ. The FY2024 RFQ for the ACP requirements is substantively similar to the RFQs for the other regions therefore any differences between the two solicitations can be inferred as differences also existing between the instant RFQ and the solicitations for the northwest, southwest, and southeast regions.

¹² The record further reflects the evaluation criteria for the FY2024 RFQ is different from the instant RFQ. Both solicitations use the same three evaluation factors--technical approach, past performance, and price--for their basis of award; however, the importance of each factor is different. For the FY2024 RFQ, technical approach was the most important factor, with past performance being more important than price but less important than technical approach, and price was the least important factor. FY2024 RFQ at 4, 11. In contrast, the instant RFQ provided that technical approach and past performance are equally rated, together these two factors are more important than price, and price is the least important factor. RFQ amend. 3 at 2-3, 12.

for the instant RFQ was different from the evaluation board for the FY2024 RFQ because two individuals served on both evaluation boards, the record reflects that the other individuals on the evaluation boards, as well as the SSAs, were different between the two procurements. COS at 2. As such, we find that the source selection evaluation boards are not the same even though two evaluators served on both boards. Moreover, as noted above, the solicitations for the procurements are different, the SSAs for the procurements are different, and there has been a significant passage of time between the procurements. See, e.g., *AdvanceMed Corp.*, *supra* (denying protest of evaluation under “materially similar” solicitations because different solicitations, different proposals, different evaluators, and a “significant passage of time between the procurements”--approximately eight months between issued solicitations--provided no reasonable basis to find that the agency was required to reconcile any alleged differences between the evaluations of two different regions). We therefore find no reasonable basis exists on which to require the agency to reconcile any alleged differences between the instant RFQ and the FY2024 RFQ evaluations.¹³ As such, we find nothing unreasonable regarding the agency’s evaluation of LVW’s quotation under the technical approach factor. We deny this protest ground.

Competitive Prejudice

The protester also challenges the agency evaluation of its past performance, arguing that the evaluation was unreasonable, that the agency failed to consider the protester’s recent past performance information, and that the agency used unstated evaluation criteria in its evaluation. Protest at 18-20; Supp. Protest at 6-9. Even if our Office were to conclude, however, that the asserted errors existed in the agency’s past performance evaluation, we would not find that the protester suffered any competitive prejudice. Competitive prejudice is an essential element of a viable protest; where the protester fails to demonstrate that, but for the agency’s actions, it would have had a substantial chance of receiving the award, there is no basis for finding prejudice, and our Office will not sustain the protest, even if deficiencies in the procurement are found. *Booker DiMaio, LLC*, B-423224, Mar. 17, 2025, 2025 CPD ¶ 76 at 6.

Here, even if we assume that LVW were to prevail on every challenge to its past performance evaluation--thus increasing its rating from satisfactory confidence to substantial confidence as the protester asserts--LVW’s quotation is higher-priced than TeamGOV’s and remains lower rated than TeamGOV’s under the technical approach factor (*i.e.*, good versus outstanding). In this connection, as detailed above, we find nothing unreasonable regarding the agency’s evaluation of LVW’s quotation as good

¹³ As noted above, it is unclear whether LVW submitted identical quotations under the instant RFQ and the FY2024 RFQ; however, even if LVW submitted the same quotations for both solicitations, the solicitations use different evaluation criteria and the SSAs are different; therefore, different evaluation findings are not objectionable. *Parmatic Filter Corp.*, *supra* (finding that evaluation ratings under another solicitation are not probative of the alleged unreasonableness of the evaluation ratings under the solicitation at issue, given that each procurement stands on its own).

under the technical approach factor. Assuming LVW's quotation merits a rating of good for the technical approach factor versus TeamGOV's rating of outstanding, and a rating of substantial confidence for past performance, which is equal to TeamGOV's substantial confidence past performance rating, then LVW's quotation is lower rated than TeamGOV's, and TeamGOV's price is \$1.1 million less expensive than LVW's price. LVW has not argued that its quotation is technically superior such that it warrants a price premium or otherwise explained why the Corps should be willing to pay more for LVW's performance of the task order. Thus, the record is clear that the protester did not suffer any competitive prejudice because, even if the asserted errors existed in the agency's past performance evaluation, LVW's quotation remains higher-priced and lower-rated than TeamGOV's. Accordingly, we cannot conclude that LVW would have had a substantial chance of receiving award.

The protest is denied.

Edda Emmanuelli Perez
General Counsel