

Health and Human Services

315.204-1

Subpart 314.2—Solicitation of Bids

314.202 General rules for solicitation of bids.

314.202-7 Facsimile bids.

(c) If the HCA (not delegable) has determined that the contracting activity will allow use of facsimile bids and proposals, the HCA shall prescribe internal procedures, in accordance with the FAR, to ensure uniform processing and control.

[71 FR 76498, Dec. 20, 2006]

Subpart 314.4—Opening of Bids and Award of Contract

314.404 Rejection of bids.

314.404-1 Cancellation of invitations after opening.

(c) The HCA or CCO (not delegable) shall make the determinations required to be made by the agency head in FAR 14.404-1.

[71 FR 76498, Dec. 20, 2006]

314.407 Mistakes in bids.

314.407-3 Other mistakes disclosed before award.

(e) Authority has been delegated to the Departmental Protest Control Officer, Office of Acquisition Management and Policy, to make administrative determinations in connection with mistakes in bid alleged after opening and before award. This authority may not be redelegated.

(f) Each proposed determination shall have the concurrence of the Chief, General Law Division, Office of General Counsel.

(i) Doubtful cases shall not be submitted by the Contracting Officer directly to the Comptroller General, but, instead, shall be submitted to the Departmental Protest Control Officer.

[71 FR 76498, Dec. 20, 2006]

314.407-4 Mistakes after award.

(c) Authority has been delegated to the Departmental Protest Control Officer to make administrative determinations in connection with mistakes in bid alleged after award. This authority may not be redelegated.

(d) Each proposed determination shall have the concurrence of the Chief, General Law Division, Office of General Counsel.

[66 FR 4233, Jan. 17, 2001, as amended at 71 FR 76498, Dec. 20, 2006]

PART 315—CONTRACTING BY NEGOTIATION

Subpart 315.2—Solicitation and Receipt of Proposals and Information

Sec.

315.204 Contract format.

315.204-1 Uniform contract format.

315.208 Submission, modification, revision, and withdrawal of proposals.

315.209 Solicitation provisions and contract clauses.

Subpart 315.3—Source Selection

315.305 Proposal evaluation.

315.306 Exchanges with offerors after receipt of proposals.

315.307 Proposal revisions.

315.370 Finalization of details with the selected source.

315.371 Contract preparation and award.

315.372 Preparation of negotiation memorandum.

Subpart 315.4—Contract Pricing

315.404 Proposal analysis.

315.404-2 Information to support proposal analysis.

315.404-4 Profit.

Subpart 315.6—Unsolicited Proposals

315.605 Content of unsolicited proposals.

315.606 Agency procedures.

315.606-1 Receipt and initial review.

315.609 Limited use of data.

AUTHORITY: 5 U.S.C. 301; 40 U.S.C. 486(c).

SOURCE: 66 FR 4233, Jan. 17, 2001, unless otherwise noted.

Subpart 315.2—Solicitation and Receipt of Proposals and Information

315.204 Contract format.

315.204-1 Uniform contract format.

(a) When preparing solicitations and resulting contracts, Contracting Officers/Contract Specialists are strongly encouraged to use as a guide the HHS

315.208

Solicitation/Contract Structure Document found at <http://www.knownet.hhs.gov/acquisition/policy.htm>.

[71 FR 76498, Dec. 20, 2006]

315.208 Submission, modification, revision, and withdrawal of proposals.

(b) When the head of the contracting activity (HCA) for a health agency determines that certain classes of biomedical or behavioral research and development acquisitions should be subject to conditions other than those specified in FAR 52.215-1(c)(3), the HCA may authorize the use of the provision at 352.215-70 in addition to the provision at FAR 52.215-1. This is an authorized deviation.

(2) When the provision at 352.215-70 is included in the solicitation and a proposal is received after the exact time specified for receipt, the contracting officer, with the assistance of cost and technical personnel, shall make a written determination as to whether the proposal meets the requirements of the provision at 352.215-70 and, therefore, can be considered.

315.209 Solicitation provisions and contract clauses.

(a) Paragraph (e) of the provision at 352.215-1 shall be used in place of that specified at FAR 52.215-1(e). This is an authorized deviation.

[66 FR 4233, Jan. 17, 2001, as amended at 71 FR 76498, Dec. 20, 2006]

Subpart 315.3—Source Selection

315.305 Proposal evaluation.

(a)(1) *Cost or price evaluation.* (i) The Contracting Officer shall evaluate business proposals in accordance with the requirements set forth in FAR 15.404. The extent of cost or price analysis in each case depends on the contract type, the amount of the proposal, the technical complexity, and related cost or price. The Project Officer shall be requested to analyze the following elements, if applicable, to determine if they are necessary and reasonable for efficient contract performance:

(A) The number of labor hours proposed for the various labor categories

48 CFR Ch. 3 (10-1-08 Edition)

and the mix in relation to the technical requirements;

(B) Types, numbers and hours/days of proposed consultants;

(C) The kinds and quantities of material, equipment, supplies, and services;

(D) Kinds and quantities of information technology;

(E) Logic of proposed subcontracting; and

(F) Travel proposed, including number of trips, locations, purpose, and travelers.

(ii) The Project Officer shall provide written comments, including the rationale for any exceptions to the elements. The Project Officer's comments shall be used for negotiations or to support award without discussions. The Contracting Officer should also request assistance of a cost/price analyst, when necessary. The Contracting Officer's negotiation memorandum must include the rationale used in determining that the price or cost is fair and reasonable.

(2) *Past performance evaluation.* When evaluating past performance, the contracting officer is responsible for conducting reference checks to obtain information concerning the performance history of offerors. The contracting officer may require the assistance of the project officer as well as other Government technical personnel in performing this function.

(3) *Technical evaluation.* (i) Technical evaluation plan. (A) A technical evaluation plan may be required by the contracting officer, at his/her discretion, when an acquisition is sufficiently complex as to warrant a formal plan.

(B) The technical evaluation plan should include at least the following:

(1) A list of recommended technical evaluation panel members, their organizations, a list of their major consulting clients (if applicable), their qualifications, and curricula vitae (if applicable);

(2) A justification for using non-Government technical evaluation panel members. (Justification is not required if non-Government evaluators will be used in accordance with standard contracting activity procedures or policies);

(3) A statement that there is no apparent or actual conflict of interest regarding any recommended panel member;

(4) A copy of each rating sheet, approved by the contracting officer, to be used to assure consistency with the evaluation criteria; and

(5) A brief description of the general evaluation approach.

(C) The technical evaluation plan must be signed by an official within the program office in a position at least one level above the project officer, or in accordance with contracting activity procedures.

