

SUBCHAPTER C—CONTRACTING METHODS AND CONTRACT TYPES

PART 1813—SIMPLIFIED ACQUISITION PROCEDURES

Sec.

- 1813.000 Scope of part.
1813.003 Policy.

Subpart 1813.1 Procedures

- 1813.106 Soliciting competition, evaluation of quotations or offers, award and documentation.
1813.106-3 Award and documentation.

Subpart 1813.3 Simplified Acquisition Methods

- 1813.301 Governmentwide commercial purchase card.
1813.301-70 Purchase card documentation.
1813.301-71 Training.
1813.301-72 Approving official.
1813.301-73 Program officials.
1813.302 Purchase orders.
1813.302-1 General.
1813.302-70 Purchase orders under section 8(a) of the Small Business Act.
1813.302-570 NASA solicitation provisions.
1813.303 Blanket Purchase Agreements (BPAs).
1813.303-3 Preparation of BPAs.
1813.307 Forms.

AUTHORITY: 42 U.S.C. 2473(c)(1).

SOURCE: 63 FR 40189, July 28, 1998, unless otherwise noted.

1813.000 Scope of part.

FAR Part 13 and 1813 do not apply to NASA Research Announcements (NRA) and Announcements of Opportunity (AO). These acquisitions shall be conducted in accordance with the procedures in 1835.016-71 and 1872, respectively. However, awards resulting from NRAs or AOs that are to be made as procurement instruments, can be made as either a contract or a purchase order. When a purchase order is used, it must not exceed the simplified acquisition threshold and must include the appropriate clauses pertaining to data rights, key personnel requirements, and any other requirements determined necessary by the contracting officer. Contracting officers must determine whether obtaining the contrac-

tor's acceptance of the order is necessary (see FAR 13.302-3(a)).

[65 FR 46628, July 31, 2000]

1813.003 Policy. (NASA supplements paragraph (g))

(g) Acquisitions under these simplified acquisition procedures shall be fixed-price, except as provided under the unpriced purchase order method in FAR 13.302-2.

[63 FR 40189, July 28, 1998, as amended at 64 FR 5620, Feb. 4, 1999]

Subpart 1813.1—Procedures

1813.106 Soliciting competition, evaluation of quotations or offers, award and documentation.

1813.106-3 Award and documentation. (NASA supplements paragraph (b))

(b)(3)(ii) For purchases up to \$50,000, documentation shall be limited to a brief notation in the file indicating the rationale for selecting other than the lowest priced offer.

Subpart 1813.3—Simplified Acquisition Methods

1813.301 Governmentwide commercial purchase card. (NASA supplements paragraphs (a), (b), and (c))

(a) The procurement officer or deputy procurement officer shall designate individual cardholders in accordance with center procedures, subject to the following limitations:

(i) Personnel other than contracting officers may be designated as cardholders for micro-purchases and for individual orders under BPAs up to \$5,000 (see 1813.303-3(a)(4)), provided they complete training adequate to ensure appropriate use of the purchase card.

(ii) The procurement officer's designation shall be in writing and shall specify the scope of the cardholder's authority.

(iii) The center shall establish and maintain administrative procedures and management controls required by the General Services Administration

National Aeronautics and Space Administration

1813.302-70

(GSA). Purchases made with the Governmentwide commercial purchase card shall comply with the instructions and procedures issued by GSA as well as applicable parts of the FAR and NFS.

(b) The Governmentwide commercial purchase card may be used to order and pay for purchases under contracts established under FAR Part 8 procedures, up to the simplified acquisition threshold (except see paragraph (a)(i) of this section for dollar limitations for personnel other than contracting officers).

(c) The Governmentwide commercial purchase card may be used to order and pay for purchases in the circumstances described in FAR 13.301(c) up to the simplified acquisition threshold (except see paragraph (a)(i) of this section for limitations for personnel other than contracting officers). Except as authorized in paragraphs (b) and (c) of this section, the Governmentwide commercial purchase card may not be used for purchases in excess of \$25,000. Purchases above the micro-purchase threshold shall comply with all applicable statutory and regulatory requirements, including the following:

(i) Small business set-aside (see FAR 13.003(b)).

(ii) Representations and certifications. The applicable items from the provision at FAR 52.212-3, Offeror Representations and Certifications—Commercial Items, shall be obtained for commercial or noncommercial purchases. This information may be obtained orally from vendors.

(iii) Maximum practicable competition (see FAR 13.106-1).

(iv) Implementation of the applicable contract clauses. This requirement may be satisfied by forwarding a completed SF 1449, appropriately modified to reflect purchase card terms, to the awardee after placing the order via the card, provided that the awardee must be notified of, and agree to, the applicability of the SF 1449 clauses when the order is placed.

[63 FR 40189, July 28, 1998, as amended at 65 FR 12484, Mar. 9, 2000]

1813.301-70 Purchase card documentation.

Documentation of purchases shall be minimized. For transactions below the

micro-purchase threshold, the card holder shall maintain a brief log of purchases and a file of monthly purchase card statements indicating whether item receipt has occurred. For purchases above the micro-purchase threshold, see 1813.106-3(b)(3)(ii).

1813.301-71 Training.

All cardholders and approving officials must complete training prior to receiving a purchase card. Training will address the responsibilities of the cardholder and approving official, prohibited purchases, purchase limitations, and sources of supply.

[65 FR 82296, Dec. 23, 2000]

1813.301-72 Approving official.

The approving official is the individual who reviews and approves a cardholder's monthly statement of purchases. The approving official shall be the cardholder's immediate or higher level supervisor; in no case shall cardholders approve their own statement of purchases. Unless center procedures otherwise provide for their designation, the procurement officer shall designate approving officials.

1813.301-73 Program officials.

(a) The Langley Research Center, Office of Procurement (Code AG), is the agency program coordinator.

(b) The procurement officer shall identify the center program coordinator and the center billing office point of contact, and provide their names to the agency program coordinator.

[63 FR 40189, July 28, 1998, as amended at 64 FR 51079, Sept. 21, 1999]

1813.302 Purchase orders.

1813.302-1 General.

(a) See 1813.003(g).

[67 FR 50823, Aug. 6, 2002]

1813.302-70 Purchase orders under section 8(a) of the Small Business Act.

Purchase orders made using simplified acquisition procedures are authorized for 8(a) acquisitions under the simplified acquisition threshold.

1813.302-570

1813.302-570 NASA solicitation provisions.

(a)(1) The contracting officer may use the provision at 1852.213-70, Offeror Representations and Certifications—Other Than Commercial Items, in simplified acquisitions exceeding the micro-purchase threshold that are for other than commercial items. This provision shall not be used for acquisition of commercial items as defined in FAR 2.101.

(2) This provision provides a single, consolidated list of certifications and representations for the acquisition of other than commercial items using simplified acquisition procedures and is attached to the solicitation for offerors to complete and return with their offer.

(i) Use the provision with its Alternate I in solicitations for acquisitions that are for, or specify the use of recovered materials (see FAR 23.4).

(ii) Use the provision with its Alternate II in solicitations for the acquisition of research, studies, supplies, or services of the type normally acquired from higher education institutions (see FAR 26.3).

(iii) Use the provision with its Alternate III in solicitation which include the clause at FAR 52.227-14, Rights in Data—General (see FAR 27.404(d)(2) and 1827.404(d)).

(b) The contracting officer may insert a provision substantially the same as the provision at 1852.213-71, Evaluation—Other than Commercial Items, in solicitations using simplified acquisition procedures for other than commercial items when a trade-off source selection process will be used, that is, factors in addition to technical acceptability and price will be considered. (See FAR 13.106.)

[67 FR 38904, June 6, 2002, as amended at 67 FR 50823, Aug. 6, 2002]

1813.303 Blanket Purchase Agreements (BPAs).

1813.303-3 Preparation of BPAs. (NASA supplements paragraph (a))

(a)(4) Non-GS-1102 or -1105 personnel shall not be authorized to place individual orders under a BPA in an amount greater than \$5,000. For sole source orders above \$2,500, a con-

48 CFR Ch. 18 (10-1-02 Edition)

tracting officer's determination is required in accordance with FAR 13.106-1(b)(1).

1813.307 Forms. (NASA supplements paragraphs (b), (c), and (d))

(b) Installations may use locally prescribed forms.

(c) Installations may use locally prescribed forms.

(d) The SF 44 may be used for purchases of aviation fuel and oil of \$10,000 or less.

PART 1814—SEALED BIDDING

Subpart 1814.2—Solicitation of Bids

Sec.

1814.201 Preparation of invitations for bids.
1814.201-5 Part IV—Representations and instructions.

1814.201-6 Solicitation provisions.

1814.201-670 NASA solicitation provisions.

Subpart 1814.3—Submission of Bids

1814.302 Bid submission.

Subpart 1814.4—Opening of Bids and Award of Contract

1814.404 Rejection of bids.

1814.404-1 Cancellation of invitations after opening.

1814.407 Mistakes in bids.

1814.407-3 Other mistakes disclosed before award.

1814.407-4 Mistakes after award.

1814.408 Award.

1814.408-1 General.

AUTHORITY: 42 U.S.C. 2473(c)(1).

SOURCE: 61 FR 47079, Sept. 6, 1996, unless otherwise noted.

Subpart 1814.2—Solicitation of Bids

1814.201 Preparation of invitations for bids.

1814.201-5 Part IV—Representations and instructions. (NASA supplements paragraph (c))

(c) Section M, Evaluation factors for award.

(i) The contracting officer shall state if award is to be made in the aggregate (all-or-non basis) or by specified groups of items.

(ii) if bidders are required to have special technical qualifications because

National Aeronautics and Space Administration

1814.408-1

of the complexity of the equipment being purchased or for some other reason, the contracting officer shall state those qualifications.

1814.201-6 Solicitation provisions.

1814.201-670 NASA solicitation provisions.

(a) The contracting officer shall insert the provision at 1852.214-70, Caution to Offerors Furnishing Descriptive Literature, in invitations for bids. See FAR 52.214-21, Descriptive Literature.

(b) The contracting officer shall insert the provision at 1852.214-71, Grouping for Aggregate Award, in invitations for bids, except for construction, when it is in the Government's best interest not to make award for less than specified quantities solicited for certain items or groupings of certain items. Insert the item numbers and/or descriptions applicable for the particular procurement.

(c) The contracting officer shall insert the provision at 1852.214-72, Full Quantities, in invitations for bids, except for construction, when it is in the Government's best interest not to make award for less than the full quantities solicited.

(d) If a pre-bid conference is planned, the contracting officer shall insert the provision at 1852.215-77, Preproposal/Pre-bid Conference. See 1815.209-70(a).

[61 FR 47079, Sept. 6, 1996, as amended at 63 FR 9966, Feb. 27, 1998]

Subpart 1814.3—Submission of Bids

1814.302 Bid submission. (NASA supplements paragraph (b))

(b) NASA contracting officers shall not consider telegraphic bids communicated by the telephone.

Subpart 1814.4—Opening of Bids and Award of Contract

1814.404 Rejection of bids.

1814.404-1 Cancellation of invitations after opening. (NASA supplements paragraphs (c) and (e))

(c) The authority to make the determination at FAR 14.404-1(c) is delegated to the contracting officer, except

as provided in paragraph (e)(1) of this subsection.

(e)(1) A determination that includes an authorization to complete the acquisition through negotiation shall be made by the procurement officer, in consultation with the chief counsel.

1814.407 Mistakes in bids.

1814.407-3 Other mistakes disclosed before award. (NASA supplements paragraph (e))

(e) Procurement officers are authorized to make the determinations under 14.407-3 (a), (b), (c) and (d).

1814.407-4 Mistakes after award. (NASA supplements paragraph (d))

(d) Determinations shall be made by the procurement officer.

1814.408 Award.

1814.408-1 General.

(1) A notice of award as a specific document is used when the contracting officer needs to inform a responsible bidder that its offer was determined to be the most advantageous to the Government (considering only price and price-related factors) and that the formal award will be made upon satisfaction of specified pre-performance conditions.

(2) The notice of award is not a contractual instrument. It does not authorize the successful bidder to perform and, in itself, does not obligate the Government to award a contractual document. Its limited purpose is to provide: evidence of the Government's selection of the successful bidder; instruction to that bidder to satisfy specified pre-performance conditions; and a statement that the Government intends to award the contract to the successful bidder upon satisfaction of these conditions if a contract is awarded as a result of the invitation for bids.

(3) Use of a notice of award is optional. The contracting officer may issue the award document itself without first issuing a notice of award. However, there are instances when a notice of award should be considered, for example, in construction contracts where performance or payment bonds are required. In such cases, the most

cost effective technique is to require only the successful bidder to provide the necessary bonds. The notice of award advises the successful bidder to provide the bonds, and it also serves as formal evidence from the Government of the impending award if such evidence is required to secure the bonds.

(4) The notice of award shall not be issued unless bids have been evaluated and a selection made, and a definitive contract document is ready for execution upon satisfaction of the conditions specified in the notice. Upon satisfaction of these conditions, the approved and executed contract instrument shall be provided to the successful bidder.

(5) Since the notice of award is not a contractual document authorizing performance, the period of performance of the resultant contract shall not be based on the date of issuance or receipt of the notice of award. The period of performance specified in the contract shall be based on some other reference point, such as the date the contract is provided to the successful bidder, a mutually agreeable effective date of a later authorization to proceed date.

(6) The notice of award can be issued by any formal written means such as a letter, telegram or electronic means. The notice should be substantially the same as the following format.

Format

Subject: Notice of Award—Invitation for Bids (IFB) (a). This notice is to advise you that your bid (b) in response to the subject IFB has been determined to be the most advantageous to the Government (considering only price and price-related factors). It is the Government's intention to award you a contract in the amount of (c) for this effort pending satisfaction of the following pre-performance conditions: (d)

Evidence (e) of satisfaction of these conditions must be provided to the contracting officer by (f). In the event these conditions are not satisfied by this date, the Government reserves the right to award the contract to the bidder who submitted the next most advantageous bid.

Please note that this notice of award is not a contractual document. It does not obligate the Government to award you, or any other bidder, a contract relative to the subject IFB, and it does not authorize you to proceed with contract performance or incur costs pursuant to such performance. Any costs incurred for contract performance prior to your receipt of a fully executed contract doc-

ument are at your own risk and are not recoverable under any Government contract should the Government fail, for whatever reason, to award you a contract in response to the subject IFB.

If a contract is awarded after evidence of satisfaction of the pre-performance conditions listed above is provided to the contracting officer by the specified due date, the date of commencement of work will be provided with the formal award. This date will be based on (g).

NOTES.—The contracting officer shall insert, where shown, the following information:

- (a) Identification of the IFB by number and title.
- (b) Identification of the contractor's bid.
- (c) The award price.
- (d) The preperformance conditions (e.g., any required payment and performance bonds).
- (e) The evidence required to satisfy the pre-performance conditions (e.g., the actual payment and performance bonds).
- (f) The date by which the evidence must be provided to the contracting officer.
- (g) Identification of the date for commencement of performance. The period of performance of the contract shall not be based on the date of issuance or receipt of the notice of award. It shall be based on the date the contract is provided to the successful bidder, a mutually agreeable effective date, or a later authorization to proceed date.

PART 1815—CONTRACTING BY NEGOTIATION

Subpart 1815.2—Solicitation and Receipt of Proposals and Information

Sec.

- 1815.201 Exchanges with industry before receipt of proposals.
- 1815.203 Requests for proposals.
- 1815.203-70 Installation reviews.
- 1815.203-71 Headquarters reviews.
- 1815.203-72 Risk Management.
- 1815.204 Contract format.
- 1815.204-2 Part I—The Schedule.
- 1815.204-5 Part IV—Representations and instructions.
- 1815.204-70 Page limitations.
- 1815.207 Handling proposals and information.
- 1815.207-70 Release of proposal information.
- 1815.207-71 Appointing non-Government evaluators as special Government employees.
- 1815.208 Submission, modification, revision, and withdrawal of proposals.
- 1815.209 Solicitation provisions and contract clauses.
- 1815.209-70 NASA solicitation provisions.

Subpart 1815.3—Source Selection

- 1815.300 Scope of subpart.
- 1815.300-70 Applicability of subpart.
- 1815.303 Responsibilities.
- 1815.304 Evaluation factors and significant subfactors.
- 1815.304-70 NASA evaluation factors.
- 1815.305 Proposal evaluation.
- 1815.305-70 Identification of unacceptable proposals.
- 1815.305-71 Evaluation of a single proposal.
- 1815.306 Exchanges with offerors after receipt of proposals.
- 1815.307 Proposal revisions.
- 1815.308 Source selection decision.
- 1815.370 NASA source evaluation boards.

