



**Comptroller General  
of the United States**

Washington, D.C. 20548

**Decision**

**Matter of:** Cajar Defense Support Company

**File:** B-240477

**Date:** August 3, 1990

Mason Ford, for the protester.  
William R. Medsger, Esq., and Robert J. Parise, Esq.,  
Department of the Army, for the agency.  
Catherine M. Evans, and David Ashen, Esq., Office of the  
General Counsel, GAO, participated in the preparation of the  
decision.

**DIGEST**

1. Protest of agency's refusal to extend date for receipt of proposals and of defective solicitation is dismissed for failure to set forth a detailed statement of the legal and factual grounds of the protest as required by General Accounting Office's Bid Protest Regulations.
2. Protest of agency contracting practices in general is not within the scope of the General Accounting Office's bid protest function.

**DECISION**

Cajar Defense Support Company protests the terms of request for proposals (RFP) No. DAAA21-90-R-0098, issued by the Department of the Army, Armament, Munitions and Chemical Command (AMCCOM), for an investigative study on small arms usage.

We dismiss the protest.

The solicitation set August 13, 1990, as the date for receipt of proposals. On July 12, Cajar telephoned the contracting officer to request a 2-month extension of the closing date. Upon being denied an extension, Cajar reiterated its request in writing on July 12, citing "other concerns and activities with the AMCCOM procurement process, as well as a need to define whether we can provide a valid proposal." The agency again denied the request, explaining that Cajar had not provided sufficient justification for an

extension. Cajar then protested the agency's decision to our Office, and also alleged with respect to the statement of work and evaluation criteria that it is impossible "to determine any reasonable approach to a proposal."

Our Regulations require that a protest include a detailed statement of the legal and factual grounds of protest, 4 C.F.R. § 21.1(c)(4) (1990), and that the grounds stated be legally sufficient. 4 C.F.R. § 21.1(e). This requirement contemplates that protesters will provide, at a minimum, either allegations or evidence sufficient, if uncontradicted, to establish the likelihood of the protester's claim of improper agency action. Professional Medical Prods., Inc., B-231743, July 1, 1988, 88-2 CPD ¶ 2.

Where a protester contends that the agency allowed insufficient time for preparation of proposals, we require a showing that the time allowed was inconsistent with statutory requirements or otherwise unreasonable or insufficient, or that it precluded full and open competition. See Massa Prods. Corp., B-236892, Jan. 9, 1990, 90-1 CPD ¶ 38; Control Data Corp., B-235737, Oct. 4, 1989, 89-2 CPD ¶ 304. Contracting agencies generally are required to allow a minimum 30-day response period for procurements. See 15 U.S.C. § 637(e)(3)(B) (1988). Here, AMCCOM allowed 35 days between the date the RFP was issued and the proposal due date, and Cajar has not offered any specific reason why this amount of time is insufficient. The protester's unexplained dissatisfaction with the amount of time the agency allowed for preparation of proposals does not meet our standard for specificity.

We likewise dismiss Cajar's protest that it is impossible "to determine any reasonable approach to a valid proposal," as Cajar has not identified any specific defect in the RFP.

Cajar's protest also offers various allegations concerning past solicitations and AMCCOM's procurement practices in general. Broad issues such as these are outside the scope of our bid protest function. Cajar Defense Support Co.-- Recon., B-238621.2, B-238622.2, May 18, 1990, 90-1 CPD ¶ 488.

The protest is dismissed.



John M. Melody  
Assistant General Counsel