(D) The technical evaluation plan shall be submitted to the Contracting Officer for review and approval before the solicitation is issued. The Contracting Officer shall make sure that the significant factors and subfactors relating to the evaluation are reflected in the evaluation criteria when conducting the review of the plan.

(ii) Technical evaluation panel.

(A) *General.* (1) A technical evaluation panel is required for all acquisitions subject to this subpart which are expected to exceed \$500,000 and in which technical evaluation is considered a key element in the award decision. The contracting officer has the discretion to require a technical evaluation panel for acquisitions not exceeding \$500,000 based on the complexity of the acquisition.

(2) The technical evaluation process requires careful consideration regarding the size, composition, expertise, and function of the technical evaluation panel. The efforts of the panel can result in the success or failure of the acquisition.

(B) *Role of the Project Officer.* (1) The Project Officer is the Contracting Officer's technical representative for the acquisition action. The Project Officer may be a voting member of the technical evaluation panel, and may also serve as the chairperson of the panel, unless prohibited by law or contracting activity procedures.

(2) The Project Officer is responsible for recommending panel members who are knowledgeable in the technical aspects of the acquisition and capable of identifying strengths and weaknesses in the proposals received. Government

employees serving as panel members must be selected in accordance with the requirements set forth in 307.170.

(3) The Project Officer shall ensure that persons possessing expertise and experience in addressing issues relative to sex, race, national origin, and handicapped discrimination are included as panel members for acquisitions in which such issues are applicable.

(4) The Project Officer shall submit the list of recommended panel members to an official within the project office in a position at least one level higher. This official will review the list and select the chairperson.

(5) The Project Officer shall arrange for adequate and secure working space for the panel.

(C) *Role of the contracting officer.* (1) The term "contracting officer," as used in this subpart, may be the contracting officer or his/her designated representative within the contracting office.

(2) The contracting officer shall not serve as a member of the technical evaluation panel but should be available to:

(i) Address the initial meeting of the technical evaluation panel;

(ii) Provide assistance to the evaluators as required; and

(iii) Ensure that the scores adequately reflect the written technical report comments.

(D) *Conflict of interest.* (1) If a panel member has an actual or apparent conflict of interest related to a proposal under evaluation, he/she shall be removed from the panel and replaced with another evaluator. If a suitable replacement is not available, the panel shall perform the review without a replacement.

(2) For the purposes of this subpart, conflicts of interest are defined in the Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch (5 CFR part 2635), Supplemental Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Department of Health and Human Services (5 CFR part 5501), and the Procurement Integrity Act. For outside evaluators serving on the technical evaluation panel, see paragraph (a)(3)(ii)(F) of this section.

(E) *Continuity of evaluation process.* (1) The technical evaluation panel shall evaluate all original proposals, make

recommendations to the chairperson regarding strengths and weaknesses of proposals, and, if required by the Contracting Officer, assist the Contracting Officer during communications and discussions, and review supplemental, revised and/or final proposal revisions. To the extent possible, the same evaluators should be available throughout the entire evaluation and selection process to ensure continuity and consistency in the treatment of proposals. The following are examples of circumstances when it would not be necessary for the technical evaluation panel to evaluate revised proposals submitted during the acquisition:

(i) The answers to questions do not have a substantial impact on the proposal;

(ii) Final proposal revisions are not materially different from the original proposals; or

(iii) The rankings of the offerors are not affected because the revisions to the proposals are relatively minor.

(2) The chairperson, with the concurrence of the contracting officer, may decide not to have the panel evaluate the revised proposals. Whenever this decision is made, it must be fully documented by the chairperson and approved by the contracting officer.

(3) When technical evaluation panel meetings are considered necessary by the contracting officer, the attendance of evaluators is mandatory. When the chairperson determines that an evaluator's failure to attend the meetings is prejudicial to the evaluation, the chairperson shall remove and/or replace the individual after discussing the situation with the contracting officer and obtaining his/her concurrence and the approval of the official responsible for appointing the panel members.

(4) When continuity of the evaluation process is not possible, and either new evaluators are selected or the size of the evaluation panel is reduced, all proposals shall be reviewed by each panel member at the current stage of the acquisition (*i.e.*, initial proposal, final proposal revisions, etc.). Also, guidance should be provided concerning what to do if an unusually large number of proposals are received, including how to determine what con-

stitutes an unusually large number of proposals.

(F) *Use of outside evaluators.* (1) The National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) are required to have a peer review of research and development contracts in accordance with Public Law 93-352 as amended by Public Law 94-63; 42 U.S.C. 289 a and 42 U.S.C. 290aa-3 respectively. This legislation requires peer review of projects and proposals, and not more than one-fourth of the members of a peer review group may be officers or employees of the United States. NIH and SAMHSA are therefore exempt from the provisions of 315.305(a)(3)(ii) to the extent that 42 U.S.C. 289a and 290aa-3 apply. Conflicts of interest are addressed at 42 CFR part 52h. Other agencies subject to statutory scientific peer review requirements are also exempt from the requirements of paragraph (a)(3)(ii) of this section to the extent that these requirements are inconsistent with their legislative requirements.

(2) Decisions to disclose proposals to evaluators outside of the Government shall be made by the official responsible for appointing panel members in accordance with operating division procedures. The avoidance of organization conflict of interest and competitive relationships must be taken into consideration when making the decision to use outside evaluators.

(3) When it is determined to disclose a solicited proposal outside the Government for evaluation purposes, the following or similar conditions shall be included in the written agreement with evaluator(s) prior to disclosure:

CONDITIONS FOR EVALUATING PROPOSALS

The evaluator agrees to use the data (trade secrets, business data, and technical data) contained in the proposal for evaluation purposes only.

The foregoing requirement does not apply to data obtained from another source without restriction.

Any notice or legend placed on the proposal by either the Department or the submitter of the proposal shall be applied to any reproduction or abstract provided to the evaluator or made by the evaluator. Upon completion of the evaluation, the evaluator shall return to the Government the furnished copy of the proposal or abstract, and

all copies thereof, to the Departmental office which initially furnished the proposal for evaluation.

Unless authorized by the Department's initiating office, the evaluator shall not contact the submitter of the proposal concerning any aspects of its contents.

The evaluator's employees and subcontractors shall abide by these conditions.

(iii) Receipt of proposals.

(A) After the closing date set by the solicitation for the receipt of proposals, the contracting officer will use a transmittal memorandum to forward the technical proposals to the project officer or chairperson for evaluation. The business proposals will be retained by the contracting officer for evaluation.

