



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: Incentive Technology Group, LLC

File: B-415716.30

Date: August 13, 2019

Edward J. Tolchin, Esq., Offit Kurman Attorneys at Law, for the protester.
Kevin P. Stiens, Esq., and Alexis J. Bernstein, Esq., Department of the Air Force, for the agency.
Evan C. Williams, Esq., and Amy B. Pereira, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, GAO, participated in the preparation of the decision.

DIGEST

Protest challenging agency's evaluation of protester's proposal under the technical experience evaluation factor is denied where the record shows that the evaluation was reasonable and consistent with the solicitation.

DECISION

Incentive Technology Group, LLC (Incentive), a small business of Arlington, Virginia, protests the exclusion of its proposal from the competition by the Department of the Air Force under request for proposals (RFP) No. FA8771-17-R-1000 for information technology (IT) services. Incentive argues that the agency unreasonably evaluated its proposal under the technical experience factor.

We deny the protest.

BACKGROUND

On September 28, 2017, the Air Force issued the Small Business Enterprise Application Solutions (SBEAS) RFP, which was set aside for small businesses, pursuant to the procedures of Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) part 15. Agency Report (AR), Tab 5, RFP at 162.¹ The solicitation contemplated the award of 40 indefinite-delivery,

¹ Citations to the RFP are to the conformed copy provided by the agency. AR, Tab 5, RFP.

indefinite-quantity (IDIQ) contracts with a 5-year base and 5-year option ordering period. Id. at 138-139, 162. The scope of the SBEAS RFP included a “comprehensive suite of IT services and IT solutions to support IT systems and software development in a variety of environments and infrastructures.” Id. at 130. Additional IT services in the solicitation included, but were not limited to, “documentation, operations, deployment, cybersecurity, configuration management, training, commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) product management and utilization, technology refresh, data and information services, information display services and business analysis for IT programs.” Id.

Proposals were to be evaluated based on two factors, technical experience and past performance.² Id. at 164. The technical experience factor was comprised of ten technical elements and various sub-elements (each with a designated point value), and one non-technical experience element.³ Id. at 165-171. The past performance factor was comprised of the following three subfactors in descending order of importance: life-cycle software services, cybersecurity, and information technology business analysis. Id. at 164. Award was to be made on a past performance tradeoff basis among technically acceptable offerors, using the three past performance subfactors. Id. at 162.

Section L of the solicitation instructed offerors that “[t]he proposal shall be clear, specific, and shall include sufficient detail for effective evaluation and for substantiating the validity of stated claims.” Id. at 142. Offerors were instructed to not simply rephrase or restate requirements, but to “provide [a] convincing rationale [addressing] how the [o]fferor’s proposal meets these requirements.” Id. The RFP also instructed offerors to assume that the agency has no knowledge of the offeror’s facilities and experience, and would “base its evaluation on the information presented in the [o]fferor’s proposal.” Id.

The solicitation provided that offerors should submit their proposals in four volumes: capability maturity model integration (CMMI) documentation, technical experience, past

² The solicitation stated that pursuant to “10 U.S.C. § 2305(a)(3)(C), as amended by Section 825 of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 2017, the Government will not evaluate cost or price for the IDIQ contract. Cost or price to the Government will be considered in conjunction with the issuance of a task or delivery order under any contract awarded hereunder.” Id. at 162.

³ The technical experience factor was comprised of the following ten technical elements: (1) life-cycle software services; (2) cybersecurity; (3) IT business analysis; (4) programming languages/frameworks; (5) tools/software development methodologies; (6) platforms/environments; (7) database components; (8) mobile/internet of things; (9) server operating systems; and (10) COTS/GOTS (government-off-the-shelf)/FOSS (free and open source software) software, as well as the non-technical experience element of government facility clearance level. Id. at 165-171. Under these ten elements are a series of sub-elements, designated by letters. For example, under the first element are five sub-elements, designated as 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, and 1e. Id. at 165-166.

performance, and contract documentation. Id. at 145. As relevant to this protest, the technical volume was to contain a table of contents, a cross-reference matrix,⁴ a glossary of terms, a self-scoring worksheet, and technical narratives (TNs).⁵ Id. at 149. The RFP instructed offerors to describe, in their TNs, experience that supports the technical element points claimed in the self-scoring worksheet. Id.

The solicitation stated that the agency intended to evaluate proposals and make awards without discussions to the offerors deemed responsible, and whose proposals conformed to the solicitation's requirements and were judged, based on the evaluation factors, to represent the best value to the government.⁶ Id. at 162-163.

