



DOCUMENT FOR PUBLIC RELEASE

The decision issued on the date below was subject to a GAO Protective Order. The entire decision has been approved for public release.

Decision

Matter of: INTECON LLC

File: B-424573; B-424573.2

Date: September 14, 2026

Eric S. Crusius, Esq., and Kevin E. Gaunt, Esq., Hunton Andrews Kurth LLP, for the protester.

Diana L. King, Esq., Department of the Navy, for the agency.

Michelle Litteken, Esq., and April Y. Shields, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, GAO, participated in the preparation of the decision.

DIGEST

Protest challenging the agency's evaluation of the protester's proposal under the organizational experience evaluation factor is denied where the evaluation was reasonable and consistent with the terms of the solicitation.

DECISION

INTECON, LLC, of Fredericksburg, Virginia, protests the non-selection of its proposal for award under request for proposals (RFP) No. N66001-26-R-0019, issued by the Department of the Navy, Naval Information Warfare Systems Command, for development, technical, management, and engineering services for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) systems and information operations.¹ The protester challenges various aspects of the agency's evaluation of INTECON's proposal.

We deny the protest.

¹ The agency awarded 16 contracts under the RFP. Contracting Officer's Statement (COS) at 1-2. Aside from the discrete disparate treatment allegations discussed below, INTECON is not challenging the agency's award decision as it pertains to any of the awardees. Protest at 2 n.1.

BACKGROUND

On December 16, 2025, pursuant to the procedures of Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) part 15, the Navy issued the solicitation for a multiple-award indefinite-delivery, indefinite-quantity (IDIQ) contract to provide research, development, test and evaluation services, and technical engineering services in support of projects to develop and field ISR systems. Agency Report (AR), Exh. 4, RFP at 1, 10. The RFP contemplated the award of multiple IDIQ contracts, each with a 7-year period of performance, and a combined ceiling value of \$349,993,874. *Id.* at 2, 29.

The RFP established that the agency would use a three-step methodology to evaluate proposals and select qualifying proposals for award. RFP at 131. In step one, the Navy would evaluate acceptability based on the offeror's assent to the terms and conditions of the solicitation. *Id.* at 131-32. In step two, the agency would assess capability through the evaluation of three factors: organizational experience, past performance, and small business participation. *Id.* at 132-33. In step three, "contracts [would] be awarded to all qualifying offerors that: are determined to be a responsible source; submit a technically acceptable proposal that conforms to the requirements of the solicitation; and the Contracting Officer has no reason to believe would be likely to offer other than fair and reasonable pricing." *Id.* at 131. The solicitation defined a technically acceptable proposal as "a proposal that receives a rating of *Acceptable* or above in all evaluation factors, other than Past Performance. For Past Performance, an offeror must receive a confidence assessment rating of *Neutral Confidence*, *Satisfactory Confidence*, or *Substantial Confidence* for the Past Performance factor." *Id.* at 134. The agency would not perform a tradeoff analysis, and it would not evaluate cost or price.² *Id.* at 131.

As relevant here, for the organizational experience factor, offerors were instructed to submit no more than three references to show the offeror's organizational experience in four key areas: (1) software engineering for Department of Defense (DOD) ISR systems; (2) test and evaluation for DOD ISR systems; (3) system engineering for DOD ISR systems; and (4) integration of DOD ISR systems.³ RFP at 127. The Navy would

² The solicitation did not require the submission of any pricing information. Offerors were required to submit cost-related information, such as the offeror's policy for uncompensated overtime, accounting system information, and information regarding the general financial condition of the firm. RFP at 125-26. The RFP stated that the agency would consider price or cost as a factor in the source selection decision for each task or delivery order issued under the IDIQ contract. *Id.* at 131.

