



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: Peridot Solutions, LLC; enGenius Consulting Group, Inc.

File: B-424234; B-424234.2; B-424234.3; B-424234.4; B-424234.5

Date: May 5, 2026

Christopher R. Shiplett, Esq., Randolph Law, PLLC, for Peridot Solutions, LLC; Kyle M. Wise, Esq., Maynard Nexsen PC, for enGenius Consulting Group, Inc., the protesters. Thomas Coulter, Esq., Norton Rose Fulbright US LLP, for Integrated Finance & Accounting Solutions, LLC, the intervenor. Susan M. Chagrin, Esq., Defense Information Systems Agency, for the agency. Charmaine A. Stevenson, Esq., and John Sorrenti, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, GAO, participated in the preparation of the decision.

DIGEST

1. Protests challenging the evaluation of quotations and selection decision are denied where the record shows that both evaluations were reasonable and consistent with the terms of the solicitation.
 2. Protests alleging that the agency engaged in disparate treatment are denied where the record shows that the differences in the evaluations were the result of differences in quotations.
-

DECISION

Peridot Solutions, LLC, a small business of Leesburg, Virginia, and enGenius Consulting Group, Inc., a small business of Huntsville, Alabama, protest the issuance of an order to Integrated Finance & Accounting Solutions, LLC (IFAS), a small business of Washington, D.C., under request for quotation (RFQ) No. 612572077, issued by the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) for financial management support services. Both protesters challenge the agency's evaluation of technical and price quotations and the selection decision and allege that the evaluation reflects disparate treatment.

We deny the protests.

BACKGROUND

The agency issued the RFQ using the procedures under Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) subpart 8.4 and set aside the procurement for small businesses holding General Services Administration (GSA) Multiple Award Schedule (MAS) contracts under North American Industry Classification Code number 541611, administrative management and general management consulting services. Agency Report (AR), Tab 1, RFQ at 1-2.¹ The RFQ contemplated award of a fixed-price contract with a period of performance consisting of a 1-year base period, four 1-year option periods, and a 6-month optional extension. *Id.* at 2. The RFQ requires that the contractor work with the government on financial controls, assist with the conduct of program and organizational assessments, provide financial management information and products, and furnish timely, reliable, and comprehensive financial products and information. AR, Tab 1a, Performance Work Statement (PWS) at 2.

The RFQ stated that quotations would be evaluated in two phases. Phase one would assess vendors' facility clearance level and would be rated as acceptable or unacceptable. RFQ at 4-5. Vendors rated as acceptable under phase one would then be evaluated during phase two under the following factors: technical capabilities, management and administration, and price. *Id.* at 5. The technical capabilities and management and administration factors were of equal importance and would be assigned ratings as follows: outstanding/blue; good/purple; acceptable/green; marginal/yellow; or unacceptable/red. *Id.* When combined, the non-price factors were identified as being more important than price. *Id.* at 8.

The agency received four quotations, including from Peridot, enGenius, and IFAS. AR, Tab 4, Price Negotiation Memorandum (PNM) at 2. All three received acceptable ratings under phase one and following evaluation of phase two, the vendors received ratings and had prices as follows:

	Peridot	enGenius	IFAS
Technical Capabilities	Acceptable/Green	Acceptable/Green	Good/Purple
Management and Administration	Acceptable/Green	Good/Purple	Acceptable/Green
Price	\$30,098,603	\$46,189,289	\$36,496,998

Id. at 4. The contracting officer, who also served as the source selection authority, selected IFAS for award. These protests followed.

¹ The RFQ was amended three times. Citations to the RFQ in this decision are to the conformed RFQ issued on November 18, 2025, and produced by the agency as tab 1. All page citations are to Adobe Acrobat PDF page numbers.

DISCUSSION

Both protesters challenge the agency's evaluation of their quotations under the technical capabilities factor and additionally contend that the agency engaged in disparate treatment when evaluating IFAS under this factor. In addition, both protesters challenge aspects of the price evaluation and argue that the best-value tradeoff was unreasonable. Although we do not address all the allegations raised by the protesters, we have considered them all and conclude that they do not provide a basis to sustain either protest.

