U.S. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE

441 G St. N.W.
Washington, DC 20548

Comptroller General
of the United States

Decision

Matter of: Cinteot, Inc.

File: B-424433.18

Date: September 28, 2026

David Kachmar for the protester.
Jonathan A. Hardage, Esq., Brittany N. York, Esq., Adam R. Bosse, Esq., and Betty W. Irungu, Esq., Department of the Army, for the agency.
Emily R. O'Hara, Esq., and Peter H. Tran, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, GAO, participated in the preparation of the decision.

DIGEST

1. Protest challenging the procurement process and terms of the solicitation is denied where offerors are able to compete intelligently and on a common basis.

2. Protest challenging the time set to respond to solicitation amendments is denied where the agency allowed sufficient time after amendment of the solicitation for revision of proposals.

3. Protest challenging inclusion of an allegedly defective form is denied where any defect was resolved by clear instructions from the agency and would not otherwise prevent offerors from competing on a common basis.

DECISION

Cinteot, Inc., a small business of Chambersburg, Pennsylvania, protests the terms of request for proposals (RFP) No. W15P7T26RA006, issued by the Department of the Army for a variety of professional services. The protester contends the solicitation contains various flaws, and that these flaws prevent offerors from competing intelligently and on a common basis.

We deny the protest.

BACKGROUND

On April 1, 2026, the Army issued the solicitation using the procedures of Revolutionary Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Overhaul (RFO) part 15.[1] Agency Report (AR), Base Contracting Officer's Statement (Base COS) at 6; AR, Tab 15, RFP at 1, 4, 243.[2] The solicitation contemplates the award of multiple indefinite-delivery, indefinite-quantity (IDIQ) contracts to establish a marketplace for the acquisition of professional services (MAPS), which will combine services currently procured under two different sets of multiple-award IDIQ contracts into a single procurement vehicle intended to provide "uncommon knowledge-based professional services and support [for] the Army enterprise infrastructure and infostructure goals with information technology (IT) services worldwide."[3] RFP at 2-3.

The MAPS solicitation divides intended awards into five "domains" covering the following technical support areas: (1) engineering, logistics and operational services; (2) research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E) services; (3) management and advisory services; (4) emerging IT services; and (5) foundational IT services. *Id.* at 3. The Army "intends to make 70 awards per Domain (30 Large Businesses, 25 Small Businesses, and 15 Commercial-Sector Vendors in each)" for up to 350 awards, "but reserves the right to upward or downward adjust the number of awards without limit." *Id.* at 243. The types of orders permitted under the awarded IDIQ contracts will include fixed price, time-and-materials, cost reimbursement, and hybrids "of all types." *Id.* at 5. The awarded IDIQ contracts will have a base ordering period of 5-years with one 5-year optional ordering period. *Id.* at 4, 20. The maximum contract ceiling, including the optional ordering period, will be $50 billion, and the minimum guarantee for each awarded contract will be $100. *Id.* at 2, 29.

The solicitation provides that awards will be made to the "Highest Rated Technical Offerors," proposing fair and reasonable prices in each domain without tradeoffs between price and non-price factors. RFP at 243. The agency will use a phased and rolling evaluation process that takes into consideration offerors' verified scorecards, past performance qualifying projects (QPs), price (assessed for reasonableness), and,

---

[1] The Department of Defense (DOD) issued a DOD-wide class deviation adopting the policies and procedures of RFO part 15 effective March 16, 2026. AR, Tab 18, RFO DOD Deviation Table at 2. The solicitation also incorporates policies, procedures, clauses, and provisions from other parts of the RFO, for which similar DOD-wide class deviations have been issued. *See generally* AR, Tab 18, RFO DOD Deviation Table with attachs.

[2] Our citations use the Adobe PDF pagination of documents in the record. The solicitation was amended 10 times; unless otherwise noted our citations to the solicitation are to RFP amendment 10 at tab 15 of the agency report.

[3] The two multiple-award IDIQ contract vehicles being combined to form MAPS are the Army's Responsive Strategic Sourcing for Services (RS3) and Information Technology Enterprise Solutions-3 Services (ITES-3S) IDIQ contracts. RFP at 3.

for large business offerors, their small business subcontracting plans. *Id.* at 243-246, 256-257.