³ The solicitation provided that ISR systems included "surveillance programs, systems, networks and tactical data communications systems including automated radio communications systems, satellite terminal systems and space, air, land & water autonomous or non-autonomous systems that could be used in ISR operations." RFP at 10.

assess the breadth, depth, and relevance of the offeror's organizational experience in the key areas, and it would assign each proposal an adjectival rating of outstanding, good, acceptable, marginal, or unacceptable.⁴ RFP at 132. The solicitation provided that "ratings may be maximized for offerors who . . . cited organizational experience references that collectively demonstrate maximum breadth and depth of relevant experience in the Key Areas." *Id.* The solicitation stated: "[a]n offeror's organizational experience is relevant when it has been confronted with the kinds of challenges it will likely face under the contract contemplated by this RFP."⁵ *Id.*

The three references submitted under the organizational experience factor would also be used to evaluate past performance. RFP at 128. In the past performance evaluation, the Navy would consider the offeror's record supplying "products and services that meet the contract's requirements and, specifically, in the Key Areas." *Id.* at 132. The agency would evaluate the recency, "collective relevance," and "the overall quality and usefulness of the offeror's past performance."⁶ *Id.* The agency would then assign one of the following performance confidence assessment ratings: substantial confidence, satisfactory confidence, neutral confidence, limited confidence, or no confidence. *Id.* at 133.

During the question and answer (Q&A) process for the RFP, potential offerors submitted questions asking the agency to define or clarify the four key areas identified in the solicitation. For example, one potential offeror asked: "[f]or evaluation purposes, please provide definitions for each of the four Key Areas required for Organizational Experience?" AR, Exh. 5, Q&A at 2.⁷ The agency responded: "[d]efinitions are not provided for the four Key Areas; they are sufficient to inform our source selection." *Id.* Another potential offeror asked: "[t]he title of the [statement of work] and the Introduction mention Information Operation (IO), but the Key Areas only mention DoD ISR systems. Can the government please confirm 'DoD ISR' in the Key Areas is a holistic term meant to encompass ISR and IO systems?" *Id.* at 10. The Navy

⁴ As relevant here, the agency defined a marginal rating as "[p]roposal has not demonstrated adequate experience, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is high," and it defined an acceptable rating as "[p]roposal demonstrates adequate experience, and risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate." AR, Exh. 6, Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) Report at 151.

⁵ In addition, the RFP stated: "[r]elevance may include, but is not limited to, similarity of work contemplated under the RFP with respect to complexity, length of performance, number of tasks, scope, type of work, and value." RFP at 132.

⁶ The definition provided for relevancy under the past performance factor mirrored the definition provided for evaluating organizational experience. RFP at 132. In evaluating quality, the agency would assess schedule, cost control, management, utilization of small business, and regulatory compliance. *Id.* at 132-33.

⁷ The Q&A is not paginated. All citations to the Q&A refer to the PDF page numbers.

responded: “[t]he Key Areas are sufficient as written, and the Government is basing its evaluation on the Key Areas.” *Id.*

The agency received 34 proposals, including the proposal submitted by INTECON, prior to the RFP’s February 3, 2026 closing date. COS at 4. When the SSEB evaluated INTECON’s proposal in step one, the SSEB rated the proposal as acceptable. AR, Exh. 6, SSEB Report at 150. When the SSEB evaluated the protester’s proposal in step two, of relevance here, the SSEB rated the proposal as marginal under the organizational experience factor and limited confidence under the past performance factor.

Specifically, under the organizational experience factor, the agency assessed a significant weakness under the first and fourth key areas, and a weakness under each of the other two key areas in INTECON’s proposal. AR, Exh. 6, SSEB Report at 153-54. For example, when the SSEB evaluated the protester’s proposal under the integration of DOD ISR systems key area, the agency assessed a significant weakness after finding that INTECON’s references “did not sufficiently demonstrate experience with the integration of DoD ISR systems.” *Id.* at 154. In reaching this conclusion, the SSEB noted that one of INTECON’s references involved the National Leadership Command Capability, a non-ISR system, and the other reference concerned the integration of “an unspecified system into the broader [Nuclear Command, Control, and Communications (NC3)] enterprise.” *Id.* The SSEB also noted that for each experience reference, INTECON “did not provide sufficient detail on the integration activities to demonstrate the scope or magnitude of the integration experience.” *Id.*

