

SUBPART 215.4—CONTRACT PRICING

(Revised April 26, 2007)

215.403 Obtaining cost or pricing data.

215.403-1 Prohibition on obtaining cost or pricing data.

(c) *Standards for exceptions from cost or pricing data requirements.*

(1) *Adequate price competition.* For acquisitions under dual or multiple source programs:

(A) The determination of adequate price competition must be made on a case-by-case basis. Even when adequate price competition exists, in certain cases it may be appropriate to obtain additional information to assist in price analysis.

(B) Adequate price competition normally exists when—

(i) Prices are solicited across a full range of step quantities, normally including a 0-100 percent split, from at least two offerors that are individually capable of producing the full quantity; and

(ii) The reasonableness of all prices awarded is clearly established on the basis of price analysis (see FAR 15.404-1(b)).

(3) *Commercial items.* By November 30th of each year, departments and agencies shall provide a report to the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy (DPAP), ATTN: DPAP/CPF, of all contracting officer determinations that commercial item exceptions apply under FAR 15.403-1(b)(3), during the previous fiscal year, for any contract, subcontract, or modification expected to have a value of \$15,000,000 or more. See PGI 215.403-1(c)(3) for the format and guidance for the report. The Director, DPAP, will submit a consolidated report to the congressional defense committees.

(4) *Waivers.*

(A) The head of the contracting activity may, without power of delegation, apply the exceptional circumstances authority when a determination is made that—

(1) The property or services cannot reasonably be obtained under the contract, subcontract, or modification, without the granting of the waiver;

(2) The price can be determined to be fair and reasonable without the submission of certified cost or pricing data; and

(3) There are demonstrated benefits to granting the waiver. See PGI 215.403-1(c)(4)(A) for guidance applicable to waivers for part of a proposal and unpriced options.

(B) By November 30th of each year, departments and agencies shall provide a report to the Director, DPAP, ATTN: DPAP/CPF, of all waivers granted under FAR

Part 215—Contracting By Negotiation

15.403-1(b)(4), during the previous fiscal year, for any contract, subcontract, or modification expected to have a value of \$15,000,000 or more. See PGI 215.403-1(c)(4)(B) for the format and guidance for the report. The Director, DPAP, will submit a consolidated report to the congressional defense committees.

(C) DoD has waived the requirement for submission of cost or pricing data for the Canadian Commercial Corporation and its subcontractors.

(D) DoD has waived cost or pricing data requirements for nonprofit organizations (including educational institutions) on cost-reimbursement-no-fee contracts. The contracting officer shall require—

(1) Submission of information other than cost or pricing data to the extent necessary to determine price reasonableness and cost realism; and

(2) Cost or pricing data from subcontractors that are not nonprofit organizations when the subcontractor's proposal exceeds the cost or pricing data threshold at FAR 15.403-4(a)(1).

215.403-5 Instructions for submission of cost or pricing data or information other than cost or pricing data.

When the solicitation requires contractor compliance with the Contractor Cost Data Reporting System, follow the procedures at PGI 215.403-5.

215.404 Proposal analysis.

215.404-1 Proposal analysis techniques.

(a) *General.* For spare parts or support equipment, perform an analysis of—

(i) Those line items where the proposed price exceeds by 25 percent or more the lowest price the Government has paid within the most recent 12-month period based on reasonably available information;

(ii) Those line items where a comparison of the item description and the proposed price indicates a potential for overpricing;

(iii) Significant high-dollar-value items. If there are no obvious high-dollar-value items, include an analysis of a random sample of items; and

(iv) A random sample of the remaining low-dollar value items. Sample size may be determined by subjective judgment, e.g., experience with the offeror and the reliability of its estimating and accounting systems.

215.404-2 Information to support proposal analysis.

See PGI 215.404-2 for guidance on obtaining field pricing or audit assistance.

215.404-3 Subcontract pricing considerations.

Follow the procedures at PGI 215.404-3 when reviewing a subcontractor's proposal.

215.404-4 Profit.

Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement

Part 215—Contracting By Negotiation

(b) *Policy.*

(1) Contracting officers shall use a structured approach for developing a prenegotiation profit or fee objective on any negotiated contract action when cost or pricing data is obtained, except for cost-plus-award-fee contracts (see 215.404-74, 216.405-2, and FAR 16.405-2) or contracts with Federally Funded Research and Development Centers (FFRDCs) (see 215.404-75). There are three structured approaches—

- (A) The weighted guidelines method;
- (B) The modified weighted guidelines method; and
- (C) An alternate structured approach.

(c) *Contracting officer responsibilities.*

(1) Also, do not perform a profit analysis when assessing cost realism in competitive acquisitions.

(2) When using a structured approach, the contracting officer—

(A) Shall use the weighted guidelines method (see 215.404-71), except as provided in paragraphs (c)(2)(B) and (c)(2)(C) of this subsection.

(B) Shall use the modified weighted guidelines method (see 215.404-72) on contract actions with nonprofit organizations other than FFRDCs.

(C) May use an alternate structured approach (see 215.404-73) when—

(1) The contract action is—

- (i) At or below the cost or pricing data threshold (see FAR 15.403-4(a)(1));
- (ii) For architect-engineer or construction work;
- (iii) Primarily for delivery of material from subcontractors; or
- (iv) A termination settlement; or

(2) The weighted guidelines method does not produce a reasonable overall profit objective and the head of the contracting activity approves use of the alternate approach in writing.

(D) Shall use the weighted guidelines method to establish a basic profit rate under a formula-type pricing agreement, and may then use the basic rate on all actions under the agreement, provided that conditions affecting profit do not change.

(E) Shall document the profit analysis in the contract file.

Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement

Part 215—Contracting By Negotiation

(5) Although specific agreement on the applied weights or values for individual profit factors shall not be attempted, the contracting officer may encourage the contractor to—

(A) Present the details of its proposed profit amounts in the weighted guidelines format or similar structured approach; and

(B) Use the weighted guidelines method in developing profit objectives for negotiated subcontracts.

(6) The contracting officer must also verify that relevant variables have not materially changed (e.g., performance risk, interest rates, progress payment rates, distribution of facilities capital).

(d) *Profit-analysis factors.*

(1) *Common factors.* The common factors are embodied in the DoD structured approaches and need not be further considered by the contracting officer.

215.404-70 DD Form 1547, Record of Weighted Guidelines Method Application.

Follow the procedures at PGI 215.404-70 for use of DD Form 1547 whenever a structured approach to profit analysis is required.

215.404-71 Weighted guidelines method.

215.404-71-1 General.

(a) The weighted guidelines method focuses on four profit factors—

(1) Performance risk;

(2) Contract type risk;

(3) Facilities capital employed; and

(4) Cost efficiency.

(b) The contracting officer assigns values to each profit factor; the value multiplied by the base results in the profit objective for that factor. Except for the cost efficiency special factor, each profit factor has a normal value and a designated range of values. The normal value is representative of average conditions on the prospective contract when compared to all goods and services acquired by DoD. The designated range provides values based on above normal or below normal conditions. In the price negotiation documentation, the contracting officer need not explain assignment of the normal value, but should address conditions that justify assignment of other than the normal value. The cost efficiency special factor has no normal value. The contracting officer shall exercise sound business judgment in selecting a value when this special factor is used (see 215.404-71-5).

215.404-71-2 Performance risk.

Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement

Part 215—Contracting By Negotiation

(a) *Description.* This profit factor addresses the contractor's degree of risk in fulfilling the contract requirements. The factor consists of two parts:

- (1) Technical--the technical uncertainties of performance.
- (2) Management/cost control--the degree of management effort necessary--
 - (i) To ensure that contract requirements are met; and
 - (ii) To reduce and control costs.

(b) *Determination.* The following extract from the DD Form 1547 is annotated to describe the process.

| Item | Contractor Risk Factors | Assigned Weighting | Assigned Value | Base (Item 20) | Profit Objective |
|------|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|
| 21. | Technical | (1) | (2) | N/A | N/A |
| 22. | Management/ Cost Control | (1) | (2) | N/A | N/A |
| 23. | Performance Risk (Composite) | N/A | (3) | (4) | (5) |

(1) Assign a weight (percentage) to each element according to its input to the total performance risk. The total of the two weights equals 100 percent.

(2) Select a value for each element from the list in paragraph (c) of this subsection using the evaluation criteria in paragraphs (d) and (e) of this subsection.

(3) Compute the composite as shown in the following example:

| | Assigned Weighting | Assigned Value | Weighted Value |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Technical | 60% | 5.0% | 3.0% |
| Management/ Cost Control | 40% | 4.0% | 1.6% |
| Composite Value | 100% | | 4.6% |

(4) Insert the amount from Block 20 of the DD Form 1547. Block 20 is total contract costs, excluding facilities capital cost of money.

(5) Multiply (3) by (4).

(c) *Values: Normal and designated ranges.*

Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement

Part 215—Contracting By Negotiation

| | Normal Value | Designated Range |
|----------------------|--------------|------------------|
| Standard | 5% | 3% to 7% |
| Technology Incentive | 9% | 7% to 11% |

(1) Standard. The standard designated range should apply to most contracts.

(2) Technology incentive. For the technical factor only, contracting officers may use the technology incentive range for acquisitions that include development, production, or application of innovative new technologies. The technology incentive range does not apply to efforts restricted to studies, analyses, or demonstrations that have a technical report as their primary deliverable.

(d) *Evaluation criteria for technical.*

(1) Review the contract requirements and focus on the critical performance elements in the statement of work or specifications. Factors to consider include—

- (i) Technology being applied or developed by the contractor;
- (ii) Technical complexity;
- (iii) Program maturity;
- (iv) Performance specifications and tolerances;
- (v) Delivery schedule; and
- (vi) Extent of a warranty or guarantee.

(2) Above normal conditions.

(i) The contracting officer may assign a higher than normal value in those cases where there is a substantial technical risk. Indicators are—

(A) Items are being manufactured using specifications with stringent tolerance limits;

(B) The efforts require highly skilled personnel or require the use of state-of-the-art machinery;

(C) The services and analytical efforts are extremely important to the Government and must be performed to exacting standards;

(D) The contractor's independent development and investment has reduced the Government's risk or cost;

(E) The contractor has accepted an accelerated delivery schedule to meet DoD requirements; or

Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement

Part 215—Contracting By Negotiation

(F) The contractor has assumed additional risk through warranty provisions.

(ii) Extremely complex, vital efforts to overcome difficult technical obstacles that require personnel with exceptional abilities, experience, and professional credentials may justify a value significantly above normal.

(iii) The following may justify a maximum value—

(A) Development or initial production of a new item, particularly if performance or quality specifications are tight; or

(B) A high degree of development or production concurrency.

(3) Below normal conditions.

(i) The contracting officer may assign a lower than normal value in those cases where the technical risk is low. Indicators are—

(A) Requirements are relatively simple;

(B) Technology is not complex;

(C) Efforts do not require highly skilled personnel;

(D) Efforts are routine;

(E) Programs are mature; or

(F) Acquisition is a follow-on effort or a repetitive type acquisition.

