

6795

Little  
PK-11

**DECISION**



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

**FILE: B-191905**

**DATE: June 22, 1978**

**MATTER OF: United Coatings**

**DIGEST:**


Contention that contractor is attempting to substitute materials not in conformance with specifications will not be considered since it concerns matter of contract administration which is responsibility and function of contracting agency and not for resolution under Bid Protest Procedures.

United Coatings (United) has protested what it alleges is Peckham and Associates' (Peckham) attempt to have its roof repair contract with the Navy (N62474-77-C-6231) modified to reflect a less stringent specification requirement.

Specifically, the protester states that the specification listed three acceptable roof coating materials, one of which is manufactured by it to be used to repair roofs of family housing at the Naval Air Station, Lemoore California. It is United's understanding that Peckham is trying to obtain approval from the Navy to use the roofing material of a fourth supplier which material, in the United's opinion, is inferior to that which was originally specified.

This matter pertains to contract administration which is the function and responsibility of the contracting agency. Matters of contract administration are not for resolution under our Bid Protest Procedures, 4 C.F.R. Part 20 (1977), which are reserved for considering whether an award, or proposed award, of a contract complies with the statutory, regulatory and other legal requirements. See Joy Manufacturing Company, B-191168, March 7, 1978, 78-1 CPD 180.

For the foregoing reasons, we will not consider United Coating's protest on the merits.

  
Paul G. Dembling  
General Counsel