

DFARS Procedures, Guidance, and Information

PGI 201—Federal Acquisition Regulations System

(Revised April 1, 2019)

PGI 201.3—AGENCY ACQUISITION REGULATIONS

PGI 201.301 Policy.

(b)(i) Contract clauses and solicitation provisions developed by departments and agencies (local clauses) that constitute a significant revision, as defined at FAR 1.501-1, shall be—

(A) Published for public comment in the Federal Register in accordance with FAR 1.501; and

(B) Approved in accordance with DFARS [201.304](#).

(ii) A local clause is considered a significant revision, as defined at FAR 1.501-1, if the clause—

(A) Contains a new certification requirement for contractors or offerors that is not imposed by statute (see FAR 1.107 and DFARS [201.107](#) and [201.304\(2\)](#));

(B) Constitutes a deviation (as defined at FAR 1.401) from the parts and subparts identified at DFARS [201.402\(1\)](#); or

(C) Will be used on a repetitive basis; and

(1) Imposes a new requirement for the collection of information from 10 or more members of the public (see FAR 1.106); or

(2) Has any cost or administrative impact on contractors or offerors beyond that contained in the FAR or DFARS.

(iii) A local clause is not considered a significant revision as defined at FAR 1.501-1, if the clause—

(A) Is for a single-use intended to meet the needs of an individual acquisition (e.g. a clause developed as a result of negotiations and documented in the business clearance or similar document), except for clauses that constitute a deviation (as defined at FAR 1.401) from the parts and subparts identified at DFARS [201.402\(1\)](#); or

(B) May be used on a repetitive basis and has no new or additional cost or administrative impact on contractors or offerors beyond any cost or administrative impact contained in existing FAR or DFARS coverage.

DFARS Procedures, Guidance, and Information

PGI 201—Federal Acquisition Regulations System

PGI 201.304 Agency control and compliance procedures.

(4) Plans for controlling the use of clauses or provisions other than those prescribed by the FAR or DFARS (local clauses), as required by DFARS [201.304\(4\)](#), shall include procedures to ensure that a local clause—

(A) Is evaluated to determine whether the local clause constitutes a significant revision (see [201.301\(b\)](#));

(B) Is numbered in accordance with FAR 52.1 and DFARS [252.1](#) (see [252.103](#));

(C) Is accompanied by a prescription in the appropriate part and subpart of the department or agency FAR supplement where the subject matter of the clause receives its primary treatment;

(D) If it constitutes a significant revision—

(1) Is published for public comment in the Federal Register in accordance with FAR 1.501 and DFARS [201.501](#);

(2) Complies with the Paperwork Reduction Act 1980 (44 USC chapter 35), in accordance with FAR 1.106 and 1.301;

(3) As a matter of policy, complies with the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601, *et seq.*); and

(4) Is approved in accordance with DFARS [201.304](#); and

(E) Is published with a prescription as a final rule in the Federal Register in order to amend the department or agency's chapter of Title 48 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), if it is to be used on a repetitive basis.

(5)(A) Prior to publication for public comment in the Federal Register of a local clause that constitutes a significant revision (see [201.301\(b\)](#)), departments and agencies shall submit, in accordance with agency procedures, the following information electronically via email to the Director, Defense Acquisition Regulation (DAR) Council, at osd.clause.control@mail.mil:

(1) The name of the requesting department or agency.

(2) The name, email address and phone number of the point of contract for the local clause and the department or agency clause control point of contact.

(3) A detailed rationale for the request, to include—

(i) Why existing FAR or DFARS clauses or provisions do not satisfy, or could not be tailored to meet, the department or agency's needs;

(ii) What contracting problem or situation will be avoided, corrected, or improved if the local clause is approved; and

DFARS Procedures, Guidance, and Information

PGI 201—Federal Acquisition Regulations System

(iii) Identification of other DoD Components that have expressed interest in use of the clause for consideration for incorporation into the DFARS.

(4) The draft rule to be published in the Federal Register to solicit public comments on the proposal to amend the department and agency's chapter of Title 48 of the CFR to incorporate the local clause.

(5) The initial regulatory flexibility analysis. For additional information on the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601, *et seq.*) see Appendix 8 of the FAR Operating Guide accessible via the Defense Acquisition Regulation System (DARS) website at <http://www.acq.osd.mil/dpap/dars/about.html>.