Evaluation of Technical Capabilities

Both protesters challenge the agency's evaluation of their quotations under the technical capabilities factor and argue that their quotations should have received higher ratings. In this regard, under the technical capabilities factor, the RFQ provided that the agency would evaluate the vendors' solution to fulfill the PWS performance requirements. Specifically, the RFQ stated as follows:

The offeror's solution will be evaluated based on how it demonstrates the offeror's ability to execute Infrastructure Executive Support, Planning, Programming, Budgeting, and Execution; as well as the offeror's solution in clearly describing its experience, capabilities, and approach to fully meet or exceed the performance requirements. The offeror's solution will describe where the offeror sees risk and how it would solve, mitigate, or reduce risks: as required in accordance with the PWS Task Areas indicated above.

RFQ at 6.

Where, as here, an agency issues a solicitation to MAS contractors under FAR subpart 8.4 and conducts a competition, we will review the record to ensure that the evaluation was reasonable and consistent with the terms of the solicitation. *Deloitte Consulting, LLP*, B-416882.4, Jan. 6, 2020, at 4. In reviewing a protest challenging an agency's technical evaluation, our Office will not reevaluate quotations; 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 law and regulation. *ASI Gov't, Inc.*, B-419080.2, B-419080.3, June 24, 2021, at 4. 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 4-5.

Peridot

Peridot argues that the agency should have identified strengths in its quotation that would have resulted in a higher rating. Peridot Protest at 9-11. Specifically related to the technical capabilities factor, the protester argues that the agency should have

identified two strengths or significant strengths in its quotation: (1) for its extensive and relevant financial management experience performing other DISA requirements; and (2) for offering a detailed strategy for the anticipated transition from the current Financial Accounting Management Information's System (FAMIS) to the Defense Integrated Management and Execution System (DIMES) and OneStream, thereby providing transition leadership and advanced automation. *Id.* at 10.

Here, the record shows that in its quotation, Peridot made references to its past performance on prior similar DISA contracts as "validated" in the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS). For example, the quotation stated:

- Our Record: Validated by CPARS and client testimonials, proves delivery of compliant, on time results on complex DISA and DoD Programs.
- Exceptional Performance: Five years of 100% on-time [program objective memorandum/budget estimate submissions] for \$6.8 [billion] in federal portfolios [DELETED]—with zero late/corrective actions. All deliverables are ready per CPARS and government validation.

AR, Tab 2a, Peridot Technical and Management Quotation at 5; see *also id.* at 6 ("Through quarterly lessons-learned reviews, we update [standard operating procedures] and best practices—improving process accuracy as validated in CPARS and ensuring sustained performance gains.").

Regarding a transition from FAMIS to DIMES, Peridot's quotation stated: "Although not referenced in [the] PWS, our active engagement with DISA and recent agency notices confirm the FAMIS to DIMES transition as a near-term objective. . . . [We] bring proven expertise in FAMIS operations and are fully prepared to ensure a seamless transition to the upcoming [Defense] Integrated Management and Execution System (DIMES)." *Id.* at 5. Peridot then repeatedly referenced an upcoming transition to DIMES, including "**DIMES Integration Readiness:** We position DISA for efficient DIMES adoption through data migration (covering reconciliation, spend plan, and funding packages), process organization using DIMES automation, and targeted training/[standard operating procedures] to maintain expertise across FAMIS and DIMES." *Id.* at 6; see *also id.* at 7 ("With DIMES and OneStream integration, reporting is automated, reducing manual input, enabling enhanced dashboard functionalities, and providing real-time visibility into portfolio funds and projections for more responsive budget management."); *id.* at 9 ("With the move to DIMES, new platform capabilities will enable integrated, automated budget formulation, enhanced data validation, and more efficient [program objective memorandum] preparation.").

In its evaluation, the agency concluded that Peridot's quotation demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the PWS requirements, described its capabilities to support them, and addressed DISA budget formulation workflows and submissions which reflected familiarity with DISA's internal financial enterprise processes. AR, Tab 4, PNM at 4-5. However, the evaluators also identified a

weakness “stemming from the proposed reliance on DIMES and OneStream financial automation tools that are not yet fully operational for end-to-end financial execution.” *Id.* at 5. Evaluators noted that “both tools currently require manual reconciliation and interface support to complete [planning, programming, budgeting, and execution (PPBE)] submissions, which may affect the timeliness and accuracy of financial deliverables required under the PWS.” *Id.*

As Peridot acknowledges in its quotation, the PWS does not discuss or require a transition to DIMES and OneStream, and neither is mentioned anywhere in the RFQ. Instead, the scope of the task order set forth in the PWS states, in pertinent part:

Personnel supporting the reporting functions are required to possess advanced skills in operating Microsoft Office tools as well as current DISA and DoD source financial systems. These systems include the Financial Dashboard, DISA Financial Management System (DFMS), Financial Accounting Management Information’s System (FAMIS) and other systems.

