of Audits' Regional Audit Director. In both cases, the contracting officer shall, in the request:

(i) Prescribe the extent of the support needed;

(ii) State the specific areas for which input is required;

(iii) Include the information necessary to perform the review (such as the offeror's proposal and the applicable portions of the solicitation, particularly those describing requirements and delivery schedules);

(iv) Provide the complete address of the location of the offeror's financial records that support the proposal;

(v) Identify the office having audit responsibility if other than the HHS Regional Audit Office; and

(vi) Specify a due date for receipt of a verbal report to be followed by a written audit report. (If the time available is not adequate to permit satisfactory coverage of the proposal, the auditor shall so advise the contracting officer and indicate the additional time needed.) One copy of the audit request letter that was submitted to the Regional Audit Director and a complete copy of the contract price proposal shall be submitted to OIG/OA/DAC. Whenever, an audit review has been conducted by the Office of Audits, two (2) copies of the memorandum of negotiation shall be forwarded to OIG/OA/DAC by the contracting officer.

315.404–4 Profit.

(b) *Policy*. (1) The structured approach for determining profit or fee (hereafter referred to as profit) provides contracting officers with a technique that will ensure consideration of the relative value of the appropriate profit factors described in paragraph (d) of this section in the establishment of a profit objective for the conduct of negotiations. The contracting officer's analysis of these profit factors is based on information available to him/her prior to negotiations. The information is furnished in proposals, audit data, assessment reports, preaward surveys and the like. The structured approach also provides a basis for documentation of this objective, including an explanation of any significant departure from this objective in reaching an agreement. The extent of documentation should be directly related to the dollar value and complexity of the proposed acquisition. Additionally, the negotiation process does not require agreement on either estimated cost elements or profit elements. The profit objective is a part of an overall negotiation objective which, as a going-in objective, bears a distinct relationship to the cost objective and any proposed sharing arrangement. Since profit is merely one of several interrelated variables, the Government negotiator generally should not complete the profit negotiation without simultaneously agreeing on the other variables. Specific agreement on the exact weights or values of the individual profit factors is not required and should not be attempted.

(ii) The profit-analysis factors set forth at FAR 15.404–4(d) shall be used for establishing profit objectives under the following listed circumstances. Generally, it is expected that this method will be supported in a manner similar to that used in the structured approach (profit factor breakdown and documentation of the profit objective); however, factors within FAR 15.404–4(d) considered inapplicable to the acquisition will be excluded from the profit objective.

(A) Contracts not expected to exceed $100,000;

(B) Architect-engineer contracts;

(C) Management contracts for operations and/or maintenance of Government facilities;

(D) Construction contracts;

(E) Contracts primarily requiring delivery of material supplies by subcontractors;

(F) Termination settlements; and

(G) Cost-plus-award-fee contracts (However, contracting officers may find it advantageous to perform a structured profit analysis as an aid in arriving at an appropriate fee arrangement). Other exceptions may be made in the negotiation of contracts having unusual pricing situations, but shall be justified in writing by the contracting officer in situations where the structured approach is determined to be unsuitable.

(c) *Contracting officer responsibilities*. A profit objective is that part of the estimated contract price objective or

value which, in the judgment of the contracting officer, constitutes an appropriate amount of profit for the acquisition being considered. This objective should realistically reflect the total overall task to be performed and the requirements placed on the contractor. Development of a profit objective should not begin until a thorough review of proposed contract work has been made; a review of all available knowledge regarding the contractor pursuant to FAR subpart 9.1, including audit data, preaward survey reports and financial statements, as appropriate, has been conducted; and an analysis of the contractor's cost estimate and comparison with the Government's estimate or projection of cost has been made.

(d) *Profit—analysis factors* (1) *Common factors*. The following factors shall be considered in all cases in which profit is to be negotiated. The weight ranges listed after each factor shall be used in all instances where the structured approach is used.

Profit factors	Weight ranges (in percent)
Contractor effort:	
Material acquisition	1 to 5.
Direct labor	4 to 15.
Overhead	4 to 9.
General management (G&A)	4 to 8.
Other costs	1 to 5.
Other factors:	
Cost risk	0 to 7.
Investment	−2 to +2.
Performance	−1 to +1.
Socioeconomic programs	−.5 to +.5.
Special situations..	