(ii) The contracting officer may assign a value significantly below normal for—

(A) Routine services;

(B) Production of simple items;

(C) Rote entry or routine integration of Government-furnished information; or

(D) Simple operations with Government-furnished property.

(4) Technology incentive range.

(i) The contracting officer may assign values within the technology incentive range when contract performance includes the introduction of new, significant technological innovation. Use the technology incentive range only for the most innovative contract efforts. Innovation may be in the form of--

Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement

Part 215—Contracting By Negotiation

(A) Development or application of new technology that fundamentally changes the characteristics of an existing product or system and that results in increased technical performance, improved reliability, or reduced costs; or

(B) New products or systems that contain significant technological advances over the products or systems they are replacing.

(ii) When selecting a value within the technology incentive range, the contracting officer should consider the relative value of the proposed innovation to the acquisition as a whole. When the innovation represents a minor benefit, the contracting officer should consider using values less than the norm. For innovative efforts that will have a major positive impact on the product or program, the contracting officer may use values above the norm.

(e) *Evaluation criteria for management/cost control.*

(1) The contracting officer should evaluate--

(i) The contractor's management and internal control systems using contracting office information and reviews made by field contract administration offices or other DoD field offices;

(ii) The management involvement expected on the prospective contract action;

(iii) The degree of cost mix as an indication of the types of resources applied and value added by the contractor;

(iv) The contractor's support of Federal socioeconomic programs;

(v) The expected reliability of the contractor's cost estimates (including the contractor's cost estimating system);

(vi) The adequacy of the contractor's management approach to controlling cost and schedule; and

(vii) Any other factors that affect the contractor's ability to meet the cost targets (e.g., foreign currency exchange rates and inflation rates).

(2) Above normal conditions.

(i) The contracting officer may assign a higher than normal value when there is a high degree of management effort. Indicators of this are—

(A) The contractor's value added is both considerable and reasonably difficult;

(B) The effort involves a high degree of integration or coordination;

(C) The contractor has a good record of past performance;

Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement

Part 215—Contracting By Negotiation

(D) The contractor has a substantial record of active participation in Federal socioeconomic programs;

estimates; (E) The contractor provides fully documented and reliable cost

(F) The contractor makes appropriate make-or-buy decisions; or

(G) The contractor has a proven record of cost tracking and control.

(ii) The contracting officer may justify a maximum value when the effort—

(A) Requires large scale integration of the most complex nature;

(B) Involves major international activities with significant management coordination (e.g., offsets with foreign vendors); or

(C) Has critically important milestones.

(3) Below normal conditions.

(i) The contracting officer may assign a lower than normal value when the management effort is minimal. Indicators of this are—

made; (A) The program is mature and many end item deliveries have been

(B) The contractor adds minimal value to an item;

(C) The efforts are routine and require minimal supervision;

(D) The contractor provides poor quality, untimely proposals;

subcontractor costs; (E) The contractor fails to provide an adequate analysis of

of the proposal; (F) The contractor does not cooperate in the evaluation and negotiation

(G) The contractor's cost estimating system is marginal;

programs; (H) The contractor has made minimal effort to initiate cost reduction

(I) The contractor's cost proposal is inadequate;

unreliable cost estimates and lack of cost control; or

(K) The contractor has a poor record of past performance.

(ii) The following may justify a value significantly below normal—

Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement

Part 215—Contracting By Negotiation

(A) Reviews performed by the field contract administration offices disclose unsatisfactory management and internal control systems (e.g., quality assurance, property control, safety, security); or

(B) The effort requires an unusually low degree of management involvement.

215.404-71-3 Contract type risk and working capital adjustment.

(a) *Description.* The contract type risk factor focuses on the degree of cost risk accepted by the contractor under varying contract types. The working capital adjustment is an adjustment added to the profit objective for contract type risk. It only applies to fixed-price contracts that provide for progress payments. Though it uses a formula approach, it is not intended to be an exact calculation of the cost of working capital. Its purpose is to give general recognition to the contractor's cost of working capital under varying contract circumstances, financing policies, and the economic environment.

(b) *Determination.* The following extract from the DD 1547 is annotated to explain the process.

| Item | Contractor Risk Factors | Assigned Value | Base (Item 20) | Profit Objective |
|------|-------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|
| 24. | Contract Type Risk | (1) | (2) | (3) |

| | | Cost Financed | Length Factor | Interest Rate | |
|-----|---------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-----|
| 25. | Working Capital (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |

(1) Select a value from the list of contract types in paragraph (c) of this subsection using the evaluation criteria in paragraph (d) of this subsection.

(2) Insert the amount from Block 20, i.e., the total allowable costs excluding facilities capital cost of money.

(3) Multiply (1) by (2).

(4) Only complete this block when the prospective contract is a fixed-price contract containing provisions for progress payments.

(5) Insert the amount computed per paragraph (e) of this subsection.

(6) Insert the appropriate figure from paragraph (f) of this subsection.

Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement

Part 215—Contracting By Negotiation

(7) Use the interest rate established by the Secretary of the Treasury (see http://www.treasurydirect.gov/govt/rates/tcir/tcir_opdirsemi.htm). Do not use any other interest rate.

(8) Multiply (5) by (6) by (7). This is the working capital adjustment. It shall not exceed 4 percent of the contract costs in Block 20.