(6) If applicable, the request package to be submitted to the Office of Management and Budget for any new information collection requirement imposed by the local clause. For additional information on the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 USC Chapter 35) see Appendix 9 of the FAR Operating Guide accessible via the DARS website at <http://www.acq.osd.mil/dpap/dars/about.html>.

(7) Evidence of coordination with the department or agency's legal counsel.

(8) Evidence of coordination with the appropriate stakeholders (e.g., Chief Information Officer, Office of Small Business Programs, etc.).

(B) The Director, DAR Council, shall—

(1) Determine whether the local clause unnecessarily duplicates coverage currently contained within the FAR or DFARS;

(2) Determine whether the local clause constitutes a deviation from the FAR or DFARS (see FAR 1.401) and requires approval in accordance with DFARS [201.4](#);

(3) Coordinate the local clause with the appropriate stakeholders;

(4) Coordinate local clauses, as appropriate, with the DAR Council for consideration of the local clause for incorporation in the DFARS; and

(5) Provide recommendations regarding the local clause package.

(C) Requests for Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy (DPAP), approval of local clauses that have been published for public comment in the Federal Register, shall be submitted electronically via email through the Director, DAR Council, at osd.clause.control@mail.mil and shall include the following:

(1) A memorandum requesting Director, DPAP, approval of the local clause.

(2) A copy of the notice of the rule published in the Federal Register.

(3) A copy of all public comments received in response to the Federal Register notice.

(4) An analysis of, and responses to, any public comments received.

DFARS Procedures, Guidance, and Information

PGI 201—Federal Acquisition Regulations System

(5) The draft final rule to be published in the Federal Register to amend the department or agency's chapter of Title 48 of the CFR to incorporate the local clause.

(6) The final regulatory flexibility analysis. For additional information on the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601, *et seq.*) see Appendix 8 of the FAR Operating Guide accessible via the DARS website at <http://www.acq.osd.mil/dpap/dars/about.html>.

(7) If applicable, a copy of the Office of Management and Budget's approval of any new information collection requirement imposed by the local clause. For additional information on the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 USC chapter 35) see Appendix 9 of the FAR Operating Guide accessible via the DARS website at <http://www.acq.osd.mil/dpap/dars/about.html>.

(8) Evidence of coordination with the department or agency's legal counsel.

(9) Evidence of coordination with the appropriate stakeholders (e.g., Chief Information Officer, Office of Small Business Programs, etc.).

(10) A copy of any initial recommendations received from the Director, DAR Council on the proposed rule.

DFARS Procedures, Guidance, and Information

PGI 216—Types of Contracts

(Revised April 1, 2019)

PGI 216.4—INCENTIVE CONTRACTS

PGI 216.401 General.

(c) Incentive contracts. DoD has established the Award and Incentive Fees Community of Practice (CoP) under the leadership of the Defense Acquisition University (DAU). The CoP serves as the repository for all related materials including policy information, related training courses, examples of good award fee arrangements, and other supporting resources. The CoP is available on the DAU Acquisition Community Connection at <https://acc.dau.mil/awardandincentivefees>. Additional information can be found on the MAX website maintained by the Office of Management and Budget at: <https://max.omb.gov>.

(e) Award-fee contracts.

(i) It is DoD policy to utilize objective criteria, whenever possible, to measure contract performance. In cases where an award-fee contract must be used due to lack of objective criteria, the contracting officer shall consult with the program manager and the fee determining official when developing the award-fee plan. Award-fee criteria shall be linked directly to contract cost, schedule, and performance outcomes objectives.

(ii) Award fees must be tied to identifiable interim outcomes, discrete events or milestones, as much as possible. Examples of such interim milestones include timely completion of preliminary design review, critical design review, and successful system demonstration. In situations where there may be no identifiable milestone for a year or more, consideration should be given to apportioning some of the award fee pool for a predetermined interim period of time based on assessing progress toward milestones. In any case, award fee provisions must clearly explain how a contractor's performance will be evaluated.

(iii) FAR 16.401(d) requires a determination and findings (D&F) to be completed for all incentive- and award-fee contracts, justifying that the use of this type of contract is in the best interest of the Government. The D&F for award-fee contracts shall be signed by the head of the contracting activity or designee no lower than one level below the head of the contracting activity. The D&F required by FAR 16.401(d) for all other incentive contracts may be signed at one level above the contracting officer. This authority may not be further delegated.

