### PRATT'S GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING LAW REPORT

VOLUME 10	NUMBER 8	August 2024
Editor's Note: PPP Problems Victoria Prussen Spears		239
The Paycheck Protection Pro Llewelyn M. Engel, Sam Crock	gram Today: Lessons Learned and Wh kett Neel and Julian L. André	nat Lies Ahead 241
, 0	tractors, Beware of Lapses in SAM Re n, George E. Petel and Vaibhavi Patria	gistration 246
What the New Federal Artific Contractors Zohra Tejani	ial Intelligence Rules Mean For Govern	ment 250
In the Courts Steven A. Meyerowitz		255



### QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

Outside the United States and Canada, please call ......

Library of Congress Card Number:

ISBN: 978-1-6328-2705-0 (print)

ISSN: 2688-7290

Cite this publication as:

[author name], [article title], [vol. no.] PRATT'S GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING LAW REPORT [page number] (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

Michelle E. Litteken, GAO Holds NASA Exceeded Its Discretion in Protest of FSS Task Order, 1 PRATT'S GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING LAW REPORT 30 (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

Because the section you are citing may be revised in a later release, you may wish to photocopy or print out the section for convenient future reference.

This publication is designed to provide authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of RELX Inc. Matthew Bender, the Matthew Bender Flame Design, and A.S. Pratt are registered trademarks of Matthew Bender Properties Inc.

Copyright © 2024 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved. Originally published in: 2017

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis or Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

Editorial Office 230 Park Ave., 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169 (800) 543-6862 www.lexisnexis.com

MATTHEW & BENDER

(800) 223-1940

(518) 487-3385

# Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors

### **EDITOR-IN-CHIEF**

STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ

President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

### **EDITOR**

VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS

Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS MARY BETH BOSCO

Partner, Holland & Knight LLP

PABLO J. DAVIS

Of Counsel, Dinsmore & Shohl LLP

MERLE M. DELANCEY JR.

Partner, Blank Rome LLP

J. ANDREW HOWARD

Partner, Alston & Bird LLP

KYLE R. JEFCOAT

Counsel, Latham & Watkins LLP

JOHN E. JENSEN

Partner, Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP

DISMAS LOCARIA

Partner, Venable LLP

MARCIA G. MADSEN

Partner, Mayer Brown LLP

KEVIN P. MULLEN

Partner, Morrison & Foerster LLP

VINCENT J. NAPOLEON

Partner, Nixon Peabody LLP

KEITH SZELIGA

Partner, Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton LLP

STUART W. TURNER

Counsel, Arnold & Porter

ERIC WHYTSELL

Partner, Stinson Leonard Street LLP

Pratt's Government Contracting Law Report is published 12 times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Copyright © 2024 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 9443 Springboro Pike, Miamisburg, OH 45342 or call Customer Support at 1-800-833-9844. Direct any editorial inquiries and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway Suite 18R, Floral Park, New York smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 631.291.5541. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to lawyers and law firms, in-house counsel, government lawyers, senior business executives, and anyone interested in privacy and cybersecurity related issues and legal developments. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Pratt's Government Contracting Law Report*, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 230 Park Ave. 7th Floor, New York NY 10169.

iV (2024–Pub.4938)

## SAM (Registered) I Am: Contractors, Beware of Lapses in SAM Registration

### By Kara M. Sacilotto, Brian Walsh, George E. Petel and Vaibhavi Patria\*

In this article, the authors examine a recent decision by the Government Accountability Office that offers the lesson that government contractors should give themselves plenty of time before their deadline to renew their System for Award Management registration if they have any pending awards or upcoming proposal submissions, especially because the system can take days (or even weeks) to display an active status.

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) has sustained¹ a disappointed offeror's protest alleging that a solicitation's inclusion of FAR 52.204-7 required the awardee to be found ineligible because its System for Award Management (SAM) registration temporarily lapsed for approximately 24 hours after its proposal submission but before award.

In *TLS Joint Venture, LLC*, GAO extended last year's Court of Federal Claims (COFC) decision in *Myriddian, LLC v. United States*, which held that the plain language of FAR 52.204-7 required the agency to disqualify an awardee whose SAM registration lapsed pending award.

Moreover, GAO was unpersuaded by the agency's defense that FAR 52.204-7 did not require continuous registration and—even if it did—the awardee satisfied the requirement by submitting its renewal information in SAM prior to expiration of its existing registration. And, GAO found that there was competitive prejudice.

Now that GAO has joined COFC in finding that an awardee was ineligible for failure to maintain an active SAM registration continuing from proposal submission until award, contractors should be on high alert given the vagaries of the SAM registration and update process.

### **BACKGROUND**

In *TLS*, GAO addressed the meaning of FAR 52.204-7 and the sequence of efforts necessary for a contractor to update their SAM registration. After asking the General Services Administration (GSA) to weigh in on the process and detailing the numerous steps to update a registration, GAO noted that the SAM

**246** (7/2024–Pub.4938)

<sup>\*</sup> The authors, attorneys with Wiley Rein LLP, may be contacted at ksacilotto@wiley.law, bwalsh@wiley.law, gpetel@wiley.law and vpatria@wiley.law, respectively.

https://www.gao.gov/products/b-422275#mt=e-report.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> TLS Joint Venture, LLC, B-422275 (GAO April 1, 2024).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Myriddian, LLC v. United States, 165 Fed. Cl. 650 (COFC 2023).

registration of the awardee, SFR, expired at 9:34 a.m. on December 11, and that the Government did not activate the renewed registration until 9:48 a.m. on December 12. As a consequence, GAO found that the awardee did not comply with FAR 52.204-7.