PWS at 2; see *also id.* at 10 (“Contractor support will consist of working to proactively automate reports into a DISA approved financial system and/or business management systems (e.g. Financial Dashboard, DFMS, Knowledge Tree, and FAMIS) to support the Executive Office ([Other Acquisition Directorate (PEO)] Transport) in business process improvements.”). In response to the protest, the technical lead also explains that this aspect of Peridot’s quotation did not merit a strength because the PWS did not include support for the DIMES transition. Decl. of Tech. Lead at 4.

Based on our review, we find no basis to question the agency’s evaluation conclusions. It is a vendor’s responsibility to submit a well-written quotation, with adequately detailed information, which clearly demonstrates compliance with the solicitation requirements and allows a meaningful review by the procuring agency. See *InterOps, LLC*, B-416563, B-416563.2, Oct. 16, 2018, at 6. Agencies are not required to infer information from an inadequately detailed quotation, or to supply information that the protester elected not to provide. See *Engility Corp.*, B-413120.3 *et al.*, Feb. 14, 2017, at 16.

We find reasonable the agency’s conclusion that Peridot’s quotation demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the PWS requirements and its assignment of an acceptable/green rating. The RFQ stated that the agency would evaluate a vendor’s “experience, capabilities, and approach” to the PWS requirements under the technical capabilities factor. RFQ at 6. Peridot’s statements that its experience was “validated in CPARS” did not require that evaluators consider the CPARS or any other past performance information or conclude on that basis that the quotation merited a strength. Past performance was not an evaluation criterion in the solicitation, and based on the information presented, the record shows that the evaluators reasonably determined Peridot’s quotation demonstrated that it would meet but did not exceed the requirements.

The record also confirms that the PWS did not identify DIMES or OneStream as systems currently utilized by DISA for which the contractor was to demonstrate its technical capability to fulfill the requirements. As indicated in the weakness, Peridot's repeated references to a transition to the use of DIMES in its quotation gave the evaluators reason for concern to the extent that Peridot's proposed performance relied on these tools that had not yet been deployed for the work scope, and which would still require manual reconciliation despite Peridot's expectation that they would offer increased automation and reduce manual effort. We find no basis to question the reasonableness of the agency's conclusion that Peridot's references to a DIMES and OneStream transition presented a weakness rather than a strength in Peridot's quotation.² Accordingly, we deny these allegations.

enGenius

enGenius similarly argues that its quotation should have received a good/purple rating too because it has received phenomenal CPARS ratings under similar DISA contracts, including the incumbent contract. enGenius Protest at 8-10. The agency argues that it reasonably concluded that enGenius's quotation met the technical capabilities requirements but did not present any strengths or weaknesses, and that its past performance and status as the incumbent contractor was properly not considered consistent with the RFQ criteria. enGenius Contracting Officer's Statement (COS) at 2; enGenius Memorandum of Law (MOL) at 16-20.

The record shows that enGenius's quotation repeatedly identified its experience performing three contracts to demonstrate its technical capabilities. *E.g.*, AR, Tab 2a, enGenius Technical and Management Quotation at 15 ("From FMSS to APCO and BCFMAS, we bring proven experience that maps directly to the requirements in this PWS.").³ enGenius's quotation highlights multiple favorable statements from a recent CPARS assessing performance of its FMSS task order, and stated that recent ratings of very good and exceptional were assigned. *Id.* at 10-11, 13-15.

² In responding to the protest, the technical lead also explains that Peridot's quotation received a weakness "because its transition plan demonstrated a critical misunderstanding of the DIMES system." Decl. of Tech. Lead at 4. Peridot asserts that this was flawed because its transition plan did not refer to DIMES. Comments & Supp. Protest at 5. Even if the technical lead's description of the weakness inaccurately refers to Peridot's transition plan, the contemporary evaluation document clearly explained that the weakness was assessed because Peridot's quotation relied too heavily on the DIMES and OneStream tools that were not yet fully operational. As explained above, we find the agency reasonably assessed this weakness.

