



## Decision

**Matter of:** LOGMET LLC

**File:** B-423066.2

**Date:** April 15, 2026

---

Wayne Rankin for the protester.

Kevin P. Connelly, Esq., Kelly E. Buroker, Esq., Jeffrey M. Lowry, Esq., and Michael P. Ols, Esq., Vedder Price P.C., for Amentum Services, Inc., the intervenor.

Colonel Justin A. Silverman, Geoffrey R. Townsend, Esq., Major Princess Gaye, and Alexander S. Hall, Esq., Department of the Air Force, for the agency.

Hannah G. Barnes, Esq., and April Y. Shields, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, GAO, participated in the preparation of the decision.

---

### DIGEST

1. Protest challenging the agency's evaluation of the protester's proposal is denied where the evaluation was reasonable and in accordance with the terms of the solicitation.
  2. Protest that the agency should have conducted discussions to allow the protester to cure its proposal's technical unacceptability is denied where the solicitation expressly stated that the agency intended to award without discussions.
- 

### DECISION

LOGMET LLC (Logmet), a service-disabled veteran-owned small business of Round Rock, Texas, protests its non-selection for a multiple-award indefinite-delivery, indefinite-quantity (IDIQ) contract under request for proposals (RFP) No. FA810824RB001, issued by the Department of the Air Force for maintenance services. The protester argues that the agency incorrectly and unreasonably evaluated its proposal.

We deny the protest.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> This protest is not subject to a GAO protective order because Logmet opted to proceed *pro se*, that is, without counsel. Accordingly, our discussion of some aspects of (continued...)

## BACKGROUND

The agency issued the solicitation on June 24, 2024, in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) part 15 and FAR subpart 16.5. Contracting Officer's Statement (COS) at 2; Agency Report (AR), Tab 8, RFP at 3.<sup>2</sup> The RFP sought maintenance services in support of the Contractor Field Team (CFT) program, which provides Department of Defense entities and other federal agencies with "the ability to rapidly augment existing organic maintenance efforts with contract maintenance services using the CFT Labor Augmentations Support Requirements (LASR) [IDIQ] [c]ontract." AR, Tab 9, Performance Work Statement (PWS) at 6. The solicitation anticipated the award of multiple CFT LASR IDIQ contracts with a base ordering period of five years and one 5-year option ordering period. AR, Tab 3, Source Selection Plan at 4; Memorandum of Law (MOL) at 3. The solicitation provided for the issuance of task orders under the CFT LASR IDIQ contract vehicle in two different pools: a full and open competition pool, and a pool set aside for small businesses. AR, Tab 15, RFP amend. 0002 Section L at 1-2. The solicitation instructed offerors to indicate the pool for which they were competing, with small businesses eligible to compete in both pools. *Id.* at 2.

The solicitation provided for award "utilizing the Highest Technically Rated Offerors (HTRO) Minimum Technical Threshold Rating (MTTR) approach." AR, Tab 16, RFP amend. 0002 Section M at 1. The RFP established that the agency would evaluate three factors: certification, technical, and past performance. *Id.* at 3. The solicitation specified that the technical factor included two subfactors: an HTRO self-scoring matrix, and a small business participation commitment document. *Id.* To be eligible for award, the RFP required that offerors' proposals be rated acceptable under the certification factor, have a validated self-score at or above the minimum technical threshold rating of 40,000 points under the HTRO self-scoring matrix subfactor, be rated acceptable under the small business participation commitment document subfactor, and be rated acceptable under the past performance factor. *Id.* at 6.

The RFP provided for a multi-step evaluation process. In the first step, the RFP advised that proposals would be evaluated on a pass/fail basis on whether offerors provided a current copy of the certification required by the solicitation. AR, Tab 16, RFP amend. 0002 Section M at 4, 6. Offerors rated as acceptable under this first step would then have their proposals evaluated under the technical subfactors. *Id.* at 4.

In the next step, under the technical factor, HTRO self-scoring matrix subfactor, the RFP required offerors to submit a self-rated score; the solicitation established a minimum technical threshold rating of 40,000 points that offerors needed to meet or

---

the record is necessarily general to limit references to non-public information. Nonetheless, GAO reviewed the entire record *in camera* in preparing our decision.

