

Environmental Planning; Geodetic Surveying; Ground and Airborne; Geospatial Data Conversion; Scanning, Digitizing, Compilation, Attributing, Scribing, Drafting; Intelligent Transportation Systems; Mapping Location/Addressing Systems; Navigation Structures and Locks; and Remote Sensing. Finally, we changed the following profile code experience categories: Aerial Photogrammetry to Photogrammetry; Design-Build to Design-Build—Preparation of Requests for Proposals; Geographic Information System Development/Analysis to Geographic Information System Services; Development, Analysis, and Data Collection; Land Boundary Surveying to Land Surveying; and Topographic Mapping to Topographic Surveying and Mapping.

Comment: Firms need to be able to expand block 10 to allow for more than 20 profile codes.

Response: We disagree. The principal competencies and expertise of a firm, which is the focus of the Brooks A–E Act, can typically be covered by its 20 most prevalent profile codes.

Comment: Are individual projects illustrating each profile code listed in block 10?

Response: No. The profile code description is inserted in column 10.b. Specific example projects are not required in Part II, although they were required in the SF 254 to illustrate each profile code.

Comment: Block 10—Profile of Firm's Experience, requires data for 5 years, but block 11—Annual Average Professional Services Revenues, requires data for 3 years. The same time period should be used for both blocks.

Response: We disagree. There is no reason that the time periods for these blocks must be the same. The 3-year period for revenues in block 11 was selected to be compatible with the same period used for measuring the revenues of small businesses. A 3-year basis for computing average revenues is sufficient to determine the annual workload capacity of a firm. On the other hand, 3 years is not long enough to characterize the type of work a firm does, especially since the design phase of some large projects can last 2 to 3 years. Therefore, 5 years was selected for block 10.

Comment: Include example projects in Part II as were included in the SF 254.

Response: We disagree. Selection boards rarely refer to the example projects in block 11 of the SF 254. Instead, selection boards focus on the example relevant projects in block 8 of

the SF 255, which corresponds with Section F of SF 330, Part I.

This is not a significant regulatory action and, therefore, was not subject to review under Section 6(b) of Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review, dated September 30, 1993. This rule is not a major rule under 5 U.S.C. 804.

B. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Department of Defense, the General Services Administration, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration certify that this final rule will not 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 this final rule does not change the current policy on how architect-engineer contracts are awarded or administered. This change deals directly with the information collection questionnaire, which is a paperwork change. This SF 330 provides a more streamlined format that reflects the current architect-engineer practices and eliminates requesting unnecessary information as requested by the current SFs 254 and 255.

Overall, the SF 330 will request less information than the SFs 254 and 255 and will take no longer to complete than the SFs 254 and 255. There was a comment period and no comments were received from small businesses complaining of any additional burden to them as a result of the SF 330.

C. Paperwork Reduction Act

The Paperwork Reduction Act (Pub. L. 104–13) applies because the final rule contains information collection requirements. The final rule replaces the current SF 254, Architect-Engineer and Related Services Questionnaire, and the current SF 255, Architect-Engineer and Related Services Questionnaire for Specific Project, with a new SF 330, Architect-Engineer Qualifications. The current SF 254 approved information collection requirement states that it takes 1 hour to complete; and the current SF 255 approved information collection requirement states that it takes 1 hour to complete. Experience has shown that these hours are substantially underestimated. The SF 330, Architect-Engineer Qualifications, has been developed by an interagency ad hoc committee, based on Federal Facilities (FCC) Council Technical Report No. 130, "Joint Federal-Industry Survey on the use of SFs 254 and 255 for Architect-Engineer Qualifications," 1996.

To respond to a public comment that the reporting burden for this SF 330 is significantly underestimated, we acknowledge that additional effort will be required initially for firms to become familiar with using the new SF 330. However, after the transition, the SF 330 should take no longer to complete than SFs 254 and 255. Overall, the SF 330 requires less information than SFs 254 and 255. The following information was deleted: duplication of data on number of personnel by discipline (SF 255, block 4 and SF 254, block 8); work currently being performed for Federal agencies (SF 255, block 9); list of all offices and number of personnel in each (SF 254, block 7); revenue information for each of last 5 years (SF 254, block 9); number of projects for each profile code (SF 254, block 10); and 30 example projects (SF 254, block 11). Also, the profile of a firm's project experience is expressed in ranges on the SF 330 instead of specific dollar amounts (SF 254, block 10). The following information was added in comparison to the SF 255: organization chart of proposed team, expanded information on the firm's example projects, and matrix of key personnel participation in example projects. However, firms typically provide much or all of this information now in project submissions. Hence, there is no meaningful burden over current practices. Accordingly, the new information collection requirement for SF 330 has been submitted to the Office of Management and Budget during the proposed rule stage and has received concurrence.

List of Subjects in 48 CFR Parts 1, 36, and 53

Government procurement.

Dated: December 4, 2003.

Laura Auletta,

Director, Acquisition Policy Division.

■ Therefore, DoD, GSA, and NASA amend 48 CFR parts 1, 36, and 53 as set forth below:

■ 1. The authority citation for 48 CFR parts 1, 36, and 53 is revised to read as follows:

Authority: 40 U.S.C. 121(c); 10 U.S.C. chapter 137; and 42 U.S.C. 2473(c).

PART 1—FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATIONS SYSTEM

1.106 [Amended]

■ 2. Amend section 1.106 in the table following the introductory paragraph by—

■ a. Removing from FAR segment 36.603 its corresponding OMB Control Number "9000–0004 and 9000–0005" and adding "9000–0157" in its place;