The SSEB considered the evaluation findings under the four key areas and found that INTECON’s proposal did not demonstrate adequate experience. AR, Exh. 6, SSEB Report at 154. For example, for the software engineering for DOD ISR systems key area, the SSEB wrote: “[r]eferences [one] and [two] demonstrate little to no experience in software development, software engineering or management processes. Furthermore, the references do not show that the offeror directly works for or fields capability through a DoD ISR program.” *Id.* In this vein, for each key area, the SSEB noted that INTECON lacked experience specific to DOD ISR systems. *Id.* at 154-55. The SSEB concluded: “[o]verall, the offeror demonstrated little to no experience in two key areas, and limited experience in two key areas. The offeror is unlikely to be able to perform the work contemplated by this RFP.” *Id.* at 155.

The SSEB then evaluated INTECON’s proposal under the past performance factor. The SSEB first compared the references to the RFP’s four key areas and noted the types of work that INTECON had performed and those for which it lacked experience.⁸

⁸ For example, for the systems engineering for DOD ISR systems key area, the SSEB wrote: “the offeror covered creating some systems engineering artifacts, such as [concept of operations], but did not adequately cover systems engineering experience (continued...) ”

AR, Exh. 6, SSEB Report at 159. The evaluators found that INTECON's references "involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities" required by the solicitation and rated the references as somewhat relevant. *Id.* With respect to quality, the SSEB found that INTECON had received ratings of satisfactory or better on every reference. *Id.* at 160. The evaluators considered the relevance and quality of INTECON's past performance and wrote: "although the offeror has performed at least satisfactorily on somewhat relevant work, the Government has a low expectation that the offeror would successfully perform the required effort." *Id.*

The source selection advisory council (SSAC) reviewed the SSEB's findings. AR, Exh. 9, SSAC Report at 2. The SSAC noted that to be eligible for award, a proposal must receive a rating of acceptable or above for evaluation factors other than past performance, and for past performance, a rating of neutral, satisfactory, or substantial confidence. *Id.* at 4. The SSAC concurred with the SSEB's findings, and because INTECON's proposal was assigned a rating of marginal under the organizational experience factor, and a rating of limited confidence under the past performance factor, the SSAC did not recommend INTECON's proposal for award. *Id.* at 3-4.

On June 1, the agency notified INTECON that its proposal had not been selected for award. Protest, exh. D, Unsuccessful Offeror Notice at 1. This protest followed.

DISCUSSION

The protester challenges the agency's evaluation of INTECON's proposal under the organizational experience and past performance factors. While we do not address in detail every argument, or permutation thereof, raised by the protester, we have considered them all and find none provides a basis to sustain the protest.

Organizational Experience Evaluation

The protester challenges various aspects of the agency's evaluation of INTECON's proposal under the organizational experience factor. We discuss below several representative examples of the protester's allegations.

At the outset, we note that where a protester challenges the evaluation of its experience, our Office will examine the evaluation record to determine whether the agency's judgments were reasonable and consistent with the solicitation. *A&D Gen. Contracting, Inc.*, B-409429, Apr. 17, 2014, at 2. Where a solicitation provides for the evaluation of an offeror's experience, the agency has broad discretion to determine the extent to which a particular reference contract is relevant to the agency's requirement. *Id.* Our review recognizes that the evaluation of experience involves subjective

(...continued)

for a DoD ISR acquisition program or formal systems engineering expertise for an ISR system." AR, Exh. 6, SSEB Report at 159.

judgments, so we will not substitute our judgment for the agency's reasonably-based evaluation ratings. See *Obayashi-JPS JV*, B-407792, Jan. 29, 2013, at 3.