Subpart 1815.4—Contract Pricing

- 1815.403 Obtaining cost or pricing data.
- 1815.403-1 Prohibition on obtaining cost or pricing data.
- 1815.403-170 Waivers of cost or pricing data.
- 1815.403-3 Requiring information other than cost or pricing data.
- 1815.403-4 Requiring cost or pricing data.
- 1815.404 Proposal analysis.
- 1815.404-2 Information to support proposal analysis.
- 1815.404-4 Profit.
- 1815.404-470 NASA Form 634.
- 1815.404-471 NASA structured approach for profit or fee objective.
- 1815.404-471-1 General
- 1815.404-471-2 Performance risk.
- 1815.404-471-3 Contract type risk and working capital adjustment.
- 1815.404-471-4 Other considerations.
- 1815.404-471-5 Facilities capital cost of money.
- 1815.404-471-6 Modification to structured profit/fee approach for nonprofit organizations.
- 1815.404-472 Payment of profit or fee under letter contracts.
- 1815.406 Documentation.
- 1815.406-1 Prenegotiation objectives.
- 1815.406-170 Content of the prenegotiation position memorandum.
- 1815.406-171 Installation reviews.
- 1815.406-172 Headquarters reviews.
- 1815.406-3 Documenting the negotiation.
- 1815.407 Special cost or pricing areas.
- 1815.407-2 Make-or-buy programs.
- 1815.408 Solicitation provisions and contract clauses.
- 1815.408-70 NASA solicitation provisions and contract clauses.

Subpart 1815.5—Preward, Award, and Postaward Notifications, Protests, and Mistakes

- 1815.504 Award to successful offeror.
- 1815.506 Postaward debriefing of offerors.
- 1815.506-70 Debriefing of offerors—Major System acquisitions.

Subpart 1815.6—Unsolicited Proposals

- 1815.602 Policy.
- 1815.604 Agency points of contact.
- 1815.606 Agency procedures.
- 1815.606-70 Relationship of unsolicited proposals to NRAs.
- 1815.609 Limited use of data.
- 1815.609-70 Limited use of proposals.
- 1815.670 Foreign proposals.

Subpart 1815.70—Ombudsman

- 1815.7001 NASA Ombudsman Program.
- 1815.7002 Synopses of solicitations and contracts.
- 1815.7003 Contract clause.

AUTHORITY: 42 U.S.C. 2473(c)(1).

SOURCE: 63 FR 9954, Feb. 27, 1998, unless otherwise noted.

Subpart 1815.2—Solicitation and Receipt of Proposals and Information**1815.201 Exchanges with industry before receipt of proposals. (NASA supplements paragraphs (c) and (f))**

(c)(6)(A) Except for acquisitions described in 1815.300-70(b), contracting officers shall issue draft requests for proposals (DRFPs) for all competitive negotiated acquisitions expected to exceed \$1,000,000 (including all options or later phases of the same project). DRFPs shall invite comments from potential offerors on all aspects of the draft solicitation, including the requirements, schedules, proposal instructions, and evaluation approaches. Potential offerors should be specifically requested to identify unnecessary or inefficient requirements. If the DRFP contains Government-unique standards, potential offerors should be invited to identify voluntary consensus standards that meet the Government's requirements as alternatives to Government-unique standards cited as requirements, in accordance with FAR 11.101 and OMB Circular A-119. Comments should also be requested on any perceived safety, occupational health, security (including information technology security), environmental, export control, and/or other programmatic risk issues associated with performance of the work. When considered appropriate, the statement of work or the specifications may be

1815.203

issued in advance of other solicitation sections.

(B) Contracting officers shall plan the acquisition schedule to include adequate time for issuance of the DRFP, potential offeror review and comment, and NASA evaluation and disposition of the comments.

(C) When issuing DRFPs, potential offerors should be advised that the DRFP is not a solicitation and NASA is not requesting proposals.

(D) Whenever feasible, contracting officers should include a summary of the disposition of significant DRFP comments with the final RFP.

(E) If performance-based payments are planned to be used in a competitive negotiated acquisition, the DRFP shall request potential offerors to suggest terms, including performance events or payment criteria. Contracting officers shall use that information to establish a common set of performance-based payments parameters in the formal RFP when practicable.

(F) The procurement officer may waive the requirement for a DRFP upon written determination that the expected benefits will not be realized given the nature of the supply or service being acquired. The DRFP shall not be waived because of poor or inadequate planning.

(f)(i) Upon release of the formal RFP, the contracting officer shall direct all personnel associated with the acquisition to refrain from communicating with prospective offerors and to refer all inquiries to the contracting officer or other authorized representative. This procedure is commonly known as a "blackout notice" and shall not be imposed before release of the RFP. The notice may be issued in any format (e.g., letter or electronic) appropriate to the complexity of the acquisition.

(ii) Blackout notices are not intended to terminate all communication with offerors. Contracting officers should continue to provide information as long as it does not create an unfair competitive advantage or reveal proprietary data.

[63 FR 9954, Feb. 27, 1998, as amended at 63 FR 44408, Aug. 19, 1998; 65 FR 12484, Mar. 9, 2000; 65 FR 31102, May 16, 2000; 65 FR 37059, June 13, 2000]

48 CFR Ch. 18 (10-1-02 Edition)

1815.203 Requests for proposals.

1815.203-70 Installation reviews.

(a) Installations shall establish procedures to review all RFPs before release. When appropriate given the complexity of the acquisition or the number of offices involved in solicitation review, centers should consider use of a single review meeting called a Solicitation Review Board (SRB) as a streamlined alternative to the serial or sequential coordination of the solicitation with reviewing offices. The SRB is a meeting in which all offices having review and approval responsibilities discuss the solicitation and their concerns. Actions assigned and changes required by the SRB shall be documented.

(b) When source evaluation board (SEB) procedures are used in accordance with 1815.370, the SEB shall review and approve the RFP prior to issuance.

1815.203-71 Headquarters reviews.

For RFPs requiring Headquarters review and approval, the procurement officer shall submit ten copies of the RFP to the Assistant Administrator for Procurement (Code HS). Any significant information relating to the RFP or the planned evaluation methodology omitted from the RFP itself should also be provided.

[65 FR 12485, Mar. 9, 2000]

1815.203-72 Risk management.

In all RFPs and RFOs for supplies or services for which a technical proposal is required, proposal instructions shall require offerors to identify and discuss risk factors and issues throughout the proposal where they are relevant, and describe their approach to managing these risks.

[65 FR 70316, Nov. 22, 2000]

1815.204 Contract format.

1815.204-2 Part I—The Schedule. (NASA supplements paragraph (c))

(c) To the maximum extent practicable, requirements should be defined as performance based specifications/

statements of work that focus on required outcomes or results, not methods of performance or processes.

1815.204-5 Part IV—Representations and instructions. (NASA supplements paragraph (b))

(b) The information required in proposals should be kept to the minimum necessary for the source selection decision.

1815.204-70 Page limitations.

(a) Technical and contracting personnel will agree on page limitations for their respective portions of an RFP. Unless approved in writing by the procurement officer, the page limitation for the contracting portion of an RFP (all sections except Section C, Description/specifications/work statement) shall not exceed 150 pages, and the page limitation for the technical portion (Section C) shall not exceed 200 pages. Attachments to the RFP count as part of the section to which they relate. In determining page counts, a page is defined as one side of a sheet, 8½" × 11", with at least one inch margins on all sides, using not smaller than 12-point type. Foldouts count as an equivalent number of 8½" × 11" pages. The metric standard format most closely approximating the described standard 8½" × 11" size may also be used.

(b) Page limitations shall also be established for proposals submitted in competitive acquisitions. Accordingly, technical and contracting personnel will agree on page limitations for each portion of the proposal. Unless a different limitation is approved in writing by the procurement officer, the total initial proposal, excluding title pages, tables of content, and cost/price information, shall not exceed 500 pages using the page definition of 1815.204-70(a). Firm page limitations shall also be established for final proposal revisions, if requested. The appropriate page limitations for final proposal revisions should be determined by considering the complexity of the acquisition and the extent of any discussions. The same page limitations shall apply to all offerors. Pages submitted in excess of specified limitations will not be evaluated by the Government and will be returned to the offeror.

1815.207 Handling proposals and information.

1815.207-70 Release of proposal information.

(a) NASA personnel participating in any way in the evaluation may not reveal any information concerning the evaluation to anyone not also participating, and then only to the extent that the information is required in connection with the evaluation. When non-NASA personnel participate, they shall be instructed to observe these restrictions.

(b)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (b)(2) of this section, the procurement officer is the approval authority to disclose proposal information outside the Government. If outside evaluators are involved, this authorization may be granted only after compliance with FAR 37.2 and 1837.204, except that the determination of unavailability of Government personnel required by FAR 37.2 is not required for disclosure of proposal information to JPL employees.

(2) Proposal information in the following classes of proposals may be disclosed with the prior written approval of a NASA official one level above the NASA program official responsible for the overall conduct of the evaluation. If outside evaluators are involved, the determination of unavailability of Government personnel required by FAR 37.2 is not required for disclosure in these instances.

(i) Proposals submitted in response to broad agency announcements such as Announcements of Opportunity and NASA Research Announcements;

(ii) Unsolicited proposals; and

(iii) SBIR and STTR proposals.

(3) If JPL personnel, in evaluating proposal information released to them by NASA, require assistance from non-JPL, non-Government evaluators, JPL must obtain written approval to release the information in accordance with paragraphs (b)(1) and (b)(2) of this section.

[63 FR 9954, Feb. 27, 1998, as amended at 63 FR 44408, Aug. 19, 1998]

1815.207-71

1815.207-71 Appointing non-Government evaluators as special Government employees.

(a) Except as provided in paragraph (c) of this section, non-Government evaluators, except employees of JPL, shall be appointed as special Government employees.

(b) Appointment as a special Government employee is a separate action from the approval required by paragraph 1815.207-70(b) and may be processed concurrently. Appointment as a special Government employee shall be made by:

(1) The NASA Headquarters personnel office when the release of proposal information is to be made by a NASA Headquarters office; or

(2) The installation personnel office when the release of proposal information is to be made by the installation.

(c) Non-Government evaluators need not be appointed as special Government employees when they evaluate:

(1) Proposals submitted in response to broad agency announcements such as Announcements of Opportunity and NASA Research Announcements;

(2) Unsolicited proposals; and

(3) SBIR and STTR proposals.

[63 FR 9954, Feb. 27, 1998, as amended at 63 FR 44408, Aug. 19, 1998]

1815.208 Submission, modification, revision, and withdrawal of proposals. (NASA supplements paragraph (b))

(b) The FAR late proposal criteria do not apply to Announcements of Opportunity (see 1872.705-1 paragraph VII), NASA Research Announcements (see 1852.235-72), and Small Business Innovative Research (SBIR) Phase I and Phase II solicitations, and Small Business Technology Transfer (STTR) solicitations. For these solicitations, proposals or proposal modifications received from qualified firms after the latest date specified for receipt may be considered if a significant reduction in cost to the Government is probable or if there are significant technical advantages, as compared with proposals previously received. In such cases, the project office shall investigate the circumstances surrounding the late submission, evaluate its content, and submit written recommendations and find-

48 CFR Ch. 18 (10-1-02 Edition)

ings to the selection official or a designee as to whether there is an advantage to the Government in considering it. The selection official or a designee shall determine whether to consider the late submission.

1815.209 Solicitation provisions and contract clauses. (NASA supplements paragraph (a))

(a) The contracting officer shall insert FAR 52.215-1 in all competitive negotiated solicitations.

1815.209-70 NASA solicitation provisions.

(a) The contracting officer shall insert the provision at 1852.215-77, Preproposal/Pre-bid Conference, in competitive requests for proposals and invitations for bids where the Government intends to conduct a preproposal or pre-bid conference. Insert the appropriate specific information relating to the conference.

(b) When it is not in the Government's best interest to make award for less than the specified quantities solicited for certain items or groupings of items, the contracting officer shall insert the provision at 1852.214-71, Grouping for Aggregate Award. *See* 1814.201-670(b).

(c) When award will be made only on the full quantities solicited, the contracting officer shall insert the provision at 1852.214-72, Full Quantities. *See* 1814.201-670(c).

(d) The contracting officer shall insert the provision at 1852.215-81, Proposal Page Limitations, in all competitive requests for proposals.

[63 FR 9954, Feb. 27, 1998, as amended at 67 FR 50824, Aug. 6, 2002]

Subpart 1815.3—Source Selection

1815.300 Scope of subpart.

1815.300-70 Applicability of subpart.

(a)(1) Except as indicated in paragraph (b) of this section, NASA competitive negotiated acquisitions shall be conducted as follows:

(i) Acquisitions of \$50 million or more—in accordance with FAR 15.3 and this subpart.

(ii) Other acquisitions—in accordance with FAR 15.3 and this subpart except section 1815.370.

(2) Estimated dollar values of acquisitions shall include the values of multiple awards, options, and later phases of the same project.

(b) FAR 15.3 and this subpart are not applicable to acquisitions conducted under the following procedures:

(1) MidRange (see part 1871).

(2) Announcements of Opportunity (see part 1872).

(3) NASA Research Announcements (see 1835.016-71).

(4) The Small Business Innovative Research (SBIR) program and the Small Business Technology Transfer (STTR) pilot program under the authority of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638).

(5) Architect and Engineering (A&E) services (see FAR 36.6 and 1836.6).

[63 FR 9954, Feb. 27, 1998, as amended at 64 FR 48561, Sept. 7, 1999]

1815.303 Responsibilities. (NASA supplements paragraphs (a) and (b))

(a) The SSA shall be established at the lowest reasonable level for each acquisition. Notwithstanding the FAR designation of the contracting officer as SSA, the SSA for center acquisitions shall be established in accordance with center procedures. For acquisitions designated as Headquarters selections, the SSA will be identified as part of the Master Buy Plan process (see 1807.71).

(b)(i) The source selection authority (SSA) is the Agency official responsible for proper and efficient conduct of the source selection process and for making the final source selection decision. The SSA has the following responsibilities in addition to those listed in the FAR:

(A) Approve the evaluation factors, subfactors, the weight of the evaluation factors and subfactors, and any special standards of responsibility (see FAR 9.104-2) before release of the RFP, or delegate this authority to appropriate management personnel;

(B) Appoint the source selection team. However, when the Administrator will serve as the SSA, the Official-in-Charge of the cognizant Head-

quarters Program Office will appoint the team; and

(C) Provide the source selection team with appropriate guidance and special instructions to conduct the evaluation and selection procedures.

(b)(2) Approval authorities for Acquisition Plans and Acquisition Strategy Meetings are in accordance with 1807.103.

[63 FR 9954, Feb. 27, 1998, as amended at 63 FR 44408, Aug. 19, 1998; 65 FR 30013, May 10, 2000]

1815.304 Evaluation factors and significant subfactors. (NASA supplements paragraph (c))

(c)(4)(A) The extent of participation of small disadvantaged business (SDB) concerns shall be evaluated as a subfactor under the Mission Suitability factor. If a Mission Suitability factor is not used, the SDB participation shall be evaluated as a separate factor or subfactor, as appropriate.

(B) SDB concerns that choose the FAR 19.11 price evaluation adjustment shall receive the lowest possible score/rating under the FAR 15.304(c)(4) evaluation.

[64 FR 25214, May 11, 1999]

1815.304-70 NASA evaluation factors.

(a) Typically, NASA establishes three evaluation factors: Mission Suitability, Cost/Price, and Past Performance. Evaluation factors may be further defined by subfactors. Evaluation subfactors should be structured to identify significant discriminators, or “key swingers”—the essential information required to support a source selection decision. Too many subfactors undermine effective proposal evaluation. All evaluation subfactors should be clearly defined to avoid overlap and redundancy.

(b) Mission Suitability factor. (1) This factor indicates the merit or excellence of the work to be performed or product to be delivered. It includes, as appropriate, both technical and management subfactors. Mission Suitability shall be numerically weighted and scored on a 1000-point scale.

(2) The Mission Suitability factor may identify evaluation subfactors to further define the content of the factor. Each Mission Suitability subfactor

shall be weighted and scored. The adjectival rating percentages in 1815.305(a)(3)(A) shall be applied to the subfactor weight to determine the point score. The number of Mission Suitability subfactors is limited to five. The Mission Suitability evaluation subfactors and their weights shall be identified in the RFP.

(3) For cost reimbursement acquisitions, the Mission Suitability evaluation shall also include the results of any cost realism analysis. The RFP shall notify offerors that the realism of proposed costs may significantly affect their Mission Suitability scores.

(4) If the solicitation requires the submission of a Safety and Health Plan (see 1823.7001(c) and NPG 8715.3, NASA Safety Manual, Appendix H), safety and health must be a consideration in the evaluation. For acquisitions valued at \$10 million or more, or \$25 million or more for commercial items, then the Mission Suitability factor, if used, shall include a subfactor for safety and health. Otherwise, use of that subfactor is optional.

(c) Cost/Price factor. This factor evaluates the reasonableness and, if necessary, the cost realism, of proposed costs/prices. The Cost/Price factor is not numerically weighted or scored.

(d) Past Performance factor. (1) This factor indicates the relevant quantitative and qualitative aspects of each offeror's record of performing services or delivering products similar in size, content, and complexity to the requirements of the instant acquisition.

(2) The RFP shall instruct offerors to submit data (including data from relevant Federal, State, and local governments and private contracts) that can be used to evaluate their past performance. Typically, the RFP will require:

(i) A list of contracts similar in size, content, and complexity to the instant acquisition, showing each contract number, the type of contract, a brief description of the work, and a point of contact from the organization placing the contract. Normally, the requested contracts are limited to those received in the last three years. However, in acquisitions that require longer periods to demonstrate performance quality, such as hardware development, the

time period should be tailored accordingly.

