



**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:** Inflowlogistics, LLC

**File:** B-421459; B-421459.2

**Date:** May 22, 2023

---

Issac D. Schabes, Esq., and John E. McCarthy Jr., Esq., Crowell & Moring LLP, for the protester.

Jeffery M. Chiow, Esq., Eleanor M. Ross, Esq., and Jordan N. Malone, Esq., Greenberg Traurig LLP, for ASIRTek Federal Services, LLC, the intervenor.

Amy A. Cook, Esq., General Services Administration, for the agency.

Hannah G. Barnes, Esq., April Y. Shields, Esq., and Christina Sklarew, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, GAO, participated in the preparation of the decision.

---

## DIGEST

1. Protest challenging the agency's technical evaluation is denied where the weakness the agency identified in the protester's proposal reflects the protester's failure to sufficiently address the solicitation's requirements.
  2. Protest that the agency failed to assess a weakness in the awardee's proposal for failing to demonstrate compliance with certification requirements is denied where the agency's evaluation was reasonable and consistent with the terms of the solicitation, and where the certification requirements at issue are a matter of contract administration.
  3. Protest alleging that the agency engaged in disparate treatment is denied where the differences in assessed strengths were based on differences in the proposals.
  4. Protest challenging the agency's best-value tradeoff analysis is denied where the record reflects that the agency's source selection rationale was consistent with the stated evaluation criteria.
- 

## DECISION

Inflowlogistics, LLC, of San Antonio, Texas, protests the issuance of a task order to ASIRTek Federal Services, LLC, of San Antonio, Texas, by the General Services Administration (GSA) under task order request for proposals (RFP) No. 47QFWA22Q0021 for services and contractor positions in support of the United States Air Force 67 Cyberspace Operations Group (COG). Inflowlogistics argues that

the agency used unstated evaluation criteria in assigning a weakness to its proposal, unreasonably evaluated ASIRTek's proposal by not assigning the proposal a weakness for failing to identify employees with proper certifications, treated the two proposals disparately, and made a flawed best-value determination.

We deny the protest.

## BACKGROUND

The RFP was issued on September 8, 2022, to small businesses holding indefinite-delivery, indefinite-quantity (IDIQ) contracts under GSA's One Acquisition Solution for Integrated Services (OASIS) program.<sup>1</sup> Agency Report (AR), Tab 4, RFP at 1. The RFP sought a variety of services, including technical and management services, to analyze, assess, and recommend cyber program requirements, as well as conduct research and analysis to develop strategic planning materials, requirements, and resource requirements to ensure alignment and synchronization of COG<sup>2</sup> mission areas and priorities with national requirements. RFP at 4.

The solicitation contemplated the issuance of a cost-plus-fixed-fee task order with a 1-year base period, four 1-year option periods, and a potential 6-month extension. RFP at 1, 4, 52. Award would be made on a best-value tradeoff basis, considering the following three factors: technical management approach, previous experience, and price. RFP at 53. The RFP advised that the non-price factors, which the agency would evaluate first, would be "equally weighted, and when combined, are significantly more important than price," but that price might become more important as the "difference in non-price factors becomes closer." *Id.*

With regard to the technical factor, the solicitation advised that proposals would be evaluated based on the offeror's demonstrated understanding of the solicitation requirements and its approach to meeting those requirements. RFP at 54. More specifically, the solicitation stated that evaluators would consider each offeror's "demonstrated understanding of the task order requirements, the adequacy of the approach, the quality and completeness of their technical solutions to these objectives and the overall qualifications and skill mix of the [c]ontractor workforce proposed to address these task order objectives." *Id.* The solicitation further cautioned offerors that this technical response would be limited to twenty pages, although offerors were told to submit an organizational conflict of interest (OCI) certification, an OCI mitigation plan, if necessary, and a quality control plan, none of which would be included in the page

---

<sup>1</sup> The procurement is being conducted as a small-business set-aside under "SB Pool 1" of the OASIS contract; Inflowlogistics holds an "SB Pool 1" contract.

