REQUIRED CENTRAL CONTRACTOR REGISTRATION (XXX 19XX)

(a) *Definitions.*

Central Contractor Registration (CCR) database means the primary DoD repository for contractor information required for the conduct of business with DoD.

Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number means the 9-digit number assigned by Dun and Bradstreet Information Services to identify unique business entities.

Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS)+4 number means the DUNS number assigned by Dun and Bradstreet plus a 4-digit suffix that may be assigned by a parent (controlling) business concern. This 4-digit suffix may be assigned at the discretion of the parent business concern for such purposes as identifying subunits or affiliates of the parent business concern.

Registered in the CCR database means that all mandatory information, including the DUNS number or the DUNS+4 number, if applicable, and the corresponding Commercial and Government Entity (CAGE) code, is in the CCR database; the DUNS number and the CAGE code have been validated; and all edits have been successfully completed. To remain registered in the CCR database after the initial registration, the Contractor is required to confirm on an annual basis that its CCR registration is still accurate and complete.

(b)(1) By submission of an offer, the offeror acknowledges the requirement that a prospective awardee must be registered in the CCR database prior to award, during performance, and through final payment of any contract resulting from this solicitation except for awards to foreign vendors for work to be performed outside the United States.

(2) The offeror shall provide its DUNS or, if applicable, its DUNS+4 number with its offer, which will be used by the Contracting Officer to verify that the offeror is registered in the CCR database.

(3) Lack of registration in the CCR database will make an offeror ineligible for award.

(4) Since initial registration in the CCR database may take up to 30 days, offerors that are not registered should consider applying for registration immediately upon receipt of this solicitation.

(c) The Contractor is responsible for the accuracy and completeness of the data within the CCR, and for any liability resulting from the Government's reliance on inaccurate or incomplete data. To remain registered in the CCR database after the initial registration, the Contractor is required to confirm on an annual basis that its information in the CCR database is accurate and complete.

(d) Offerors and contractors may obtain information on registration and annual confirmation requirements by calling 1–888–xxx–xxxx or via the Internet at http://ccr.edi.disa.mil.

(End of clause)

[FR Doc. 97–24387 Filed 9–12–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5000–04–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

48 CFR Part 215

[DFARS Case 97–D025]

Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Weighted Guidelines—Federally Funded Research and Development Centers

AGENCY: Department of Defense (DoD).

ACTION: Proposed rule with request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Director of Defense Procurement is proposing to amend the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS) to exempt Federally Funded Research and Development Centers from the weighted guidelines method for establishing profit and fee objectives.

DATES: Comment date: Comments on the proposed rule should be submitted in writing to the address shown below on or before November 14, 1997 to be considered in the formulation of the final rule.

ADDRESSES: Interested parties should submit written comments to: Defense Acquisition Regulations Council, Attn: Ms. Amy Williams, PDUSD (A&T) DP (DAR), IMD 3D139, 3062 Defense Pentagon, Washington, DC 20301–3062. Telefax number (703) 602–0350.

E-mail comments submitted over the Internet should be addressed to: dfars@acq.osd.mil

Please cite DFARS Case 97–D025 in all correspondence related to this issue. E-mail correspondence should cite DFARS Case 97–D025 in the subject line.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Amy Williams, (703) 602–0131.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Background

This proposed rule amends DFARS Subpart 215.9 to exempt Federally Funded Research and Development Centers (FFRDCs) from the weighted guidelines method for establishing profit and fee objectives. The fee for an FFRDC is based on assessment of need and, therefore, should not be subject to the structured, risk-based approach embodied in the weighted guidelines method of profit/fee computation. The proposed rule instead requires contracting officers to establish fee objectives for FFRDCs in accordance with FFRDC fee policies in the DoD FFRDC Management Plan.

B. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The proposed rule is not expected to have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities within the meaning of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601, et seq., because the rule applies only to contract actions with Federally Funded Research and Development Centers. The rule is not applicable to small businesses. An initial regulatory flexibility analysis has therefore not been prepared. Comments are invited from small businesses and other interested parties. Comments from small entities concerning the affected DFARS subpart also will be considered in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 610. Such comments should be submitted separately and should cite DFARS Case 97–D025 in correspondence.

C. Paperwork Reduction Act

The Paperwork Reduction Act does not apply because the proposed rule does not impose any information collection requirements that require the approval of the Office of Management and Budget under 44 U.S.C. 3501, et seq.

List of Subjects in 48 CFR Part 215

Government procurement.

Michele P. Peterson,

Executive Editor, Defense Acquisition Regulations Council.

Therefore, 48 CFR Part 215 is proposed to be amended as follows:

1. The authority citation for 48 CFR Part 215 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 41 U.S.C. 421 and 48 CFR Chapter 1.

PART 215—CONTRACTING BY NEGOTIATION

2. Section 215.902 is amended by revising the introductory text to read as follows:

215.902 Policy.

Departments and agencies shall use a structured approach for developing a prenegotiation profit or fee objective (profit objective) on any negotiated contract action that requires cost analysis, except on cost-plus-award-fee contracts (see 215.974) or contracts with Federally Funded Research and Development Centers (FFRDCs) (see 215.975). There are three structured approaches—

* * * * *

3. Section 215.903 is amended by revising paragraphs (b)(1) and (b)(2) to read as follows:

215.903 Contracting officer responsibilities.

* * * * *

(b) The contracting officer—

(1) Shall use the weighted guidelines method (see 215.971), unless—

(A) The modified weighted guidelines method applies;

(B) An alternate structured approach is justified;

(C) Developing a fee objective for a cost-plus-award-fee contract; or

(D) Developing a fee objective for a contract with an FFRDC.

