



## Decision

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

**File:** B-423980.5; B-423980.6

**Date:** May 21, 2026

---

Michael Winters, for the protester.

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

Todd C. Culliton, Esq., and Tania Calhoun, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, GAO, participated in the preparation of the decision.

---

### DIGEST

1. Request for reconsideration is denied where our decision did not contain any factual or legal error.
2. Second request for reconsideration is dismissed because our Office's Bid Protest Regulations do not contemplate such review.

---

### DECISION

Mission Analytics, LLC, of Falls Church, Virginia, requests reconsideration of our decisions, *Mission Analytics, LLC-Recon.*, B-423980.2, B-420983.4, Mar. 31, 2026, and *Mission Analytics, LLC*, B-423980.3, Apr. 1, 2026. The decisions concern allegations raised in connection with request for quotations (RFQ) No. FA500426Q1001, issued by the Department of the Air Force for closed-circuit television (CCTV) system upgrades. Mission Analytics argues that both decisions contain factual and legal errors.

We deny and dismiss the requests.

### BACKGROUND

On September 11, 2025, the Air Force issued the RFQ to procure upgrades for the CCTV system at Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska. *Mission Analytics, LLC, supra* at 1; see also Req. for Dismissal (B-423980), attach. A, RFQ at 4. The acquisition was conducted in accordance with the commercial products and services acquisition procedures set forth in Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) subpart 12.6. RFQ at 4. The RFQ contemplated the issuance of a purchase order to the vendor whose quotation

represents the best-value considering price and technical factors. *Id.* at 6. The closing time for receipt of proposals was 12:00 p.m., Alaskan Time (*i.e.*, 4:00 p.m., Eastern Time (ET)), on September 17. *Id.* at 1.

At 9:11 a.m. ET on September 17, Mission Analytics contacted agency contracting officials and asked the agency to revise the solicitation to include an actual zoom range for the cameras of “30X,” as opposed to the solicited requirement of “36X.” Protest (B-423980), E-mails Between Mission Analytics and Agency at 3. The protester explained that the “36X” zoom range requirement was overly restrictive because the solicited camera can only achieve the “36X” zoom range with image stabilization deactivated; otherwise, the zoom range is reduced to “30X.” *Id.* At 1:35 p.m. ET, an agency official responded that they had reviewed the email and were reviewing the request. *Id.* at 1-2.

At 3:40 p.m. ET, Mission Analytics informed the agency that “[d]ue to the impending closure of the solicitation, this will be elevated to an Agency Protest.” Protest (B-423980), E-mails Between Mission Analytics and Agency at 1. The firm argued that the “36X” zoom range requirement was unduly restrictive of competition. *Id.* At 3:48 p.m. ET, Mission Analytics sent the agency an email challenging the RFQ’s inclusion of Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS) clause 252.225-7001, Buy American and Balance of Payments Program, and arguing that several other clauses and provisions should be removed. Req. for Dismissal (B-423980), attach. D, Mission Analytics Quote Submission and Emails Between Agency and Protester at 1-4. At 3:59 p.m. ET, Mission Analytics sent another email to the agency complaining that the Air Force unreasonably failed to solicit the requirement as a small business set-aside. Req. for Dismissal, attach. G, Emails Between Agency and Protester at 2-3. The agency considered both complaints to be part of an agency-level protest. Req. for Dismissal (B-423980) at 2.

Rather than pause or extend the solicitation period, the Air Force instead proceeded to receive and evaluate quotations. Req. for Dismissal (B-423980) at 2. On September 23, the agency identified the quotation submitted by Wingmann, LLC, of McCloud, Oklahoma, as representing the best-value and issued a purchase order to that firm in the amount of \$1,030,578. *Id.* The agency explained that it posted notice of the purchase order to the System for Award Management (SAM) that same day. *Id.*

On September 25, Mission Analytics withdrew its agency-level protest challenging the RFQ’s inclusion of DFARS clause 252.225-700122, acknowledging that this clause was properly included. Req. for Dismissal (B-423980), attach. D, Mission Analytics Quote Submission and Emails Between Agency and Protester at 1.

