



## Decision

**Matter of:** E-Logic, Inc.

**File:** B-423306.13; B-423306.21

**Date:** May 15, 2026

---

Luis Padilla for the protester.

Jennifer L. Howard, Esq., and Stephen T. O’Neal, Esq., National Aeronautics and Space Administration, for the agency.

Jacob M. Talcott, Esq., and Heather Weiner, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, GAO, participated in the preparation of the decision.

---

### DIGEST

Protest challenging the agency’s elimination of the protester’s proposal from the competition is denied where the agency’s evaluation was reasonable and in accordance with the terms of the solicitation.

---

### DECISION

E-Logic, Inc., a small business of Washington, District of Columbia, protests the elimination of its proposal from the competition under request for proposals (RFP) No. 80TECH24R0001, issued by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), for information technology (IT) products, cloud solutions, cybersecurity, and related services. The protester contends that the agency unreasonably eliminated its proposal from the competition.

We deny the protest.

### BACKGROUND

NASA issued the solicitation on May 23, 2024, in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) part 15, seeking to award the sixth generation of the solutions for enterprise-wide procurement (SEWP VI) government-wide acquisition contract vehicle for IT products and services.<sup>1</sup> The RFP will result in multiple government-wide

---

<sup>1</sup> The solicitation was amended 14 times and citations to the RFP are to the conformed version in amendment 14. Contracting Officer’s Statement (COS) at 1; Agency

(continued...)

indefinite-delivery, indefinite-quantity contracts under which fixed-price, time-and-materials, labor-hour, fixed-price award fee, fixed-price incentive fee, and fixed-price economic price adjustment task orders can be issued. RFP at 40. The solicitation contemplates awarding contracts to all qualifying offerors for an ordering period of 10 years. *Id.* at 40, 117. The maximum ordering value is \$20 billion. *Id.* at 44.

The solicitation advised that contracts will be awarded for three categories;<sup>2</sup> each category is self-contained with its own separate fulfillment requirements, quotation submission requirements, and evaluation criteria. *Id.* at 25-39. This protest concerns category A, ITC/AV service solutions. The due date for receipt of category A proposals was February 24, 2025. COS at 2.

NASA is conducting this procurement in three phases. RFP at 117. Upon the completion of each phase of the evaluation, the agency will notify the offeror whether its proposal was selected to proceed to the next phase of the competition or eliminated from the competition. *Id.* at 118. As relevant to this protest, during phase 1, offerors were to complete a spreadsheet template, attached to the solicitation as exhibit 3a, in which offerors were to propose technology solutions for four out of eight mandatory technical areas.<sup>3</sup> *Id.* at 100-103. The exhibit 3a spreadsheet provided tabs for each of the eight technical areas and each tab contained the following seven columns: contract line item numbers (CLINs)<sup>4</sup> (column A); original equipment manufacturer (OEM)/service provider (column B); part number (column C); model name (column D); description (column E); United Nations Standard Products and Services Code (column F); and the SEWP catalog price (column G). See AR, Tab 4, Exhibit 3a for E-Logic; see *also* RFP at 104. The solicitation required offerors to populate each column with the relevant information. RFP at 103-104.

The solicitation required that offerors “provide a letter of authorization (LOA) from a designated provider (OEM)” for each of the four technical areas to ensure that the provider approved of the offeror proposing its products for the SEWP VI proposal. *Id.*

---

Report (AR), Tab 1, RFP. Citations to the record use the Adobe PDF pagination of the documents produced.

<sup>2</sup> SEWP VI consists of three categories of IT services: (1) category A, IT, communication, and audio visual (ITC/AV) solutions; (2) category B, enterprise-wide ITC/AV service solutions; and (3) category C, ITC/AV mission-based services. RFP at 25-39.

<sup>3</sup> These technical areas include: (1) IT computer systems/compute facilities, (2) IT storage systems; (3) networking and communication equipment; (4) imaging equipment and support technology; (5) IT power and cabling equipment; (6) audio/video equipment; (7) security and sensor equipment; and (8) software and cloud technology. *Id.* at 100-103.