The agency explains the four-phased rolling evaluation process as follows:

> In Phase 1, proposals are organized in descending order based strictly on the Offeror's self-assigned scorecard total. During Phase 2, the Government conducts a Verification Review, systematically examining the submitted supporting documentation to validate the Offeror's self-scores. Crucially, the Army will never increase an Offeror's score–-only downwardly adjust Offerors' self-scores, potentially to zero points, for unsubstantiated or undocumented claims. This verification results in a "Verified Score" that is equal to or less than the Offeror's initial self-score.
>
> If an Offeror's score is reduced, a Rolling Evaluation Procedure is triggered, whereby the proposal is re-organized by the Verified Score, and the Government pulls the next-highest scored proposal into the verification process. This iterative verification continues until the top 70 Verified Scores are established within each Domain. In the event of a tie, the Solicitation provides a progressive tie-breaker methodology based initially on the highest percentage of "Exceptional" CPARS [contractor performance assessment reporting system] or PPQ [past performance questionnaire] ratings. In Phase 3, the preliminary prospective awardees undergo a formal responsibility determination, aided by the Determination of Responsibility Assistant (DORA) bot, alongside a review of any required subcontracting plans. If a prospective awardee is deemed ineligible during Phase 3, it is eliminated from consideration and replaced by the Offeror holding the next-highest Verified Score. Finally, Phase 4 formally designates the top 70 eligible, verified Offerors per Domain as the final contract awardees.

Base COS at 16 (internal citations to RFP at 243-246 omitted).[4] The solicitation requires offerors to submit proposals "through the Digital Market Portal" (Portal), and for proposals to consist of the following volumes: (I) cover letter; (II) scorecard; (III) past performance QPs; and, (IV) small business subcontracting plan, to be submitted only by large business offerors. RFP at 200-201. For the first three proposal volumes, the

---

[4] The DORA bot is an automation tool Army contracting officials are required to use to assist them in making responsibility determinations. Army Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (AFARS) 5109.103(b); AFARS Procedures, Guidance, and Information (PGI) 5109.103(b)-1. The bot pulls information from the System for Award Management (SAM.gov) and Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System and creates summary reports, populates a memorandum template with a summary of results, and sends all attachments to contracting personnel. AFARS PGI 5109.103(b)-1(a), (b).

solicitation includes attachments offerors are required to use as part of their proposal submissions. *Id.* at 200-201, 205-206, 217.

Among other things, section L of the solicitation sets out instructions for the information required to be included with the cover letter; how to complete the scorecard; and the various definitions applicable to past performance QPs (*e.g.,* total contract value, level of effort, outcome-based QP, recency, relevancy, North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code alignment, completeness, *etc.*). RFP *generally* at 204-227. Solicitation section M explains how the evaluators will verify offerors' self-scored scorecards, review QPs, and establishes the points available under the various evaluation criteria. *Id. generally* at 243-256.

The initial solicitation, issued on April 1, established a proposal due date of May 1. Base COS at 6. Relevant here, the Army amended the solicitation multiple times, with amendment 7 extending the due date for receipt of proposals to June 22.[5] *Id.* at 10. On May 22, the agency issued amendment 8, which, according to the agency "was a substantial overhaul of the MAPS Solicitation where the Army eliminated, revised, and enhanced Solicitation requirements extensively." *Id.* at 10. The Army then issued RFP amendment 9 on June 2, to clarify and update the scorecard attachment; this amendment maintained the June 22 due date for receipt of proposals. *Id.* at 11. The Army amended the solicitation once more via RFP amendment 10 on June 18. *Id.* at 13. The solicitation closed on June 22. *Id.* at 14.

Cinteot timely filed this protest on June 22, before the solicitation closed.

DISCUSSION

The protester challenges multiple aspects of the MAPS solicitation. First, Cinteot challenges the manner in which the agency issued amendments to the solicitation, as well as challenges to the terms of the solicitation, itself. Protest at 5. Second, the protester argues that the agency failed to give offerors a reasonable amount of time to respond to solicitation amendments. *Id.* at 6. Lastly, Cinteot alleges that offerors were unable to compete intelligently and on a common basis because one required form was

---

[5] Several firms protested the terms of the MAPS solicitation prior to the proposal submission deadlines established by earlier amendments as well as the most recent June 22 submission due date. Many of those protests were withdrawn or dismissed as academic. Additionally, our Office previously issued four published decisions involving the MAPS solicitation. *See JAAW Group, LLC*, B 424433.22, July 31, 2026 (dismissed for failing to state a factually sufficient basis of protest); *Intelligence Consulting Enterprise Sols., Inc.*, B-424433.3, B-424433.7, Aug. 11, 2026 (sustained in part and denied in part challenges to the terms of the MAPS solicitation); *Aim for AdVantage, LLC*, B-424433.23, Aug. 31, 2026 (dismissed for abuse of our bid protest process); *Kearney & Co., P.C. et al.*, B-424433.14 *et al.*, Sept. 21, 2026 (denied challenges to the terms of the MAPS solicitation).

defective. *Id.* at 7. While we do not address every allegation, we have reviewed the entire record, and we find no basis to sustain the protest.