<sup>2</sup> The 67 COG is tasked by Air Force Combat Command to organize, train, and equip offensive cyberspace operations units to provide combat ready forces in support of the Air Force, the Department of Defense, and global cyberspace operations. RFP at 4.

count. *Id.* at 55. The solicitation also directed offerors to include a security plan, as the solicitation required certain higher-level security clearances, and a transition plan, both to be included in the technical management approach response. *Id.* at 56. As relevant here, the solicitation advised that a specific form, DD254, needed to be submitted, given the requirement for some personnel to have top secret/sensitive compartmented information clearances.<sup>3</sup> *Id.* The solicitation specified that personnel proposed for positions requiring a security clearance “must have an active security clearance,” due no later than thirty days after contract award. *Id.*

With regard to the previous-experience factor, the RFP advised that evaluators would consider the extent “of the [c]ontractor’s previous experience in carrying out work that is similar in scope, size and duration” to the requirements in the current solicitation. RFP at 54. The solicitation directed offerors to identify three projects they had worked on within the past five years. *Id.* Both the technical and previous-experience factor were to be given ratings of either excellent, very good, acceptable, marginal, or unacceptable. RFP at 57. The solicitation also provided for the assessment of significant strengths, strengths, weaknesses, and significant weaknesses, defined as an aspect of the proposal that increases or appreciably increases the probability of successful contract performance, or, in the alternative, as an aspect of a proposal that increases or appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. RFP at 57.

With regard to price, the solicitation advised that price would be evaluated for fairness, reasonableness, and realism. RFP at 54. The RFP stated that price would not be rated and would be evaluated separately from the technical proposal. *Id.* at 55.

The agency received four timely proposals, including those from Inflowlogistics and ASIRTek. Contracting Officer’s Statement (COS) at 9. The agency noted that while three of the four offerors complied with the solicitation’s page limitation requirements, Inflowlogistics did not, and the contracting officer removed the excess pages from the submission to the technical evaluation board so that they would not be considered. *Id.* The agency evaluated Inflowlogistics’s and ASIRTek’s proposals as follows:

---

<sup>3</sup> The government uses DD Form 254, Contract Security Classification Specification, to convey security requirements to contractors when contract performance requires access to classified information. Prime contractors also use DD Form 254 to convey security requirements to subcontractors who also require access to classified information. See *Defense Sols. Grp., LLC*, B-420353, Feb. 15, 2022, 2022 CPD ¶ 124 at 2 n.3; see also generally, NISPOM Rule, available at <https://www.dcsa.mil/Industrial-Security/National-Industrial-Security-Program-Oversight/32-CFR-Part-117-NISPOM-Rule/> (last visited May 11, 2023).

	Technical Management Approach	Previous Experience	Price
Inflowlogistics	Very Good	Acceptable	\$79,433,975
ASIRTek	Very Good	Very Good	\$74,426,146

AR, Tab 9, Award Decision Document at 19, 21.

Under the technical management approach factor, the agency identified six strengths and one weakness for Inflowlogistics, as well as five strengths and no weaknesses for ASIRTek. AR, Tab 8, Consensus Technical Review at 3-4, 6-8. Under the previous-experience factor, the agency assigned neither strengths nor weaknesses to Inflowlogistics’s proposal and assigned four strengths to ASIRTek’s proposal. *Id.* at 5-6, 10.

The agency selected ASIRTek’s proposal for award on February 2, 2023. COS at 19. In making the award decision, the agency found that a tradeoff was unnecessary because the protester’s proposal did not “offer notable benefits to the [g]overnment that would justify paying a price premium over ASIRTek’s proposal.” AR, Tab 9, Award Decision Document at 37. Evaluators noted that ASIRTek’s proposal received the highest rating for non-price factors and offered the lowest price, concluding that ASIRTek’s proposal presented the best value to the agency. *Id.*

On February 3, the agency notified Inflowlogistics that its proposal had not been selected for award and gave the protester the opportunity to submit written questions, which Inflowlogistics sent via email on February 6. COS at 21. On February 13, the protester told the agency that it no longer requested responses to its written questions and notified the agency that it would be filing a protest. That same day, Inflowlogistics filed this protest with our Office.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> As noted above, the task order RFP here was issued by GSA on behalf of the Air Force under the OASIS IDIQ contracts established by GSA. For purposes of determining the applicable dollar value threshold for our Office’s jurisdiction to hear protests in connection with the issuance of a task or delivery order, we analyze the statutory authority (*i.e.*, title 10 or title 41 of the United States Code) under which the IDIQ contract was established, rather than the authority applicable to the agency that issued the task or delivery order. See *Analytic Strategies LLC; Gemini Indus., Inc.*, B-413758.2, B-413758.3, Nov. 28, 2016, 2016 CPD ¶ 340 at 2 n.2. The GSA OASIS IDIQ contracts were established under the authority of title 41, and thus the jurisdictional dollar threshold applicable here is \$10 million. 41 U.S.C. § 4106(f)(1)(B). The value of the protested task order exceeds this amount, and, as such, this protest is within our jurisdiction to hear protests of task orders placed under civilian agency IDIQ contracts. *Id.*