(B) The transmittal memorandum shall include at least the following:

(1) A list of the names of the organizations submitting proposals;

(2) A reference to the need to preserve the integrity of the source selection process;

(3) A statement that only the contracting officer is to conduct discussions.

(4) A requirement for a technical evaluation report in accordance with paragraph (a)(3)(vi) of this section; and

(5) The establishment of a date for receipt of the technical evaluation report.

(iv) Convening the technical evaluation panel.

(A) Normally, the technical evaluation panel will convene to evaluate the proposals. However, there may be situations when the contracting officer determines that it is not feasible for the panel to convene. Whenever this decision is made, care must be taken to assure that the technical review is closely monitored to produce acceptable results.

(B) When a panel is convened, the chairperson is responsible for the control of the technical proposals provided to him/her by the contracting officer for use during the evaluation process. The chairperson will generally distribute the technical proposals prior to the initial panel meeting and will establish procedures for securing the proposals whenever they are not being evaluated to insure their confidentiality. After the evaluation is complete, all proposals must be returned to

the contracting officer by the chairperson.

(C) The contracting officer shall address the initial meeting of the panel and state the basic rules for conducting the evaluation. The contracting officer shall provide written guidance to the panel if he/she is unable to attend the initial panel meeting. The guidance should include:

(1) Explanation of conflicts of interest;

(2) The necessity to read and understand the solicitation, especially the statement of work and evaluation criteria, prior to reading the proposals;

(3) The need for evaluators to restrict the review to only the solicitation and the contents of the technical proposals;

(4) The need for each evaluator to review all the proposals;

(5) The need to watch for ambiguities, inconsistencies, errors, and deficiencies which should be surfaced during the evaluation process;

(6) An explanation of the evaluation process and what will be expected of the evaluators throughout the process;

(7) The need for the evaluators to be aware of the requirement to have complete written documentation of the individual strengths and weaknesses which affect the scoring of the proposals; and

(8) An instruction directing the evaluators that, until the award is made, information concerning the acquisition must not be disclosed to any person not directly involved in the evaluation process.

(v) Rating and ranking of proposals. The evaluators will individually read each proposal, describe tentative strengths and weaknesses, and independently develop preliminary scores in relation to each evaluation factor set forth in the solicitation. After this has been accomplished, the evaluators shall discuss in detail the individual strengths and weakness described by each evaluator and, if possible, arrive at a common understanding of the major strengths and weaknesses and the potential for correcting each offeror's weakness(es). Each evaluator will score each proposal, and then the technical evaluation panel will collectively rank the proposals. Generally, ranking will be determined by adding

315.306

the numerical scores assigned to the evaluation factors and finding the average for each offeror. The evaluators should then identify whether each proposal is acceptable or unacceptable. Predetermined cutoff scores shall not be employed.

(vi) Technical evaluation report. A technical evaluation report shall be prepared and furnished to the contracting officer by the chairperson and maintained as a permanent record in the contract file. The report must reflect the ranking of the proposals and identify each proposal as acceptable or unacceptable. The report must also include a narrative evaluation specifying the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal, a copy of each signed rating sheet, and any reservations, qualifications, or areas to be addressed that might bear upon the selection of sources for negotiation and award. Concrete technical reasons supporting a determination of unacceptability with regard to any proposal must be included. The report should also include specific points and questions which are to be raised in discussions or negotiations.

[66 FR 4233, Jan. 17, 2001, as amended at 71 FR 76498, Dec. 20, 2006]

315.306 Exchanges with offerors after receipt of proposals.

(d) *Exchanges with offerors after establishment of the competitive range.* The contracting officer and project officer should discuss the uncertainties and/or deficiencies that are included in the technical evaluation report for each proposal in the competitive range. Technical questions should be developed by the project officer and/or the technical evaluation panel and should be included in the technical evaluation report. The management, past performance and cost or price questions should be prepared by the contracting officer with assistance from the project officer and/or panel as required. The method of requesting offerors in the competitive range to submit the additional information will vary depending on the complexity of the questions, the extent of additional information requested, the time needed to analyze the responses, and the time frame for making the award. However, to the extent

48 CFR Ch. 3 (10-1-08 Edition)

practicable, all questions and answers should be in writing. Each offeror in the competitive range shall be given an equitable period of time for preparation of responses to questions to the extent practicable. The questions should be developed so as to disclose the ambiguities, uncertainties, and deficiencies of the offeror.

315.307 Proposal revisions.

(b) Final proposal revisions are subject to a final evaluation of price or cost and other salient factors by the contracting officer and project officer with assistance from a cost/price analyst, and an evaluation of technical factors by the technical evaluation panel, as necessary. Proposals may be technically rescored and reranked by the technical evaluation panel and a technical evaluation report prepared. To the extent practicable, the evaluation shall be performed by the same evaluators who reviewed the original proposals. A final evaluation of past performance will be made by the contracting officer and project officer. The technical evaluation panel may be involved in the final evaluation of past performance if the panel is comprised solely of Government personnel.

315.370 Finalization of details with the selected source.

(a) After selection of the successful proposal, finalization of details with the selected offeror may be conducted if deemed necessary. However, no factor which could have any effect on the selection process may be introduced after the common cutoff date for receipt of final proposal revisions. The finalization process shall not in any way prejudice the competitive interest or rights of the unsuccessful offerors. Finalization of details with the selected offeror shall be restricted to defining the final agreement on terms and conditions, assuming none of these factors were involved in the selection process.

(b) Caution must be exercised by the contracting officer to insure that the finalization process is not used to change the requirements contained in the solicitation, nor to make any other changes which would impact on the source selection decision. Whenever a

material change occurs in the requirements, the competition must be reopened and all offerors submitting final proposal revisions must be given an opportunity to resubmit proposals based on the revised requirements. Whenever there is a question as to whether a change is material, the contracting officer should obtain the advice of technical personnel and legal counsel before reopening the competition. Significant changes in the offeror's cost proposal may also necessitate a reopening of competition if the changes alter the factors involved in the original selection process.

(c) Should finalization details beyond those specified in paragraph (a) of this section be required for any reason, discussions must be reopened with all offerors submitting final proposal revisions.

(d) Upon finalization of details, the contracting officer should obtain a confirmation letter from the successful offeror which includes any revisions to the technical proposal, the agreed to price or cost, and, as applicable, a certificate of current cost or pricing data.

315.371 Contract preparation and award.

(a) After details have been finalized with the selected offeror, the Contracting Officer shall:

(1) Prepare the negotiation memorandum in accordance with 315.372;

(2) Prepare the contract containing all agreed to terms and conditions and clauses required by law or regulation;

(3) Include in the contract file the pertinent documents referenced in FAR 4.803; and

(4) Obtain the appropriate approval of the proposed contract award(s) in accordance with subpart 304.71 and contracting activity procedures.