(c) *Values: Normal and designated ranges.*

| Contract Type | Notes | Normal Value (percent) | Designated Range (percent) |
|--|-------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Firm-fixed-price, no financing | (1) | 5 | 4 to 6. |
| Firm-fixed-price, with performance-based payments | (6) | 4 | 2.5 to 5.5. |
| Firm-fixed-price, with progress payments | (2) | 3 | 2 to 4. |
| Fixed-price incentive, no financing | (1) | 3 | 2 to 4. |
| Fixed-price incentive, with performance-based payments | (6) | 2 | 0.5 to 3.5. |
| Fixed-price with redetermination provision | (3) | | |
| Fixed-price incentive, with progress payments | (2) | 1 | 0 to 2. |
| Cost-plus-incentive-fee | (4) | 1 | 0 to 2. |
| Cost-plus-fixed-fee | (4) | .5 | 0 to 1. |
| Time-and-materials (including overhaul contracts priced on time-and-materials basis) | (5) | .5 | 0 to 1. |
| Labor-hour | (5) | .5 | 0 to 1. |
| Firm-fixed-price, level-of-effort | (5) | .5 | 0 to 1. |

(1) “No financing” means either that the contract does not provide progress payments or performance-based payments, or that the contract provides them only on a limited basis, such as financing of first articles. Do not compute a working capital adjustment.

(2) When the contract contains provisions for progress payments, compute a working capital adjustment (Block 25).

(3) For the purposes of assigning profit values, treat a fixed-price contract with redetermination provisions as if it were a fixed-price incentive contract with below normal conditions.

(4) Cost-plus contracts shall not receive the working capital adjustment.

Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement

Part 215—Contracting By Negotiation

(5) These types of contracts are considered cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts for the purposes of assigning profit values. They shall not receive the working capital adjustment in Block 25. However, they may receive higher than normal values within the designated range to the extent that portions of cost are fixed.

(6) When the contract contains provisions for performance-based payments, do not compute a working capital adjustment.

(d) *Evaluation criteria.*

(1) General. The contracting officer should consider elements that affect contract type risk such as—

- (i) Length of contract;
- (ii) Adequacy of cost data for projections;
- (iii) Economic environment;
- (iv) Nature and extent of subcontracted activity;
- (v) Protection provided to the contractor under contract provisions (e.g., economic price adjustment clauses);
- (vi) The ceilings and share lines contained in incentive provisions;
- (vii) Risks associated with contracts for foreign military sales (FMS) that are not funded by U.S. appropriations; and
- (viii) When the contract contains provisions for performance-based payments—
 - (A) The frequency of payments;
 - (B) The total amount of payments compared to the maximum allowable amount specified at FAR 32.1004(b)(2); and
 - (C) The risk of the payment schedule to the contractor.

(2) Mandatory. The contracting officer shall assess the extent to which costs have been incurred prior to definitization of the contract action (also see 217.7404-6(a)). The assessment shall include any reduced contractor risk on both the contract before definitization and the remaining portion of the contract. When costs have been incurred prior to definitization, generally regard the contract type risk to be in the low end of the designated range. If a substantial portion of the costs have been incurred prior to definitization, the contracting officer may assign a value as low as 0 percent, regardless of contract type.

(3) Above normal conditions. The contracting officer may assign a higher than normal value when there is substantial contract type risk. Indicators of this are—

Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement

Part 215—Contracting By Negotiation

- (i) Efforts where there is minimal cost history;
- (ii) Long-term contracts without provisions protecting the contractor, particularly when there is considerable economic uncertainty;
- (iii) Incentive provisions (e.g., cost and performance incentives) that place a high degree of risk on the contractor;
- (iv) FMS sales (other than those under DoD cooperative logistics support arrangements or those made from U.S. Government inventories or stocks) where the contractor can demonstrate that there are substantial risks above those normally present in DoD contracts for similar items; or
- (v) An aggressive performance-based payment schedule that increases risk.

(4) Below normal conditions. The contracting officer may assign a lower than normal value when the contract type risk is low. Indicators of this are—

- (i) Very mature product line with extensive cost history;
- (ii) Relatively short-term contracts;
- (iii) Contractual provisions that substantially reduce the contractor's risk;
- (iv) Incentive provisions that place a low degree of risk on the contractor;
- (v) Performance-based payments totaling the maximum allowable amount(s) specified at FAR 32.1004(b)(2); or
- (vi) A performance-based payment schedule that is routine with minimal risk.

(e) *Costs financed*.

(1) Costs financed equal total costs multiplied by the portion (percent) of costs financed by the contractor.

(2) Total costs equal Block 20 (i.e., all allowable costs excluding facilities capital cost of money), reduced as appropriate when—

- (i) The contractor has little cash investment (e.g., subcontractor progress payments liquidated late in period of performance);
- (ii) Some costs are covered by special financing provisions, such as advance payments; or
- (iii) The contract is multiyear and there are special funding arrangements.

(3) The portion that the contractor finances is generally the portion not covered by progress payments, i.e., 100 percent minus the customary progress payment rate (see FAR 32.501). For example, if a contractor receives progress payments at 80 percent, the portion that the contractor finances is 20 percent. On contracts that

Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement

Part 215—Contracting By Negotiation

provide progress payments to small businesses, use the customary progress payment rate for large businesses.

(f) *Contract length factor.*

(1) This is the period of time that the contractor has a working capital investment in the contract. It—

(i) Is based on the time necessary for the contractor to complete the substantive portion of the work;

(ii) Is not necessarily the period of time between contract award and final delivery (or final payment), as periods of minimal effort should be excluded;

(iii) Should not include periods of performance contained in option provisions; and

(iv) Should not, for multiyear contracts, include periods of performance beyond that required to complete the initial program year's requirements.

