



**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:** Platinum Business Services, LLC

**File:** B-424276; B-424276.2

**Date:** May 4, 2026

---

Lee Dougherty, Esq., Esna Mihail, Esq., and Bryan Short, Esq., Effectus, PLLC, for the protester.

Isaias “Cy” Alba, IV, Esq., Katherine B. Burrows, Esq., Eric A. Valle, Esq., Timothy F. Valley, Esq., and Kelly A. Kirchgasser, Esq., Piliero Mazza, PLLC, for 2TechJV, LLC, the intervenor.

Richard C. Loeb, Esq., Office of Personnel Management, for the United States Agency for International Development, the agency.<sup>1</sup>

Michelle Litteken, 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 vendors’ technical and price quotations is denied where the agency’s evaluation was reasonable and consistent with the stated evaluation criteria.
  2. Protest that the agency performed a flawed best-value tradeoff determination is denied where the agency’s actions were reasonable and consistent with the terms of the solicitation.
- 

### DECISION

Platinum Business Services, LLC, a service-disabled veteran-owned small business (SDVOSB) of Clarksville, Maryland, protests the issuance of a task order to 2TechJV, LLC, an SDVOSB joint venture<sup>2</sup> of Woodbridge, Virginia, under request for quotations (RFQ) No. 7200AA26Q00002, issued by the United States Agency for International

---

<sup>1</sup> The agency elected to be represented by an attorney from the Office of Personnel Management in this protest. See Electronic Protest Docketing System No. 14.

<sup>2</sup> 2TechJV is comprised of TechAnax LLC and OBXtek, Inc. Agency Report (AR), Tab 12, Price Analysis at 5. Citations to documents in this decision are to the PDF page numbers.

Development (USAID), to provide institutional support services for the closeout of USAID.<sup>3</sup> The protester challenges various aspects of the agency's evaluation of the vendors' technical and price quotations, as well as the best-value tradeoff determination.

We deny the protest.

## BACKGROUND

On January 16, 2026, using the procedures of Revolutionary Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Overhaul section 8.401 and General Services Administration Manual subpart 538.71,<sup>4</sup> USAID issued the RFQ to SDVOSB firms under the applicable General Services Administration's federal supply schedule (FSS) contract for institutional support contractor services.<sup>5</sup> Contracting Officer's Statement (COS) at 1; AR, Tab 2, RFQ at 1. USAID sought a contractor to provide services to support agency-wide closeout activities, including "winding down of programs, systems, contracts, grants, other transaction authority mechanisms, interagency agreements, and workforce elements."<sup>6</sup> RFQ at 9, 12. The RFQ contemplated the issuance of a time-and-materials task order (labor hour with ceiling prices), with a base period from task order issuance until March 7, 2026, followed by four 6-month options. *Id.* at 1.

The RFQ provided that the agency would issue the task order to the vendor whose quotation represented the best value to the agency, and the non-price factors were more important than price. RFQ at 65. The agency reserved the right to issue the task order to a vendor other than the lowest-price vendor. *Id.* at 66.

The RFQ described the three evaluation factors to be used in evaluating technical quotations as follows:

---

<sup>3</sup> Although the parties use the terms "quotations" and "proposals" interchangeably throughout the record, the solicitation was labeled as an RFQ. For consistency, our decision refers to the submission of quotations by vendors.

<sup>4</sup> The agency explains that USAID has issued a class deviation and is following the Revolutionary FAR Overhaul. Supp Memorandum of Law (MOL) at 2; AR, Tab 15, Acquisition & Assistance Policy Directive 25-03 Rev. No. 2 at 2.

<sup>5</sup> The agency issued an amendment to the RFQ on January 21, which delineated revisions to the RFQ and provided answers to interested vendors' questions, but the amendment did not provide the full text of the RFQ. AR, Tab 3, RFQ amend. 1. When citing to a provision of the RFQ that was revised by amendment 1, we cite to the original RFQ and the relevant portion of the amendment.

<sup>6</sup> The RFQ further stated: "[t]he scope and scale of closeout activities necessitate institutional support capacity across multiple operational domains and requires subject matter expertise and execution support on a time limited basis to ensure closeout activities are completed accurately, efficiently, and in accordance with applicable U.S. Government laws, regulations, and policies." RFQ at 12.

