



## Decision

**Matter of:** Mission Analytics, LLC--Reconsideration

**File:** B-423980.2; B-423980.4

**Date:** April 1, 2026

---

Michael Winters for the requester.

Colonel Justin A. Silverman, Major Edward S. Coleman, Isabelle Cutting, Esq., and Erika Whelan Retta, Esq., Department of the Air Force, for the agency.

Samantha S. Lee, Esq., Emily R. O'Hara, Esq., and Peter H. Tran, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, GAO, participated in the preparation of the decision.

---

### DIGEST

Request for reconsideration of prior decision is denied where the requesting party fails to show that our decision contains errors of fact or law that would warrant reversal or modification of the decision.

---

### DECISION

Mission Analytics, LLC, a service-disabled veteran-owned small business (SDVOSB) of Falls Church, Virginia, requests that we reconsider our decision, *Mission Analytics, LLC*, B-423980, Jan. 14, 2026, dismissing the protest of the terms of the solicitation--as well as the subsequent award to Wingmann, LLC, an SDVOSB of McCloud, Oklahoma--under request for quotations (RFQ) No. FA500425Q1001, issued by the Department of the Air Force for a closed-circuit television (CCTV) system. Mission Analytics argues that our decision contained errors of fact and law that warrant modification of our prior decision, and that newly discovered information supports the same.<sup>1</sup>

We deny the requests.

---

<sup>1</sup> Mission Analytics filed the first request for reconsideration on January 26, 2026, which was docketed as B-423980.2. While that request was still pending, Mission Analytics filed the second request for reconsideration on February 13, which was docketed as B-423980.4. Because both submissions requested reconsideration of the same decision (B-423980), we have consolidated the requests.

## BACKGROUND

On September 11, 2025, pursuant to the commercial item acquisition procedures of Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) subpart 12.6, the Air Force issued the RFQ as a combined synopsis/solicitation on the System for Award Management (SAM.gov) for an upgrade to a CCTV system. Req. for Dismissal, attach. A, RFQ at 1-2.<sup>2</sup> The RFQ provided for award to the vendor whose quotation “will be most advantageous to the Government” considering two factors: technical and price. *Id.* at 6. The solicitation notified vendors that quotations were due by September 17, 2025. *Id.* at 4.

On September 17, prior to the closing time for receipt of quotations, Mission Analytics sent multiple emails to the contracting officer challenging the terms of the solicitation. Req. for Dismissal, attach. F, Agency Protest Email at 1-3. In those emails, Mission Analytics argued that a term of the solicitation was unduly restrictive of competition. *Id.* That same day, Mission Analytics sent another series of emails to the agency, contending that the RFQ should have been set aside for small businesses. Req. for Dismissal, attach. G, Post-Award Agency Protest Email at 2-3 (containing Sept. 17 email requesting relief to amend the RFQ to “reestablish the small business set aside”). The Air Force considered the various emails submitted by Mission Analytics to constitute a single agency-level protest dated September 17. Req. for Dismissal at 2. Mission Analytics, however, did not submit a quotation by the September 17 deadline, and the agency proceeded to evaluate quotations received by the due date. *Id.* at 6.

On September 23, 2025, the Air Force awarded the CCTV contract to Wingmann, and published the notice of award on SAM.gov.<sup>3</sup> Req. for Dismissal, attach. C, Award Notice. On September 29, Mission Analytics submitted a quotation in response to the solicitation (RFQ No. FA500425Q1001) that had just been awarded. Req. for Dismissal, attach. D, Mission Analytics Quotation at 1. Concurrently, Mission Analytics also filed a protest with our Office challenging the terms of the same RFQ, which was docketed on September 30.<sup>4</sup>

During this period, the requester also submitted an agency-level protest to the Air Force on October 10, contending that Wingmann was “ineligible” for award and that the award was improper because FAR section 33.103(f) prohibited the agency from making award

---

<sup>2</sup> Citations are to the filings and documents produced as part of Mission Analytics’s initial protest (B-423980).

<sup>3</sup> SAM.gov is the current governmentwide point of entry that serves as the single point where government business opportunities greater than \$25,000, including synopses of proposed contract actions, solicitations, and associated information, can be accessed electronically by the public. FAR 2.101.

<sup>4</sup> Mission Analytics submitted its protest to GAO at 5:31 p.m., Eastern Time on September 29, 2025. Our regulations provide that a document is filed on a particular day when it is received by 5:30 p.m. Eastern Time on that day. 4 C.F.R. § 21.0(g). As such, the protest was filed on September 30. *Id.*

while the September 17 agency-level protest was still pending. Req. for Dismissal at 3; Req. for Dismissal, attach. G, Post-award Agency Protest Email at 1. The Air Force denied that post-award agency-level protest on October 14. Req. for Dismissal, attach. G, Post-Award Agency Protest Email at 1. Following the denial of the agency-level protest, Mission Analytics subsequently filed a “corrected version” of its GAO protest on November 13, which added post-award challenges to firm’s earlier protest filed with our Office on September 30.<sup>5</sup> See Corrected Protest at 2.