(2) Shall use the modified weighted guidelines method (see 215.972) on contract actions with nonprofit organizations, except contract actions with FERDCs;

* * * * *

4. Section 215.972 is amended by revising the section heading and paragraphs (b) and (c), and by removing paragraph (d). The revised text read as follows:

215.972 Modified weighted guidelines method for nonprofit organizations except FFRDCs.

* * * * *

(b) For nonprofit organizations which are entities that have been identified by the Secretary of Defense or a Secretary of a Department as receiving sustaining support on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis from a particular DoD department or agency, compute a fee objective for covered actions using the weighted guidelines method in 215.971, with the following modifications:

(1) *Modifications to performance risk (Blocks 21–24 of the DD Form 1547.*

(i) If the contracting officer assigns a value from the standard designated range (see 215.971–2(c), reduce the fee objective by an amount equal to 1 percent of the costs in Block 18 of the DD Form 1547. Show the net (reduced) amount on the DD Form 1547.

(ii) If the contracting officer assigns a value from the alternate designated range, reduce the fee objective by an amount equal to 2 percent of the costs in Block 18 of the DD Form 1547. Shown the net (reduced) amount on the DD Form 1547.

(2) *Modifications to contract type risk (Block 25 of the DD Form 1547).* Use a designated range of −1 percent to 0 percent instead of the values in 215.971–3. There is no normal value.

(c) For all other nonprofit organizations except FFRDCs, compute a fee objective for covered actions using the weighted guidelines method in 215.971, modified as described in paragraph (b)(1) of this section.

215.975 [Redesignated]

5. Section 215.975 is redesignated as 215.976.

6. A new section 215.975 is added to read as follows:

215.975 Fee requirements for FFRDCs.

For nonprofit organizations that are FFRDCs, the contracting officer–

(a) Should consider whether any fee is appropriate. Considerations shall include the FFRDC's—

(1) Proportion of retained earnings (as established under generally accepted accounting methods) that relates to DoD contracted effort;

(2) Facilities capital acquisition plans;

(3) Working capital funding as assessed on operating cycle cash needs;

(4) Contingency funding; and

(5) Provision for funding unreimbursed costs deemed ordinary and necessary to the FFRDC.

(b) Shall, when a fee is considered appropriate, establish the fee objective in accordance with FFRDC fee policies in the DoD FFRDC Management Plan.

(c) Shall not use the weighted guidelines method or an alternate structured approach.

[FR Doc. 97–24386 Filed 9–12–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5000–04–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

50 CFR Part 17

RIN 1018–AEOO

Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Extension of Comment Period and Notice of Public Hearings on Proposed Rule and Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Grizzly Bear Recovery in the Bitterroot Ecosystem

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Proposed rule; notice of public hearings and extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: The Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) provides notice that public hearings will be held on the proposed rule to establish a nonessential experimental population of grizzly bears in the Bitterroot Ecosystem. Public meetings on the draft EIS for the proposed recovery action will be held concurrently. To accommodate the public hearings, the comment period on the proposal is being extended. All interested parties are invited to submit comments on this proposal.

DATES: Public hearings will be held at the following cities between the hours of 4:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Wednesday, October 1, 1997, at Challis, Idaho, and Hamilton, Montana; Thursday, October 2, 1997, at Missoula, Montana, and Lewiston, Idaho; Friday, October 3, 1997, at Helena, Montana, and Boise, Idaho; and Wednesday, October 8, 1997, at Salmon, Idaho. Registration will begin 1 hour prior to each hearing. Comments will be accepted until November 1, 1997.

ADDRESSES: The public hearings will be held at the following locations: October 1, 1997—Challis Middle School, 700 Main Street, Challis, Idaho 83226; and City Hall, 223 South 2nd Street, Hamilton, Montana 59840. October 2, 1997—Grant Creek Inn, 5280 Grant Creek Road, Missoula, Montana 59802; and Lewiston Community Center, 1424 Main Street, Lewiston, Idaho 83501. October 3, 1997—Colonial Park Hotel, 2301 Colonial Drive, Helena, Montana 59601; and Boise State University, Student Union Building, 1700 University Drive, Boise, Idaho 83725. October 8, 1997—Pioneer Multipurpose Room, Pioneer School, 900 Sharkey street, Salmon, Idaho 83467. Written comments and materials should be addressed to Dr. Christopher Servheen, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Project Leader, Bitterroot Grizzly Bear EIS, P.O. Box 5127, Missoula, Montana 59806.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Christopher Servheen, Grizzly Bear Recovery Coordinator (see **ADDRESSES** above), at telephone (406) 243–4903.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) proposes to reintroduce the grizzly bear (*Ursus arctos horribilis*), a threatened species, into east-central Idaho and a portion of western Montana. On July 2, 1997, the Service published a proposed rule (62 FR 35762) to establish a nonessential experimental population pursuant to section 10(j) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended. Grizzly bear populations have been extirpated from most of the lower 48 United States. They presently occur in populations in the Cabinet/Yaak ecosystem in northwestern Montana and north Idaho, the Selkirk ecosystem in north Idaho and northeastern Washington, the North Cascades ecosystem in northwestern Washington, the Northern Continental Divide ecosystem in Montana, and the Yellowstone ecosystem in Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho. The purpose of this reintroduction is to reestablish a viable grizzly bear population in the Bitterroot ecosystem in east-central Idaho and adjacent areas of Montana, one of six grizzly recovery areas identified in the Grizzly Bear Recovery Plan. Potential effects of this proposed rule are evaluated in a draft