



June 3, 2011

Memorandum

To: Members of the Board

From: Domenic N. Savini, Assistant Director

Through: Wendy M. Payne, Executive Director

Subject: Draft Exposure Draft: Deferred Maintenance and Repairs: *Amending Statements of Federal Financial Accounting Standards 6, 14, 29 and 32 – TAB G*¹

OBJECTIVES

The objective is to approve the issuance of the draft Exposure Draft (ED): Deferred Maintenance and Repairs: *Amending Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards 6, 14, 29 and 32*.

BRIEFING MATERIALS

The following materials are attached to this memorandum.

1. Tracked changes PDF version of the draft ED.
2. Smooth MSWord Version of the draft ED.
3. Ballot

BACKGROUND

The objective of this proposed ED is to amend SFFAS 6 to require entities to: (1) describe their maintenance and repairs (M&R) policies and how they are applied, (2) discuss how they rank and prioritize M&R activities among other activities, (3) identify factors considered in determining acceptable condition standards, (4) state whether deferred maintenance and repairs (DM&R) relates solely to capitalized general property,

¹ The staff prepares Board meeting materials to facilitate discussion of issues at the Board meeting. This material is presented for discussion purposes only; it is not intended to reflect authoritative views of the FASAB or its staff. Official positions of the FASAB are determined only after extensive due process and deliberations.

plant and equipment (PP&E) and stewardship PP&E or also to non-capitalized or fully depreciated general PP&E, (5) identify PP&E for which management does not measure and/or report DM&R and the rationale for the exclusion of other than non-capitalized or fully depreciated general PP&E, (6) provide beginning and ending DM&R balances by category of PP&E, and (7) explain significant changes from the prior year.

Other significant proposals contained in this Exposure Draft include (1) requiring that condition standards, related assessment methods, and reporting formats be consistently applied, (2) eliminating the requirement to report condition information and (3) eliminating the optional reporting of high-low DM&R estimates as well as the mention of the option to report critical and non-critical DM&R.

Additionally, the proposed amendments note the importance of and require using an interdisciplinary and integrated entity approach in compiling and reporting DM&R.

BALLOTS

The attached Ballot includes submission instructions and is due by Friday, June 17, 2011. Members not responding by Thursday, June 23, 2011 will be considered to have abstained. If you decide to write an alternative view, please notify staff immediately and provide your alternative view as soon as possible but no later than Friday, June 10, 2011. Any alternative views received will be circulated to other members for full Board consideration.

If you have questions or need additional information, please contact Dom at 202-512-6841 or email at savinid@fasab.gov at your convenience.

Attachments

1. Ballot Draft ED – Tracked Changes PDF Version
2. Ballot Draft ED – Clean MSWord Version
3. Ballot



Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board

Date: June 3, 2011

To: Members of the Board

From: Wendy M. Payne, Executive Director

Subject: **Ballot for Exposure Draft**, Deferred Maintenance and Repairs: *Amending Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards 6, 14, 29 and 32.*

The following is a ballot for the Exposure Draft on the standard referenced above. Please enter your name in the space provided below and indicate your approval or disapproval. Please fax the ballot to us at 202 512-7366. If you wish to submit your ballot via e-mail, please e-mail to me at paynew@fasab.gov.

Ballots are due by Friday, June 17. Members not responding by Thursday, June 23, 2011, will be considered to have abstained. If you wish to express an alternative view, please notify staff immediately and provide your alternative view as soon as possible but no later than Friday, June 10, 2011. **When staff receives six affirmative votes, we will publish the exposure draft unless a member has notified us that he or she is preparing an alternative view.**

Board Member: _____ Date _____

_____ I approve the subject Exposure Draft

_____ I do not approve the subject Exposure Draft



Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board

Deferred Maintenance and Repairs

Amending Statements of Federal Financial Accounting Standards 6, 14, 29 and 32

Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards

Exposure Draft

Written comments are requested by September 16, 2011

June X, 2011

Working Draft – Comments are Not Requested on This Draft

THE FEDERAL ACCOUNTING STANDARDS ADVISORY BOARD

The Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), and the Comptroller General, established the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board (FASAB or “the Board”) in October 1990. FASAB is responsible for promulgating accounting standards for the United States Government. These standards are recognized as generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP) for the federal government.

An accounting standard is typically formulated initially as a proposal after considering the financial and budgetary information needs of citizens (including the news media, state and local legislators, and analysts from private firms, academe, and elsewhere), Congress, federal executives, federal program managers, and other users of federal financial information. The proposed standards are published in an exposure draft for public comment. In some cases, a discussion memorandum, invitation for comment, or preliminary views document may be published before an exposure draft is published on a specific topic. A public hearing is sometimes held to receive oral comments in addition to written comments. The Board considers comments and decides whether to adopt the proposed standard with or without modification. After review by the three officials who sponsor FASAB, the Board publishes adopted standards in a Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards. The Board follows a similar process for Statements of Federal Financial Accounting Concepts, which guide the Board in developing accounting standards and formulating the framework for federal accounting and reporting.

Additional background information is available from the FASAB or its website:

- “Memorandum of Understanding among the Government Accountability Office, the Department of the Treasury, and the Office of Management and Budget, on Federal Government Accounting Standards and a Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board.”
- “Mission Statement: Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board,” exposure drafts, Statements of Federal Financial Accounting Standards and Concepts, FASAB newsletters, and other items of interest are posted on FASAB’s website at: www.fasab.gov.

Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board
441 G Street, NW, Suite 6814
Mail stop 6K17V
Washington, DC 20548
Telephone 202-512-7350
FAX – 202-512-7366
www.fasab.gov

This is a work of the U. S. government and is not subject to copyright protection in the United States. It may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without further permission from FASAB. However, because this work may contain copyrighted images or other material, permission from the copyright holder may be necessary if you wish to reproduce this material separately.



June X, 2011

TO: ALL WHO USE, PREPARE, AND AUDIT FEDERAL FINANCIAL INFORMATION

The Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board (FASAB or the Board) is requesting comments on this exposure draft of a proposed Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards entitled, *Deferred Maintenance and Repairs - Amending Statements of Federal Financial Accounting Standards 6, 14, 29 and 32*. Specific questions for your consideration begin on page 7 but you are welcome to comment on any aspect of this proposal. Your response would be more helpful to the Board if you explain the reasons for your position and any alternative you propose. Responses are requested by September 16, 2011.

All comments received by the FASAB are considered public information. Those comments may be posted to the FASAB's website and will be included in the project's public record.

We have experienced delays in mail delivery due to increased screening procedures. Therefore, please provide your comments in electronic form. Responses in electronic form should be sent by e-mail to fasab@fasab.gov. If you are unable to provide electronic delivery, we urge you to fax the comments to (202) 512-7366. Please follow up by mailing your comments to:

Wendy M. Payne, Executive Director
Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board
Mailstop 6K17V
441 G Street, NW, Suite 6814
Washington, DC 20548

The Board's rules of procedure provide that it may hold one or more public hearings on any exposure draft. No hearing has yet been scheduled for this exposure draft.

Notice of the date and location of any public hearing on this document will be published in the *Federal Register* and in the FASAB's newsletter.

Tom L. Allen

Chairman

Executive Summary

What is the Board proposing?

This exposure draft proposes amending the reporting requirements contained in SFFAS 6, *Accounting for Property, Plant, and Equipment*. The amendments would require entities to: (1) describe their maintenance and repairs (M&R) policies and how they are applied, (2) discuss how they rank and prioritize M&R activities among other activities, (3) identify factors considered in determining acceptable condition standards, (4) state whether deferred maintenance and repairs (DM&R) relate solely to capitalized general property, plant and equipment (PP&E) and stewardship PP&E or also to non-capitalized or fully depreciated general PP&E, (5) identify PP&E for which management does not measure and/or report DM&R and the rationale for the exclusion of other than non-capitalized or fully depreciated general PP&E, (6) provide beginning and ending DM&R balances by category of PP&E, and (7) explain significant changes from the prior year.

Other significant proposals contained in this Exposure Draft include (1) requiring that condition standards, related assessment methods, and reporting formats be consistently applied, (2) eliminating the requirement to report condition information and (3) eliminating the optional reporting of high-low DM&R estimates as well as the option to report critical and non-critical DM&R.

Additionally, the proposed amendments note the importance of and require using an interdisciplinary and integrated entity approach in compiling and reporting DM&R.

How would this proposal improve federal financial reporting and contribute to meeting the federal financial reporting objectives?

Of the four objectives outlined in Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Concepts (SFFAC) 1, *Objectives of Federal Financial Reporting*, the operating performance objective is identified as being most important for DM&R reporting.¹ DM&R reporting is important to meeting this objective because the federal government is accountable to citizens for the proper stewardship and administration of its assets. Reporting on DM&R assists users by providing an entity's realistic estimate of DM&R amounts and in ascertaining the effectiveness of an entity's asset maintenance practices.

The two most common issues noted since the implementation of SFFAS 6 are (1) the lack of comparability in assessing asset condition both within and among entities and (2) measurement and reporting practices and formats that vary greatly among entities. These issues largely result from entities defining and estimating DM&R differently and the degree of flexibility afforded by both SFFAS 6 and the Federal Real Property Profile (FRPP)

¹ SFFAC 1, *Objectives of Federal Financial Reporting*, September 2, 1993, par. 9-10.

Reporting Guidelines.² As a result, these issues have contributed to confusion among interested users of DM&R information.

In an attempt to achieve greater consistency and comparability in the reporting of DM&R and to increase the reliability and relevance of DM&R estimates, the Board believes that certain refinements and changes to DM&R requirements in SFFAS 6 are required. These significant changes would include both the addition and elimination of certain reporting requirements. The Board believes that these changes will facilitate use of the same methods for financial reporting and FRPP Reporting so that users receive comparable information to assess operating performance.

Operating Performance Objective

Federal financial reporting should assist report users in evaluating the service efforts, costs, and accomplishments of the reporting entity; the manner in which these efforts and accomplishments have been financed; and the management of the entity's assets and liabilities. Federal financial reporting should provide information that helps the reader to determine

- the costs of providing specific programs and activities and the composition of, and changes in, these costs;
- the efforts and accomplishments associated with federal programs and the changes over time and in relation to costs; and
- the efficiency and effectiveness of the government's management of its assets and liabilities.

Source: SFFAC 1

² The most current version can be found at: <http://www.gsa.gov/portal/content/104918>. Please refer to *Federal Real Property Council, Real Property Inventory - User Guidance for FY 2010 Reporting October 25, 2010*.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary 4

 What is the Board proposing? 4

 How would this proposal improve federal financial reporting and contribute to meeting
 the federal financial reporting objectives?..... 4

Questions for Respondents..... 7

Introduction 10

 Purpose 10

 Materiality 10

 Effective Date 10

Proposed Standards..... 11

 Scope 11

Appendix A: Basis for Conclusions 19

Appendix B: Sample Illustration 29

Appendix C: Abbreviations 36

Questions for Respondents

The FASAB encourages you to become familiar with all proposals in the Exposure Draft before responding to the questions in this section. In addition to the questions below, the Board also would welcome your comments on other aspects of the proposed Statement.