(iv) The head of the contracting activity for each defense agency shall retain the D&F for (a) all acquisition category (ACAT) I or II programs, and (b) all non-ACAT I or II contracts with an estimated value of \$50 million or more. The head of the contracting activity shall forward the D&Fs for ACAT I programs to Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy/ Contract Policy and International Policy directorate (DPAP/CPIC) within 1 month of the end of the quarter. Copies of D&Fs on all contracts shall also be included in the contract file.

DFARS Procedures, Guidance, and Information

PGI 216—Types of Contracts

PGI 216.402 Application of predetermined, formula-type incentives.

PGI 216.402-2 Technical performance incentives.

Contractor performance incentives should relate to specific performance areas of milestones, such as delivery or test schedules, quality controls, maintenance requirements, and reliability standards.

PGI 216.403 Fixed-price incentive contracts.

PGI 216.403-1 Fixed-price incentive (firm target) contracts.

(1) *Use of FPIF contract.*

(i) *Not mandatory.* DFARS [216.403-1](#)(b)(1) directs the contracting officer to give particular consideration to the use of fixed-price incentive (firm target) (FPIF) contracts, especially for acquisitions moving from development to production. DFARS does not mandate the use of FPIF for initial production and each acquisition situation must be evaluated in terms of the degree and nature of the risk presented in order to select the proper contract type.

(ii) *Considerations.* Volume 4, chapter 1, of the Contract Pricing Reference Guide provides a detailed discussion of the considerations involved in selecting the proper contract type. For example:

(A) It is not in the Government's best interest to use FPIF when the cost risk is so great that establishing a ceiling price is unrealistic.

(B) It is also not in the Government's best interest to use firm-fixed-price (FFP) contracts on production programs until costs have become stable. Therefore, FPIF contracts should be considered in production and sole source follow-on programs where actual costs on prior FFP contracts have varied by more than 3-4 percent from the costs considered negotiated. Contracting officers are reminded that actual costs on prior contracts for the same item or essentially the same item, regardless of contract type or data reporting requirements of the prior contract, are cost and pricing data on the pending contract, and must be obtained from the contractor on production programs when certified cost or pricing data are required.

(C) For sole source major systems procurements, contracting officers should utilize FPIF contracts instead of FFP contracts unless the reasons for significant variation are well understood and actions have been taken to ensure that significant variation will not recur. In addition, when options are included as described in [PGI 217.202](#)(2), the use of

DFARS Procedures, Guidance, and Information

PGI 216—Types of Contracts

FPIF contracts is both highly recommended and encouraged, because both parties will be assuming more risk in pricing multiple years of requirements.

(2) *Incentive arrangement.* DFARS [216.403-1](#)(b)(2) directs the contracting officer to pay particular attention to share lines and ceiling prices for fixed-price incentive (firm target) contracts, with 120 percent ceiling and a 50/50 share ratio as the point of departure for establishing the incentive arrangement. While DFARS does not mandate the use of these share ratios or ceiling percentage, it is not unreasonable to expect that upon entering into production, risks have been mitigated to the point that the DFARS recommended point of departure for an FPIF incentive arrangement would be normal.

(3) *Analyzing risk.*

(i) *Quantification of risk.*

(A) The first step is establishing a target cost for which the probability of an underrun and overrun are considered equal and therefore, the risks and rewards are shared equally, hence the 50/50 share is the point of departure. Equally important is determining that the contractor has a high probability of being able to accomplish the effort within a ceiling percentage of 120 percent. In accomplishing both these steps, the analysis of risk is essential.

(B) Too often, risk is evaluated only in general terms without attempting to quantify the risk posed by the various elements of cost. Also, a contracting officer may incorrectly fall back on the share ratios and ceiling percentages negotiated on prior contracts or other programs, without examining the specific risks.

(C) Whether being used to select the proper contract type or establishing share lines and ceiling price on an FPIF contract, the analysis of risk as it pertains to the prime contractor is key. From a contractor's perspective, all risks, including technical and schedule risk, have financial ramifications. Technical and schedule risks, if realized, generally translate into increased effort, which means increased cost. Therefore, all risk can be translated into cost risk and quantified. Risk always has two components that must be considered in the quantification: the magnitude of the impact and the probability that it will occur.