(ii) The identification and explanation of any cost overruns or underruns, completion delays, performance problems, and terminations.

(3) The contracting officer may start collecting past performance data before proposal receipt. One method for early evaluation of past performance is to request offerors to submit their past performance information in advance of the proposal due date. The RFP could also include a past performance questionnaire for offerors to send their previous customers with instructions to return the completed questionnaire to the Government. Failure of the offeror to submit its past performance information early or of the customers to submit the completed questionnaires shall not be a cause for rejection of the proposal nor shall it be reflected in the Government's evaluation of the offeror's past performance.

(4) The contracting officer shall evaluate the offeror's past performance in occupational health, security, safety, and mission success (*e.g.*, mishap rates and problems in delivered hardware and software that resulted in mishaps or failures) when these areas are germane to the requirement.

[63 FR 9954, Feb. 27, 1998, as amended at 64 FR 25215, May 11, 1999; 65 FR 30013, May 10, 2000; 65 FR 37059, June 13, 2000]

1815.305 Proposal evaluation. (NASA supplements paragraphs (a) and (b))

(a) Each proposal shall be evaluated to identify and document:

- (i) Any deficiencies;
- (ii) All strengths and significant weaknesses;
- (iii) The numerical score and/or adjectival rating of each Mission Suitability subfactors and for the Mission Suitability factor in total;
- (iv) Cost realism, if appropriate;
- (v) The Past Performance evaluation factor; and

(vi) Any programmatic risk to mission success, *e.g.*, technical, schedule, cost, safety, occupational health, security, export control, or environmental. Risks may result from the offeror's technical approach, manufacturing plan, selection of materials, processes,

equipment, or as a result of the cost, schedule, and performance impacts associated with its approach. Risk evaluations must consider the probability of the risk occurring, the impact and severity of the risk, the timeframe when the risk should be addressed, and the alternatives available to meet the requirements. Risk assessments shall be considered in determining Mission Suitability strengths, weaknesses, deficiencies, and numerical or adjectival ratings. Identified risks and the potential for cost impact shall be considered in the cost or price evaluation.

(a)(1) Cost or price evaluation.

(A) Cost or pricing data shall not be requested in competitive acquisitions. See 1815.403-1(b)(1) and 1815.403-3(b).

(B) When contracting on a basis other than firm-fixed-price, the contracting officer shall perform price and cost realism analyses to assess the reasonableness and realism of the proposed costs. A cost realism analysis will determine if the costs in an offeror's proposal are realistic for the work to be performed, reflect a clear understanding of the requirements, and are consistent with the various elements of the offeror's technical proposal. The analysis should include:

(a) The probable cost to the Government of each proposal, including any recommended additions or reductions in materials, equipment, labor hours, direct rates, and indirect rates. The probable cost should reflect the best estimate of the cost of any contract which might result from that offeror's proposal.

(b) The differences in business methods, operating procedures, and practices as they affect cost.

(c) A level of confidence in the probable cost assessment for each proposal.

(C) The cost realism analysis may result in adjustments to Mission Suitability scores in accordance with the procedure described in 1815.305(a)(3)(B).

(a)(2) Past performance evaluation.

(A) The Past Performance evaluation assesses the contractor's performance under previously awarded contracts.

(B) The evaluation may be limited to specific areas of past performance considered most germane for the instant acquisition. It may include any or all of the items listed in FAR 42.1501, and/or any other aspects of past performance considered pertinent to the solicitation requirements or challenges. Regardless of the areas of past performance selected for evaluation, the same areas shall be evaluated for all offerors in that acquisition.

(C) Questionnaires and interviews may be used to solicit assessments of the offerors's performance, as either a prime or subcontractor, from the offeror's previous customers.

(D) All pertinent information, including customer assessments and any offeror rebuttals, will be made part of the source selection records and included in the evaluation.

(a)(3) Technical Evaluation.

(A) Mission Suitability subfactors and the total Mission Suitability factor shall be evaluated using the following adjectival ratings, definitions, and percentile ranges.

Adjectival rating	Definitions	Percentile range
Excellent	A comprehensive and thorough proposal of exceptional merit with one or more significant strengths. No deficiency or significant weakness exists.	91-100
Very Good	A proposal having no deficiency and which demonstrates over-all competence. One or more significant strengths have been found, and strengths outbalance any weaknesses that exist.	71-90
Good	A proposal having no deficiency and which shows a reasonably sound response. There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both. As a whole, weaknesses not offset by strengths do not significantly detract from the offeror's response.	51-70
Fair	A proposal having no deficiency and which has one or more weaknesses. Weaknesses outbalance any strengths.	31-50
Poor	A proposal that has one or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses that demonstrate a lack of overall competence or would require a major proposal revision to correct.	0-30

(B) When contracting on a cost reimbursement basis, the Mission Suitability evaluation shall reflect the results of any required cost realism analysis performed under the cost/price factor. A structured approach shall be used to adjust Mission Suitability scores based on the degree of assessed cost realism. An example of such an approach would:

(a) Establish a threshold at which Mission Suitability adjustments would start. The threshold should reflect the acquisition's estimating uncertainty

(i.e., the higher the degree of estimating uncertainty, the higher the threshold);

(b) Use a graduated scale that proportionally adjusts a proposal's Mission Suitability score for its assessed cost realism;

(c) Affect a significant number of points to induce realistic pricing;

(d) Calculate a Mission Suitability point adjustment based on the percentage difference between proposed and probable cost as follows:

Services	Hardware development	Point adjustment
±5 percent	±30 percent	0
±6 to 10 percent	±31 to 40 percent	-50
±11 to 15 percent	±41 to 50 percent	-100
±16 to 20 percent	±51 to 60 percent	-150
±21 to 30 percent	±61 to 70 percent	-200
±more than 30 percent	±more than 70 percent	-300

(a)(4) The cost or price evaluation, specifically the cost realism analysis, often requires a technical evaluation of proposed costs. Contracting officers may provide technical evaluators a copy of the cost volume or relevant information from it to use in the analysis.

(b) The contracting officer is authorized to make the determination to reject all proposals received in response to a solicitation.

[63 FR 9954, Feb. 27, 1998, as amended at 63 FR 44408, Aug. 19, 1998; 65 FR 37059, June 13, 2000]

1815.305-70 Identification of unacceptable proposals.

(a) The contracting officer shall not complete the initial evaluation of any proposal when it is determined that the proposal is unacceptable because:

(1) It does not represent a reasonable initial effort to address the essential requirements of the RFP or clearly demonstrates that the offeror does not understand the requirements;

(2) In research and development acquisitions, a substantial design drawback is evident in the proposal, and sufficient correction or improvement to consider the proposal acceptable would require virtually an entirely new technical proposal; or

(3) It contains major efficiencies or omissions or out-of-line costs which discussions with the offeror could not reasonably be expected to cure.

(b) The contracting officer shall document the rationale for discontinuing the initial evaluation of a proposal in accordance with this section.

[63 FR 9954, Feb. 27, 1998, as amended at 63 FR 44408, Aug. 19, 1998]

1815.305-71 Evaluation of a single proposal.

(a) If only one proposal is received in response to the solicitation, the contracting officer shall determine if the solicitation was flawed or unduly restrictive and determine if the single proposal is an acceptable proposal. Based on these findings, the SSA shall direct the contracting officer to:

(1) Award without discussions provided for contracting officer determines that adequate price competition exists (see FAR 15.403-1(c)(1)(ii));

(2) Award after negotiating an acceptable contract. (The requirement for submission of cost or pricing data shall be determined in accordance with FAR 15.403-1); or

(3) Reject the proposal and cancel the solicitation.

(b) The procedure in 1815.305-71(a) also applies when the number of proposals equals the number of awards

contemplated or when only one acceptable proposal is received.

1815.306 Exchanges with offerors after receipt of proposals. (NASA supplements paragraphs (c), (d), and (e))

(c)(2) A total of no more than three proposals shall be a working goal in establishing the competitive range. Field installations may establish procedures for approval of competitive range determinations commensurate with the complexity or dollar value of an acquisition.

(d)(3)(A) The contracting officer shall identify any cost/price elements that do not appear to be justified and encourage offerors to submit their most favorable and realistic cost/price proposals, but shall not discuss, disclose, or compare cost/price elements of any other offeror. The contracting officer shall question inadequate, conflicting, unrealistic, or unsupported cost information; differences between the offeror's proposal and most probable cost assessments; cost realism concerns; differences between audit findings and proposed costs; proposed rates that are too high/low; and labor mixes that do not appear responsive to the requirements. No agreement on cost/price elements or a "bottom line" is necessary.

(B) The contracting officer shall discuss contract terms and conditions so that a "model" contract can be sent to each offeror with the request for final proposal revisions. If the solicitation allows, any proposed technical performance capabilities above those specified in the RFP that have value to the Government and are considered proposal strengths should be discussed with the offeror and proposed for inclusion in that offeror's "model" contract. If the offeror declines to include these strengths in its "model" contract, the Government evaluators should reconsider their characterization as strengths.

(e)(1) In no case shall the contacting officer relax or amend RFP requirements for any offeror without amending the RFP and permitting the other offerors an opportunity to propose against the relaxed requirements.

[63 FR 9954, Feb. 27, 1998, as amended at 63 FR 44408, Aug. 19, 1998]

1815.307 Proposal revisions. (NASA supplements paragraph (b))

(b)(i) The request for final proposal revisions (FPRs) shall also:

(A) Instruct offerors to incorporate all changes to their offers resulting from discussions, and require clear traceability from initial proposals;

(B) Require offerors to complete and execute the "model" contract, which includes any special provisions or performance capabilities the offeror proposed above those specified in the RFP;

(C) Caution offerors against unsubstantiated changes to their proposals; and

(D) Establish a page limit for FPRs.

(i) Approval of the Assistant Administrator for Procurement (Code HS) is required to reopen discussions for acquisitions of \$50 million or more. Approval of the procurement officer is required for all other acquisitions.

(iii) Proposals are rescored based on FPR evaluations. Scoring changes between initial and FPRs shall be clearly traceable.

[63 FR 9954, Feb. 27, 1998, as amended at 63 FR 44409, Aug. 19, 1998]

1815.308 Source selection decision. (NASA paragraphs (1), (2) and (3))

(1) All significant evaluation findings shall be fully documented and considered in the source selection decision. A clear and logical audit trail shall be maintained for the rationale for ratings and scores, including a detailed account of the decisions leading to the selection. Selection is made on the basis of the evaluation criteria established in the RFP.

(2) Before aware, the SSA shall sign a source selection statement that clearly and succinctly justifies the selection. Source selection statements must describe: the acquisition; the evaluation procedures; the substance of the Mission Suitability evaluation; and the evaluation of the Cost/Price and Past Performance factors. The statement also addresses unacceptable proposals, the competitive range determination, late proposals, or any other considerations pertinent to the decision. The statement shall not reveal any confidential business information. Except for certain major system acquisition competitions (see 1815.506-70), source

selection statements shall be releasable to competing offerors and the general public upon request. The statement shall be available to the Debriefing Official to use in postaward debriefings of unsuccessful offerors and shall be provided to debriefed offerors upon request.

(3) Once the selection decision is made, the contracting officer shall award the contract.

1815.370 NASA source evaluation boards.

(a) The source evaluation board (SEB) procedures shall be used for those acquisitions identified in 1815.300-700(a)(1)(i).

(b) The SEB assists the SSA by providing expert analyses of the offerors' proposals in relation to the evaluation factors and subfactors contained in the solicitation. The SEB will prepare and present its findings to the SSA, avoiding trade-off judgments among either the individual offerors or among the evaluation factors. The SEB will not make recommendations for selection to the SSA.

(c) *Designation.* (1) The SEB shall be comprised of competent individuals fully qualified to identify the strengths, weaknesses, and risks associated with proposals submitted in response to the solicitation. The SEB shall be appointed as early as possible in the acquisition process, but not later than acquisition plan or acquisition strategy meeting approval.

(2) While SEB participants are normally drawn from the cognizant installation, personnel from other NASA installations or other Government agencies may participate. When it is necessary to disclose the proposal (in whole or in part) outside the Government, approval shall be obtained in accordance with 1815.207-70.

(3) When Headquarters retains SSA authority, the Headquarters Office of Procurement (Code HS) must concur on the SEB appointments. Qualifications of voting members, including functional title, grade level, and related SEB experience, shall be provided.

(d) *Organization.* (1) The organization of an SEB is tailored to the requirements of the particular acquisition. This can range from the simplest situa-

tion, where the SEB conducts the evaluation and factfinding without the use of committees or panels/consultants (as described in paragraphs (d)(4) and (5) of this section) to a highly complex situation involving a major acquisition where two or more committees are formed and these, in turn, are assisted by special panels or consultants in particular areas. The number of committees or panels/consultants shall be kept to a minimum.

(2) The SEB Chairperson is the principal operating executive of the SEB. The Chairperson is expected to manage the team efficiently without compromising the validity of the findings provided to the SSA as the basis for a sound selection decision.

(3) The SEB Recorder functions as the principal administrative assistant to the SEB Chairperson and is principally responsible for logistical support and recordkeeping of SEB activities.

(4) An SEB committee functions as a factfinding arm of the SEB, usually in a broad grouping of related disciplines (e.g., technical or management). The committee evaluates in detail each proposal, or portion thereof, assigned by the SEB in accordance with the approved evaluation factors and subfactors and summarizes its evaluation in a written report to the SEB. The committee will also respond to requirements assigned by the SEB, including further justification or reconsideration of its findings. Committee chairpersons shall manage the administrative and procedural matters of their committees.

(5) An SEB panel or consultant functions as a factfinding arm of the committee in a specialized area of the committee's responsibilities. Panels are established or consultants named when a particular area requires deeper analysis than the committee can provide.

(6) The total of all such evaluators (committees, panels, consultants, etc. excluding SEB voting members and ex officio members) shall be limited to a maximum of 20, unless approved in writing by the procurement officer.

(e) *Voting members.* (1) Voting members of the SEB shall include people who will have key assignments on the

project to which the acquisition is directed. However, it is important that this should be tempered to ensure objectivity and to avoid an improper balance. It may even be appropriate to designate a management official from outside the project as SEB Chairperson.

(2) Non-government personnel shall not serve as voting members of an SEB.

(3) The SEB shall review the findings of committees, panels, or consultants and use its own collective judgment to develop the SEB evaluation findings reported to the SSA. All voting members of the SEB shall have equal status as rating officials.

(4) SEB membership shall be limited to a maximum of 7 voting individuals. Wherever feasible, an assignment to SEB membership as a voting member shall be on a full-time basis. When not feasible, SEB membership shall take precedence over other duties.

(5) The following people shall be voting members of all SEBs:

- (i) Chairperson.
- (ii) A senior, key technical representative for the project.
- (iii) An experienced procurement representative.
- (iv) A senior Safety & Mission Assurance (S&MA) representative, as appropriate.
- (v) Committee chairpersons (except where this imposes an undue workload).

(f) *Ex officio members.* (1) The number of nonvoting ex officio (advisory) members shall be kept as small as possible. Ex officio members should be selected for the experience and expertise they can provide to the SEB. Since their advisory role may require access to highly sensitive SEB material and findings, ex officio membership for persons other than those identified in paragraph (f)(3) of this section is discouraged.

(2) Nonvoting ex officio members may state their views and contribute to the discussions in SEB deliberations, but they may not participate in the actual rating process. However, the SEB recorder should be present during rating sessions.

(3) For field installation selections, the following shall be nonvoting ex officio members on all SEBs:

(i) Chairpersons of SEB committees, unless designated as voting members.

(ii) The procurement officer of the installation, unless designated a voting member.

(iii) The contracting officer responsible for the acquisition, unless designated a voting member.

(iv) The Chief Counsel and/or designee of the installation.

(v) The installation small business specialist.

(vi) The SEB recorder.

(g) *Evaluation.* (1) If committees are used, the SEB Chairperson shall send them the proposals or portions thereof to be evaluated, along with instructions regarding the expected function of each committee, and all data considered necessary or helpful.

(2) While oral reports may be given to the SEB, each committee shall submit a written report which should include the following:

- (i) Copies of individual worksheets and supporting comments to the lowest level evaluated;
- (ii) An evaluation sheet summarized for the committee as a whole; and
- (iii) A statement for each proposal describing any strengths, deficiencies, or significant weaknesses which significantly affected the evaluation and stating any reservations or concerns, together with supporting rationale, which the committee or any of its members want to bring to the attention of the SEB.

(3) The SEB process must be adequately documented. Clear traceability must exist at all levels of the SEB process. All reports submitted by committees or panels will be retained as part of the SEB records.

(4) Each voting SEB member shall thoroughly review each proposal and any committee reports and findings. The SEB shall rate or score the proposals for each evaluation factor and subfactor according to its own collective judgment. SEB minutes shall reflect this evaluation process.

(h) *SEB presentation.* (1) The SEB Chairperson shall brief the SSA on the results of the SEB deliberations to permit an informed and objective selection of the best source(s) for the particular acquisition.

