



Decision

Matter of: Mission Analytics, LLC--Reconsideration

File: B-423165.6

Date: May 14, 2026

Michael Winters, for the requester.
Jared M. Levin, Esq., Department of Veterans Affairs, for the agency.
Paula A. Williams, Esq., and Evan D. Wesser, Esq., Office of the General Counsel,
GAO, participated in the preparation of the decision.

DIGEST

Request for reconsideration is dismissed where the requesting party merely repeats arguments previously raised and rejected by our Office and has not otherwise shown that our prior decision contains errors of fact or law that warrant reversal or modification of the decision.

DECISION

Mission Analytics, LLC, a service-disabled veteran-owned small business (SDVOSB) located in Falls Church, Virginia, requests that we reconsider our decision in *Mission Analytics, LLC*, B-423165.5, Feb. 20, 2026. In that decision, we denied its protest of the Department of Veterans Affairs' (VA) decision to purchase video display monitors using the Federal Supply Schedule (FSS) and the subsequent issuance of a delivery order to Focus Camera, LLC, of Brooklyn, New York, under request for quotations (RFQ) No. 1748442. The requester argues that our Office erred in denying its protest.

We dismiss the request.

BACKGROUND

On September 24, 2024, Mission Analytics filed an agency-level protest challenging the issuance of an order to Aviate Enterprises, Inc., under request for quotations (RFQ) No. 36C26224Q1803 (RFQ 1803), which was issued as an SDVOSB set-aside for the video monitors on a brand name or equal basis. In response to that protest, the contracting officer took corrective action to address defects in the RFQ by terminating the order issued to Aviate, reviewing the agency's requirements, conducting additional market research, and revising the solicitation. On September 26, the contracting officer dismissed Mission Analytics' initial agency-level protest based on the proposed corrective action. See Protest (B-423165).

On October 7, Mission Analytics filed a second agency-level protest challenging the scope of the contracting officer's proposed corrective action. Among other things, Mission Analytics alleged that the VA impermissibly intended to cancel the solicitation (RFQ 1803) rather than make award to Mission Analytics as the next lowest-priced eligible vendor. On October 29, the VA's senior procurement executive denied Mission Analytics' protest finding that the contracting officer's proposed corrective action was reasonable to correct the identified defects in the solicitation.

Thereafter, on November 8, Mission Analytics filed its first protest with our Office, challenging the agency's denial of the second agency-level protest, which was docketed as B-423165. See *Mission Analytics, LLC*, B-423165, Jan. 28, 2025. In its protest, Mission Analytics again challenged the agency's proposed corrective action that included additional market research and revisions to the solicitation. Additionally, Mission Analytics alleged that the agency's additional corrective action unreasonably included cancellation of the underlying solicitation (RFQ 1803) rather than making award to the protester as the only other vendor. We denied Mission Analytics' protest, finding that the VA's intended corrective action, *i.e.*, terminating the initial award, reviewing its requirements, conducting additional market research, and revising the RFQ was reasonable to address the identified flaws in the solicitation. In that decision, we stated that "the parties are in apparent agreement that the solicitation is defective, though perhaps differing as to how." *Mission Analytics, LLC, supra* at 4. We also considered and rejected as effectively premature Mission Analytics' claim that the VA intended to cancel the underlying solicitation noting that "nothing in the record provides that the agency has committed to cancelling the RFQ." *Id.* at 4 n.4.

On February 7, Mission Analytics requested that we reconsider our decision denying protest B-423165. We denied that request because Mission Analytics did not demonstrate any error of fact or law that would have altered the outcome of our original decision. *Mission Analytics, LLC--Recon.*, B-423165.2, Apr. 15, 2025. Mission Analytics subsequently filed a second and a third request for reconsideration that were dismissed by our Office; as we explained in those decisions, our Bid Protest Regulations do not contemplate reconsideration of a decision resolving a prior request for reconsideration. See *Mission Analytics, LLC--Recon.*, B-423165.3, June 11, 2025; *Mission Analytics, LLC--Recon.*, B-423165.4, Nov. 24, 2025 (unpublished decisions).

During the pendency of Mission Analytics' first protest to our Office, on November 12, 2024, the VA conducted additional market research by issuing request for information (RFI) No. 36C26225Q0112. The agency received 16 responses to the RFI and based on those responses, the contracting officer concluded that there was no reasonable expectation of receiving quotations from two or more responsible small businesses at fair and reasonable prices and instead decided to procure the agency's requirements on an unrestricted basis using the FSS. On March 17, 2025, the VA issued a new solicitation, RFQ No. 1748442 on an unrestricted basis, through the General Services Administration's eBuy website. The agency received 35 quotations in response to this

RFQ, and the delivery order was issued to Focus Camera on April 30. Mission Analytics does not have an FSS contract and, therefore, was not solicited.