Alleged Flaws in the Procurement Process

Cinteot takes issue with various aspects of the agency's issuance of the solicitation amendments, as well as what the protester describes as "contradictory instructions" contained in the RFP. Protest at 5-6. We have reviewed the protester's allegations, and none provide a basis to sustain. We discuss a few representative examples below.

Solicitation and Amendment Posting

The protester contends that the manner in which the Army posted solicitation amendments on SAM.gov was improper.[6] *Id.* at 5. Specifically, Cinteot alleges the agency "posted each Amendment and update as new, independent SAM.gov records with unique weblinks, rather than utilizing the standard amendment notification stream," arguing that this practice "obscures the record, prevents offerors from verifying the binding version of the solicitation, and creates a significant risk that offerors will operate under outdated or contradictory terms." *Id.* According to Cinteot, "[a]ny Offeror which used the [SAM].gov process to 'follow' an RFP to receive updates would have not received any updates because none of the dozen or so different postings were ever updated." *Id.*

The Army asserts the protester's claims of confusion created by the agency's manner of posting solicitation amendments "are self-defeating" as "Cinteot successfully tracked amendments on SAM.gov and identified specific numerical changes within the Solicitation" to formulate its protest arguments, thereby undermining Cinteot's assertion that the independent links "obscure the record." Memorandum of Law (MOL) at 11. Further, the Army argues it "is well-settled law that knowledge of an Agency posting on [SAM.gov] is imputed to all potential offerors" as they are "charged with constructive notice of procurement actions published on [SAM.gov]."[7] *Id.* at 12.

Here, consistent with the requirements of the RFO, the contracting officer posted the MAPS solicitation and its amendments on SAM.gov, the government point of entry.

---

[6] SAM.gov is the current governmentwide point of entry which serves as the single point where government business opportunities greater than $25,000, including synopses of proposed contract actions, solicitations, and associated information, can be accessed electronically by the public. RFO 2.101

[7] The agency explains that since April 1, 2026, "when the MAPS Solicitation was released, the Army has maintained the same solicitation number: W15P7T-26-R-0006." MOL at 10. To identify solicitation amendments, the Army Contract Writing System (ACWS)--a new, "mandatory Army-wide contract writing system designed to modernize and standardize" the contract writing process--adds a dash ("-") "with the amendment number to the end of the solicitation number." *Id.* at 10-11.

RFO 5.201(a); RFO 2.101. Notwithstanding Cinteot's complaints regarding the Army's specific method of posting amendments, the protester has not identified--and we are not aware of--any procurement law or regulation that the agency violated by failing to link all solicitation amendments to the same SAM.gov posting. *See Bramstedt Surgical Inc.*, B-424064, Jan. 28, 2026, at 6 (finding agency met regulatory requirement by posting solicitation on SAM.gov, despite the protester's contention that there were fairer ways to notify offerors of the procurement).

Further, as the Army points out, the protester does not claim that Cinteot, itself, was unable to find the various RFP amendments. In fact, the protester provided several screenshots of the SAM.gov webpage for the solicitation and subsequent amendments in its protest submission. Protest, exhs. 1-10. Here, because the record shows Cinteot had actual knowledge of the various solicitation amendments and was not, in fact, misled by the purportedly problematic postings, Cinteot's complaints about the agency's manner of posting RFP amendments provide no basis to sustain the protest. *See Intelligence Consulting Enter. Sols., Inc.*, B-424433.3, B-424433.7, August 11, 2026, at 11 (finding agency's manner of posting solicitation amendments reasonable where protester was not adversely impacted by posting, and manner of posting was consistent with applicable procurement regulations); *ProSource360 Consulting Servs., Inc.*, B-424386, June 4, 2026, at 4 (finding no merit in contention that the agency's failure to mark synopsis as a set-aside deprived the protester of the ability to know the solicitation was set aside and pursue it where the record showed the protester was not misled by the alleged failure). The allegation is denied.