(2) The presentation shall focus on the significant strengths, deficiencies, and significant weaknesses found in the proposals, the probable cost of each proposal, and any significant issues and problems identified by the SEB. This presentation must explain any applicable special standards of responsibility; evaluation factors and subfactors; the significant strengths and significant weaknesses of the offerors; the Government cost estimate, if applicable; the offerors' proposed cost/price; the probable cost; the proposed fee arrangements; and the final adjectival ratings and scores to the subfactor level.

(3) Attendance at the presentation is restricted to people involved in the selection process or who have a valid need to know. The designated individuals attending the SEB presentation(s) shall:

(i) Ensure that the solicitation and evaluation processes complied with all applicable agency policies and that the presentation accurately conveys the SEB's activities and findings;

(ii) Not change the established evaluation factors, subfactors, weights, or scoring systems; or the substance of the SEB's findings. They may, however, advise the SEB to rectify procedural omissions, irregularities or inconsistencies, substantiate its findings, or revise the presentation.

(4) The SEB recorder will coordinate the formal presentation including arranging the time and place of the presentation, assuring proper attendance, and distributing presentation material.

(5) For Headquarters selections, the Headquarters Office of Procurement (Code HS) will coordinate the presentation, including approval of attendees. When the Administrator is the SSA, a preliminary presentation should be made to the center director and to the Official-in-Charge of the cognizant Headquarters Program Office.

(i) *Recommended SEB presentation format.* (1) *Identification of the acquisition.* Identifies the installation, the nature of the services or hardware to be acquired, some quantitative measure including the Government cost estimate for the acquisition, and the planned contractual arrangement. Avoids detailed objectives of the acquisition.

(2) *Background.* Identifies any earlier phases of a phased acquisition or, as in the case of continuing support services, identifies the incumbent and any consolidations or proposed changes from the existing structure.

(3) *Evaluation factors, and subfactors.* Explains the evaluation factors, subfactors, and any special standards of responsibility. Lists the relative order of importance of the evaluation factors and the numerical weights of the Mission Suitability subfactors. Presents the adjectival scoring system used in the Mission Suitability and Past Performance evaluations.

(4) *Sources.* Indicates the number of offerors solicited and the number of offerors expressing interest (e.g., attendance at a preproposal conference). Identifies the offerors submitting proposals, indicating any small businesses, small disadvantaged businesses, and women-owned businesses.

(5) *Summary of findings.* Lists the initial and final Mission Suitability ratings and scores, the offerors' proposed cost/prices, and any assessment of the probable costs. Introduces any clear discriminator, problem, or issue which could affect the selection. Addresses any competitive range determination.

(6) *Significant strengths, deficiencies, and significant weaknesses of offerors.* Summarizes the SEB's findings, using the following guidelines:

(i) Present only the significant strengths, deficiencies, and significant weaknesses of individual offerors.

(ii) Directly relate the significant strengths, deficiencies, and significant weaknesses to the evaluation factors and subfactors.

(iii) Indicate the results and impact, if any, of discussions and FPRs on ratings and scores.

(7) *Final Mission Suitability Ratings and Scores.* Summarizes the evaluation subfactors, the maximum points achievable, and the scores of the offerors in the competitive range.

(8) *Final cost/price evaluation.* Summarizes proposed cost/prices and any probable costs associated with each offeror including proposed fee arrangements. Presents the data as accurately as possible, showing SEB adjustments to achieve comparability. Identifies the SEB's confidence in the probable costs

of the individual offerors, noting the reasons for low or high confidence.

(9) *Past performance.* Reflects the summary conclusions, supported by specific case data.

(10) *Special interest.* Includes only information of special interest to the SSA that has not been discussed elsewhere, e.g., procedural errors or other matters that could affect the selection decision.

(j) A source selection statement shall be prepared in accordance with 1815.308. For installation selections, the installation Chief Counsel or designee will prepare the source selection statement. For Headquarters selections, the Office of General Counsel or designee will prepare the statement.

[63 FR 9954, Feb. 27, 1998, as amended at 63 FR 44409, Aug. 19, 1998; 65 FR 30013, May 10, 2000; 65 FR 38777, June 22, 2000]

Subpart 1815.4—Contract Pricing

1815.403 Obtaining cost or pricing data.

1815.403-1 Prohibition on obtaining cost or pricing data. (NASA supplements paragraphs (b) and (c))

(b)(1) The adequate price competition exception is applicable to both fixed-price and cost-reimbursement type acquisitions. Contracting officers shall assume that all competitive acquisitions qualify for this exception.

(c)(4) Waivers of the requirement for submission of cost or pricing data shall be prepared in accordance with FAR 1.704. A copy of each waiver shall be sent to the Headquarters Office of Procurement (Code HK).

1815.403-170 Waivers of cost or pricing data.

(a) NASA has waived the requirement for the submission of cost or pricing data when contracting with the Canadian Commercial Corporation (CCC). This waiver applies to the CCC and its subcontractors. The CCC will provide assurance of the fairness and reasonableness of the proposed price. This assurance should be relied on; however, contracting officers shall ensure that the appropriate level of information other than cost or pricing data is submitted by subcontractors to support

any required proposal analysis, including a technical analysis and a cost realism analysis. The CCC also will provide for follow-up audit activity to ensure that any excess profits are found and refunded to NASA.

(b) NASA has waived the requirement for the submission of cost or pricing data when contracting for Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) program Phase II contracts. However, contracting officers shall ensure that the appropriate level of information other than cost or pricing data is submitted to determine price reasonableness and cost realism.

[64 FR 10573, Mar. 5, 1999]

1815.403-3 Requiring information other than cost or pricing data.

(b) As indicated in 1815.403-1(b)(1), the adequate price competition exception applies to all competitive acquisitions. For other than firm-fixed price competitions, only the minimum information other than cost or pricing data necessary to ensure price reasonableness and assess cost realism should be requested. For firm-fixed price competitions, the contracting officer shall not request any cost information, except as required by FAR 22.1103, unless proposed prices appear unreasonable or unrealistically low given the offeror's proposed approach and there are concerns that the contractor may default.

[64 FR 69416, Dec. 13, 1999]

1815.403-4 Requiring cost or pricing data. (NASA supplements paragraph (b))

(b)(2) If a certificate of current cost or pricing data is made applicable as of a date other than the date of price agreement, the agreed date should generally be within two weeks of the date of that agreement.

1815.404 Proposal analysis.

1815.404-2 Information to support proposal analysis. (NASA supplements paragraph (a))

(a)(1)(A) A field pricing report consists of a technical report and an audit report by the cognizant contract audit activity. Contracting officers should request a technical report from the

1815.404-4

48 CFR Ch. 18 (10-1-02 Edition)

ACO only if NASA resources are not available.

(B) When the required participation of the ACO or auditor involves merely a verification of information, contracting officers should obtain this verification from the cognizant office by telephone rather than formal request of field pricing support.

(C) When the cost proposal is for a product of a follow-on nature, contracting officers shall ensure that the following items, at a minimum are considered: actuals incurred under the previous contract, learning experience, technical and production analysis, and subcontract proposal analysis. This information may be obtained through NASA resources or the cognizant DCMA ACO or DCAA.

(D) Requests for field pricing assistance may be made on NASA Form 1434, Letter of Request for Pricing-Audit-Technical Evaluation Services.

[63 FR 9954, Feb. 27, 1998, as amended at 67 FR 53547, Oct. 23, 2001]

1815.404-4 Profit. (NASA supplements paragraphs (b) and (c))

(b)(1)(i)(a) The NASA structured approach for determining profit or fee objectives, described in 1815.404-471 shall be used to determine profit or fee objectives in the negotiation of contracts greater than or equal to \$100,000 that use cost analysis and are:

(1) Awarded on the basis of other than full and open competition (see FAR 6.3);

(2) Awarded under NASA Research Announcements (NRAs) and Announcements of Opportunity (AO's); or

(3) Awarded under the Small Business Innovative Research (SBIR) or the Small Business Technology Transfer (STTR) programs.

(b) The rate calculated for the basic contract may only be used on actions under a negotiated contract when the conditions affecting profit or fee do not change.

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

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

(2) Use the structured approach method in developing profit or fee objectives for negotiated subcontracts.

(ii) The use of the NASA structured approach for profit or fee is not required for:

(a) Architect-engineer contracts;

(b) Management contracts for operation and/or maintenance of Government facilities;

(c) Construction contracts;

(d) Contracts primarily requiring delivery of materials supplied by subcontractors;

(e) Termination settlements; and

(f) Contracts having unusual pricing situations when the procurement officer determines in writing that the structured approach is unsuitable.

(c)(2) Contracting officers shall document the profit or fee analysis in the contract file.

[64 FR 51472, Sept. 23, 1999]

1815.404-470 NASA Form 634.

NASA Form (NF) 634 shall be used in performing the analysis necessary to develop profit or fee objectives.

[64 FR 51473, Sept. 23, 1999]

1815.404-471 NASA structured approach for profit or fee objective.

1815.404-471-1 General.

(a) The structured approach for determining profit or fee objectives (NF 634) focuses on three profit factors:

(1) Performance risk;

(2) Contract type risk including working capital adjustment; and

(3) Other Considerations which may be considered by the contracting officer to account for special circumstances that are not adequately addressed in the performance risk and contract type risk factors.

(b) The contracting officer assigns values to each profit or fee factor; the value multiplied by the base results in the profit/fee objective for that factor. Each 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 NASA. The designated range provides values based on above normal or below normal conditions. Values outside the designated range

must not be used. In the negotiation documentation, the contracting officer need not explain assignment of the normal value, but must address conditions that justify assignment of other than the normal value.

[64 FR 51473, Sept. 23, 1999, as amended at 65 FR 12485, Mar. 9, 2000]

1815.404-471-2 Performance risk.

(a) *Risk factors.* Performance risk addresses the contractor's degree of risk in fulfilling the contract requirements. It consists of three risk factors:

(1) Technical—the technical uncertainties of performance;

(2) Management—the degree of management effort necessary to ensure that contract requirements are met; and

(3) Cost control—the contractor's efforts to reduce and control costs.

(b) *Risk factor weighting, values and calculations.* A weighting and value is assigned to each of the risk factors to determine a profit/fee objective.

(c) *Values.* The normal value is 6 percent and the designated range is 4 percent to 8 percent.

(d) *Evaluation criteria for technical risk factor.* (1) In determining the appropriate value for the technical risk factor, the contracting officer shall review the contract requirements and focus on the critical performance elements in the statement of work or specifications. Contracting officers shall consider the—

(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 indicating substantial technical risk.* (i) The contracting officer may assign a higher than normal value in those cases where there is a substantial technical risk, such as when—

(A) The contractor is either developing or applying advanced technologies;

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

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

(D) The services or analytical efforts are extremely important to the government and must be performed to exacting standards;

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

(F) The contractor has accepted an accelerated delivery schedule to meet the Government's requirements; or

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

(ii) The contracting officer may assign a value significantly above normal. A maximum value may be assigned when the effort involves—

(A) Extremely complex, vital efforts to overcome difficult technical obstacles that require personnel with exceptional abilities, experience, and professional credentials;

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

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

(3) *Below normal conditions indicating lower than normal technical risk.* (i) The contracting officer may assign a lower than normal value in those cases where the technical risk is low, such as when the—

(A) Acquisition is for off-the-shelf items;

(B) Requirements are relatively simple;

(C) Technology is not complex;

(D) Efforts do not require highly skilled personnel;

(E) Efforts are routine; or

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

(ii) The contracting officer may assign a value significantly below normal. A minimum value may be justified when the effort involves—

(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.

(e) *Evaluation criteria for management risk factor.* (1) In determining the appropriate value for the management risk factor, the contracting officer shall review the contract requirements and focus on the critical performance elements in the statement of work or specifications. Contracting officers shall—

(i) Assess the contractor's management and internal control systems using contracting office information and reviews made by contract administration offices;

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

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

(2) *Above normal conditions indicating substantial management risk.* (i) The contracting officer may assign a higher than normal value when the management effort is intense, such as when—

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

(B) The effort involves a high degree of integration and coordination.

(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; or

(C) Has critically important milestones.

(3) *Below normal conditions indicating lower than normal management risk.* (i) The contracting officer may assign a lower than normal value when the management effort is minimal, such as when—

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

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

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

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

(E) The contractor does not cooperate in the evaluation and negotiation of the proposal.

(ii) The contracting officer may assign a value significantly below normal. A minimum value may be assigned when—

(A) Reviews performed by the field 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.

(f) *Evaluation criteria for cost control risk factor.* (1) In determining the appropriate value for the cost control risk factor, the contracting officer shall—

(i) Evaluate the expected reliability of the contractor's cost estimates (including the contractor's cost estimating system);

(ii) Evaluate the contractor's cost reduction initiatives (e.g., competition advocacy programs);

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

(iv) Evaluate 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 indicating substantial cost control risk.* (i) The contracting officer may assign a value higher than normal value if the contractor can demonstrate a highly effective cost control program, such as when—

(A) The contractor has an aggressive cost reduction program that has demonstrable benefits;

(B) The contractor uses a high degree of subcontract competition; or

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

(3) *Below normal conditions indicating lower than normal cost control risk.* (i) The contracting officer may assign a lower than normal value in those cases where the contractor demonstrates minimal concern for cost control, such as when—

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

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

(C) The contractor's cost proposal is inadequate; or

(D) The contractor has a record of cost overruns or the indication of unreliable cost estimates and lack of cost control.

[64 FR 51473, Sept. 23, 1999]

1815.404-471-3 Contract type risk and working capital adjustment.

(a) *Risk factors.* 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 applies to fixed-price type 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. This adjustment is limited to a maximum of 2 percent.

(b) *Risk factor values and calculations.* A risk value is assigned to calculate the profit or fee objective for contract type. A contract length factor is assigned and applied to costs financed when a working capital adjustment is appropriate. This calculation is only performed when the prospective contract is a fixed-price contract containing provisions for progress payments.

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

Contract Type	Note	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	.5 to 3.5
Fixed-price, redeterminable	(3)		
Fixed-price-incentive, with progress payments	(2)	1	0 to 2
Cost-plus-incentive-fee	(4)	1	0 to 2
Cost-plus-award fee	(4)	.75	.5 to 1.5
Cost-plus-fixed fee	(4)	.5	0 to 1
Time-and-materials	(5)	.5	0 to 1
Labor-hour	(5)	.5	0 to 1
Firm-fixed-price, level-of-effort, term	(5)	.5	0 to 1

(1) *No financing*, means that the contract either does not provide progress or performance based payments, or provides them only on a limited basis. Do not compute a working capital adjustment.

(2) When progress payments are present, compute a working capital adjustment.

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

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

(5) These types of contracts are considered cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts for the purposes of assigning profit values. Do not compute the working capital adjustment. However, higher than normal values may be assigned within the

designated range to the extent that portions of cost are fixed.

(6) When performance-based payments are used, do not compute a working capital adjustment.

(d) *Evaluation criteria.* (1) *General.* The contracting officer shall consider elements that affect contract type risk such as—

- (i) Length of contract;
- (ii) Adequacy of cost projection data;
- (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 the incentive provisions; and
- (vii) The rate, frequency, and risk to the contractor of performance-based payments, if provided.

(2) *Mandatory.* The contracting officer shall assess the extent to which costs have been incurred prior to definitization 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. Conditions indicating higher than normal contract type risk are—

- (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 that place a high degree of risk on the contractor;
- (iv) Performance-based payments totaling less than the maximum allowable amount(s) specified at FAR 32.1004(b)(2); 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. Conditions indicating lower than normal contract type risk 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, e.g. economic price adjustment provisions; and
- (iv) Incentive provisions that place a low amount of risk on the contractor.
- (v) A performance-based payment schedule that is routine with minimal risk.

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

(2) Total costs may be reduced as appropriate when—

- (i) The contractor has little cash investment (e.g., subcontractor progress

payments are liquidated late in the period of performance);

- (ii) Some costs are covered by special funding arrangements, such as advance payments;

(3) The portion financed by the contractor is generally the portion not covered by progress payments. (i.e.—for progress payments: 100 percent minus the customary progress payments rate. For example, if a contractor receives progress payments at 75 percent, the portion financed by the contractor is 25 percent. On contracts that provide progress payments to small business, 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, as periods of minimal effort should be excluded;
- (iii) Should not include periods of performance contained in option provisions when calculating the objective for the base period; and
- (iv) Should not, for multiyear contracts, include periods of performance beyond that required to complete the initial year's requirements.

(2) The contracting officer—

- (i) Should use the following to select the contract length factor:

Period to perform substantive portion (in months)	Contract length factor
21 or less40
22 to 2765
28 to 3390
34 to 39	1.15
40 or more	1.40

- (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.

(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

National Aeronautics and Space Administration

1815.404-471-5

months and the contract length factor is 1.15.

[64 FR 51474, Sept. 23, 1999]

1815.404-471-4 Other considerations.

(a) Other Considerations may be included by the contracting officer to account for special circumstances, such as contractor efficiencies or unusual acceptance of contractual or program risks that are not adequately addressed in the structured approach calculations described in 1815.404-471-2 or 1815.404-4713. The total adjustment resulting from Other Considerations may be positive or negative but in no case should the total adjustment exceed +/- 5 percent.

(b) The contracting officer shall analyze and verify information provided by the contractor that demonstrates that the special circumstances being recognized under this section—

(1) Provide substantial benefits to the Government under the contract and/or overall program;

(2) Have not been recognized in the structured approach calculations; and

(3) Represent unusual and innovative actions or acceptance of risk by the contractor.