(2) The contracting officer—

(i) Should use the following table to select the contract length factor;

(ii) Should develop a weighted average contract length when the contract has multiple deliveries; and

(iii) May use sampling techniques provided they produce a representative result.

| TABLE | |
|---|------------------------|
| Period to Perform Substantive Portion (in months) | Contract Length Factor |
| 21 or less | .40 |
| 22 to 27 | .65 |
| 28 to 33 | .90 |
| 34 to 39 | 1.15 |
| 40 to 45 | 1.40 |
| 46 to 51 | 1.65 |
| 52 to 57 | 1.90 |
| 58 to 63 | 2.15 |
| 64 to 69 | 2.40 |
| 70 to 75 | 2.65 |
| 76 or more | 2.90 |

(3) Example: A prospective contract has a performance period of 40 months with end items being delivered in the 34th, 36th, 38th, and 40th months of the contract. The average period is 37 months and the contract length factor is 1.15.

215.404-71-4 Facilities capital employed.

(a) *Description.* This factor focuses on encouraging and rewarding capital investment in facilities that benefit DoD. It recognizes both the facilities capital that the contractor will employ in contract performance and the contractor's commitment to improving productivity.

(b) *Contract facilities capital estimates.* The contracting officer shall estimate the facilities capital cost of money and capital employed using—

(1) An analysis of the appropriate Forms CASB-CMF and cost of money factors (48 CFR 9904.414 and FAR 31.205-10); and

(2) DD Form 1861, Contract Facilities Capital Cost of Money.

(c) *Use of DD Form 1861.* See PGI 215.404-71-4(c) for obtaining field pricing support for preparing DD Form 1861.

(1) *Purpose.* The DD Form 1861 provides a means of linking the Form CASB-CMF and DD Form 1547, Record of Weighted Guidelines Application. It—

(i) Enables the contracting officer to differentiate profit objectives for various types of assets (land, buildings, equipment). The procedure is similar to applying overhead rates to appropriate overhead allocation bases to determine contract overhead costs.

(ii) Is designed to record and compute the contract facilities capital cost of money and capital employed which is carried forward to DD Form 1547.

(2) *Completion instructions.* Complete a DD Form 1861 only after evaluating the contractor's cost proposal, establishing cost of money factors, and establishing a prenegotiation objective on cost. Complete the form as follows:

(i) List overhead pools and direct-charging service centers (if used) in the same structure as they appear on the contractor's cost proposal and Form CASB-CMF. The structure and allocation base units-of-measure must be compatible on all three displays.

(ii) Extract appropriate contract overhead allocation base data, by year, from the evaluated cost breakdown or prenegotiation cost objective and list against each overhead pool and direct-charging service center.

(iii) Multiply each allocation base by its corresponding cost of money factor to get the facilities capital cost of money estimated to be incurred each year. The sum of these products represents the estimated contract facilities capital cost of money for the year's effort.

(iv) Total contract facilities cost of money is the sum of the yearly amounts.

(v) Since the facilities capital cost of money factors reflect the applicable cost of money rate in Column 1 of Form CASB-CMF, divide the contract cost of money by that same rate to determine the contract facilities capital employed.

Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement

Part 215—Contracting By Negotiation

(d) *Preaward facilities capital applications.* To establish cost and price objectives, apply the facilities capital cost of money and capital employed as follows:

(1) *Cost of Money.*

(i) Cost Objective. Use the imputed facilities capital cost of money, with normal, booked costs, to establish a cost objective or the target cost when structuring an incentive type contract. Do not adjust target costs established at the outset even though actual cost of money rates become available during the period of contract performance.

(ii) Profit Objective. When measuring the contractor's effort for the purpose of establishing a prenegotiation profit objective, restrict the cost base to normal, booked costs. Do not include cost of money as part of the cost base.

(2) *Facilities Capital Employed.* Assess and weight the profit objective for risk associated with facilities capital employed in accordance with the profit guidelines at 215.404-71-4.

(e) *Determination.* The following extract from the DD Form 1547 has been annotated to explain the process.

| Item | Contractor Facilities Capital Employed | Assigned Value | Amount Employed | Profit Objective |
|------|--|----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| 26. | Land | N/A | (2) | N/A |
| 27. | Buildings | N/A | (2) | N/A |
| 28. | Equipment | (1) | (2) | (3) |

(1) Select a value from the list in paragraph (c) of this subsection using the evaluation criteria in paragraph (d) of this subsection.

(2) Use the allocated facilities capital attributable to land, buildings, and equipment, as derived in DD Form 1861, Contract Facilities Capital Cost of Money.

(i) In addition to the net book value of facilities capital employed, consider facilities capital that is part of a formal investment plan if the contractor submits reasonable evidence that—

(A) Achievable benefits to DoD will result from the investment; and

(B) The benefits of the investment are included in the forward pricing structure.

(ii) If the value of intracompany transfers has been included in Block 20 at cost (i.e., excluding general and administrative (G&A) expenses and profit), add to the contractor's allocated facilities capital, the allocated facilities capital attributable to the buildings and equipment of those corporate divisions supplying the intracompany transfers. Do not make this addition if the value of intracompany transfers has been included in Block 20 at price (i.e., including G&A expenses and profit).

Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement

Part 215—Contracting By Negotiation

(3) Multiply (1) by (2).

(f) *Values: Normal and designated ranges.*

| Asset Type | Normal Value | Designated Range |
|------------|--------------|------------------|
| Land | 0% | N/A |
| Buildings | 0% | N/A |
| Equipment | 17.5% | 10% to 25% |

(g) *Evaluation criteria.*

(1) In evaluating facilities capital employed, the contracting officer—

(i) Should relate the usefulness of the facilities capital to the goods or services being acquired under the prospective contract;

(ii) Should analyze the productivity improvements and other anticipated industrial base enhancing benefits resulting from the facilities capital investment, including—

(A) The economic value of the facilities capital, such as physical age, undepreciated value, idleness, and expected contribution to future defense needs; and

(B) The contractor's level of investment in defense related facilities as compared with the portion of the contractor's total business that is derived from DoD; and

(iii) Should consider any contractual provisions that reduce the contractor's risk of investment recovery, such as termination protection clauses and capital investment indemnification.