Our decision ultimately resolved Mission Analytics’s challenges from the two separate filings with our Office. In its September 30 protest, Mission Analytics argued that the solicitation contained unduly restrictive terms and should have been set aside for small businesses. Protest at 1. In the November 13 “corrected” protest, Mission Analytics argued that Wingmann was an “ineligible” vendor for award. Corrected Protest at 21. Mission Analytics also asserted that the agency violated FAR section 33.103(f) by making award while Mission Analytics’s pre-award (September 17) agency-level protest remained pending. *Id.* at 20.

Responding to protest filed with our Office, the agency submitted a request for dismissal on December 5, 2025. Req. for Dismissal. We dismissed the protest on January 14. In that decision, we found Mission Analytics’s challenges to the terms of the solicitation to be untimely, and that the firm was not an interested party to challenge the agency’s award decision. *Mission Analytics, LLC*, B-423980, Jan. 14, 2026, at 4, 6. Mission Analytics subsequently submitted a request for reconsideration of the decision on January 26 (B-423980.2) and an “additional” request for reconsideration of the same decision on February 13 (B-423980.4).

## DISCUSSION

In its request for reconsideration, Mission Analytics argues that our decision contains factual and legal errors. The requester contends that (1) the decision improperly stated that Mission Analytics learned about the Air Force’s award decision before submitting its quotation to the agency, and (2) the decision erroneously concludes that Mission Analytics is not an interested party to bring forth its post-award challenges. Req. for Recon. at 1-2. In its additional request for reconsideration, Mission Analytics asserts that it had recently discovered an issue within the Electronic Protest Docketing System (EPDS) that should excuse the untimely filing of its pre-award solicitation challenges. Additional Req. for Recon. at 1-5. We have reviewed all arguments in the requests for reconsideration and find no basis to reconsider our prior decision.

---

<sup>5</sup> On October 1, our Office closed due to a lapse in appropriations. On November 12, the Congress passed, and the President signed, the *Continuing Appropriations, Agriculture, Legislative Branch, Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Extensions Act, 2026*, Pub. L. No. 119-37, div. C, title I, 139 Stat. 495, 581 (2025), which appropriated funding for GAO through the remainder of fiscal year 2026. As a result, our Office reopened on November 13. *Oready LLC--Recon.*, B-424096.2, Jan. 5, 2026, at 2.

Under our Bid Protest Regulations, to obtain reconsideration, the requesting party must set out the factual and legal grounds upon which reversal or modification of the decision is deemed warranted, specifying any errors of law made or information not previously considered. 4 C.F.R. § 21.14(a). We will reverse a decision upon reconsideration only where the requesting party demonstrates that the decision contains a material error of law or fact; that is, but for the error, our Office would have likely reached a different conclusion as to the merits of the protest. *Department of Justice; Hope Village, Inc.--Recon.*, B-414342.5, B-414342.6, May 21, 2019, at 4 (declining to grant a request for reconsideration alleging that our decision contained a material error of fact where, even assuming the requester's assertion of a factual error was correct, the changed facts would not have impacted our underlying legal analysis).

#### Quotation Submission Timeline

The requester first argues that our underlying decision contained a factual error. Req. for Recon. at 1. Specifically, our decision stated that “[a]fter learning of the award to Wingmann, Mission submitted a quotation to the agency on September 29.” *Mission Analytics, LLC, supra* at 6. Mission Analytics contends:

This is false. The quote was submitted at 5:03PM EDT on 29 Sep 2025. The award was first revealed to the protester later that evening at 6:45PM first published on SAM even later at 6:59PM EDT. Thus the quote was submitted BEFORE learning of award.

Req. for Recon. at 1.<sup>6</sup>

This fact, however, has no relevance to the decision issued by our Office. In this regard, whether Mission Analytics had actual notice of the award when the firm submitted its quotation to the agency on September 29 was immaterial to our analysis and conclusions regarding the timeliness of the protest's challenges to the terms of the solicitation.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> The requester provides no evidence to support its assertion that the notice of award was first published on SAM.gov on September 29. Rather, the record shows that the agency published the award notice on SAM.gov on September 23. Req. For Dismissal at 2; see <https://sam.gov/workspace/contract/opp/ec76c6162b1049a8bb57ed0e19a89529/view> (last visited Mar. 24, 2026).