The Board believes that this proposal would improve federal financial reporting and contribute to meeting the federal financial reporting objectives. The Board has considered the perceived costs associated with this proposal. In responding, please consider the expected benefits and perceived costs and communicate any concerns that you may have in regard to implementing this proposal.

Because the proposals may be modified before a final Statement is issued, it is important that you comment on proposals that you favor as well as any that you do not favor. Comments that include the reasons for your views will be especially appreciated.

The questions in this section are available in a Word file for your use at www.fasab.gov/exposure.html. Your responses should be sent by e-mail to fasab@fasab.gov. If you are unable to respond electronically, please fax your responses to (202) 512-7366 and follow up by mailing your responses to:

Wendy M. Payne, Executive Director
Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board
Mailstop 6K17V
441 G Street, NW, Suite 6814
Washington, DC 20548

All responses are requested by September 16, 2011.

Q1. The Board proposes to eliminate the requirement to report condition information. Refer to paragraphs 13, 14, and 17 of the proposed standards and paragraph A8 in Appendix A - Basis for Conclusions for a discussion and related explanation.

Do you agree or disagree with the Board's proposal to no longer require condition reporting? Please provide the rationale for your answer.

Q2. The proposed standards would require that DM&R estimates for beginning and ending balances be presented with an explanation of significant changes. Refer to paragraph 14.f. and g. of the proposed standard and paragraph A21 in Appendix A - Basis for Conclusions for a discussion and related explanation.

- a. **Do you agree or disagree that DM&R estimates for beginning and ending balances should be presented? Please provide the rationale for your answer.**
- b. **Do you agree or disagree with the requirement to explain significant DM&R changes? Please provide the rationale for your answer.**

Q3. The proposed standards state that entities should apply reported methods and reporting formats consistently and if changes to methods or formats are necessary, such changes should be explained. Refer to paragraph 11 of the proposed standards and paragraphs A10 and A11 in Appendix A - Basis for Conclusions for a discussion and related explanation.

- a. **Do you agree or disagree that entities should apply reported methods and reporting formats consistently? Please provide the rationale for your answer.**
- b. **Do you agree or disagree with requiring an explanation if entities change methods or formats? Please provide the rationale for your answer.**

Q4. The proposed standards would require entities to provide narrative information related to DM&R costs and identify any significant changes from the prior year. Refer to paragraphs 13 and 14, items a. through f. of the proposed standards and paragraphs A11 and A18, respectively in Appendix A - Basis for Conclusions for a discussion and related explanation.

Do you agree or disagree with each of the above referenced requirements? Please provide the rationale for your answer.

Q5. The proposed standards state that entities should use an interdisciplinary and integrated approach in compiling and reporting DM&R. Refer to paragraph 11 of the proposed standards and paragraphs A15 through A17 in Appendix A - Basis for Conclusions for a detailed discussion and related explanation. .

Do you agree or disagree that entities should use an interdisciplinary and integrated approach in compiling and reporting DM&R? Please provide the rationale for your answer.

Q6. The proposed standards would eliminate the option to report a range of DM&R estimates and the distinction between critical and non-critical amounts. The reported amount of DM&R may be disaggregated in a variety of ways without explicit mention in the standards. Refer to paragraph 14 of the proposed standards and to paragraphs A19 and A20 in Appendix A - Basis for Conclusions for a discussion and related explanations.

a. **Do you agree or disagree with eliminating the distinction between critical and non-critical DM&R estimates? Please provide the rationale for your answer.**

b. **Do you agree or disagree with eliminating the option to report a range of DM&R estimates? Please provide the rationale for your answer.**

Q7. The proposed standards would be effective beginning in fiscal year 2015 with earlier implementation permitted.

Do you agree or disagree with the proposed effective date? Please provide the rationale for your answer.

Introduction

Purpose

1. The Board desires to improve deferred maintenance and repairs (DM&R) measurement and to enhance current federal reporting. The objective of this Statement is to incorporate reporting changes responsive to concerns raised by the financial and technical³ communities. The Board also considered, where appropriate, a Government Accountability Office (GAO) study⁴ specific to repair and maintenance backlog issues surrounding federal real property.

Materiality

2. The provisions of this Statement need not be applied to immaterial items. The determination of whether an item is material depends on the degree to which omitting or misstating information about the item makes it probable that the judgment of a reasonable person relying on the information would have been changed or influenced by the omission or the misstatement.

Effective Date

3. When finalized, the requirements in this Statement will be effective beginning in fiscal year 2015. The Board believes the standards will be finalized in fiscal year 2012 and a two year implementation period is sufficient.

³ This Statement uses the phrase “technical community” to refer to entity personnel responsible for the management of property, plant, and equipment including maintenance and repair.

⁴ GAO Report No. GAO-09-10 dated October 2008. Federal Real Property. *Government’s Fiscal Exposure from Repair and Maintenance Backlogs is Unclear.*

Proposed Standards

Scope

4. This Statement replaces DM&R definitions, measurement and reporting requirements established in SFFAS 6, as amended by *SFFAS 40, Definitional Changes Related to Deferred Maintenance and Repairs: Amending Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards 6, Accounting for Property, Plant, and Equipment* (SFFAS 40). SFFAS 6, *Chapter 3: Deferred Maintenance and Repairs*, paragraphs 77 through 84 are rescinded and *Appendix C, Deferred Maintenance and Repairs Illustration* is also rescinded.
5. In addition to SFFAS 6, this Statement also provides the following conforming amendments:
 - a. ***SFFAS 14, Amendments to Deferred Maintenance Reporting Amending SFFAS 6, Accounting for Property, Plant and Equipment and SFFAS 8, Supplementary Stewardship Reporting*** is rescinded.
 - b. ***SFFAS 29, Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards 29: Heritage Assets and Stewardship Land*** is amended to adopt the revised terminology and to rescind requirements for condition information.
 - c. ***SFFAS 32: Consolidated Financial Report of the United States Government Requirements: Implementing Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Concepts 4 "Intended Audience and Qualitative Characteristics for the Consolidated Financial Report of the United States Government"*** is amended to adopt the revised terminology and to rescind certain requirements.
 - d. ***Technical Release 9: Implementation Guide for Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards 29: Heritage Assets and Stewardship Land, Section III: Assessing and Reporting Condition*** is amended to explain the status of guidance relating to condition reporting.

Definition

6. "Deferred maintenance and repairs" (DM&R) are maintenance and repairs that were not performed when they should have been or were scheduled to be and which, therefore, are put off or delayed for a future period.

-
7. Maintenance and repairs are activities directed toward keeping fixed assets in an acceptable condition.⁵ Activities include preventive maintenance; replacement of parts, systems,⁶ or components; and other activities needed to preserve or maintain the asset. Maintenance and repairs, as distinguished from capital improvements, exclude activities directed towards expanding the capacity of an asset or otherwise upgrading it to serve needs different from, or significantly greater than, its current use.

Measurement

8. Amounts for DM&R may be measured using:
- a. condition assessment surveys,
 - b. life-cycle cost forecasts, or
 - c. other methods which are similar to the condition assessment survey or life-cycle costing methods.
9. *Condition assessment surveys* are periodic⁷ visual (i.e., physical) inspections of property, plant and equipment (PP&E) to determine their current condition and estimated cost to correct any deficiencies.
10. *Life-cycle costing* is an acquisition or procurement technique which considers operating, maintenance, and other costs in addition to the acquisition cost of assets. Since it results in forecasts of maintenance and repairs expense, these forecasts may serve as a basis against which to compare actual maintenance and repairs expense to arrive at an estimate of deferred maintenance and repairs.
11. Management should determine which methods to apply and what condition standards are acceptable. Once determined, condition standards, related assessment methods⁸ and reporting formats should be consistently applied. However, changes to methods or formats that management determines are necessary should be accompanied by an explanation documenting the rationale for

⁵ The determination of acceptable condition may vary both between entities and among sites within the same entity. Management shall determine what level of condition is acceptable.

⁶ The term "systems" can refer to either (1) information technology assets (e.g., hardware, internal use software, data communication devices, etc.) or (2) groupings (assemblages) of component parts belonging to a building, equipment or other personal property.

⁷ This Statement does not require an entity's entire portfolio to be inspected each year. It is permissible to schedule condition assessment surveys on a cyclical basis, provided scheduling is done in accordance with established practices.

⁸ Assessment methods are techniques or procedures used in a process of systematically evaluating an entity's PP&E in order to project M&R, renewal, or replacement needs that will maintain or preserve their ability to support the entity's mission or activities they are assigned to serve.

the change and any related impact to the DM&R estimate(s). Entities should use an interdisciplinary and integrated approach to best meet the goal of DM&R reporting. This includes communicating with and considering input from diverse disciplines such as engineering, facilities management, finance, budgeting and accounting.

12. DM&R should be measured and reported for capitalized general PP&E and stewardship PP&E. DM&R also may be measured and reported for non-capitalized or fully depreciated general PP&E. DM&R should include funded Maintenance & Repair (M&R) that has been put off or delayed for a future period as well as unfunded M&R. DM&R on inactive and/or excess PP&E should be included to the extent that it is required to maintain inactive or excess PP&E in acceptable condition. For example, inactive PP&E may be maintained or repaired either to comply with existing laws and regulations, or to cost-beneficially preserve the value of PP&E pending disposal.

Component Entity Required Supplementary Information

13. DM&R reporting should provide (1) DM&R beginning and ending balances for the reporting period and (2) narrative information related to DM&R costs. Entities are required to present both qualitative and quantitative information.
14. At a minimum, the following information should be presented as required supplementary information (RSI) for all PP&E (each category established in SFFAS 6, as amended, should be included) regardless of the measurement method chosen.

Qualitative

- a. A summary of the entity's Maintenance & Repair (M&R) policies and brief description of how they are applied; i.e., method of measuring DM&R
- b. Policies for ranking and prioritizing M&R activities⁹
- c. Factors the entity considers in determining acceptable condition standards
- d. Whether DM&R relates solely to capitalized general PP&E and stewardship PP&E or also to amounts relating to non-capitalized or fully depreciated PP&E

⁹ As an example, entities may report (1) how they will pursue reducing their DM&R backlog and how they will be impacted by budget or funding shortfalls or reductions, and (2) whether or not the entity has used Return on Investment analyses in its ranking and prioritizing of either M&R or DM&R.

- e. Capitalized PP&E to include heritage assets and stewardship land for which management does not measure and/or report DM&R and the rationale for the exclusion
- f. If applicable, explanation of any significant changes to (1) the policies and factors subject to the reporting requirements established in a through e above and (2) DM&R amounts from the prior year¹⁰

Quantitative

- g. estimates of the beginning and ending balances of deferred maintenance and repairs for each major category¹¹ of asset for which maintenance and repairs have been deferred

Consolidated Financial Report of the US Government Required Supplementary Information

- 15. The disclosure requirements listed in paragraphs 13 and 14 above are not applicable to the U.S. government-wide financial statements. The U. S. government-wide financial statements should include the following required supplementary information:
 - a. a description of what constitutes deferred DM&R and how it was measured,
 - b. amounts of DM&R for each major category of PP&E (i.e., general PP&E, heritage assets, and stewardship land),
 - c. a reference to component entity reports for additional information

Conforming Amendments to Other Statements and Technical Releases

- 16. This Statement amends requirements in SFFAS 29 and 32 to replace 'deferred maintenance' with 'deferred maintenance and repairs' and to rescind certain requirements in SFFAS 29 and 32, including the requirement to report condition information. The changes to SFFAS 29 and 32 are presented in paragraphs 17 and 18 below.