Section M of the solicitation established a tiered evaluation process. Id. at 163-164. The first step of the evaluation was a CMMI appraisal, which required offerors to be certified at level 2 in CMMI.⁷ Id. If an offeror passed the CMMI appraisal as level 2 certified, the agency would then evaluate an offeror's technical experience using the self-scoring worksheet and TNs provided by the offeror. Id. at 164. The solicitation provided that technical experience would receive an adjectival rating of acceptable or unacceptable. Id. at 164-165. A proposal would be considered acceptable when it attained 4,200 points per the self-scoring worksheet, and was "verified per the technical narratives." Id. at 165.

In the event that technical experience was evaluated as acceptable, the agency would then evaluate the offeror's past performance. Id. at 164. The agency would review the accompanying past performance narratives and evaluate each offeror's past performance references for recency, relevancy, and quality. Id. at 172.

Incentive timely submitted its proposal in response to the solicitation. On April 22, 2019, the agency notified Incentive that its proposal was considered unacceptable and had been eliminated from further consideration because its proposal, having only received

⁴ The RFP's instructions directed offerors to complete a cross-reference matrix, which was attached to the solicitation. Id. at 146, 179-183. The offeror's cross-reference matrix was required to demonstrate "traceability" between the offeror's contract references. Id. at 146. An offeror's cross-reference matrix was required to show "which contract references [were] used to satisfy each technical element and each past performance sub-factor." Id.

⁵ The solicitation allowed offerors to provide up to six contract references, each of which was to have its own TN, to demonstrate its technical experience. Id. at 149. TNs were to be submitted in numerical order (i.e., TN 1, TN 2, TN 3). Id.

⁶ The agency's estimated value for all of the SBEAS contract awards is a maximum of \$13.4 billion. Contracting Officer's Statement (COS) at 3.

⁷ CMMI is a process level improvement training and appraisal program that is administered by the CMMI Institute.

3,550 points, did not receive the minimum required 4,200 points under the technical experience factor. AR, Tab 9, Incentive Notice of Removal from Competition, at 1. On May 6, following its debriefing, Incentive filed this protest with our Office.

DISCUSSION

Incentive challenges the agency's exclusion of its proposal from the competition, asserting that the agency failed to properly evaluate its proposal under the technical experience factor. Specifically, the protester argues that the agency unreasonably deducted points under three sub-elements of the life-cycle software services element, two sub-elements of the platforms/environments element, three sub-elements of the mobile/internet of things element, and the server operating systems element.

Our Office will examine an agency's evaluation of an offeror's technical experience only to ensure that it was reasonable and consistent with the stated evaluation criteria and applicable statutes and regulations. See Shumaker Trucking & Excavating Contractors, Inc., B-290732, Sept. 25, 2002, 2002 CPD ¶ 169 at 3. A protester's disagreement with a procuring agency's judgment, without more, is insufficient to establish that the agency acted unreasonably. WingGate Travel, Inc., B-412921, July 1, 2016, 2016 CPD ¶ 179 at 4-5. In addition, it is an offeror's responsibility to submit an adequately written proposal with adequately detailed information which clearly demonstrates compliance with the solicitation requirements and allows a meaningful review by the procuring agency. See International Med. Corps, B-403688, Dec. 6, 2010, 2010 CPD ¶ 292 at 8.

Because the solicitation provided that an offeror must score a minimum of 4,200 points to be rated technically acceptable, for the reasons discussed below, we need only address Incentive's challenges to the agency's evaluation under two sub-elements of the life-cycle software services element, one sub-element of the platforms/environments element, and the server operating systems element.⁸

Life-cycle Software Services Element

The life-cycle software services element was comprised of five sub-elements: developing/implementation; re-engineering; data or system migration; modernization; and COTS/GOTS/FOSS enterprise resource planning software systems. RFP at 165-166. As relevant here, Incentive challenges the agency's evaluation of its proposal under both the developing/implementation and re-engineering sub-elements of this element. Protest at 7-9; Comments at 1-3. In this regard, Incentive asserts that the agency's evaluation was unreasonable because its proposal established the required experience under these two sub-elements. Id.

⁸ Incentive has presented arguments that are in addition to, or variations of, those discussed in this decision. While we do not address them all, we have considered all of Incentive's allegations and find no basis to sustain the protest.