1. The effectiveness and feasibility of the proposed management approach, including organizational structure, management oversight, coordination mechanisms, and internal controls to ensure timely, high quality performance and successful delivery of all [statement of work (SOW)] requirements and deliverables.
2. The effectiveness of the Offeror's approach to recruiting, onboarding, and retaining qualified personnel, including strategies to ensure continuity of performance and access to personnel with relevant experience necessary to successfully perform the work.
3. The extent to which the Offeror and proposed subcontractors demonstrate the breadth and depth of past experience in providing similar services and deliverables. The Offeror's depth of experience managing an activity of similar size and complexity will be evaluated.

RFQ at 65. When evaluating the vendors' quotations, the agency referred to these factors as the management approach, staffing plan, and organizational capacity factors, respectively.<sup>7</sup> AR, Tab 13, Technical Evaluation at 4-5; COS at 4-5.

In addition, and as relevant here, for the price quotation, vendors were instructed to submit a price narrative and complete the price worksheet provided as an attachment to the RFQ, which would include a "notational level of effort (LOE) by labor category." RFQ at 63; RFQ amend. 1 at 2-4; AR, Tab 4, RFQ attach. J.1. As for the price evaluation, the agency would "conduct a price analysis to include an evaluation of the level of effort and mix of the labor proposed and determine if the total price is reasonable." RFQ at 65.

USAID received 18 quotations prior to the RFQ's January 27 closing date. COS at 1. The contracting officer conducted a compliance check and determined that five of the quotations were non-compliant. *Id.* The technical evaluation committee (TEC) evaluated the 13 remaining quotations, with 2TechJV's and Platinum's quotations evaluated as follows:

---

<sup>7</sup> For these three technical factors, quotations were assigned ratings of exceptional, very good, satisfactory, marginal, and unsatisfactory. As relevant here, the agency defined a "very good" quotation as a quotation with the following characteristics: "demonstrates a strong grasp of the requirements," "meets RF[Q] requirements and presents a low overall degree of risk of unsuccessful contract performance," and "[s]trengths significantly outweigh any risks that exist." AR, Tab 13, Technical Evaluation at 4. USAID defined a "satisfactory" quotation as a quotation that "demonstrates a reasonably sound response and a good grasp of the requirements," "meets RF[Q] requirements and presents a moderate overall degree of risk of unsuccessful contract performance," and "[s]trengths outweigh weaknesses." *Id.*

	2TechJV	Platinum
<b>Management Approach</b>	Very Good	Satisfactory
<b>Staffing Plan</b>	Exceptional	Satisfactory
<b>Organizational Capacity</b>	Exceptional	Marginal
<b>Price</b>	\$80,576,496	\$66,977,164

AR, Tab 13, Technical Evaluation at 5; AR, Tab 8, Source Selection Decision Document (SSDD) at 3, 9.

In evaluating the protester’s quotation under the management approach factor, the TEC assessed one strength and one weakness, and assigned a rating of satisfactory.<sup>8</sup> AR, Tab 13, Technical Evaluation at 20-21. The TEC assessed a weakness because the evaluators found that Platinum’s “proposed management approach is largely generic and does not sufficiently tailor execution to the uniquely compressed, agency-wide USAID closeout context.” *Id.* at 21.

As also relevant here, when the TEC evaluated Platinum’s quotation under the organizational capacity factor, the agency assessed one strength and two weaknesses.<sup>9</sup> AR, Tab 13, Technical Evaluation at 21-22. The agency assessed one weakness after finding that Platinum’s “past performance examples are primarily acquisition-focused and provide limited evidence of experience supporting agency-wide institutional shutdowns or personnel-intensive closeout efforts at a scale comparable to USAID.” *Id.* at 22. The TEC assessed the second weakness because the evaluators found the protester’s quotation did not demonstrate experience across all required functional areas and showed limited experience supporting human capital, financial management, and legal functions. *Id.*