¹⁰ Consistent with paragraph 11, once determined, condition standards and related assessment methods and reporting formats should be consistently applied.

¹¹ SFFAS 6 sets forth three categories of PP&E: (1) general PP&E are PP&E used to provide general government services or goods; (2) heritage assets are those assets possessing significant educational, cultural, or natural characteristics; and (3) stewardship land (i.e., land other than that included in general PP&E).

17. Paragraphs 26, 28, 41 and 42 of SFFAS 29, Heritage Assets and Stewardship Land, are amended as follows:

~~[26] Entities should report the condition¹⁴ of the heritage assets (which may be reported with the deferred maintenance information¹²) as required supplementary information. Entities should include a reference to the condition and deferred maintenance and repairs information¹³ if reported elsewhere in the report containing the basic financial statements.~~

Paragraph 26 Footnote references:

~~¹⁴ Condition is the physical state of an asset. The condition of an asset is based on an evaluation of the physical status/state of an asset, its ability to perform as planned, and its continued usefulness. Evaluating an asset's condition requires knowledge of the asset, its performance capacity and its actual ability to perform, and expectations for its continued performance. The condition of a long-lived asset is affected by its durability, the quality of its design and construction, its use, the adequacy of maintenance that has been performed, and many other factors, including: accidents (an unforeseen and unplanned or unexpected event or circumstance), catastrophes (a tragic event), disasters (a sudden calamitous event bringing great damage, loss, or destruction), and obsolescence. Examples of condition information include, among others, (1) averages of standardized condition rating codes; (2) percentage of assets above, at, or below acceptable condition; or (3) narrative information.~~

~~¹² See SFFAS 6, Chapter 3, Deferred Maintenance (par. 77-84) for information regarding definition, measurement and disclosures specific to deferred maintenance.~~

~~¹³ See SFFAS ##, Deferred Maintenance and Repairs, for information regarding definition, measurement and required supplementary information. SFFAS 14, Amendments to Deferred Maintenance Reporting Amending SFFAS 6, Accounting for Property, Plant and Equipment and SFFAS 8, Supplementary Stewardship Reporting, defined deferred maintenance as RSI. The Board believed that a period of experimentation was necessary for deferred maintenance information and that classifying it as RSI would be more appropriate during the experimentation period. The Board may revise this standard based on experience gained during this time and the development of additional criteria.~~

~~[28.][c.] A general reference to agency reports for additional information about heritage assets, such as agency stewardship policies for heritage assets, and~~

physical units by major categories of heritage assets, and the condition of the heritage assets.

[41] ~~Entities should report the condition²² of the stewardship land (which may be reported with the deferred maintenance information²³) as required supplementary information. Entities should include a reference to the condition and deferred maintenance and repairs information²⁴ if reported elsewhere in the report containing the basic financial statements.~~

Paragraph 41 Footnote references:

~~²² Condition is the physical state of an asset. The condition of an asset is based on an evaluation of the physical status/state of an asset, its ability to perform as planned, and its continued usefulness. Evaluating an asset's condition requires knowledge of the asset, its performance capacity and its actual ability to perform, and expectations for its continued performance. The condition of a long lived asset is affected by its durability, the quality of its design and construction, its use, the adequacy of maintenance that has been performed, and many other factors, including: accidents (an unforeseen and unplanned or unexpected event or circumstance), catastrophes (a tragic event), disasters (a sudden calamitous event bringing great damage, loss, or destruction), and obsolescence. Examples of condition information include, among others, (1) averages of standardized condition rating codes; (2) percentage of assets above, at, or below acceptable condition; or (3) narrative information.~~

~~²³ See SFFAS 6, Chapter 3, Deferred Maintenance (par. 77-84) for information regarding definition, measurement and disclosures specific to deferred maintenance.~~

~~²⁴ See SFFAS ##, *Deferred Maintenance and Repairs*, for information regarding definition, measurement and required supplementary information. SFFAS 14, Amendments to Deferred Maintenance Reporting Amending SFFAS 6, Accounting for Property, Plant and Equipment and SFFAS 8, Supplementary Stewardship Reporting, defined deferred maintenance as RSI. The Board believed that a period of experimentation was necessary for deferred~~

~~maintenance information and that classifying it as RSI would be more appropriate during the experimentation period. The Board may revise this standard based on experience gained during this time and the development of additional criteria.~~

~~[42. c.] A general reference to agency reports for additional information about stewardship land, such as agency stewardship policies for stewardship land, and physical units by major categories of stewardship land use, and the condition of the stewardship land.~~

18. Paragraphs 12b., 12c., and 24 of *SFFAS 32: Consolidated Financial Report of the United States Government Requirements: Implementing Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Concepts 4 "Intended Audience and Qualitative Characteristics for the Consolidated Financial Report of the United States Government"* are rescinded.

~~12. b. The text "The above listed required supplementary information is not applicable to the U.S. government wide financial statements. SFFAS 32 provides for required supplementary information applicable to the U.S. government wide financial statements for these activities." is added as a separate bullet following the existing text for par. 83.~~

~~12. c. The text "The U.S. government wide financial statements need not separately report stratification between critical and non-critical amounts of maintenance needed to return each major class of asset to its acceptable operating condition as well as management's definition of these categories. SFFAS 32 provides for optional information applicable to the U.S. government wide financial statements for these activities." is added to par. 84 as the final sentences.~~

~~24. The U.S. government wide financial statements should include the following required supplementary information:~~

~~a. a broad description of deferred maintenance,~~

~~b. amounts or ranges of amounts of deferred maintenance for each major asset category (i.e., general property, plant, and equipment; heritage assets, and stewardship land) for which maintenance has been deferred,~~

~~c. a general reference to component entity reports, and~~

~~d. optional reporting of the stratification between critical and non-critical amounts of maintenance needed to return each major asset category to its acceptable operating condition.~~

19. This Statement amends requirements in Technical Release 9, Section III, to acknowledge the rescission of requirements to report condition information as RSI. The following text is to be inserted before Section III:

Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards ##, *Deferred Maintenance and Repairs*, rescinded the requirement to report condition information regarding heritage assets and stewardship land as RSI. The following guidance offers insights regarding condition assessments and factors that may influence reporting of deferred maintenance and repairs information. The guidance has not been updated to conform to the new standards and should be considered other literature until revised implementation guidance – if any – is provided.

Effective Date

20. These standards are effective for periods beginning after September 30, 2014. Earlier implementation is encouraged.

The provisions of this Statement need not be applied to immaterial items.

Appendix A: Basis for Conclusions

This appendix discusses some factors considered significant by Board members in reaching the conclusions in this Statement. It includes the reasons for accepting certain approaches and rejecting others. Individual members gave greater weight to some factors than to others. The standards provided in this Statement—not the material in this appendix—should govern the accounting for specific transactions, events, or conditions.

Project History

- A1. Issues pertaining to DM&R reporting have arisen since the issuance of SFFAS 6. The two most common issues related to (1) the lack of comparability in assessing asset condition both within and among entities and (2) measurement and reporting practices and formats that vary greatly among entities. In their most recent real property study, the GAO noted that entities define and estimate DM&R differently in part due to the degree of flexibility afforded by both SFFAS 6 and the Federal Real Property Profile Reporting Guidelines. As a result, these issues have contributed to confusion and uncertainty among users of DM&R information.
- A2. Primarily as a result of auditor concerns, SFFAS 14, *Amendments to Deferred Maintenance Reporting Amending SFFAS 6, Accounting for Property, Plant and Equipment and SFFAS 8, Supplementary Stewardship Reporting*, amended SFFAS 6 and SFFAS 8 to reclassify deferred maintenance information as required supplemental information instead of a disclosure in the notes to the financial statements.
- A3. At that time, the Board believed that a period of experimentation would be desirable for deferred maintenance information and that classifying it as RSI was appropriate during the experimentation period. As a result, the standards for estimating deferred maintenance were intentionally flexible. However, at a minimum, the Board expected to develop guidance on determining acceptable condition and revise the standards based on experience gained during the experimentation period.
- A4. Since completing deliberations on *Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards (SFFAS 40): Definitional Changes Related to Deferred Maintenance and Repairs: Amending Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards 6, Accounting for Property, Plant, and*

Equipment, the Board has continued seeking advice and guidance from stakeholders interested in improving the management of, and reporting on, federal PP&E and related DM&R.

- A5. As demonstrated by SFFAS 40, the Board has spent considerable time and effort working with key stakeholders and the community-at-large evaluating much of the experience gained during the experimentation period. As a result, the Board has both reaffirmed and refined its position regarding DM&R measurement and reporting.
- A6. Two external reports served as the initial basis for the scope of the Task Force's work.¹² The first report was a critique of the deferred maintenance definition in Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards 6, *Accounting for Property, Plant, and Equipment* (SFFAS 6). This report was prepared by the Federal Facilities Council under the auspices of The National Academies. The report was reviewed by the Task Force and provided a foundation for the proposed amendment(s) contained in SFFAS 40. The second report was a GAO study specific to federal real property repair and maintenance backlog issues. In that study, the GAO discussed the need for comparability and realistic estimates of deferred maintenance so that the government's fiscal exposure could be revealed.
- A7. It is important to note that the Task Force's work was not constrained by either of these external reports. Task Force members contributed entity specific information which also included input from internal and external audit communities.

Refining the Goal of DM&R

- A8. The goal of DM&R is to provide reliable information on the estimated cost of the PP&E maintenance and repairs that have been deferred. To that end, the proposed standards would no longer require that condition information be

¹² During 2008 FASAB established a task force to address deferred maintenance and asset impairment issues. The task force consists of government and non-government representatives from various disciplines such as: real property/facilities management, personal property management, appraisal & valuation services, engineering, architecture, accounting, internal auditing, external auditing, finance and budgeting.

reported. Although condition reporting is important and is the basis of an entity's DM&R estimate, it is not an essential component of financial reports. The Board's rationale for this decision is that condition assessment methods and reporting continue to evolve and there are no federal-wide uniform assessment or measurement methods that would increase comparability and understandability. Therefore, summarized condition information may not provide meaningful information to users. The Board believes the wide variation among entities in condition assessment methods and reporting (i.e., different condition ratings/rankings) could obscure user understanding of the government's fiscal exposure (realistic DM&R estimate). The Board believes that this is an area where entity administrative burden can be alleviated given the questionable benefits of summarized condition information.

Assessment Method Factors & Selection Criteria

- A9. Entities are free to choose among assessment methods described in this Statement. The Board realizes that entities need to consider many factors when selecting assessment methods. Such factors could include:
- a. health and safety considerations,
 - b. cost versus benefit,
 - c. mission requirements,
 - d. changes in economic outlook,
 - e. project management strategy,
 - f. nature, size & complexity of the PP&E portfolio,
 - g. nature or type of asset to be inspected,
 - h. asset-specific condition assessment requirements,
 - i. environmental or weather conditions,
 - j. availability of commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) software,
 - k. availability of government-off-the-shelf (GOTS) software,

-
- I. software scalability & related vendor support, and
 - m. regulatory requirements.