(c) Examples of special circumstances include, but are not limited to the following:

(1) Consistent demonstration by the contractor of excellent past performance within the last three years, with a special emphasis on excellence in safety, may merit an upward adjustment of as much as 1 percent. Similarly, an assessment of poor past performance, especially in the area of safety, may merit a downward adjustment of as much -1 percent. This consideration is especially important when negotiating modifications or changes to an ongoing contract.

(2) Extraordinary steps to achieve the Government's socioeconomic goals, environmental goals, and public policy goals established by law or regulation that are sufficiently unique or unusual may merit an upward adjustment of as much as .5 percent. Similarly, for non-participation in or violation of Federal programs, the contracting officer may adjust the objective by as much as -.5 percent. However, this consideration does not apply to the utilization of

small disadvantaged businesses. Incentives for use of these firms may only be structured according to FAR 19.1203 and 19.1204(c).

(3) Consideration of up to 1 percent should be given when contract performance requires the expenditure of significant corporate capital resources.

(4) Unusual requests for use of government facilities and property may merit a downward adjustment of as much as—1 percent.

(5) Cost efficiencies arising from innovative product design, process improvements, or integration of a life cycle cost approach for the design and development of systems that minimize maintenance and operations costs, that have not been recognized in Performance Risk or Contract Type Risk, may merit an upward adjustment. This factor is intended to recognize and reward improvements resulting from better ideas and management that will benefit the Government in the contract and/or program.

(d) Other considerations need not be limited to situations that increase profit/fee levels. A negative consideration may be appropriate when there is a significant expectation of near-term spin-off benefits as a direct result of the contract.

[64 FR 51475, Sept. 23, 1999]

1815.404-471-5 Facilities capital cost of money.

(a) When facilities capital cost of money is included as an item of cost in the contractor's proposal, it shall not be included in the cost base for calculating profit/fee. In addition, a reduction in the profit/fee objective shall be made in the amount equal to the facilities capital cost of money allowed in accordance with FAR 31.205-10(a)(2) or 1 percent of the cost base, whichever is less.

(b) CAS 417, cost of money as an element of the cost of capital assets under construction, should not appear in contract proposals. These costs are included in the initial value of a facility for purposes of calculating depreciation under CAS 414.

[64 FR 51476, Sept. 23, 1999]

1815.404-471-6 Modification to structured profit/fee approach for non-profit organizations.

(a) The structured approach was designed for determining profit or fee objectives for commercial organizations. However, the structured approach must be used as a basis for arriving at profit/fee objectives for nonprofit organizations (FAR subpart 31.7), excluding educational institutions (FAR subpart 31.3), in accordance with paragraph (b) of this section. It is NASA policy not to pay profit or fee on contracts with educational institutions.

(b) For contracts with nonprofit organizations under which profit or fee is involved, an adjustment of up to 3 percent of the costs in Block 13 of NASA Form 634 must be subtracted from the total profit/fee objective. In developing this adjustment, it is necessary to consider the following factors:

- (1) Tax position benefits;
- (2) Granting of financing through letters of credit;
- (3) Facility requirements of the nonprofit organization; and
- (4) Other pertinent factors that may work to either the advantage or disadvantage of the contractor in its position as a nonprofit organization.

[65 FR 45306, July 21, 2000]

1815.404-472 Payment of profit or fee under letter contracts.

NASA's policy is to pay profit or fee only on definitized contracts.

[65 FR 12485, Mar. 9, 2000]

1815.406 Documentation.**1815.406-1 Prenegotiation objectives. (NASA supplements paragraph (b))**

(b)(i) Before conducting negotiations requiring installation or Headquarters review, contracting officers or their representatives shall prepare a prenegotiation position memorandum setting forth the technical, business, contractual, pricing, and other aspects to be negotiated.

(ii) A prenegotiation position memorandum is not required for contracts awarded under the competitive negotiated procedures of FAR 15.3 and 1815.3.

1815.406-170 Content of the prenegotiation position memorandum.

The prenegotiation position memorandum (PPM) should fully explain the contractor and Government positions. Since the PPM will ultimately become the basis for negotiation, it should be structured to track to the price negotiation memorandum (see FAR 15.406-3 and 1815.406-3). In addition to the information described in FAR 15.406-1 and, as appropriate, 15.406-3(a), the PPM should address the following subjects, as applicable, in the order presented:

(a) Introduction. Include a description of the acquisition and a history of prior acquisitions for the same or similar items. Address the extent of competition and its results. Identify the contractor and place of performance (if not evident from the description of the acquisition). Document compliance with law, regulations and policy, including JOFOC, synopsis, EEO compliance, and current status of contractor systems (see FAR 15.406-3(a)(4)). In addition, the negotiation schedule should be addressed and the Government negotiation team members identified by name and position.

(b) Type of contract contemplated. Explain the type of contract contemplated and the reasons for its suitability.

(c) Special features and requirements. In this area, discuss any special features (and related cost impact) of the acquisition, including such items as—

- (1) Letter contract or precontract costs authorized and incurred;
- (2) Results of preaward survey;
- (3) Contract option requirements;
- (4) Government property to be furnished;
- (5) Contractor/Government investment in facilities and equipment (and any modernization to be provided by the contractor/Government);
- (6) Any deviations, special clauses, or unusual conditions anticipated, for example, unusual financing, warranties, EPA clauses and when approvals were obtained, if required; and
- (7) Any risk management issues, *e.g.*, mission success, safety, occupational health, information technology, export

control, security, and environmental risks.

(d) Cost analysis. For the basic requirement, and any option, include—

(1) A parallel tabulation, by element of cost and profit/fee, of the contractor's proposal and the Government's negotiation objective. The negotiation objective represents the fair and reasonable price the Government is willing to pay for the supplies/services. For each element of cost, compare the contractor's proposal and the Government position, explain the differences and how the Government position was developed, including the estimating assumptions and projection techniques employed, and how the positions differ in approach. Include a discussion of excessive wages found (if applicable) and their planned resolution. Explain how historical costs, including costs incurred under a letter contract (if applicable), were used in developing the negotiation objective.

(2) Significant differences between the field pricing report (including any audit reports) and the negotiation objectives and/or contractor's proposal shall be highlighted and explained. For each proposed subcontract meeting the requirement of FAR 15.404-3(c), there shall be a discussion of the price and, when appropriate, cost analyses performed by the contracting officer, including the negotiation objective for each such subcontract. The discussion of each major subcontract shall include the type of subcontract, the degree of competition achieved by the prime contractor, the price and, when appropriate, cost analyses performed on the subcontractor's proposal by the prime contractor, any unusual or special pricing or finance arrangements, and the current status of subcontract negotiations.

(3) The rationale for the Government's profit/fee objectives and, if appropriate, a completed copy of the NASA Form 634, Structured Approach—Profit/Fee Objective, and DD Form 1861, Contract Facilities Capital Cost of Money, should be included. For incentive and award fee contracts, describe the planned arrangement in terms of share lines, ceilings, and cost risk.

(e) Negotiation approval sought. The PPM represents the Government's realistic assessment of the fair and reasonable price for the supplies and services to be acquired. If negotiations subsequently demonstrate that a higher dollar amount (or significant term or condition) is reasonable, the contracting officer shall document the rationale for such a change and request approval to amend the PPM from the original approval authority.

[63 FR 9954, Feb. 27, 1998, as amended at 65 FR 37059, June 13, 2000]

1815.406-171 Installation reviews.

Each contracting activity shall establish procedures to review all prenegotiation position memoranda. The scope of coverage, exact procedures to be followed, levels of management review, and contract file documentation requirements should be directly related to the dollar value and complexity of the acquisition. The primary purpose of these reviews is to ensure that the negotiator, or negotiation team, is thoroughly prepared to enter into negotiations with a well-conceived, realistic, and fair plan.

1815.406-172 Headquarters reviews.

(a) When a prenegotiation position has been selected for Headquarters review and approval, the contracting activity shall submit to the Office of Procurement (Code HS) one copy each of the prenegotiation position memorandum, the contractor's proposal, the Government technical evaluations, and all pricing reports (including any audit reports).

(b) The required information described in paragraph (a) of this section shall be furnished to Headquarters as soon as practicable and sufficiently in advance of the planned commencement of negotiations to allow a reasonable period of time for Headquarters review. Electronic submittal is acceptable.

1815.406-3 Documenting the negotiation. (NASA supplements paragraph (a))

(a)(i) The price negotiation memorandum (PNM) serves as a detailed summary of: the technical, business, contractual, pricing (including price reasonableness), and other elements of

1815.407

the contract negotiated; and the methodology and rationale used in arriving at the final negotiated agreement.

(ii) A PNM is not required for a contract awarded under competitive negotiated procedures. However, the information required by FAR 15.406-3 shall be reflected in the evaluation and selection documentation to the extent applicable.

(iii) When the PNM is a “stand-alone” document, it shall contain the information required by the FAR and NFS for both PPMs and PNMs. However, when a PPM has been prepared under 1815.406-1, the subsequent PNM need only provide any information required by FAR 15.406-3 that was not provided in the PPM, as well as any changes in the status of factors affecting cost elements (e.g., use of different rates, hours, or subcontractors; wage rate determinations; or the current status of the contractor’s systems).

1815.407 Special cost or pricing areas.

1815.407-2 Make-or-buy programs. (NASA supplements paragraph (e))

(e)(1) Make-or-buy programs should not include items or work efforts estimated to cost less than \$500,000.

1815.408 Solicitation provisions and contract clauses.

1815.408-70 NASA solicitation provisions and contract clauses.

(a) The contracting officer shall insert the provision at 1852.215-78, Make-or-Buy Program Requirements, in solicitations requiring make-or-buy programs as provided in FAR 15.407-2(c). This provision shall be used in conjunction with the clause at FAR 52.215-9, Changes or Additions to Make-or-Buy Program. The contracting officer may add additional paragraphs identifying any other information required in order to evaluate the program.

(b) The contracting officer shall insert the clause at 1852.215-79, Price Adjustment for “Make-or-Buy” Changes, in contracts that include FAR 52.215-9 with its Alternate I or II. Insert in the appropriate columns the items that will be subject to a reduction in the contract value.

Subpart 1815.5—Preaward, Award, and Postaward Notifications, Protests, and Mistakes

1815.504 Award to successful offeror.

The reference to notice of award in FAR 15.504 on negotiated acquisitions is a generic one. It relates only to the formal establishment of a contractual document obligating both the Government and the offeror. The notice is effected by the transmittal of a fully approved and executed definitive contract document, such as the award portion of SF 33, SF 26, SF 1449, or SF 1447, or a letter contract when a definitized contract instrument is not available but the urgency of the requirement necessitates immediate performance. In this latter instance, the procedures in 1816.603 for approval and issuance of letter contracts shall be followed.

1815.506 Postaward debriefing of offerors.

1815.506-70 Debriefing of offerors—Major System acquisitions.

(a) When an acquisition is conducted in accordance with the Major System acquisition procedures in part 1834 and multiple offerors are selected, the debriefing will be limited in such a manner that it does not prematurely disclose innovative concepts, designs, and approaches of the successful offerors that would result in a transfusion of ideas.

(b) When Phase B awards are made for alternative system design concepts, the source selection statements shall not be released to competing offerors or the general public until the release of the source selection statement for Phase C/D without the approval of the Assistant Administrator for Procurement (Code HS).

Subpart 1815.6—Unsolicited Proposals

1815.602 Policy. (NASA paragraphs (1) and (2))

(1) An unsolicited proposal may result in the award of a contract, grant,

National Aeronautics and Space Administration

1815.7001

cooperative agreement, or other agreement. If a grant or cooperative agreement is used, the NASA Grant and Cooperative Agreement Handbook (NPG 5800.1) applies.

(2) Renewal proposals (i.e., those for the extension or augmentation of current contracts) are subject to the same FAR and NFS regulations, including the requirements of the Competition in Contracting Act, as are proposals for new contracts.

1815.604 Agency points of contact. (NASA supplements paragraph (a))

(a) Information titled "Guidance for the Preparation and Submission of Unsolicited Proposals" is available on the Internet at <http://ec.msfc.nasa.gov/hq/library/unSol-Prop.html>. A deviation is required for use of any modified or summarized version of the Internet information or for alternate means of general dissemination of unsolicited proposal information.

[63 FR 9954, Feb. 27, 1998, as amended at 63 FR 44409, Aug. 19, 1998; 66 FR 53546, Oct. 23, 2001]

1815.606 Agency procedures. (NASA supplements paragraphs (a) and (b))

(a) NASA will not accept for formal evaluation unsolicited proposals initially submitted to another agency or to the Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL) without the offeror's express consent.

(b)(i) NASA Headquarters and each NASA field installation shall designate a point of contact for receiving and coordinating the handling and evaluation of unsolicited proposals.

(ii) Each installation shall establish procedures for handling proposals initially received by other offices within the installation. Misdirected proposals shall be forwarded by the point of contact to the proper installation. Points of contact are also responsible for providing guidance to potential offerors regarding the appropriate NASA officials to contact for general mission-related inquiries or other preproposal discussions.

(iii) Points of contact shall keep records of unsolicited proposals received and shall provide prompt status information to requesters. These

records shall include, at a minimum, the number of unsolicited proposals received, funded, and rejected during the fiscal year; the identity of the offerors; and the office to which each was referred. The numbers shall be broken out by source (large business, small business, university, or nonprofit institution).

1815.606-70 Relationship of unsolicited proposals to NRAs.

An unsolicited proposal for a new effort or a renewal, identified by an evaluating office as being within the scope of an open NRA, shall be evaluated as a response to that NRA (see 1835.016-71), provided that the evaluating office can either:

(a) State that the proposal is not at a competitive disadvantage, or

(b) Give the offeror an opportunity to amend the unsolicited proposal to ensure compliance with the applicable NRA proposal preparation instructions. If these conditions cannot be met, the proposal must be evaluated separately.

[63 FR 9954, Feb. 27, 1998, as amended at 64 FR 48561, Sept. 7, 1999]

1815.609 Limited use of data.

1815.609-70 Limited use of proposals.

Unsolicited proposals shall be evaluated outside the Government only to the extent authorized by, and in accordance with, the procedures prescribed in, 1815.207-70.

1815.670 Foreign proposals.

Unsolicited proposals from foreign sources are subject to NPD 1360.2, Initiation and Development of International Cooperation in Space and Aeronautics Programs.

[64 FR 36606, July 7, 1999]

Subpart 1815.70—Ombudsman

1815.7001 NASA Ombudsman Program.

NASA's implementation of an ombudsman program is in NPG 5101.33, Procurement Advocacy Programs.

[63 FR 9954, Feb. 27, 1998, as amended at 65 FR 58931, Oct. 3, 2000]

1815.7002

1815.7002 Synopses of solicitations and contracts.

In all synopses announcing competitive acquisitions, the contracting officer shall indicate that the clause at 1852.215-84, Ombudsman, is applicable. This may be accomplished by referencing the clause number and identifying the installation Ombudsman.

1815.7003 Contract clause.

The contracting officer shall insert a clause substantially the same as the one at 1852.215-84, Ombudsman, in all solicitations (including draft solicitations) and contracts. Use the clause with its Alternate I when a task or delivery order contract is contemplated.

[65 FR 38777, June 22, 2000]

PART 1816—TYPES OF CONTRACTS

Subpart 1816.1—Selecting Contract Types

Sec.

1816.104 Factors in selecting contract types.
1816.104-70 Contract type for performance-based contracting (PBC).

Subpart 1816.2—Fixed-Price Contracts

1816.202 Firm-fixed-price contracts.
1816.202-70 NASA contract clause.
1816.203 Fixed-price contracts with economic price adjustment.
1816.203-4 Contract clauses.

Subpart 1816.3—Cost-Reimbursement Contracts

1816.303-70 Cost-sharing contracts.
1816.306 Cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts.
1816.307 Contract clauses.
1816.307-70 NASA contract clauses.

Subpart 1816.4—Incentive Contracts

1816.402 Application of predetermined, formula-type incentives. (NASA paragraphs 1.2 and 3).
1816.402-2 Performance incentives.
1816.402-270 NASA technical performance incentives.
1816.404 Fixed-price contracts with award fees.
1816.405 Cost-reimbursement incentive contracts.
1816.405-2 Cost-plus-award-fee (CPAF) contracts.
1816.405-270 CPAF contracts.
1816.405-271 Base fee.
1816.405-272 Award fee evaluation periods.
1816.405-273 Award fee evaluations.
1816.405-274 Award fee evaluation factors.

48 CFR Ch. 18 (10-1-02 Edition)

1816.405-275 Award fee evaluation scoring.
1816.405-276 Award fee payments and limitations.
1816.406 Contract clauses.
1816.406-70 NASA contract clauses.

Subpart 1816.5—Indefinite-Delivery Contracts

1816.504 Indefinite quantity contracts.
1816.505 Ordering.
1816.505-70 Task ordering.
1816.506-70 NASA contract clause.

Subpart 1816.6—Time-and-Materials, Labor-House, and Letter Contracts

1816.603 Letter contracts.
1816.603-2 Application.
1816.603-370 Approvals.

AUTHORITY: 42 U.S.C. 2473(c)(1).