³ enGenius's quotation defines the contracts as follows: FMSS - financial management support services (incumbent DISA task order); APCO - Approved Products Certification Office; and BCFMAS - budget/cost/financial analysis, financial management and technical support services.

In its evaluation, the agency concluded that enGenius's quotation demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the PWS requirements, described its integration processes between portfolio and program levels, and demonstrated familiarity with PPBE-related data systems and templates to support defense working capital fund processes. AR, Tab 4, PNM at 7. The evaluators concluded that enGenius's approach reflected a comprehensive understanding of the technical requirements and demonstrated that they would meet but not exceed the requirements, did not identify any strengths or weaknesses, and assigned a rating of acceptable/green. *Id.*

enGenius argues that its quotation did not simply rely on its status as the incumbent contractor but that the contracting officer should have considered their firsthand knowledge of its past performance of DISA requirements, having completed CPARS reports for enGenius. According to enGenius, this information was too close-at-hand for the contracting officer to have ignored.⁴ Comments & Supp. Protest at 1-5. However, as noted, past performance was not an evaluation criterion in the RFQ, thus there was no basis for considering this information. Moreover, there is no requirement that an incumbent be given extra credit for its status as an incumbent, or that the agency assign or reserve the highest rating for the incumbent offeror. *Hendall, Inc.*, B-417513.3, B-417513.4, Feb. 24, 2020, at 9. A protester's disagreement with the agency's judgment regarding the evaluation of quotations, without more, is not sufficient to establish that the agency acted unreasonably. *CSRA LLC*, B-417635 *et al.*, Sept. 11, 2019, at 9. Other than its disagreement, the protester has not demonstrated that the agency's evaluation rating of acceptable/green was unreasonable. *Electrosoft Servs., Inc.*, *supra*. Thus, we deny this allegation.

Disparate Treatment

Both protesters argue that the agency's evaluation of quotations was disparate. Peridot argues that the agency considered IFAS's experience when evaluating quotations and finding IFAS to be technically superior but ignored extensive examples of Peridot's corporate experience described in its quotation. Peridot Comments & Supp. Protest at 8-13. enGenius also argues that the agency failed to consider its equal if not superior experience to IFAS, and the agency's consideration of IFAS's experience resulted in a disparate evaluation of quotations. enGenius Comments & Supp. Protest at 5-7.

⁴ Known as the close-at-hand rule, our Office has recognized that there are certain limited circumstances in which an agency has an obligation (as opposed to the discretion) to consider past performance information that is simply too close at hand to require offerors to shoulder the inequities that spring from an agency's failure to obtain, and consider, the information. We have generally limited application of this principle to situations where the alleged "close at hand" information relates to contracts for the same services with the same procuring activity, or information personally known to the evaluators. See *Veterans Elite, Inc.*, B-409233, Feb. 10, 2014, at 4.

In conducting procurements, agencies may not generally engage in conduct that amounts to unfair or disparate treatment of competing vendors. *Arc Aspicio, LLC et al.*, B-412612 *et al.*, Apr. 11, 2016, at 13. Where a protester alleges unequal treatment in a technical evaluation, it must show that the differences in ratings did not stem from differences in the quotations. *Logmet LLC*, B-420941, B-420941.2, Nov. 9, 2022, at 5.

In its quotation, IFAS indicated that combined with Deloitte, its exclusive major subcontractor and teaming partner, it had experience as follows:

Together, we offer 50+ years of combined Planning, Programming, Budgeting, and Execution (PPBE) financial management experience across the Department of Defense (DOD) – including 42+ years with DISA and additional support to [Washington Headquarters Service], [Defense Logistics Agency], [United States Special Operations Command], [United States Transportation Command], Army, Navy, Air Force, and [National Guard Bureau] – providing unmatched insight into [DISA Office of the Chief Financial Officer’s] mission, systems, and evolving needs.

IFAS Technical Quotation at 5; *see also id.* at 7 (“At DISA, our partner Deloitte manages three contracts totaling \$200 [million] with 150 staff delivering financial management, PPBE, and IT systems support. . . . We offer 42+ combined years of DISA-specific PPBE support, including budget formulation, execution, accounting, and financial IT systems.”).