At 5:07 p.m. ET on September 29, Mission Analytics submitted a quotation. Req. for Recon. (B-423980.6), at 4. The protester explains that, after it submitted its quotation, the Air Force posted notice of the awarded purchase order to SAM. *Id.* The firm provides a screenshot of the SAM posting showing that the agency published the notice at 5:59 p.m. ET. *Id.* at 1.

At 5:31 p.m. ET, Mission Analytics submitted its first protest filing with our Office.<sup>1</sup> The firm argued that the RFQ's requirement for a camera with a "36X" zoom range was unduly restrictive, and that the agency unreasonably failed to restrict the competition to small businesses. Protest (B-423980) at 1.

At 7:22 p.m. ET, an Air Force official responded to Mission Analytics with the following:

I found your emails buried in a spam folder including this one. There's no way I could've known you had submitted anything. Your emails were not received in a timely manner your "protests" were not submitted in a concise and logical manner, there's no evidence that your company is an interested party, you didn't file directly with the agency, your questions were submitted past the question deadline, and the quote you submitted was over 12 days late and incomplete with Chinese products. All of the items I have identified are grounds for dismissal.

Req. for Dismissal (B-423980), attach. G, Post-Award Agency Protest at 1.

On October 10, Mission Analytics submitted an agency-level protest to the Air Force. *Id.* The agency responded "[d]enied, untimely." *Id.*

On November 13, Mission Analytics filed a "Corrected Version" of its September 29 protest filing with our Office. The protester reiterated its allegations that the terms of the RFQ were unduly restrictive and unreasonably failed to restrict competition to small businesses. Protest, Corrected Version (B-423980) at 1-2. The protester also argued that the Air Force unreasonably issued the purchase order while its agency-level protest was pending. *Id.* at 2, 20. The firm also argued that the agency unreasonably evaluated Wingmann's quotation as technically acceptable because the quotation included a Chinese product. *Id.* at 22-23.

On December 5, the agency requested dismissal of all allegations raised. It argued that the challenges to the terms of the solicitation were untimely because they were filed more than 10 days after the initial adverse agency action (*i.e.*, the agency's decision to receive and evaluate quotations). Req. for Dismissal at 4-5. The agency explained that the solicitation closed on September 17, and therefore, the protester had until September 29, 10 days later, to file any challenge to the terms of the solicitation. *Id.* at 5. Because Mission Analytics did not file its protest until 5:31 p.m. ET on September 29, the agency explained that the protest was not considered filed until September 30 and was untimely by "one-minute and forty-nine seconds." *Id.*

As to the allegations challenging the evaluation of Wingmann's quotation, the Air Force argued that Mission Analytics was not an interested party to raise them. Req. for

---

<sup>1</sup> Specifically, the protester filed its protest at 5:31:49 p.m. ET. *Mission Analytics LLC*, B-423980, Electronic Protest Docketing System No. 1 (Time Stamp).

Dismissal at 6. It explained that Mission Analytics did not submit a quotation prior to the close of the solicitation period, and, as a result, the firm lacked any direct economic interest affected by the issuance of the purchase order to Wingmann. *Id.* at 7.

On December 10, Mission Analytics responded to the agency's request for dismissal. It argued that its challenges to the terms of the solicitation were timely because the closing of the solicitation period did not represent the initial adverse agency action; rather, the agency's September 29 response constituted the initial adverse agency action. Resp. to Req. for Dismissal at 2. As to the post-award allegations, Mission Analytics argued that it was an interested party because it had challenged the terms of the solicitation. *Id.* at 3-4. Finally, Mission Analytics argued that its challenges should be excepted from our timeliness rules because they should be excused for good cause or because they raise significant issues of public interest. *Id.* at 4-6.