<sup>2</sup> The solicitation was amended four times. COS at 5. All citations are to the most updated versions of the solicitation.

exceed to be eligible for award. *Id.* at 4-5. The point scores were based on the extent of an offeror's prior relevant work. *See id.* at 6. Offerors had to provide work samples of previous contracts or task orders and accompanying narratives explaining the relevancy of those prior contracts or orders to the proposed effort. AR, Tab 15, RFP amend. 0002 Section L at 9-10. Offerors were to rate and substantiate these work samples by completing an HTRO self-scoring matrix, resulting in an overall self-score. This self-score was based on 21 total criteria, with 18 criteria applying to the full and open competition pool and 18 criteria applying to the small business pool.<sup>3</sup> AR, Tab 16, RFP amend. 0002 Section M at 6; see AR, Tab 12, HTRO Self-Scoring Matrix at 1-2. The RFP further advised that offerors' technical proposals should "be written on a stand-alone basis" and cautioned offerors that "[i]nformation required for the technical proposal evaluation, which is not found [in] the [t]echnical volume, will be assumed to have been omitted from the proposal, and will not be considered in the technical evaluation." AR, Tab 15, RFP amend. 0002 Section L at 5.

Consistent with these instructions, the RFP then advised that the agency's evaluation would consist of validating offerors' self-scores based on their work samples and work sample narratives for those offerors with self-scores at or above 40,000 points. AR, Tab 16, RFP amend. 0002 Section M at 4. More specifically, and as relevant here, the solicitation stated the following:

The Government will only conduct a validation evaluation . . . for Offerors that initially submit an HTRO Self-Scoring Matrix with a self-score equal to or above the MTTR of 40,000. To validate self-scores, the Government will only evaluate the information in the location identified by the Offeror in its Cross-Reference Matrix for the corresponding requirement []. If the Government is unable to validate that Offeror's self-rated score based on the work samples and work sample narratives, the Government will unilaterally downward adjust the Offeror's self-rated score, potentially down to zero points. The Government will only adjust the Offeror's self-rated score downward, not upward. Such adjustments are within the sole discretion of the Government and are based upon the substantiation of the self-rated score provided by the Offeror. At the conclusion of the initial evaluation, in the event the Government conducts an award without discussions, Offerors who are determined to be below the MTTR of 40,000 points will not be assessed and will not be considered in the best value award decision. In the event the Government determines discussions are necessary, Offerors below the MTTR of 40,000 [points] will be excluded from the Competitive Range.

---

<sup>3</sup> For example, one of the criteria was for the number of prior contracts or task orders, administered in the last five years, that "included direct wheeled and track vehicle maintenance activities." AR, Tab 12, HTRO Self-Scoring Matrix at 1. For that one criterion, offerors could reach a maximum possible score of 1000 points. *Id.* A larger number of work samples, up to five, that met that criterion would result in a higher score. *Id.*

*Id.* at 4-5.

Proposals with a validated score at or above 40,000 points would then be evaluated under the next steps--the small business participation commitment document subfactor<sup>4</sup> and the past performance factor<sup>5</sup>--and finally, the award decision. In sum, only offerors with technically acceptable proposals under all three evaluation factors and a validated self-score at or above the 40,000 point minimum technical threshold rating would be eligible for award.

As relevant here, the solicitation stated that the agency “reserves the right to conduct discussions[,]” if the contracting officer determined they were necessary. RFP at 60. However, it advised that the agency “intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions with offerors” and warned that, “[t]herefore, the offeror’s initial proposal should contain the offeror’s best terms from a . . . technical standpoint.” *Id.*

The agency received 26 proposals by the January 22, 2025 due date for proposals. COS at 5; AR, Tab 18, RFP amend. 0003 at 2. The agency found that Logmet’s proposal did not meet the solicitation requirements under the HTRO self-scoring matrix subfactor because Logmet failed to include the HTRO self-scoring matrix in its proposal. AR, Tab 24, Logmet Technical Worksheet at 3. As a result, the agency determined that it could not validate Logmet’s score and concluded that Logmet was ineligible to be evaluated any further under the technical or past performance factors. *Id.* at 4. In making this determination, the Source Selection Authority (SSA) noted that Logmet “failed to provide the actual HTRO self-scoring matrix to be evaluated and therefore, Logmet was deemed technically unacceptable and ineligible for award.” AR, Tab 25, Source Selection Decision Document (SSDD) at 9.