In its evaluation of IFAS, the agency concluded that IFAS demonstrated a thorough approach and understanding of the technical requirements. The evaluators also specifically found as follows:

The depth of IFAS’s experience supporting DISA and other [Department of Defense] financial portfolios, combined with its documented PPBE processes and tools, exceeds the minimum requirements and reduces the level of Government oversight needed to achieve mission execution. This was assessed as a strength, as it provides measurable benefits to the Government in terms of analytical quality, workload reduction, and improved financial insight. This aspect of the requirement provides tangible benefits to the Government in terms of analytical accuracy, workload reduction, data quality, and improved decision-support for senior leadership.

This was assessed as a strength because it exceeds specified performance or capability requirements to the advantage of the Government during contract[.]

AR, Tab 4, PNM at 8-9. On this basis, the agency assigned a rating of good/purple. *Id.* at 9.

The agency contends that it did not fail to evaluate the experience of either Peridot or enGenius, but rather that the experience of both vendors lacked the depth of IFAS's experience and did not "provide tangible benefits to the Government in terms of analytical accuracy, workload reduction, data quality, and improved decision-support for senior leadership." Peridot Supp. MOL at 6; enGenius Supp. MOL at 3-4. Moreover, the agency explains that while Peridot and enGenius both had similar experience, the strength assessed to IFAS's quotation was because IFAS "articulated how that experience was applied to develop specific processes and tools that offered capabilities beyond the PWS requirements, providing a tangible benefit to the government." Peridot Supp. MOL at 6; enGenius Supp. MOL at 4.

On this record, we find the agency did not treat vendors differently, rather the difference in the evaluations was a result of the differences in the quotations. Based on our review, as compared to the quotations of Peridot and enGenius, the IFAS quotation indicated that it possessed experience performing multiple financial management services contracts for defense organizations that had spanned decades and which exceeded the experience discussed by the protesters in their quotations. Moreover, each vendor's quotation focused on their CPARS ratings, which is a measure of past performance, rather than explaining in detail, as the awardee did, how that experience would be applied to the PWS requirements.⁵ The protesters have not demonstrated that the agency treated the vendors differently, rather, the difference in the evaluation was the result of differences in the quotations, accordingly these allegations are denied.

Price Evaluation

Both protesters also challenge different aspects of the agency's price evaluation. Regarding price, the RFQ stated as follows:

The Price Quotation will be evaluated to determine if they are reasonable and complete. Price Reasonableness is established through cost and price analysis techniques as described in FAR 15.404. For a price to be complete, all solicitation requirements must be priced, figures correctly calculated, and prices presented in a clear and useful format. If an incomplete price quotation is submitted, the Government reserves the right to eliminate the contractor for consideration for award. The Government reserves the right, but is not obligated, to conduct a realism analysis.

RFQ at 8.

⁵ To the extent the protesters argue that the agency should have considered CPARS or other past performance ratings or information as evidence of their respective experience, we disagree. We have consistently found that there is a difference in evaluating a vendor's experience, which focuses on the degree to which a vendor has performed similar work, and past performance, which focuses on the quality of that work. See *Amyx, Inc.*, B-410623, B-410623.2, Jan. 16, 2015, at 14.

Here, the record states that the agency performed a price evaluation in accordance with the RFQ and applicable FAR provisions to determine whether the proposed prices were fair, reasonable, complete, and balanced for the required effort. AR, Tab 3, Selection Recommendation Document at 7. The price evaluation included a review of labor categories, labor rates, proposed hours, contract line item number (CLIN) pricing, and the total evaluated price for each vendor to assess whether they were consistent with the PWS requirements. The price evaluation concluded that each vendor's proposed labor categories and total proposed hours were in line with the PWS task areas and were considered acceptable to perform the requirements. *Id.* In addition, the price analyst evaluated the realism of the proposed labor rates by comparing them to market and historical data derived from other governmentwide acquisition contracts; verified the proposed GSA MAS ceiling rates, discounts, escalation rates, travel, and other direct costs; and concluded that all quotations were within a 1.5 standard deviation from the independent government cost estimate (IGCE). AR, Tab 4, PNM at 10. The record shows that the IGCE anticipated 393,390 labor hours at a total cost of \$32,257,686. *Id.*

In its evaluation of Peridot's price quotation, the agency concluded as follows:

Peridot proposed a total evaluated price approximately [DELETED] below the IGCE. The Price Analyst indicated that Peridot's [quotation] was complete, logically structured, and arithmetically accurate, with all solicitation requirements properly priced. Based on comparison to the IGCE and competitive pricing, Peridot's total evaluated price was determined to be price reasonable under FAR 15.404-1(b)(2).