FAR 52.204-7 was amended to clarify that an offeror is required to be registered in SAM at the time of proposal submission and that the offeror "shall continue to be registered until time of award"; the older version required only that offerors "be registered in the SAM database *prior to award*, during performance, and through final payment of any contract." In *TLS*, the agency argued that the regulatory history of the change indicated that the FAR Council did not intend to "create new requirements for offerors" but to clarify the required timing for SAM registration. GAO rejected any reliance on this regulatory history, however, finding that the FAR provision was unambiguous by its terms.

Taking a step further, GAO turned to the definition of what it means to be "registered" in SAM and held that FAR 52.204-7 is satisfied only when offerors enter all mandatory information, complete all representations and certifications, receive validation from the Government, and the Government has marked the record as "active." Thus, GAO cautioned that "until that sequence is complete, the contractor is not registered in SAM."

GAO found this error rose to the level of competitive prejudice: "[W]e conclude that, but for the agency's failure to identify SFR as ineligible for award under the terms of the RFP, TLS would have had a substantial chance for award as one of the offerors remaining in the competitive field." TLS was also next in line for award.

### OTHER DECISIONS

TLS comes after GAO's 2021 decision in Continuity Global Solutions-Secure Me WLL Security, JV.4 There, an offeror that was not registered in SAM and deemed ineligible argued that the agency was "required" to waive the "minor informality." GAO stated that "because registration—or failure to register—in SAM does not affect a firm's obligation to perform in accordance with the terms of the solicitation, compliance with the registration requirement is not a matter of responsiveness, but rather a matter of responsibility" and "in a negotiated procurement, information to be used in determining responsibility could be submitted up until the time of award and an agency properly may provide an offeror with an opportunity to submit the information prior to award." GAO denied the protest and upheld an agency's disqualification because the agency

**247** (7/2024–Pub.4938)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Continuity Global Solutions-Secure Me WLL Security, JV, B-419875 (GAO 2021).

had, in fact, provided the offeror an opportunity to cure by demonstrating its active status, and the offeror could not.

In *TLS*, GAO does not cite to or even mention its 2021 decision. Rather, in a footnote, it cites to *CGS-ASP Security JV LLC*, decided in 2022,<sup>5</sup> and states: "A challenge that an offeror did not comply with a mandatory solicitation requirement, such as FAR provision 52.204-7, does not constitute part of the agency's responsibility determination."

GAO also did not cite to or mention its 2020 decision in *Phoenix Envt'l Design, Inc.*, where it held that "[w]ith respect to allegations that an offeror's SAM registration is inaccurate or incomplete, our Office has generally recognized that minor informalities related to SAM (or its predecessor systems) registration generally do not undermine the validity of the award and are waivable by the agency without prejudice to other offerors. . . . We have found no prejudicial error in such cases largely because an awardee's registration status does not implicate the terms of its proposal, and there is nothing to suggest that another offeror would have altered its proposal to its competitive advantage in response to a relaxed SAM registration requirement."

Regardless of whether an offeror's SAM registration ultimately pertains to its responsibility—which agencies can raise with an offeror without holding discussions—or its responsiveness to a solicitation's requirements, unless and until the FAR Council amends FAR 52.204-7, COFC and apparently now GAO will strictly apply the requirements for SAM registration when the solicitation incorporates the current version of FAR 52.204-7.

Contractors should take note. The SAM registration and update process includes numerous governmental steps, some of which are manual, such as sending the record to the Internal Revenue Service for verification of the contractor taxpayer identification number. The Defense Logistics Agency must also verify the contractor's CAGE code, and once all of these steps are completed, GSA must process the application and mark the registration as "active." Under the best of circumstances, as shown in *TLS*'s registration timeline, this can take several days. Unfortunately, however, the process can experience delays at any point and take even weeks for a registration to be updated. As a final observation, while it may not have changed the outcome, the awardee did not intervene in the GAO protest. Contractors may also wish to take note of the non-intervention here as a "lesson learned."

248

(7/2024-Pub.4938)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> CGS-ASP Security JV LLC, B-420497 (GAO 2022).

<sup>6</sup> Phoenix Envt'l Design, Inc., B-418473 (GAO 2020).

### WHAT THIS MEANS FOR INDUSTRY

The *TLS* decision serves as another cautionary tale for contractors to take seriously what appears to be a minor ministerial task. Both GAO and the COFC have found that the current language in FAR 52.204-7 mandates severe impacts on contractors having SAM registration issues, even where government processing delays are the cause. *TLS* offers the lesson that contractors should give themselves plenty of time before their deadline to renew their SAM registration if they have any pending awards or upcoming proposal submissions, especially because the system can take days (or even weeks) to display an active status.

**249** (7/2024–Pub.4938)