



Decision

Matter of: Delta Food Service, Inc.
File: B-259992.3
Date: August 28, 1995

DECISION

Delta Food Service, Inc. (Delta) protests the Army's award of a full food services and dining facility attendant services contract to Centro Management Services (Centro) pursuant to request for proposals (RFP) No. DAKF24-94-R-0001. Delta contends that the Army did not properly evaluate Centro's proposal.

The protest, as filed with our Office, does not establish a basis for challenging the agency's action and, accordingly, is dismissed.

The jurisdiction of our Office is established by the bid protest provisions of the Competition in Contracting Act of 1984, 31 U.S.C. §§ 3551-3556 (1988). Our role in resolving bid protests is to ensure that the statutory requirements for full and open competition are met. Brown Assocs. Management Servs., Inc.--Recon., B-235906.3, Mar. 16, 1990, 90-1 CPD ¶ 299.

To achieve this end, our Bid Protest Regulations require that a protest include a detailed statement of the legal and factual grounds of a protest, 4 C.F.R. § 21.1(c)(4), and that the grounds stated be legally sufficient. 4 C.F.R. § 21.1(e). These requirements contemplate that protesters will provide, at a minimum, either allegations or evidence sufficient, if uncontradicted, to establish the likelihood that the protester will prevail in its claim of improper agency action. Robert Wall Edge--Recon., 68 Comp. Gen. 352 (1989), 89-1 CPD ¶ 335.

Delta's sole argument is that Centro's overall technical score rose from 48.6 points for its initial technical proposal to 85.3 points for its best and final offer (BAFO). Delta contends that the "extreme shift in score" is due to improper evaluation of Centro's offer. However, even if uncontradicted by the agency, the fact that Centro's technical score improved dramatically between initial and BAFO evaluations is not evidence that the Army's evaluation violated procurement laws or regulations or was otherwise

064570/155164

improper. Since the protest does not include sufficient factual information to establish the likelihood that the agency here violated applicable procurement laws or regulations, it is dismissed without further action.



Michael R. Golden
Assistant General Counsel