(i) Under the structured approach, the contracting officer shall first measure ''Contractor Effort'' by the assignment of a profit percentage within the designated weight ranges to each element of contract cost recognized by the contracting officer. The amount calculated for the cost of money for facilities capital is not to be included for the computation of profit as part of the cost base. The suggested categories under ''Contractor Effort'' are for reference purposes only. Often individual proposals will be in a different format, but since these categories are broad and basic, they provide sufficient guidance to evaluate all other items of cost.

(ii) After computing a total dollar profit for ''Contractor Effort,'' the contracting officer shall then calculate the specific profit dollars assigned for cost risk, investment, performance, socioeconomic programs, and special situations. This is accomplished by multiplying the total Government Cost Objective, exclusive of any cost of money for facilities capital, by the specific weight assigned to the elements within the ''Other Factors'' category. Form HHS–674, Structured Approach Profit/Fee Objective, should be used, as appropriate, to facilitate the calculation of this profit objective. Form HHS–674 is illustrated in 353.370–674.

(iii) In making a judgment of the value of each factor, the contracting officer should be governed by the definition, description, and purpose of the factors together with considerations for evaluating them.

(iv) The structured approach was designed for arriving at profit objectives for other than nonprofit organizations. However, if appropriate adjustments are made to reflect differences between profit and nonprofit organizations, the structured approach can be used as a basis for arriving at profit objectives for nonprofit organizations. Therefore, the structured approach, as modified in paragraph (d)(1)(iv)(B) of this section, shall be used to establish profit objectives for nonprofit organizations.

(A) For purposes of this section, nonprofit organizations are defined as those business entities organized and operated exclusively for charitable, scientific, or educational purposes, no part of the net earnings of which inure to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, and which are exempt from Federal income taxation under Section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code.

(B) For contracts with nonprofit organizations where profit is involved, an adjustment of up to 3 percentage points will be subtracted from the total profit objective percentage. In developing this adjustment, it will be necessary to consider the following factors;

(*1*) Tax position benefits;

(*2*) Granting of financing through advance payments; and

(*3*) Other pertinent factors which may work to either the advantage or

disadvantage of the contractor in its position as a nonprofit organization.

(2) *Contractor effort.* Contractor effort is a measure of how much the contractor is expected to contribute to the overall effort necessary to meet the contract performance requirement in an efficient manner. This factor, which is apart from the contractor's responsibility for contract performance, takes into account what resources are necessary and what the contractor must do to accomplish a conversion of ideas and material into the final service or product called for in the contract. This is a recognition that within a given performance output, or within a given sales dollar figure, necessary efforts on the part of individual contractors can vary widely in both value and quantity, and that the profit objective should reflect the extent and nature of the contractor's contribution to total performance. A major consideration, particularly in connection with experimental, developmental, or research work, is the difficulty or complexity of the work to be performed, and the unusual demands of the contract, such as whether the project involves a new approach unrelated to existing technology and/or equipment or only refinements to these items. The evaluation of this factor requires an analysis of the cost content of the proposed contract as follows:

(i) *Material acquisition.* (Subcontracted items, purchased parts, and other material.) Analysis of these cost items shall include an evaluation of the managerial and technical effort necessary to obtain the required subcontracted items, purchased parts, material or services. The contracting officer shall determine whether the contractor will obtain the items or services by routine order from readily available sources or by detailed subcontracts for which the prime contractor will be required to develop complex specifications. Consideration shall also be given to the managerial and technical efforts necessary for the prime contractor to select subcontractors and to perform subcontract administration functions. In application of this criterion, it should be recognized that the contribution of the prime contractor to its purchasing program may be substantial. Normally, the lowest unadjusted weight for direct material is 2 percent. A weighting of less than 2 percent would be appropriate only in unusual circumstances when there is a minimal contribution by the contractor.

