Konvitz
023946

DECISION

THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

FILE: B-213574 DATE: April 19, 1984

MATTER OF: Integrity Management International, Inc.

DIGEST:

1. Protest that agency's refusal to permit weekend site visit to observe mess attendant services precludes intelligent bidding for weekend services is without merit where solicitation contains information sufficient to prepare bids for weekend services.

2. Government is not required to equalize competitive advantage of past contractor where such advantage does not result from preference or unfair action by government.

Integrity Management International, Inc. (Integrity), protests invitation for bids (IFB) No. N00600-83-B-4694, issued by the Naval Sea Systems Command (Navy), for mess attendant services for the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland. Integrity argues that the Navy's restriction of an onsite visit to a weekday hinders a bidder's ability to prepare manning lists for weekends and bid competitively for weekend services and results in an unfair competitive advantage for the incumbent contractor. The Navy has advised this Office that award was made on December 15, 1983.

We deny Integrity's protest.

For purposes of determining responsibility, bidders were required to submit manning lists showing daily estimates of mess attendant personnel present to perform various services.

The Navy maintains that the solicitation package which permitted a weekday onsite visit contained adequate information to prepare daily manning lists and submit realistic prices for weekend services. We agree.

The solicitation contains daily estimates of work volume, i.e., estimates which show the number of individuals

to be served on a daily basis for each month of the contract. These figures, which are not challenged by the protester, show the variances in work volume for weekdays, weekends, holidays and special events and for each meal. The solicitation also provides monthly estimates of the number of tables to be served, a detailed description of services to be performed by mess attendant personnel and floor plans of the work areas. Based upon this, we do not see how the Navy's refusal to provide a weekend site visit affected the protester's ability to prepare manning lists and intelligently bid for weekend services. See Dynalectron Corp., B-193679, August 11, 1981, 81-2 CPD 115. Moreover, in this regard, we note that only three of the nine bidders attended the weekday site visit provided and the protester did not attend.

Concerning Integrity's allegation that the Navy's failure to permit a weekend site visit gives the incumbent an unfair competitive advantage, we point out that any advantage which the incumbent contractor may possess by virtue of its past experience, absent preferential treatment by the government, is not unfair and the government is not required to equalize competition to compensate for the incumbent's advantage. Southeastern Services, Inc., and MC&E Service Support Co., Inc., B-183108, June 16, 1975, 75-1 CPD 366. Here, as discussed above, the solicitation contained information sufficient for all bidders to prepare daily manning lists and bid intelligently and, therefore, we cannot conclude that the Navy's refusal to allow a weekend site visit resulted in an unfair competitive advantage for the incumbent. Southeastern Services, Inc., and MC&E Service Support Co., Inc., supra.

The protest is denied.

for Comptroller General
of the United States