

Proposed Changes to BIS-4023P

The critical change to the BIS-4023P is an update to the e-mail address for the DOC point of contact. The new e-mail address is provided at the bottom of the instructions (page 1 of 5).

The other changes involve either updating information or clarifying information/instructions. The proposed changes 1) do not request new information or additional information, 2) do not add to the information collection burden on the applicant, and 3) will serve to speed up the application review process.

Rationale for Changes

(Page 1 of 5):

The NATO contracting entities (collectively, NATO) require the full legal name of the approved facility. NATO will not accept P.O. boxes in lieu of a street address. (1)

BIS needs the CAGE code for a facility whether or not the facility has a facility security clearance. Moving the request for the CAGE code to its own space is clarification. (2)

If a firm has worked at the state/local level, it is welcome to include that information, but the key information for determining approval is work done for the U.S./foreign governments. (5)

The term “financial report” was confusing and needed to be replaced. (6)

The NAICS terminology is corrected. We need to know the full range of goods and services that a company provides so that we can determine the company’s ability to compete on current and future NATO International Competitive Bidding (ICB) projects. (7)

The person who signs the BIS-4023P is not necessarily the same person who will be serving as the point of contact for NATO. The signatory usually has a higher level of responsibility in the company than does the person serving as the NATO point of contact. (8)

(Page 2 of 5):

The U.S. Government approves firms for participation in NATO ICB on a facility-by-facility basis. NATO requires the full legal name of the facility, which can be the headquarters or a subsidiary. NATO does not accept P.O. Box numbers. (1)

We need to know the facility’s CAGE code whether or not the facility has a security clearance. Moving the CAGE code to its own section serves as clarification. (2)

Correction/ clarification of the terminology used for facility security clearances. (3)

(Page 3 of 5)

To qualify for participation in NATO ICB, a company must have performed contracts of a scope similar to that of NATO ICB projects. (For example, if a construction firm has experience only at the state and local level, the firm would not be qualified to work on NATO construction projects, which are performed in challenging overseas environments, ex. Afghanistan.) We want to clarify that the standard for acceptance BIS will be using goes beyond professional competence. (5)

The new wording provides clarification of the documentation that is being requested. (6)

The NAICS terminology is corrected. The instructions (page 1 of 5) provide the applicant with complete information on obtaining NAICS codes. (7)

(Page 4 of 5)

NAICS terminology corrected and coding updated to that of the most current (2012) edition of the NAICS.

(Page 5 of 5)

NAICS terminology corrected and coding updated to that of the most current (2012) edition of the NAICS.