<sup>7</sup> We note, however, that the requester--through email correspondence with the agency--appears to confirm that Mission Analytics was aware that award had been made before submitting its quotation. Req. for Dismissal, attach. G, Post-Award Agency Protest Email at 2 (writing at 3:02 p.m. on September 29, “As you stated that award was made for FA500425Q1001, please provide . . .”).

In other words, whether the requester submitted its quotation before or after finding out that Wingmann was the awardee on September 29, has no bearing on the fact that Mission Analytics failed to submit its protest to GAO within 10 days of September 17, the date of initial agency adverse action taken in response its agency-level protest.<sup>8</sup> As is plainly evident from our decision, the underlying analysis rests on the timeliness of Mission Analytics’s submission of its protest to GAO after initial adverse agency action. Thus, any potential misidentification of when the requester may have learned of the award impacted neither the analysis nor the outcome of the decision. Consequently, we do not find that our prior decision contained a material mistake of fact that would warrant reversal of our dismissal of the protest. *The i4 Grp. Consulting, LLC--Recon.*, B-418842.2, Oct. 8, 2020, at 3-4 (finding that background information was not relevant to our analysis and concluded that our underlying decision did not contain a mistake of fact “that would warrant reversal of our denial of [requester’s] protest.”).

### Interested Party Status

Next, the requester alleges our prior decision was in error when we concluded that the firm was not an interested party to challenge the award of the contract to Wingmann, because Mission Analytics had not submitted (1) a timely quotation responding to the solicitation, or (2) a timely protest of the terms of the solicitation to our Office. Req. for Recon. at 2. According to the requester, this conclusion “ignores that Mission Analytics timely protested the terms of the solicitation” in an agency-level protest. *Id.*

As explained in our decision, only an interested party may protest a federal procurement. *Mission Analytics, LLC, supra* at 5-6. A protester is not an interested party where it would not be in line for contract award if its protest were sustained. *Id.* In our prior decision, we rejected Mission Analytics’s argument that the firm “has standing regardless of whether or not it submitted a bid or offer.” *Id.* at 6.

---

<sup>8</sup> As explained in our decision, the requester’s September 17 agency-level protest challenged the terms of the solicitation. We concluded:

[T]he agency’s decision to proceed with the September 17 closing date for the submission of quotations under the RFQ served as initial adverse agency action on Mission’s pending agency-level protest. In other words, the agency’s decision to move forward with receiving and evaluating quotations, notwithstanding the protester’s challenges to the terms of the solicitation, put the protester on notice that the Air Force was not taking the desired corrective action. Therefore, to be timely, any subsequent protest to our Office had to be filed within 10 days of September 17, the closing date for receipt of quotations. . . . Mission did not timely file its protest by 5:30 p.m. on September 29, in accordance with our regulations. See 4 C.F.R. § 21.0(g). Instead, the protester filed at 5:31 p.m., a fact which it does not dispute. As a result, Mission’s pre-award protest challenges are untimely.

*Mission Analytics, LLC, supra* at 4-5.

In its request for reconsideration, Mission Analytics again asserts that because the firm had timely filed an agency-level protest challenging the terms of the solicitation, the requester “had standing even without submitting a” quotation. Req. for Recon. at 2; Resp. to Req. for Dismissal at 3 (arguing that Mission Analytics “had standing with no offer submitted”). According to the requester, because Mission Analytics had filed a timely agency-level protest challenging the solicitation, the firm was forever an interested party for any protest under that solicitation.

We will summarily dismiss any request for reconsideration that fails to state a valid basis. 4 C.F.R. § 21.14(c). A request for reconsideration that reiterates arguments made previously and merely expresses disagreement with the prior decision does not meet the standard for granting reconsideration. *Latvian Connection LLC--Recon.*, B-415043.3, Nov. 29, 2017, at 4-5.

Here, the requester repeats the same arguments asserted in the prior protest. In this regard, Mission Analytics cites the same decisions from our Office--*Johnson Controls, Inc.*, B-243605, Aug. 1, 1991, at 4 and *Quantico Arms & Tactical Supply, Inc.*, Sept. 19, 2008, at 3 n.4--to argue that the timely filed agency-level protest meant that the firm was an interested party to challenge the award to Wingmann. Req. for Recon. at 2. As we explained in our decision, both of the referenced cases were distinguishable because they “involved post-award challenges where the protesters had also filed timely protests challenging the terms of a solicitation.” *Mission Analytics, LLC, supra* at 6.