For example, an entity may elect to use a life-cycle method to assess its PP&E as part of its overall project management strategy to enhance its ability to predict future maintenance and repair requirements. Another entity may elect to use a parametric¹³ method due to the size and complexity of its portfolio and to realize efficiencies and cost savings while another entity requiring asset-specific condition information may select the condition assessment survey method.

- A10. In order to obtain greater consistency and comparability the Statement provides that once selected, condition standards, related assessment methods and reporting formats should be consistently applied. Some general selection criteria management could use in evaluating different assessment methods include the following:

VISUAL (i.e. physical) INSPECTIONS

PROS

- Generates DM&R estimates
- More timely identification of health & safety issues
- Usually identifies and prioritizes work items / specific repairs
- Modified surveys are affordable
- Knowledge-based surveys (e.g., risk management strategies) eliminate over- and under-inspection

¹³ Parametric cost estimating is an accepted technique used in planning, budgeting, and performance stages of the acquisition process. The technique expedites the development of cost estimates and is appropriate when discrete estimating techniques would require inordinate amounts of time and resources, without leading to significant improvements in estimate accuracy or probability of obtaining additional resources. This process of documenting DM&R by using parametric cost estimates is designed to be a simplified approach based on existing empirical data. The method assumes that: condition assessments are performed at the system level rather than the component level; simple condition levels are used; there are a limited number of systems to assess; and the current replacement value (CRV) of the systems and the facility they support are available. Source: National Institute of Building Sciences, *Whole Building Design Guide*.

-
- Engineered-based surveys provide consistent & credible results

CONS

- Traditional surveys are expensive
- Does not always identify or prioritize work items / specific repairs
- Wasteful over-inspection, risky under-inspection
- Inspector bias could distort results

LIFE CYCLE COSTING METHODS (i.e., modeling)

PROS

- Generates DM&R estimates
- Affordable
- Efficient
- Focuses on buildings and systems
- Facilitates evaluation of large portfolios

CONS

- Does not identify or prioritize work items / specific repairs
- Not always appropriate for smaller portfolios
- Could require expensive updating of initial procurement information
- Credibility issues

Consistency and Comparability

- A11. Because consistency in measurement and reporting significantly adds to the informational value of DM&R estimates (i.e., trend information is useful to decision makers), management must use consistent assessment techniques, measurement methods and reporting formats from year-to-year. However, if management decides to change methods or formats such changes should be accompanied by an explanation documenting the rationale for the change and any related impact to the DM&R estimate(s). This is consistent with Task Force concerns that (1) entities be allowed to adopt new and improved methods or technologies that might be brought about in the area of asset management and (2) greater rigor and

discipline is needed in the area of DM&R measurement and reporting.

- A12. Staff research found that some agencies have interpreted SFFAS 6 requirements to apply only to unfunded DM&R activities.¹⁴ As a result, inaccurate reporting and increased lack of consistency and comparability has resulted. The Board notes whether funded or not, DM&R should be reported. For example, if funding exists but competing demands cause a schedule slippage and result in a delay to a future period, such costs should be reported as DM&R.
- A13. Staff research also found that some entities have not reported DM&R because they have not distinguished between needed capital improvements (e.g., activities which extend the useful life of PP&E) and needed repairs (e.g., activities which allow PP&E to attain the original useful life). SFFAS 34, *The Hierarchy of Generally Accepted Accounting Principles, Including the Application of Standards Issued by the Financial Accounting Standards Board*, states that “[g]enerally accepted accounting principles recognize the importance of reporting transactions and events in accordance with their substance. Consideration should be given to whether the substance of transactions or events differs materially from their form.”¹⁵ For DM&R amounts to be comparable, entities must consider the substance of rather than the form—that is, the terms applied by management—of future activities relating to PP&E.
- A14. Measuring DM&R related to active and inactive PP&E helps ensure that DM&R estimates capture reliable information on the estimated cost of the PP&E maintenance and repairs that have been deferred. For example, entities are often required by law or regulation to obtain approval(s) prior to disposing real property deemed inactive or excess. In such cases where agencies continue to measure DM&R on PP&E pending disposition, DM&R estimates may be overstated. As a result, DM&R that has a lower probability of occurrence due to an asset’s inactive status may be separately identified in order to

¹⁴ DoD Inspector General Report dated September 25, 2009, *Deferred Maintenance on the Air Force C-130 Aircraft* (Report No. D-2009-112.)

¹⁵ SFFAS 34, footnote 5.

provide for a more realistic DM&R estimate, if deemed material.

Interdisciplinary and Integrated Approach

- A15. Staff research found that at some entities DM&R information is not being obtained directly from asset management feeder systems but rather via data gathering processes. As a result, DM&R estimates are not always reflective of the underlying data contained in the entity's asset management systems. Differing amounts of DM&R reported by the same entity in different venues contribute to the perception that DM&R estimates are not reliable and therefore, not relevant. Additionally, information not consistently derived from the appropriate management information system leads to lack of consistency and comparability in addition to being an inefficient use of resources.
- A16. Joint Financial Management Improvement Program (JFMIP) requirements contained at JFMIP-SR-00-4, dated October 2000, require that financial management systems must be designed with effective and efficient interrelationships between software, hardware, personnel, procedures, controls and data contained within the systems. Such systems are planned and managed together, operated in an integrated fashion, and linked together electronically in an efficient and effective manner to provide agency-wide financial system support necessary to carry out the agency's mission and support the agency's financial management needs.
- A17. Consistent with the JFMIP goal of integrated systems, entities should use an interdisciplinary and integrated approach to best meet the goals of DM&R reporting. This includes communicating among and considering input from diverse disciplines such as engineering, facilities management, finance, budgeting, and accounting. Such input should be considered together when determining acceptable condition and related costs to remedy assets. Such an approach will help to (1) ensure the increased value and efficacy of the reported information, (2) meet diverse user needs, and (3) foster system and process improvements via continual integration and interaction among entity staff.

Additional Narrative Information

- A18. Although flexibility is necessary in the areas of determining asset condition and defining acceptable condition, the Board believes that additional disclosures are required in order to increase consistency, comparability, and the reliability and relevance of DM&R estimates. Consequently, the Board believes that:
- a. disclosing M&R policies and how they are applied in practice assists users in understanding how an entity manages its DM&R.
 - b. disclosing policies for ranking and prioritizing M&R activities assists users in understanding how an entity efficiently and effectively manages its M&R resources. Additionally, the Board believes that in order to enhance the relevance and reliability of the entity's estimated DM&R amount, an entity should explain how it decides to allocate its (available) resources. For example, entities frequently give top priority to maintenance and repair activities that maintain employee or constituent health and safety or are required to satisfy regulatory mandates. Once this is accomplished, entity rankings may be adjusted for asset condition assessments, and management considerations that include: capital improvement plans, asset disposal plans, and budgetary funding outlook.
 - c. identifying factors the entity considers in selecting acceptable condition standards assists users in understanding the unique nature of the entity's mission and operating environment and how these affect asset management. Regardless of whether entities report condition information, the underlying rationale an entity uses in making this managerial judgment enhances the relevance and reliability of the entity's estimated DM&R. For example, an entity might set different acceptable condition standards for identical assets because of geographical or environmental factors specific to each.
 - d. disclosing whether DM&R relates solely to capitalized general PP&E and stewardship PP&E or also includes amounts relating to non-capitalized or fully depreciated general PP&E assists users in

understanding how an entity manages its DM&R. Partially as a result of increased emphasis in the reporting of real property information, it has come to the Board's attention that in addition to capitalized general and stewardship PP&E, entities track and report DM&R on expensed or fully depreciated general PP&E; i.e., all accountable PP&E.

- e. identifying PP&E for which management does not measure and/or report DM&R and the rationale for the exclusion assists users in understanding how an entity efficiently and effectively manages its M&R resources. Management should clearly disclose this fact and provide its rationale for the exclusion. For example, PP&E designated as excess and subject to disposal or considered unserviceable may not have any associated DM&R.

Reducing Confusion and Increasing Relevance & Reliability

- A19. The stratification between critical and non-critical DM&R at SFFAS 6, paragraph 84 was intended to be optional and not an unnecessary burden to entities. It has come to the Board's attention that the Federal Real Property Guidelines define "critical" at the asset level (i.e., asset classification defines if M&R is critical or not) whereas the SFFAS 6 guidelines have been interpreted to apply to the discrete M&R activity (i.e., the nature of the work defines if M&R is critical or not). Furthermore, some entities are following Treasury guidelines which define "critical" as a matter of consequence or exigency (i.e., impact of not performing the M&R work/activity).¹⁶ Consistent with the Task Force's recommendation, it is the Board's opinion that having three separate definitions for "critical" has led to confusion, increased lack of comparability, and estimates that are not necessarily reflective of what entities expect to incur. The Board believes that the reporting of critical and non-critical

¹⁶ June 17, 2010, Appendix 4 of Chapter 4700 in Vol. 1 of the Treasury Financial Manual, Other Financial Report (FR) Notes Data and Instructions. *"Critical deferred maintenance is urgently needed, absolutely necessary, and is an element that needs immediate attention. Furthermore, critical deferred maintenance is any deferred maintenance that poses a serious threat to the public or employee safety or health, natural or cultural resources, and a bureau's ability to carry out its assigned mission."*

DM&R is not useful, can lead to inconsistency, and therefore should be not be addressed in the Statement.

- A20. Permitting entities to provide a range of DM&R estimates (i.e., high and low), was in recognition of the fact that assessment methods and practices were fairly new and still evolving at the time SFFAS 6 was issued. However, as the GAO noted in its October 2008 report, DM&R estimates do not necessarily reflect the cost that agencies expect to incur owing, at least in part, to the methodological flexibility permitted by SFFAS 6. The identification of low and high dollar DM&R estimates contributes to the lack of comparability and hinders the transparent reporting of a more realistic estimate. A single DM&R estimate is more appropriate and informative. Moreover, an analysis of a seven-year (2004 through 2010) time span at the government-wide level reveals that there is very little distinction between low and high dollar estimates. Consistent with the Task Force's recommendation that DM&R estimates be derived directly from asset management systems and be consistent with FRPP reporting requirements, the Board believes that by eliminating the reporting of a dollar range, financial reporting of DM&R is significantly improved and administrative burdens can be reduced.

Presenting DM&R Balances and Discussing Significant Changes

- A21. The Board believes that users need to know how much the maintenance and repairs requirements increased (decreased) and how many of the requirements have been addressed. Moreover, it is important for users to (1) understand what events occurred during the year and why they brought about significant increases or decreases and (2) whether or not DM&R levels have improved. To that end, federal entities are required to present their DM&R beginning and ending balances. As a minimum and as illustrated in Appendix B, entities should present these balances by category (i.e., general PP&E, heritage assets, and stewardship land), and explain significant changes by major asset category. The Board believes that this will increase comparability and the relevance and reliability of the DM&R estimates and will significantly enhance entity-specific consistency from year to year.