The source selection authority (SSA) considered the evaluation results and compared 2TechJV’s quotation to the other vendors’ quotations under each of the non-price factors. AR, Tab 8, SSDD at 10-12. For example, the SSA compared Platinum’s and 2TechJV’s quotations under the management approach factor and noted that while both vendors “provided limited tailoring to the USAID-specific context,” 2Tech JV’s quotation

---

<sup>8</sup> In evaluating 2TechJV’s quotation under the management approach factor, USAID assessed three strengths and one weakness, and assigned a rating of very good. AR, Tab 13, Technical Evaluation at 5-6. The TEC assessed the weakness because the TEC found that the firm’s “quotation produced limited USAID-specific tailoring in discussing the operational context, i.e.,[.] staffing an Agency that is in the final stages of closeout.” *Id.* at 6. The evaluators noted that the quotation discussed “fewer concrete examples tailored to the unique dynamics of USAID closeout operations” and “[t]his lack of awareness about the operational context is a weakness that introduces a risk to successful implementation of [ ] deliverables.” *Id.*

<sup>9</sup> In contrast, USAID identified two strengths and no weaknesses in 2TechJV’s quotation under the organizational capacity factor. AR, Tab 13, Technical Evaluation at 7-8.

offered “a robust oversight framework that supports execution at scale and timely delivery,” and it “incorporated USAID [DELETED] into its [DELETED].” *Id.* at 11.

As an additional example, the SSA compared 2TechJV’s and Platinum’s quotations under the organizational capacity factor and noted that 2TechJV’s quotation demonstrated experience with contracts of similar size, scope, and complexity in multiple federal agencies, and the firm had experience with human capital, acquisition, finance, and legal functions. AR, Tab 8, SSDD at 12. The SSA found that Platinum demonstrated experience operating independently in “non-inherently governmental roles,” but it had limited experience supporting human capital, finance, and legal functions. *Id.* The SSA also noted that Platinum had “limited evidence of experience supporting agency-wide institutional shutdowns or personnel-intensive closeout efforts at a scale.” *Id.*

The SSA acknowledged that Platinum’s proposed price was 17 percent lower than 2TechJV’s proposed price, but the SSA found that “2TechJV provided a superior technical proposal demonstrating a strong understanding of the requirements of the RFQ and pose[d] a low risk of unsuccessful contract implementation.” AR, Tab 8, SSDD at 11. At the same time, Platinum’s quotation “demonstrate[d] a limited understanding of RFQ requirements and pose[d] a moderate to high risk of unsuccessful contract performance.” *Id.* From this, the SSA concluded that 2TechJV’s quotation was worth a higher price and represented the best value. *Id.*

On February 9, USAID issued the task order to 2TechJV, notified Platinum that its quotation was not selected, and provided Platinum with a brief explanation of the selection decision. AR, Tab 10, Task Order; COS at 3; Protest at 2. This protest followed.

## DISCUSSION

Platinum challenges USAID’s evaluation of the vendors’ quotations under the non-price and price factors, as well as the source selection decision. The protester raises various arguments, including ones that are in addition to, or variations of, those discussed below. While we do not specifically address every argument, we have fully considered all of them and find that they afford no basis on which to sustain the protest.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> For example, in the context of size and status protests that Platinum also filed with the Small Business Administration (SBA) challenging 2TechJV’s eligibility for award, the protester contends that USAID’s communications with the SBA “undermine[d] the integrity of the procurement process.” Supp. Comments at 13; see *also* Supp. Protest at 6-8. As relevant here, the USAID contracting officer told the SBA that “Platinum was eliminated from consideration” and therefore did not meet the criteria in SBA’s regulations to be an interested party to file a size protest; the SBA then dismissed the protest. See AR, Tab 14, USAID Email to SBA at 1 (discussing the protester’s status under 13 C.F.R. § 13.121.1001(a)(2)(i)); Supp. Protest at 9.

(continued...)

## Challenges to the Technical Evaluation

Platinum protests USAID's evaluation of the vendors' technical quotations, alleging that the agency treated the vendors unequally and applied unstated evaluation criteria. We address the protester's principal allegations below.

