



Decision

Matter of: Mission Analytics, LLC--Reconsideration

File: B-423198.2

Date: May 30, 2025

Michael Winters for the requester.

Erika Whelan Retta, Esq., Josephine Farinelli, Esq., and Siobhan Donahue, Esq.,
Department of the Air Force, for the agency.

Thomas J. Warren, Esq., and Alexander O. Levine, 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 has not shown that our decision contains material errors of fact or law.

DECISION

Mission Analytics, LLC, a service-disabled veteran-owned small business of Falls Church, Virginia, requests reconsideration of our decision in *Mission Analytics, LLC*, B-423198, Feb. 26, 2025, 2025 CPD ¶ 54, denying its protest of the award of a contract to ThunderCat Technology, LLC, a service-disabled veteran-owned small business of Reston, Virginia, under request for quotations (RFQ) No. FA442724Q0145, issued by the Department of the Air Force, to provide technology upgrades to an auditorium. The requester argued that the agency's evaluation of Mission Analytics's technical approach was unreasonable and the agency's price analysis was flawed. We denied the protest because the record supported the agency's evaluation of Mission Analytics's quotation as technically unacceptable and the agency's price evaluation of the awardee's quotation as fair and reasonable. The requester argues that our decision contained errors of fact and law that warrant modification of our prior decision.

We deny the request for reconsideration.

BACKGROUND

The agency issued the solicitation on August 6, 2024, as a small business set-aside, under the procedures of Federal Acquisition Regulation parts 12 and 13. Agency

Report (AR), Tab 4, RFQ at 1.¹ The RFQ contemplated the award of a fixed-price service contract to upgrade the audio-visual technology of the auditorium used by the 9th Air Refueling Squadron on Travis Air Force Base in Fairfield, California. AR, Tab 14, Performance Work Statement (PWS) at 2. The solicitation advised that vendors “shall provide a detailed description and specification of the items included in the quote,” and that each quotation “shall meet the needs detailed in the [PWS].” RFQ at 3. Award would be made to the “responsible offeror whose offer . . . will be most advantageous” to the government, considering the following evaluation factors: technical capability and price. *Id.* at 3. For technical capability, quotations would be evaluated as acceptable or unacceptable. *Id.* Price would be evaluated for reasonableness. *Id.*

As relevant here, the solicitation required the installation of a modernized audio-visual system, including a 55-inch “confidence monitor” intended to hang from the ceiling of the auditorium. AR, Tab 14, PWS at 4, 6. The PWS instructed vendors that the monitor should be “mounted in the ceiling of the facility and facing the presenter, to show the presenter what is on-screen without requiring the presenter to turn-around.” *Id.* at 4.

Mission Analytics submitted two quotations in response to the solicitation, and the agency evaluated both quotations as technically unacceptable, in part because Mission Analytics failed to include a detailed plan to install the confidence monitor in either quotation. Contracting Officer’s Statement (COS) at 4-5; AR, Tab 19, Abstract of Quotation Evaluations at 1. As relevant here, the agency determined that both quotations omitted pertinent information such as where the confidence monitor would be placed in the auditorium. AR, Tab 24, Technical Evaluation of Protester’s Quotation at 2; COS at 8; Memorandum of Law (MOL) at 7. The Air Force found only ThunderCat’s quotation to be technically acceptable and awarded the contract to ThunderCat after finding its price to be fair and reasonable. COS at 6; AR, Tab 31, Price Reasonableness Analysis at 2.

After being notified of the award decision and receiving a debriefing, Mission Analytics filed an agency-level protest on October 10, which the Air Force dismissed as untimely. AR, Tab 47, Agency-Level Protest Decision. Mission Analytics then filed a timely protest with our Office. In its protest, the requester alleged that the agency improperly dismissed Mission Analytics’s agency-level protest, unreasonably evaluated Mission Analytics’s quotation as technically unacceptable for failing to provide detail on where and how the confidence monitor would be installed, and unreasonably determined the awardee’s price to be fair and reasonable. Protest at 1-7, 12-14.

On February 26, 2025, our Office denied the protest, finding that the agency reasonably evaluated Mission Analytics’s quotation as technically unacceptable for failing to describe where the confidence monitor would be placed and how installation would

¹ Citations to the record are to the pages in the Adobe PDF documents. Unless otherwise noted, references are to the redacted documents in the agency report in the underlying protest.

occur. *Mission Analytics LLC, supra* at 5. We also concluded that the agency reasonably determined that the awardee's price was fair and reasonable. *Id.* at 6-7. Mission Analytics filed this request that we reconsider our decision on March 10, 2025.

DISCUSSION

Mission Analytics requests reconsideration of our decision denying its protest and contends that the decision contained errors of law and fact. Req. for Recon. at 1. In this regard, the requester asserts that our decision "ignore[d]" the allegation that Mission Analytics's agency-level protest was improperly dismissed. *Id.* The requester further argues that our decision erred by affirming the reasonableness of the agency's evaluation of Mission Analytics's quotation as technically unacceptable for not including a detailed plan to install the confidence monitor. *Id.* at 4-6. Finally, Mission Analytics states that our decision failed to address the requester's argument that the agency unreasonably relied on a comparison to a project that was "not similar in scope" to the instant requirement, when analyzing Thundercat's price quotation. *Id.* at 7-8. For the reasons discussed below, we find that none of the arguments presented by the requester provide a basis to grant the request for reconsideration.