(b) After receiving the required approvals, the contract should be transmitted to the prospective contractor for signature. The prospective contractor must be informed that the contract is not effective until accepted by the contracting officer.

(c) The contract shall not be issued until the finance office certifies that the funds are available for obligation.

[66 FR 4233, Jan. 17, 2001, as amended at 71 FR 76499, Dec. 20, 2006]

315.372 Preparation of negotiation memorandum.

The negotiation memorandum or summary of negotiations is a complete record of all actions leading to award of a contract and is prepared by the Contracting Officer/Contract Specialist to support the source selection decision discussed in FAR 15.308. It should be in sufficient detail to explain and support the rationale, judgments, and authorities upon which all actions were predicated. The memorandum will document the negotiation process and reflect the negotiator's actions, skills, and judgments in concluding a satisfactory agreement for the Government. The negotiation memorandum shall address each item listed below. If an item is not applicable, it shall be so stated in the memorandum. Information already contained in the contract file may be referenced rather than reiterated.

(a) *Description of articles and services and period of performance.* A description of articles and services, quantity, unit price, total contract amount, and period of contract performance should be set forth.

(b) *Acquisition planning.* Summarize or reference any acquisition planning activities that have taken place.

(c) *Synopsis of acquisition.* A statement as to whether the acquisition has or has not been publicized in accordance with FAR Subpart 5.2. A brief statement of explanation should be included with reference to the specific basis for exemption under the FAR, if applicable.

(d) *Contract type.* Provide sufficient detail to support the type of contractual instrument recommended for the acquisition. If the contract is a cost-sharing type, explain the essential cost-sharing features.

(e) *Extent of competition.* The extent to which full and open competition was solicited and obtained must be discussed. The discussion shall include the date of solicitation, sources solicited, and solicitation results. If a late proposal was received, discuss whether or not the late proposal was evaluated and the rationale for the decision.

(f) *Technical evaluation.* Summarize or reference the results presented in the technical evaluation report.

(g) *Business evaluation.* Summarize or reference results presented in the business report.

(h) *Past performance.* Summarize or reference results of past performance evaluation and reference checks.

(i) *Competitive range (if applicable).* Describe how the competitive range was determined and state the offerors who were included in the competitive range and the ones who were not.

(j) *Cost breakdown and analysis.* Include a complete cost breakdown together with the negotiator's analysis of the estimated cost by individual cost elements. The negotiator's analysis should contain information such as:

(1) A comparison of cost factors proposed in the instant case with actual factors used in earlier contracts, using the same cost centers of the same supplier or cost centers of other sources having recent contracts for the same or similar item.

(2) Any pertinent Government-conducted audit of the proposed contractor's record of any pertinent cost advisory report.

(3) Any pertinent technical evaluation inputs as to necessity, allocability and reasonableness of labor, material and other direct expenses.

(4) Any other pertinent information to fully support the basis for and rationale of the cost analysis.

(5) If the contract is an incentive type, discuss all elements of profit and fee structure.

(6) A justification of the reasonableness of the proposed contractor's estimated profit or fixed fee, considering the requirements of FAR 15.404-4 and HHSAR 315.404-4.

(k) *Cost realism.* Describe the cost realism analysis performed on proposals.

(1) *Government-furnished property and Government-provided facilities.* With respect to Government-furnished or Government-provided facilities, equipment, tooling, or other property, include the following:

(1) Where no property is to be provided, a statement to that effect.

(2) Where property is to be provided, a full description, the estimated dollar value, the basis of price comparison with competitors, and the basis of rental charge, if rental is involved.

(3) Where the furnishing of any property or the extent has not been determined and is left open for future resolution, a detailed explanation.

(m) *Negotiations.* Include a statement as to the date and place negotiations were conducted, and identify members of both the Government and contractor negotiating teams by area of responsibility. Include negotiation details relative to the statement of work, terms and conditions, and special provisions. The results of cost or price negotiations must include the information required by FAR 31.109 and 15.406-3. In addition, if cost or pricing data was required to be submitted, the negotiation record must also contain the extent to which the contracting officer relied upon the factual cost or pricing data submitted and used in negotiating the cost or price.

(n) *Other considerations.* Include coverage of areas such as:

(1) Financial data with respect to a contractor's capacity and stability.

(2) Determination of contractor responsibility.

(3) Details as to why the method of payment, such as progress payment, advance payment, etc., is necessary. Also cite any required D & F's.

(4) Information with respect to obtaining of a certificate of current cost or pricing data.

(5) Other required special approvals.

(6) If the contract represents an extension of previous work, the status of funds and performance under the prior contract(s) should be reflected. Also, a determination should be made that the Government has obtained enough actual or potential value from the work previously performed to warrant continuation with the same contractor. (Project officer should furnish the necessary information.)

(7) If the contract was awarded by full and open competition, state where the unsuccessful offerors' proposals are filed.

(8) State that equal opportunity provisions of the proposed contract have been explained to the contractor, and it is aware of its responsibilities. Also state whether or not a clearance is required.

(9) If the contract is for services, a statement must be made, in accordance

Health and Human Services

315.404-4

with FAR 37.103, that the services to be acquired are nonpersonal in nature.

(o) *Terms and conditions.* Identify the general and special clauses and conditions that are contained in the contract, such as option arrangements, incremental funding, anticipatory costs, deviations from standard clauses, etc. The basis and rationale for inclusion of any special terms and conditions must be stated and, where applicable, the document which granted approval for its use identified.

(p) *Recommendation.* A brief statement setting forth the recommendations for award.

(q) *Signature.* The memorandum must be signed by the contract negotiator who prepared the memorandum.

[66 FR 4233, Jan. 17, 2001, as amended at 71 FR 76499, Dec. 20, 2006]

Subpart 315.4—Contract Pricing

315.404 Proposal analysis.

315.404-2 Information to support proposal analysis.

(a)(2) When some or all information sufficient to determine the reasonableness of the proposed cost or price is already available or can be obtained by phone from the cognizant audit agency, contracting officers may request less-than-complete field pricing support (specifying in the request the information needed) or may waive in writing the requirement for audit and field pricing support by documenting the file to indicate what information is to be used instead of the audit report and the field pricing report.