## DECISION

Inflowlogistics challenges the weakness it received under the technical factor, arguing that it was improperly assessed based on the agency's application of an unstated evaluation criterion. Protest at 11. Inflowlogistics also challenges the agency's evaluation of ASIRTek's proposal, arguing that the agency improperly ignored the awardee's alleged failure to propose computer analysts with the proper certifications. *Id.* at 14. In its supplemental protest, Inflowlogistics contends that the agency treated the two proposals disparately when evaluators assigned a strength to ASIRTek for its transition manager but "failed to award Inflowlogistics a strength for its proposed use of a dedicated [t]ransition [m]anager." Comments and Supp. Protest at 15-16. Finally, Inflowlogistics asserts that the agency made a flawed best-value determination and failed to reasonably consider technical discriminators in its tradeoff decision. *Id.* at 21-22. After reviewing the record, we find no basis to sustain Inflowlogistics's protest.<sup>5</sup>

### Technical Management Approach Weakness

As noted above, the protester argues that the agency improperly applied an unstated evaluation criterion in assessing its proposal with a weakness under the technical factor. Protest at 11. In assigning the weakness, the agency concluded that the protester's security plan did not "mention anything regarding employees having [counterintelligence polygraph (CI-Poly)] exam qualification." *Id.* at 10 (quoting AR, Tab 8, Consensus Technical Review at 8). Inflowlogistics contends that this concern ignores language in its proposal addressing this issue. Specifically, the protester points to language in its proposal indicating that its team had experience through prior efforts in "obtaining the highest-level clearances with polygraphs." Protest at 13 (quoting AR, Tab 5, Technical Management Approach at 43). The protester also maintains that the weakness is based on an unstated evaluation criterion because the solicitation did not require a security plan.<sup>6</sup> Protest at 11-12 (quoting AR, Tab 9, Award Decision Document at 11). In the alternative, Inflowlogistics complains that it was unreasonable to "elevate the limited need for some personnel on a discrete part of this contract to have CI-Poly

---

<sup>5</sup> In its various protest submissions, Inflowlogistics has raised arguments that are in addition to, or variations of, those specifically discussed below. While we do not specifically address all of the protester's arguments, we have considered all of them and find that they afford no basis on which to sustain the protest.

<sup>6</sup> In its initial protest, the protester uses the term "mitigation plan," but the agency clarified in its report that the evaluators' prior use of this term was a clerical error, as the agency was referencing the protester's security plan. COS at 22. The protester asserts in its comments that the solicitation did not require offerors to submit a security plan, either. Comments and Supp. Protest at 8.

qualifications” to the level of a weakness, acknowledging that the need for CI-Poly qualification appears in the RFP. Protest at 12-13.

The agency argues that the solicitation clearly requires CI-Poly testing and further explains that “CI-POLY has been a problematic issue for those working on site. . . . Mentioning CI-POLY qualifications, pre-screening or other efforts . . . would have helped the government determine ‘the adequacy of the approach, [and] the quality and completeness of their technical solutions to these objectives.’” Memorandum of Law (MOL) at 5-6; COS at 22-23 (quoting RFP at 54 regarding how offerors would be evaluated for their technical management approach).<sup>7</sup> The agency also rejects the protester’s assertion that Inflowlogistics addressed CI-Poly testing anywhere in its proposal, and argues that the single reference it made to general polygraph testing was distinct from, and did not address, the unique CI-Poly testing requirement. MOL at 7.

In reviewing protests challenging the evaluation of proposals in a task order competition, we do not conduct a new evaluation or substitute our judgment for that of the agency, but examine the record to determine whether the agency’s judgment was reasonable and in accord with the evaluation criteria and applicable procurement laws and regulations. *IndraSoft, Inc.*, B-414026, B-414026.2, Jan. 23, 2017, 2017 CPD ¶ 30 at 6. A protester’s disagreement with an agency’s judgment is not sufficient to establish that an agency acted unreasonably. See *SRA Int’l, Inc.; Vistronix, LLC*, B-413000, B-413000.2, July 25, 2016, 2016 CPD ¶ 208 at 10.