Scorecard Past Performance Credit

Next, the protester argues that the solicitation contained several contradictory instructions. For example, the protester contends that the agency's instructions on how to fill out the past performance section of the scorecard were internally inconsistent and could not result in the agency evaluating proposals on a common basis. Protest at 6; Comments at 8.

As noted, the solicitation requires offerors to submit a scorecard with their proposals. RFP at 206. The scorecards--which are Excel spreadsheets attached to the solicitation--consisted of two sections. *Id.* Section 1 is a series of screening questions, and if an "[o]fferor answered 'No' to any of the Screening Questions, the [offeror's] proposal will not be evaluated further for award." *Id.* at 206, 208. Section 2 "contains Government Approved Systems and Certifications, and Past Performance" questions, which an offeror was required to answer and "provide substantiating documents for" that the agency would use to validate an offeror's self-score. *Id.* at 206, 211.

Relevant here, section M.5.4 of the RFP sets out the past performance quality evaluation factor, for which a maximum of 22,500 points are available. *Id.* at 252. Offerors can submit up to three QPs per domain. *Id.* at 249. The solicitation provides that if a submitted QP has a CPARS report, the agency will use the CPARS to conduct the evaluation. *Id.* at 252. If a submitted QP does not have CPARS report, the agency will use the PPQ submitted by the offeror. *Id.* The solicitation further explained that three elements of each CPARS or PPQ would be evaluated--quality, schedule, and management--and that points would be assigned per element based on the CPARS or PPQ rating for that element--2,500 points for ratings of exceptional; 1,875 points for ratings of very good; 1,125 points for ratings of satisfactory; 250 points for ratings of neutral or not applicable; and 0 points for ratings of marginal or unsatisfactory. *Id.* at 252.

Offerors would use the scorecard to self-score performance quality. For each QP, an offeror would rate its quality, schedule, and management, from a dropdown list on the scorecard spreadsheet, which included the adjectival ratings mentioned above. AR, Tab 14a, Attachment 2 Small Business (SB) Scorecard, June 15. When an offeror selects an adjectival rating from the dropdown list, the associated points value automatically populates in the next cell of the spreadsheet.[8] Point values are automatically totaled for each QP based on the adjectival ratings selected for quality, schedule, and management.

The version of the scorecard that first included the QP elements of quality, schedule, and management, was published with amendment 9 of the solicitation on June 2. Base COS at 11-12. The June 2 scorecard included the following language under the past performance quality section:

> The Offeror will receive 2,500 points per each individual element with Exceptional PP [Past Performance] Rating in any CPARS/PPQ element.
>
> The Offeror will receive 1,875 points per each individual element with a Very Good PP Rating in any CPARS/PPQ element.
>
> The Offeror will receive 1,125 points per each individual element with a Satisfactory PP Rating in any CPARS/PPQ element.
>
> The Offeror will receive 250 points per each individual element with a neutral or "not applicable" PP Rating in any CPARS/PPQ element.
>
> The Offeror will receive zero (0) points per each individual element with a rating of Marginal or Unsatisfactory PP Rating in any CPARS/PPQ element.
>
> * Offeror does not receive credit for a project with a below satisfactory rating in any of the CPARS ratings, a neutral rating (*i.e.*, lack of past performance information), or a non-relevant project (regardless of the PP

[8] For example, if an offeror selects "exceptional" as the "self-scored rating" for the management element for QP 1, then the "self-point(s) received" column of the spreadsheet automatically populates 2,500 points.

> score). If the Offeror has CPARS the Government will utilize CPARS. If no CPARS is available then the offeror can submit PPQs.

AR, Tab 13b, Attachment 2 SB Scorecard, June 2 (Item 6).

On June 15, the agency issued a clarification notice on SAM.gov and posted a new version of the scorecard. The notice stated:

> It has been brought to the Government's attention that the note within the Attachments 0002, item # 6 presented confusion. To clarify, the Government has updated this note. This update does not amend the solicitation or attachments. Offerors may use either the 02 or 15 JUNE 2026 version of Attachment 0002 with the understanding of this correction.

AR, Tab 23, SAM.gov Notices at 5.

