



DOCUMENT FOR PUBLIC RELEASE

The decision issued on the date below was subject to a GAO Protective Order. This version has been approved for public release.

Decision

Matter of: Centurion Analytics, LLC

File: B-423727.3; B-423727.4

Date: January 23, 2026

Jonathan D. Shaffer, Esq., and John Tanner, Esq., Haynes and Boone, LLP, for the protester.

Krishon Gill-Edmond, Esq., Department of Veterans Affairs, for the agency.

Janis R. Millete, Esq., and John Sorrenti, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, GAO, participated in the preparation of the decision.

DIGEST

Protest challenging the agency's corrective action, which included canceling the solicitation, is denied where the agency had a reasonable basis to cancel the solicitation.

DECISION

Centurion Analytics, LLC, a service-disabled veteran-owned small business (SDVOSB) of Fredericksburg, Virginia, protests the cancellation of request for quotations (RFQ) No. 36C78625Q50222, issued by the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), National Cemetery Administration (NCA), for grounds maintenance services at Beaufort National Cemetery located in Beaufort, South Carolina. The VA canceled the solicitation as part of corrective action taken in response to a protest filed with our Office by the protester. The protester contends that the cancellation was improper.

We deny the protest.

BACKGROUND

The agency issued the combined synopsis/solicitation on April 10, 2025, as a set-aside for SDVOSBs, under the procedures of Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) parts 12 and 13. Agency Report (AR), Tab 1.3, RFQ at 1, 4.¹ The solicitation contemplated the

¹ Unless otherwise noted, citations refer to the Adobe PDF page numbers of referenced documents.

award of a single indefinite-delivery, indefinite-quantity (IDIQ) contract with a 1-year base period, and four 1-year option periods. *Id.* at 2. Through this IDIQ, the VA sought services for the replacement of damaged headstones and markers, and for turf restoration. *Id.* at 2. The solicitation advised that quotations would be evaluated in accordance with FAR section 13.106-2(b)(3) to determine which quotation was “best as a whole.” *Id.* at 5.

On July 9, the VA notified Centurion that it selected another vendor for award. See Protest at 5. On July 17, Centurion filed a protest with our Office challenging the agency’s evaluation of the awardee based on an alleged conflict of interest which should have resulted in the exclusion of the awardee’s quotation and argued that the VA failed to evaluate the awardee under the past performance and technical factors in accordance with the solicitation. *Id.* at 5-6. Our Office dismissed Centurion’s protest as academic based on the agency’s notification that it was taking corrective action, which included cancellation of the solicitation and issuance of a new solicitation. *Centurion Analytics, LLC*, B-423727, B-423727.2, August 26, 2025 (unpublished decision).

On August 28, the agency canceled the solicitation. AR, Tab 1.2, RFQ amend. 003 at 1. Following cancellation of the solicitation, Centurion filed this protest.

DISCUSSION

Centurion raises several challenges to the agency’s decision to cancel the RFQ. See Protest at 6-19; Comments and Supp. Protest at 2, 7-8. The protester primarily asserts that the agency’s stated reasons for cancellation are not “sufficiently documented or explained” and claims that the agency canceled the solicitation to avoid resolution of Centurion’s protest. See Comments and Supp. Protest at 1, 7-8. Specifically, Centurion argues that the agency should not cancel the solicitation but should instead either amend the solicitation and request revised quotations or simply reevaluate the existing quotations and issue a new best-value determination under the requirement because the agency’s “technical needs or requirements” did not change.² *Id.* at 7, 11.

The agency provides several reasons for its decision to cancel the solicitation. The VA contends that it canceled the RFQ to correct flaws in the solicitation’s evaluation criteria. AR, Tab 1.1, Contracting Officer Statement (COS), Aug. 18, 2025; see COS, Nov. 17, 2025, at 4.³ The contracting officer further notes that “budget limitations and workforce constraints” prevented the agency from conducting a re-evaluation of

² Centurion also raises other collateral arguments. Although not addressed in this decision, we have considered the protester’s various arguments and conclude that none provide a basis to sustain the protest.

³ The agency provided two documents titled contracting officer statement. To distinguish between the two statements in this decision, our citations refer to the specific dates for each.

quotations and award before the end of the fiscal year. See COS, Nov. 17, 2025, at 2.