Moreover, although agencies are required to identify in a solicitation all major evaluation factors, they are not required to specifically identify each and every element an agency considers during an evaluation. FAR 15-304(d). Rather, as a general matter, an agency properly may take into account specific, albeit not expressly identified, matters that are logically encompassed by or related to the stated evaluation criteria. *UDC USA, Inc.*, B-419671, June 21, 2021, at 5. When a protester challenges an evaluation as unfairly utilizing unstated evaluation criteria, our Office will assess whether the solicitation reasonably informed offerors of the basis for the evaluation. *ERP Servs., Inc.*, B-419315, Feb. 24, 2021, at 3.

Undisclosed Direct ISR Experience Requirement

We first address INTECON's argument that the agency applied an undisclosed requirement under all four key areas when the Navy downgraded the protester's proposal for demonstrating experience with ISR-enabling or ISR-related systems, as opposed to direct ISR systems. Protest at 8-10; Comments & Supp. Protest at 1-4. In this regard, INTECON contends that the Navy "repeatedly downgraded INTECON because its experience was not for what the Agency later characterized as a direct ISR system." Protest at 9.

For example, in evaluating the protester's experience references under the test and evaluation key area, the SSEB wrote: "although the offeror stated that it supported an 'ISR-related system,' the system supported is not an ISR system." AR, Exh. 6, SSEB Report at 153. The evaluators continued: "while the offeror demonstrated experience supporting test planning, execution, and assessment activities in both references with non-ISR systems, the proposal did not provide sufficient detail to demonstrate experience conducting the tests or creating the required test documentation to show experience with the test and evaluation of DoD ISR systems." *Id.*

INTECON argues the agency's evaluation was unreasonable because "[t]he solicitation did not define [DOD ISR Systems], did not establish boundaries between direct ISR systems and ISR-enabling systems, and did not tell offerors that ISR-related, ISR-enabling, NC3, command-and-control, sensor, communications, or missile-defense architectures would be excluded from consideration even where they supported ISR missions." Protest at 9. INTECON notes that the agency declined to define "DoD ISR systems" or the key areas during the Q&A process for the RFP, and as a result, the terms must be construed broadly such that experience with ISR-enabling systems would be evaluated as equivalent to experience with ISR systems. See Comments & Supp. Protest at 4.

The Navy responds that the solicitation was plain and unambiguous, and if INTECON believed that the agency's responses during the Q&A process were insufficient, the protester should have filed a pre-award protest. Memorandum of Law (MOL) at 7;

Supp. MOL at 5-6. In addition, the agency responds that offerors were not required to “submit direct DoD ISR experience. However, it was incumbent on each offeror to explain the relevance of its experience to the work contemplated under the RFP.” Supp. MOL at 3.

Where a protester and agency disagree over the meaning of solicitation language, we will resolve the matter by reading the solicitation as a whole and in a manner that gives effect to all of its provisions; to be reasonable, and therefore valid, an interpretation must be consistent with the solicitation when read as a whole and in a reasonable manner. *Constructure-Trison JV, LLC*, B-416741.2, Nov. 21, 2018, at 3. An ambiguity exists where two or more reasonable interpretations of the terms or specifications of the solicitation are possible.⁹ *Colt Def., LLC*, B-406696, July 24, 2012, at 8. Where, before the deadline for proposal submission, a protester is aware of an ambiguity, such as a solicitation’s lack of clarity, that ambiguity is patent, and a protest of the ambiguity is timely only if filed before the proposal deadline. *ConsortiEX, Inc.*, B-422078, B-422078.2, Dec. 22, 2023, at 5; see *Cybergenic Sys., LLC*, B-421213, Jan. 19, 2023, at 4; 4 C.F.R. § 21.2(a)(1).

As an initial matter, we agree with the Navy that to the extent that INTECON contends that the RFP was vague with respect to the meaning of DOD ISR systems, the protester’s argument constitutes an untimely challenge to the terms of the solicitation because it was not raised prior to the closing date for receipt of proposals. *ConsortiEX, supra* at 5-7 (dismissing arguments premised on the alleged vagueness of the solicitation as untimely). Having failed to do so, INTECON may not now assert that the only legally permissible interpretation of the language is its own. See *Allied Tech. Grp., Inc.*, B-402135, B-402135.2, Jan. 21, 2010, at 9 n.10.