On January 14, our Office dismissed Mission Analytics' protest allegations. We concluded that the challenges to the terms of the solicitation were untimely because they were filed more than 10 days after the initial adverse agency action. *Mission Analytics, LLC*, B-423980, Jan. 14, 2026, at 4-5. We agreed with the agency that the September 17 close of the solicitation period and the agency's receipt of quotations constituted the initial adverse agency action. *Id.* Indeed, we stated "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." *Id.* at 4. Thus, we explained that Mission Analytics protest was untimely because it was filed on September 30, which was more than 10 days after the September 17 closing of the solicitation period.<sup>2</sup>

We also concluded that Mission Analytics was not an interested party to challenge the issuance of the purchase order to Wingmann because Mission Analytics neither submitted a quotation nor filed a timely protest challenging the terms of the RFQ. *Mission Analytics, LLC*, B-423980, Jan. 14, 2026, at 5-6. In this regard, we explained that Mission Analytics' contention that it had "standing regardless of whether or not it submitted a bid or offer" was legally incorrect in this context. *Id.* at 6.

On January 26 and February 13, Mission Analytics filed two separate requests for reconsideration of our decision. On February 2, Mission Analytics filed a new protest. On April 1, we dismissed the protest and denied the requests for reconsideration in two

---

<sup>2</sup> Our decision explained that the tenth day after September 17 fell on Saturday, September 27, and as a result, the deadline moved to Monday, September 29, the next business day. *Mission Analytics, LLC*, B-423980, Jan. 14, 2026, at 5.

The decision also explained that a document is filed on a particular day when it is received in EPDS by 5:30 p.m. ET. *Id.* That fact was relevant because, while Mission Analytics filed its protest at 5:31 p.m. ET on September 29, that filing was considered filed on September 30, pursuant to 4 C.F.R. § 21.0(g). *Id.* at 4-5.

separate decisions. *Mission Analytics, LLC*, B-423980.3, April 1, 2026; *Mission Analytics, LLC--Recon.*, B-424980.2, B-424980.4.

On April 13, Mission Analytics requested reconsideration of both decisions.

## DISCUSSION

Mission Analytics contends that both our April 1, decisions contain legal and factual errors warranting further reconsideration. We provide additional context and discuss the requests separately.

### Request for Reconsideration of *Mission Analytics, LLC*, B-423980.3, April 1, 2026

As noted above, on February 2, Mission Analytics filed a second protest ostensibly challenging the agency's conduct of the acquisition. Mission Analytics contended that the Air Force improperly failed to review and issue decisions resolving its September 17, pre-award agency-level protest and the October 10, post-award protest. Protest, B-423980.3 at 1. In so doing, Mission Analytics argued that the agency's actions violated its duty under FAR 33.103(h) to produce a well-reasoned decision. *Id.*; see also FAR 33.103(h) ("Agency protest decisions shall be well-reasoned, and explain the agency position. The protest decision shall be provided to the protester using a method that provides evidence of receipt."). Mission Analytics also complained that the agency acted in bad faith by misrepresenting whether one of the agency-level protests was timely. *Id.*

On February 24, the Air Force requested dismissal of the protest. The Air Force argued that Mission Analytics' protest allegation lacked a valid basis because the firm failed to allege any improper agency action.<sup>3</sup> Req. for Dismissal at 4-6. The agency explained that its receipt and evaluation of quotations constituted an effective denial of the September 17 protest, and therefore, the agency did not fail to issue a decision or otherwise resolve the agency-level protest in accordance with FAR 33.103(h). *Id.* at 5-6.

On February 27, Mission Analytics responded by arguing that the protest stated a valid basis because the agency has a responsibility to issue a written decision, and a GAO

---

<sup>3</sup> The Air Force also argued that the protest was untimely filed. Specifically, it asserted that it sent an email to Mission Analytics that it would not take any further action on the agency-level protest at 4:44 p.m. ET on January 20, but that Mission Analytics filed the protest more than 10 days later. Req. for Dismissal at 2-3. We did not find this argument persuasive because the pleadings demonstrated that Mission Analytics received the email outside of its business hours, and therefore did not have notice that the protest was considered resolved until the following day, January 21. *Mission Analytics, LLC*, B-423980.3, Apr. 1, 2026, at 2-3, n.2. We then determined that Mission Analytics filed its protest within 10 days of January 21. *Id.*

decision does not resolve an agency-level protest. See Resp. to Req. for Dismissal, Version 2, at 8.