The realism assessment identified two (2) labor categories— [DELETED]—proposed at rates below realistic labor rate thresholds. Although Peridot proposed discounts ranging from [DELETED] [percent] to [DELETED] [percent] off its GSA MAS rates and an escalation rate of [DELETED] [percent], the analyst concluded that the identified labor rates posed potential staffing risk and required clarification.

Id. at 11.

Peridot argues that the agency's price realism evaluation of the two labor categories failed to consider Peridot's specific technical approach in its analysis and focused only on the labor rates, and that the labor categories giving rise to the agency's concern account for just two of the 20 positions proposed and are not key positions. Peridot Comments & Supp. Protest at 13-15.

The nature and extent of an agency's price realism analysis are matters within the agency's discretion. *Clear Global Sols., LLC*, B-419402, Feb. 5, 2021, at 9. The FAR recognizes a number of price analysis techniques that may be used to determine whether prices are realistic, including a comparison of proposed prices with prices obtained through market research for the same or similar items. FAR 15.404-

1(b)(2)(vi); *see Amaze Techs., LLC, B-421002.2 et al.*, May 8, 2023, at 12. Our review of a price realism analysis is limited to determining whether it was reasonable and consistent with the terms of the solicitation. *Epic Sys., Inc., B-418104, B-418104.2*, Jan. 2, 2020, at 6.

Other than its disagreement, the protester has not demonstrated that the agency's comparison of specific labor rates to market rates was improper. As noted, the agency concluded that overall Peridot properly priced all solicitation requirements but nevertheless concluded that two positions presented "potential staffing risk" because the proposed labor rates were below market rates. Peridot does not rebut the conclusion that the rates were low, and its argument that the finding related to only two of 20 positions, neither of which were key, fails to demonstrate that the agency's conclusions were unreasonable. Accordingly, we deny this allegation.

enGenius also challenges the agency's price evaluation, arguing that DISA's evaluation of IFAS's price was unreasonable. Specifically, enGenius argues that its status as the incumbent contractor provided it with enhanced knowledge of the work to be done under the contract, and IFAS's proposed price--\$10 million below its own proposed price--indicates that IFAS underbid each CLIN.⁶ enGenius Protest at 10-12.

The record shows that in its evaluation of IFAS's price quotation, the agency concluded as follows:

IFAS proposed a total evaluated price approximately 13.1 [percent] above the IGCE. The Price Analyst found IFAS' [quotation] to be complete, well-supported, and internally consistent. The realism assessment identified no labor categories proposed below realistic thresholds. All labor rates were validated against [other government wide acquisition contracts, *i.e.*,] SETI, CIO-SP3, and GSA CALC+ benchmarks and were determined to be realistic.

IFAS proposed escalation rates of [DELETED] [percent], which were assessed as reasonable, and discounts ranging from [DELETED] [percent] to [DELETED] [percent] off its GSA MAS rates. The analyst documented no Evaluation Notices and took no exception to IFAS' price realism, indicating low assessed performance risk, despite the [quotation] being above the IGCE.

AR, Tab 4, PNM at 11. In comparison, the agency found enGenius's proposed price to be approximately 43 percent above the IGCE and specifically identified a rate for a

⁶ enGenius initially argued in the alternative that IFAS failed to use surge values required by the RFQ to propose its price. enGenius Protest at 10-12. However, enGenius later acknowledged that this was false. enGenius Comments & Supp. Protest at 7 ("enGenius now knows that IFAS *did* use the required 45 [percent] Surge in its total evaluated price."). Accordingly, we consider this allegation to be abandoned.

budget analyst proposed by its subcontractor that was unreasonably high when compared to market benchmarks. *Id.*

We find no merit to the protester's argument that the evaluation of IFAS's price was unreasonable. As an initial matter, we note that enGenius does not allege that the IGCE is unrealistically low or provide any explanation for why its proposed price was significantly higher, despite its "enhanced knowledge" of what it takes to perform the requirements. Regardless, none of its arguments demonstrate that the agency's conclusions were unreasonable or provide any basis for us to find that the agency should have concluded that IFAS's proposed price was unrealistically low. Accordingly, we deny this allegation.