(D) When cost risk is quantified, it is much easier to establish a reasonable ceiling percentage. The ceiling percentage is applicable to the target cost on the prime contract. It is important to understand the degree of risk that various cost elements pose in relation to that target cost. A discussion of the major cost elements and the risk implications follows in paragraphs (3)(ii) through (iv) of this section.

(ii) *Subcontracts and material cost and risk.*

DFARS Procedures, Guidance, and Information

PGI 216—Types of Contracts

(A) In many prime contractors' contracts, a substantial amount of risk is borne by subcontractors, not the prime contractor, via negotiated firm-fixed-price (FFP) subcontracts. In the case of FFP subcontracts, the subcontractor is obligated to deliver at the negotiated price. The risk to the prime contractor is the supplier's failure to perform or perform on time. Generally, that risk is considered to be low by both the prime and the subcontractor as evidenced by the FFP contract type. In addition, the prime contractor will normally have priced effort for material management or subcontract administration to ensure timely performance on the part of the suppliers. This effort may be bid directly or indirectly (e.g., as part of an overhead expense) depending on the contractor's accounting practices.

(B) The impact of negotiated FFP subcontracts on the prime contractor's risk can be significant. A prime contract with a 120 percent ceiling price provides overrun protection to the prime contractor equal to 20 percent of the target cost on the contract. However, if FFP subcontracts represent half of the total contract cost, then half of the target cost is subject to little or no cost risk on the part of the prime contractor. Therefore, the overrun protection provided by 20 percent of the target cost is really closer to 40 percent protection of the prime's cost that is truly at risk to the prime contractor, which likely is significantly overstated. Thus, a ceiling price less than 120 percent in this risk situation would be more appropriate.

(C) For subcontracts that have not yet been negotiated between the prime and subcontractor at the time of negotiation of the prime contract, the degree of risk is essentially limited to the difference between the price proposed by the subcontractor and the subcontract value included in the prime contractor's proposal.

(D) For subcontracts that are not FFP, the risk to the prime is based on the risk represented by the subcontractors' contractual relationship with the prime. If the subcontract is FPIF and has a 50/50 share ratio and 120 percent ceiling, the prime's risk is 50 percent of each dollar of overrun up to the ceiling amount. An analysis of the subcontractor's risk would be necessary to determine the probability of reaching the ceiling price.

(iii) *Direct labor cost and risk.*

(A) The risk in direct labor is in the hours needed to perform the effort and the risk in the labor rates paid to employees. There is generally little risk in the direct labor rates. However, there are various levels of risk in the direct labor hours needed by the prime contractor to accomplish the contract requirements. This risk can be driven by a number of factors including technical complexity, schedule constraints, or availability of personnel, parts, or tooling. Risks vary by task and the key is to identify the major tasks and assess the "what if" impact at the total contract cost level.

DFARS Procedures, Guidance, and Information

PGI 216—Types of Contracts

(B) Schedule is often correctly cited as a risk factor, but it is important to understand and quantify the probability and impact of a potential schedule slip. Generally, any schedule slip can only affect the prime contractor's in-house cost. Therefore, any schedule impact should be assessed on the impact it would have on the prime contractor's performance of its tasks.

(C) However, it is wrong to assume the worst-case scenario that a schedule delay results in an extension of the entire prime contractor workforce for the period of the delay. A responsible contractor will take steps to minimize both the delay and the impact of that delay. For instance, a production schedule assumes an optimal sequencing of tasks which presumes the timely arrival and availability of parts from suppliers or other in-house sources. A delay in receiving parts as planned could require a resequencing of tasks and could adversely affect the efficiency of performing a number of tasks, but it will not cause the entire workforce to be idle during the delay.

(iv) *Indirect (e.g., overhead) cost and risk.* Overhead and other indirect costs (e.g., general and administrative expense) can represent a significant portion of the prime contractor's in-house cost. Indirect expense (hereafter referred to as overhead) poses potential cost growth risk or the opportunity for cost reduction from the following two perspectives:

(A) *Actual overhead rate.* (1) First, the actual overhead rate could be different than that proposed. Proposed overhead rates, even those covered by a forward pricing rate agreement, are based on forecasts of overhead expenses and the bases to which they are applied. The final overhead rate that is actually applied (charged) to a contract will be based on the actual overhead expenses and the actual base, each of which could be considerably different than estimated. The net effect could be a higher or lower overhead rate than estimated.