We agree with the agency that its evaluation was consistent with the terms of the RFP’s stated basis for evaluation. The solicitation references the need for CI-Poly testing in two places: the portion of the RFP requiring this level of security clearance for personnel with access to certain systems, and in connection with the DD254 form, which was attached to the solicitation and was required to be completed as part of the security plan. RFP at 6, 40, 56. Also, notwithstanding the protester’s assertion to the contrary, the RFP specifically required offerors to address their security plan as part of the technical management approach section of their proposals. RFP at 56. The security plan required the submission of a DD254 form and required that “personnel proposed for positions identified as requiring a security clearance level must have an active security clearance.” *Id.* Inflowlogistics in fact discussed its security plan, but it did not specifically address the solicitation requirement for CI-Poly testing, a requirement that the protester itself acknowledges exists in the plain language of the solicitation. See Protest at 12. Further, we agree with the agency that any reference by Inflowlogistics to polygraph testing fell outside of the mandatory page limit and that, in any event, such a reference was to general polygraph testing, which is different from

---

<sup>7</sup> The MOL and supplemental MOL contain inconsistent pagination, as the original page numbers on the document itself do not align with the Adobe PDF page numbers. All citations to the MOL and the supplemental MOL are to the Adobe PDF page numbers.

CI-Poly testing.<sup>8</sup> Consequently, we find that the agency reasonably assessed a weakness in Inflowlogistics's proposal for failing to sufficiently address the solicitation's requirements.<sup>9</sup> This protest ground is denied.

#### Alleged Weakness in ASIRTEK's Proposal

Inflowlogistics argues that the agency should have downgraded ASIRTEK's proposal because it failed to provide computer network defense analysts with the proper certifications. Protest at 14. The protester points to the solicitation requirements for these analysts, one of which states that "[m]inimum training standard will be Network+ and Certified Ethical Hacker certifications." RFP at 25. Inflowlogistics also points to a different part of the solicitation that states "[t]he [c]ontractor is responsible for ensuring all employees possess and maintain current [i]nformation certifications and or licenses as described through the entire contract." RFP at 9. The protester asserts that "[u]nder the technical evaluation, the [a]gency should have downgraded ASIRTEK for not

---

<sup>8</sup> The agency explains that general polygraph testing is broader in nature, while CI-Poly testing seeks to determine whether the examinee has worked against the United States government through means such as espionage or unauthorized disclosure of classified material. See COS at 24.

<sup>9</sup> The protester raises a supplemental argument, claiming that the agency unreasonably failed to evaluate its entire technical proposal, as the quality control plan was exempt from the technical narrative page limit and that plan contained the reference to the protester's ability to obtain "the highest-level clearances with polygraphs." Comments and Supp. Protest at 4-5. The evaluation documents show, and the agency explains, that the protester's reference to "the highest-level clearances with polygraphs" was contained in a part that the protester itself labeled "Back Up Detail, not Required" and which the agency deemed "not directly related" to the quality control plan; thus, those additional pages were not evaluated because "there was a clear break in the proposal where the draft [quality control plan] ended and the [part of the proposal titled] "Back Up Detail, not Required" [] began." MOL at 6-7; Supp. MOL at 3.

Where a solicitation directs offerors to address their approach to certain solicitation requirements in specific proposal sections, agencies are not required to search for information regarding that approach in other sections of a proposal. See *Morgan Bus Consulting, LLC*, B-418165.6, B-418165.9, Apr. 15, 2021, 2021 CPD ¶ 171 at 13. It is an offeror's responsibility to submit a well-written proposal, with adequately detailed information that clearly demonstrates compliance with the solicitation and allows a meaningful review. *Id.* Inflowlogistics put certain information about polygraph testing in a part of its proposal that may have been its quality control plan, but was titled in a confusing manner, rather than in the technical narrative. In doing so, the protester assumed the risk of its proposal being evaluated unfavorably. Moreover, as previously stated, we agree with the agency's argument that general polygraph testing is different from CI-Poly testing, and the protester's disagreement with the agency's judgment has not established that the agency acted unreasonably. See *SRA Int'l, Inc.; Vistrionix, LLC*, *supra*. This ground is denied.

proposing [computer analysts] that are qualified to perform on [the] contract.” Protest at 16. Inflowlogistics complains that the agency “read ASIRTek’s proposal in an expansive manner to resolve any doubts about how it would meet this requirement,” in contrast to “the exacting standard that the [a]gency applied” in identifying a weakness based on the protester’s failure to address CI-Poly testing. Comments and Supp. Protest at 14.