Furthermore, we find that the protester’s interpretation of the RFP (*i.e.*, that experience with ISR-enabling systems is equivalent to experience with ISR systems) is unreasonable. As noted above, the RFP provided that proposals with “organizational experience references that collectively demonstrate maximum breadth and depth of relevant experience in the Key Areas” would be better rated. RFP at 132. The RFP stated that relevance included similarity to the work contemplated under the solicitation, and the solicitation sought technical services “in support of ISR activities, ISR systems and corresponding cybersecurity operations.” *Id.* at 10, 132. In this context, the agency reasonably viewed experience supporting an ISR-enabling system as less relevant than experience supporting an ISR system--the work contemplated under the RFP. The protester does not dispute that its experience references were not directly for ISR systems, and we find nothing objectionable in the agency evaluating experience with an

⁹ A patent ambiguity exists where the solicitation contains an obvious, gross, or glaring error, while a latent ambiguity is more subtle; a latent ambiguity exists when, for example, the solicitation is susceptible to two reasonable interpretations that do not rely on conflicting solicitation terms. *IBM Corp., IBM Consulting--Fed.*, B-421471 *et al.*, June 1, 2023, at 11.

actual ISR system more favorably than experience with an ISR-related system. Accordingly, we reject the protester's argument. See *A&D Gen. Contracting, supra*.

Unequal Evaluation

In a similar vein, the protester alleges that the Navy engaged in disparate treatment because the SSEB "credited other offerors for the same categories of experience it discounted for INTECON, such as [command and control (C2)]/NC3 work, ISR-enabling experience, non-ISR DoD program experience, and integration of non-ISR systems into ISR-related architectures." Comments & Supp. Protest at 5-7. The agency responds that the protester's allegation "rests on the false premise that its experience was materially similar" to the experience of the awardees. Supp. MOL at 7. In addition, the Navy states that INTECON "mischaracterizes the evaluation process by focusing on isolated negative remarks within specific references" when the agency evaluated an offeror's collective experience across all references. *Id.* at 7-8. Below, we address two representative examples of the alleged disparate treatment.

It is a fundamental principle of federal procurement law that a contracting agency must treat all offerors equally and evaluate their proposals evenhandedly against the solicitation's requirements and evaluation criteria. *Abacus Tech. Corp.; SMS Data Prods. Grp., Inc.*, B-413421 *et al.*, Oct. 28, 2016, at 11. Where a protester alleges unequal treatment in a technical evaluation, it must show that the differences in the evaluation did not stem from differences between the proposals. *Nexant Inc.*, B-417421, B-417421.2, June 26, 2019, at 10. To prevail on an allegation of disparate treatment, a protester must show that an agency unreasonably failed to assess strengths for aspects of its submission that were substantively indistinguishable from, or nearly identical to, those contained in other submissions. See *Battelle Mem'l Inst.*, B-418047.3, B-418047.4, May 18, 2020, at 5.

As a first example, we address INTECON's allegation that the Navy engaged in unequal treatment under the software engineering key area when the SSEB credited another offeror whose proposal was selected for award (referred to here as "Offeror A") with having relevant ISR experience for developing a C2 application for unmanned underwater vehicles, while, at the same time, the SSEB characterized INTECON's NC3/C2 software engineering experience as "not directly for an ISR system." Comments & Supp. Protest at 6 (quoting AR, Exh. 6, SSEB Report at 153).

We have reviewed the record and find no support for INTECON's allegation. As the agency notes, Offeror A submitted three experience references, one of which was the aforementioned reference developing a C2 application, which the SSEB noted was "not directly related to the ISR domain." AR, Exh. 6, SSEB Report at 180. The SSEB considered Offeror A's two other experience references and noted one involved "software development of ISR autonomous unmanned systems capabilities," and the other involved "software development of operational ISR capabilities for Unmanned Systems." *Id.* The SSEB viewed the references collectively and found that two of the references "show[ed] significant software development experience on operational DoD

ISR Systems,” and the agency assessed a significant strength for this aspect of Offeror A’s proposal. *Id.* When the SSEB evaluated the protester’s two references, the evaluators found that neither reference demonstrated experience directly working for or fielding capability through a DOD ISR system. *Id.* at 153.