(ii) *Direct labor.* (Professional, service, manufacturing and other labor). Analysis of the various labor categories of the cost content of the contract should include evaluation of the comparative quality and quantity of professional and semiprofessional talents, manufacturing and service skills, and experience to be employed. In evaluating professional and semiprofessional labor for the purpose of assigning profit dollars, consideration should be given to the amount of notable scientific talent or unusual or scarce talent needed in contrast to nonprofessional effort. The assessment should consider the contribution this talent will provide toward the achievement of contract objectives. Since nonprofessional labor is relatively plentiful and rather easily obtained by the contractor and is less critical to the successful performance of contract objectives, it cannot be weighted nearly as high as professional or semiprofessional labor. Service contract labor should be evaluated in a like manner by assigning higher weights to engineering or professional type skills required for contract performance. Similarly, the variety of manufacturing and other categories of labor skills required and the contractor's manpower resources for meeting these requirements should be considered. For purposes of evaluation, categories of labor (*i.e.,* quality control, receiving and inspection, etc.) which do not fall within the definition for professional, service or manufacturing labor may be categorized as appropriate. However, the same evaluation considerations as outlined in this paragraph will be applied.

(iii) *Overhead and general management* (G&A). (A) Analysis of these overhead items of cost should include the evaluation of the makeup of these expenses and how much they contribute to contract performance. To the extent practicable, analysis should include a determination of the amount of labor

within these overhead pools and how this labor should be treated if it were considered as direct labor under the contract. The allocable labor elements should be given the same profit considerations that they would receive if they were treated as direct labor. The other elements of these overhead pools should be evaluated to determine whether they are routine expenses, such as utilities and maintenance, and hence given lesser profit consideration, or whether they are significant contributing elements. The composite of the individual determinations in relation to the elements of the overhead pools will be the profit consideration given the pools as a whole. The procedure for assigning relative values to these overhead expenses differs from the method used in assigning values of the direct labor. The upper and lower limits assignable to the direct labor are absolute. In the case of overhead expenses, individual expenses may be assigned values outside the range as long as the composite ratio is within the range.

(B) It is not necessary that the contractor's accounting system break down overhead expenses within the classifications of research overhead, other overhead pools, and general administrative expenses, unless dictated otherwise by Cost Accounting Standards (CAS). The contractor whose accounting system reflects only one overhead rate on all direct labor need not change its system (if CAS exempt) to correspond with these classifications. The contracting officer, in an evaluation of such a contractor's overhead rate, could break out the applicable sections of the composite rate which could be classified as research overhead, other overhead pools, and general and administrative expenses, and follow the appropriate evaluation technique.

(C) Management problems surface in various degrees and the management expertise exercised to solve them should be considered as an element of profit. For example, a contract for a new program for research or an item which is on the cutting edge of the state of the art will cause more problems and require more managerial time and abilities of a higher order than a follow-on contract. If new contracts create more problems and require a higher profit weight, follow-ons should be adjusted downward because many of the problems should have been solved. In any event, an evaluation should be made of the underlying managerial effort involved on a case-by-case basis.

(D) It may not be necessary for the contracting officer to make a separate profit evaluation of overhead expenses in connection with each acquisition action for substantially the same project with the same contractor. Where an analysis of the profit weight to be assigned to the overhead pool has been made, that weight assigned may be used for future acquisitions with the same contractor until there is a change in the cost composition of the overhead pool or the contract circumstances, or the factors discussed in paragraph (d)(2)(iii)(C) of this section are involved.

(iv) *Other costs.* Analysis of this factor should include all other direct costs associated with contractor performance (*e.g.*, travel and relocation, direct support, and consultants). Analysis of these items of cost should include, the significance of the cost of contract performance, nature of the cost, and how much they contribute to contract performance. Normally, travel costs require minimal administrative effort by the contractor and, therefore, usually receive a weight no greater than 1%. Also, the contractor may designate individuals as ''consultants'' but in reality these individuals may be obtained by the contractor to supplement its workforce in the performance of routine duties required by contract. These costs would normally receive a minimum weight. However, there will be instances when the contractor may be required to locate and obtain the services of consultants having expertise in fields such as medicine or human services. In these instances, the contractor will be required to expend greater managerial and technical effort to obtain these services and, consequently, the costs should receive a much greater weight.