<sup>4</sup> Exhibit 3a defined a CLIN as a “unique representation of a part number and is created by the Offeror.” AR, Tab 4, E-Logic Exhibit 3a Spreadsheet, tabs 1 and 2.

at 103. The solicitation further required offerors to designate one of the technical areas as the “primary” technical area and the other three technical areas as the “non-primary” technical areas. *Id.* at 104. For the primary technical area, offerors were required to propose a minimum of 1000 CLINs from the designated provider.<sup>5</sup> *Id.* For the non-primary technical areas, offerors were required to propose a minimum of 100 CLINs from the designated provider. *Id.*

The solicitation provided that the agency would evaluate proposals on a pass/fail basis under phase 1 and that if a proposal did not meet all the requirements, the proposal would be ineligible for award and excluded from the competition. *Id.* at 118-119.

E-Logic timely submitted its proposal, which as relevant here, included a completed exhibit 3a spreadsheet as required by the RFP. COS at 4. The agency reviewed E-Logic’s proposal and found that E-Logic’s spreadsheet failed to meet the solicitation requirement to propose a minimum of 100 CLINs from the offeror’s designated provider for each of the offeror’s non-primary technical areas. AR, Tab 5, Down-Select Notice at 1. Specifically, E-Logic’s proposal identified Hewlett Packard, Inc. (HP) as its designated provider for non-primary technical areas one and two, and as required, provided an LOA from HP for these two technical areas. AR, Tab 4, E-Logic Exhibit 3a Spreadsheet, Point of Contact Info tab. In completing the spreadsheet tabs for these two technical areas, E-Logic’s spreadsheet listed HP as the designated provider in the OEM/service provider column for 100 CLINs under technical area one and for 178 CLINs under technical area two. *Id.* Under the description column for those same CLINs, E-Logic’s spreadsheet identified a different company--Hewlett Packard Enterprise Company (HPE)--as the manufacturer for three of the CLINs under technical area one and for 168 of the CLINs under technical area two. *Id.*

Given what appeared to be a discrepancy as to which company was the manufacturer for some of the CLIN items, the agency conducted internet research to verify whether the products proposed were manufactured by HP or HPE. COS at 4. The information the agency found identified that the products at issue were HPE products and that HPE is “a separate and distinct company” from HP. *Id.*; AR, Tab 5, Down-Select Notice at 1. As such, the agency concluded that E-Logic’s spreadsheet “included 97 CLINs from a designated provider (HP) in Technical Area 1 and 10 CLINs from a designated provider (HP) in Technical Area 2 as opposed to the minimum of 100 CLINs as required by the RFP.” AR, Tab 5, Down-Select Notice at 1. As a result, because the agency found that E-Logic’s proposal failed to meet the solicitation’s requirement of proposing 100 CLINs from a designated provider for each non-primary technical area, the agency eliminated E-Logic’s proposal from the competition. *Id.*

The agency notified the protester of the elimination of its proposal from the competition on February 9, 2026, and stated that the down-select notice constituted the agency’s written debriefing in accordance with FAR part 15. *Id.* This protest followed.

---

<sup>5</sup> Enclosure 1 of the solicitation contained the agency’s list of designated providers for this procurement. See AR, Tab 3, Designated Provider List.