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. *Alion Sci. & Tech. Corp.--Recon.*, B-420778.3, Dec. 27, 2022, 2023 CPD ¶ 39 at 2. The repetition of arguments made during our consideration of the original protest and disagreement with our decision do not meet this standard. *Id.* at 5-7.

As an initial matter, Mission Analytics argues that our decision did not acknowledge that the agency erred when it dismissed Mission Analytics's agency-level protest as untimely.² As noted above, however, after the agency dismissed the requester's agency-level protest, Mission Analytics filed a timely protest with our Office. Our Office then considered and denied Mission Analytics's protest. See *Mission Analytics LLC, supra*. By assigning fault to the agency for dismissing the requester's agency-level protest--and ignoring the fact that our Office considered and denied these same allegations in the subsequent protest filed with our Office--the requester fails to identify a legal or factual error in our decision supporting reconsideration. As a result, we dismiss this argument.

² The agency acknowledged, in the agency report filed in response to Mission Analytics's protest, that it "erred in determining that the entire agency-level protest was untimely." MOL at 4 n.2. Nevertheless, the agency explained that "those timely allegations are raised for GAO's consideration on the merits of the subject protest," which the agency "addressed [] in its report." *Id.*

Mission Analytics also argues that the agency improperly evaluated the requester's quotation as unacceptable for failing to explain where and how Mission Analytics intended to install the confidence monitor in the auditorium. Req. for Recon. at 4-6. In this regard, the requester argues that because the agency provided photographic examples of an existing confidence monitor mounted in another auditorium, the agency should have understood that Mission Analytics intended to mount the confidence monitor in the same location, and in the same manner, as in the solicitation's reference photos. See *id.* at 4-6. Mission Analytics raised this same argument in its protest, which our Office considered and rejected when we found that the agency reasonably determined that Mission Analytics failed to adequately specify where and how Mission Analytics intended to install the confidence monitor. See Protest at 6, 12; Comments at 2; *Mission Analytics LLC, supra* at 4-5. Neither the requester's repetition of its previous argument nor its disagreement with our conclusion provide a basis for reconsideration. *Alion Sci. & Tech. Corp.--Recon., supra* at 7. As such, we deny this argument.

Finally, Mission Analytics contends that our decision erred by finding the agency's price evaluation to be reasonable. Req. for Recon. at 7-8. In this regard, the requester openly repeats its argument that the agency's price analysis was flawed because the agency compared the awardee's proposed prices to contract prices for a requirement the requester maintains was "not similar in scope, and in fact, was almost exactly twice the scope" of the instant requirement. *Id.* at 7. In the requester's view, our Office erred by not addressing this argument when we concluded that the agency's price evaluation was reasonable. *Id.* at 7-8.

We see no basis to reconsider our prior decision. First, we note that Mission Analytics incorrectly implies that our Office ignored or otherwise failed to consider this challenge of the agency's price evaluation. Although our decisions may not necessarily address every argument raised, our Office reviews and decides all issues raised by protesters consistent with our mandate to provide for the "inexpensive and expeditious resolution of protests." *Gunnison Consulting Grp., Inc.--Recon.*, B-418876.5, Feb. 4, 2021, 2021 CPD ¶ 101 at 5 (quoting 31 U.S.C. § 3554(a)(1)). Accordingly, the fact that our decision did not address Mission Analytics's specific argument about the alleged difference in scope between these two requirements does not mean the argument was not considered by our Office. Nor does the lack of specific discussion provide a basis to reconsider our decision. See *Analytical Sols. by Kline, LLC*, B-417161.3, July 11, 2019, 2019 CPD ¶ 398 at 4 (noting that "a lack of discussion is not indicative of an error of fact or law").

Second, as noted above, Mission Analytics raised the same argument in the underlying protest. Compare Comments at 11-12 with Req. for Recon. at 6-8. By repeating this argument in its request, Mission Analytics fails to meet our standard for reconsideration.

Alion Sci. & Tech. Corp.--Recon., *supra* at 7. Accordingly, this argument is likewise denied.³

The request is denied.

Edda Emmanuelli Perez
General Counsel

³ In any event, we note that our conclusion that the agency's price evaluation was reasonable did not rest exclusively on the comparison between the awardee's prices to the specific contract that the requester alleges was "twice the scope" of the requirement being solicited. Instead, our decision assessed the agency's overall price analysis, which relied on multiple methods, such as comparing the awardee's price to an independent government cost estimate and to the prices of the quotations submitted in response to the solicitation. *Mission Analytics LLC*, *supra* at 6-7. Our Office weighed the entire record, and all aspects of the agency's documented price analysis, and on this basis we concluded that the agency reasonably determined the awardee's price to be fair and reasonable. *Id.* at 7.