At the outset, we note where an agency issues an RFQ to FSS vendors and conducts a competition for the issuance of an order, we will review the record to ensure that the agency's evaluation was reasonable and consistent with the terms of the solicitation and applicable procurement laws and regulations.<sup>11</sup> See *DataSavers of Jacksonville, Inc.*, B-415113.3, Aug. 24, 2018, at 4. In reviewing a protest challenging an agency's technical evaluation, our Office will not reevaluate quotations or substitute our judgment for that of the agency; rather, we will examine the record to determine whether the agency's evaluation conclusions were reasonable and consistent with the terms of the solicitation and applicable procurement laws and regulations. *Quotient, Inc.*, B-416473.6, B-416473.7, July 30, 2019, at 5. A protester's disagreement with the agency's judgment, without more, does not establish that an evaluation was unreasonable. *Electrosoft Servs., Inc.*, B-413661, B-413661.2, Dec. 8, 2016, at 5. Furthermore, where a protester challenges the evaluation as unfairly utilizing unstated

---

While we agree with Platinum that the contracting officer's statement to the SBA is inconsistent with the record filed with our Office, as the protester's quotation was not "eliminated from consideration" but instead was evaluated and included in the tradeoff decision, we disagree that USAID's actions provide a basis to question the integrity of the procurement or sustain the protest. See AR, Tab 14, USAID Email to SBA at 1; AR, Tab 8, SSDD at 11-12. In this regard, the protester's assertions regarding the integrity of the procurement, without more, are insufficient to meet the high bar necessary to establish bad faith or bias on the part of government personnel. See *Cooper/Ports Am., LLC*, B-419000.2, Jan. 15, 2021, at 5. Government officials are presumed to act in good faith, and our Office will not conclude that an agency's actions are motivated by bad faith merely because they are adverse to the protester's interests. *Id.*; see also *Trailboss Enters., Inc.*, B-415812.2 *et al.*, May 7, 2018, at 12. There is nothing in the record that provides a basis to question the integrity of the procurement or USAID's conduct in its communications with the SBA. To the extent the protester seeks to challenge the SBA's handling of Platinum's size protest, our Office is not the appropriate forum. See *The Building People*, B-423896, Nov. 20, 2025, at 5 (declining to consider arguments that "would be more properly addressed in an appeal of the SBA's determination" of the protest filed with the SBA). Accordingly, we need not further address this allegation.

<sup>11</sup> We note that although the RFQ was issued pursuant to the Revolutionary FAR Overhaul (RFO) section 8.401(b), the parties have not established that any distinctions between the prior and the RFO versions of FAR part 8 affect the analysis of the agency's actions in this procurement. Supp. MOL at 2-4; Supp. Comments at 1-3; Intervenor Supp. Comments at 1 n.1.

evaluation criteria, our Office will assess whether the solicitation reasonably informs vendors of the basis for the evaluation. *Tesla Labs., Inc.*, B-414428, June 7, 2017, at 4.

In addition, when a protester alleges disparate treatment in a technical evaluation, it must show that the differences between ratings did not stem from differences between the quotations. See *IndraSoft, Inc.*, B-414026, B-414026.2, Jan. 23, 2017, at 10. That is to say, to prevail on an allegation of disparate treatment, a protester must show that the agency unreasonably evaluated the protester's quotation in a different manner than another quotation that was substantively indistinguishable or nearly identical. *H2 Tech. Grp., LLC*, B-423777, B-423777.2, Dec. 15, 2025, at 7; see also *CAE USA, Inc.*, B-421550 *et al.*, June 22, 2023, at 9; *Battelle Mem'l Inst.*, B-418047.3, B-418047.4, May 18, 2020, at 5 (citing *Office Design Grp. v. United States*, 951 F.3d 1366, 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2020)).

#### Unequal Evaluation under the Management Approach Factor

The protester contends that USAID treated the vendors disparately because although both quotations were assessed weaknesses under the management approach factor for proposing approaches with limited tailoring to USAID, 2TechJV's quotation was rated as very good, and the protester's quotation was rated as satisfactory. Supp. Protest at 2-3. The protester alleges that each quotation was assessed one strength, and the quotations should not have been assigned different ratings under the factor. Supp. Comments at 6-7. The agency responds that Platinum is "cherry-picking information" and a "holistic assessment of 2TechJV's quote against this evaluation criterion justifies the very good rating." Supp. COS at 2; see also Supp. MOL at 5.