(3) *Other factors* (i) *Contract cost risk.* The contract type employed basically determines the degree of cost risk assumed by the contractor. For example,

where a portion of the risk has been shifted to the Government through cost-reimbursement provisions, unusual contingency provisions, or other risk-reducing measures, the amount of profit should be less than where the contractor assumes all the risk.

(A) In developing the prenegotiation profit objective, the contracting officer will need to consider the type of contract anticipated to be negotiated and the contractor risk associated therewith when selecting the position in the weight range for profit that is appropriate for the risk to be borne by the contractor. This factor should be one of the most important in arriving at prenegotiation profit objective. Evaluation of this risk requires a determination of the degree of cost responsibility the contractor assumes; the reliability of the cost estimates in relation to the task assumed; and the complexity of the task assumed by the contractor. This factor is specifically limited to the risk of contract costs. Thus, risks on the part of the contractor such as reputation, losing a commercial market, risk of losing potential profits in other fields, or any risk which falls on the contracting office, such as the risk of not acquiring a satisfactory report, are not within the scope of this factor.

(B) The first and basic determination of the degree of cost responsibility assumed by the contractor is related to the sharing of total risk of contract cost by the Government and the contractor through the selection of contract type. The extremes are a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract requiring the contractor to use its best efforts to perform a task and a firm fixed-price contract for a service or a complex item. A cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract would reflect a minimum assumption of cost responsibility, whereas a firm-fixed-price contract would reflect a complete assumption of cost responsibility. Where proper contract selection has been made, the regard for risk by contract type would usually fall into the following percentage ranges:

	Percent
Cost-reimbursement type contracts	0–3
Fixed-price type contracts	2–7

(C) The second determination is that of the reliability of the cost estimates. Sound price negotiation requires well-defined contract objectives and reliable cost estimates. Prior experience assists the contractor in preparing reliable cost estimates on new acquisitions for similar related efforts. An excessive cost estimate reduces the possibility that the cost of performance will exceed the contract price, thereby reducing the contractor's assumption of contract cost risk.

(D) The third determination is that of the difficulty of the contractor's task. The contractor's task can be difficult or easy, regardless of the type of contract.

(E) Contractors are likely to assume greater cost risk only if contracting officers objectively analyze the risk incident to proposed contracts and are willing to compensate contractors for it. Generally, a cost-plus-fixed fee contract will not justify a reward for risk in excess of 0.5 percent, nor will a firm fixed-price contract justify a reward of less than the minimum in the structured approach. Where proper contract-type selection has been made, the reward for risk, by contract type, will usually fall into the following percentage ranges:

(*1*) Type of contract and percentage ranges for profit objectives developed by using the structured approach for research and development and manufacturing contracts:

	Percent
Cost-Plus-fixed fee	0 to 0.5
Cost-plus-incentive fee:	
With cost incentive only	1 to 2
With multiple incentives	1.5 to 3
Fixed-price-incentive:	
With cost incentive only	2 to 4
With multiple incentives	3 to 5
Prospective price redetermination	3 to 5
Firm fixed-price	5 to 7

(*2*) Type of contract and percentage ranges for profit objectives developed by using the structured approach for service contracts:

	Percent
Cost-plus-fixed-fee	0 to 0.5
Cost-plus-incentive fee	1 to 2
Fixed-price incentive	2 to 3
Firm fixed-price	3 to 4

(F) These ranges may not be appropriate for all acquisitions. For instance, a fixed-price-incentive contract that is closely priced with a low ceiling price and high incentive share may be tantamount to a firm fixed-price contract. In this situation, the contracting officer may determine that a basis exists for high confidence in the reasonableness of the estimate and that little opportunity exists for cost reduction without extraordinary efforts. On the other hand, a contract with a high ceiling and low incentive formula can be considered to contain cost-plus incentive-fee contract features. In this situation, the contracting officer may determine that the Government is retaining much of the contract cost responsibility and that the risk assumed by the contractor is minimal. Similarly, if a cost-plus-incentive-fee contract includes an unlimited downward (negative) fee adjustment on cost control, it could be comparable to a fixed-price-incentive contract. In such a pricing environment, the contracting officer may determine that the Government has transferred a greater amount of cost responsibility to the contractor than is typical under a normal cost-plus-incentive-fee contract.

