§ 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:

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

- The original cost of the asset;
- Its estimated remaining useful life at the time of the negotiations;
- The effect of any increased maintenance charges or decreased performance due to age; and
- 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.

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:

- It is difficult to assign values to these intangible contributions;
- Their value usually is a manifestation of prior research costs, which are not allowed as cost share under § 603.545; and
(3) Contributions of intellectual property rights generally do not represent the same cost of lost opportunity to a recipient as contributions of cash or tangible assets. The purpose of cost share is to ensure that the recipient incurs real risk that gives it a vested interest in the project’s success.

(b) The contracting officer may include costs associated with intellectual property if the costs are based on sound estimates of market value of the contribution. For example, a for-profit firm may offer the use of commercially available software for which there is an established license fee for use of the product. The costs of the development of the software would not be a reasonable basis for valuing its use.

§ 603.555 Value of other contributions.

For types of participant contributions other than those addressed in §§ 603.535 through 603.550, the general rule is that the contracting officer is to value each contribution consistently with the cost principles or standards in § 603.625 and § 603.635 that apply to the participant making the contribution. When valuing services and property donated by parties other than the participants, the contracting officer may use as guidance the provisions of 10 CFR 600.313(b)(2) through (b)(5).

Fixed-Support or Expenditure-Based Approach

§ 603.560 Estimate of project expenditures.

(a) To use a fixed-support TIA, rather than an expenditure-based TIA, the contracting officer must have confidence in the estimate of the expenditures required to achieve well-defined outcomes. Therefore, the contracting officer must work carefully with program officials to select outcomes that, when the recipient achieves them, are reliable indicators of the amount of effort the recipient expended. However, the estimate of the required expenditures need not be a precise dollar amount, as illustrated by the example in paragraph (b) of this section, if:

(1) The recipient is contributing a substantial share of the costs of achieving the outcomes, which must meet the criteria in § 603.305(a); and

(2) The contracting officer is confident that the costs of achieving the outcomes will be at least a minimum amount that can be specified and the recipient is willing to accept the possibility that its cost sharing percentage ultimately will be higher if the costs exceed that minimum amount.

(b) To illustrate the approach, consider a project for which the contracting officer is confident that the recipient will have to expend at least $800,000 to achieve the specified outcomes. The contracting officer must determine, in conjunction with program officials, the minimum level of recipient cost sharing required to demonstrate the recipient’s commitment to the success of the project. For purposes of this illustration, let that minimum recipient cost sharing be 60% of the total project costs. In that case, the Federal share should be no more than 40% and the contracting officer could set a fixed level of Federal support at $320,000 (40% of $800,000). With that fixed level of Federal support, the recipient would be responsible for the balance of the costs needed to complete the project.

(c) Note, however, that the level of recipient cost sharing negotiated should be based solely on the level needed to demonstrate the recipient’s commitment. The contracting officer may not use a shortage of Federal Government funding for the program as a reason to try to persuade a recipient to accept a fixed-support TIA, rather than an expenditure-based instrument, or to accept responsibility for a greater share of the total project costs than it otherwise is willing to offer. If there is insufficient funding to provide an appropriate Federal Government share for the entire project, the contracting officer should re-scope the effort covered by the agreement to match the available funding.

§ 603.565 Use of a hybrid instrument.

For a RD&D project that is to be carried out by a number of participants, the contracting officer may award a TIA that provides for some participants to perform under fixed-support arrangements and others to perform under expenditure-based arrangements.