(2) Above normal conditions.

(i) The contracting officer may assign a higher than normal value if the facilities capital investment has direct, identifiable, and exceptional benefits. Indicators are—

(A) New investments in state-of-the-art technology that reduce acquisition cost or yield other tangible benefits such as improved product quality or accelerated deliveries; or

(B) Investments in new equipment for research and development applications.

(ii) The contracting officer may assign a value significantly above normal when there are direct and measurable benefits in efficiency and significantly reduced acquisition costs on the effort being priced. Maximum values apply only to those cases where the benefits of the facilities capital investment are substantially above normal.

(3) Below normal conditions.

Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement

Part 215—Contracting By Negotiation

(i) The contracting officer may assign a lower than normal value if the facilities capital investment has little benefit to DoD. Indicators are—

- (A) Allocations of capital apply predominantly to commercial item lines;
- (B) Investments are for such things as furniture and fixtures, home or group level administrative offices, corporate aircraft and hangars, gymnasiums; or
- (C) Facilities are old or extensively idle.

(ii) The contracting officer may assign a value significantly below normal when a significant portion of defense manufacturing is done in an environment characterized by outdated, inefficient, and labor-intensive capital equipment.

215.404-71-5 Cost efficiency factor.

(a) This special factor provides an incentive for contractors to reduce costs. To the extent that the contractor can demonstrate cost reduction efforts that benefit the pending contract, the contracting officer may increase the prenegotiation profit objective by an amount not to exceed 4 percent of total objective cost (Block 20 of the DD Form 1547) to recognize these efforts (Block 29).

(b) To determine if using this factor is appropriate, the contracting officer shall consider criteria, such as the following, to evaluate the benefit the contractor's cost reduction efforts will have on the pending contract:

- (1) The contractor's participation in Single Process Initiative improvements;
 - (2) Actual cost reductions achieved on prior contracts;
 - (3) Reduction or elimination of excess or idle facilities;
 - (4) The contractor's cost reduction initiatives (e.g., competition advocacy programs, technical insertion programs, obsolete parts control programs, spare parts pricing reform, value engineering, outsourcing of functions such as information technology). Metrics developed by the contractor such as fully loaded labor hours (i.e., cost per labor hour, including all direct and indirect costs) or other productivity measures may provide the basis for assessing the effectiveness of the contractor's cost reduction initiatives over time;
 - (5) The contractor's adoption of process improvements to reduce costs;
 - (6) Subcontractor cost reduction efforts;
 - (7) The contractor's effective incorporation of commercial items and processes;
- or
- (8) The contractor's investment in new facilities when such investments contribute to better asset utilization or improved productivity.

(c) When selecting the percentage to use for this special factor, the contracting officer has maximum flexibility in determining the best way to evaluate the benefit the contractor's cost reduction efforts will have on the pending contract. However, the contracting officer shall consider the impact that quantity differences, learning, changes in scope, and economic factors such as inflation and deflation will have on cost reduction.

215.404-72 Modified weighted guidelines method for nonprofit organizations other than FFRDCs.

(a) *Definition.* As used in this subpart, a nonprofit organization is a business entity—

- (1) That operates exclusively for charitable, scientific, or educational purposes;
- (2) Whose earnings do not benefit any private shareholder or individual;
- (3) Whose activities do not involve influencing legislation or political campaigning for any candidate for public office; and
- (4) That is exempted from Federal income taxation under section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code.

(b) For nonprofit organizations that are entities that have been identified by the Secretary of Defense or a Secretary of a Department as receiving sustaining support on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis from a particular DoD department or agency, compute a fee objective for covered actions using the weighted guidelines method in 215.404-71, with the following modifications:

- (1) *Modifications to performance risk (Blocks 21-23 of the DD Form 1547).*
 - (i) If the contracting officer assigns a value from the standard designated range (see 215.404-71-2(c)), reduce the fee objective by an amount equal to 1 percent of the costs in Block 20 of the DD Form 1547. Show the net (reduced) amount on the DD Form 1547.
 - (ii) Do not assign a value from the technology incentive designated range.
- (2) *Modifications to contract type risk (Block 24 of the DD Form 1547).* Use a designated range of -1 percent to 0 percent instead of the values in 215.404-71-3. There is no normal value.

(c) For all other nonprofit organizations except FFRDCs, compute a fee objective for covered actions using the weighted guidelines method in 215.404-71, modified as described in paragraph (b)(1) of this subsection.

215.404-73 Alternate structured approaches.

(a) The contracting officer may use an alternate structured approach under 215.404-4(c).

Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement

Part 215—Contracting By Negotiation

(b) The contracting officer may design the structure of the alternate, but it shall include—

(1) Consideration of the three basic components of profit--performance risk, contract type risk (including working capital), and facilities capital employed. However, the contracting officer is not required to complete Blocks 21 through 30 of the DD Form 1547.

(2) Offset for facilities capital cost of money.

(i) The contracting officer shall reduce the overall prenegotiation profit objective by the amount of facilities capital cost of money under Cost Accounting Standard (CAS) 414, Cost of Money as an Element of the Cost of Facilities Capital (48 CFR 9904.414). Cost of money under CAS 417, Cost of Money as an Element of the Cost of Capital Assets Under Construction (48 CFR 9904.417), should not be used to reduce the overall prenegotiation profit objective. The profit amount in the negotiation summary of the DD Form 1547 must be net of the offset.