SOURCE: 62 FR 3478, Jan. 23, 1997, unless otherwise noted.

Subpart 1816.1—Selecting Contract Types

SOURCE: 63 FR 12997, Mar. 17, 1998, unless otherwise noted.

1816.104 Factors in selecting contract types.

1816.104-70 Contract type for performance-based contracting (PBC).

(a) PBC is defined in FAR 2.101 and discussed in FAR 37.6. Although FAR part 37 primarily addresses services contracts, PBC is not limited to these contracts. PBC is the preferred way of contracting for all supplies and services at NASA. Generally, when contract performance risk under a PBC specification can be fairly shifted to the contractor to allow for the operation of objective incentives, a contract type with objectively measurable incentives (e.g., FFP, FPIF, or CPIF) is appropriate. However, when contractor performance (e.g., cost control, schedule, or quality/technical) is best evaluated subjectively using quantitative measures, a CPAF contract may be used.

(b) A PBC is a completion form of contract (something is accomplished). Term/level-of-effort, time-and-materials and labor hour contracts are not PBC.

[63 FR 12997, Mar. 17, 1998, as amended at 67 FR 30603, May 7, 2002]

Subpart 1816.2—Fixed-Price Contracts

1816.202 Firm-fixed-price contracts.

1816.202-70 NASA contract clause.

The contracting officer shall insert the clause at 1852.216-78, Firm-Fixed-Price, in firm-fixed-price solicitations and contracts. Insert the appropriate amount in the resulting contract.

1816.203 Fixed-price contracts with economic price adjustment.

1816.203-4 Contract clauses. (NASA supplements paragraphs (a) and (d)).

(a) In addition to the approval requirements in the prescriptions at FAR 52.216-2 through 52.216-4, the contracting officer shall coordinate with the installation's Deputy Chief Financial Officer (Finance) before exceeding the ten-percent limit in paragraph (c)(1) of the clauses at FAR 52.216-2 and 52.216-3 and paragraph (c)(4) of the clause at 52.216-4.

(d)(2) Contracting officers shall contact the Office of Procurement, Code HK, for specific guidance on preparing clauses using cost indexes. Such clauses require advance approval by the Assistant Administrator for Procurement. Requests for approval shall be submitted to the Headquarters Office of Procurement (Code HS).

[62 FR 3478, Jan. 23, 1997, as amended at 64 FR 5620, Feb. 4, 1999; 65 FR 82296, Dec. 28, 2000]

Subpart 1816.3—Cost-Reimbursement Contracts

1816.303-70 Cost-sharing contracts.

(a) *Cost-sharing with for-profit organizations.* (1) Cost sharing by for-profit organizations is mandatory in any contract for basic or applied research resulting from an unsolicited proposal, and may be accepted in any other contract when offered by the proposing organization. The requirement for cost-sharing may be waived when the contracting officer determines in writing that the contractor has no commercial, production, education, or service activities that would benefit from the results of the research, and the con-

tractor has no means of recovering its shared costs on such projects.

(2) The contractor's cost-sharing may be any percentage of the project cost. In determining the amount of cost-sharing, the contracting officer shall consider the relative benefits to the contractor and the Government. Factors that should be considered include—

(i) The potential for the contractor to recover its contribution from non-Federal sources;

(ii) The extent to which the particular area of research requires special stimulus in the national interest; and

(iii) The extent to which the research effort or result is likely to enhance the contractor's capability, expertise, or competitive advantage.

(b) *Cost-sharing with not-for-profit organizations.* (1) Costs to perform research stemming from an unsolicited proposal by universities and other educational or not-for-profit institutions are usually fully reimbursed. When the contracting officer determines that there is a potential for significant benefit to the institution cost-sharing will be considered.

(2) The contracting officer will normally limit the institution's share to no more than 10 percent of the project's cost.

(c) *Implementation.* Cost-sharing shall be stated as a minimum percentage of the total allowable costs of the project. The contractor's contributed costs may not be charged to the Government under any other contract or grant, including allocation to other contracts and grants as part of an independent research and development program.

1816.306 Cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts. (NASA supplements paragraph (d)).

(d) *Completion and term forms.*

(4) Term form contracts are incompatible with performance base contracting (PBC) and should not be used with PBC requirements.

1816.307 Contract clauses. (NASA supplements paragraphs (a), (b), (d), and (g)).

(a) In paragraph (h)(2)(ii)(B) of the Allowable Cost and Payment clause at FAR 52.216-7, the period of years may

1816.307-70

be increased to correspond with any statutory period of limitation applicable to claims of third parties against the contractor; provided, that a corresponding increase is made in the period for retention of records required in paragraph (f) of the clause at FAR 52.215-2, Audit and Records—Negotiation.

(b) In solicitations and contracts containing the clause at FAR 52.216-8, Fixed Fee, the Schedule shall include appropriate terms, if any, for provisional billing against fee.

(d) In solicitations and contracts containing the clause at FAR 52.216-10, Incentive Fee, the Schedule shall include appropriate terms, if any, for provisional billing against fee.

(g) In paragraph (g)(2)(ii) of the Allowable Cost and Payment—Facilities clause at FAR 52.216-13, the period of years may be increased to correspond with any statutory period of limitation applicable to claims of third parties against the contractor; provided, that a corresponding increase is made in the period for retention of records required in paragraph (f) of the clause at FAR 52.215-2, Audit and Records—Negotiation.

1816.307-70 NASA contract clauses.

(a) The contracting officer shall insert the clause at 1852.216-73, Estimated Cost and Cost Sharing, in each contract in which costs are shared by the contractor pursuant to 1816.303-70.

(b) The contracting officer shall insert the clause substantially as stated at 1852.216-74, Estimated Cost and Fixed Fee, in cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts.

(c) The contracting officer may insert the clause at 1852.216-75, Payment of Fixed Fee, in cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts. Modifications to the clause are authorized.

(d) The contracting officer may insert the clause at 1852.216-81, Estimated Cost, in cost-no-fee contracts that are not cost sharing or facilities contracts.

(e) The contracting officer may insert a clause substantially as stated at 1852.216-87, Submission of Vouchers for Payment, in cost-reimbursement solicitations and contracts.

48 CFR Ch. 18 (10-1-02 Edition)

(f) When either FAR clause 52.216-7, Allowable Cost and Payment, or FAR clause 52.216-13, Allowable Cost and Payment—Facilities, is included in the contract, as prescribed at FAR 16.307 (a) and (g), the contracting officer should include the clause at 1852.216-89, Assignment and Release Forms.

Subpart 1816.4—Incentive Contracts

1816.402 Application of predetermined, formula-type incentives. (NASA paragraphs 1, 2 and 3).

When considering the use of a quality, performance, or schedule incentive, the following guidance applies.

(1) A positive incentive is generally not appropriate unless—

(i) Performance above the target (or minimum, if there are no negative incentives) level is of significant value to the Government;

(ii) The value of the higher level of performance is worth the additional cost/fee;

(iii) The attainment of the higher level of performance is clearly within the control of the contractor; and

(iv) An upper limit is identified, beyond which no further incentive is earned.

(2) A negative incentive is generally not appropriate unless—

(i) A target level of performance can be established, which the contractor can reasonably be expected to reach with a diligent effort, but a lower level of performance is also minimally acceptable;

(ii) The value of the negative incentive is commensurate with the lower level of performance and any additional administrative costs; and

(iii) Factors likely to prevent attainment of the target level of performance are clearly within the control of the contractor.

(3) When a negative incentive is used, the contract must indicate a level below which performance is not acceptable.

[63 FR 12997, Mar. 17, 1998]

1816.402-2 Performance incentives.**1816.402-270 NASA technical performance incentives.**

(a) Pursuant to the guidelines in 1816.402, NASA has determined that a performance incentive shall be included in all contracts based on performance-oriented documents (see FAR 11.101(a)), except those awarded under the commercial item procedures of FAR part 12, where the primary deliverable(s) is (are) hardware with a total value (including options) greater than \$25 million. Any exception to this requirement shall be approved in writing by the Center Director. Performance incentives may be included in hardware contracts valued under \$25 million acquired under procedures other than FAR Part 12 at the discretion of the procurement officer upon consideration of the guidelines in 1816.402. Performance incentives, which are objective and measure hardware performance after delivery and acceptance, are separate from other incentives, such as cost or delivery incentives.

(b) When a performance incentive is used, it shall be structured to be both positive and negative based on hardware performance after delivery and acceptance, unless the contract type requires complete contractor liability for product performance (e.g., fixed price). In this latter case, a negative incentive is not required. In structuring the incentives, the contract shall establish a standard level of performance based on the salient hardware performance requirement. This standard performance level is normally the contract's minimum performance requirement. No incentive amount is earned at this standard performance level. Discrete units of measurement based on the same performance parameter shall be identified for performance above and, when a negative incentive is used, below the standard. Specific incentive amounts shall be associated with each performance level from maximum beneficial performance (maximum positive incentive) to, when a negative incentive is included, minimal beneficial performance or total failure (maximum negative incentive). The relationship between any given incentive, either positive and negative,

and its associated unit of measurement should reflect the value to the Government of that level of hardware performance. The contractor should not be rewarded for above-standard performance levels that are of no benefit to the Government.

(c) The final calculation of the performance incentive shall be done when hardware performance, as defined in the contract, ceases or when the maximum positive incentive is reached. When hardware performance ceases below the standard established in the contract and a negative incentive is included, the Government shall calculate the amount due and the contractor shall pay the Government that amount. Once hardware performance exceeds the standard, the contractor may request payment of the incentive amount associated with a given level of performance, provided that such payments shall not be more frequent than monthly. When hardware performance ceases above the standard level of performance, or when the maximum positive incentive is reached, the Government shall calculate the final performance incentive earned and unpaid and promptly remit it to the contractor.

(d) When the deliverable hardware lends itself to multiple, meaningful measures of performance, multiple performance incentives may be established. When the contract requires the sequential delivery of several hardware items (e.g. multiple spacecraft), separate performance incentive structures may be established to parallel the sequential delivery and use of the deliverables.

(e) In determining the value of the maximum performance incentives available, the contracting officer shall follow the following rules.

(1) For a CPFF contract, the sum of the maximum positive performance incentive and fixed fee shall not exceed the limitations in FAR 15.404-4(c)(4)(i).

(2) For an award fee contract.

(i) The individual values of the maximum positive performance incentive and the total potential award fee (including any base fee) shall each be at least one-third of the total potential contract fee. The remaining one-third of the total potential contract fee may be divided between award fee and the

1816.404

maximum performance incentive at the discretion of the contracting officer.

(ii) The maximum negative performance incentive for research and development hardware (e.g., the first and second units) shall be equal in amount to the total *earned* award fee (including any base fee). The maximum negative performance incentives for production hardware (e.g., the third and all subsequent units of any hardware items) shall be equal in amount to the total *potential* award fee (including any base fee). Where one contract contains both cases described above, any base fee shall be allocated reasonably among the items.

(3) For cost reimbursement contracts other than award fee contracts, the maximum negative performance incentives shall not exceed the total earned fee under the contract.

[62 FR 3478, Jan. 23, 1997, as amended at 62 FR 58687, Oct. 30, 1997; 63 FR 9965, Feb. 27, 1998; 63 FR 12997, Mar. 17, 1998; 63 FR 28285, May 22, 1998]

1816.404 Fixed-price contracts with award fees.

Section 1816.405-2 applies to the use of FPAF contracts as if they were CPAF contracts. However, neither base fee (see 1816.405-271) nor evaluation of cost control (see 1816.405-274) apply to FPAF contracts.

[62 FR 58687, Oct. 30, 1997]

1816.405 Cost-reimbursement incentive contracts.

[62 FR 3478, Jan. 23, 1997. Redesignated at 62 FR 36706, July 9, 1997]

1816.405-2 Cost-plus-award-fee (CPAF) contracts.

[62 FR 3478, Jan. 23, 1997. Redesignated at 62 FR 36706, July 9, 1997]

1816.405-270 CPAF contracts.

(a) Use of an award fee incentive shall be approved in writing by the procurement officer. The procurement officer's approval shall include a discussion of the other types of contracts considered and shall indicate why an award fee incentive is the appropriate choice. Award fee incentives should not be used on contracts with a total esti-

48 CFR Ch. 18 (10-1-02 Edition)

mated cost and fee less than \$2 million per year. The procurement officer may authorize use of award fee for lower-valued acquisitions, but should do so only in exceptional situations, such as contract requirements having direct health or safety impacts, where the judgmental assessment of the quality of contractor performance is critical.

(b) Except as provided in paragraph (c) of this section, an award fee incentive may be used in conjunction with other contract types for aspects of performance that cannot be objectively assessed. In such cases, the cost incentive is based on objective formulas inherent in the other contract types (e.g., FPI, CPIF), and the award fee provision should not separately incentivize cost performance.

(c) Award fee incentives shall not be used with a cost-plus-fixed-fee (CPFF) contract.

[63 FR 12998, Mar. 17, 1998]

1816.405-271 Base fee.

(a) A base fee shall not be used on CPAF contracts for which the periodic award fee evaluations are final (1816.405-273(a)). In these circumstances, contractor performance during any award fee period is independent of and has no effect on subsequent performance periods or the final results at contract completion. For other contracts, such as those for hardware or software development, the procurement officer may authorize the use of a base fee not to exceed 3 percent. Base fee shall not be used when an award fee incentive is used in conjunction with another contract type (e.g., CPIF/AF).

(b) When a base fee is authorized for use in a CPAF contract, it shall be paid only if the final award fee evaluation is "satisfactory" or better. (See 1816.405-273 and 1816.405-275) Pending final evaluation, base fee may be paid during the life of the contract at defined intervals on a provisional basis. If the final award fee evaluation is "poor/unsatisfactory", all provisional base fee payments shall be refunded to the Government.

[62 FR 3478, Jan. 23, 1997. Redesignated and amended at 62 FR 36706, July 9, 1997; 63 FR 13133, Mar. 18, 1998]

1816.405-272 Award fee evaluation periods.

(a) Award fee evaluation periods, including those for interim evaluations, should be at least 6 months in length. When appropriate, the procurement officer may authorize shorter evaluation periods after ensuring that the additional administrative costs associated with the shorter periods are offset by benefits accruing to the Government. Where practicable, such as developmental contracts with defined performance milestones (e.g., Preliminary Design Review, Critical Design Review, initial system test), establishing evaluation periods at conclusion of the milestones rather than calendar dates, or in combination with calendar dates should be considered. In no case shall an evaluation period be longer than 12 months.

(b) A portion of the total available award fee contract shall be allocated to each of the evaluation periods. This allocation may result in an equal or unequal distribution of fee among the periods. The contracting officer should consider the nature of each contract and the incentive effects of fee distribution in determining the appropriate allocation structure.

[62 FR 3478, Jan. 23, 1997. Redesignated at 62 FR 36706, July 9, 1997, as amended at 63 FR 13133, Mar. 18, 1998]

1816.405-273 Award fee evaluations.

(a) *Service contracts.* On contracts where the contract deliverable is the performance of a service over any given time period, contractor performance is often definitively measurable within each evaluation period. In these cases, all evaluations are final, and the contractor keeps the fee earned in any period regardless of the evaluations of subsequent periods. Unearned award fee in any given period in a service contract is lost and shall not be carried forward, or "rolled-over," into subsequent periods.

(b) *End item contracts.* On contracts, such as those for end item deliverables, where the true quality of contractor performance cannot be measured until the end of the contract, only the last evaluation is final. At that point, the total contract award fee pool is available, and the contractor's total per-

formance is evaluated against the award fee plan to determine total earned award fee. In addition to the final evaluation, interim evaluations are done to monitor performance prior to contract completion, provide feedback to the contractor on the Government's assessment of the quality of its performance, and establish the basis for making interim award fee payments (see 1816.405-276(a)). These interim evaluations and associated interim award fee payments are superseded by the fee determination made in the final evaluation at contract completion. The Government will then pay the contractor, or the contractor will refund to the Government, the difference between the final award fee determination and the cumulative interim fee payments.

(c) *Control of evaluations.* Interim and final evaluations may be used to provide past performance information during the source selection process in future acquisitions and should be marked and controlled as "Source Selection Information—See FAR 3.104".

[63 FR 13133, Mar. 18, 1998]

1816.405-274 Award fee evaluation factors.

(a) Explicit evaluation factors shall be established for each award fee period.

(b) Evaluation factors will be developed by the contracting officer based upon the characteristics of an individual procurement. Normally, technical and schedule considerations will be included in all CPAF contracts as evaluation factors. Cost control shall be included as an evaluation factor in all CPAF contracts. When explicit evaluation factor weightings are used, cost control shall be no less than 25 percent of the total weighted evaluation factors. The predominant consideration of the cost control evaluation should be a measurement of the contractor's performance against the negotiated estimated cost of the contract. This estimated cost may include the value of undefinitized change orders when appropriate.

(c)(1) The technical factor, if used, must include consideration of risk management (including mission success, safety, security, health, export

control, and damage to the environment, as appropriate) unless waived at a level above the contracting officer, with the concurrence of the project manager. The rationale for any waiver shall be documented in the contract file. When safety, export control, or security are considered under the technical factor, the award fee plan shall allow the following fee determinations, regardless of contractor performance in other evaluation factors, when there is a major breach of safety or security.