Here, the protester has not shown that the offerors’ proposals were substantively indistinguishable. Offeror A’s proposal included two references that involved developing software in the ISR domain, and INTECON’s proposal did not include any comparable experience references. INTECON’s selective (and inaccurate) comparison of the Navy’s evaluation of proposals fails to demonstrate that the evaluation was unequal or otherwise unreasonable. *See, e.g., Blue Origin Fed’n, LLC; Dynetics, Inc.--A Leidos Co., B-419783 et al.*, July 30, 2021, at 44 (denying allegation of disparate evaluation where protester’s “selective and broad comparison of [the agency’s] evaluation of the offerors’ respective proposals fail[ed] to demonstrate that [the] evaluation was unequal or otherwise unreasonable”).

As a second example, we address the protester’s contention that the Navy engaged in unequal treatment when the SSEB assessed a strength to the proposal submitted by another offeror whose proposal was also selected for award (referred to here as “Offeror B”) under the integration of DOD ISR systems key area. The entirety of INTECON’s allegation is provided below.

[Offeror B] also received a Key Area 4 Strength for “procuring and standing up/checking out the full material stack” “for Naval C4ISR solutions” even though [Offeror B] “did not demonstrate experience being the responsible party for defining/creating/building the interfaces.” INTECON, on the other hand, received a [key area four] Significant Weakness for integrating [National Leadership Command Capability] “into the broader NC3 enterprise” integration at a higher architectural level because of insufficient “scope and magnitude.”

Comments & Supp. Protest at 6 (internal citations omitted).

As an initial matter, INTECON has not explained how its experience references were substantively indistinguishable from Offeror B’s references. Furthermore, the record does not support the protester’s allegation of unequal treatment. In this regard, the record shows that Offeror B submitted three experience references, and the SSEB found that the references collectively “demonstrated experience with both hardware and software integration.” AR, Exh. 6, SSEB Report at 398-99. The SSEB noted that one of Offeror B’s references “demonstrated experience providing integration services at an integration facility for Naval C4ISR solutions,” and another reference “showed experience integrating an ISR-related tool with existing data flows and processing chains.” *Id.* at 399. Stated differently, at least one of Offeror B’s experience references involved an ISR system, and the SSEB found that Offeror B’s references collectively demonstrated experience integrating DOD ISR systems. *Id.*

In contrast, as noted above, INTECON submitted two references, neither of which involved an ISR system. AR, Exh. 6, SSEB Report at 154. The SSEB assessed a significant weakness in INTECON's proposal because the evaluators found that INTECON's references "demonstrated little to no experience in the area of Integration of DoD ISR Systems." *Id.* The SSEB noted that "the experience that was mentioned was not for ISR systems." *Id.* In other words, INTECON did not demonstrate experience comparable to Offeror B's experience, *i.e.*, experiencing integrating a DOD ISR system. There is no evidence of disparate treatment. Accordingly, we reject INTECON's argument.

Integration of DOD ISR Systems

We next address INTECON's allegations regarding the agency's evaluation of the protester's proposal under the integration of DOD ISR systems key area. As noted above, the SSEB assessed a significant weakness in this key area after finding that INTECON "demonstrated little to no experience" in this area, and the proposal "did not provide sufficient detail on the integration activities to demonstrate the scope or magnitude of the integration experience." AR, Exh. 6, SSEB Report at 154. INTECON complains that the agency unreasonably evaluated the protester's proposal under the integration of DOD ISR systems key area by imposing an undisclosed scope or magnitude requirement and by failing to credit INTECON for its experience. Protest at 14-15; Comments & Supp. Protest at 3. The Navy defends the evaluation, stating that INTECON's proposal "failed to provide any specific, verifiable details that would allow evaluators to assess the complexity, scale, or relevance of this work," and "[w]ithout such details, the Agency could not determine if the experience met the requirements of the [statement of work]." MOL at 10. The agency also states that scope and magnitude are "are intrinsic aspects of any qualitative assessment of experience." *Id.* at 11.