(3) When initiating audit and field pricing support, the contracting officer shall do so by sending a request to the cognizant administrative contracting officer (ACO), with an information copy to the cognizant audit office. When field pricing support is not available, the contracting officer shall initiate an audit by sending, in accordance with agency procedures, two (2) copies of the request to the OIG Office of Audits' Regional Audit Director. In both cases, the contracting officer shall, in the request:

(i) Prescribe the extent of the support needed;

(ii) State the specific areas for which input is required;

(iii) Include the information necessary to perform the review (such as the offeror's proposal and the applicable portions of the solicitation, particularly those describing requirements and delivery schedules);

(iv) Provide the complete address of the location of the offeror's financial records that support the proposal;

(v) Identify the office having audit responsibility if other than the HHS Regional Audit Office; and

(vi) Specify a due date for receipt of a verbal report to be followed by a written audit report. (If the time available is not adequate to permit satisfactory coverage of the proposal, the auditor shall so advise the contracting officer and indicate the additional time needed.) One copy of the audit request letter that was submitted to the Regional Audit Director and a complete copy of the contract price proposal shall be submitted to OIG/OA/DAC. Whenever, an audit review has been conducted by the Office of Audits, two (2) copies of the memorandum of negotiation shall be forwarded to OIG/OA/DAC by the contracting officer.

315.404-4 Profit.

(b) *Policy.* (1) The structured approach for determining profit or fee (hereafter called profit) provides a technique for establishing a profit objective for negotiation. A profit objective is that part of the estimated contract price objective or value which, in the judgment of the Contracting Officer, constitutes an appropriate amount of profit for the acquisition being considered. This technique allows for consideration of the profit factors described in paragraph (d) of this section. The Contracting Officer's analysis of these factors is based on available information such as proposals, audit data, assessment reports, preaward surveys, etc. The structured approach provides a basis for documenting the profit objective. Any significant departure from this objective shall be explained. The amount of documentation depends on the dollar value and complexity of the proposed acquisition. The profit objective is a part of the overall negotiation objective and is directly related to

the cost objective and any proposed sharing arrangement. The profit objective should be negotiated at the same time as the other cost items. The profit objective should be negotiated as a whole and not as individual profit factors.

(ii) The profit analysis factors in FAR 15.404-4(d) shall be used in lieu of the structured approach in the following circumstances. Factors considered inapplicable to the acquisition shall be excluded from the profit objective. Documentation shall be provided which includes the profit factor breakdown.

(A) Contracts not expected to exceed \$100,000;

(B) Architect-engineer contracts;

(C) Management contracts for operations and/or maintenance of Government facilities;

(D) Construction contracts;

(E) Contracts primarily requiring delivery of material supplies by subcontractors;

(F) Termination settlements; and

(G) Cost-plus-award-fee contracts (However, contracting officers may find it advantageous to perform a structured profit analysis as an aid in arriving at an appropriate fee arrangement). Other exceptions may be made in the negotiation of contracts having unusual pricing situations, but shall be justified in writing by the contracting officer in situations where the structured approach is determined to be unsuitable.

(c) *Contracting Officer responsibilities.* The Contracting Officer shall develop the profit objective. This objective shall realistically reflect the total overall task to be performed and the requirements placed on the contractor. The Contracting Officer shall not begin to develop the profit objective until a thorough review of proposed contract work has been made; a review of all available knowledge regarding the contractor pursuant to FAR subpart 9.1, including audit data, preaward survey reports and financial statements, as appropriate, has been conducted; and an analysis of the contractor's cost estimate and comparison with the Government's estimate or projection of cost has been made.

(d) *Profit—analysis factors—(1) Common factors.* The following factors shall be considered in all cases in which profit is to be negotiated. The weight ranges listed after each factor shall be used in all instances where the structured approach is used.

Profit factors	Weight ranges (in percent)
Contractor effort:	
Material acquisition	1 to 5.
Direct labor	4 to 15.
Overhead	4 to 9.
General management (G&A)	4 to 8.
Other costs	1 to 5.
Other factors:	
Cost risk	0 to 7.
Investment	-2 to +2.
Performance	-1 to +1.
Socioeconomic programs	-.5 to +.5.
Special situations..	

(i) The Contracting Officer shall measure "Contractor Effort" by assigning a profit percentage within the designated weight range to each element of contract cost. The categories listed are for reference purposes only, but are broad and basic enough to provide guidance to other elements of cost. Facilities capital cost of money is not to be included. A total dollar profit shall be computed for "Contractor Effort."

(ii) The Contracting Officer shall use the total dollar profit for the "Contractor Effort" to calculate specific profit dollars for "Other Factors"—cost risk, investment, performance, socioeconomic programs, and special situations. The Contracting Officer shall multiply the total dollar profit for the "Contractor Effort" by the weight assigned to each of the elements in the "Other Factors" category. Facilities capital cost of money is not included. Form HHS-674, Structured Approach Profit/Fee Objective, should be used. Form HHS-674 is illustrated in 353.370-674.

(iii) In making a judgment of the value of each factor, the contracting officer should be governed by the definition, description, and purpose of the factors together with considerations for evaluating them.

(iv) The structured approach was designed for arriving at profit objectives for other than nonprofit organizations. However, the structured approach can be used for nonprofit organizations if

appropriate adjustments are made. The Contracting Officer shall use the modified structured approach in paragraph (d)(1)(iv)(B) of this section to establish profit objectives for nonprofit organizations.

(A) For purposes of this section, nonprofit organizations are defined as those business entities organized and operated exclusively for charitable, scientific, or educational purposes, no part of the net earnings of which inure to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, and which are exempt from Federal income taxation under Section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code.

(B) For contracts with nonprofit organizations where profit is involved, an adjustment of up to 3 percentage points will be subtracted from the total profit objective percentage. In developing this adjustment, it will be necessary to consider the following factors;

(1) Tax position benefits;

(2) Granting of financing through advance payments; and

(3) Other pertinent factors which may work to either the advantage or disadvantage of the contractor in its position as a nonprofit organization.

(2) *Contractor effort.* Contractor effort is a measure of how much the contractor is expected to contribute to the overall effort necessary to meet the contract performance requirement in an efficient manner. This factor, which is apart from the contractor's responsibility for contract performance, takes into account what resources are necessary and what the contractor must do to accomplish a conversion of ideas and material into the final service or product called for in the contract. This is a recognition that within a given performance output, or within a given sales dollar figure, necessary efforts on the part of individual contractors can vary widely in both value and quantity, and that the profit objective should reflect the extent and nature of the contractor's contribution to total performance. A major consideration, particularly in connection with experimental, developmental, or research work, is the difficulty or complexity of the work to be performed, and the unusual demands of the contract, such as whether the project involves a new ap-

proach unrelated to existing technology and/or equipment or only refinements to these items. The evaluation of this factor requires an analysis of the cost content of the proposed contract as follows:

(i) *Material acquisition.* (Subcontracted items, purchased parts, and other material.) Analysis of these cost items shall include an evaluation of the managerial and technical effort necessary to obtain the required subcontracted items, purchased parts, material or services. The contracting officer shall determine whether the contractor will obtain the items or services by routine order from readily available sources or by detailed subcontracts for which the prime contractor will be required to develop complex specifications. Consideration shall also be given to the managerial and technical efforts necessary for the prime contractor to select subcontractors and to perform subcontract administration functions. In application of this criterion, it should be recognized that the contribution of the prime contractor to its purchasing program may be substantial. Normally, the lowest unadjusted weight for direct material is 2 percent. A weighting of less than 2 percent would be appropriate only in unusual circumstances when there is a minimal contribution by the contractor.