## DISCUSSION

The protester contends that the agency unreasonably evaluated its proposal as failing to meet the solicitation's requirement to propose 100 CLINs from a designated provider for each non-primary technical area. Protest at 3. According to the protester, in determining whether the CLINs proposed by E-Logic were from a designated provider, the agency improperly relied on an unstated evaluation criterion by considering the information included in the description column of E-Logic's exhibit 3a spreadsheet in such a manner that it would "override" the information provided in the OEM/service provider column. Comments & Supp. Protest at 2-3. The protester also contends that it was improper for the agency to conduct internet research to determine whether the actual manufacturer of certain products matched the manufacturer identified in the protester's proposal. *Id.* at 2. The agency responds that it conducted the evaluation in accordance with the terms of the solicitation and reasonably concluded that the protester failed to propose the minimum number of CLINs from a designated provider for technical areas one and two as required by the RFP. Memorandum of Law (MOL) at 3. For the reasons discussed below, we find nothing unreasonable regarding the agency's evaluation and deny the protest.<sup>6</sup>

The evaluation of proposals is a matter within the discretion of the procuring agency. *The Bionetics Corp.*, B-420272, Jan. 7, 2022, at 3. In reviewing a protest of an agency's evaluation, it is not our role to reevaluate proposals; rather, our Office will examine the record to determine whether the agency's judgment was reasonable and consistent with the solicitation criteria. *Id.* A protester's disagreement with the agency, without more, does not render the evaluation unreasonable. *Id.*

As mentioned above, the solicitation required offerors to complete a spreadsheet template to propose technology solutions for four out of eight mandatory technical areas and required that offerors provide a LOA from a designated provider for each of the four technical areas. RFP at 103. In addition, as relevant here, the RFP required that offerors designate three technical areas as the "non-primary" technical areas, and for each, offerors were required to propose a minimum of 100 CLINs from a designated provider. *Id.* at 103-104; AR, Tab 3, List of Designated Providers. The solicitation also specifically notified offerors that proposals that did not meet all the solicitation requirements would not be eligible for award and removed from the competition. *Id.* at 118-119.

E-Logic's proposal identified only HP as its designated provider for non-primary technical areas one and two, and provided the required LOA from HP for these technical areas. AR, Tab 4, E-Logic Exhibit 3a Spreadsheet, Point of Contact Info tab; AR, Tab 2, E-Logic Proposal at 13. In completing the spreadsheet tabs for these two technical areas, E-Logic's spreadsheet listed HP as the designated provider in the

---

<sup>6</sup> Although we do not address every argument raised by the protester, we have considered all of them and find that none provide a basis upon which to sustain the protest.

OEM/service provider column for 100 CLINs under technical area one and for 178 CLINs under technical area two. AR, Tab 4, E-Logic Exhibit 3a Spreadsheet. Under the description column for those same CLINs, E-Logic's spreadsheet identified a different company--HPE--as the manufacturer for three of the CLINs under technical area one and for 168 of the CLINs under technical area two. *Id.*

In evaluating the protester's spreadsheet, the agency noted that three of the 100 CLINs proposed under technical area one described the proposed products as HPE products in the description column even though the spreadsheet listed HP as the designated provider in the OEM/service provider column. AR, Tab 5, Down-Select Notice at 1; see AR, Tab 4, E-Logic Exhibit 3a Spreadsheet. Similarly, for technical area two, the agency noted that 168 of the 178 CLINs described the product as an HPE product in the description column but E-Logic identified HP as the designated provider in the OEM/service provider column. AR, Tab 5, Down-Select Notice at 1; see AR, Tab 4, E-Logic Exhibit 3a Spreadsheet. The contracting officer further explains in response to the protest that the agency found that "E-Logic provided conflicting/ambiguous proposal information" in that "E-Logic submitted an LOA for HP; however, its Exhibit 3a included products that were from HPE, for which E-Logic did not provide an LOA as required by the RFP." Supp. COS at 2, *citing* AR, Tab 4, E-Logic Exhibit 3a Spreadsheet. The contracting officer also states that it found that E-Logic's spreadsheet "provided HPE part numbers in [the part number column], but their [OEM/service provider column] stated HP as the OEM." *Id.* The contracting officer explains that "[t]his conflicting information proposed between [the OEM/service provider column, the part number column, and the description column] of Exhibit 3a and the LOA provided, required NASA to determine whether the products proposed were from HP as that is the only designated provider for which E-Logic provided an LOA for Technical Areas 1 and 2." *Id.*, *citing* AR, Tab 4, E-Logic Exhibit 3a Spreadsheet; AR, Tab 2, E-Logic Proposal.