On January 26, 2026, the Air Force notified Logmet that it was an unsuccessful offeror. AR, Tab 26, Notice of Unsuccessful Offeror at 1. On January 30, this protest followed.

---

<sup>4</sup> Under the small business participation commitment document subfactor, the solicitation provided for proposals to be evaluated on a pass/fail basis for the “extent of [their] proposed participation/commitment to use of U.S. small businesses in the performance of this acquisition.” AR, Tab 16, RFP amend. 0002 Section M at 6. The solicitation required offerors to, at a minimum, provide an approach demonstrating this commitment and to submit a completed “Small Business Participation Commitment Document.” *Id.*

<sup>5</sup> Proposals with a rating of acceptable under the small business participation commitment document subfactor would then proceed to the next step: past performance evaluation. AR, Tab 16, RFP amend. 0002 Section M at 5. Under the past performance factor, evaluators would consider recency, relevancy, and performance quality; proposals would be rated as either acceptable or unacceptable. *Id.* at 7-9.

## DISCUSSION

Logmet argues that the agency failed to evaluate its proposal in accordance with the requirements of the solicitation under the technical factor, HTRO self-scoring matrix subfactor, despite the protester's failure to include the required self-scoring matrix in its technical proposal. The protester also asserts that the agency should have given Logmet an opportunity to cure this issue and submit the missing matrix through discussions. After reviewing the record, we find no basis to sustain the protest.<sup>6,7</sup>

### HTRO Self-Scoring Matrix

In its protest, Logmet acknowledges that its self-scoring matrix was missing from the proposal as documented in the agency's evaluation. Logmet also specifically acknowledges that the HTRO self-scoring matrix is a "technical discriminator" and that "its absence materially affects the evaluation[.]" Protest at 5. Yet, Logmet argues that it provided other information--work samples and corresponding narratives--in its proposal and asserts that the Air Force could and should have used this information to perform a validation review, calculating a score for Logmet and adjusting it downward, if necessary. Comments at 10-12.

---

<sup>6</sup> In its various protest submissions, Logmet has raised arguments that are variations of those specifically discussed below. While we do not specifically address all of the protester's arguments, we have considered them and conclude that they do not provide a basis to sustain the protest.

<sup>7</sup> We note that in reviewing the protester's filings, we identified several irregularities in citations provided by the protester. In this regard, the protester cited decisions of our Office for which we were unable to locate the decisions identified by the protester and misrepresented the content of several decisions. For example, the protester cites to "*Innovative Test Asset Solutions, LLC*, B-419132, Dec. 16, 2020, 2020 CPD ¶ 398" for the proposition that "omissions affecting the evaluation of a scored factor are material defects" requiring further action from the agency. Protest at 5. We could not locate a decision matching this citation or proposition asserted by Logmet in its protest. The protester later acknowledges that certain citations were "inaccurate" but claims that the "[e]rrors [w]ere [i]nadvertent[.]" Resp. to Address Citations at 2.

Parties appearing before our Office have an obligation to accurately summarize factual or legal assertions, including cited decisions. *Assessment & Training Sols. Consulting Corp.*, B-423398, June 27, 2025, at 7 n.6. As we have explained, our Office necessarily reserves an inherent right to dismiss any protest and to impose sanctions against a protester, where a protester's actions undermine the integrity and effectiveness of our process. *Id.* Although we did not impose sanctions here, we advise the protester that the submission of filings with citations to non-existent authority may result in the imposition of sanctions where appropriate. See *Raven Investigations & Sec. Consulting, LLC*, B-423447, May 7, 2025, at 5.