The new version of the scorecard included the following language under the past performance quality section:

> The Offeror will receive 2,500 points per each individual element with Exceptional PP Rating in any CPARS/PPQ element.
>
> The Offeror will receive 1,875 points per each individual element with a Very Good PP Rating in any CPARS/PPQ element.
>
> The Offeror will receive 1,125 points per each individual element with a Satisfactory PP Rating in any CPARS/PPQ element.
>
> The Offeror will receive 250 points per each individual element with a neutral or "not applicable" PP Rating in any CPARS/PPQ element.
>
> The Offeror will receive zero (0) points per each individual element with a rating of Marginal or Unsatisfactory PP Rating in any CPARS/PPQ element.
>
> * Offeror does not receive credit for a non-relevant project (regardless of the PP score). If the Offeror has CPARS, the Government will utilize CPARS. If no CPARS is available then the offeror can submit PPQs.

AR, Tab 14a, Attachment 2 SB Scorecard, June 15 (Item 6).

Cinteot takes issue with the fact that the June 2 and June 15 scorecards use different language in the last paragraph of item 6. Specifically, the protester contends that "the two files state materially different rules for whether a QP earns Performance Quality credit." Comments at 2. Specifically, the protester argues that "[t]wo offerors preparing proposals under the same Solicitation, both following the Government's express instruction that they ‘may use either the 02 or 15 JUNE 2026 version of Attachment 0002’ . . . would apply different rules to select their QPs and would compute different self-scores from identical past performance. That is the opposite of competing ‘on a common basis’ and ‘on equal terms.’” *Id.* at 8 (noting that under the June 2 version, a QP with no past performance history would receive zero credit, whereas under the June 15 version, that same QP would earn 250 points).

As a general rule, a solicitation must be drafted in a fashion that enables offerors to intelligently prepare their proposals and must be sufficiently free from ambiguity so that offerors may compete on a common basis. *Data Monitor Sys., Inc.*, B-415761, Mar. 6, 2018, at 8. However, there is no requirement that a competition be based on specifications drafted in such detail as to completely eliminate all risk or remove every uncertainty from the mind of every prospective offeror; to the contrary, an agency may provide for a competition that imposes maximum risks on the contractor and minimum burdens on the agency, provided the solicitation contains sufficient information for offerors to compete intelligently and on equal terms. *American Corr. Healthcare, Inc.*, B-424391, July 6, 2026, at 5.

Based on our review of the record, we agree that the language in the scorecard past performance quality section could have been clearer. For example, the statement in the June 2 scorecard that an “[o]fferor does not receive credit for a project with . . . a neutral rating” appears to conflict with the statement above in item 6 that neutral past performance would receive “250 points per each individual element with a neutral . . . Rating.” AR, Tab 13b, Attachment 2 SB Scorecard, June 2 (Item 6). However, any potential ambiguity is resolved by the fact that offerors are required to complete the scorecards using the available adjectival ratings on the spreadsheet’s drop down menu, which automatically awards points based on the selected adjectival ratings for quality, schedule, and management.

Contrary to the protester’s allegations, the scorecards do not allow an offeror to manually type or compute its own point values in the spreadsheet. Rather, regardless of whether an offeror used the June 2 or June 15 scorecard, the result remained the same--a selection of the “N/A” adjectival rating generated 250 points on both spreadsheets for each element.[9] *Compare* AR, Tab 13b, Attachment 0002 SB Scorecard, June 2 (Item 6), *with* AR, Tab 14a, Attachment 2 SB Scorecard, June 15 (Item 6). In this connection, the treatment of past performance ratings for all elements, and the associated points received, is consistent across both scorecards. Because we do not find that offerors would be able to compute different self-scores based on the spreadsheet version used, we do not find it objectionable for the Army to instruct that offerors may submit either the June 2 or June 15 scorecard with their proposals. On this record, we find no reason to conclude the agency’s instruction prevented offerors

---

[9] Although, the language in both versions of the scorecard described a “lack of past performance information" as a “neutral rating,” the only available dropdown selectable menu item in the scorecard for no past performance information was “N/A,” which, as described above, resulted in automatically awarding 250 points.

from competing on a common basis. *Essex Electro Eng'rs, Inc.*, B-252288, July 23, 1993, at 10 (finding despite RFP containing more than one set of performance standards, RFP was not fatally flawed because offerors were given enough information to compete on a common basis). Therefore, this allegation is denied.