Appendix B: Sample Illustration

Appendix B

Deferred Maintenance and Repairs Illustration

This appendix illustrates paragraphs 13 -14. The examples shown here are for illustrative purposes only. Different entities may develop different asset classes and descriptive terminology consistent with the set categories of General PP&E, Heritage assets, and Stewardship Land. The following narrative discussion and Illustration #1, *General Purpose Display* meet the minimum requirements of the proposed standards. Please note that the various illustrations are not meant to articulate with one another and should be viewed on a stand-alone basis.

XYZ Entity

Deferred Maintenance and Repairs for Fiscal Year 20x2

The XYZ entity operates over 1,300 facilities throughout the world, preserves nearly 300 national historical landmarks of natural, cultural, educational, or artistic importance, and is responsible for maintaining over 80,000 acres of stewardship land. Most of the facilities are predominantly used for office space and warehousing defense assets. Additionally, the entity operates a hospital at one of its remote sites. It is entity policy to ensure that medical equipment and critical equipment systems are maintained and managed in a safe and effective manner; therefore, deferred maintenance and repairs do not arise for these two types of equipment and no periodic assessment is performed. Additionally, since (1) it is entity policy to maintain and preserve all fixed property, plant and equipment (PP&E) regardless of recorded values and (2) accounting and asset management systems do not differentiate M&R between PP&E capitalized (i.e., items whose cost exceeds the capitalization threshold) versus those expensed, DM&R estimates reported herein relate to all PP&E whether capitalized or not or fully depreciated.

Defining and Implementing M&R Policies in Practice.

As permitted under FASAB SFFAS XX, the entity employs a parametric estimating method for the largest portion of its portfolio (real property such as office and warehouse space) and the condition assessment method for its hospital facility, defense and stewardship assets. With the exception of the hospital facility which is inspected on a yearly basis, the entity's real property portfolio is assessed on a 3 to 5 year rotating calendar. Both methods measure current real property asset condition and document real property deterioration.

Real property assessment methods produce both a cost estimate of deferred maintenance and repairs, and a Facility Condition Index (FCI). Both measures are indicators of the overall condition of the entity's facilities. The parametric estimating methodology involves an independent, rapid visual assessment of nine different systems within each facility to include: structure, roof, exterior, interior finishes, HVAC, electrical, plumbing, conveyance, and program support equipment. The parametric estimating method is designed to be cost effective and appropriate for application to a large population of facilities; results are not necessarily applicable for individual facilities or small populations of facilities.

The entity's hospital is inspected on a yearly basis employing a physical inspection method which focuses on component as well as system distresses in addition to identifying deficiencies. The entity's defense assets are routinely surveyed by unit and depot maintenance personnel and stewardship assets are routinely surveyed by on-site personnel and regional inspection teams.

As stated above, it is entity policy to ensure that medical equipment and critical facility equipment systems are maintained and managed in a safe and effective manner. Therefore, deferred maintenance and repairs assessment methods are generally not applied to equipment assigned to hospitals as any DM&R would be negligible.

Ranking and Prioritizing M&R Activities.

Maintenance and repair activities are first prioritized via health, safety and regulatory considerations at all facilities. Once this is accomplished, the FCI values are then ranked based on the ratings obtained during the condition assessment site visits. Rankings are generally adjusted to take into account current capital improvement efforts underway, future capital improvement plans, asset disposal plans, and budgetary funding outlook.

Factors Considered in Setting Acceptable Condition.

For office and warehouse space, the entity defines acceptable condition in accordance with standards comparable to those used in private industry. For example, industry standards for administrative buildings can vary substantially depending upon their classification as either a Class A, B or C property. Such classifications are affected by building location, design, and age. Condition standards for warehouses are primarily set by local jurisdictions and consider factors such as accommodating loads, materials to be stored, the associated handling equipment, the receiving and shipping operations and associated trucking, and the needs of the operating personnel. Acceptable condition for the hospital facility is in accordance with federal statutory requirements and requirements adopted by the health care facilities industry substantially comparable to the requirements at 42 C.F.R. Part 483 entitled, *Requirements for States and Long Term Care Facilities*.

Military specifications and standards for defense assets vary greatly depending upon numerous factors such as the nature and type of equipment and mission expectations. Acceptable condition standards for defense assets are set at levels deemed to be mission capable or serviceable. Heritage assets and stewardship land adopt scientific conservation standards to preserve assets in a manner that fulfills the entity's obligation to stabilize, protect, and preserve the assets.

Significant Changes from Prior Year.

The overall net increase of \$2.0 billion in DM&R is a result of the \$3.0 billion increase in General PP&E, offset by a \$1.0 billion DM&R decrease in heritage assets.

Funded DM&R decreased by \$1.0 billion as result of the entity's strategic initiative to repair and restore many of its historical landmarks. However, unfunded DM&R pertaining to inactive/excess General PP&E increased by \$3.0 billion as a result of (1) the transfer of properties from other federal entities, (2) newly identified properties and equipment no longer needed by the entity, and (3) continued degradation of properties awaiting final disposition. Management policy is to comply with legal requirements to maintain inactive/excess property in safe condition and to pursue cost-beneficial measures to preserve the value of properties. The entity in collaboration with other entities and members of Congress is in the process of finalizing plans to either dispose of or find alternate uses for the aforementioned properties. For such properties, DM&R include those M&R activities management believes are warranted but not necessarily the M&R appropriate for an equivalent active property.

The following illustration presents information on major PP&E categories experiencing material amounts of deferred maintenance and repairs and meets the basic illustration requirements of this proposed standard:

ILLUSTRATION 1 - GENERAL PURPOSE DISPLAY

Deferred Maintenance and Repair Costs
(Dollars in Millions)

<u>Asset Category</u>	20x2 Beginning Balance DM&R	20x2 Ending Balance DM&R
General PP&E	\$30,500	\$33,500
Heritage Assets	6,000	5,000
Stewardship Land	2,500	2,500
Total	<u><u>\$39,000</u></u>	<u><u>\$41,000</u></u>

The following Illustration # 2 presents information on major PP&E categories experiencing material amounts of deferred maintenance and repairs with an emphasis on active versus inactive/excess assets:

ILLUSTRATION 2 - EMPHASIS ON ACTIVE vs. INACTIVE & EXCESS

Deferred Maintenance and Repair Costs

(Dollars in Millions)

<u>Asset Category</u>	20x2 Beginning Balance <u>DM&R</u>	20x2 Ending Balance <u>DM&R</u>
<u>Active:</u>		
General PP&E	\$30,000	\$31,250
Heritage Assets	1,000	0
Stewardship Land	1,000	1,000
subtotal -active	32,000	32,250
<u>Inactive & Excess:</u>		
General PP&E	7,000	8,750
subtotal -inactive	7,000	8,750
Total	\$39,000	\$41,000

The following Illustration # 3 presents information on major asset classes experiencing material amounts of deferred maintenance and repairs with an emphasis on active versus inactive/excess assets:

ILLUSTRATION 3 - EMPHASIS ON ACTIVE vs. INACTIVE & EXCESS BY ASSET CLASS

Deferred Maintenance and Repair Costs
(Dollars in Millions)

<u>Asset Category / Class</u>	20x2 Beginning Balance <u>DM&R</u>	20x2 Ending Balance <u>DM&R</u>
<u>Active:</u>		
General PP&E:		
Structures	\$28,000	\$28,750
Aircraft	10	106
Missiles	117	279
Ships	1,873	2,115
subtotal - general PP&E active	30,000	31,250
Stewardship Land	1,000	1,000
Heritage Assets	1,000	0
subtotal - all active	\$32,000	\$32,250
<u>Inactive & Excess:</u>		
General PP&E		
Buildings	5,000	5,000
Structures	2,000	3,750
subtotal - general PP&E inactive & excess	7,000	8,750
Total	\$39,000	\$41,000

The following Illustration # 4 presents information on major PP&E categories experiencing material amounts of deferred maintenance and repairs with an emphasis on funded and unfunded maintenance and repairs:

ILLUSTRATION 4 - EMPHASIS ON FUNDED & UNFUNDED M&R

Deferred Maintenance and Repair Costs

(Dollars in Millions)

<u>Asset Category</u>	20x2 Beginning Balance <u>DM&R</u>	20x2 Ending Balance <u>DM&R</u>
<u>Funded M&R:</u>		
General PP&E -active	\$15,000	\$13,250
General PP&E - inactive & excess	8,000	9,750
Heritage Assets	1,000	0
subtotal	<u>24,000</u>	<u>23,000</u>
<u>Unfunded M&R:</u>		
General PP&E -active	7,500	7,500
General PP&E - inactive & excess	0	3,000
Heritage Assets	5,000	5,000
Stewardship Land	2,500	2,500
subtotal	<u>15,000</u>	<u>18,000</u>
Total	<u>\$39,000</u>	<u>\$41,000</u>

Appendix C: Abbreviations

DoD	Department of Defense
DM&R	deferred maintenance and repair
FASAB	Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board
FRPP	Federal Real Property Profile (GSA Asset Management Database)
GAAP	generally accepted accounting principles
GAO	Government Accountability Office
M&R	maintenance and repair
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
PP&E	property, plant and equipment
RSI	required supplementary information
SFFAC	Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Concepts
SFFAS	Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards

FASAB Board Members

Tom L. Allen, Chair

Debra J. Bond

Robert F. Dacey

Michael H. Granof

Norwood J. Jackson, Jr.

Mark Reger

Alan H. Schumacher

D. Scott Showalter

Harold I. Steinberg

FASAB Staff

Wendy M. Payne, Executive Director

Project Staff

Domenic Nicholas Savini

Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board
441 G Street NW, Suite 6814
Mail Stop 6K17V
Washington, DC 20548
Telephone 202-512-7350
FAX 202-512-7366
www.fasab.gov

Style Definition: Appendix Bullet:
Outline numbered + Level: 1 +
Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start
at: 16 + Alignment: Left + Aligned
at: 0.5" + Tab after: 1" + Indent at:
1"

Deleted: <sp>



Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board

Deferred Maintenance and Repairs

Amending Statements of Federal Financial Accounting Standards 6, 14, 29 and 32

Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards

Exposure Draft

Written comments are requested by September 16, 2011

Deleted: July 31

June X, 2011

Working Draft – Comments are Not Requested on This Draft

THE FEDERAL ACCOUNTING STANDARDS ADVISORY BOARD

The Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), and the Comptroller General, established the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board (FASAB or “the Board) in October 1990. FASAB is responsible for promulgating accounting standards for the United States Government. These standards are recognized as generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP) for the federal government.

An accounting standard is typically formulated initially as a proposal after considering the financial and budgetary information needs of citizens (including the news media, state and local legislators, and analysts from private firms, academe, and elsewhere), Congress, federal executives, federal program managers, and other users of federal financial information. The proposed standards are published in an exposure draft for public comment. In some cases, a discussion memorandum, invitation for comment, or preliminary views document may be published before an exposure draft is published on a specific topic. A public hearing is sometimes held to receive oral comments in addition to written comments. The Board considers comments and decides whether to adopt the proposed standard with or without modification. After review by the three officials who sponsor FASAB, the Board publishes adopted standards in a Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards. The Board follows a similar process for Statements of Federal Financial Accounting Concepts, which guide the Board in developing accounting standards and formulating the framework for federal accounting and reporting.