(i) For evaluation of service contracts under 1816.405-273(a), an overall fee determination of zero for any evaluation period in which there is a major breach of safety or security.

(ii) For evaluation of end item contracts under 1816.405-273(b), an overall fee determination of zero for any interim evaluation period in which there is a major breach of safety or security. To ensure that the final award fee evaluation at contract completion reflects any major breach of safety or security, in an interim period, the overall award fee pool shall be reduced by the amount of the fee available for the period in which the major breach occurred if a zero fee determination was made because of a major breach of safety or security.

(2) A major breach of safety must be related directly to the work on the contract. A major breach of safety is an act or omission of the Contractor that consists of an accident, incident, or exposure resulting in a fatality or mission failure; or in damage to equipment or property equal to or greater than \$1 million; or in any "willful" or "repeat" violation cited by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) or by a state agency operating under an OSHA approved plan.

(3) A major breach of security may occur on or off Government installations, but must be directly related to the work on the contract. A major breach of security is an act or omission by the contractor that results in compromise of classified information, illegal technology transfer, workplace violence resulting in criminal conviction, sabotage, compromise or denial of information technology services, equipment or property damage from van-

dalism greater than \$250,000, or theft greater than \$250,000.

(4) The Assistant Administrator for Procurement (Code HS) shall be notified prior to the determination of a zero award fee because of a major breach of safety or security.

(d) In rare circumstances, contract costs may increase for reasons outside the contractor's control and for which the contractor is not entitled to an equitable adjustment. One example is a weather-related launch delay on a launch support contract. The Government shall take such situations into consideration when evaluating contractor cost control.

(e) Emphasis on cost control should be balanced against other performance requirement objectives. The contractor should not be incentivized to pursue cost control to the point that overall performance is significantly degraded. For example, incentivizing an underrun that results in direct negative impacts on technical performance, safety, or other critical contract objectives is both undesirable and counterproductive. Therefore, evaluation of cost control shall conform to the following guidelines:

(1) Normally, the contractor should be given a score of 0 for cost control when there is a significant overrun within its control. However, the contractor may receive higher scores for cost control if the overrun is insignificant. Scores should decrease sharply as the size of the overrun increases. In any evaluation of contractor overrun performance, the Government shall consider the reasons for the overrun and assess the extent and effectiveness of the contractor's efforts to control or mitigate the overrun.

(2) The contractor should normally be rewarded for an underrun within its control, up to the maximum score allocated for cost control, provided the average numerical rating for all other award fee evaluation factors is 81 or greater (see 1816.405-275). An underrun shall be rewarded as if the contractor has met the estimated cost of the contract (see 1816.405-274(d)(3)) when the average numerical rating for all other factors is less than 81 but greater than 60.

(3) The contractor should be rewarded for meeting the estimated cost of the contract, but not to the maximum score allocated for cost control, to the degree that the contractor has prudently managed costs while meeting contract requirements. No award shall be given in this circumstance unless the average numerical rating for all other award fee evaluation factors is 61 or greater.

(f) When an AF arrangement is used in conjunction with another contract type, the award fee's cost control factor will only apply to a subjective assessment of the contractor's efforts to control costs and not the actual cost outcome incentivized under the basic contract type (e.g. CPIF, FPIF).

(g)(1) The contractor's performance against the subcontracting plan incorporated in the contract shall be evaluated. Emphasis may be placed on the contractor's accomplishment of its goals for subcontracting with small business, HUBZone small business, women-owned small business, veteran-owned small business, and service-disabled veteran-owned small business concerns.

(2) The contractor's performance against the contract target for participation as subcontractors by small disadvantaged business concerns in the NAICS Major Groups designated by the Department of Commerce (see FAR 19.201(c)) shall also be evaluated if the clause at FAR 52.219-26, Small Disadvantaged Business Participation—Incentive Subcontracting, is not included in the contract (see FAR 19.1204(c)).

(3) The contractor's achievements in subcontracting high technology efforts as well as the contractor's performance under the Mentor-Protégé Program, if applicable, may also be evaluated.

(4) The evaluation weight given to the contractor's performance against the considerations in paragraphs (g)(1) through (g)(3) of this section should be significant (up to 15 percent of available award fee). The weight should motivate the contractor to focus management attention to subcontracting with small, HUBZone, women-owned, veteran-owned, and service-disabled veteran-owned small business concerns, and with small disadvantaged business concerns in designated NAICS Major

Groups to the maximum extent practicable, consistent with efficient contract performance.

(h) When contract changes are anticipated, the contractor's responsiveness to requests for change proposals should be evaluated. This evaluation should include the contractor's submission of timely, complete proposals and cooperation in negotiating the change.

(i) Only the award fee performance evaluation factors set forth in the performance evaluation plan shall be used to determine award fee scores.

(j) The Government may unilaterally modify the applicable award fee performance evaluation factors and performance evaluation areas prior to the start of an evaluation period. The contracting officer shall notify the contractor in writing of any such changes 30 days prior to the start of the relevant evaluation period.

[62 FR 3478, Jan. 23, 1997. Redesignated and amended at 62 FR 36706, 36707, July 9, 1997; 63 FR 12998, Mar. 17, 1998; 64 FR 25215, May 11, 1999; 65 FR 37059, June 13, 2000; 65 FR 46628, July 31, 2000; 65 FR 58932, Oct. 3, 2000; 65 FR 70316, Nov. 22, 2000; 66 FR 53547, Oct. 23, 2001; 67 FR 7618, Feb. 20, 2002]

1816.405-275 Award fee evaluation scoring.

(a) A scoring system of 0-100 shall be used for all award fee ratings. Award fee earned is determined by applying the numerical score to the award fee pool. For example, a score of 85 yields an award fee of 85 percent of the award fee pool. No award fee shall be paid unless the total score is 61 or greater.

(b) The following standard adjectival ratings and the associated numerical scores shall be used on all award fee contracts.

(1) *Excellent* (100-91): Of exceptional merit; exemplary performance in a timely, efficient, and economical manner; very minor (if any) deficiencies with no adverse effect on overall performance.

(2) *Very good* (90-81): Very effective performance, fully responsive to contract requirements; contract requirements accomplished in a timely, efficient, and economical manner for the most part; only minor deficiencies.

(3) *Good* (80-71): Effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable deficiencies, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance.

(4) *Satisfactory* (70-61): Meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable deficiencies with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance.

(5) *Poor/Unsatisfactory* (less than 61): Does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; deficiencies in one or more areas which adversely affect overall performance.

(c) As a benchmark for evaluation, in order to be rated "Excellent," the contractor must be under cost, on or ahead of schedule, and have provided excellent technical performance.

(d) A scoring system appropriate for the circumstances of the individual contract requirement should be developed. Weighted scoring is recommended. In this system, each evaluation factor (e.g., technical, schedule, cost control) is assigned a specific percentage weighting with the cumulative weightings of all factors totaling 100. During the award fee evaluation, each factor is scored from 0-100 according to the ratings defined in 1816.405-275(b). The numerical score for each factor is then multiplied by the weighting for that factor to determine the weighted score. For example, if the technical factor has a weighting of 60 percent and the numerical score for that factor is 80, the weighted technical score is 48 (80×60 percent). The weighted scores for each evaluation factor are then added to determine the total award fee score.

[62 FR 3478, Jan. 23, 1997. Redesignated and amended at 62 FR 36706, 36707, July 9, 1997; 63 FR 13134, Mar. 18, 1998]

1816.405-276 Award fee payments and limitations.

(a) *Interim award fee payments.* The amount of an interim award fee payment (see 1816.405-273(b)) is limited to the lesser of the interim evaluation score or 80 percent of the fee allocated to that interim period less any provisional payments (see paragraph (b) of

this subsection) made during the period.

(b) *Provisional award fee payments.* Provisional award fee payments are payments made within evaluation periods prior to an interim or final evaluation for that period. Provisional payments may be included in the contract and should be negotiated on a case-by-case basis. For a service contract, the total amount of award fee available in an evaluation period that may be provisionally paid is the lesser of a percentage stipulated in the contract (but not exceeding 80 percent) or the prior period's evaluation score. For an end item contract, the total amount of provisional payments in a period is limited to a percentage not to exceed 80 percent of the prior interim period's evaluation score.

(c) *Fee payment.* The Fee Determination Official's rating for both interim and final evaluations will be provided to the contractor within 45 calendar days of the end of the period being evaluated. Any fee, interim or final, due the contractor will be paid no later than 60 calendar days after the end of the period being evaluated.

[63 FR 13134, Mar. 18, 1998]

1816.406 Contract clauses.

[62 FR 3478, Jan. 23, 1997. Redesignated at 62 FR 36706, July 9, 1997]

1816.406-70 NASA contract clauses.

(a) As authorized by FAR 16.406(e), the contracting officer shall insert the clause at 1852.216-76, Award Fee for Service Contracts, in solicitations and contracts when an award fee contract is contemplated and the contract deliverable is the performance of a service.

(b) As authorized by FAR 16.406(e), the contracting officer shall insert the clause at 1852.216-77, Award Fee for End Item Contracts, in solicitations and contracts when an award fee contract is contemplated and the contract deliverables are hardware or other end items for which total contractor performance cannot be measured until the end of the contract. When the clause is used in a fixed-price award fee contract, it shall be modified by deleting references to base fee in paragraphs (a), and by deleting paragraph (c)(1), the

last sentence of (c)(4), and the first sentence of (c)(5).

(c) The contracting officer may insert a clause substantially as stated at 1852.216-83, Fixed Price Incentive, in fixed-price-incentive solicitations and contracts utilizing firm or successive targets. For items subject to incentive price revision, identify the target cost, target profit, target price, and ceiling price for each item.

(d) The contracting officer shall insert the clause at 1852.216-84, Estimated Cost and Incentive Fee, in cost-plus-incentive-fee solicitations and contracts.

(e) The contracting officer may insert the clause at 1852.216-85, Estimated Cost and Award Fee, in cost an award fee solicitations and contracts. When the contract includes performance incentives, use Alternate I. When the clause is used in a fixed-price award fee contract, it shall be modified to delete references to base fee and to reflect the contract type.

(f) As provided at 1816.402-270, the contracting officer shall insert a clause substantially as stated at 1852.216-88, Performance Incentive, when the primary deliverable(s) is (are) hardware and total estimated cost and fee is greater than \$25 million. A clause substantially as stated at 1852.216-88 may be included in lower dollar value hardware contracts with the approval of the procurement officer.

[62 FR 3478, Jan. 23, 1997. Redesignated and amended at 62 FR 36706, 36707, July 9, 1997; 62 FR 58687, Oct. 30, 1997; 63 FR 13134, Mar. 18, 1998]

Subpart 1816.5—Indefinite-Delivery Contracts

1816.504 Indefinite quantity contracts. (NASA supplements paragraph (a))

(a)(4)(ii) ID/IQ service contract values and task order values shall be expressed only in dollars.

(a)(4)(v) See 1815.7003.

[62 FR 3478, Jan. 23, 1997, as amended at 65 FR 38777, June 22, 2000]

1816.505 Ordering. (NASA supplements paragraphs (a) and (b))

(a)(2) Task and delivery orders shall be issued by the contracting officer.

(b)(5) The Agency and installation ombudsmen designated in accordance with 1815.7001 shall review complaints from contractors on task order contracts and delivery order contracts.

[62 FR 3478, Jan. 23, 1997, as amended at 64 FR 51079, Sept. 21, 1999; 65 FR 38777, June 22, 2000; 65 FR 46628, July 31, 2000]

1816.505-70 Task ordering.

(a) The contracting officer shall, to the maximum extent possible, state task order requirements in terms of functions and the related performance and quality standards such that the standards may be objectively measured.

(b) To the maximum extent possible, contracting officers shall solicit contractor task plans to use as the basis for finalizing task order requirements and enable evaluation and pricing of the contractor's proposed work on a performance based approach as described in 1816.104-70(a).

(c) Task order contract type shall be individually determined, based on the nature of each task order's requirements.

(1) Task orders may be grouped by contract type for administrative convenience (e.g., all CPIF orders, all FFP orders, etc.) for contractor progress and cost reporting.

(2) Under multiple awards, solicitations for individual task plans shall request the same pricing structure from all offerors.

(d) Any undefinitized task order issued under paragraph (f) of the clause at 1852.216-80, Task Ordering Procedure, shall be treated and reported as an undefinitized contract action in accordance with 1843-70.

[62 FR 3478, Jan. 23, 1997, as amended at 65 FR 46628, July 31, 2000]

1816.506-70 NASA contract clause.

Insert the clause at 1852.216-80, Task Ordering Procedure, in solicitations and contracts when an indefinite-delivery, task order contract is contemplated. The clause is applicable to both fixed-price and cost-reimbursement type contracts. If the contract does not require 533M reporting (See

1816.603

NPG 9501.2, NASA Contractor Financial Management Reporting System), use the clause with its Alternate I.

[62 FR 3478, Jan. 23, 1997, as amended at 64 FR 51079, Sept. 21, 1999]

Subpart 1816.6—Time-and-Materials, Labor-Hour, and Letter Contracts

1816.603 Letter contracts.

1816.603-2 Application.

(a) Centers must ensure that NASA liabilities and commitments are minimized under letter contracts. When a letter contract is justified and program requirements can be severed into smaller, discreet efforts, the work authorized by the letter contract must be limited to the minimum severable effort required to satisfy the urgent program requirements. The remaining requirements may not be initially included in the letter contract and must be acquired through a separate fully priced and definitized contract action.

[66 FR 53547, Oct. 23, 2001]

1816.603-370 Approvals.

(a)(1) The approval authority to issue a letter contract is—

(i) The Assistant Administrator for Procurement when the estimated value of the definitized contract is equal to or greater than the Master Buy Plan (MBP) submission threshold of 1807.7101;

(ii) The procurement officer when the estimated value of the definitized contract is below the MBP submission threshold; and

(iii) The Assistant Administrator for Procurement for any modification of an undefinitized letter contract approved by the procurement officer that increases the estimated value of the definitized contract to an amount equal to or above the MBP submission threshold. This approval must be obtained prior to issuing the modification.

(2) The procurement officer must sign all requests for approval by the Assistant Administrator for Procurement and submit them to Code HS.

48 CFR Ch. 18 (10-1-02 Edition)

(b) All requests for authority to issue a letter contract must include the following:

- (1) Contractor name and address.
- (2) Place of performance.
- (3) Contract number, including modification number, if applicable.
- (4) Brief description of the work or services to be performed.
- (5) Performance period or delivery schedule for both the letter contract and definitized contract.
- (6) Estimated value of the work authorized by the letter contract.
- (7) Estimated value of the definitized contract.
- (8) Contract type of the definitized contract.
- (9) A statement that the definitized contract will contain all required clauses or identification of approved specific clause deviations.
- (10) Complete justification of the necessity for the letter contract, including the advantages to the Government and a description of the efforts to avoid its issuance or to minimize its scope.
- (11) The definitization schedule described in FAR 16.603-2(c) expected to be negotiated with the contractor.

[67 FR 30603, May 7, 2002]

PART 1817—SPECIAL CONTRACTING METHODS

Subpart 1817.1—Multiyear Contracting

Sec.

1817.105 Policy.
1817.105-1 Uses.

Subpart 1817.2—Options

1817.200 Scope of subpart.
1817.203 Solicitations.
1817.204 Contracts.
1817.206 Evaluation.
1817.207 Exercise of options.
1817.208 Solicitation provisions and contract clauses.

Subpart 1817.4—Leader Company Contracting

1817.401 General.

Subpart 1817.5—Interagency Acquisitions Under the Economy Act

1817.503 Determinations and findings requirements.
1817.504 Ordering procedures.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration

1817.207

Subpart 1817.70—Acquisitions With Military Departments

- 1817.7000 Scope of subpart.
- 1817.7001 Authorization and policy.
- 1817.7002 NASA-Defense Purchase Request and acceptance.
- 1817.7002-1 Acceptance by Military Department.
- 1817.7002-2 Changes in estimated total prices.
- 1817.7002-3 Payments.
- 1817.7002-4 Contract clause.

Subpart 1817.71—Exchange or Sale of Personal Property

- 1817.7101 Policy.

Subpart 1817.72—Interagency Transactions

- 1817.7201 Policy.

Subpart 1817.730—Phased Acquisition

- 1817.7300 Definitions.
- 1817.7301 Down-selections in phased acquisitions.
 - 1817.7301-1 Pre-solicitation planning.
 - 1817.7301-2 Evaluation factors.
 - 1817.7301-3 Down-selection milestones.
 - 1817.7301-4 Synopsis.
 - 1817.7301-5 Progressive competition.
- 1817.7302 Contract clauses.

AUTHORITY: 42 U.S.C. 2473(c)(1)

SOURCE: 61 FR 55753, Oct. 29, 1996, unless otherwise noted.

Subpart 1817.1—Multiyear Contracting

1817.105 Policy.

1817.105-1 Uses. (NASA supplements paragraph (b))

(b) The Assistant Administrator for Procurement (Code HS) is the approval authority for the use of the multiyear contracting technique. Requests for approval shall be signed by the procurement officer and shall include a description of the acquisition, identification of anticipated contract costs and funding, and a determination, with supporting rationale, that each of the criteria in FAR 17.105-1(b) (1) through (5) is met by the proposed use of multiyear contracting.