(2) In general, the risk in an overhead rate tends to be driven more by fluctuations in the base than in the expenses. This is because overhead expenses are made up of expenses that consist of "fixed" (e.g., depreciation) and variable (e.g., fringe benefits) in nature. When the actual base turns out to be lower than the estimated base, the fixed costs are spread over a smaller base resulting in a higher overhead rate. In general, if the actual base is greater than estimated, a lower overhead rate will result.

(3) In assessing this risk, the contracting officer should consider the contractor's ability to predict overhead rates based on comparing proposed versus actual rates for prior years. In making this comparison, it is important to do so in a manner consistent with the proposal being reviewed. For instance, if the majority of overhead costs on the proposal being reviewed occur two years in the future, the comparison should look at the contractor's accuracy in predicting overhead rates two years in advance. For example,

DFARS Procedures, Guidance, and Information

PGI 216—Types of Contracts

in looking at the 2009 actual overhead rate, what did the contractor propose for 2009 in its 2007 forward pricing rate proposal?

(B) *Actual base cost.* If the actual base cost on the contract (e.g., direct labor dollars) is different than that proposed, the contract will be charged overhead costs according to the actual base costs on that contract. If the contractor overruns direct labor, even if the actual labor overhead rate was the same as proposed, that rate would be applied to a higher base resulting in increased overhead dollars on that contract. The opposite would be true if the contractor underruns direct labor on the contract. Since this aspect of risk is tied to the base cost on the contract, the risk is the same as it is for those base costs (e.g., direct labor, material).

PGI 216.403-2 Fixed-price incentive (successive targets) contracts.

The formula specified in FAR 16.403-2(a)(1)(iii) does not apply for the life of the contract. It is used to fix the firm target profit for the contract. To provide an incentive consistent with the circumstances, the formula should reflect the relative risk involved in establishing an incentive arrangement where cost and pricing information were not sufficient to permit the negotiation of firm targets at the outset.

PGI 216.405 Cost-reimbursement incentive contracts.

PGI 216.405-1 Cost-plus-incentive-fee contracts.

Give appropriate weight to basic acquisition objectives in negotiating the range of fee and the fee adjustment formula. For example—

(1) In an initial product development contract, it may be appropriate to provide for relatively small adjustments in fee tied to the cost incentive feature, but provide for significant adjustments if the contractor meets or surpasses performance targets; and

(2) In subsequent development and test contracts, it may be appropriate to negotiate an incentive formula tied primarily to the contractor's success in controlling costs.

PGI 216.405-2 Cost-plus-award-fee contracts.

(1) Although weighted guidelines do not apply per DFARS [216.405-2\(3\)\(ii\)](#) when definitizing a contract action, the contracting officer shall, nevertheless, separately assess and document the reduced cost risk on the contract for—

(i) The period up to the date of definitization; as well as

(ii) The remaining period of performance (see DFARS [217.7404-6](#)).

DFARS Procedures, Guidance, and Information

PGI 216—Types of Contracts

(2) Normally, award fee is not earned when the fee-determining official has determined that contractor performance has been submarginal or unsatisfactory.

(3) The basis for all award fee determinations shall be documented in the contract file.

(4) The cost-plus-award-fee contract is also suitable for level of effort contracts where mission feasibility is established but measurement of achievement must be by subjective evaluation rather than objective measurement. See Table 16-1, Performance Evaluation Criteria, for sample performance evaluation criteria and Table 16-2, Contractor Performance Evaluation Report, for a sample evaluation report.

(5) The contracting activity may—

(i) Establish a board to—

(A) Evaluate the contractor's performance; and

(B) Determine the amount of the award or recommend an amount to the contracting officer; and

(ii) Afford the contractor an opportunity to present information on its own behalf.

PGI 216.470 Other applications of award fees.

The “award amount” portion of the fee may be used in other types of contracts under the following conditions:

(1) The Government wishes to motivate and reward a contractor for—

(i) Purchase of capital assets (including machine tools) manufactured in the United States, on major defense acquisition programs; or

(ii) Management performance in areas which cannot be measured objectively and where normal incentive provisions cannot be used. For example, logistics support, quality, timeliness, ingenuity, and cost effectiveness are areas under the control of management which may be susceptible only to subjective measurement and evaluation.

(2) The “base fee” (fixed amount portion) is not used.