As noted above, the agency assessed a weakness in 2TechJV's quotation because the "quotation produced limited USAID-specific tailoring in discussing the operational context" and had "fewer concrete examples tailored to the unique dynamics of USAID closeout operations." AR, Tab 13, Technical Evaluation at 6. The TEC noted that this weakness introduced a risk to the successful implementation of certain deliverables. *Id.* At the same time, the TEC assessed three strengths because 2TechJV proposed a clearly defined management structure, the firm described robust oversight mechanisms, and 2TechJV "incorporated USAID [DELETED] into its [DELETED]." *Id.* The TEC considered the three strengths and the single weakness and rated 2TechJV's quotation as very good under the management approach factor. *Id.* at 5.

On the other hand, USAID identified a weakness in the protester's quotation because the TEC found that Platinum's "proposed management approach is largely generic and does not sufficiently tailor execution to uniquely compressed, agency-wide USAID closeout context." AR, Tab 13, Technical Evaluation at 21. The TEC observed that this weakness increased the risk of delays or coordination gaps. *Id.* The TEC also assessed Platinum's quotation a strength for its management structure, noting it supported coordinated execution and reduced the risk of role ambiguity. *Id.* at 20. The TEC assigned the protester's quotation a satisfactory rating under this factor. *Id.*

We have reviewed the record and find the protester's arguments are unavailing. For one, contrary to Platinum's assertions otherwise, the record reflects that the vendors' quotations were not assessed the same number of strengths and weaknesses. See Supp. Comments at 7. Rather, 2TechJV's quotation was assessed three strengths, while the protester's quotation was assessed a single strength. AR, Tab 13, Technical Evaluation at 5-6, 20-21. USAID determined that the three "*meaningful strengths*" in 2TechJV's quotation "justified a higher rating." Supp. MOL at 5. The agency found that the robust oversight framework and USAID [DELETED] that 2TechJV's quotation offered offset the weakness. Supp. COS at 2. In this regard, the TEC's conclusions are consistent with the definitions used in the evaluation. As noted above, the agency defined very good as "[s]trengths significantly outweigh any weaknesses that exist" and satisfactory as "[s]trengths outweigh weaknesses." AR, Tab 13, Technical Evaluation at 4. It was not unreasonable for the agency to find the multiple strengths in 2TechJV's quotation significantly outweighed the single weakness--warranting a very good rating--while the sole strength in the protester's quotation did not significantly outweigh the weakness and resulted in a satisfactory rating.

In addition, as mentioned above, to prevail on its allegation of disparate treatment, Platinum must demonstrate that USAID unreasonably evaluated a substantively indistinguishable aspect of the protester's quotation in a different manner than 2TechJV's quotation. *CAE USA, Inc., supra*. Here, while Platinum contends that each quotation was assessed a "functionally identical" weakness and therefore should have received the same adjectival ratings, Supp. Comments at 7, the protester has not shown the weaknesses in the vendors' quotations were substantively indistinguishable. The record shows that the TEC assessed a weakness in 2TechJV's quotation because the quotation lacked "USAID-specific tailoring" in "the operational context," such as staffing, and the agency was concerned this would impact deliverables. AR, Tab 13, Technical Evaluation at 6. In contrast, the TEC faulted the protester for a "largely generic" management approach--not tailored to "the uniquely compressed, agency-wide USAID closeout context"--that could cause delays or coordination gaps. *Id.* at 21. In other words, although the TEC referenced a lack of tailoring to USAID in describing the weaknesses, the basis of the weaknesses and the resulting concerns were not the same. As such, it was not unreasonable for USAID to find that the weaknesses had different impacts on the overall merit of the vendors' quotations under the management approach factor--and, considered along with the different strengths discussed above, resulted in different adjectival ratings. Accordingly, we deny this protest allegation.

