

(2) After evaluation of bids (see subpart 14.4) and determinations of responsibility, the contracting officer shall provide the price of the low responsive, responsible bidder to the preparer of the cost estimate for Government performance, for final Government review of the cost comparison form.

(3) Upon completion of the review process, including resolution of any request under 7.307, the responsible agency official shall make the final determination for performance by the Government or under contract and provide written notification to the contracting officer, who shall either award a contract or cancel the solicitation as required.

(4) The contracting officer shall make the completed and approved cost comparison analysis available to interested parties upon request.

(b) *Negotiation.* The contracting officer shall receive proposals, evaluate them (see subpart 15.3), conduct negotiations, and select the most advantageous proposal in accordance with normal contracting procedures (see part 15). The contracting officer shall, before public announcement, open the sealed estimate in the presence of the preparer, enter the amount of the most advantageous proposal on the cost comparison form, and return the form to the preparer of the cost estimate for Government performance for completion. The preparer shall give due consideration to all types of costs which could add or subtract from the cost of either mode of performance.

(1) If the result of the cost comparison favors performance under contract and the responsible agency official approves the result, the contracting officer shall award a contract in accordance with agency procedures. Concurrently with the award, the contracting officer shall publicly—

(i) Notify interested parties of the result of the cost comparison;

(ii) Inform interested parties that the completed cost comparison form and detailed supporting data are available for review;

(iii) Announce the contractor's name; and

(iv) Advise interested parties that contractor preparations for performance are conditioned upon completion

of the public review period specified in the solicitation plus any additional period required by the appeals procedure.

(2) If the result of the cost comparison favors Government performance, the contracting officer shall—

(i) Notify interested parties of the result of the cost comparison;

(ii) Inform interested parties that the completed cost comparison form and detailed supporting data relative to the Government cost estimate are available for public review (see subparagraph (3) below); and

(iii) Announce the price of the offer most advantageous to the Government.

(3) The public review period shall begin with the contracting officer's announcement of the cost comparison result and availability of the cost comparison forms and detailed supporting data to interested parties. The review period shall last for the period specified in the solicitation (at least 15 working days, up to a maximum of 30 working days if the contracting officer considers the action to be complex). Upon completion of the public review period and resolution of any questions raised under 7.307, the responsible agency official shall provide the contracting officer written notification of the final cost comparison decision. The contracting officer shall then, in the case of subparagraph (b)(1) of this section, give the contractor notice to commence or cancel the contract as appropriate or, in the case of subparagraph (b)(2) of this section, cancel the solicitation or award the contract, as appropriate.

[48 FR 42124, Sept. 19, 1983, as amended at 50 FR 1735, Jan. 11, 1985; 50 FR 52429, Dec. 23, 1985; 51 FR 34125, Sept. 3, 1986; 53 FR 661, Jan. 11, 1988; 55 FR 25526, June 21, 1990; 56 FR 41744, Aug. 22, 1991; 57 FR 60575, Dec. 21, 1992; 60 FR 34737, July 3, 1995; 62 FR 51270, Sept. 30, 1997]

7.307 Appeals.

(a) The Circular provides that each agency shall establish an appeals procedure for informal administrative review of the initial cost comparison result. The appeals procedure shall provide for an independent, objective review of the initial result by an official at a higher level than the official who approved that result. The purpose is to

protect the rights of affected parties and to ensure that final agency determinations are fair, equitable, and in accordance with established policy.

(b) The Circular provides that the appeals procedure shall be used only to resolve questions concerning the calculation of the cost comparison and shall not apply to questions concerning selection of one contractor in preference to another, which shall be treated as prescribed in subpart 33.1, Protests. Directly affected parties may request review of any discrepancy in the cost comparison. Any such requests shall be made in writing to the contracting officer, who shall forward them in accordance with agency procedures. Such requests shall be considered only if based on specific objections and received within the public review period stated in the solicitation.

[48 FR 42124, Sept. 19, 1983, as amended at 55 FR 25527, June 21, 1990; 57 FR 60575, Dec. 21, 1992; 60 FR 34737, July 3, 1995; 62 FR 40236, July 25, 1997]

Subpart 7.4—Equipment Lease or Purchase

7.400 Scope of subpart.

This subpart provides guidance pertaining to the decision to acquire equipment by lease or purchase. It applies to both the initial acquisition of equipment and the renewal or extension of existing equipment leases.

7.401 Acquisition considerations.

(a) Agencies should consider whether to lease or purchase equipment based on a case-by-case evaluation of comparative costs and other factors. The following factors are the minimum that should be considered:

- (1) Estimated length of the period the equipment is to be used and the extent of use within that period.
- (2) Financial and operating advantages of alternative types and makes of equipment.
- (3) Cumulative rental payments for the estimated period of use.
- (4) Net purchase price.
- (5) Transportation and installation costs.
- (6) Maintenance and other service costs.

(7) Potential obsolescence of the equipment because of imminent technological improvements.

(b) The following additional factors should be considered, as appropriate, depending on the type, cost, complexity, and estimated period of use of the equipment:

- (1) Availability of purchase options.
- (2) Potential for use of the equipment by other agencies after its use by the acquiring agency is ended.
- (3) Trade-in or salvage value.
- (4) Imputed interest.
- (5) Availability of a servicing capability, especially for highly complex equipment; e.g., can the equipment be serviced by the Government or other sources if it is purchased?

7.402 Acquisition methods.

(a) *Purchase method.* (1) Generally, the purchase method is appropriate if the equipment will be used beyond the point in time when cumulative leasing costs exceed the purchase costs.

(2) Agencies should not rule out the purchase method of equipment acquisition in favor of leasing merely because of the possibility that future technological advances might make the selected equipment less desirable.

(b) *Lease method.* (1) The lease method is appropriate if it is to the Government's advantage under the circumstances. The lease method may also serve as an interim measure when the circumstances—

- (i) Require immediate use of equipment to meet program or system goals; but
- (ii) Do not currently support acquisition by purchase.

(2) If a lease is justified, a lease with option to purchase is preferable.

(3) Generally, a long term lease should be avoided, but may be appropriate if an option to purchase or other favorable terms are included.

(4) If a lease with option to purchase is used, the contract shall state the purchase price or provide a formula which shows how the purchase price will be established at the time of purchase.

[50 FR 35475, Aug. 30, 1985, as amended at 59 FR 67026, Dec. 28, 1994]