

title VIII, §853(a)(2), Nov. 29, 1989, 103 Stat. 1518, directed the Administrator of General Services to enter into negotiations with commercial air carriers for agreements that would permit personnel of contractors who were traveling solely in the performance of covered contracts to be transported by such carriers at the same discount rates as such carriers charged for travel by Federal Government employees traveling at Government expense, directed the Secretary of Defense, not later than 120 days after the first such agreement would go into effect, to prescribe regulations that would provide that costs in excess of the rates established under the agreement were not allowable if the rate had been available and travel could have reasonably been performed under the conditions required by the air carrier to qualify for such rate, and provided that section 833 of Pub. L. 100-456 would cease to be effective three years after Sept. 29, 1988.

BURDEN OF PROOF IN GOVERNMENT CONTRACT DISPUTE
RESOLUTION

Section 933 of Pub. L. 99-145, which provided that in proceeding before the Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals, United States Claims Court, or any other Federal court in which reasonableness of indirect costs for which a contractor seeks reimbursement from Department of Defense is in issue, the burden of proof is upon the contractor to establish that such costs are reasonable, was repealed and restated in subsec. (j) of this section by Pub. L. 100-370, §1(f)(3)(A)(ii), (B), July 19, 1988, 102 Stat. 846.

§ 2325. Restructuring costs

(a) LIMITATION ON PAYMENT OF RESTRUCTURING COSTS.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may not pay, under section 2324 of this title, a defense contractor for restructuring costs associated with a business combination of the contractor that occurs after November 18, 1997, unless the Secretary determines in writing either—

(A) that the amount of projected savings for the Department of Defense associated with the restructuring will be at least twice the amount of the costs allowed; or

(B) that the amount of projected savings for the Department of Defense associated with the restructuring will exceed the amount of the costs allowed and that the business combination will result in the preservation of a critical capability that otherwise might be lost to the Department.

(2) The Secretary may not delegate the authority to make a determination under paragraph (1), with respect to a business combination, to an official of the Department of Defense—

(A) below the level of an Assistant Secretary of Defense for cases in which the amount of restructuring costs is expected to exceed \$25,000,000 over a 5-year period; or

(B) below the level of the Director of the Defense Contract Management Agency for all other cases.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than March 1 in each of 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report that contains, with respect to business combinations occurring on or after August 15, 1994, the following:

(1) For each defense contractor to which the Secretary has paid, under section 2324 of this title, restructuring costs associated with a business combination, a summary of the following:

(A) An estimate of the amount of savings for the Department of Defense associated with the restructuring that has been realized as of the end of the preceding calendar year.

(B) An estimate of the amount of savings for the Department of Defense associated with the restructuring that is expected to be achieved on defense contracts.

(2) An identification of any business combination for which the Secretary has paid restructuring costs under section 2324 of this title during the preceding calendar year and, for each such business combination—

(A) the supporting rationale for allowing such costs;

(B) factual information associated with the determination made under subsection (a) with respect to such costs; and

(C) a discussion of whether the business combination would have proceeded without the payment of restructuring costs by the Secretary.

(3) For business combinations of major defense contractors that took place during the year preceding the year of the report—

(A) an assessment of any potentially adverse effects that the business combinations could have on competition for Department of Defense contracts (including potential horizontal effects, vertical effects, and organizational conflicts of interest), the national technology and industrial base, or innovation in the defense industry; and

(B) the actions taken to mitigate the potentially adverse effects.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “business combination” includes a merger or acquisition.

(Added Pub. L. 105-85, div. A, title VIII, §804(a)(1), Nov. 18, 1997, 111 Stat. 1832; amended Pub. L. 106-65, div. A, title X, §1066(a)(19), Oct. 5, 1999, 113 Stat. 771; Pub. L. 108-375, div. A, title VIII, §819, Oct. 28, 2004, 118 Stat. 2016.)

PRIOR PROVISIONS

A prior section 2325, added Pub. L. 99-500, §101(c) [title X, §907(a)(1)], Oct. 18, 1986, 100 Stat. 1783-82, 1783-137, and Pub. L. 99-591, §101(c) [title X, §907(a)(1)], Oct. 30, 1986, 100 Stat. 3341-82, 3341-137; Pub. L. 99-661, div. A, title IX, formerly title IV, §907(a)(1), Nov. 14, 1986, 100 Stat. 3917, renumbered title IX, Pub. L. 100-26, §3(5), Apr. 21, 1987, 101 Stat. 273; amended Pub. L. 101-189, div. A, title XVI, §1622(c)(5), Nov. 29, 1989, 103 Stat. 1604; Pub. L. 101-510, div. A, title VIII, §810, Nov. 5, 1990, 104 Stat. 1595; Pub. L. 103-160, div. A, title IX, §904(d)(1), Nov. 30, 1993, 107 Stat. 1728, directed Secretary of Defense to ensure that requirements of Department of Defense with respect to procurement of supplies be stated in terms of functions to be performed, performance required, or essential physical characteristics, and related to preference for non-developmental items in procurement of supplies, prior to repeal by Pub. L. 103-355, title VIII, §8104(b)(1), Oct. 13, 1994, 108 Stat. 3391. See sections 2376 and 2377 of this title.