Reasonable Opportunity to Respond

Next, the protester generally argues that the agency did not provide offerors sufficient time to submit proposals after issuing solicitation amendments. Protest at 6. The agency responds that it afforded offerors a reasonable amount of time to submit proposals, including more than eighty days from original solicitation issuance, and more than thirty days from the last major amendment. MOL at 25.

Over the course of the procurement, the Army issued ten amendments to the solicitation. *See generally* AR, Tab 23, SAM.gov Notices. The initial solicitation was issued on April 1, 2026, with a submission deadline of May 1. Base COS at 6. Amendment 7 extended the proposal due date to June 22. *Id.* at 10. According to the agency, amendment 8, issued on May 22, was the last "substantial overhaul of the MAPS Solicitation where the Army eliminated, revised, and enhanced Solicitation requirements extensively." *Id.* at 10. In this amendment, the agency updated CPARS scoring, provided extensive clarifications about joint venture participation, and provided additional clarifications on how past performance would be evaluated. AR, Tab 12, RFP Amend. 8; COS at 10. The due date for receipt of proposals remained June 22.

Amendment 9 was issued on June 2. This amendment changed the total point values for past performance quality on scorecards by removing the element of cost control from the evaluation. Base COS at 11; *see* AR, Tab 13, RFP Amend. 9. As a result, the total amount of points an offeror could receive for past performance quality for one QP changed from 10,000 to 7,500 points. Base COS at 11. All offerors were required to submit revised proposals to comply with the new amendment 9 changes by the same June 22 deadline. AR, Tab 23, SAM.gov Notices at 5. As noted above, on June 15, the Army issued a notice on SAM.gov, which clarified the performance quality language on the scorecard. Notably, that notice indicated that the new scorecard did not amend the solicitation, and that offerors were not required to resubmit proposals with use of the new scorecard. *Id.* One final amendment (Amendment 10) was issued on June 18. This amendment made alterations to the definition of "Financial Services," which was part of the Management and Advisory domain's technical capability description. AR, Tab 23, SAM.gov Notices at 4. Again, the agency noted that offerors who had already submitted revised proposals in accordance with amendment 9 were not required to resubmit proposals after the issuance of amendment 10. *Id.*

As we have explained, there is no *per se* requirement that an agency extend the closing date in a negotiated procurement following an amendment to the solicitation. *Patriot First Prof'l Servs., Inc.*, B-417965, Nov. 21, 2019, at 2. The determination of what constitutes a sufficient amount of time for proposal preparation is a matter committed to the discretion of the contracting officer; we will not object to that determination unless it is shown to be unreasonable. *Raytheon Co.*, B-410719.10, B-410719.11, Nov. 15, 2016, at 15.

The protester takes issue with various amendments and clarification notices posted by the agency. Although we do not specifically address all of Cinteot's arguments, we have fully considered all of them and find that they afford no basis on which to sustain the protest. For example, the protester takes issue with amendment 9. Specifically, Cinteot argues that the introduction of the new point values for performance quality on the scorecard "altered the relative importance of quality compared to technical relevance" and that "this significant change impacts [] selection of Qualified Projects to use within the proposal." Protest at 6; *see* Comments at 1, 12, 15. The protester contends that "[a]llowing only four business days to respond to a significant change in the scoring and source selection methodology is unreasonable." Protest at 6.

On this record, we find nothing to support the protester's contention that the agency only afforded offerors four business days to respond to amendment 9. Rather, offerors had from June 2 until June 22 to respond to amendment 9. Even accepting as accurate the protester's representation that the change in performance quality points on the scorecard would impact an offeror's choice of proposed QPs, Cinteot has provided no information to support its contention that the agency's timeframe of 20 days to submit revised proposals was unreasonable. *Financial Asset Mgmt. Sys., Inc.*, B-409722.9, Apr. 24, 2015, at 7 (finding that the protester failed to show it could not have reasonably prepared its proposal within the timeframe between the amendment at issue and the proposal submission deadline). In other words, the protester has provided no reason to find that a 20-day timeframe was an unreasonable amount of time for offerors to consider changing the qualifying projects they proposed with their offers.[10] *Raytheon Co.*, *supra* at 16 (finding that although amendment was substantial, the timeframe to submit new proposals was "a reasonable amount of time to implement [the] change"). As such, this allegation is denied.