The agency responds that Inflowlogistics misinterprets the solicitation--the RFP did not require computer network defense analysts to obtain certified ethical hacker certifications prior to award. MOL at 8. Further, the agency asserts that ASIRTek’s proposal definitively committed to obtaining these certifications “within six months of contract award or as required.” *Id.* at 10. Ultimately, the agency argues that the RFP did not require that computer network defense analysts hold certified ethical hacker certifications at the time of proposal submission because they are a minimum training standard, rather than a minimum requirement, and a matter of contract administration. Supp. MOL at 8; Supp. COS at 6.

We have found that provisions that require a contractor to obtain necessary certifications establish performance requirements that must be satisfied by the successful offeror during contract performance; as such, offerors are not required to satisfy the requirements prior to award, and the requirements do not affect the award decision, except as a matter of a contractor’s general responsibility. *MILVETS Systems Technology, Inc.*, B-411721.2, B-411721.3, Jan. 14, 2016, 2016 CPD ¶ 42 at 10. Moreover, in the absence of a solicitation requirement that offerors provide proof of qualifications or certifications prior to award, such requirements constitute performance provisions rather than preconditions for award, and whether an offeror complies with such certification requirements is a matter of contract administration. See *Bode Aviation, Inc.*, B-411265, June 26, 2015, 2015 CPD ¶ 191 at 3.

Here, we agree with the agency that this is a matter of contract administration. To the extent Inflowlogistics argues that the agency has treated it unfairly by identifying a weakness regarding CI-Poly testing while not requiring computer network defense analysts possess certain certifications at the time of award, we find that the two requirements are different. As previously discussed, the protester did not address CI-Poly testing in its technical narrative, and only generally referenced obtaining higher-level clearances with polygraph testing in a separate part of its proposal that was deemed to be outside the page limit. The solicitation requirement for CI-Poly testing was one the agency considered to be necessarily addressed in offerors’ proposals. See MOL at 4-5. Based on our review of the record, we do not find the agency’s position in this regard unreasonable. See RFP at 6, 40, 56.

In contrast, the agency distinguishes security clearance requirements from training certifications and views the solicitation requirements regarding ethical hacker certifications as matters of contract administration. See Supp. MOL at 8; Supp. COS at 6. The agency’s view in this regard reflects the solicitation requirement that such



certifications be obtained “through the entire contract.”<sup>10</sup> See RFP at 9. Based on our review of the record, we do not find the agency’s position unreasonable. That is, the agency reasonably concluded that ethical hacker certifications constituted performance provisions rather than preconditions for award. See *Bode Aviation, Inc., supra*. Ultimately, whether ASIRTek complies with the certification requirements is a matter of contract administration, which we will not review. 4 C.F.R. § 21.5(a). Accordingly, this protest ground is denied.

### Disparate Treatment Allegation

In its supplemental protest, Inflowlogistics argues that the agency disparately evaluated proposals by assessing a strength to ASIRTek’s proposal under the technical management approach factor and failing to identify a similar strength in the protester’s proposal. Comments and Supp. Protest at 15-16. Specifically, Inflowlogistics contends that the agency should have assigned its proposal a strength for its proposed use of a “highly experienced [t]ransition [m]anager,” asserting that while both offerors proposed to assign a transition manager, only ASIRTek was credited with a strength, whereas Inflowlogistics was not. *Id.* In its supplemental comments, the protester adds that, to the extent ASIRTek received a strength for its knowledge transfer plan, Inflowlogistics proposed a “substantively indistinguishable offering,” asserting that both firms had proposed coordinating with incumbent leadership to ensure a smooth transition. Supp. Comments at 10.

