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§ 169a.11 Expansions.

In cases where expansion of an in-house commercial activity is anticipated, a review of the entire commercial activity, including the proposed expansion, shall be conducted to determine if performance by DoD personnel is authorized for national defense reasons, because no commercial source is available, or because it is in the best interest of direct patient care. If performance by DoD personnel is not justified under these criteria, a cost comparison of the entire activity shall be performed. Government facilities and equipment normally will not be expanded to accommodate expansions if adequate and cost effective contractor facilities and equipment are available.

§ 169a.12 New requirements.

(a) In cases where a new requirement for a commercial product or service is anticipated, a review shall be conducted to determine if performance by DoD personnel is authorized for national defense reasons, because no commercial source is available, or because it is in the best interest of direct patient care. If performance by DoD personnel is not justified under these criteria, the new requirement normally shall be performed by contract.

(b) If there is reason to believe that commercial prices may be unreasonable, a preliminary cost analysis shall be conducted to determine whether it is likely that the work can be performed in-house at a cost that is less than anticipated for contract performance. If in-house performance appears to be more economical, a cost comparison shall be scheduled. The appropriate conversion differentials will be added to the preliminary in-house cost before it is determined that in-house performance is likely to be more economical.

(c) Government facilities and equipment normally will not be expanded to accommodate new requirements if adequate and cost effective contractor facilities are available. The requirement for Government ownership of facilities does not obviate the possibility of contract operation. If justification for in-house operation is dependent on relative cost, the cost comparison may be delayed to accommodate the lead time necessary for acquiring the facilities.

(d) Approval or disapproval of in-house performance of new requirements involving a capital investment of $500,000 or more will not be delegated below the level of DAS or equivalent.

(e) Approval to budget for a major capital investment associated with a new requirement will not constitute OSD approval to perform the new requirement with DoD personnel. Government performance shall be determined in accordance with this part.

§ 169a.13 CAs involving forty-five or fewer DoD civilian employees.

(a) When adequately justified under the criteria required in Appendix C to this part, CAs involving 11 to 45 DoD civilian employees may be competed based on simplified cost comparison procedures and 10 or fewer DoD civilian employees may be directly converted to contract without the use of a simplified cost comparison. Such conversion shall be approved by the DoD Component’s central point of contact office having the responsibility for implementation of this part. Part IV of the Supplement to OMB Circular A–76 and Appendix C to this part shall be utilized to define the specific elements of costs to be estimated in the simplified cost comparison.

(b) In no case shall any CA involving more than forty-five employees be modified, reorganized, divided, or in any way changed for the purpose of circumventing the requirement to perform a full cost comparison.

(c) The decision to perform a simplified cost comparison on a CA involving military personnel and 11 to 45 DoD Civilian employees reflects a management decision that the work need not be performed in-house. Therefore, all direct military personnel costs will be estimated in the simplified cost comparison (see Appendix C to this part) on the basis of civilian performance.

(d) A most efficient and cost-effective organization analysis certification is