On April 1, we dismissed the protest because we agreed with the agency that the allegation failed to state a valid basis since it did not demonstrate any improper agency action. *Mission Analytics, LLC*, B-423980.3, Apr. 1, 2026, at 3-4. We determined that the Air Force had effectively denied the September 17 pre-award protest when it received and evaluated quotations. *Id.* at 4. As a result, we concluded that the allegation did not demonstrate improper agency action because there was no evidence that the agency had failed to resolve that protest.

On April 13, Mission Analytics requested that our Office reconsider our decision because it allegedly contains a plethora of factual and legal errors. Principally, the firm argues that our Office improperly determined that the agency-level protest had been resolved because the agency had not yet issued a written decision either sustaining or denying the protest. Req. for Recon, B-423980.5, at 1-6. In this regard, Mission Analytics asserted that no legal precedent (GAO jurisprudence or otherwise) exists finding that an agency may resolve an agency-level protest without issuing a formal written notice. *Id.* at 3-6. Mission Analytics also complains that our decision failed to address its allegations concerning the agency's alleged failure to resolve its October 10, post-award protest and the agency's alleged bad faith in representing the timeliness of the agency-level protests.<sup>4</sup> *Id.* at 1.

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(c).

After reviewing the request, we do not find that our decision contained any error in determining that the protest failed to state a valid basis because we do not review the sufficiency or manner in which an agency chooses to resolve agency-level protests. Our Regulations provide that an interested party may protest one of the following: (1) a solicitation or other request by a Federal agency for offers for a contract for the procurement of property or services; (2) the cancelation of such a solicitation or other request; (3) an award or proposed award of such a contract; and (4) a termination of such a contract, if the protest alleges that the termination was based on improprieties in the award of the contract. 4 C.F.R. § 21.1(a). None of these enumerated grounds contemplate a protester challenging an agency's alleged failure to resolve an agency-level protest, or provide that our Office will conduct an appellate-style review of such. Furthermore, Mission Analytics requests, as relief, that our Office direct the agency to resolve its agency-level protests, but such action is plainly inconsistent with the remedies that we typically recommend (e.g., refrain from exercising options,

---

<sup>4</sup> The request for reconsideration identifies the post-award protest as being filed September 29; however, the February 2 protest identifies the post-award protest as being filed October 10. We refer to the post-award protest specified in the protest filing.

terminate a contract, or reissue a solicitation). See 4 C.F.R. § 21.8. Thus, we confirm that our Office did not make any error in dismissing the allegation because we do not review whether an agency properly issued a decision resolving an agency-level protest.

Moreover, we do not find that our decision erred in determining that the agency had, in fact, denied the agency-level protests. In its request for dismissal of B-423980.3, the Air Force explained that it considered its receipt and evaluation of quotations as a denial of the firm's pre-award agency protest. Req. for Dismissal at 5 ("The agency extinguished and effectively denied Mission's September 17, 2025, agency-level protest when it accepted quotations without changing the RFQ terms or extending the submission period."). Additionally, and as noted above, the record shows that the agency denied the firm's October 10 post-award agency-level protest. Thus, because the agency represented that it effectively denied the pre-award agency-level protest through its actions and expressly denied the post-award protest, we see no basis to conclude that our Office improperly accepted that representation as a fact since we do not review the sufficiency of an agency's internal bid protest procedures or processes.

Finally, we do not find that our decision erred for failing to address Mission Analytics' claim that the agency engaged in bad faith when representing the status of the agency-level protest. Agency officials are presumed to act in good faith, and allegations of bias or bad faith must be supported by convincing proof, beyond mere inference and innuendo. *Oready, LLC*, B-423524.2, Aug. 13, 2025, at 4. Here, the protester did not provide any proof beyond an email chain showing that the agency considered the agency-level protest resolved following the issuance of our January 14 decision, and that the commanding officer directed agency staff to refrain from further communications with Mission Analytics regarding the procurement. Nothing about that exchange evidences actions resembling bad faith. Thus, we did not commit any legal error in dismissing this allegation. Accordingly, we deny the request.