(ii) This adjustment is needed for the following reason: The values of the profit factors used in the weighted guidelines method were adjusted to recognize the shift in facilities capital cost of money from an element of profit to an element of contract cost (see FAR 31.205-10) and reductions were made directly to the profit factors for performance risk. In order to ensure that this policy is applied to all DoD contracts that allow facilities capital cost of money, similar adjustments shall be made to contracts that use alternate structured approaches.

215.404-74 Fee requirements for cost-plus-award-fee contracts.

In developing a fee objective for cost-plus-award-fee contracts, the contracting officer shall—

(a) Follow the guidance in FAR 16.405-2 and 216.405-2;

(b) Not use the weighted guidelines method or alternate structured approach;

(c) Apply the offset policy in 215.404-73(b)(2) for facilities capital cost of money, i.e., reduce the base fee by the amount of facilities capital cost of money; and

(d) Not complete a DD Form 1547.

215.404-75 Fee requirements for FFRDCs.

For nonprofit organizations that are FFRDCs, the contracting officer—

(a) Should consider whether any fee is appropriate. Considerations shall include the FFRDC's—

(1) Proportion of retained earnings (as established under generally accepted accounting methods) that relates to DoD contracted effort;

(2) Facilities capital acquisition plans;

(3) Working capital funding as assessed on operating cycle cash needs; and

(4) Provision for funding unreimbursed costs deemed ordinary and necessary to the FFRDC.

(b) Shall, when a fee is considered appropriate, establish the fee objective in accordance with FFRDC fee policies in the DoD FFRDC Management Plan.

(c) Shall not use the weighted guidelines method or an alternate structured approach.

215.404-76 Reporting profit and fee statistics.

Follow the procedures at PGI 215.404-76 for reporting profit and fee statistics.

215.406-1 Prenegotiation objectives.

Follow the procedures at PGI 215.406-1 for establishing prenegotiation objectives.

215.406-3 Documenting the negotiation.

Follow the procedures at PGI 215.406-3 for documenting the negotiation.

215.407-2 Make-or-buy programs.

(e) *Program requirements.*

(1) *Items and work included.* The minimum dollar amount is \$1 million.

215.407-3 Forward pricing rate agreements.

(b)(i) Use forward pricing rate agreement (FPRA) rates when such rates are available, unless waived on a case-by-case basis by the head of the contracting activity.

(ii) Advise the ACO of each case waived.

(iii) Contact the ACO for questions on FPRAs or recommended rates.

215.407-4 Should-cost review.

See PGI 215.407-4 for guidance on determining whether to perform a program or overhead should-cost review.

215.407-5 Estimating systems.

215.407-5-70 Disclosure, maintenance, and review requirements.

(a) *Definitions.*

(1) “Acceptable estimating system” is defined in the clause at 252.215-7002, Cost Estimating System Requirements.

(2) “Contractor” means a business unit as defined in FAR 2.101.

(3) “Estimating system” is as defined in the clause at 252.215-7002, Cost Estimating System Requirements.

Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement

Part 215—Contracting By Negotiation

(4) “Significant estimating system deficiency” means a shortcoming in the estimating system that is likely to consistently result in proposal estimates for total cost or a major cost element(s) that do not provide an acceptable basis for negotiation of fair and reasonable prices.

(b) *Applicability.*

(1) DoD policy is that all contractors have acceptable estimating systems that consistently produce well-supported proposals that are acceptable as a basis for negotiation of fair and reasonable prices.

(2) A large business contractor is subject to estimating system disclosure, maintenance, and review requirements if—

(i) In its preceding fiscal year, the contractor received DoD prime contracts or subcontracts totaling \$50 million or more for which cost or pricing data were required; or

(ii) In its preceding fiscal year, the contractor received DoD prime contracts or subcontracts totaling \$10 million or more (but less than \$50 million) for which cost or pricing data were required and the contracting officer, with concurrence or at the request of the ACO, determines it to be in the best interest of the Government (e.g., significant estimating problems are believed to exist or the contractor's sales are predominantly Government).

(c) *Responsibilities.*

(1) The contracting officer shall—

(i) Through use of the clause at 252.215-7002, Cost Estimating System Requirements, apply the disclosure, maintenance, and review requirements to large business contractors meeting the criteria in paragraph (b)(2)(i) of this subsection;

(ii) Consider whether to apply the disclosure, maintenance, and review requirements to large business contractors under paragraph (b)(2)(ii) of this subsection; and

(iii) Not apply the disclosure, maintenance, and review requirements to other than large business contractors.

(2) The cognizant ACO, for contractors subject to paragraph (b)(2) of this subsection, shall—

(i) Determine the acceptability of the disclosure and system; and

(ii) Pursue correction of any deficiencies.

(3) The cognizant auditor, on behalf of the ACO, serves as team leader in conducting estimating system reviews.

(4) A contractor subject to estimating system disclosure, maintenance, and review requirements shall—

Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement

Part 215—Contracting By Negotiation

- (i) Maintain an acceptable system;
- (ii) Describe its system to the ACO;
- (iii) Provide timely notice of changes in the system; and
- (iv) Correct system deficiencies identified by the ACO.

(d) *Characteristics of an acceptable estimating system.*

(1) General. An acceptable system should provide for the use of appropriate source data, utilize sound estimating techniques and good judgment, maintain a consistent approach, and adhere to established policies and procedures.

