FILE: B-210411.2 DATE: April 3, 1984

MATTER OF: Turbine Engine Services

DIGEST:

A private person who does not represent any entity participating in a questioned procurement, but rather requests reconsideration of a protest as "an aggrieved taxpayer," is not an "interested party" under GAO's Bid Protest Procedures since he does not have a direct economic interest in the procurement.

The president of Turbine Engine Services requests that we reconsider our decision in Gas Turbine Corporation, B-210411, May 25, 1983, 83-1 CPD 566. We dismiss this request.

In our initial decision, we rejected as untimely the protester's argument that the invitation requirements were unreasonable. Additionally, we rejected the protester's allegation that the awardee, whose bid we found to be responsive, would not comply with the contract requirements, concluding that this was a matter of contract administration and therefore a responsibility of the contracting agency.

The request for reconsideration raises the same two issues raised in the original protest, namely whether the solicitation was inadequately written and whether the awardee has complied with the contract terms. The requester states that he is merely an "aggrieved taxpayer" whose ". . . company was not a bidder nor a sub-contractor on this solicitation and therefore . . . not an aggrieved party from the standpoint of loss of business."

Our Bid Protest Procedures, 4 C.F.R. § 21.9(a) (1983), provide that the protester, any interested party who submitted comments during consideration of

01061

B-210411.2

the protest, and any agency involved in a protest may request reconsideration of a decision of the Comptroller General. On occasion, we have overlooked the requirement for such submission of comments on the original protest where, for example, an interested party was not notified that the protest had been filed with our Office. See R. A. Schemel & Assoc., Inc.—Reconsideration, B-209707.2, September 2, 1983, 83-2 CPD 291. However, in both an original protest and on reconsideration, we strictly construe "interested party" to require an individual or firm to have a direct economic interest in the procurement.

In circumstances similar to those here, we have held that private persons who do not represent any entity participating in a questioned procurement and protest only as concerned taxpayers are not "interested parties" under our Bid Protest Procedures, since they are not sufficiently affected by the procurement. See A. Kenneth Bernier and C. J. Willis, B-186502, July 19, 1976, 76-2 CPD 56.

We conclude that the president of Turbine Engine Services is ineligible to request reconsideration of the Gas Turbine Corporation decision because he is not an interested party who submitted comments during consideration of the protest.

The request for reconsideration is dismissed.

Harry R. Van Cleve Acting General Counsel