#### Unstated Evaluation Criteria

Next, the protester alleges that USAID used unstated evaluation criteria when evaluating Platinum's quotation under the organizational capacity factor, for which it was assigned a marginal rating. As mentioned above, when the TEC evaluated the protester's quotation, it assessed weaknesses because Platinum's quotation provided limited evidence of experience supporting agency-wide shutdowns, and the protester did not demonstrate experience across all required functional areas (*i.e.*, human capital, financial management, and legal counsel). AR, Tab 13, Technical Evaluation at 22.

Platinum complains that these requirements were absent from the RFQ, and it was unreasonable to penalize the protester for lacking this experience. Supp. Comments at 3-5. The agency argues that it was reasonable to assess a vendor's experience supporting efforts comparable to the instant requirements. Supp. MOL at 4-5.

As noted above, where a protester challenges the evaluation as unfairly utilizing unstated evaluation criteria, our Office will assess whether the solicitation reasonably informs vendors of the basis for the evaluation. *Tesla Labs., supra*. Although agencies are required to identify in a solicitation all major evaluation factors, they are not required to identify all areas of each factor that might be taken into account in an evaluation, provided that the unidentified areas are reasonably related to, or encompassed by, the established factors, *i.e.*, there is a clear nexus between the stated criteria and the unstated consideration. *TechOp Sols. Int'l, Inc.*, B-419964.2, B-419964.3, Jan. 18, 2022; *see also ARC Relocation, LLC*, B-416035.2, B-416035.3, Nov. 22, 2019, at 6.

The record here provides no basis to sustain this protest ground. As the agency states, the RFQ provided that USAID would evaluate “[t]he extent to which the Offeror and proposed subcontractors demonstrate the breadth and depth of past experience in providing similar services and deliverables.” RFQ at 65; Supp. MOL at 4. The services USAID sought with this procurement are “support services to the Offices of Human Capital and Talent Management (HCTM), Acquisition and Assistance (OAA), and Financial Management (CFO) to support Agency-wide closeout activities.” RFQ at 9. In addition, the SOW required the contractor to support an array of agency functions, including the financial management office, the office of human capital, and the office of general counsel. RFQ at 18-28.

In light of these requirements, we find the agency did not apply unstated evaluation criteria when it assessed weaknesses in Platinum's quotation. Specifically, the agency reasonably found that Platinum's quotation did not demonstrate experience with agency-wide institutional shutdowns and experience across all functional areas, as these criteria were logically encompassed by the stated evaluation criteria. *See Cloud All., Inc.*, B-422884, Dec. 3, 2024, at 8. Accordingly, we deny this protest ground.

### Price Evaluation

Platinum also challenges the agency's price evaluation, asserting that USAID “never grappled with the actual price difference between the offerors” and instead focused on comparing the quoted prices to the agency's independent government cost estimate (IGCE). Supp. Comments at 8-9. The agency responds that the price evaluation was reasonable and consistent with applicable regulations and the RFQ. Supp. COS at 2.

The manner and depth of an agency's price analysis is a matter committed to the discretion of the agency, which we will not disturb provided that it is reasonable and consistent with the solicitation's evaluation criteria and applicable procurement statutes and regulations. *Deloitte Consulting LLP*, B-419336.2 *et al.*, Jan. 21, 2021, at 12.

As noted above, the RFQ provided that the agency would “conduct a price analysis to include an evaluation of the level of effort and mix of the labor proposed and determine if the total price is reasonable.” RFQ at 65. The record shows that for each quotation, USAID compared the vendor’s proposed price to the IGCE and the average total proposed price for all vendors. AR, Tab 12, Price Analysis at 5, 12. For example, in evaluating the protester’s quotation, the agency observed that Platinum’s proposed price was [DELETED] percent lower than the IGCE and 38 percent lower than the average price offered, and Platinum had offered the lowest price. *Id.* at 12. Then, the agency considered the vendors’ proposed rates. For example, the agency noted that 2TechJV used a commercially available [DELETED] and mapped “[p]ositions requiring [DELETED]” to [DELETED]. *Id.* at 5. USAID also verified that each vendor utilized the level of effort and plug number for the order level materials provided in the RFQ, and the agency considered whether the proposed level of effort was sufficient to meet the requirements. *Id.* at 5-6, 12.