Indeed, a timely agency-level protest is not necessarily sufficient to establish that the protester is an interested party--*i.e.*, that it would be in line for contract award if the protest were sustained. Determining whether a party is an interested party involves consideration of a variety of factors, including the nature of issues raised, the benefit or relief sought by the protester, and the party’s status in relation to the procurement. *RELM Wireless Corp.*, B-405358, Oct. 7, 2011, at 2. Where, as here, an agency takes adverse action in response to a timely agency-level protest challenging the terms of the solicitation, the protester must maintain direct economic interest in the award of the contract to be considered an interested party to protest. See *DAI, Inc.*, B-408625, B-408625.2, Nov. 6, 2013, at 5 (finding protester was not an interested party to challenge “de facto sole-source” award). In this regard, a protester cannot demonstrate the requisite direct economic interest where it has not filed a timely protest challenging the terms of the solicitation to our Office after initial adverse action by the agency, and the protester has not (or cannot) submitted a proposal that meets the solicitation’s criteria. *Id.* at 5; see 4 C.F.R. §§ 21.0(a)(1), 21.2(a)(3). Under these circumstances, a timely agency-level protest, by itself, is not enough to demonstrate a direct economic interest to establish a protester is an interested party to file a protest challenging the award of a contract--*i.e.*, a post-award protest. *DAI, supra*.

We find the requester’s repetition of arguments merely expresses disagreement with the prior decision regarding Mission Analytics’s status as an interested party to bring a post-award protest challenging the evaluation of the awardee’s proposal. As such, the

allegation does not meet the standard necessary for reconsideration, as it fails to present information not considered previously and does not demonstrate an error of fact or law in our prior decision. 4 C.F.R. § 21.14(c); see, e.g., *A-B Computer Sols., Inc.--Recon.*, B-415819.2, Aug. 27, 2018, at 5 (“Such repetition of arguments . . . and disagreement with our decision, do not meet the standard necessary for reconsideration.”)

#### Timeliness of Second Request

As noted earlier, on February 13, during the pendency of the first request for reconsideration, Mission Analytics submitted a second request for reconsideration of the same decision. In the February 13 request, the requester contends that on Monday, February 2, Mission Analytics first discovered that the late filing of its pre-award protest should be “at least partly attributed to” an issue with EPDS. *Additional Req. for Recon.* at 5. Specifically, the requester asserts that to file a protest, EPDS requires protesters to identify the relevant contracting agency by selecting from a drop-down list under “Agency Tier 1” and “Agency Tier 2,” and that the selections under “Agency Tier 2” for the Air Force are “incorrect” and incomplete. *Id.* From there, Mission Analytics contends that “[i]t is assumed that this condition similarly existed during filing” of its initial protest, “and similarly caused a few minutes of delay” such that the late filing should be excused. *Id.*

Our Bid Protest Regulations contain strict rules for the timely submission of protests, comments, and requests for reconsideration; specifically, a request for reconsideration must be filed not later than 10 days after the basis for reconsideration is known or should have been known, whichever is earlier. 4 C.F.R. § 21.14(b). These rules reflect the dual requirements of giving parties a fair opportunity to present their cases and resolving protests expeditiously without unduly disrupting or delaying the procurement process. *Verizon Wireless*, B-406854, B-406854.2, Sept. 17, 2012, at 4. A request for reconsideration that fails to meet our timeliness requirements will not be considered. 4 C.F.R. § 21.14(c).

Here, even if we accept that Mission Analytics only knew (or should have known) of this new basis of reconsideration on February 2--when the requester alleges the information first “came to light”--this additional request is untimely. *Additional Req. for Recon.* at 5. To be timely, Mission Analytics was required file its request by within 10 days of February 2, .i.e., February 12. The request, however, was not filed until February 13.

Mission Analytics, for its part, asserts that “further analysis” was necessary to understand the issue, such that “the effective day of discovery” should be imputed to be February 3. *Id.* As our Office has explained, in order to provide a basis for reconsideration, additional information not previously considered must have been *unavailable* to the requesting party during the initial protest. *Department of Commerce-Recon.*, B-417084.2, Mar. 21, 2019, at 2. The requester simply has not explained--nor proffered *any* evidence to support--why we should find that Mission

Analytics did not know of this “issue” with EPDS until February 3, or should not be charged with that knowledge until then.

Finally, even if the second request could be considered timely filed, we are at a loss to understand--and the requester has not explained--how an alleged “few minutes of delay,” attributable to a procedural question during the protest filing process on EPDS, caused or contributed to the late submission of the firm’s initial protest. As our decisions have stated, when EPDS is functioning and available, a user’s failure to timely complete a filing in EPDS is generally not excusable. *Optimo Info. Tech., LLC --Recon.*, B-419956.351, July 24, 2023, at 4 (“[T]he inability of protester’s counsel to timely file was not due to any problem with EPDS; rather, it was due to counsel’s imprudent decision to log in to the system only a few minutes before the filing deadline.”). An untimely filing that results from lack of diligence is still untimely. *Id.*; 4 C.F.R. § 21.14(c).

The requests for reconsideration are denied.

Edda Emmanuelli Perez  
General Counsel