



Comptroller General
of the United States

Washington, D.C. 20548

Decision

414175

Matter of: GRD, Inc.
File: B-251926
Date: May 14, 1993

Thomas A. Giacomponello for the protester.
Diane-Marie Carrero, Esq., and Jonathan H. Kosarin, Esq.,
Department of the Navy, for the agency.
John L. Formica, Esq., and James A. Spangenberg, Esq.,
Office of the General Counsel, GAO, participated in the
preparation of the decision.

DIGEST

Agency's determination that a protester's proposal for specialized training services was unacceptable was reasonable where the protester proposed an individual in its best and final offer to perform the required services whose resume did not demonstrate that he met the minimum experience requirements set forth in the solicitation.

DECISION

GRD, Inc. protests the award of a contract to Kay and Associates, Inc. under request for proposals (RFP) No. N00140-92-R-3428, issued by the Department of the Navy for training in the maintenance of aircraft communications equipment at three different locations, including the Naval Air Station (NAS) at Patuxent River, Maryland. GRD argues that the Navy improperly rejected its proposal as technically unacceptable with regard to its offer to perform the required services at Patuxent River.

We deny the protest.

The RFP was issued on July 27, 1992, for the performance of training services at the Patuxent River NAS, the Norfolk, Virginia, NAS, and Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma. The RFP referred to each location as a "bid lot," and the services to be performed at each location as a "task." Awards on a lot-by-lot/task-by-task basis, of firm, fixed-price contracts, were to be made to the offerors submitting the low priced, technically acceptable offers.

The RFP provided detailed instructions for the preparation of technical proposals. Offerors were informed that they were to furnish a complete explanation of the background experience of the personnel proposed for each bid lot or task. The solicitation included guidelines for the preparation of resumes, and a detailed sample resume. The RFP set forth for each task "qualification requirements," which detailed certain education and experience requirements for proposed personnel, and specified that "[a]ll resumes must demonstrate each individual's general and specific experience as it applies to the . . . qualification requirements detailed to the required task."

The agency received proposals from four offerors with respect to the services to be performed at Patuxent River. Three of the proposals, including GRD's, were found technically acceptable and included in the competitive range. Discussions were held, and best and final offers (BAFO) were requested and received.

GRD, the incumbent contractor at Patuxent River, revised its acceptable initial offer by substituting the resume of the individual who had performed the services under the predecessor contract with the resume of another individual. In evaluating GRD's BAFO, the agency found that the resume of the individual proposed failed to demonstrate that the individual had the level of experience specified as required by the RFP. Specifically, the agency determined that the individual proposed did not have 2 years of experience at the intermediate and organizational maintenance levels gained within the past 5 years on the equipment specified in the RFP as required.¹ Based on its evaluation, the agency concluded that GRD's proposal for Patuxent River was technically unacceptable.

¹As explained by the agency, organizational level maintenance is normally performed by an operating unit on a day-to-day basis in support of its own mission, and is the maintenance of assigned aircraft in a full mission capable status. Organizational level maintenance functions include inspections, servicing, record keeping, and corrective and preventative maintenance. Intermediate level maintenance is performed by designated maintenance activities in support of the using activities, and is performed when operational level maintenance is inadequate to remedy a potential problem. Intermediate level maintenance consists of equipment calibration, maintenance on aeronautical components, processing of aircraft components from stricken aircraft, and providing technical assistance to supported units.

GRD argues that the agency improperly evaluated its proposal with regard to the services to be performed at Patuxent River. The protester claims that the individual it proposed for Patuxent River "more than meets the requirement[s]" of the RFP with regard to tasks to be performed because the individual has "29 months [of experience] as an inflight maintenance technician" gained since 1988, and "2,500 hours of classroom time as an avionics systems maintenance instructor."

In reviewing protests concerning the propriety of an agency's evaluation of proposals, we will examine the agency's evaluation to ensure that it had a reasonable basis. Tate-Griffin Joint Venture, B-241377.2, Jan. 7, 1992, 92-1 CPD ¶ 29. The fact that a protester does not agree with the agency's evaluation does not render the evaluation unreasonable. Id.

While the protester may be correct in its assertion that the 29 months of experience as an inflight maintenance technician possessed by the individual proposed in GRD's BAFO meets the qualification requirements set forth in the RFP, the resume submitted with the BAFO does not contain any reference to this 29 months of experience. With regard to the individual's 2,500 hours of classroom time as an avionics systems maintenance instructor, the resume provides that this experience was gained between 1985 and July 1988, and is thus outside of the 5-year period preceding the Navy's issuance of the RFP as required. Based on our review of GRD's proposal, including the individual's resume, we cannot find unreasonable the agency's determination that the individual's experience referenced in the resume did not demonstrate that the individual possessed the required 2 years of maintenance level experience. In this regard, GRD submitted this resume, which contains vague and broad descriptions of the individual's experience, despite the solicitation's detailed instructions that require resumes to demonstrate specific experience as it applies to the particular task's minimum qualification requirements.² It is an offeror's responsibility to prepare an adequately written proposal which can be evaluated in accordance with the criteria set

²GRD assumed the risk that its substitution of the individual proposed in its initial offer, who had performed the services for the Navy under the predecessor contract, with another individual in its BAFO, might raise questions concerning the individual's ability to meet the qualification requirements specified in the solicitation, and thus result in the rejection of its proposal as technically unacceptable. Ramtech Modular Design, Inc., B-243700, Aug. 6, 1991, 91-2 CPD ¶ 132; RCA Serv. Co., B-219643, Nov. 18, 1985, 85-2 CPD ¶ 563.

forth in the solicitation; an offeror runs the risk of being rejected if it does not submit an adequately written proposal. Engineering Mgmt. Resources, Inc., B-248866, Sept. 29, 1992, 92-2 CPD ¶ 217. In sum, the Navy reasonably determined that GRD's BAFO did not meet the experience and capability requirements for the tasks to be performed at Patuxent River, and that the proposal was thus unacceptable.

The protest is denied.



for James F. Hinchman
General Counsel