Based on our review of the record here, we have no basis to question the agency’s price evaluation. As an initial matter, Platinum’s allegation that the agency did not consider the difference between the quotations is contradicted by the record, as the agency compared each vendor’s price to the prices proposed by the other vendors and the average proposed price. Indeed, as Platinum points out, the agency’s analysis included considering that Platinum quoted the lowest price and 2TechJV quoted the second lowest price. Supp. Comments at 9; AR, Tab 12, Price Analysis at 5, 12.

Furthermore, to the extent the protester argues that USAID was required to conduct a deeper and more exhaustive price evaluation, the protester’s position is not supported by the terms of the RFQ, which required USAID to evaluate the level of effort, labor mix, and price reasonableness. RFQ at 65. As noted above, the manner and depth of an agency’s price analysis is a matter committed to the discretion of the agency. *Deloitte Consulting LLP, supra*. Platinum has not demonstrated that USAID’s price evaluation was unreasonable or inconsistent with the RFQ or applicable statutes and regulations, and we deny this allegation.

#### Best-Value Tradeoff

Finally, Platinum challenges USAID’s best-value tradeoff decision and complains that the agency has not justified paying a price premium to issue the task order to 2TechJV. Comments at 1-3. The agency responds that the tradeoff decision was reasonable, and the protester’s disagreement with USAID’s judgments does not prove otherwise. MOL at 14.

Where, as here, an agency issues an RFQ to FSS vendors and conducts a competition for the issuance of a task order on a “best-value” tradeoff basis, it is the function of the SSA to perform a price/technical tradeoff, that is, to determine whether one quotation’s technical superiority is worth its higher price. See *Spatial Front, Inc.*, B-422058.2, B-422058.3, May 21, 2024, at 14. A protester’s disagreement with the agency’s

judgment, without more, does not establish that the best-value tradeoff was unreasonable. *Sigmattech, Inc.*, B-415028.3, B-415028.4, Sept. 11, 2018, at 11.

As noted above, the protester complains that USAID did not justify paying a higher price to issue the task order to 2TechJV. Comments at 1-3. To begin, we reject the protester's assertion that the agency was required to make "a comparative assessment of the **total** cost to the government weighed against **specific** technical benefits." *Id.* at 6. There is no need for extensive documentation of every consideration factored into a tradeoff decision. *Advanced Mgmt. Strategies Grp., Inc.*, B-423290, B-423290.2, Apr. 16, 2025, at 10. Rather, the documentation need only be sufficient to establish that the agency was aware of the relative merits and costs of the competing quotations and that the source selection was reasonably based. *Id.*

Here, the record supports the reasonableness of USAID's evaluation of both firms' quotations, and thus the basis for the tradeoff decision. The SSA conducted an independent review of each quotation under each factor and documented the results of that independent review. The SSA's judgment was that 2TechJV's quotation met or exceeded the requirements with regard to all evaluation criteria. AR, Tab 8, SSDD at 4. The tradeoff decision adequately explained the agency's rationale for the award decision. The SSA found that 2TechJV's quotation offered a clearly defined management structure, an oversight framework that supported execution at scale, an ability to rapidly recruit staff, and experience implement contracts of similar size, scope and complexity. *Id.* The SSA's judgment was that selecting 2TechJV's quotation at its higher proposed price and higher non-price ratings provided the best value. *Id.* at 10. The SSA's determination that 2TechJV's superior technical approach and understanding of the requirements justified paying a higher price was reasonable and consistent with the RFQ criteria. RFQ at 66; *Pioneer Credit Recovery, Inc.*, B-419599, B-419599.2, June 1, 2021, at 9.

On this record, we find no basis to disturb the agency's best-value tradeoff decision. We conclude that the protester's challenge to the best-value tradeoff decision amounts to disagreement with the agency's judgment, which does not provide a basis to sustain the protest. See *Professional Analysis, Inc.*, B-419239, B-419239.2, Jan. 8, 2021, at 9 (denying protest of best-value tradeoff decision where the agency reasonably concluded that the benefits in the awardee's quotation justified the payment of a higher price).

The protest is denied.

Edda Emmanuelli Perez  
General Counsel