(3) The chief of the contracting office approves the use of the “award amount.”

(4) An award review board and procedures are established for conduct of the evaluation.

DFARS Procedures, Guidance, and Information

PGI 216—Types of Contracts

(5) The administrative costs of evaluation do not exceed the expected benefits.

TABLE 16-1, PERFORMANCE EVALUATION CRITERIA						
		Submarginal	Marginal	Good	Very Good	Excellent
A Time of Delivery.	(A-1) Adherence to plan schedule.	Consistently late on 20% plans	Late on 10% plans w/o prior agreement	Occasional plan late w/o justification.	Meets plan schedule.	Delivers all plans on schedule & meets prod. Change requirements on schedule
	(A-2) Action on Anticipated delays.	Does not expose changes or resolve them as soon as recognized.	Exposes changes but is dilatory in resolution on plans.	Anticipates changes, advise Shipyard but misses completion of design plans 10%.	Keeps Yard posted on delays, resolves independently on plans.	Anticipates in good time, advises Shipyard, resolves independently and meets production requirements.
	(A-3) Plan Maintenance.	Does not complete interrelated systems studies concurrently.	System studies completed but constr. Plan changes delayed.	Major work plans coordinated in time to meet production schedules.	Design changes from studies and interrelated plant issued in time to meet product schedules.	Design changes, studies resolved and test data issued ahead of production requirements.
B Quality of Work.	(B-1) Work Appearance.	25% dwgs. Not compatible with Shipyard repro. processes and use.	20% not compatible with Shipyard repro. processes and use.	10% not compatible with Shipyard repro. processes and use.	0% dwgs prepared by Des. Agent not compatible with Shipyard repro. processes and use.	0% dwgs. Presented incl. Des. Agent, vendors, subcontr. Not compatible with Shipyard repro processes and use.
	(B-2) Thoroughness and Accuracy of Work.	Is brief on plans tending to leave questionable situations for Shipyard to resolve.	Has followed guidance, type and standard dwgs.	Has followed guidance, type and standard dwgs. Questioning and resolving doubtful areas.	Work complete with notes and thorough explanations for anticipated questionable areas.	Work of highest caliber incorporating all pertinent data required including related activities.
	(B-3) Engineering Competence.	Tendency to follow past practice with no variation to meet reqmts. job in hand.	Adequate engrg. To use & adapt existing designs to suit job on hand for routine work.	Engineered to satisfy specs., guidance plans and material provided.	Displays excellent knowledge of constr. Reqmts. considering systems aspect,	Exceptional knowledge of Naval shipwork & adaptability to work process incorporating

DFARS Procedures, Guidance, and Information

PGI 216—Types of Contracts

					cost, shop capabilities and procurement problems.	knowledge of future planning in Design.
B Quality of Work (Cont'd)	(B-4) Liaison Effectiveness	Indifferent to requirements of associated activities, related systems, and Shipyard advice.	Satisfactory but dependent on Shipyard of force resolution of problems without constructive recommendations to subcontr. or vendors.	Maintains normal contract with associated activities depending on Shipyard for problems requiring military resolution.	Maintains independent contact with all associated activities, keeping them informed to produce compatible design with little assistance for Yard.	Maintains expert contact, keeping Yard informed, obtaining info from equip, supplies w/o prompting of Shipyard.
	(B-5)	Constant surveillance required to keep job from slipping—assign to low priority to satisfy needs.	Requires occasional prodding to stay on schedule & expects Shipyard resolution of most problems.	Normal interest and desire to provide workable plans with average assistance & direction by Shipyard.	Complete & accurate job. Free of incompatibilities with little or no direction by Shipyard.	Develops complete and accurate plans, seeks out problem areas and resolves with assoc. act. ahead of schedule.
C Effective-ness in Control-ling and/or Reducing Costs	(C-1) Utilization of Personnel	Planning of work left to designers on drafting boards.	Supervision sets & reviews goals for designers.	System planning by supervisory, personnel, studies checked by engineers.	Design parameters established by system engineers & held in design plans.	Mods. to design plans limited to less than 5% as result lack engrg. System correlation.
	(C-2) Control Direct Charges (Except Labor)	Expenditures not controlled for services.	Expenditures reviewed occasionally by supervision.	Direct charges set & accounted for on each work package.	Provides services as part of normal design function w/o extra charges.	No cost overruns on original estimates absorbs service demands by Shipyard.
	(C-3) Performance to Cost Estimate	Does not meet cost estimate for original work or changes 30% time.	Does not meet cost estimate for original work or changes 20% time.	Exceeds original est. on change orders 10% time and meets original design costs.	Exceeds original est. on changing orders 5% time.	Never exceeds estimates of original package or change orders.