(ii) *Direct labor.* (Professional, service, manufacturing and other labor.) Analysis of the various labor categories of the cost content of the contract should include evaluation of the comparative quality and quantity of professional and semiprofessional talents, manufacturing and service skills, and experience to be employed. In evaluating professional and semiprofessional labor for the purpose of assigning profit dollars, consideration should be given to the amount of notable scientific talent or unusual or scarce talent needed in contrast to nonprofessional effort. The assessment should consider the contribution this talent will provide toward the achievement of contract objectives. Since nonprofessional labor is relatively plentiful and rather easily obtained by the contractor and is less critical to the

successful performance of contract objectives, it cannot be weighted nearly as high as professional or semiprofessional labor. Service contract labor should be evaluated in a like manner by assigning higher weights to engineering or professional type skills required for contract performance. Similarly, the variety of manufacturing and other categories of labor skills required and the contractor's manpower resources for meeting these requirements should be considered. For purposes of evaluation, categories of labor (*i.e.*, quality control, receiving and inspection, etc.) which do not fall within the definition for professional, service or manufacturing labor may be categorized as appropriate. However, the same evaluation considerations as outlined in this paragraph will be applied.

(iii) *Overhead and general management (G&A).* (A) Analysis of these overhead items of cost should include the evaluation of the makeup of these expenses and how much they contribute to contract performance. To the extent practicable, analysis should include a determination of the amount of labor within these overhead pools and how this labor should be treated if it were considered as direct labor under the contract. The allocable labor elements should be given the same profit considerations that they would receive if they were treated as direct labor. The other elements of these overhead pools should be evaluated to determine whether they are routine expenses, such as utilities and maintenance, and hence given lesser profit consideration, or whether they are significant contributing elements. The composite of the individual determinations in relation to the elements of the overhead pools will be the profit consideration given the pools as a whole. The procedure for assigning relative values to these overhead expenses differs from the method used in assigning values of the direct labor. The upper and lower limits assignable to the direct labor are absolute. In the case of overhead expenses, individual expenses may be assigned values outside the range as long as the composite ratio is within the range.

(B) It is not necessary that the contractor's accounting system break down overhead expenses within the classifications of research overhead, other overhead pools, and general administrative expenses, unless dictated otherwise by Cost Accounting Standards (CAS). The contractor whose accounting system reflects only one overhead rate on all direct labor need not change its system (if CAS exempt) to correspond with these classifications. The contracting officer, in an evaluation of such a contractor's overhead rate, could break out the applicable sections of the composite rate which could be classified as research overhead, other overhead pools, and general and administrative expenses, and follow the appropriate evaluation technique.

(C) Management problems surface in various degrees and the management expertise exercised to solve them should be considered as an element of profit. For example, a contract for a new program for research or an item which is on the cutting edge of the state of the art will cause more problems and require more managerial time and abilities of a higher order than a follow-on contract. If new contracts create more problems and require a higher profit weight, follow-ons should be adjusted downward because many of the problems should have been solved. In any event, an evaluation should be made of the underlying managerial effort involved on a case-by-case basis.

(D) It may not be necessary for the contracting officer to make a separate profit evaluation of overhead expenses in connection with each acquisition action for substantially the same project with the same contractor. Where an analysis of the profit weight to be assigned to the overhead pool has been made, that weight assigned may be used for future acquisitions with the same contractor until there is a change in the cost composition of the overhead pool or the contract circumstances, or the factors discussed in paragraph (d)(2)(iii)(C) of this section are involved.

(iv) *Other costs.* Analysis of this factor should include all other direct costs associated with contractor performance (e.g., travel and relocation, direct

support, and consultants). Analysis of these items of cost should include, the significance of the cost of contract performance, nature of the cost, and how much they contribute to contract performance. Normally, travel costs require minimal administrative effort by the contractor and, therefore, usually receive a weight no greater than 1%. Also, the contractor may designate individuals as "consultants" but in reality these individuals may be obtained by the contractor to supplement its workforce in the performance of routine duties required by contract. These costs would normally receive a minimum weight. However, there will be instances when the contractor may be required to locate and obtain the services of consultants having expertise in fields such as medicine or human services. In these instances, the contractor will be required to expend greater managerial and technical effort to obtain these services and, consequently, the costs should receive a much greater weight.

(3) *Other factors* (i) *Contract cost risk.* The contract type employed basically determines the degree of cost risk assumed by the contractor. For example, where a portion of the risk has been shifted to the Government through cost-reimbursement provisions, unusual contingency provisions, or other risk-reducing measures, the amount of profit should be less than where the contractor assumes all the risk.

(A) In developing the prenegotiation profit objective, the contracting officer will need to consider the type of contract anticipated to be negotiated and the contractor risk associated therewith when selecting the position in the weight range for profit that is appropriate for the risk to be borne by the contractor. This factor should be one of the most important in arriving at prenegotiation profit objective. Evaluation of this risk requires a determination of the degree of cost responsibility the contractor assumes; the reliability of the cost estimates in relation to the task assumed; and the complexity of the task assumed by the contractor. This factor is specifically limited to the risk of contract costs. Thus, risks on the part of the contractor such as reputation, losing a commercial

market, risk of losing potential profits in other fields, or any risk which falls on the contracting office, such as the risk of not acquiring a satisfactory report, are not within the scope of this factor.

(B) The first and basic determination of the degree of cost responsibility assumed by the contractor is related to the sharing of total risk of contract cost by the Government and the contractor through the selection of contract type. The extremes are a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract requiring the contractor to use its best efforts to perform a task and a firm fixed-price contract for a service or a complex item. A cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract would reflect a minimum assumption of cost responsibility, whereas a firm-fixed-price contract would reflect a complete assumption of cost responsibility. Where proper contract selection has been made, the regard for risk by contract type would usually fall into the following percentage ranges:

	Percent
Cost-reimbursement type contracts	0-3
Fixed-price type contracts	2-7

(C) The second determination is that of the reliability of the cost estimates. Sound price negotiation requires well-defined contract objectives and reliable cost estimates. Prior experience assists the contractor in preparing reliable cost estimates on new acquisitions for similar related efforts. An excessive cost estimate reduces the possibility that the cost of performance will exceed the contract price, thereby reducing the contractor's assumption of contract cost risk.