The agency responds that the protester has mischaracterized the basis for ASIRTek’s strength, which was for ASIRTek’s overall transition plan, including “the development of a knowledge transfer plan that would ensure a timely transition.” Supp. MOL at 5. Consequently, the agency asserts that there is no evidence of disparate treatment, as the differences in evaluation stemmed from differences between the proposals. *Id.* at 6. Finally, the agency notes that the protester also received a strength for its overall transition plan. *Id.*

It is a fundamental principle of federal procurement law that a contracting agency must treat all firms equally and evaluate their proposals evenhandedly against the solicitation’s requirements and evaluation criteria. See *Sumaria Sys., Inc.; COLSA Corp.*, B-412961, B-412961.2, July 21, 2016, 2016 CPD ¶ 188 at 10. Where a protester alleges unequal treatment in a technical evaluation, it must show that the differences in ratings did not stem from differences between the proposals. *Paragon Sys., Inc.; SecTek, Inc.*, B-409066.2, B-409066.3, June 4, 2014, 2014 CPD ¶ 169 at 8-9. Accordingly, to prevail on an allegation of disparate treatment, a protester must show that the agency unreasonably downgraded its proposal for features that were substantively indistinguishable from, or nearly identical to, those contained in other

---

<sup>10</sup> The RFP advised offerors that “[t]he [c]ontractor is responsible for ensuring all employees possess and maintain current [i]nformation certifications and or licenses as described through the entire contract.” RFP at 9.

proposals. *Battelle Mem'l Inst.*, B-418047.3, B-418047.4, May 18, 2020, 2020 CPD ¶ 176 at 5.

Here, we agree with the agency that the protester has failed to show disparate treatment. In contrast to the protester's claim, the record shows that the agency assigned a strength to the awardee's proposal not just for the proposed transition manager, but also for ASIRTek's development of "a knowledge transfer plan that will help contribute to a successful 30-day transition plan" through the planned use of [REDACTED]. AR, Tab 9, Award Decision Document at 6-7. The record also shows that the agency identified a strength in the protester's proposal for its transition plan, based on Inflowlogistics's plan to transition [REDACTED] to ensure full staffing, to utilize [REDACTED] to attract talent, and to [REDACTED] to identify recruits and cultivate talent. *Id.* at 10. In other words, the agency identified strengths in the protester's and awardee's proposals based on their respective transition plans, and those strengths were based on unique aspects of those plans. Inflowlogistics has not shown that the agency unfairly evaluated features of its proposal that were substantively indistinguishable from those contained in ASIRTek's proposal. See *Battelle Mem'l Inst.*, *supra*. As such, this protest ground is denied.

#### Best-Value Determination

Finally, Inflowlogistics contends that the agency made an unreasonable best-value tradeoff decision. The protester first argues that the allegedly flawed technical evaluation renders the award decision inherently flawed. Comments and Supp. Protest at 16-17. The protester also asserts that the agency failed to reasonably consider technical discriminators between the awardee's and protester's proposals, contending that the agency did not sufficiently document its award decision or "explain why Inflowlogistics'[s] specific technical enhancers did not warrant the slight price premium." *Id.* at 18.

The agency responds that the record clearly documents and demonstrates the reasonableness of its award decision. Supp. MOL at 10. The agency also asserts that the government is only required to make a cost/technical tradeoff when one technical proposal is more highly rated, but the other proposal has a lower price, noting that ASIRTek's proposal had both higher technical ratings and a lower price. *Id.* Ultimately, the agency contends that it did make a qualitative assessment of the proposals, finding that Inflowlogistics's proposal "[did not] offer notable benefits to the [g]overnment that would justify paying a price premium." AR, Tab 9, Award Decision Document at 37; Supp. COS at 7.

Where, as here, the highest technically rated, lowest-cost proposal is selected for award, a cost/technical tradeoff is not required. *NTT Data Servs. Fed. Gov't, LLC*, B-420274, B-420274.2, Jan. 18, 2022, 2022 CPD ¶ 69 at 18.

We find that the agency properly exercised its discretion in making its best-value award decision. Inflowlogistics's argument that the agency's best-value determination was

irrational is predicated on the various alleged improprieties in the agency's evaluation, discussed above. Because we have found these allegations to be without merit, we find no basis to question the reasonableness of the agency's determination that the awardee's lower-priced, higher-rated proposal represented the best value to the government. Further, the government did not have to conduct a price/technical tradeoff in this case, given ASIRTek's higher ratings and lower price. Ultimately, the protester's disagreement with the agency's conclusions regarding the relative merits of the proposals, without more, does not establish that the award decision was unreasonable. See *SRA Int'l, Inc.; Vistronix, LLC, supra*.

The protest is denied.

Edda Emmanuelli Perez  
General Counsel