

Mr. Ayer

17582



DECISION

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

FILE: B-201743, et al. DATE: April 1, 1981
MATTER OF: Alan Scott Industries--Request for reconsideration]

DIGEST:

Prior decision is affirmed where request for reconsideration disagrees with previous decision but offers no persuasive reason why decision is factually or legally incorrect.

Alan Scott Industries (ASI) requests reconsideration of our decision in Alan Scott Industries, B-201743, et al., March 3, 1981, 81-1 CPD _____, where we summarily denied ASI's protests on the basis of its initial submission.

ASI generally questions our conclusion that the topics raised in its protests lack legal merit and specifically urges: (1) that we review the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) application of MIL-STD-753A; (2) that we not rely on DLA's agency report as a factual basis for our prior decision in Alan Scott Industries, B-199662, et al., January 27, 1981, 81-1 CPD 44, in view of ASI's general allegations of discrepancies between the agency report and a Department of Defense, Defense Investigative Service Report No. CCM#79288-DI4-PP30-8Z9; (3) that we conduct investigations to determine the validity of ASI's allegations; and (4) that we review DLA's technical qualifications.

ASI has not, however, demonstrated that our decision was either factually or legally in error. We remain of the view, for the reasons stated in our decision: (1) that DLA's application of MIL-STD-753A is a matter of contract administration; (2) that in an irreconcilable conflict between a protester and an agency on a factual matter we will accept the agency's view as correct, Phelps Protection Systems Inc., B-181148, November 7, 1974, 74-2 CPD 244;

~~D16216~~ 114783

(3) that it is not part of our bid protest function to conduct investigations to establish the validity of unsupported allegations; and (4) that the qualifications of DLA's postaward technical evaluators constitute a matter of contract administration which is not for resolution under our Bid Protest Procedures (4 C.F.R. part 20 (1980)).

We have taken the position that under our Bid Protest Procedures the protester's "detailed statement" of the factual and legal grounds for reversal or modification is essential for without such a statement we lack a basis upon which to reconsider our prior decision. Moreover, general allegations to the effect that our conclusions are not supported by a full examination of the facts do not amount to facts or legal arguments demonstrating the error of our prior decision. Department of Commerce; International Computaprint Corporation, 57 Comp. Gen. 615 (1978), 78-2 CPD 84.

For the above reasons, we remain of the opinion that the protests were correctly denied. Accordingly, the decision of March 3, 1981, is affirmed.



Acting Comptroller General
of the United States