---

[10] To the extent the protester argues that the June 15 notice, which clarified the performance quality language on the scorecard, also impacted an offeror's ability to submit its proposal, we also find this argument unavailing. As is discussed above, we do not find that the June 15 notice, or the issuance of the new June 15 scorecard, made any material changes to how an offeror would compute its self-score. Because the June 15 notice indicated that the clarification was not meant to act as an amendment, and offerors were not required to submit a revised proposal in response to the clarification, we have no reason to find that the agency's notice impacted offerors' abilities to submit revised proposals by the proposal submission deadline. *Harmonia Holdings, LLC*, B-407186.2, B-407186.3, Mar. 5, 2013, at 8 (finding that additional details requested by agency the day before proposal submission deadline were not necessary for preparation of proposals, and that the agency's decision to not extend deadline for proposal submissions was therefore reasonable).

Alleged Form Defect

Lastly, Cinteot argues that the "Qualifying Project Form," provided as attachment 3 to the solicitation, was "fundamentally defective," and thus, prevented offerors from submitting the information required for evaluation. Protest at 7. Specifically, the protester alleges that the QP form required offerors to select North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) codes from the spreadsheet's dropdown menu, but that the form only included five out of the twelve applicable NACIS codes that were listed in the solicitation. Comments at 10.

Similar to the scorecards, the QP form is an Excel spreadsheet, attached to the RFP, that offerors are required to complete as part of proposal submission. The form requires offerors to provide details about the qualifying projects that offerors submitted for each domain.[11] AR, Tab 7c, QP Form Attach. 3, amend. 3. Part of the form asked offerors: "Does this QP have a NAICS Code on the contract, order, or agreement"? *Id.* (item 7). An offeror was then required to identify the NAICS code of the QP from the list of 12 codes that were provided in section L.2.3.2.5 of the solicitation. *Id.* (item 8). If the QP did not contain one of the 12 NAICS codes listed in the solicitation, the QP form instructed offerors to identify the NAICS code that would best align with those found in section L.2.3.2.5. *Id.* (item 9).

The protester is correct that some versions of the QP form did not contain all 12 NAICS codes from the dropdown menu in item 9, which asked offerors to "identify which permissible NAICS Code would it best align to per RFP Section L.2.3.2." *Compare* AR, Tab 7c, QP Form Attach. 3, amend. 3, *with* AR, Tab 12e, QP Form Attach. 3, amend 4. The agency, however, issued a clarification notice on SAM.gov, informing offerors of the following:

> It has been brought to the Government's attention that the Attachment 0003 Amd 04 "Qualifying Project Form," Item #9, does not contain all available options detailed in accordance with Solicitation Section L.2.3.2.5. If an Offeror's QP is one of those permissible NAICS Codes that is not in the available drop down selection of Item #9, please state the Section L.2.3.2.5 permissible NAICS Code in the fillable section in Item 9a. of the Attachment 0003.

AR, Tab 23, SAM.gov Notices at 4. Cinteot argues that this "prescribed workaround does not cure the defect and creates evaluation risk." Comments at 17. We disagree.

Our review of the record finds unobjectionable the agency's clarification once the discrepancy was brought to the Army's attention. As noted, item 8 of the QP form lists all 12 applicable NAICS codes. While item 9 only lists 5 of the 12 applicable NAICS

---

[11] The QP form has been revised several times. The latest version was issued after amendment 8, on May 27, 2026. AR, Tab 12e, QP Form Attach. 3, amend. 4; Base COS at 11.

codes, the agency's clarification clearly directs offerors to manually type in the applicable NAICS code to item 9a of the spreadsheet if the NAICS code is one that is missing from item 9. AR, Tab 7c, QP Form Attach. 3, amend. 3; AR, Tab 23, SAM.gov Notices at 4. As we noted, there is no requirement that a solicitation be drafted in such detail as to completely eliminate all risk or remove every uncertainty from the mind of every prospective offeror. *Sterisyn, Inc.*, B-418366 *et al.*, Apr. 1, 2020, at 9.

Here, we find that the solicitation was sufficiently free from ambiguity so that offerors could compete on a common basis because offerors could fill in the required QP form with the applicable NAICS code associated with the qualifying project. *Data Monitor Sys., Inc.*, B-415761, Mar. 6, 2018, at 9 (finding RFP provided adequate detail for offerors to compete intelligently and on equal terms). Contrary to the protester's contention, the QP form could be fully completed with the necessary information for evaluation by the agency. We find no basis to sustain the allegation.

The protest is denied.

Edda Emmanuelli Perez
General Counsel