Additional background information is available from the FASAB or its website:

- “Memorandum of Understanding among the Government Accountability Office, the Department of the Treasury, and the Office of Management and Budget, on Federal Government Accounting Standards and a Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board.”
- “Mission Statement: Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board,” exposure drafts, Statements of Federal Financial Accounting Standards and Concepts, FASAB newsletters, and other items of interest are posted on FASAB’s website at: www.fasab.gov.

Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board
441 G Street, NW, Suite 6814
Mail stop 6K17V
Washington, DC 20548
Telephone 202-512-7350
FAX – 202-512-7366

www.fasab.gov

This is a work of the U. S. government and is not subject to copyright protection in the United States. It may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without further permission from FASAB. However, because this work may contain copyrighted images or other material, permission from the copyright holder may be necessary if you wish to reproduce this material separately.



Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board

Deleted: <sp>

Formatted

June X, 2011

TO: ALL WHO USE, PREPARE, AND AUDIT FEDERAL FINANCIAL INFORMATION

The Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board (FASAB or the Board) is requesting comments on this exposure draft of a proposed Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards entitled, *Deferred Maintenance and Repairs - Amending Statements of Federal Financial Accounting Standards 6, 14, 29 and 32*. Specific questions for your consideration begin on page 7 but you are welcome to comment on any aspect of this proposal. Your response would be more helpful to the Board if you explain the reasons for your position and any alternative you propose. Responses are requested by September 16, 2011.

Deleted: July 31

All comments received by the FASAB are considered public information. Those comments may be posted to the FASAB's website and will be included in the project's public record.

We have experienced delays in mail delivery due to increased screening procedures. Therefore, please provide your comments in electronic form. Responses in electronic form should be sent by e-mail to fasab@fasab.gov. If you are unable to provide electronic delivery, we urge you to fax the comments to (202) 512-7366. Please follow up by mailing your comments to:

Wendy M. Payne, Executive Director
Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board
Mailstop 6K17V
441 G Street, NW, Suite 6814
Washington, DC 20548

The Board's rules of procedure provide that it may hold one or more public hearings on any exposure draft. No hearing has yet been scheduled for this exposure draft.

Notice of the date and location of any public hearing on this document will be published in the *Federal Register* and in the FASAB's newsletter.

Tom L. Allen

Chairman

Executive Summary

What is the Board proposing?

This exposure draft proposes amending the reporting requirements contained in SFFAS 6, Accounting for Property, Plant, and Equipment. The amendments would require entities to: (1) describe their maintenance and repairs (M&R) policies and how they are applied, (2) discuss how they rank and prioritize M&R activities among other activities, (3) identify factors considered in determining acceptable condition standards, (4) state whether deferred maintenance and repairs (DM&R) relate solely to capitalized general property, plant and equipment (PP&E) and stewardship PP&E or also to non-capitalized or fully depreciated general PP&E, (5) identify PP&E for which management does not measure and/or report DM&R and the rationale for the exclusion of other than non-capitalized or fully depreciated general PP&E, (6) provide beginning and ending DM&R balances by category of PP&E, and (7) explain significant changes from the prior year.

Deleted: This exposure draft proposes amending the reporting requirements contained in SFFAS 6, Accounting for Property, Plant, and Equipment. The amendments would require agencies to discuss (1) their maintenance and repairs (M&R) policies and brief description of how they are applied, (2) how they rank and prioritize M&R activities among other activities, and (3) factors the entity considers in determining acceptable condition standards.

Other significant proposals contained in this Exposure Draft include (1) requiring that condition standards, related assessment methods, and reporting formats be consistently applied, (2) eliminating the requirement to report condition information and (3) eliminating the optional reporting of high-low DM&R estimates as well as the option to report critical and non-critical DM&R.

Deleted: Significant proposals contained in this Exposure Draft include (1) eliminating the requirement to report condition information, (2) eliminating the optional reporting of critical, non-critical and high-low deferred maintenance & repair (DM&R) estimates, and (3) requiring that agencies provide beginning and ending DM&R balances.

Additionally, the proposed amendments note the importance of and require using an interdisciplinary and integrated entity approach in compiling and reporting DM&R.

Further, entities would be required to report (1) unfunded and funded DM&R amounts, (2) state whether DM&R relates solely to capitalized general property, plant and equipment (PP&E) and stewardship PP&E or also to non-capitalized general PP&E, (3) identify PP&E for which management does not measure and/or report DM&R and the rationale for the exclusion of other than non-capitalized general PP&E, and (4) explain changes from the prior year.

How would this proposal improve federal financial reporting and contribute to meeting the federal financial reporting objectives?

Of the four objectives outlined in Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Concepts (SFFAC) 1, Objectives of Federal Financial Reporting, the operating performance objective is identified as being most important for DM&R reporting. DM&R reporting is important to meeting this objective because the federal government is accountable to citizens for the proper stewardship and administration of its assets. Reporting on DM&R assists users by providing an entity's realistic estimate of DM&R amounts and in ascertaining the effectiveness of an entity's asset maintenance practices.

Deleted: holistic agency

The two most common issues noted since the implementation of SFFAS 6 are (1) the lack of comparability in assessing asset condition both within and among entities, and (2) measurement and reporting practices and formats that vary greatly among entities. These issues largely result from entities defining and estimating DM&R differently and the degree of flexibility afforded by both SFFAS 6 and the Federal Real Property Profile (FRPP).

Deleted: relative to

Deleted: agencies employ in fulfilling their missions

Deleted: Problems with DM&R reporting have existed since the issuance of SFFAS 6.

Deleted: agencies

Deleted: agencies.

Deleted: problems

Deleted: agencies

¹ SFFAC 1, Objectives of Federal Financial Reporting, September 2, 1993, par. 9-10.

Deleted: technical issues such as

Executive Summary

5

Deleted: <sp>

Reporting Guidelines.² As a result, these issues have contributed to confusion among interested users of DM&R information.

Deleted: agency

Deleted: problems

In an attempt to achieve greater consistency and comparability in the reporting of DM&R and to increase the reliability and relevance of DM&R estimates, the Board believes that certain refinements and changes to DM&R requirements in SFFAS 6 are required. These significant changes would include both the addition and elimination of certain reporting requirements. The Board believes that these changes will facilitate use of the same methods for financial reporting and FRPP Reporting so that users receive comparable information to assess operating performance.

Deleted: The Board continues to recognize that flexibility is needed in assessing and measuring asset condition (i.e., determining acceptable condition). However, in

Deleted: Accordingly, the Board believes that this amendment improves financial reporting consistent with the operating performance objective and addresses principal concerns raised by both the GAO and Task Force.³

Formatted

Operating Performance Objective

Federal financial reporting should assist report users in evaluating the service efforts, costs, and accomplishments of the reporting entity; the manner in which these efforts and accomplishments have been financed; and the management of the entity's assets and liabilities. Federal financial reporting should provide information that helps the reader to determine

- the costs of providing specific programs and activities and the composition of, and changes in, these costs;
- the efforts and accomplishments associated with federal programs and the changes over time and in relation to costs; and
- the efficiency and effectiveness of the government's management of its assets and liabilities.

Source: SFFAC 1

² The most current version can be found at: <http://www.gsa.gov/portal/content/104918>. Please refer to *Federal Real Property Council, Real Property Inventory - User Guidance for FY 2010 Reporting October 25, 2010*.

⁴ This Statement uses the phrase "technical community" to refer to entity personnel responsible for the management of property, plant, and equipment including maintenance and repair.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary 4

 What is the Board proposing? 4

 How would this proposal improve federal financial reporting and contribute to meeting the federal financial reporting objectives? 4

Questions for Respondents 7

Introduction 10

 Purpose 10

 Materiality 10

 Effective Date 10

Proposed Standards 11

 Scope 11

Appendix A: Basis for Conclusions 20

Appendix B: Sample Illustration 30

Appendix C: Abbreviations 37

Appendix C: Abbreviations 37

Field Code Changed

Formatted: TOC 1

Field Code Changed

Deleted: Effect on Existing Standards -

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Deleted: Appendix A: Basis for Conclusions

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Deleted: Appendix B: Sample Illustration

Field Code Changed

Questions for Respondents

The FASAB encourages you to become familiar with all proposals in the Exposure Draft before responding to the questions in this section. In addition to the questions below, the Board also would welcome your comments on other aspects of the proposed Statement.

The Board believes that this proposal would improve federal financial reporting and contribute to meeting the federal financial reporting objectives. The Board has considered the perceived costs associated with this proposal. In responding, please consider the expected benefits and perceived costs and communicate any concerns that you may have in regard to implementing this proposal.

Because the proposals may be modified before a final Statement is issued, it is important that you comment on proposals that you favor as well as any that you do not favor. Comments that include the reasons for your views will be especially appreciated.

The questions in this section are available in a Word file for your use at www.fasab.gov/exposure.html. Your responses should be sent by e-mail to fasab@fasab.gov. If you are unable to respond electronically, please fax your responses to (202) 512-7366 and follow up by mailing your responses to:

Wendy M. Payne, Executive Director
Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board
Mailstop 6K17V
441 G Street, NW, Suite 6814
Washington, DC 20548

All responses are requested by September 16, 2011.

Deleted: July 31

Q1. The Board proposes to eliminate the requirement to report condition information. Refer to paragraphs 13, 14, and 17 of the proposed standards and paragraph A8 in Appendix A - Basis for Conclusions for a discussion and related explanation.

Deleted: 15

Do you agree or disagree with the Board's proposal to no longer require condition reporting? Please provide the rationale for your answer.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.63", Space After: 6 pt

Q2. The proposed standards would require that DM&R estimates for beginning and ending balances be presented with an explanation of significant changes. Refer to paragraph 14.f, and g. of the proposed standard and paragraph A21 in Appendix A - Basis for Conclusions for a discussion and related explanation.

Deleted: agencies to apply disclosed practices consistently and provide additional narrative explanations, such as the identification of any changes from the prior year, and providing

- a. Do you agree or disagree that DM&R estimates for beginning and ending balances should be presented? Please provide the rationale for your answer.
- b. Do you agree or disagree with the requirement to explain significant DM&R changes? Please provide the rationale for your answer.

Deleted: DM&R

Deleted: .

Deleted: refer to paragraphs 12

Deleted: 15, items a. through

Deleted: standards and paragraph A10

Q3. The proposed standards state that entities should apply reported methods and reporting formats consistently and if changes to methods or formats are necessary, such changes should be explained. Refer to paragraph 11 of the proposed standards and paragraphs A10 and A11 in Appendix A - Basis for Conclusions for a discussion and related explanation.

- a. Do you agree or disagree that entities should apply reported methods and reporting formats consistently? Please provide the rationale for your answer.
- b. Do you agree or disagree with requiring an explanation if entities change methods or formats? Please provide the rationale for your answer.

Q4. The proposed standards would require entities to provide narrative information related to DM&R costs and identify any significant changes from the prior year. Refer to paragraphs 13 and 14, items a. through f. of the proposed standards and paragraphs A11 and A18, respectively, in Appendix A - Basis for Conclusions for a discussion and related explanation.

Deleted: A17

Do you agree or disagree with each of the above referenced requirements? Please provide the rationale for your answer.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Q5. The proposed standards state that entities should use an interdisciplinary and integrated approach in compiling and reporting DM&R. Refer to paragraph 11 of the proposed standards and paragraphs A15 through A17 in Appendix A - Basis for Conclusions for a detailed discussion and related explanation. .