Subpart 1817.2—Options

1817.200 Scope of subpart.

FAR subpart 17.2 applies to all NASA contracts.

1817.203 Solicitations. (NASA supplements paragraph (g))

(g)(2) The procurement officer is authorized to approve option quantities greater than 50 percent.

1817.204 Contracts. (NASA supplements paragraph (e))

(e)(i) The 5-year limitation (basic plus option periods) does not apply when the time needed to complete system development or hardware production is greater than five years.

(ii) Requests for deviations from the 5-year limitation policy shall be sent to the Assistant Administrator for Procurement (Code HS) and shall include justification for exceeding five years and evidence that the extended years can be reasonably priced.

1817.206 Evaluation. (NASA supplements paragraph (b))

(b)(i) The procurement officer is the approval authority for determinations by the contracting officer not to evaluate offers for any option quantities or periods.

(ii) Unless a determination has been approved under 1817.206(b)(i), the selection statement for each acquisition involving an option shall address the source selection authority's consideration of the option as part of the initial competition.

1817.207 Exercise of options. (NASA supplements paragraph (f))

(f) Options under cost type contracts shall contain an estimated cost for the option period(s).

(f)(2) Use of the provision (or formula) for determining the price of a fixed price option requires advance approval by the Assistant Administrator for Procurement (Code HS).

(f)(3)(ii) Use of a formula to determine the fee of an option in a cost-type contract requires advance approval of the Assistant Administrator for Procurement (Code HS). The formula shall

1817.208

preclude the contractor from increasing costs for the purpose of earning additional fee.

1817.208 Solicitation provisions and contract clauses. (NASA supplements paragraph (c))

(c)(3) The contracting officer shall insert a provision substantially the same as FAR 52.217-5 in cost reimbursement contracts when the other conditions of FAR 17.208(c) are met.

Subpart 1817.4—Leader Company Contracting

1817.401 General.

It is NASA policy not to use the leader company contracting technique.

Subpart 1817.5—Interagency Acquisitions Under the Economy Act

1817.503 Determinations and findings requirements. (NASA supplements paragraph (a))

(a) See 1817.72 for additional information on interagency transaction requirements.

(2) Current market prices, recent acquisition prices, or prices obtained by informational submissions as provided in FAR 15.201 may be used to ascertain whether the acquisition can be accomplished more economically from commercial sources.

(c) The Assistant Administrator for Procurement as the agency senior procurement executive will approve all D&F's for a servicing agency not covered by the Federal Acquisition Regulations. This approval may not be delegated below the senior procurement executive level.

[61 FR 55753, Oct. 29, 1996, as amended at 62 FR 58687, Oct. 30, 1997; 63 FR 9967, Feb. 27, 1998; 66 FR 53547, Oct. 23, 2001]

1817.504 Ordering procedures. (NASA supplements paragraph (b))

(b)(4) All payment provisions shall require the servicing agency or department to submit a final voucher, invoice, or other appropriate payment document within six months after the completion date of the order. A different period may be specified by mu-

48 CFR Ch. 18 (10-1-02 Edition)

tual agreement if six months is not sufficient. The rationale for a longer period shall be documented in the contract file.

Subpart 1817.70—Acquisitions With Military Departments

1817.7000 Scope of subpart.

This subpart contains policies and procedures, developed jointly by NASA and DOD, for acquisition of supplies or services by NASA from or through the Military Departments.

1817.7001 Authorization and policy.

(a) NASA is authorized by the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. 2451 et seq.) to use the acquisition services, personnel, equipment, and facilities of the Military Departments, with their consent and with or without reimbursement, and, on a similar basis, to cooperate with the Military Departments in the use of acquisition services, equipment, and facilities.

(b) The Military Departments have agreed to cooperate fully with NASA in making their acquisition services, equipment, personnel, and facilities available on the basis of mutual agreement.

(c) The Military Departments have agreed not to claim reimbursement for administrative costs incident to acquisitions for NASA, except as may be otherwise agreed before the services are performed.

(d) When procuring supplies or services for NASA or performing field service functions in support of NASA contracts, the Military Departments have agreed to use their own methods, except when otherwise required by the terms of the agreement involved.

(e) The Military Departments normally will use their own funds when procuring supplies or services or performing services for NASA, and will not cite NASA funds on any Defense obligation or payment document.

[61 FR 55753, Oct. 29, 1996, as amended at 62 FR 58687, Oct. 30, 1997]

National Aeronautics and Space Administration

1817.7101

1817.7002 NASA-Defense Purchase Request and acceptance.

(a) The NASA-Defense Purchase Request (NASA Form 523) shall be used by NASA contracting offices for requesting acquisition of supplies or services from all activities of the Military Departments. Individual NASA-Defense Purchase Requests shall be prepared in accordance with the instructions on the reverse of NASA Form 523 and shall be numbered in accordance with subpart 1804.71. The form shall not be used for requesting—

(1) Block transfers of excess property between NASA and the Military Departments;

(2) Performance by the Military Departments of field service functions related to NASA contracts; or

(3) Items that the Military Departments normally purchase and stock for military use or in-house service, except when a DOD activity is willing to accept the form for these purposes. Supplies and services of this nature may be requisitioned using appropriate DOD forms when they are provided by and are acceptable to or preferred by the Military Department supplying activity or as otherwise mutually agreed upon by the parties.

(b) The contracting officer shall include a provision in the order in accordance with 1817.504(b)(4).

(c) To obtain materials from the Air Force Missile Procurement Fund, the contracting officer shall follow the procedures of 1808.002-72.

1817.7002-1 Acceptance by Military Department.

(a) Except as provided in paragraph (c) of this section, the Military Department concerned will, within 30 days after receipt of a NASA-Defense Purchase Request, forward to the initiator of the request an Acceptance of MIPR, DD Form 448-2. Each DD Form 448-2 will show the action being taken to fill the requirement and the name and complete address of the DOD contracting activity.

(b) To the extent feasible, all documents (including acceptances, contracts, correspondence, shipping documents, work or project orders, and Standard Form 1080 (Voucher for Transfer between Appropriations and/

or Funds) billings) will reference the NASA-Defense Purchase Request number and the item number.

(c) Acceptance by the Military Department is not required for NASA-Defense Purchase Requests covering deliveries of common-use standard-stock items that the supplying agency has on hand or on order for prompt delivery at published prices.

1817.7002-2 Changes in estimated total prices.

When a Military Department determines that the estimated total price (Block 7, NASA Form 523) of the items to be acquired for NASA is not sufficient to cover the required reimbursement or is in excess of the amount required, a request for an amendment will be forwarded to the NASA originating office. The request will indicate a specific dollar amount, rather than a percentage, and will include justification for any upward adjustment requested. Upon approval of the request, the cognizant NASA contracting office shall forward to the DOD contracting activity an amendment to the NASA Defense Purchase Request.

1817.7002-3 Payments.

Except when agreements provide that reimbursement is not required, payments to the Military Departments shall be made by that NASA office designated in block 9 of the NASA-Defense Purchase Request upon receipt of Standard Form 1080. Billings will be supported in the same manner as billings between Military Departments.

1817.7002-4 Contract clause.

The contracting officer shall insert the clause at 1852.217-70, Property Administration and Reporting, in any NASA-Defense Purchase Request when property will be involved.

Subpart 1817.71—Exchange or Sale of Personal Property

1817.7101 Policy.

(a) Section 201(c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, 63 Stat. 384, as amended (40 U.S.C. 481(c)), authorizes the exchange

1817.7201

or sale of Government personal property and the application of the exchange allowance or proceeds from the sale to the acquisition of similar property for replacement purposes. The transaction must be evidenced in writing.

(b) NASA installations and contractors are authorized to conduct exchange/sale transactions as long as the requirements and restrictions of NPG 4300.1 and the Federal Property Management Regulations, Subchapter H, part 101-46, are followed. In conducting such exchanges/sales, NASA contractors must obtain the contracting officer's prior written approval and must report the transactions to the cognizant NASA installation Property Disposal Officer (PDO).

[61 FR 55753, Oct. 29, 1996, as amended at 65 FR 58932, Oct. 3, 2000]

Subpart 1817.72—Interagency Transactions

1817.7201 Policy.

(a) Although the Space Act provides interagency transaction authority nearly equivalent to the Economy Act, NASA has elected to conform its implementation of the Space Act to the requirements of the Economy Act. Therefore, unless exempt from the Economy Act for reasons other than the general authority of the Space Act, interagency acquisitions shall be supported by a Determination and Findings equivalent to that required for Economy Act transactions (see FAR 17.503 and 1817.503). This requirement applies to all purchases of goods or services under contracts entered into or administered by the Military Departments or other agencies. The Space Act may be cited as authority for a transaction where appropriate, but that does not provide relief from this D&F requirement.

(b) The determination described in paragraph (a) of this section is not required for contracts awarded under the Space Act to Government agencies pursuant to a Broad Agency Announcement when a review of the acquisition records would make it obvious that the award is nor being used as a method of circumventing regulatory or statutory

48 CFR Ch. 18 (10-1-02 Edition)

requirements, particularly FAR part 6, Competition Requirements (e.g., when a significant number and value of awards made under the BAA are made to entities other than Government agencies).

[62 FR 58687, Oct. 30, 1997]

Subpart 1817.73—Phased Acquisition

SOURCE: 63 FR 56091, Oct. 21, 1998, unless otherwise noted.

1817.7300 Definitions.

(a) *Down-selection*. In a phased acquisition, the process of selecting contractors for later phases from among the preceding phase contractors.

(b) *Phased Acquisition*. An incremental acquisition implementation comprised of several distinct phases where the realization of program/project objectives requires a planned, sequential acquisition of each phase. The phases may be acquired separately, in combination, or through a down-selection strategy.

(c) *Progressive Competition*. A type of down-selection strategy for a phased acquisition. In this method, a single solicitation is issued for all phases of the program. The initial phase contracts are awarded, and the contractors for subsequent phases are expected to be chosen through a down-selection from among the preceding phase contractors. In each phase, progressively fewer contracts are awarded until a single contractor is chosen for the final phase. Normally, all down-selections are accomplished without issuance of a new, formal solicitation.

1817.7301 Down-selections in phased acquisitions.

1817.7301-1 Pre-solicitation planning.

(a) The rationale for the use of the down-selection technique shall be thoroughly justified in the acquisition planning requirement. Because the initial phase solicitation will also lead to subsequent phase award(s), the decision to use a down-selection strategy must be made prior to release of the initial solicitation. Accordingly, all phases

must be addressed in the initial acquisition strategy planning and documented in the acquisition plan or ASM minutes.

(b) If there is no direct link between successful performance in the preceding phase and successful performance in a subsequent phase, down-selection is inappropriate. In this case, the phases should be contracted for separately without a down-selection.

(c) With one exception, both the initial and subsequent phase(s) of an acquisition down-selection process are considered to be full and open competition if the procedures in 1817.7301-4 and 1817.7301-5 (if using the progressive competition technique) are followed. If only one contractor successfully completed a given phase and no other offers are solicited for the subsequent phase, award of the subsequent phase may be made only if justified by one of the exceptions in FAR 6.302 or one of the exclusions in FAR 6.2, and only after compliance with the synopsis requirements of FAR 5.202 and 5.205 and 1804.570-2.

1817.7301-2 Evaluation factors.

A separate set of evaluation factors must be developed for each phase in a down-selection competition. Since these competitive down-selection strategies anticipate that a preceding phase contractor will be the subsequent phase contractor, the evaluation factors for initial phase award must specifically include evaluation of the offerors' abilities to perform all phases.

1817.7301-3 Down-selection milestones.

(a) When sufficient programmatic and technical information is available to all potential offerors, proposal evaluation and source selection activities need not be delayed until completion of a given phase. These activities should commence as early as practicable. The initial phase contracts should be structured to allow for down-selection at a discrete performance milestone (e.g., a significant design review or at contract completion) of a design maturity sufficient to allow for an informed selection decision. This will avoid time gaps between phases and eliminate unnecessary duplication of effort.

(b) The appropriate contract structure must reflect program technical objectives as well as schedule considerations. For example, if a two-phased acquisition strategy calls for formal completion of initial phase effort at Preliminary Design Review (PDR), but it is not financially practical or technically necessary for subsequent phase award and performance to carry all initial phase contractors through PDR, the initial phase contracts should be structured with a basic period of performance through a significant, discrete milestone before PDR with a priced option for effort from that milestone to PDR. The down-selection would occur at the earlier milestone, the PDR option exercised only for the down-selection winner, and the subsequent phase performance begun at the completion of the PDR option.

1817.7301-4 Synopsis.

(a) Each phase of a phased acquisition not performed in-house must be synopsisized in accordance with FAR 5.201 and must include all the information required by FAR 5.207. Time gaps between phases should be minimized by early synopsis of subsequent phase competition. The synopsis for the initial competitive phase should also state the following:

(1) The Government plans to conduct a phased acquisition involving a competitive down-selection process. (Include a description of the process and the phases involved.)

(2) Competitions for identified subsequent phases will build on the results of previous phases.

(3) The award criteria for subsequent phases will include demonstrated completion of specified previous phase requirements.

(4) The Government expects that only the initial phase contractors will be capable of successfully competing for the subsequent phase(s). Proposals for the subsequent phase(s) will be requested from these contractors.

(5) The Government intends to issue (or not issue) a new, formal solicitation(s) for subsequent phase(s). If new solicitations are not planned, the acquisition must be identified as a "progressive competition" (see

1817.7301-5), and the mechanism for providing pertinent subsequent phase proposal information (e.g., statements of work, specifications, proposal preparation instructions, and evaluation factors for award) must be described.

(6) Each subsequent phase of the acquisition will be synopsisized in accordance with FAR 5.201 and 5.203.

(7) Notwithstanding the expectation that only the initial phase contractors will be capable of successfully competing for the subsequent phase(s), proposals from all responsible sources submitted by the specified due date will be considered. In order to contend for subsequent phase awards, however, such prospective offerors must demonstrate a design maturity equivalent to that of the prior phase contractors. Failure to fully and completely demonstrate the appropriate level of design maturity may render the proposal unacceptable with no further consideration for contract award.

(b) In addition to the information in paragraph (a) of this section, the synopsis for the subsequent phase(s) must identify the current phase contractors.

1817.7301-5 Progressive competition.

(a) To streamline the acquisition process, the preferred approach for NASA phased acquisitions is the "progressive competition" down-selection technique in which new, formal solicitations are not issued for phases subsequent to the initial phase. Subsequent phase proposals are requested by less formal means, normally by a letter accompanied by the appropriate proposal preparation and evaluation information.

(b) When using the progressive competition technique, if a prospective offeror other than one of the preceding phase contractors responds to the synopsis for a subsequent phase and indicates an intention to submit a proposal, the contracting officer shall provide to that offeror all the material furnished to the preceding phase contractors necessary to submit a proposal. This information includes the preceding phase solicitation, contracts, and system performance and design requirements, as well as all proposal preparation instructions and evaluation factors. In addition, the prospec-

tive offeror must be advised of all requirements necessary for demonstration of a design maturity equivalent to that of the preceding phase contractors.

(c) A key feature of the progressive competition technique is that a formal solicitation is normally not required. However, when the Government requirements or evaluation procedures change so significantly after release of the initial phase solicitation that a substantial portion of the information provided in the initial phase synopsis, solicitation, or contracts is no longer valid, a new solicitation shall be issued for the next phase.

(d) Subsequent phase proposals should be requested by a letter including the following:

(1) A specified due date for the proposals along with a statement that the late proposal information in paragraph (c)(3) of FAR 52.215-1, Instructions to Offerors—Competitive Acquisition, applies to the due date.

(2) Complete instructions for proposal preparation, including page limitations, if any.

(3) Final evaluation factors.

(4) Any statement of work, specifications, or other contract requirements that have changed since the initial solicitation.

(5) All required clause changes applicable to new work effective since the preceding phase award.

(6) Any representations or certifications, if required.

(7) Any other required contract updates (e.g., small and small disadvantaged business goals).

(e) Certain factors may clearly dictate that the progressive competition technique should not be used. For example, if it is likely that NASA may introduce a design concept independent of those explored by the preceding phase contractors, it is also likely that a new, formal solicitation is necessary for the subsequent phase and all potential offerors should be solicited. In this circumstance, progressive competition is inappropriate.

1817.7302 Contract clauses.

(a) The contracting officer shall insert the clause at 1852.217-71, Phased

National Aeronautics and Space Administration

1817.7302

Acquisition Using Down-Selection Procedures, in solicitations and contracts for phased acquisitions using down-selection procedures other than the progressive competition technique described in 1817.7301-5. The clause may be modified as appropriate if the acquisition has more than two phases. The clause shall be included in the solicitation for each phase and in all contracts except that for the final phase.

(b) The contracting officer shall insert the clause at 1852.217-72, Phased

Acquisition Using Progressive Competition Down-Selection Procedures, in solicitations and contracts for phased acquisitions using the progressive competition technique described in 1817.7301-5. The clause may be modified as appropriate if the acquisition has more than two phases. The clause shall be included in the initial phase solicitation and all contracts except that for the final phase.