

FILE: 3-188110

DATE: Herch 15, 1977

MATTER OF: Crawford Development and Manufacturing

DIGEST:

Under 15 U.S.C. § 637(b)(7) SBA has authority to issue or deny COC and our Office will not review SBA determination, require issuance of COC or reopen case when COC denied. While GAO will recommend a reassessment of responsibility of prospective contractor where it appears all relevant information has not been considered, such does not appear to be case here.

Crawford Development and Manufacturing (Crawford) has protested the award of a contract to any other bidder for items 0002, 0004, and 0006 under solicitation No. DAAA-09-77-B-0037 1 sued by the United States Army, Rock Island Arsens1.

Specifically, Crawford questions the judgment of the Small Business Administration, apparently in connection with Certificate of Competency proceedings, in expressing doubt as to the ability of the Property Maintenance Company (Property Maintenance) to supply Crawford with necessary funds to undertake and complete the contract. Crawford states that Property Maintenance in fact has sufficient funds and has issued a \$60,000 letter of commitment to Crawford.

Under 15 U.S.C. § 637(b)(7) (1970), the SBA has the authority to issue or deny a COC and our Office will not review an SBA determination, require isquance of a COC, or reopen a case when a COC has be a denied. Zinger Construction Company, Inc., B-185390, December 16, 12/5, 75-2 CPD 397; Precision Electronics Labs, B-186751, October 29, 1976, 76-2 CPD 369. While our Office will recommend a reassessment of the responsibility of a prospective contractor where it appears that all relevant information has not been considered, see, Precision Electronics Labs, supra, such does not appear to be the case here. In this regard, the Army has advised us that the SBA has fully considered both the matter of Property Maintenance's ability to supply Crawford with sufficient funds and the matter of the alleged \$60,000 letter of commitment from Property Maintenance to Crawford.

B-188110

Accordingly, there is no justification to consider the merits of the protest.

Paul G. Dembling General Counsel