Do you agree or disagree that entities should use an interdisciplinary and integrated approach in compiling and reporting DM&R? Please provide the rationale for your answer.

Q6. The proposed standards would eliminate the option to report a range of DM&R estimates and the distinction between critical and non-critical amounts. The reported amount of DM&R may be disaggregated in a variety of ways without explicit mention in the standards. Refer to paragraph 14 of the proposed standards and to paragraphs A19 and A20 in Appendix A - Basis for Conclusions for a discussion and related explanations.

a. Do you agree or disagree with eliminating the distinction between critical and non-critical DM&R estimates? Please provide the rationale for your answer.

b. Do you agree or disagree with eliminating the option to report a range of DM&R estimates? Please provide the rationale for your answer.

Q7. The proposed standards would be effective beginning in fiscal year 2015 with earlier implementation permitted.

Do you agree or disagree with the proposed effective date? Please provide the rationale for your answer.

Deleted: The proposed standards (1) require using an interdisciplinary and holistic agency approach in compiling and reporting DM&R.

Deleted: 12

Deleted: A13

Deleted: A14

Deleted: detailed

Deleted: . .

Deleted: requiring

Deleted: use of an interdisciplinary

Deleted: holistic approach in compiling and reporting

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75", Hanging: 0.5", Space After: 6 pt, Numbered + Level: 5 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 1.13" + Tab after: 1.38" + Indent at: 1.38", Tabs: 1.25", List tab + Not at 1.38"

Deleted: ?

Formatted: Font: Bold

Deleted: <#>The proposed standards would eliminate the optional reporting of critical and non-critical DM&R estimates. Refer to paragraph 15 of the proposed standards and to paragraph A15 in Appendix A - Basis for Conclusions for a discussion and related explanations. ¶

Formatted: Questions

Deleted: eliminating this option?

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Deleted: <#>The proposed standards would eliminate the option to report low and high dollar DM&R estimates. Refer to paragraph 15 of the proposed standards and A16 in Appendix A - Basis for Conclusions for a discussion and related explanations. ¶

Do you agree or disagree with eliminating the option to rep(... [1]

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Deleted: <#>The proposed standard would change the existing illust(... [2]

Introduction**Purpose**

1. The Board desires to improve deferred maintenance and repairs (DM&R) measurement and to enhance current federal reporting. The objective of this Statement is to incorporate reporting changes responsive to concerns raised by the financial and technical⁴ communities. The Board also considered, where appropriate, a Government Accountability Office (GAO) study⁵ specific to repair and maintenance backlog issues surrounding federal real property.

Deleted: , where needed, develop

Deleted: guidance relative to DM&R that best reflects or enhances current federal practices.

Materiality

2. The provisions of this Statement need not be applied to immaterial items. The determination of whether an item is material depends on the degree to which omitting or misstating information about the item makes it probable that the judgment of a reasonable person relying on the information would have been changed or influenced by the omission or the misstatement.

Effective Date

3. When finalized, the requirements in this Statement will be effective beginning in fiscal year 2015. The Board believes the standards will be finalized in fiscal year 2012 and a two year implementation period is sufficient.

⁵ GAO Report No. GAO-09-10 dated October 2008. Federal Real Property. *Government's Fiscal Exposure from Repair and Maintenance Backlogs is Unclear.*

Proposed Standards

Scope

- 4. This Statement replaces DM&R definitions, measurement and reporting requirements established in SFFAS 6, as amended by SFFAS 40, *Definitional Changes Related to Deferred Maintenance and Repairs: Amending Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards 6, Accounting for Property, Plant, and Equipment* (SFFAS 40). SFFAS 6, Chapter 3: *Deferred Maintenance and Repairs*, paragraphs 77 through 84 are rescinded and Appendix C, *Deferred Maintenance and Repairs Illustration* is also rescinded.
- 5. In addition to SFFAS 6, this Statement also provides the following conforming amendments:
 - a. SFFAS 14, *Amendments to Deferred Maintenance Reporting Amending SFFAS 6, Accounting for Property, Plant and Equipment and SFFAS 8, Supplementary Stewardship Reporting* is rescinded.
 - b. SFFAS 29, *Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards 29: Heritage Assets and Stewardship Land* is amended to adopt the revised terminology and to rescind requirements for condition information.
 - c. SFFAS 32: *Consolidated Financial Report of the United States Government Requirements: Implementing Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Concepts 4 "Intended Audience and Qualitative Characteristics for the Consolidated Financial Report of the United States Government"* is amended to adopt the revised terminology and to rescind certain requirements.
 - d. Technical Release 9: *Implementation Guide for Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards 29: Heritage Assets and Stewardship Land, Section III: Assessing and Reporting Condition* is amended to explain the status of guidance relating to condition reporting.

Deleted: deferred maintenance and repairs (

Deleted:)

Deleted: Amend

Deleted: consistent with this Statement

Deleted: existing

Deleted: Amend

Deleted: consistent with this Statement

Deleted: addressed in this Statement.

Deleted: Amend

Deleted: .

Deleted: ¶
¶
Effect on Existing Standards – ¶
¶
<#>SFFAS 6, paragraphs 77 through 84 are rescinded. ¶

Formatted: List Number, Indent: Left: 0.25", Hanging: 0.5"

Formatted: Font: 11 pt, Not Bold

Definition

- 6. "Deferred maintenance and repairs" (DM&R) are maintenance and repairs that were not performed when they should have been or were scheduled to be and which, therefore, are put off or delayed for a future period.

- 7. Maintenance and repairs are activities directed toward keeping fixed assets in an acceptable condition.⁶ Activities include preventive maintenance; replacement of parts, systems,⁷ or components; and other activities needed to preserve or maintain the asset. Maintenance and repairs, as distinguished from capital improvements, exclude activities directed towards expanding the capacity of an asset or otherwise upgrading it to serve needs different from, or significantly greater than, its current use.

Deleted: Entities

Measurement

- 8. Amounts for DM&R may be measured using:
 - a. condition assessment surveys,
 - b. life-cycle cost forecasts, or
 - c. other methods which are similar to the condition assessment survey or life-cycle costing methods.
- 9. *Condition assessment surveys* are periodic⁸ visual (i.e., physical) inspections of property, plant and equipment (PP&E) to determine their current condition and estimated cost to correct any deficiencies.
- 10. *Life-cycle costing* is an acquisition or procurement technique which considers operating, maintenance, and other costs in addition to the acquisition cost of assets. Since it results in forecasts of maintenance and repairs expense, these forecasts may serve as a basis against which to compare actual maintenance and repairs expense to arrive at an estimate of deferred maintenance and repairs.
- 11. Management should determine which methods to apply and what condition standards are acceptable. Once determined, condition standards, related assessment methods⁹ and reporting formats should be consistently applied.

Deleted: and

Deleted: ¹⁰

⁶ The determination of acceptable condition may vary both between entities and among sites within the same entity. Management shall determine what level of condition is acceptable.

⁷ The term "systems" can refer to either (1) information technology assets (e.g., hardware, internal use software, data communication devices, etc.) or (2) groupings (assemblages) of component parts belonging to a building, equipment or other personal property.

⁸ This Statement does not require an entity's entire portfolio to be inspected each year. It is permissible to schedule condition assessment surveys on a cyclical basis, provided scheduling is done in accordance with established practices.

Deleted: at irregular time intervals

⁹ Assessment methods are techniques or procedures used in a process of systematically evaluating an entity's PP&E in order to project M&R, renewal, or replacement needs that will maintain or preserve their ability to support the entity's mission or activities they are assigned to serve.

Deleted: This Standard does not require an entity's entire portfolio to be inspected each year.

¹¹ As an example, entities may report (1) how they will pursue reducing their DM&R backlog and how they

However, changes to methods or formats that management determines are necessary should be accompanied by an explanation documenting the rationale for the change and any related impact to the DM&R estimate(s). Entities should use an interdisciplinary and integrated approach to best meet the goal of DM&R reporting. This includes communicating with, and considering input from diverse disciplines, such as engineering, facilities management, finance, budgeting, and accounting.

- Deleted: holistic entity
- Deleted: among
- Deleted: fields
- Deleted: , social sciences (i.e. economics, Congressional relations, public affairs)
- Deleted: Such input should be considered together when determining acceptable condition and related costs to remedy assets.

12. DM&R should be measured and reported for capitalized general PP&E and stewardship PP&E. DM&R also may be measured and reported for non-capitalized or fully depreciated general PP&E. DM&R should include funded Maintenance & Repair (M&R) that has been put off or delayed for a future period as well as unfunded M&R. DM&R on inactive and/or excess PP&E should be included to the extent that it is required to maintain inactive or excess PP&E in acceptable condition. For example, inactive PP&E may be maintained or repaired either to comply with existing laws and regulations, or to cost-beneficially preserve the value of PP&E pending disposal.

Component Entity Required Supplementary Information

13. DM&R reporting should provide, (1) DM&R beginning and ending balances for the reporting period and (2) narrative information related to DM&R costs. Entities are required to present both qualitative and quantitative information.
14. At a minimum, the following information should be presented as required supplementary information (RSI) for all PP&E (each category established in SFFAS 6, as amended, should be included) regardless of the measurement method chosen.

- Deleted: standards require
- Deleted: narrative information related to DM&R costs and (2)
- Deleted: . Agencies

Qualitative

- a. A summary of the entity’s Maintenance & Repair (M&R) policies and brief description of how they are applied; i.e., method of measuring DM&R
- b. Policies for ranking and prioritizing M&R activities¹¹
- c. Factors the entity considers in determining acceptable condition standards

will be impacted by budget or funding shortfalls or reductions, and (2) whether or not the entity has used Return on Investment analyses in its ranking and prioritizing of either M&R or DM&R.

- d. Whether DM&R relates solely to capitalized general PP&E and stewardship PP&E or also to amounts relating to non-capitalized or fully depreciated, PP&E
- e. Capitalized PP&E to include, heritage assets and stewardship land for which management does not measure and/or report DM&R and the rationale for the exclusion
- f. If applicable, explanation of any significant changes to (1) the policies and factors subject to the reporting requirements established in a through e above and (2) DM&R amounts from the prior year¹²

Deleted: general

Deleted: ,

Quantitative

- g. estimates of the beginning and ending balances of deferred maintenance and repairs for, each major category¹³ of asset for which maintenance and repairs have been deferred.

Formatted: Space After: 12 pt

Deleted: For

Deleted: :

Consolidated Financial Report of the US Government Required Supplementary Information

- 15. The disclosure requirements listed in paragraphs 13 and 14 above are not applicable to the U.S. government-wide financial statements. The U. S. government-wide financial statements should include the following required supplementary information:
 - a. a description of what constitutes deferred DM&R and how it was measured.
 - b. amounts of DM&R for each major category of PP&E (i.e., general PP&E, heritage assets, and stewardship land),
 - c. a reference to component entity reports for additional information

Conforming Amendments to Other Statements and Technical Releases

- 16. This Statement amends requirements in SFFAS 29 and 32 to replace 'deferred maintenance' with 'deferred maintenance and repairs' and to rescind certain requirements in SFFAS 29 and 32, including the requirement to report condition

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted: List Number, Indent: Left: 0.25"

¹² Consistent with paragraph 11, once determined, condition standards and related assessment methods and reporting formats should be consistently applied.

