



Comptroller General  
of the United States

Washington, D.C. 20548

145206 S. Riback

## Decision

**Matter of:** Trauma Service Group--Reconsideration

**File:** B-242902.3

**Date:** October 30, 1991

Joseph F. Nowoslawski, M.D., for the protester, Katherine I. Riback, Esq., and John Brosnan, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, CAO, participated in the preparation of the decision.

### DIGEST

Request for reconsideration is denied when based in part on an argument that could have been but was not raised by protester in the course of the original protest and where protester fails to show any error of fact or law that would warrant reversal or modification of prior decision.

### DECISION

Trauma Service Group requests reconsideration of our decision, Trauma Serv. Group, B-242902.2, June 17, 1991, 91-1 CPD ¶ 573, in which we denied its protest concerning the award of a contract to Coastal Government Services under request for proposals (RFP) No. DADA10-90-R-0029, issued by the United States Army Health Services Command for the healthcare services of General Medical Officers at Army Medical Training Facilities across the Eastern United States.

We deny the request for reconsideration.

Trauma contends for the first time on reconsideration that the RFP contemplated a prohibited personal services contract, and that decision should be modified in light of the proposed closing of some of the military bases for which general medical services were to be provided. The protester claims that the proposed closing of some of the military bases referred to in the RFP "will make moot the agency's determination that the fourth and fifth year wage or compensation plan is material to the award of this contract." Finally, Trauma argues that Coastal is not financially capable of performing this contract.

While the basis of Trauma's contention that the RFP contemplated a personal services contract is not at all clear,

it in any event appears to set forth a new protest basis that was available but was not submitted or argued during our consideration of the initial protest. Our Regulations do not permit a piecemeal presentation of evidence, information, or analyses, and where a party raises in reconsideration an argument that it could have but did not raise at the time of protest, the argument does not provide a basis for reconsideration. Marine Indus., Ltd.--Recon., B-225722.2, June 24, 1987, 87-1 CPD ¶ 627.

Additionally, a party requesting reconsideration must show that our prior decision contains either errors of fact or law or present information not previously considered that warrants reversal or modification of the decision. 4 C.F.R. § 21.12(a) (1991). Trauma's statement that there now exists "a preliminary list of proposed military base closures" that includes some of the bases for which general medical services were requested has no legal impact on our decision concerning an award made many months prior to the issuance of the list.

Finally, Trauma argues that it has discovered from information released by the awardee in June 1991 that Coastal is not financially capable of performing the contract. We fail to see legal relevance of this information to an award made several months before its release. Further, whether Coastal performs the contract as it is legally obligated to is a matter of contract administration within the jurisdiction of the contracting agency, not our Office. 4 C.F.R. § 21.3(m)(1) (1991), as amended by 56 Fed. Reg. 3759 (1991).

Since Trauma's reconsideration request does not meet the standard set forth in 4 C.F.R. § 21.2(a) it is denied.

  
for James F. Hinchman  
General Counsel