Developing/Implementation Sub-element

To receive the 500 points available under the developing/implementation sub-element (i.e., 1a), an offeror was required to demonstrate experience in the design, build, test, and implementation of an information system in each of the following four areas:

- The process of implementing software solutions to one or more sets of problems. [hereinafter “design”]
- The process by which source code is converted into a stand-alone form that can be run on a computer or to the form itself. One of the most important steps of a software build is the compilation process, where source code files are converted into executable code. [hereinafter “build”]
- Obtaining, verifying, or providing data for any of the following: the performance, operational capability, and suitability of systems, subsystems, components, or equipment items; or vulnerability and lethality of systems, subsystems, components, or equipment items. [hereinafter “test”]
- Planning; coordinating; scheduling; deploying/installing (or providing all needed technical assistance to deploy/install) and transitioning a technical solution (e.g., information system) into the operational environment. [hereinafter “implementation”]

RFP at 165-166,185; COS at 9.

The agency’s evaluation concluded that while Incentive’s proposal contained sufficient build, test, and implementation experience, the proposal did not demonstrate design experience as required by the solicitation. AR, Tab 8, Incentive Technical Evaluation, at 2-3. Finding that Incentive lacked experience in one of the required areas, the agency awarded it no points for the developing/implementation sub-element. Id. at 3.

Incentive contests the agency’s evaluation under this sub-element. In this regard, the protester asserts that the agency’s inadequate understanding of software development methodologies led to an erroneous finding that its proposal lacked the required experience. Protest at 7-8. Specifically, the protester argues that its proposal, in TN 2, adequately discussed design processes, and therefore should have been credited for experience designing an information system. Id.; Comments at 2-3. In support of this argument, the protester cites a quote from its proposal wherein it refers to experience “applying DevOps standards in developing, implementing, and maintaining applications.” Protest at 7 quoting AR, Tab 6, Incentive Proposal, Vol. II, Technical Experience, at 4. According to the protester, “DevOps” is a software development approach that includes design as a foundational step. Protest at 8. Thus, Incentive

contends that the agency improperly ignored a technical term in its proposal that demonstrated the required experience, resulting in a flawed evaluation.⁹

In response, the agency contends that notwithstanding its inclusion of technical terms related to software development, Incentive's proposal lacked sufficient details regarding its experience designing an information system, and therefore failed to demonstrate the claimed experience. COS at 9-12. The agency further maintains that Incentive's contentions amount to mere disagreement with the agency's evaluation. Memorandum of Law at 10.

In its proposal, Incentive described its experience in TN 2 as providing integrated support for multiple concurrent application development projects for the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). AR, Tab 6, Incentive Proposal, Vol. II, Technical Experience, at 4. In its evaluation, the agency cited TN 2 of Incentive's proposal and found that while the proposal noted several problem sets, the proposal did not demonstrate Incentive's experience engaging in the process of designing and implementing the software solution to any of the problems noted. AR, Tab 8, Incentive Technical Evaluation, at 3 citing AR, Tab 6, Incentive Proposal, Vol. II, Technical Experience, at 4-5. The agency's evaluation further explained that even though Incentive's proposal later outlines its requirements analysis process, the proposal fails to demonstrate Incentive's experience using that process to solve a problem with software for an information system. AR, Tab 8, Incentive Technical Evaluation, at 3. In sum, the agency contends that while Incentive's proposal identified a problem set, and stated that the problem was solved, the proposal nevertheless failed to adequately describe the specific processes used to solve the problem, as required by the solicitation. COS at 9-12.

Based upon our review of the record, we find no basis to question the agency's conclusion that the protester failed to demonstrate experience designing an information system, as required under this sub-element. As noted above, to demonstrate experience designing an information system, offerors were required to demonstrate "[t]he process of implementing software solutions to one or more sets of problems."

⁹ In support of its argument that its proposal demonstrated the required experience designing an information system, Incentive's comments cite--for the first time--a new TN (i.e., TN 4) that was not cited in the original protest. Compare Protest at 7-8 with Comments at 1-3. Incentive received a detailed debriefing containing, in substantial part, the contents of the agency's technical evaluation on April 26, 2019. AR, Tab 10, Incentive Debriefing, at 29-30. The debriefing informed Incentive that the agency found that its proposal lacked specific details to demonstrate the claimed experience designing an information system. Id. at 30. Since the arguments related to TN 4 could have been raised in Incentive's initial protest, but were not raised until its comments, it is dismissed as untimely. 4 C.F.R. § 21.2(a)(2); See Main Sail, LLC, B-412138, B-412138.2, Jan. 29, 2016, 2016 CPD ¶ 26 at 6 n.5.

