



Comptroller General  
of the United States

Washington, D.C. 20548

## Decision

**Matter of:** Cryptek, Inc.

**File:** B-240369

**Date:** November 1, 1990

---

Neel J. Price for the protester.  
B. Helen Sharetts-Sullivan, Esq., Defense Mapping Agency, for the agency.  
Christina Sklarew, Esq., and Andrew T. Pogany, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, GAO, participated in the preparation of the decision.

---

### DIGEST

General Accounting Office (GAO) generally will not consider contention that agency should have imposed additional, more restrictive specifications in solicitation since GAO's role in reviewing bid protests is to ensure that statutory requirements for full and open competition are met, not to protect any interest a protester may have in more restrictive specifications.

---

### DECISION

Cryptek, Inc. protests the failure of the specifications of invitation for bids (IFB) No. DMA600-90-B-0003, issued by the Defense Mapping Agency, to require full compliance with a military standard. We dismiss the protest.

The IFB contemplated the award of a firm, fixed-price contract for 11 secure facsimile (fax) transceiver devices and related cables. The statement of work required the fax machines to meet a military standard, MIL-STD-188-161B, which established interoperability and performance standards for digital fax equipment. By amendment, the agency advised bidders that paragraph 6.6 of the military standard was not required for this procurement.

Cryptek contends that the amended IFB made optional certain paragraphs of the military standard which should have been mandatory. Specifically, the protester argues that additional specification requirements concerning signaling sequence and timing requirements should have been imposed by the agency.

The purpose of the General Accounting Office's role in resolving bid protests is to ensure that the statutory requirement for full and open competition in the award of government contracts is met, not to protect any interest a protester may have in more restrictive specifications. Our Office therefore will not review a protest that an agency should have drafted additional, more restrictive specifications in order to meet the protester's definition of the agency's minimum needs. See C.R. Daniels, Inc., B-221313, Apr. 22, 1986, 86-1 CPD ¶ 390.

The protest is dismissed.

*Michael R. Golden*

Michael R. Golden  
Assistant General Counsel