Our review of the record supports the reasonableness of the agency's evaluation. To begin, we disagree that the agency applied unstated scope and magnitude requirements. As noted above, as a general matter, an agency properly may take into account specific, albeit not expressly identified, matters that are logically encompassed by or related to the stated evaluation criteria. *UDC USA, supra*. Here, the RFP provided that the agency would assess the relevance of the offeror's experience, which included, but was not limited to "complexity, length of performance, number of tasks, scope, type of work, and value." RFP at 132. The protester's objection to the agency's consideration of scope lacks merit, as scope was a component of the RFP's definition of relevance. Furthermore, we find magnitude was logically encompassed by the stated evaluation criteria, as magnitude is directly related to the stated indicators of relevance (*e.g.*, number of tasks, type of work, and value). We also reject INTECON's allegation that the agency applied an undisclosed standard for scope and magnitude because the solicitation "did not define any required scope or magnitude threshold" for this key area. Protest at 15. Again, the RFP provided that relevance was measured based on similarity to the work contemplated under the solicitation. RFP at 132.

Additionally, we see no basis to object to the SSEB's finding that INTECON's proposal did not provide sufficient detail for the agency to assess the scope or magnitude of INTECON's experience. The protester contends that its proposal provided sufficient detail because the proposal "stated that it 'supported integration of ISR sensors, operational software, networks, and command-and-control systems into fielded missile defense architectures,' and it coordinated across "directorates, Service components, Combatant Commands, and prime contractors to ensure interoperability, operational readiness, and transition of ISR capabilities from development to operational use in joint and real-world environments." Protest at 14-15 (quoting AR, Exh. 7, Proposal at 11). We disagree. The protester has not identified any language in its proposal that provided specific and verifiable information regarding the scope and magnitude of the work performed. Instead, the protester points to high-level and generic descriptions of tasks performed, without any explanation as to the size, scale, or nature of the work. INTECON's disagreement with the agency's judgments does not provide a basis to sustain this protest. See *Obayashi-JPS JV, supra*.

In sum, we have reviewed the record, and we reject all of INTECON's various complaints regarding the agency's evaluation of its quotation and assignment of a marginal rating under the organizational experience factor. Accordingly, its protest challenging that evaluation is denied.

Past Performance

INTECON also challenges the Navy's past performance evaluation, primarily asserting that the agency did not consider quality when it assigned INTECON's proposal a rating of limited confidence. Protest at 10-11; Comments & Supp. Protest at 7-8.

In order for a protest to be considered by our Office, a protester must be an interested party, that is, an actual or prospective offeror whose direct economic interest would be affected by the award or failure to award a contract. 4 C.F.R. §§ 21.0(a)(1), 21.1(a); *Two Knights Def., LLC*, B-421053.2, Apr. 30, 2024, at 9. A firm is not an interested party if it is ineligible to receive award under the protested solicitation, or if it would not be in line for award if the protest were sustained. *Trailboss Enters. Inc.*, B-419209, Dec. 23, 2020, at 8-9.

As noted above, to be considered a qualifying proposal eligible for award, a proposal was required to be rated as technically acceptable. RFP at 131. The RFP defined a technically acceptable proposal as "a proposal that receives a rating of *Acceptable* or above in all evaluation factors, other than Past Performance." *Id.* As discussed above, we have found the agency's decision to rate INTECON's proposal as marginal under the organizational experience factor--making INTECON ineligible for award--was reasonable and consistent with the terms of the solicitation. Consequently, even if INTECON were correct as to its remaining allegations, it still would be ineligible for

award of the contract. The protester therefore lacks the direct economic interest necessary to be an interested party to maintain this protest. We therefore dismiss the remaining allegations. *Trailboss Enters., supra*; see also *Two Knights Def., supra*.

The protest is denied.

Edda Emmanuelli Perez
General Counsel