(D) The third determination is that of the difficulty of the contractor's task. The contractor's task can be difficult or easy, regardless of the type of contract.

(E) Contractors are likely to assume greater cost risk only if contracting officers objectively analyze the risk incident to proposed contracts and are willing to compensate contractors for it. Generally, a cost-plus-fixed fee contract will not justify a reward for risk in excess of 0.5 percent, nor will a firm fixed-price contract justify a reward of

less than the minimum in the structured approach. Where proper contract-type selection has been made, the reward for risk, by contract type, will usually fall into the following percentage ranges:

(1) Type of contract and percentage ranges for profit objectives developed by using the structured approach for research and development and manufacturing contracts:

	Percent
Cost-Plus-fixed fee	0 to 0.5
Cost-plus-incentive fee:	
With cost incentive only	1 to 2
With multiple incentives	1.5 to 3
Fixed-price-incentive:	
With cost incentive only	2 to 4
With multiple incentives	3 to 5
Prospective price redetermination	3 to 5
Firm fixed-price	5 to 7

(2) Type of contract and percentage ranges for profit objectives developed by using the structured approach for service contracts:

	Percent
Cost-plus-fixed-fee	0 to 0.5
Cost-plus-incentive fee	1 to 2
Fixed-price incentive	2 to 3
Firm fixed-price	3 to 4

(F) These ranges may not be appropriate for all acquisitions. For instance, a fixed-price-incentive contract that is closely priced with a low ceiling price and high incentive share may be tantamount to a firm fixed-price contract. In this situation, the contracting officer may determine that a basis exists for high confidence in the reasonableness of the estimate and that little opportunity exists for cost reduction without extraordinary efforts. On the other hand, a contract with a high ceiling and low incentive formula can be considered to contain cost-plus incentive-fee contract features. In this situation, the contracting officer may determine that the Government is retaining much of the contract cost responsibility and that the risk assumed by the contractor is minimal. Similarly, if a cost-plus-incentive-fee contract includes an unlimited downward (negative) fee adjustment on cost control, it could be comparable to a fixed-price-incentive contract. In such a pricing environment, the contracting officer may determine that the Government has

transferred a greater amount of cost responsibility to the contractor than is typical under a normal cost-plus-incentive-fee contract.

(G) The contractor's subcontracting program may have a significant impact on the contractor's acceptance or risk under a contract form. It could cause risk to increase or decrease in terms of both cost and performance. This consideration should be a part of the contracting officer's overall evaluation in selecting a factor to apply for cost risk. It may be determined, for instance, that the prime contractor has effectively transferred real cost risk to a subcontractor and the contract cost risk evaluation may, as a result, be below the range which would otherwise apply for the contract type being proposed. The contract cost risk evaluation should not be lowered, however, merely on the basis that a substantial portion of the contract costs represents subcontracts without any substantial transfer of contractor's risk.

(H) In making a contract cost risk evaluation in an acquisition action that involves definitization of a letter contract, unpriced change orders, and unpriced orders under basic ordering agreements, consideration should be given to the effect on total contract cost risk as a result of having partial performance before definitization. Under some circumstances it may be reasoned that the total amount of cost risk has been effectively reduced. Under other circumstances it may be apparent that the contractor's cost risk remained substantially unchanged. To be equitable, the determination of profit weight for application to the total of all recognized costs, both those incurred and those yet to be expended, must be made with consideration to all attendant circumstances—not just the portion of costs incurred or percentage of work completed prior to definitization.

(I) Time and material and labor hour contracts will be considered to be cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts for the purpose of establishing profit weights unless otherwise exempt under paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this section in the evaluation of the contractor's assumption of contract cost risk.

(ii) *Investment.* HHS encourages its contractors to perform their contracts with the minimum of financial, facilities, or other assistance from the Government. As such, it is the purpose of this factor to encourage the contractor to acquire and use its own resources to the maximum extent possible. The evaluation of this factor should include an analysis of the following:

(A) *Facilities.* (Including equipment). To evaluate how this factor contributes to the profit objective requires knowledge of the level of facilities utilization needed for contract performance, the source and financing of the required facilities, and the overall cost effectiveness of the facilities offered. Contractors who furnish their own facilities which significantly contribute to lower total contract costs should be provided with additional profit. On the other hand, contractors who rely on the Government to provide or finance needed facilities should receive a corresponding reduction in profit. Cases between these examples should be evaluated on their merits with either positive or negative adjustments, as appropriate, in profit being made. However, where a highly facilitated contractor is to perform a contract which does not benefit from this facilitation or where a contractor's use of its facilities has a minimum cost impact on the contract, profit need not be adjusted. When applicable, the prospective contractor's computation of facilities capital cost of money for pricing purposed under CAS 414 can help the contracting officer identify the level of facilities investment to be employed in contract performance.

(B) *Payments.* In analyzing this factor, consideration should be given to the frequency of payments by the Government to the contractor. The key to this weighting is to give proper consideration to the impact the contract will have on the contractor's cash flow. Generally, negative consideration should be given for advance payments and payments more frequent than monthly with maximum reduction being given as the contractor's working capital approaches zero. Positive consideration should be given for payments less frequent than monthly with additional consideration given for a

capital turn-over rate on the contract which is less than the contractor's or the industry's normal capital turn-over rate.

(iii) *Performance.* (Cost-control and other past accomplishments.) The contractor's past performance should be evaluated in such areas as quality of service or product, meeting performance schedules, efficiency in cost control (including need for and reasonableness of cost incurred), accuracy and reliability of previous cost estimates, degree of cooperation by the contractor (both business and technical), timely processing of changes and compliance with other contractual provisions, and management of subcontract programs. Where a contractor has consistently achieved excellent results in these areas in comparison with other contractors in similar circumstances, this performance merits a proportionately greater opportunity for profit. Conversely, a poor record in this regard should be reflected in determining what constitutes a fair and reasonable profit.

(iv) *Federal socioeconomic programs.* This factor, which may apply to special circumstances or particular acquisitions, relates to the extent of a contractor's successful participation in Government sponsored programs such as small business, small disadvantaged business, women-owned small business, service-disabled veterans, handicapped sheltered workshops, and energy conservation efforts. The contractor's policies and procedures which energetically support Government socioeconomic programs and achieve successful results should be given positive considerations. Conversely, failure or unwillingness on the part of the contractor to support Government socioeconomic programs should be viewed as evidence of poor performance for the purpose of establishing a profit objective.

