

DECISION

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

FILE: B-218001

DATE: January 25, 1985

MATTER OF: Integrity Management International

DIGEST:

Protest that incumbent contractor's proposal was excluded improperly from the competitive range is dismissed for failure to state a valid basis of protest where protester's grounds of protest--its belief that it prepared a complete proposal, and that its proposal reflected its experience as the incumbent, and that the competitive range may have been limited to one firm because its proposal was rejected--do not in themselves state a legal basis to object to the agency's rejection of the firm's proposal.

Integrity Management International (IMI) protests the rejection of its technical proposal under request for proposals (RFP) No. DABT35-84-R-0040, issued by the Department of the Army (Army). IMI advises that by letter received on January 7, 1985, the Army advised IMI that its proposal was not within the competitive range because it "fell significantly short of Performance Work Statement requirements and due to extensive technical deficiencies [which made] meaningful discussion fruitless." IMI asserts that based on its prior 2 years' experience as the incumbent contractor performing virtually identical types of services as are required under this RFP and its "careful attention to preparation of the proposal," it believes that the determination that its proposal was technically unacceptable must have been unreasonable. IMI also states that it knows other major firms were preparing proposals, but believes that the competitive range for this RFP was limited to one proposal.

We find that the protester has failed to state a valid basis of protest. Therefore, pursuant to section 21.3(f) of our Bid Protest Regulations, 49 Fed. Reg. 49419 (December 20, 1984)(to be codified at 4 C.F.R. part 21), we dismiss this protest without requiring the submission of an agency report.

031086

IMI's assertion that the Army should not have found its proposal outside the competitive range because it believes it prepared a complete proposal and because of its experience as the incumbent for the solicited service does not in itself provide a valid basis for protesting the agency's determination. See Micronics, Inc., B-215266, Nov. 13, 1984, 84-2 C.P.D. ¶ 521. Furthermore, even if the Army's decision to exclude IMI's proposal from the competitive range resulted in a competitive range of one, this does not by itself constitute a valid basis for protest. All Star Dairies Inc., B-209188, Jan. 31, 1983, 83-1 C.P.D. ¶ 107.



Comptroller General
of the United States