

14-6680



Comptroller General  
of the United States

Washington, D.C. 20548

## Decision

**Matter of:** Video Educational Television

**File:** B-248596

**Date:** May 19, 1992

---

### DECISION

Video Educational Television (VET) protests that solicitation No. R6-92-462, issued by the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, for Multi Audiovisual Programs, improperly restricts competition.

We dismiss the protest.

In its protest VET explains that proposals were solicited from, and award is limited to, firms listed on the Qualified Film Producers List or the Qualified Video Producers List maintained by the Federal Audiovisual Contract Management Agency. VET asserts that this form of restriction was addressed by our Office in our decision, Office of Fed. Procurement Policy's films prod. contracting sys.; John Bransby Prods., Ltd., 60 Comp. Gen. 104 (1980), 80-2 CPD ¶ 419. VET argues that based on this decision, the Forest Service is required to reissue the solicitation without the restriction.

At issue in the case VET cites was a uniform system under which agencies would solicit their video and film production needs. The system included a qualified list for video and film producers and firms were prequalified for placement on that list under specified standards and procedures. Prequalification was permitted for all firms meeting a certain level of acceptability. When an agency required services, solicitations were issued to a limited number of firms on the list on a rotating basis. We expressly concluded that this system was not an unwarranted restriction on competition provided that individual agencies publicized their procurements under the uniform system in the Commerce Business Daily.

VET has not provided any information which demonstrates that the current solicitation it challenges is inconsistent with the guidelines of the approved system as discussed in our decision or any other statutes or regulations. Accordingly, the protest does not establish a basis for challenging the

agency's actions and we dismiss it without further action.  
See Bid Protest Regulations 4 C.F.R. § 21.1(e) (1992).

The protest is dismissed.

*Christine S. Melody*  
Christine S. Melody  
Assistant General Counsel