Best-Value Tradeoff

Finally, both protesters challenge the best-value tradeoff decision. Peridot argues that DISA's determination that a single strength in IFAS's quotation under the technical capabilities factor justified a 21 percent (or approximately \$6.4 million) price premium was unreasonable. Peridot Protest at 12-14. enGenius argues the flaws in the evaluation resulted in an unreasonable best-value decision. enGenius Protest at 12-13.

Where, as here, a procurement is conducted pursuant to FAR subpart 8.4 and provides for source selection on a best-value tradeoff basis, it is the function of the selection official to perform a price/technical tradeoff. *RIVA Sols., Inc.*, B-418952, B-418952.2, Oct. 27, 2020, at 9. The purpose of the tradeoff is to determine whether the technical qualities of a quotation are worth the price as compared to the technical qualities and prices of competing quotations. This process is used to identify the quotation which represents the best value to the government. *Deloitte Consulting LLP; ManTech Advanced Sys. Int'l, Inc.*, B-420137.7 *et al.*, July 25, 2022, at 24. There is no need for extensive documentation of every consideration factored into a tradeoff decision; 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. *American Tech. Sols., LLC*, B-422212, B-422212.2, Feb. 27, 2024, at 8.

As noted, the RFQ stated that when combined the technical capabilities and management and administration factors were more important than price, and that award would be made on a best-value basis using a tradeoff evaluation process. RFQ at 8-9. As discussed, no strengths were identified in Peridot's quotation, and it was rated as acceptable/green under the technical capabilities and management and administration factors. AR, Tab 3, Selection Recommendation Document at 3-4. A strength was identified in IFAS's quotation under the technical capabilities factor, which was rated good/purple; no strengths were identified under the management and administration factor and IFAS's quotation was rated as acceptable/green. *Id.* at 6-7. No strengths were identified in the enGenius quotation under the technical capabilities factor, which was rated as acceptable/green; enGenius was rated as good/purple under the management and administration factor based on a strength identified. *Id.* at 5-6. As

between the three, Peridot's proposed price was the lowest and enGenius's was the highest. *Id.* at 3.

When providing their recommendation to the contracting officer, who also served as the source selection authority, the evaluators concluded that Peridot's acceptable technical and management approaches did not offer any strength or differentiating features that justified selecting its quotation over IFAS's which offered a strength under the technical capabilities factor. *Id.* at 9. As between enGenius and IFAS, the evaluators found that enGenius's quotation offered a management strength but IFAS's quotation offered a technical strength. While the factors were of equal importance, the evaluators concluded that IFAS's technical strength was of greater value to the government when considered against enGenius's management strength and higher price, and the IFAS quotation presented the best value to the government. *Id.* at 9.

In comparing IFAS and enGenius, the evaluators noted that enGenius offered a management-focused strength related to training and workforce development while IFAS offered a technical strength related to innovative automation and extensive DISA PPBE experience. AR, Tab 3, Selection Recommendation Document at 9. The evaluators concluded that IFAS's strength was of greater value because it offered a technical automation solution that would improve data accuracy, reduce rework and enhance financial decision support. *Id.* In contrast, the evaluators found that enGenius's strength did not provide benefits commensurate with its higher price because while it improved workforce readiness and continuity, it did not materially reduce technical performance risk beyond an already acceptable level, nor provide a unique capability that the government could not reasonably expect from IFAS's management approach. *Id.*

When performing the best-value tradeoff analysis, the contracting officer considered and agreed with the evaluation of the quotations under the technical capabilities and management and administration factors. AR, Tab 4, PNM at 12. The contracting officer further noted that as compared to the IGCE, Peridot's proposed price was 6.7 percent below while IFAS's and enGenius's proposed prices were 13.1 percent and 43.2 percent above the IGCE, respectively. *Id.* The contracting officer also noted that unlike Peridot and enGenius, there were no concerns with the labor rates proposed by IFAS. *Id.* Weighing these considerations, the contracting officer agreed with the evaluators that the IFAS quotation would provide the best value to the government and selected IFAS for award. On this record, we find the selection decision to be reasonable. To the extent the protesters express their disagreement with the agency's decision, such disagreement does not demonstrate that the tradeoff decision was unreasonable.

The protests are denied.

Edda Emmanuelli Perez
General Counsel