The agency responds that it reasonably excluded Logmet's proposal from consideration for award because it failed to meet the solicitation's requirements. MOL at 7. The Air Force asserts that because the protester failed to include the HTRO self-scoring matrix in its proposal, as required by the solicitation, the agency reasonably determined that its proposal was technically unacceptable. *Id.* at 7-10. The agency argues that evaluators followed the steps outlined in the solicitation: after assigning a rating of acceptable to Logmet's proposal under the certification factor, the agency moved on to the first technical subfactor--the HTRO self-scoring matrix subfactor--and determined that Logmet had not met the minimum technical threshold scoring requirement because it had not provided a self-scoring matrix. *Id.* at 8. Because the Air Force "could only adjust the self-rated score downward, not upward," in the absence of a self-score, the agency asserts that it reasonably "did not attempt to evaluate [Logmet's] narrative references." *Id.*

In reviewing protests of alleged improper evaluations, it is not our role to reevaluate proposals; rather, we will examine the record to determine whether the agency's judgment was reasonable and consistent with the stated evaluation criteria and applicable procurement laws and regulations. See *SysVets, LLC*, B-415694, Feb. 13, 2018, at 3-4. In this regard, an offeror has the burden of submitting an adequately written proposal, and where a proposal omits, inadequately addresses, or fails to clearly convey required information, the offeror runs the risk of an adverse agency evaluation. *Id.* at 4. A protester's disagreement with the agency's evaluation, without more, is insufficient to demonstrate that the evaluation was unreasonable. *EEC-Lukos JV, LLC*, B-423464.2, B-423464.3, Jan. 27, 2026, at 8.

Here, we find no basis to object to the agency's evaluation. The solicitation explicitly required offerors to submit a self-scoring matrix. AR, Tab 15, RFP amend. 0002 Section L at 8-9; AR, Tab 16, RFP amend. 0002 Section M at 4-6. Indeed, the protester acknowledges the importance of the HTRO self-scoring matrix when it states that the matrix is a "technical discriminator" and that "its absence materially affects the evaluation[.]" Protest at 5. The RFP states that the agency "will only conduct a validation evaluation . . . for [o]fferors that initially submit an HTRO Self-Scoring Matrix with a self-score equal to or above the MTTR of 40,000." AR, Tab 16, RFP amend. 0002 Section M at 4. However, the record shows--and the protester does not contest--that Logmet failed to include this matrix in its submitted proposal.<sup>8</sup> See AR,

---

<sup>8</sup> The protester attempts to shift the blame for this failure to the agency by referring to a section of its proposal that states Logmet provided a completed copy of the HTRO self-scoring matrix as "a separate attachment." Comments at 18 (quoting AR, Tab 21, Logmet Proposal Volume II at 7). The protester has not provided any proof that it sent any "attachment" with the matrix to the agency; instead, it complains that the agency did not create a "receipt log, [] file inventory, [] evaluator note explaining an unsuccessful attempt to locate the attachment, [or an] explanation reconciling the proposal's explicit statement with the [a]gency's conclusion" that it did not receive a matrix. Comments at 21. Logmet characterizes this as a "documentation failure" on the agency. *Id.*

(continued...)

Tab 25, SSDD at 9. The protester not only failed to submit a matrix with a self-score equal to or above the 40,000 point threshold; it failed to submit a self-scoring matrix at all. See AR, Tab 24, Logmet Technical Worksheet at 3-4. In other words, the solicitation language directly contradicts the protester's assertion that the agency should have attempted to calculate a score for Logmet and perform a downward validation using other parts of Logmet's proposal, rather than reject Logmet's proposal as technically unacceptable for failing to submit the required self-scoring matrix.

The protester complains that the agency did not validate its score; however, Logmet fails to explain how the agency could validate a score that was never provided. See Comments at 10. The protester points to the work samples and accompanying narratives that it submitted, but Logmet fails to recognize or acknowledge that the solicitation provided for these work samples to substantiate an offeror's self-score, not to replace it entirely. See AR, Tab 16, RFP amend. 0002 Section M at 4-5. We note and agree with the logic of the agency's argument that because it could only adjust self-rated scores downward, not upward, in accordance with the solicitation, it reasonably "did not attempt to evaluate [Logmet's] narrative references" in the absence of a submitted matrix or self-score. MOL at 8; see AR, Tab 24, Logmet Technical Worksheet at 3-4.

In conclusion, we agree with the agency that it reasonably evaluated the protester's proposal as technically unacceptable under the HTRO self-scoring matrix technical subfactor given Logmet's failure to submit said matrix.