(v) *Special situations (A) Inventive and developmental contributions.* The extent and nature of contractor-initiated and financed independent development should be considered in developing the profit objective, provided that the contracting officer has made a determination that the effort will benefit the

315.605

contract. The importance of the development in furthering health and human services purposes, the demonstrable initiative in determining the need and application of the development, the extent of the contractor's cost risk, and whether the development cost was recovered directly or indirectly from Government sources should be weighed.

(B) *Unusual pricing agreements.* Occasionally, unusual contract pricing arrangements are made with the contractor wherein it agrees to cost ceilings, e.g., a ceiling on overhead rates for conditions other than those discussed at FAR 42.707. In these circumstances, the contractor should receive favorable consideration in developing the profit objective.

(C) *Negative factors.* Special situations need not be limited to those which only increase profit levels. A negative consideration may be appropriate when the contractor is expected to obtain spin-off-benefits as a direct result of the contract (e.g., products or services with commercial application).

(4) *Facilities capital cost of money.* When facilities capital cost of money (cost of capital committed to facilities) is included as an item of cost in the contractor's proposal, a reduction in the profit objective shall be made in an amount equal to the amount of facilities capital cost of money allowed in accordance with the Facilities Capital Cost-of Money Cost Principal. If the contractor does not propose this cost, a provision must be inserted in the contract that facilities capital cost of money is not an allowable cost.

[66 FR 4233, Jan. 17, 2001, as amended at 71 FR 76499, Dec. 20, 2006]

Subpart 315.6—Unsolicited Proposals

315.605 Content of unsolicited proposals.

(d) Certification by offeror—To ensure against contacts between Department employees and prospective offerors which would exceed the limits of advance guidance set forth in FAR 15.604 resulting in an unfair advantage to an offeror, the contracting officer shall ensure that the following certification is furnished to the prospective

48 CFR Ch. 3 (10–1–08 Edition)

offeror and the executed certification is included as part of the resultant unsolicited proposal:

UNSOLICITED PROPOSAL

Certification by Offeror

This is to certify, to the best of my knowledge and belief, that:

(a) This proposal has not been prepared under Government supervision.

(b) The methods and approaches stated in the proposal were developed by this offeror.

(c) Any contact with employees of the Department of Health and Human Services has been within the limits of appropriate advance guidance set forth in FAR 15.604.

(d) No prior commitments were received from departmental employees regarding acceptance of this proposal.

Date: _____

Organization: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

(This certification shall be signed by a responsible official of the proposing organization or a person authorized to contractually obligate the organization.)

315.606 Agency procedures.

(a) The HCA is responsible for establishing procedures to comply with FAR 15.606(a).

(b) The HCA or the HCA's designee shall be the point of contact for coordinating the receipt and handling of unsolicited proposals.

[66 FR 4233, Jan. 17, 2001, as amended at 71 FR 76500, Dec. 20, 2006]

315.606–1 Receipt and initial review.

(d) An unsolicited proposal shall not be refused consideration merely because it was initially submitted as a grant application. However, contracts shall not be awarded on the basis of unsolicited proposals which have been rejected for grant support on the grounds that they lack scientific merit.

315.609 Limited use of data.

The legend, Use and Disclosure of Data, prescribed in FAR 15.609(a) is to be used by the offeror to restrict the use of data for evaluation purposes only. However, data contained within the unsolicited proposal may have to be disclosed as a result of a request submitted pursuant to the Freedom of

Health and Human Services

316.603-3

Information Act. Because of this possibility, the following notice shall be provided to all prospective offerors of unsolicited proposals:

The Government will attempt to comply with the "Use and Disclosure of Data" legend.

However, the Government may not be able to withhold a record (data, document, etc.) nor deny access to a record requested by an individual (the public) when an obligation is imposed on the Government under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. 552, as amended. The Government determination to withhold or disclose a record will be based upon the particular circumstances involving the record in question and whether the record may be exempted from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act. Records which the offeror considers to be trade secrets and commercial or financial information and privileged or confidential must be identified by the offeror as indicated in the referenced legend.

[66 FR 4233, Jan. 17, 2001, as amended at 71 FR 76500, Dec. 20, 2006]

PART 316—TYPES OF CONTRACTS

Subpart 316.3—Cost-Reimbursement Contracts

Sec.

316.307 Contract clauses.

316.505 Ordering.

Subpart 316.6—Time-and-Materials, Labor-Hour, and Letter Contracts

316.603 Letter contracts.

316.603-3 Limitations.

316.603-70 Information to be furnished when requesting authority to issue a letter contract.

316.603-71 Approval for modifications to letter contracts.

Subpart 316.7—Agreements

316.770 Unauthorized types of agreements.

316.770-2 Memorandums of understanding.

AUTHORITY: 5 U.S.C. 301; 40 U.S.C. 486(c).

SOURCE: 66 FR 4243, Jan. 17, 2001, unless otherwise noted.

Subpart 316.3—Cost-Reimbursement Contracts

316.307 Contract clauses.

(a) If the contract is with a hospital (profit or nonprofit) for research and development, modify the "Allowable

Cost and Payment" clause at FAR 52.216-7 by deleting from paragraph (a) the words "Subpart 31.2 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR)" and substituting "45 CFR Part 74 Appendix E."

(j) The contracting officer shall insert the clause at 352.216-72, Additional Cost Principles, in all solicitations and resultant cost-reimbursement contracts.

316.505 Ordering.

(b)(5) The Department's task-order and delivery-order ombudsman is the Director, Strategic Acquisition Service, Program Support Center (PSC). The task-order and delivery-order ombudsmen for each of the Department's contracting activities are as follows:

AHRQ—Director, Office of Performance Accountability, Resources and Technology

CDC—Chief Information Officer

CMS—Chief Operating Officer

FDA—Director, Office of Acquisitions and Grants Services

HRSA—Associate Administrator, Office of Administration and Financial Management

Indian Health Service—Director, Office of Management Services

NIH—Senior Scientific Advisor for Extramural Research, Office of Extramural Research (R&D) and Senior Advisor to the Director (Other than R&D)

PSC—Director, Strategic Acquisition Service

SAMHSA—Executive Officer

[71 FR 76500, Dec. 20, 2006]

Subpart 316.6—Time-and-Materials, Labor-Hour, and Letter Contracts

316.603 Letter contracts.

316.603-3 Limitations.

An official one level above the Contracting Officer shall make the written determination.

[71 FR 76500, Dec. 20, 2006]