The contracting officer states that, upon noticing the discrepancy between the OEM/service provider column and description column of E-Logic's spreadsheet, he performed an internet search using information from the part number column for the items at issue and "confirmed they were not HP products, but, in fact, were HPE products listed on the HPE website." COS at 4. The agency also found that HPE is a "separate and distinct" company from HP. AR, Tab 5, Down-Select Notice at 1. As such, the agency concluded that E-Logic's spreadsheet "included 97 CLINs from a designated provider (HP) in Technical Area 1 and 10 CLINs from a designated provider (HP) in Technical Area 2 as opposed to the minimum of 100 CLINs as required by the RFP." *Id.* Because the agency concluded that E-Logic's proposal failed to provide a minimum of 100 CLINs from a designated provider for technical areas one and two, it eliminated the protester's proposal from the competition. *Id.*

The protester argues that the agency improperly used an unstated evaluation criterion when it considered the text provided in the description column of its exhibit 3a spreadsheet to determine the "actual" manufacturer of the products listed in the CLINs. Comments and Supp. Protest at 2. The protester asserts that the agency instead was required to look only at the information identified in the OEM/service provider column to determine the actual manufacturer of the products and to confirm whether the

manufacturer identified was one of the solicitation's designated providers. According to the protester, nothing in the solicitation permitted the agency to "override" the information listed by the offeror in the OEM/service provider column by looking at information in the description column. *Id.* at 2-3.

Based on our review of the record, we have no basis to object to the agency's evaluation of the protester's proposal as failing to meet the RFP's requirement that offerors propose at least 100 CLINs from a designated provider and decision to eliminate the protester's proposal from the competition. As mentioned above, the solicitation required that offerors propose products for a minimum of 100 CLINs from a designated provider for the non-primary technical areas, and that offerors provide a LOA from a designated provider for each technical area. RFP at 103. The record reflects that the only designated provider identified by E-Logic in its spreadsheet for technical areas one and two was HP, and that E-Logic's proposal provided a LOA only from HP for these two technical areas. See AR, Tab 4, Exhibit 3a for E-Logic; AR, Tab 2, E-Logic Proposal at 13. The record also reflects that, for some of the proposed CLINs under technical areas one and two, E-Logic's spreadsheet identified HP as the OEM/service provider, but provided conflicting information as to the identity of the manufacturer in the description column. AR, Tab 4, Exhibit 3a for E-Logic.

Although the protester argues that the agency improperly used the information from the descriptive column of its spreadsheet to "override" the information in the manufacturer column, the protester does not dispute that its proposed spreadsheet described some of its CLINs as being manufactured by HPE in the description column, while identifying the manufacturer as HP in the OEM/service provider column. See Comments & Supp. Protest at 2. The protester also does not cite any provision in the RFP that would limit the agency's evaluation of the exhibit 3a spreadsheet to only the information provided in the OEM/service provider column or that would preclude the agency from considering the impact of any conflicting information identified in the spreadsheet. Rather, the solicitation provided that the agency would use the information in exhibit 3a "to verify that the requirements . . . are met for the proposed [t]echnical [a]reas," and the RFP requirements specified that an offeror must propose a minimum of 100 CLINs from a designated service provider (and submit a LOA from the designated provider) for each non-primary technical area. RFP at 103-104. As is plain from the RFP language, the solicitation does not limit the agency's review to a specific column in exhibit 3a, as the protester asserts. Rather, it anticipates the agency's review of the entirety of exhibit 3a to determine whether the proposal met the requirements of the solicitation, which is what the agency did here. See *id.* We find nothing unreasonable regarding the agency's consideration of the entire exhibit 3a spreadsheet in evaluating whether E-Logic's proposal met the requirements of the solicitation.