We have reviewed the record and for reasons explained below, find no basis to sustain the protest.

A contracting agency has broad discretion in deciding whether to cancel a solicitation and need only establish a reasonable basis for doing so. *MGM Computer Systems, Inc.*, B-422741, Oct. 16, 2024, 2024 CPD ¶ 248 at 4. A reasonable basis exists when an agency determines it needs to revise evaluation standards in order to ensure a fair and equal competition. *Starry Associates, Inc.*, B-410968.3, Dec. 23, 2015, 2015 CPD ¶ 401 at 5. Furthermore, where the record reflects that there is a reasonable basis to cancel the solicitation, we will not find that the agency abused its discretion, even though it could have taken a different course of action by amending the solicitation. *CueBid Technologies, Inc.*, B-422290.2 *et al.*, April 24, 2024, 2024 CPD ¶ 101 at 7.

Here, the record demonstrates that the contracting officer identified conflicting evaluation criteria, where the RFQ stated “[p]ast [p]erformance and [t]echnical [c]apabilities when combined are more important than price,” while another section stated these two non-price factors were “equally as important as price.” COS, Nov. 17, 2025, at 2; RFQ at 4, 5. The contracting officer explains that the award decision was based on additional evaluation errors and that without these solicitation inconsistencies, vendors may have proposed differently under revised criteria. See COS at 2-4.

On this record, we find that the agency’s decision to ensure accurate evaluation criteria is a reasonable basis for cancellation. *TaxSlayer LLC*, B-411101, May 8, 2015, 2015 CPD ¶ 156 at 6-10 (agency reasonably canceled solicitation based on concerns regarding whether requirements and evaluation criteria were adequately structured to reflect the agency’s needs). Although the protester argues that the solicitation errors could be revised by an amendment to the existing solicitation, this is not the standard to determine whether a decision to cancel a solicitation is reasonable. Instead, our Office has found that, even when the changes could be addressed by amendment, “[t]he only pertinent inquiry [] is whether there existed a reasonable basis to cancel, since an agency may cancel at any time when such a basis is present.” *Social Impact, Inc.*, B-412655.3, June 29, 2016, 2016 CPD ¶ 176 at 6.

Centurion’s disagreement with the agency’s assessments of its own requirement and approach to correcting the solicitation flaws fails to demonstrate that the agency’s decision to cancel was unreasonable. *MGM Computer Systems, Inc.*, *supra* at 5. While Centurion argues that it was improper for the agency to cancel instead of amending the solicitation and requesting revised quotations, an agency may properly cancel a solicitation, where, as here, it has a reasonable basis for doing so. *CueBid Technologies, Inc.*, *supra*. As a result, we find this ground to be without merit.

In addition, where a protester alleges that the agency's rationale for cancellation is pretextual, that is, that the agency's actual motivation is to avoid awarding a contract on a competitive basis or to avoid resolving a protest, we will nonetheless examine the reasonableness of the agency's actions. *Social Impact, Inc.*, *supra*; *VIRE Consulting, Inc.*, B-408148.2, Nov. 26, 2013, 2013 CPD ¶ 272 at 3. Thus, even if it can be shown that pretext may have supplied at least part of the motivation to cancel, which is not evident here, the reasonableness standard applicable to cancellation of a solicitation remains unchanged. *Id.* at 3-4. Here, the protester has not established that the agency canceled the solicitation to avoid resolution of the protest and, more importantly, the agency has provided a reasonable basis for its decision to cancel the solicitation. Based on the record, we find that cancellation of the solicitation was proper.⁴

The protest is denied.

Edda Emmanuelli Perez
General Counsel

⁴ The agency also asserts that cancellation of the solicitation is reasonable because it no longer has the funds available for this procurement and that resolicitation would produce "greater competition." COS, Nov. 17, 2025, at 4-5. Centurion challenges the agency's explanation regarding the unavailability of funds and argues that canceling the solicitation to enhance competition is unreasonable because vendor pricing has been disclosed and it is unfair to the vendors that "timely" competed under the original solicitation. See Supp. Comments at 3; Comments and Supp. Protest at 15-16. Here, we need not address these justifications for cancellation because the agency's first justification--solicitation inconsistencies--establishes a reasonable basis for its decision to cancel the RFQ. See *MGM Computer Systems, Inc.*, *supra* at 4.