Request for Reconsideration of *Mission Analytics, LLC--Recon.*, B-423980.2, B-423980.4, Apr. 1, 2026

As referenced earlier, Mission Analytics filed two requests for reconsideration of our January 14, decision. In a January 26 filing, Mission Analytics contended that our decision contained factual and legal errors. Principally, Mission Analytics asserted that our Office concluded that the firm submitted its September 29 quotation after learning that the agency had made an award to Wingmann. Req. for Recon., B-423980.2, at 1. Mission Analytics also argued that our Office erroneously concluded that the firm was not an interested party. *Id.* at 2. In Mission Analytics' view, the firm needed only satisfy the timeliness rules for filing the agency-level protest, and thus having done so, any subsequent protest to GAO would also be considered timely. *Id.* at 2-3.

On February 13, Mission Analytics filed a second request for reconsideration of our January 14 decision. The firm argued that our decision unreasonably determined that its protest was untimely because it experienced technical difficulty when filing its protest through EPDS. Req. for Recon., B-423980.4, at 1-5. It contended that such technical

difficulty should excuse its untimely filing, particularly because the filing was only late by one minute. *Id.*

On April 1, we denied Mission Analytics' requests for reconsideration. First, we addressed Mission Analytics' claim that our Office erroneously determined that the firm submitted its protest prior to learning that the Air Force had issued the purchase order to Wingmann. *Mission Analytics, LLC--Recon.*, B-423980.2, B-423980.4, Apr. 1, 2026, at 4. We concluded that any alleged misidentification was inconsequential because this fact did not change the deadline for filing a protest challenging the terms of the solicitation. *Id.* at 4-5. In other words, we explained that whether Mission Analytics learned about the award of the contract before or after it filed its September 29 protest simply had no bearing on whether its protest was filed within 10 days from the close of the solicitation period and the agency's receipt and evaluation of quotations. *Id.* at 5.

Second, we addressed Mission Analytics' argument that our decision improperly determined that the firm was not an interested party. *Mission Analytics, LLC--Recon.*, at 6-7. While Mission Analytics claimed that it was an interested party because it timely submitted both its quotation and agency-level protest, we dismissed these arguments because the firm previously raised them as part of our consideration of the underlying protest. *Id.* at 6 ("Here, the requester repeats the same arguments asserted in the prior protest."). Further, we noted that the protester's filing of a timely agency-level protest did not demonstrate that the firm was interested to raise its challenges to the award of the contract because the agency's denial of such protest extinguished any direct economic interest in the outcome of the acquisition. *Id.*

Third, we addressed Mission Analytics' claim that its protest should be considered timely due to the technical difficulty it experienced when filing its protest. *Mission Analytics, LLC--Recon.*, *supra* at 7-8. We dismissed this request as untimely because it was filed more than 10 days after the firm alleged the information first "came to light." *Id.* at 7. Further, we noted that any minor technical difficulty related to EPDS did not excuse the firm's failure to file a timely protest. *Id.* at 8.

On April 13, Mission Analytics requested reconsideration of this decision. It contends that our decision repeats factual and legal errors which were present in our January 14, decision. *Req. for Recon.*, B-423980.6, at 1 ("Mission Analytics is requesting reconsideration of the subject decision due to Errors in Fact and Law in B-423980.1 and continued in B-423980.2."). The firm then argues that our Office erroneously determined that it submitted its quotation after learning that the agency had made award to Wingmann, that it is an interested party because it filed a timely pre-award agency-level protest and that its untimely filing of the September 30, protest should be excused due to its technical difficulty associated with using EPDS. *Id.* at 1-9.

We dismiss this request because our Bid Protest Regulations do not contemplate requests for reconsideration of reconsideration decisions. 4 C.F.R. 21.14(a) ("The protester, any intervenor, and any Federal agency involved in the protest may request reconsideration of a bid protest decision."). Moreover, having already twice considered

and rejected the protester's arguments concerning the timeliness of its protest, its status as an interested party, and whether we should excuse the untimely filing due to the experienced technical difficulty, we see no reason to consider the matter for a third time.

The requests are denied and dismissed.

Edda Emmanuelli Perez  
General Counsel