(G) The contractor's subcontracting program may have a significant impact on the contractor's acceptance or risk under a contract form. It could cause risk to increase or decrease in terms of both cost and performance. This consideration should be a part of the contracting officer's overall evaluation in selecting a factor to apply for cost risk. It may be determined, for instance, that the prime contractor has effectively transferred real cost risk to a subcontractor and the contract cost risk evaluation may, as a result, be below the range which would otherwise apply for the contract type being proposed. The contract cost risk evaluation should not be lowered, however, merely on the basis that a substantial portion of the contract costs represents subcontracts without any substantial transfer of contractor's risk.

(H) In making a contract cost risk evaluation in an acquisition action that involves definitization of a letter contract, unpriced change orders, and unpriced orders under basic ordering agreements, consideration should be given to the effect on total contract cost risk as a result of having partial performance before definitization. Under some circumstances it may be reasoned that the total amount of cost risk has been effectively reduced. Under other circumstances it may be apparent that the contractor's cost risk remained substantially unchanged. To be equitable, the determination of profit weight for application to the total of all recognized costs, both those incurred and those yet to be expended, must be made with consideration to all attendant circumstances—not just the portion of costs incurred or percentage of work completed prior to definitization.

(I) Time and material and labor hour contracts will be considered to be cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts for the purpose of establishing profit weights unless otherwise exempt under paragraph (b)(1)(ii) of this section in the evaluation of the contractor's assumption of contract cost risk.

(ii) *Investment.* HHS encourages its contractors to perform their contracts with the minimum of financial, facilities, or other assistance from the Government. As such, it is the purpose of this factor to encourage the contractor to acquire and use its own resources to the maximum extent possible. The evaluation of this factor should include an analysis of the following:

(A) *Facilities.* (Including equipment). To evaluate how this factor contributes to the profit objective requires knowledge of the level of facilities utilization needed for contract performance, the source and financing of the required facilities, and the overall cost effectiveness of the facilities offered. Contractors who furnish their own facilities which significantly contribute to lower total contract costs should be provided with additional profit. On the other hand, contractors who rely on the Government to provide or finance needed facilities should receive a corresponding reduction in profit. Cases between these examples should be evaluated on their merits with either positive or negative adjustments, as appropriate, in profit being made. However, where a highly facilitized contractor is to perform a contract which does not

benefit from this facilitization or where a contractor's use of its facilities has a minimum cost impact on the contract, profit need not be adjusted. When applicable, the prospective contractor's computation of facilities capital cost of money for pricing purposed under CAS 414 can help the contracting officer identify the level of facilities investment to be employed in contract performance.

(B) *Payments*. In analyzing this factor, consideration should be given to the frequency of payments by the Government to the contractor. The key to this weighting is to give proper consideration to the impact the contract will have on the contractor's cash flow. Generally, negative consideration should be given for advance payments and payments more frequent than monthly with maximum reduction being given as the contractor's working capital approaches zero. Positive consideration should be given for payments less frequent than monthly with additional consideration given for a capital turn-over rate on the contract which is less than the contractor's or the industry's normal capital turn-over rate.

(iii) *Performance*. (Cost-control and other past accomplishments.) The contractor's past performance should be evaluated in such areas as quality of service or product, meeting performance schedules, efficiency in cost control (including need for and reasonableness of cost incurred), accuracy and reliability of previous cost estimates, degree of cooperation by the contractor (both business and technical), timely processing of changes and compliance with other contractual provisions, and management of subcontract programs. Where a contractor has consistently achieved excellent results in these areas in comparison with other contractors in similar circumstances, this performance merits a proportionately greater opportunity for profit. Conversely, a poor record in this regard should be reflected in determining what constitutes a fair and reasonable profit.

(iv) *Federal socioeconomic programs*. This factor, which may apply to special circumstances or particular acquisitions, relates to the extent of a contractor's successful participation in Government sponsored programs such as small business, small disadvantaged business, women-owned small business, and energy conservation efforts. The contractor's policies and procedures which energetically support Government socioeconomic programs and achieve successful results should be given positive considerations. Conversely, failure or unwillingness on the part of the contractor to support Government socioeconomic programs should be viewed as evidence of poor performance for the purpose of establishing a profit objective.

