§ 603.535 Value of proposed real property or equipment.

The contracting officer rarely should accept values for cost sharing contributions of real property or equipment that are in excess of depreciation or reasonable use charges, as discussed in § 603.680 for for-profit participants. The contracting officer may accept the full value of a donated capital asset if the real property or equipment is to be dedicated to the project and the contracting officer expects that it will have a fair market value that is less than $5,000 at the project’s end. In those cases, the contracting officer should value the donation at the lesser of:

(a) The value of the property as shown in the recipient’s accounting records (i.e., purchase price less accumulated depreciation); and

(b) The current fair market value.

The contracting officer may accept the use of any reasonable basis for determining the fair market value of the property. If there is a justification to do so, the contracting officer may accept the current fair market value even if it exceeds the value in the recipient’s records.

§ 603.540 Acceptability of fully depreciated real property or equipment.

The contracting officer should limit the value of any contribution of a fully depreciated asset to a reasonable use charge. In determining what is reasonable, the contracting officer must consider:

(a) The original cost of the asset;

(b) Its estimated remaining useful life at the time of the negotiations;

(c) The effect of any increased maintenance charges or decreased performance due to age; and

(d) The amount of depreciation that the participant previously charged to Federal awards.

§ 603.545 Acceptability of costs of prior RD&D.

The contracting officer may not count any participant’s costs of prior RD&D as a cost sharing contribution. Only the additional resources that the recipient will provide to carry out the current project (which may include pre-award costs for the current project, as described in § 603.830) are to be counted.

§ 603.550 Acceptability of intellectual property.

(a) In most instances, the contracting officer should not count costs of patents and other intellectual property (e.g., copyrighted material, including software) as cost sharing because:

(1) It is difficult to assign values to these intangible contributions;

(2) Their value usually is a manifestation of prior research costs, which are not allowed as cost share under § 603.545; and