DFARS Procedures, Guidance, and Information

PGI 216—Types of Contracts

TABLE 16-2, CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALAUTION REPORT						
Ratings Excellent			Period of _____ Contract Number _____			
Very Good			Contractor _____			
Marginal			Date of Report _____			
Submarginal			PNS Technical Monitor/s _____			
CATEGORY	CRITERIA	RATING	ITEM FACTOR	EVALUATION RATING	CATEGORY FACTOR	EFFICIENCY RATING
A	TIME OF DELIVERY A-1 Adher- ence to Plan Schedule	_____	x	.40	=	_____
	A-2 Action on Anticipated Delays	_____	x	.30	=	_____
	A-3 Plan Maintenance	_____	x	.30	=	_____
	Total Item Weighed Rating			_____	x	.30 = _____
B	QUALITY OF WORK B-1 Work Appearance	_____	x	.15	=	_____
	B-2 Thorough- ness and Accuracy of Work	_____	x	.30	=	_____
	B-3 Engineering Competence	_____	x	.20	=	_____
	B-4 Liaison Effectiveness	_____	x	.15	=	_____
	B-5 Indepen- dence and Initiative	_____	x	.15	=	_____
	Total Item Weighed Rating			_____	x	.40 = _____

DFARS Procedures, Guidance, and Information

PGI 216—Types of Contracts

C	EFFECTIVE- NESS IN CONTROL- LING AND/OR REDUCING COSTS								
	C-1 Utilization of Personnel	_____	x	.30	=	_____			
	C-2 Control of all Direct Charges Other than Labor	_____	x	.30	=	_____			
	C-3 Performance to Cost Estimate	_____	x	.40	=	_____			
	Total Item Weighed Rating	_____	x	.30	=	_____			
TOTAL WEIGHT RATING _____									
Rated by: _____									
Signature(s) _____									
NOTE: Provide supporting data and/or justification for below average or outstanding item ratings.									

DFARS Procedures, Guidance, and Information

PGI 217—Special Contracting Methods

(Revised April 1, 2019)

PGI 217.2—OPTIONS

PGI 217.202 Use of options.

- (1) Options may be used for foreign military sales (FMS) requirements.
- (2) For sole source major systems for U.S. and U.S./FMS combined procurements, contracting officers, in coordination with program managers, are encouraged to—
 - (i) Establish priced options for two years beyond the base year, so that negotiations of major systems will be conducted approximately every three years; and
 - (ii) In those cases where exact quantities are subject to variation, or FMS customers are not yet identified, establish range option pricing for both U.S. and FMS quantities.
- (3) Consider use of surge options to support industrial capability. A surge option allows the Government, prior to final delivery, to—
 - (i) Accelerate the contractor's production rate in accordance with a surge production plan or a delivery schedule provided by the contractor under the terms of the contract; and
 - (ii) Purchase additional quantities of supplies or services.
- (4) See DFARS subpart [217.74](#) for limitations on the use of undefinitized options.

PGI 217.207 Exercise of options.

Before exercising an option for firm-fixed-price contracts containing spare parts, the contracting officer shall perform a cost or price analysis of the proposed spare parts. The contracting officer shall use an appropriate sampling technique or request field pricing assistance, and document the contract file with the results of the cost or price analysis.

DFARS Procedures, Guidance, and Information

PGI 225--Foreign Acquisition

(Revised April 1, 2019)

PGI 225.73--ACQUISITIONS FOR FOREIGN MILITARY SALES

PGI 225.7300 Scope of subpart.

(a) The Foreign Military Sales (FMS) acquisition infrastructure is also used to execute cases funded with U.S. appropriated funds under special authority to build international partner capacity. These Building Partner Capacity (BPC) cases are implemented using Pseudo Letter of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) documents.

PGI 225.7301 General.

(c)(i) Separately identify known FMS requirements and the FMS customer in solicitations.

(ii) For economies of scale and efficiency, combine U.S. and FMS requirements under the same contract whenever possible. It is not in the taxpayer's interest to concurrently use mixed contract types for the same or similar items.