(v) *Special situations* (A) *Inventive and developmental contributions*. The extent and nature of contractor-initiated and financed independent development should be considered in developing the profit objective, provided that the contracting officer has made a determination that the effort will benefit the contract. The importance of the development in furthering health and human services purposes, the demonstrable initiative in determining the need and application of the development, the extent of the contractor's cost risk, and whether the development cost was recovered directly or indirectly from Government sources should be weighed.

(B) *Unusual pricing agreements*. Occasionally, unusual contract pricing arrangements are made with the contractor wherein it agrees to cost ceilings, *e.g.*, a ceiling on overhead rates for conditions other than those discussed at FAR 42.707. In these circumstances, the contractor should receive favorable consideration in developing the profit objective.

(C) *Negative factors*. Special situations need not be limited to those which only increase profit levels. A negative consideration may be appropriate when the contractor is expected to obtain spin-off-benefits as a direct result of the contract (*e.g.*, products or services with commercial application).

(4) *Facilities capital cost of money*. When facilities capital cost of money (cost of capital committed to facilities) is included as an item of cost in the contractor's proposal, a reduction in the profit objective shall be made in an

amount equal to the amount of facilities capital cost of money allowed in accordance with the Facilities Capital Cost-of Money Cost Principal. If the contractor does not propose this cost, a provision must be inserted in the contract that facilities capital cost of money is not an allowable cost.

Subpart 315.6—Unsolicited Proposals

315.605 Content of unsolicited proposals.

(d) Certification by offeror—To ensure against contacts between Department employees and prospective offerors which would exceed the limits of advance guidance set forth in FAR 15.604 resulting in an unfair advantage to an offeror, the contracting officer shall ensure that the following certification is furnished to the prospective offeror and the executed certification is included as part of the resultant unsolicited proposal:

UNSOLICITED PROPOSAL

Certification by Offeror

This is to certify, to the best of my knowledge and belief, that:

(a) This proposal has not been prepared under Government supervision.

(b) The methods and approaches stated in the proposal were developed by this offeror.

(c) Any contact with employees of the Department of Health and Human Services has been within the limits of appropriate advance guidance set forth in FAR 15.604.

(d) No prior commitments were received from departmental employees regarding acceptance of this proposal.

Date: _____

Organization: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

(This certification shall be signed by a responsible official of the proposing organization or a person authorized to contractually obligate the organization.)

315.606 Agency procedures.

(a) The HCA is responsible for establishing procedures to comply with FAR 15.606(a).

(b) The HCA or his/her designee shall be the point of contract for coordinating the receipt and handling of unsolicited proposals.

315.606–1 Receipt and initial review.

(d) An unsolicited proposal shall not be refused consideration merely because it was initially submitted as a grant application. However, contracts shall not be awarded on the basis of unsolicited proposals which have been rejected for grant support on the grounds that they lack scientific merit.

315.609 Limited use of data.

The legend, Use and Disclosure of Data, prescribed in FAR 15.609(a) is to be used by the offeror to restrict the use of data for evaluation purposes only. However, data contained within the unsolicited proposal may have to be disclosed as a result of a request submitted pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act. Because of this possibility, the following notice shall be furnished to all prospective offerors of unsolicited proposals whenever the legend is provided in accordance with FAR 15.604(a)(7):

The Government will attempt to comply with the ''Use and Disclosure of Data'' legend.

However, the Government may not be able to withhold a record (data, document, etc.) nor deny access to a record requested by an individual (the public) when an obligation is imposed on the Government under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. 552, as amended. The Government determination to withhold or disclose a record will be based upon the particular circumstances involving the record in question and whether the record may be exempted from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act. Records which the offeror considers to be trade secrets and commercial or financial information and privileged or confidential must be identified by the offeror as indicated in the referenced legend.

PART 316—TYPES OF CONTRACTS

Subpart 316.3—Cost-Reimbursement Contracts

Sec.
316.307 Contract clauses.

Subpart 316.6—Time-and-Materials, Labor-Hour, and Letter Contracts

316.603 Letter contracts.
316.603–3 Limitations.
316.603–70 Information to be furnished when requesting authority to issue a letter contract.