

DECISION

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

27945

FILE:

B-212489.2

DATE:

April 10, 1984

MATTER OF:Security Assistance Forces & Equipment
OHG--Reconsideration**DIGEST:**

Prior decision is affirmed where firm requesting reconsideration fails to specify any errors of law or fact that warrant decision's reversal.

Security Assistance Forces & Equipment OHG (SAFE) requests reconsideration of our decision S.A.F.E. Export Corporation, B-212489, February 6, 1984, 84-1 CPD 146, in which we dismissed SAFE's protest against the Army Corps of Engineers' refusal to require a type-license, issued by German authorities, for smoke alarms being acquired for installation in family housing quarters in the Federal Republic of Germany. We held that we would not consider the merits of the protester's allegation that more restrictive specifications were required to serve the government's interest, since a protester's presumable interest as a beneficiary of more restrictive specifications is not protectable under our bid protest function. We further pointed out that the record did not establish that type-licensing would be required for the installation of the smoke alarms in any event, since the Army had received input from German officials indicating otherwise.

In the reconsideration request, SAFE contends that the Army "coached" certain responses from German officials concerning the need for a license, that the German authorities actually have not determined whether type-licensing will be required, and that such a determination likely will not be forthcoming for some time. The point of our February 6 decision, however, was that we will not review a protest that an agency should have used more restrictive specifications. SAFE's dispute with the Corps about the requirements of German law is irrelevant to that policy.

Our Bid Protest Procedures provide that a request for reconsideration must contain a statement of the factual and

028542

legal grounds upon which reversal or modification of the prior decision is warranted, specifying any errors of law made or information not previously considered. 4 C.F.R. § 21.9 (1983). Since SAFE has made no showing that warrants changing our prior decision, we will not consider the matter further. See Schultes Level, Inc., B-213014.2, February 27, 1984, 84-1 CPD 237.

The prior decision is affirmed.

for 
Comptroller General
of the United States