RFP at 166. Further, the solicitation clearly instructed offerors that proposals “shall be clear, specific, and shall include sufficient detail for effective evaluation and for substantiating the validity of stated claims.” RFP at 142. Here, while Incentive’s proposal states that problems were solved, we agree with the agency that the proposal failed to provide sufficient information demonstrating its experience in the process of implementing software solutions to one or more sets of problems. Additionally, we reject the protester’s contention that simply because its proposal stated that it utilized a particular software development approach (i.e., DevOps), the agency was required to credit Incentive with design experience. Such an argument is contrary to the principle that offerors are responsible for submitting well-written proposals with adequately detailed information that allows for a meaningful review by the procuring agency. Microwave Monolithics, Inc., B-413088, Aug. 11, 2016, 2016 CPD ¶ 220 at 6. We therefore find that Incentive’s protest fails to establish that the agency’s evaluation under this sub-element was unreasonable, and deny this protest ground.

Re-engineering Sub-element

To receive the 200 points available under the re-engineering sub-element (i.e., 1b), an offeror was required to demonstrate experience re-engineering an information system during its life-cycle to include what was altered from the system’s existing state and the resulting reconstituted form. RFP at 166, 185. Offerors were instructed to utilize the definitions provided in the solicitation to help form a better understanding of the agency’s use and definition of specific technical terms. Id. at 150. As relevant here, the solicitation defined re-engineering as follows:

Software Re-engineering is the examination and alteration of a system to reconstitute it in a new form. This process encompasses a combination of sub-processes such as reverse engineering, restructuring, recreating or updating documentation, forward engineering and retargeting.

Id. at 220.

The agency found that Incentive’s proposal did not demonstrate re-engineering experience. AR, Tab 8, Incentive Technical Evaluation, at 4. In this regard, the agency’s evaluation of TN 3 explained that while Incentive’s proposal asserted that a re-engineering effort took place, the proposal did not provide the technical details needed to effectively demonstrate the claimed experience. AR, Tab 8, Incentive Technical Evaluation, at 4. In addition, relying on the RFP’s definition of re-engineering, the agency noted that Incentive’s proposal did not demonstrate its experience “with any sub-process such as reverse engineering, restructuring, recreating or updating documentation, forward engineering and retargeting.” Id.

The protester asserts that TN 3 of its proposal demonstrated its re-engineering experience with respect to the solicitation’s requirements. Protest at 8-9; Comments at 3-4. In its proposal, Incentive described its experience in TN 3 as performing a re-engineering of five of the General Service Administration’s existing information

systems into a single cloud system. AR, Tab 6, Incentive Proposal, Vol. II, Technical Experience, at 10. In support of its contention, Incentive claims that TN 3 identified experience with a specific system, described what was altered, and also described the resulting reconstituted form. Protest at 8. In this regard, the protester argues that TN 3 provided the technical details required by the solicitation. Id.

Based on our review of the record, we find that the agency reasonably evaluated Incentive's proposal under this sub-element in accordance with the terms of the solicitation. The record demonstrates that the agency reasonably determined that Incentive's discussion of its experience in TN 3 failed to provide sufficient details to demonstrate its re-engineering experience, as required by the solicitation. RFP at 166, 220. Notably absent from Incentive's filings with our Office is an explanation of how its proposal demonstrates re-engineering experience, as the term is defined by the solicitation. As stated above, the solicitation expressly instructed offerors that proposals "shall be clear, specific, and shall include sufficient detail for effective evaluation and for substantiating the validity of stated claims." RFP at 142. In addition, the RFP provided a definition of re-engineering, containing a non-exhaustive list of the sub-processes that re-engineering includes. RFP at 220. However, Incentive's proposal neither discusses any of the processes listed in the RFP, nor explains which processes it utilized when performing the re-engineering effort described in TN 3. Thus, despite the fact that Incentive's proposal identified a system, and claimed that it re-engineered that system, we find no basis to question the agency's determination that Incentive's proposal failed to include adequate detail concerning its re-engineering experience. As a result, this protest ground is denied.¹⁰

Mainframe, Mid-tier/Client-Server, or Web Services Sub-element of the Platforms/Environments Element

Incentive next challenges the agency's evaluation of its proposal under the mainframe, mid-tier/client-server, or web services sub-element (i.e., 6a) of the platform/environments element. In order to receive the 100 points available under this sub-element, an offeror was required to demonstrate experience "implementing an IS [information system] into any of the following: mainframe, mid-tier/client server, web services." RFP at 169.