On August 28, Mission Analytics filed a third agency-level protest with the VA's senior procurement executive, challenging the agency's corrective action implementation, particularly its market research and the decision to conduct the procurement using the FSS. On October 2, the agency denied this protest.

On November 13, Mission Analytics filed the underlying protest with our Office, essentially challenging the additional corrective action undertaken by the VA to fulfill its requirement by using the FSS, a procurement vehicle that was unavailable to the protester.¹ Mission Analytics also asserted that the VA improperly canceled the initial solicitation, RFQ 1803, as a pretext to avoid issuing the order to the firm.

On February 20, 2026, we issued our decision, *Mission Analytics, LLC*, B-423165.5, denying the protest. Our Office determined that while the VA had not formally canceled RFQ 1803, we found that termination of the previously issued order to Aviate, and the issuance of a different solicitation to FSS contract holders effectively canceled the solicitation. *Id.* at 7. We concluded that the agency's *de facto* cancellation, *i.e.*, proceeding with a different solicitation and award was reasonable, noting that an agency is not required to ensure that its corrective action would permit a protester to continue to compete for the agency's requirements. *Id.* at 9. As to the agency's decision to resolicit the remainder of its requirement using the FSS, we found this decision was within the agency's discretion and that Mission Analytics failed to demonstrate that the agency's decision was unreasonable.

On March 3, Mission Analytics requested that we reconsider our decision to deny its protest.

DISCUSSION

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); *CymSTAR, LLC--Recon.*, B-422576.2, Sept. 10, 2024, at 3. The repetition of arguments made during our consideration of the original protest and disagreement with our decision do not meet this standard. 4 C.F.R. § 21.14(c);

¹ Due to a lapse in appropriations, GAO was closed, including access to GAO's Electronic Protest Docketing System (EPDS), effective at noon eastern time on Wednesday, October 1, 2025. As part of its orderly shutdown of operations, GAO posted notices to its website and EPDS providing, in relevant part, that "[d]eadlines for the filing of new protests that fall on a day that GAO is closed are extended to the first day that GAO resumes operations." GAO did not resume operations, including restoring access for new protest filings, until November 13, 2025. See *Effective Comm'n Strategies, LLC*, B-423993; B-423993.2, Feb. 18, 2026, at 6-7 n.9.

Gunnison Consulting Grp., Inc.--Recon., B-418876.5, Feb. 4, 2021, at 3; *Darton Innovative Techs., Inc.--Recon.*, B-418034.3, Mar. 9, 2020, at 3.

In its request, Mission Analytics effectively repeats the allegations it raised in the underlying protest, insisting that our decision contains errors of both fact and law that warrant reconsideration. For example, the requester argues that our Office erred in its conclusion that the *de facto* cancellation of RFQ 1803 was reasonable because the VA never established that the agency could not meet its needs with an award using the original solicitation and original quotations. Req. for Recon. at 3. In other words, the requester argues that our prior decision failed to consider that the VA did not provide a reasonable justification for rejecting the last remaining quotation, *i.e.*, its own. *Id.*

Here, our underlying decision already considered these same arguments, finding that Mission Analytics' allegations that the agency canceled RFQ 1803 as a pretext to avoid making award to the firm was unsupported by the record. *Mission Analytics, LLC, supra* at 8. As an initial matter, we found the VA's determination that RFQ 1803 was defective provided a reasonable basis for the agency to take corrective action. Moreover, as our underlying decision stated: "[t]he protester's position that the agency could have simply made award to Mission Analytics is also contrary to its own previous protest arguments that the RFQ was defective." *Id.* at 9. In this regard, we concluded that the agency's decision to use the FSS as an available alternative to conduct its procurement was tantamount to cancelling the defective RFQ and the requester's arguments, as set forth in its submissions in the underlying protest, and repeated in its request for reconsideration, do not persuade us otherwise. In sum, the requester's disagreement with our earlier decision and its repetition of its earlier arguments do not meet our standards for granting its request for reconsideration.

As another example that reversal of our decision is warranted, the requester contends that our Office erred in relying on the VA's assertions that its additional market research was reasonable without recognizing that the market research was conducted in a manner to support the VA's decision to cancel RFQ 1803. See *generally*, Req. for Recon. at 3-4. The requester argues that these alleged errors are more than sufficient to show that the VA violated applicable procurement laws and regulations. We find, however, that these arguments were previously considered and rejected both in Mission Analytics' August 28 agency-level protest and in our underlying decision. See *Mission Analytics, LLC, supra* at 3, 6-9. We also note that the request for reconsideration does not set forth any new facts or evidence upon which the requester bases its assertion that the additional market research was conducted in a prejudicial manner. See *generally*, Req. for Recon.

Accordingly, on this record, Mission Analytics' arguments do not show an error of fact or law and thus provides no basis on which to reconsider our decision.

The request for reconsideration is dismissed.

Edda Emmanuelli Perez
General Counsel