Another prior section 2325 was renumbered section 2345 of this title.

AMENDMENTS

2004—Subsec. (a)(2). Pub. L. 108-375 substituted “paragraph (1), with respect to a business combination, to an official of the Department of Defense—” for “paragraph

(1) to an official of the Department of Defense below the level of an Assistant Secretary of Defense.” and added subpars. (A) and (B).

1999—Subsec. (a)(1). Pub. L. 106-65 inserted “that occurs after November 18, 1997,” after “of the contractor” in introductory provisions.

EFFECTIVE DATE

Section 804(c) of Pub. L. 105-85 provided that: “Section 2325(a) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to business combinations that occur after the date of the enactment of this Act [Nov. 18, 1997].”

GAO REPORTS

Pub. L. 105-85, div. A, title VIII, §804(b), Nov. 18, 1997, 111 Stat. 1832, directed the Comptroller General, not later than Apr. 1, 1998, to identify major market areas affected by business combinations of defense contractors since Jan. 1, 1990, and develop a methodology for determining the savings from business combinations of defense contractors on the prices paid on particular defense contracts, and to submit to committees of Congress a report describing the changes in numbers of businesses competing for major defense contracts since Jan. 1, 1990; and directed the Comptroller General, not later than Dec. 1, 1998, to submit to committees of Congress a report containing updated information on restructuring costs of business combinations paid by the Department of Defense pursuant to certifications under Pub. L. 103-337, §818 (set out as a note under section 2324 of this title), savings realized by the Department of Defense as a result of the business combinations for which the payment of restructuring costs was so certified, and an assessment of the savings on the prices paid on a meaningful sample of defense contracts.

§ 2326. Undefined contractual actions: restrictions

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The head of an agency may not enter into an undefined contractual action unless the request to the head of the agency for authorization of the contractual action includes a description of the anticipated effect on requirements of the military department concerned if a delay is incurred for purposes of determining contractual terms, specifications, and price before performance is begun under the contractual action.

(b) **LIMITATIONS ON OBLIGATION OF FUNDS.**—(1) A contracting officer of the Department of Defense may not enter into an undefined contractual action unless the contractual action provides for agreement upon contractual terms, specifications, and price by the earlier of—

(A) the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date on which the contractor submits a qualifying proposal to definitize the contractual terms, specifications, and price; or

(B) the date on which the amount of funds obligated under the contractual action is equal to more than 50 percent of the negotiated overall ceiling price for the contractual action.

(2) Except as provided in paragraph (3), the contracting officer for an undefined contractual action may not obligate with respect to such contractual action an amount that is equal to more than 50 percent of the negotiated overall ceiling price until the contractual terms, specifications, and price are definitized for such contractual action.

(3) If a contractor submits a qualifying proposal (as defined in subsection (g)) to definitize

an undefined contractual action before an amount equal to more than 50 percent of the negotiated overall ceiling price is obligated on such action, the contracting officer for such action may not obligate with respect to such contractual action an amount that is equal to more than 75 percent of the negotiated overall ceiling price until the contractual terms, specifications, and price are definitized for such contractual action.

(4) The head of an agency may waive the provisions of this subsection with respect to a contract of that agency if that head of an agency determines that the waiver is necessary in order to support any of the following operations:

(A) A contingency operation.

(B) A humanitarian or peacekeeping operation.

(5) This subsection does not apply to an undefined contractual action for the purchase of initial spares.

(c) **INCLUSION OF NON-URGENT REQUIREMENTS.**—Requirements for spare parts and support equipment that are not needed on an urgent basis may not be included in an undefined contractual action for spare parts and support equipment that are needed on an urgent basis unless the head of the agency approves such inclusion as being—

(1) good business practice; and

(2) in the best interests of the United States.

(d) **MODIFICATION OF SCOPE.**—The scope of an undefined contractual action under which performance has begun may not be modified unless the head of the agency approves such modification as being—

(1) good business practice; and

(2) in the best interests of the United States.

(e) **ALLOWABLE PROFIT.**—The head of an agency shall ensure that the profit allowed on an undefined contractual action for which the final price is negotiated after a substantial portion of the performance required is completed reflects—

(1) the possible reduced cost risk of the contractor with respect to costs incurred during performance of the contract before the final price is negotiated; and

(2) the reduced cost risk of the contractor with respect to costs incurred during performance of the remaining portion of the contract.

(f) **APPLICABILITY.**—This section does not apply to the Coast Guard or the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(g) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “undefined contractual action” means a new procurement action entered into by the head of an agency for which the contractual terms, specifications, or price are not agreed upon before performance is begun under the action. Such term does not include contractual actions with respect to the following:

(A) Foreign military sales.

(B) Purchases in an amount not in excess of the amount of the simplified acquisition threshold.

(C) Special access programs.

(D) Congressionally mandated long-lead procurement contracts.