We also find no merit to the protester's assertion that it was unreasonable for the agency to conduct internet research "outside the four corners" of the protester's proposal to determine whether the actual manufacturer of certain products matched the manufacturer listed in the protester's proposal. Comments & Supp. Protest at 2-3 (arguing that "nothing in the solicitation reasonably put offerors on notice that NASA would independently verify OEM identity using part numbers or external sources and

override the Manufacturer field expressly required by the proposal format”). According to the protester, the agency’s use of an internet search materially altered how the agency evaluated proposals. *Id.* We disagree. The record reflects that the solicitation specifically advised offerors that NASA may verify the information provided by offerors in exhibit 3a. RFP at 103 (“The government reserves the right to verify the validity of each LOA and the information in Exhibit 3a.”); *id.* at 104 (“The information in Exhibit 3a will only be used to verify that the requirements above are met for the proposed Technical Areas.”). As NASA points out, it did not rely on its internet search to evaluate E-Logic’s proposal, but rather, it simply confirmed its evaluation of the information in the proposal in light of the apparent discrepancy evident on the face of E-Logic’s proposal. Supp. MOL at 4-5. We find nothing improper regarding the agency’s actions here.

Ultimately, in reviewing the information provided in E-Logic’s exhibit 3a spreadsheet, the agency noticed a discrepancy between the information provided in the descriptive column and in the OEM/service provider column concerning the identity of the manufacturer of the products proposed by E-Logic under certain CLINs. Supp. COS at 2; see *also* AR, Tab 5, Down-Select Letter at 1. As mentioned above, some of the CLINs listed both HP and HPE as the manufacturer. AR, Tab 5, Down-Select Letter at 1. Accordingly, based on the product numbers provided by E-Logic in its spreadsheet, the agency researched to verify whether HP or HPE was, in fact, the manufacturer of the products and whether they were separate companies.<sup>7</sup> Supp. COS at 2. The research indicated that the two companies were separate and that HPE was the manufacturer of the products in question, meaning that only 90 CLINs proposed by the protester for technical area one and only 10 of the CLINs proposed by the protester for technical area two were attributable to the protester’s proposed designated provider,

---

<sup>7</sup> The protester also argues that it met the 100 CLIN minimum for technical areas one and two because the CLINs associated with HPE were “reasonably attributable” to HP. Comments & Supp. Protest at 4-5. Without citing to any supporting documentation or evidence, the protester maintains that HP and HPE “share a common corporate lineage, legacy product families, and overlapping distribution and reseller ecosystems.” *Id.* The protester further claims, also without any support, that from “a commercial and procurement standpoint,” the products associated with HP and HPE are “frequently marketed, distributed, and supported through interconnected channels.” *Id.* As the agency points out, however, HP and HPE are separate publicly traded companies, with HP publicly traded as HPQ, while HPE is publicly traded as HPE. Supp. COS at 2-3, *citing* HP Inc. (HPQ) Company Profile & Facts - Yahoo Finance, *available at* <https://finance.yahoo.com/quote/HPQ/profile/> (last visited May 11, 2026); Hewlett Packard Enterprise Company (HPE) Company Profile & Facts - Yahoo Finance, *available at* <https://finance.yahoo.com/quote/HPE/profile/> (last visited May 11, 2026). In addition, the agency notes that HP has its headquarters in Palo Alto, California, while HPE has its headquarters in Spring, Texas. *Id.* Finally, the agency asserts that it found no evidence, nor does the protester provide any, that HP and HPE are affiliates or subsidiaries of one another. *Id.* at 3. Accordingly, we find nothing unreasonable regarding the agency’s conclusion that HP and HPE are separate companies. This protest allegation is denied.

HP. Because these numbers fell short of the RFP's 100 CLIN minimum, we conclude that the agency reasonably eliminated E-Logic's proposal from the competition.

The protest is denied.

Edda Emmanuelli Perez  
General Counsel