The RFP defined implementation as follows:

Planning; coordinating; scheduling; deploying/installing (or providing all needed technical assistance to deploy/install) and transitioning a technical

¹⁰ Incentive also argues that the agency applied unstated evaluation criteria by requiring Incentive to provide more technical details in TN 3 than the RFP required. Protest at 8-9. However, because we find that the agency's evaluation was reasonable and in accordance with the express terms of the solicitation, it follows that the agency did not apply unstated evaluation criteria. Accordingly, this basis of protest is denied.

solution (e.g. information system) into the operational environment. Implementation services also include performing data conversion before loading data into the system and training appropriate personnel on the operation and use of the technical solution.

Id. at 213.

In its protest, Incentive argues that the agency's finding that its proposal did not demonstrate its experience implementing an information system into a mainframe, mid-tier/client-server, or web service was unreasonable. Incentive contends that the agency improperly ignored the contents of its proposal. Protest at 10–11; Comments at 6. In this regard, Incentive asserts that its proposal included the term "implemented" in its description of its experience under this sub-element, and that by doing so it was using the definition of implementation from the solicitation, and therefore demonstrated the required experience. Id.

In response, the agency contends that Incentive's proposal lacked the detail required to establish the implementation experience required by the solicitation under this sub-element. COS at 20-21. In this regard, the agency contends that by merely using the term implementation in its proposal, Incentive failed to demonstrate its experience implementing an information system, and the agency was therefore unable to verify the 100 points that Incentive claimed for this sub-element. Id. at 21.

Based upon the record before us, we find reasonable the agency's evaluation of Incentive's proposal under this sub-element. In this regard, the agency's technical evaluation found that while Incentive's proposal--in both TN 2 and TN 4--generally discusses Incentive's responsibility for implementation, neither TN demonstrates experience engaging in the implementation activities of planning, coordinating, scheduling, deploying/installing and transitioning an information system into an operational environment. AR, Tab 8, Incentive Technical Evaluation, at 20-21. We agree that although Incentive's proposal uses the term implement to describe its experience, the protester fails to establish that the agency improperly determined that its proposal lacked specific details to demonstrate the required experience. AR, Tab 6, Incentive Proposal, Vol. II, Technical Experience, at 8, 19.

In this regard, the protester does not cite specific portions of its proposal that demonstrate its experience implementing an information system to a mainframe, mid-tier/client-server, or web services. Rather, Incentive's challenge to the agency's evaluation under this sub-element rests on its assertion that its use of the term implement sufficiently demonstrated the required experience. However, we reject the protester's contention that simply using the term implement adequately demonstrated the required experience as the solicitation here instructed offerors that proposals "shall be clear, specific, and shall include sufficient detail for effective evaluation and for substantiating the validity of stated claims." RFP at 142, 165 ("The Government will deduct points claimed by the offeror for a technical experience element when a technical narrative does not demonstrate the required experience."). Thus, we find

reasonable the agency's conclusion that Incentive's proposal failed to include adequate detail regarding the required experience under this sub-element. See ACG Systems Inc., B-413419.3, 2016 CPD ¶ 301 at 6-7. Consequently, we deny this protest ground.

Server Operating Systems Element

Finally, Incentive challenges the agency's evaluation of its proposal under the server operating systems element (i.e., 9). Protest at 14. To receive the 300 points available under this element, an offeror was required to demonstrate experience providing life-cycle services to support the efficient operations of an information system for any of the following distribution servers: Windows Server, Red Hat enterprise Linux, Software and Systems Development, UBUNTU. RFP at 171,188. The RFP defined life-cycle services as "[t]he scope of activities associated with a system, encompassing the system's initiation, development, implementation, operation and maintenance, and ultimately its disposal that instigates another system initiation." Id. at 216. The agency's evaluation concluded that Incentive's proposal did not demonstrate experience providing life-cycle services to support the efficient operations of an information system using one of the distribution servers identified in the solicitation. AR, Tab 8, Incentive Technical Evaluation, at 28.

