

*Rogony* PL II

14397

**DECISION**



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

FILE: B-199485

DATE: July 28, 1980

MATTER OF: Tenavision, Inc.

**DIGEST:**

*[Protest Alleging IFB Specifications Were Unduly Restrictive]*

Protest founded on premise that agency is obliged to exceed minimum requirements in order to neutralize advantage of incumbent is summarily denied.

Tenavision, Inc. (TI) protests the award of a contract for furnishing, installing, and maintaining washer-dryer services at Fort Benning, Georgia under invitation for bids (IFB) No. DABT10-80-B-0206.

TI takes the position that the IFB's specifications are restrictive because they allow bidders to provide the required services by using other than new equipment and by not specifying a maximum limit on the age of such equipment. (The IFB permitted the furnishing of any type of equipment that was in good working condition regardless of its age). TI argues that such a provision unduly favors the incumbent contractor which already has used equipment installed and operating.

We are not persuaded by TI's argument that specifications which allow the use of used equipment are unduly restrictive of competition. It may be that an incumbent having already amortized the cost of his now used equipment has an advantage over other competitors. Forcing an incumbent to bid new equipment or equipment with a maximum specified age could remove this competitive advantage. However, specifications are only supposed to prescribe the minimum standards to which articles required by the Government shall conform. B-161839, November 2, 1967. The protester

*011426 112873*

states that the contracting officer has indicated the Army does not need new machines and that any machine which is in working order will do. We are of the opinion that the Government is not obliged to equalize the competitive positions of all potential bidders. Price Waterhouse & Co., B-186779, November 15, 1976, 76-2 CPD 412. The purpose of competitive procurement is not to insure that all bidders face the same odds in competing for Government contracts. Rather, the purpose is to insure that the Government obtains its minimum requirements at the most favorable price. We do not think that the position TI espouses would lead to this result. IMBA, Incorporated, B-188364, B-187404, November 9, 1977, 77-2 CPD 356.

The protest is summarily denied.



For the Comptroller General  
of the United States