(2) Evaluation. In evaluating the acceptability of a contractor's estimating system, the ACO should consider whether the contractor's estimating system, for example—

(i) Establishes clear responsibility for preparation, review, and approval of cost estimates;

(ii) Provides a written description of the organization and duties of the personnel responsible for preparing, reviewing, and approving cost estimates;

(iii) Assures that relevant personnel have sufficient training, experience, and guidance to perform estimating tasks in accordance with the contractor's established procedures;

(iv) Identifies the sources of data and the estimating methods and rationale used in developing cost estimates;

(v) Provides for appropriate supervision throughout the estimating process;

(vi) Provides for consistent application of estimating techniques;

(vii) Provides for detection and timely correction of errors;

(viii) Protects against cost duplication and omissions;

(ix) Provides for the use of historical experience, including historical vendor pricing information, where appropriate;

(x) Requires use of appropriate analytical methods;

(xi) Integrates information available from other management systems, where appropriate;

(xii) Requires management review including verification that the company's estimating policies, procedures, and practices comply with this regulation;

Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement

Part 215—Contracting By Negotiation

(xiii) Provides for internal review of and accountability for the acceptability of the estimating system, including the comparison of projected results to actual results and an analysis of any differences;

(xiv) Provides procedures to update cost estimates in a timely manner throughout the negotiation process; and

(xv) Addresses responsibility for review and analysis of the reasonableness of subcontract prices.

(3) Indicators of potentially significant estimating deficiencies. The following examples indicate conditions that may produce or lead to significant estimating deficiencies—

(i) Failure to ensure that historical experience is available to and utilized by cost estimators, where appropriate;

(ii) Continuing failure to analyze material costs or failure to perform subcontractor cost reviews as required;

(iii) Consistent absence of analytical support for significant proposed cost amounts;

(iv) Excessive reliance on individual personal judgment where historical experience or commonly utilized standards are available;

(v) Recurring significant defective pricing findings within the same cost element(s);

(vi) Failure to integrate relevant parts of other management systems (e.g., production control or cost accounting) with the estimating system so that the ability to generate reliable cost estimates is impaired; and

(vii) Failure to provide established policies, procedures, and practices to persons responsible for preparing and supporting estimates.

(e) *Review procedures.* Follow the procedures at PGI 215.407-5-70(e) for establishing and conducting estimating system reviews.

(f) *Disposition of survey team findings.* Follow the procedures at PGI 215.407-5-70(f) for disposition of the survey team findings.

(g) *Impact of estimating system deficiencies on specific proposals.*

(1) Field pricing teams will discuss identified estimating system deficiencies and their impact in all reports on contractor proposals until the deficiencies are resolved.

(2) The contracting officer responsible for negotiation of a proposal generated by an estimating system with an identified deficiency shall evaluate whether the deficiency impacts the negotiations. If it does not, the contracting officer should proceed

Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement

Part 215—Contracting By Negotiation

with negotiations. If it does, the contracting officer should consider other alternatives, e.g.—

- (i) Allowing the contractor additional time to correct the estimating system deficiency and submit a corrected proposal;
- (ii) Considering another type of contract, e.g., FPIF instead of FFP;
- (iii) Using additional cost analysis techniques to determine the reasonableness of the cost elements affected by the system's deficiency;
- (iv) Segregating the questionable areas as a cost reimbursable line item;
- (v) Reducing the negotiation objective for profit or fee; or
- (vi) Including a contract (reopener) clause that provides for adjustment of the contract amount after award.

(3) The contracting officer who incorporates a reopener clause into the contract is responsible for negotiating price adjustments required by the clause. Any reopener clause necessitated by an estimating deficiency should—

- (i) Clearly identify the amounts and items that are in question at the time of negotiation;
- (ii) Indicate a specific time or subsequent event by which the contractor will submit a supplemental proposal, including cost or pricing data, identifying the cost impact adjustment necessitated by the deficient estimating system;
- (iii) Provide for the contracting officer to unilaterally adjust the contract price if the contractor fails to submit the supplemental proposal; and
- (iv) Provide that failure of the Government and the contractor to agree to the price adjustment shall be a dispute under the Disputes clause.

215.408 Solicitation provisions and contract clauses.

(1) Use the clause at 252.215-7000, Pricing Adjustments, in solicitations and contracts that contain the clause at—

- (i) FAR 52.215-11, Price Reduction for Defective Cost or Pricing Data--Modifications;
- (ii) FAR 52.215-12, Subcontractor Cost or Pricing Data; or
- (iii) FAR 52.215-13, Subcontractor Cost or Pricing Data--Modifications.

(2) Use the clause at 252.215-7002, Cost Estimating System Requirements, in all solicitations and contracts to be awarded on the basis of cost or pricing data.

(3) Use the provision at 252.215-7003, Excessive Pass-Through Charges – Identification of Subcontract Effort, and the clause at 252.215-7004, Excessive Pass-

Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement

Part 215—Contracting By Negotiation

Through Charges, in all solicitations and contracts (including task or delivery orders) except for—

- (i) Firm-fixed-price contracts awarded on the basis of adequate price competition;
- (ii) Fixed-price contracts with economic price adjustment, awarded on the basis of adequate price competition;
- (iii) Firm-fixed-price contracts for the acquisition of a commercial item; or
- (iv) Fixed-price contracts with economic price adjustment, for the acquisition of a commercial item.

215.470 Estimated data prices.

- (a) DoD requires estimates of the prices of data in order to evaluate the cost to the Government of data items in terms of their management, product, or engineering value.
- (b) When data are required to be delivered under a contract, include DD Form 1423, Contract Data Requirements List, in the solicitation. See PGI 215.470(b) for guidance on the use of DD Form 1423.
- (c) The contracting officer shall ensure that the contract does not include a requirement for data that the contractor has delivered or is obligated to deliver to the Government under another contract or subcontract, and that the successful offeror identifies any such data required by the solicitation. However, where duplicate data are desired, the contract price shall include the costs of duplication, but not of preparation, of such data.