In its protest, Incentive challenges the agency's evaluation under this element, arguing that the agency ignored information set forth in TN 4 of its proposal that demonstrated its experience with respect to the solicitation's requirements.¹¹ Protest at 14; Comments at 11-13. In its proposal, Incentive described its experience in TN 4 as providing life-cycle services to support the efficient operation of an information system for both Windows and Linux environments. AR, Tab 6, Incentive Proposal, Vol. II, Technical Experience, at 20. Quoting the following excerpt from TN 4, Incentive contends that its experience using "tools and technologies" sufficiently addressed the solicitation's requirements, and was improperly ignored by the agency:

¹¹ In support of its contention that its proposal demonstrated the required experience under this element, Incentive's comments cite a portion of its proposal from TN 3 that was not cited in the original protest. Compare Protest at 14 with Comments at 11-13. As noted above, on April 26, 2019, Incentive received a detailed debriefing containing, in substantial part, the contents of the agency's technical evaluation under this element. AR, Tab 10, Incentive Debriefing, at 41. Thus, this argument first made by the protester in its comments is based on information that was known or should have been known prior to the filing of Incentive's initial protest. Our Bid Protest Regulations do not contemplate the piecemeal presentation or development of protest issues through later submissions citing examples or providing alternate or more specific legal arguments missing from earlier general allegations of impropriety. Sealift Inc., B-405705, Dec. 8, 2011, 2011 ¶ 271 at 2 n. 1. Because Incentive waited until its June 7 comments to raise this new example of information allegedly not considered by the agency, this argument is untimely and will not be considered. 4 C.F.R. § 21.2(a)(2).

For distribution services, we maintained [DELETED] for Windows patching and [DELETED] for Linux patching. The development and test environments were [DELETED]. We provided fully managed [DELETED]. There are ongoing efforts to migrate all environments to [DELETED].

Id. at 14 quoting AR, Tab 6, Incentive Proposal, Vol. II, Technical Experience, at 20.

In response, the agency maintains that it reasonably considered the entire contents of TN 4 when it determined that Incentive's proposal failed to demonstrate the required experience. COS at 30-31. In this regard, the agency contends that Incentive's proposal does not demonstrate experience providing life-cycle services to support the efficient operations of the information system identified in TN 4. Id. at 31.

Here, we find reasonable the agency's evaluation of Incentive's proposal under the server operating systems element. As an initial matter, the record demonstrates that the agency did not ignore the contents of TN 4 as evidenced by the technical evaluation that quotes the relevant excerpt from TN 4. AR, Tab 8, Incentive Technical Evaluation, at 28 quoting AR, Tab 6, Incentive Proposal, Vol. II, Technical Experience, at 20. Additionally, the record demonstrates that the agency reasonably determined that the protester failed to provide adequate details to demonstrate experience providing life-cycle services to support efficient operations of an information system. As pointed out by the agency, while Incentive's proposal uses the term "maintained" several times in its description of its experience under this sub-element, TN 4's mere references to maintaining an information system without additional substantiating details do not demonstrate experience providing life-cycle services to support the efficient operation of an information system. In other words, Incentive's proposal failed to adequately describe how its services supported the efficient operations of an information system.

Furthermore, Incentive's protest does not explain how its proposal demonstrated experience providing the required services to support the efficient operations of an information system. Instead, Incentive's protest quotes a large section from TN 4 and flatly asserts that the language demonstrates the required experience without any specific explanation of how this quoted language meets the solicitation's requirements. Protest at 14. As noted above, offerors are responsible for submitting well-written proposals with adequately detailed information that allows for a meaningful review by the procuring agency. Government Telecomms., Inc., B-299542.2, June 21, 2007, 2007 CPD ¶ 136 at 5. Notwithstanding the fact that Incentive's proposal identified "tools and technologies" that it used, we find no basis to question the agency's determination that the protester failed to demonstrate the required experience under this element, and deny this protest ground.

Given our conclusions above, we need not address the protester's other challenges to the agency's evaluation because even if Incentive were to prevail with regard to its remaining challenges, its proposal would remain technically unacceptable. As stated above, in order to receive an acceptable rating under the technical experience factor, a proposal had to receive a score of at least 4,200 points; Incentive's technical proposal

received a score of 3,550 points. Thus, even if our Office agreed with Incentive regarding its other alleged evaluation errors, this would only afford Incentive an additional 600 points, for a total technical score of 4,150, which is 50 points below the score necessary for a technically acceptable score.¹²

The protest is denied.

Thomas H. Armstrong
General Counsel

¹² In its protest, Incentive challenged the agency's evaluation under the following six sub-elements and one element: 1a, 1b, 1e, 6a, 6c, 8a, 8b, 8c, and 9. As discussed above, the protester's allegations with respect to 1a, 1b, 6a, and 9 are denied. Consequently, even if meritorious, the remaining protest grounds would only result in 600 points, according to the following breakdown: 1e=200 points, 6c=100 points, 8a=100 points, 8b=100 points, and 8c=100 points. RFP at 185, 187-188.