(iii) Clearly identify contracts for known FMS requirements by the case identifier code in section B of the Schedule.

(iv) Ensure that the FMS LOA terms and conditions are incorporated into the signed contract.

(v) Ensure that the shipping terms for any contract for FMS materiel are stated as free on board (f.o.b.) origin.

(vi) For Pseudo LOAs, ensure that the period of performance in the contract is consistent with the period of availability of appropriated funds, as provided by the financial resource manager.

(vii) Consistent with the Defense Transportation Regulations (DTR) 4500.9-R-Part II, Cargo Movement, <http://www.transcom.mil/dtr/part-ii/>, Appendix E, contracting officers shall ensure that contracts involving the acquisition and delivery of FMS materiel comply with the policies, procedures, packaging, labeling, and documentation requirements specified by the DTR.

(viii) The Government representative responsible for acceptance shall ensure that the contractor prepares material inspection and receiving reports in compliance with—

(A) Appendix F, F-301(b)(15)(iv)(K) for a Wide Area WorkFlow (WAWF) Receiving Report; or

DFARS Procedures, Guidance, and Information

PGI 225--Foreign Acquisition

(B) F-401(b)(16)(iv)(L) for a paper DD Form 250, Material Inspection and Receiving Report, if an exception to the use of WAWF at [232.7003](#) applies.

(ix) Prior to contract award, contracting officers shall ensure that—

(A) If a contracting officer's representative is assigned, detailed point of contact information (email, phone number with international dialing protocols, and physical and mailing address) shall be clearly visible;

(B) Unique country requirements are specified in the contract (i.e., additional documentation requirements for use in country customs clearance (Levy Exemption waiver));

(C) Commodity-unique requirements are specified in the contract (i.e., responsibility for obtaining/paying for/affixing active Radio Frequency Identification tags and Transportation Control Number construction/usage); and

(D) The FMS Transportation Accounting Code is stated in the contract.

PGI 225.7302 Preparation of Letter of Offer and Acceptance.

(2) The contracting officer shall—

(i) Assist the DoD implementing agency, as necessary, in preparation of the Letter of Offer and Acceptance;

(ii) Identify and explain all unusual contractual requirements or requests for deviations; and

(iii) Assist in preparing the price and availability data.

PGI 225.7303 Pricing acquisitions for FMS.

PGI 225.7303-2 Cost of doing business with a foreign government or an international organization.

(a)(3) *Offsets.*

(A) Offsets are the entire range of industrial and commercial benefits provided to foreign governments as an inducement or condition to purchase military supplies or services, including benefits such as coproduction, licensed production, subcontracting, technology transfer, in-country procurement, marketing and financial assistance, and joint ventures (Defense Offsets Disclosure Act of 1999, Pub. L. 106-113, section 1243(3)). There are two types of offsets: direct offsets and indirect offsets.

DFARS Procedures, Guidance, and Information

PGI 225--Foreign Acquisition

(i) A direct offset involves benefits, including supplies or services that are directly related to the item being purchased. For example, as a condition of a U.S. sale, the contractor may require or agree to permit the purchaser to produce in its country certain components or subsystems of the item being sold. Generally, direct offsets must be performed within a specified period because they are integral to the deliverable of the FMS contract.

(ii) An indirect offset involves benefits, including supplies or services that are unrelated to the item being purchased. For example, as a condition of a sale the contractor may agree to purchase certain of the customer's manufactured products, agricultural commodities, raw materials, or services. Indirect offsets may be accomplished without a clearly defined period of performance.

(B) Offset costs are the costs to the contractor of providing any direct or indirect offsets required (explicitly or implicitly) as a condition of purchase in a government-to-government sale of defense articles and/or defense services as defined by the Arms Export Control Act and the International Traffic in Arms Regulations.

(C) An offset agreement is the contractual arrangement between the FMS customer and the U.S. defense contractor that identifies the offset obligation imposed by the FMS customer that has been accepted by the U.S. defense contractor as a condition of the FMS customer's purchase. These agreements are distinct and independent of the LOA and the FMS contract. Further information about offsets and LOAs may be found in the Defense Security Cooperation Agency (DSCA) Security Assistance Management Manual (DSCA 5105.38-M), chapter 6, paragraph 6.3.9. (<http://samm.dsca.mil/chapter/chapter-6>).