## Discussions

Relatedly, the protester argues that the agency should have addressed the issue of a missing matrix with Logmet through discussions. Protest at 5. The protester argues that the solicitation does not contemplate "a categorical prohibition on communications" under the HTRO self-scoring matrix subfactor. Comments at 20. The protester

---

We disagree and conclude that the protester's argument is directly at odds with the established precedent that an offeror bears the burden of submitting an adequately written proposal and runs the risk of an adverse agency evaluation where a proposal omits, inadequately addresses, or fails to clearly convey required information. See *SysVets, supra* at 4. Further, even if the protester successfully submitted the HTRO self-scoring matrix as a separate attachment--and there is no information in the record to indicate that it did--the solicitation explicitly cautioned offerors that information "required for the technical proposal evaluation," such as the HTRO self-scoring matrix, which "is not found [in] the [t]echnical volume, will be assumed to have been omitted from the proposal[.]" AR, Tab 15, RFP amend. 0002 Section L at 5. This protest ground is denied.

contends that the agency had the discretion “to seek a limited clarification”<sup>9</sup> regarding Logmet’s self-scoring matrix. *Id.* at 32.

The agency responds that Logmet’s argument--that the agency should have entered into discussions to cure the omitted HTRO matrix--is incorrect. MOL at 9. The Air Force argues that it was not required to conduct discussions and points to the solicitation, which advised that the agency intended to make award without discussions. *Id.* (citing RFP at 60). The agency adds that Logmet’s proposal was ineligible for discussions, because even in the event that the agency chose to conduct discussions, the solicitation advised that offerors with proposals below the minimum technical threshold rating of 40,000 points would “be excluded from the [c]ompetitive [r]ange.” *Id.* (quoting AR, Tab 16, RFP amend. 0002 Section M at 5).

We agree with the agency. Our Office has previously explained that where, as here, a solicitation advises offerors that the agency intends to make award without discussions, there are no statutory or regulatory criteria specifying when an agency should or should not initiate discussions. *Management Sys. Int’l, Inc.; Blumont Eng’g Sols., Inc.*, B-418080 *et al.*, Jan. 9, 2020, at 8. Thus, we will generally not review the agency’s decision not to engage in discussions. *Id.*; *see also SigNet Techs., Inc.*, B-418677, July 23, 2020, at 4 (noting further that an agency’s discretion to hold discussions is quite broad).

Here, the RFP specifically stated that the agency intended to “evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions with offerors[.]” RFP at 60. As a result, the solicitation advised that an offeror’s initial proposal “should contain the offeror’s best terms from a . . . technical standpoint.” *Id.* The contemporaneous record shows that, in accordance with the solicitation, the agency decided not to conduct discussions and determined that Logmet’s failure to include an HTRO self-scoring matrix in its proposal rendered it technically unacceptable. AR, Tab 25, SSDD at 11.

Further, we agree with the agency’s argument that, even if it chose to conduct discussions, Logmet would be ineligible for those discussions because Logmet’s proposal, which did not include a self-scoring matrix, did not meet the minimum technical threshold rating of 40,000 points. *See* MOL at 9; AR, Tab 16, RFP

---

<sup>9</sup> Logmet refers to discussions and clarifications without clearly distinguishing between the two concepts. The main thrust of the protester’s argument is that the agency had the discretion to allow Logmet to cure its proposal’s technical unacceptability through “post-submission administrative documentation”; namely, by providing the missing matrix. Comments at 32. As the protester’s failure to include the required self-scoring matrix rendered its proposal technically unacceptable, and clarifications are limited exchanges conducted at the agency’s discretion that are meant to resolve minor clerical errors, and the missing matrix was not a minor clerical error, we focus on the protester’s arguments as they relate to discussions. *See The Bionetics Corp.*, B-420272, Jan. 7, 2022, at 4 (“Clarifications cannot be used to cure deficiencies or material omissions in a proposal or otherwise revise a proposal.”).

amend. 0002 Section M at 5. In sum, the protester has not shown, and we find no basis to conclude, that the agency was required to conduct discussions with Logmet to allow it to cure the technical unacceptability of its proposal. Accordingly, we deny the protest.

The protest is denied.

Edda Emmanuelli Perez  
General Counsel