¹³ SFFAS 6 sets forth three categories of PP&E: (1) general PP&E are PP&E used to provide general government services or goods; (2) heritage assets are those assets possessing significant educational, cultural, or natural characteristics; and (3) stewardship land (i.e., land other than that included in general PP&E).

information. The changes to SFFAS 29 and 32 are presented in paragraphs 17 and 18 below.

- (1) Paragraphs 26, 28, 41 and 42 of Estimates of the beginning and ending dollar amount balances of deferred maintenance and repairs to include unfunded and funded Maintenance & Repair (M&R) activities
- (2) identification of amounts of DM&R related to active and inactive PP&E

17. The disclosure requirements listed in paragraphs 13 and 14 above are not applicable to the U.S. government-wide financial statements. The U. S. government-wide financial statements should include the following required supplementary information:

- d. a broad description of DM&R.
- e. amounts of DM&R for each major category of PP&E (i.e., general PP&E, heritage assets, and stewardship land) for which M&R have been deferred.
- f. a general reference to component entity reports

18. This Statement amends requirements in SFFAS 29 and 32 to replace 'deferred maintenance' with 'deferred maintenance and repairs' and to rescind certain requirements in SFFAS 29 and 32, including the requirement to report condition information. The changes to SFFAS 29 and 32 are presented in paragraphs 18 and 19 below.

19. Paragraphs 26 and 41 of SFFAS 29, Heritage Assets and Stewardship Land, are amended as follows:

~~[26] Entities should report the condition¹⁴ of the heritage assets (which may be reported with the deferred maintenance information¹²) as required supplementary information. Entities should include a reference to the condition and deferred maintenance and repairs information¹³ if reported elsewhere in the report containing the basic financial statements.~~

Paragraph 26 Footnote references:

~~¹⁴ Condition is the physical state of an asset. The condition of an asset is based on an evaluation of the physical status/state of an asset, its ability to perform as planned, and its continued usefulness. Evaluating an asset's condition requires knowledge of the asset, its performance capacity and its actual ability to perform, and expectations for its continued performance. The condition of a long lived asset is affected by~~

its durability, the quality of its design and construction, its use, the adequacy of maintenance that has been performed, and many other factors, including: accidents (an unforeseen and unplanned or unexpected event or circumstance), catastrophes (a tragic event), disasters (a sudden calamitous event bringing great damage, loss, or destruction), and obsolescence. Examples of condition information include, among others, (1) averages of standardized condition rating codes; (2) percentage of assets above, at, or below acceptable condition; or (3) narrative information.

¹² See SFFAS 6, Chapter 3, Deferred Maintenance (par. 77-84) for information regarding definition, measurement and disclosures specific to deferred maintenance.

¹³ See SFFAS ##, *Deferred Maintenance and Repairs*, for information regarding definition, measurement and required supplementary information. SFFAS 14, *Amendments to Deferred Maintenance Reporting* Amending SFFAS 6, *Accounting for Property, Plant and Equipment* and SFFAS 8, *Supplementary Stewardship Reporting*, defined deferred maintenance as RSI. The Board believed that a period of experimentation was necessary for deferred maintenance information and that classifying it as RSI would be more appropriate during the experimentation period. The Board may revise this standard based on experience gained during this time and the development of additional criteria.

[28.]c.] A general reference to agency reports for additional information about heritage assets, such as agency stewardship policies for heritage assets, and physical units by major categories of heritage assets, and the condition of the heritage assets.

[41] Entities should report the condition²² of the stewardship land (which may be reported with the deferred maintenance information²³) as required supplementary information. Entities should include a reference to the condition and deferred maintenance and repairs information²⁴ if reported elsewhere in the report containing the basic financial statements.

Paragraph 41 Footnote references:

²² Condition is the physical state of an asset. The condition of an asset is based on an evaluation of the physical status/state of an asset, its ability to perform as planned, and its continued usefulness. Evaluating an asset's condition requires knowledge of the asset, its performance capacity and its actual ability to

perform, and expectations for its continued performance. The condition of a long-lived asset is affected by its durability, the quality of its design and construction, its use, the adequacy of maintenance that has been performed, and many other factors, including: accidents (an unforeseen and unplanned or unexpected event or circumstance), catastrophes (a tragic event), disasters (a sudden calamitous event bringing great damage, loss, or destruction), and obsolescence. Examples of condition information include, among others, (1) averages of standardized condition rating codes; (2) percentage of assets above, at, or below acceptable condition; or (3) narrative information.

²³ See SFFAS 6, Chapter 3, Deferred Maintenance (par. 77-84) for information regarding definition, measurement and disclosures specific to deferred maintenance.

²⁴ See SFFAS ##, *Deferred Maintenance and Repairs*, for information regarding definition, measurement and required supplementary information. SFFAS 14, Amendments to Deferred Maintenance Reporting Amending SFFAS 6, Accounting for Property, Plant and Equipment and SFFAS 8, Supplementary Stewardship Reporting, defined deferred maintenance as RSI. The Board believed that a period of experimentation was necessary for deferred maintenance information and that classifying it as RSI would be more appropriate during the experimentation period. The Board may revise this standard based on experience gained during this time and the development of additional criteria.

[\[42. c.\] A general reference to agency reports for additional information about stewardship land, such as agency stewardship policies for stewardship land, and physical units by major categories of stewardship land use, and the condition of the stewardship land.](#)

20. Paragraphs 12b., 12c., and 24 of SFFAS 32: *Consolidated Financial Report of the United States Government Requirements: Implementing Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Concepts 4 "Intended Audience and Qualitative Characteristics*

for the Consolidated Financial Report of the United States Government” are rescinded.

~~12. b. The text “The above listed required supplementary information is not applicable to the U.S. government wide financial statements. SFFAS 32 provides for required supplementary information applicable to the U.S. government wide financial statements for these activities.” is added as a separate bullet following the existing text for par. 83.~~

~~12. c. The text “The U.S. government wide financial statements need not separately report stratification between critical and non-critical amounts of maintenance needed to return each major class of asset to its acceptable operating condition as well as management’s definition of these categories. SFFAS 32 provides for optional information applicable to the U.S. government wide financial statements for these activities.” is added to par. 84 as the final sentences.~~

~~24. The U.S. government wide financial statements should include the following required supplementary information:~~

~~a. a broad description of deferred maintenance,~~

~~b. amounts or ranges of amounts of deferred maintenance for each major asset category (i.e., general property, plant, and equipment; heritage assets, and stewardship land) for which maintenance has been deferred,~~

~~c. a general reference to component entity reports, and~~

~~d. optional reporting of the stratification between critical and non-critical amounts of maintenance needed to return each major asset category to its acceptable operating condition.~~

21. This Statement amends requirements in Technical Release 9, Section III, to acknowledge the rescission of requirements to report condition information as RSI. The following text is to be inserted before Section III:

Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards ##, *Deferred Maintenance and Repairs*, rescinded the requirement to report condition information regarding heritage assets and stewardship land as RSI. The following guidance offers insights regarding condition assessments and factors that may influence reporting of deferred maintenance and repairs information. The guidance has not been updated to conform to the new standards and should be considered other literature until revised implementation guidance – if any – is provided.

Deleted: adopt terminology consistent with this Statement and

Deleted: rescind existing requirements for

Deleted: ¶

Effective Date

- 22. These standards are effective for periods beginning after September 30, 2014. Earlier implementation is encouraged.

The provisions of this Statement need not be applied to immaterial items.

Appendix A: Basis for Conclusions

This appendix discusses some factors considered significant by Board members in reaching the conclusions in this Statement. It includes the reasons for accepting certain approaches and rejecting others. Individual members gave greater weight to some factors than to others. The standards provided in this Statement—not the material in this appendix—should govern the accounting for specific transactions, events, or conditions.

Project History

- A1. Issues pertaining to DM&R reporting have arisen since the issuance of SFFAS 6. The two most common issues related to (1) the lack of comparability in assessing asset condition both within and among entities and (2) measurement and reporting practices and formats that vary greatly among entities. In their most recent real property study, the GAO noted that entities define and estimate DM&R differently in part due to the degree of flexibility afforded by both SFFAS 6 and the Federal Real Property Profile Reporting Guidelines. As a result, these issues have contributed to confusion and uncertainty among users of DM&R information.
- A2. Primarily as a result of auditor concerns, SFFAS 14, Amendments to Deferred Maintenance Reporting Amending SFFAS 6, Accounting for Property, Plant and Equipment and SFFAS 8, Supplementary Stewardship Reporting, amended SFFAS 6 and SFFAS 8 to reclassify deferred maintenance information as required supplemental information instead of a disclosure in the notes to the financial statements.
- A3. At that time, the Board believed that a period of experimentation would be desirable for deferred maintenance information and that classifying it as RSI was appropriate during the experimentation period. As a result, the standards for estimating deferred maintenance were intentionally flexible. However, at a minimum, the Board expected to develop guidance on determining acceptable condition and revise the standards based on experience gained during the experimentation period.
- A4. Since completing deliberations on Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards (SFFAS 40): Definitional Changes Related to Deferred Maintenance and Repairs: Amending Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards 6, Accounting for Property, Plant, and

Deleted: <#>Since completing deliberations on *Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards (SFFAS 40): Definitional Changes Related to Deferred Maintenance and Repairs: Amending Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards 6, Accounting for Property, Plant, and Equipment*, the Board has continued working closely with stakeholders interested in improving management of and reporting on federal PP&E and related DM&R.¶ <#>Two external reports served as the initial basis for the scope of the Task Force’s work. The first report was a critique of the deferred maintenance definition in *Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards 6, Accounting for Property, Plant, and Equipment* (SFFAS 6). This report was prepared by the Federal Facilities Council under the auspices of The National Academies. The report was reviewed by the Task Force and provided a foundation for the proposed amendment(s) contained in *SFFAS 40*. The second report was a Government Accountability Office (GAO) study specific to federal real property repair and maintenance backlog issues. In that study, GAO discussed the need for comparability and realistic estimates of deferred maintenance so that the government’s fiscal exposure could be revealed. ¶ <#>Issues with DM&R reporting have existed since the issuance of SFFAS 6. The two most common issues noted are (1) the lack of comparability in assessing asset condition both within and among agencies and (2) measurement and reporting practices and formats that vary greatly among agencies. As the Government Accountability Office (GAO) noted in a real property study, these issues largely result from agencies defining and estimating DM&R differently and the degree of flexibility afforded by both SFFAS 6 and the Federal Real Property Profile Reporting Guidelines. As a result, these issues have contributed to confusion and ambiguity among interested users of DM&R information.¶ <#>It is important to note that the Task Force’s work was not constrained by either of these external reports. Task Force members contributed entity spe ... [3]

Equipment, the Board has continued seeking advice and guidance from stakeholders interested in improving the management of, and reporting on, federal PP&E and related DM&R.

- A5. As demonstrated by SFFAS 40, the Board has spent considerable time and effort working with key stakeholders and the community-at-large evaluating much of the experience gained during the experimentation period. As a result, the Board has both reaffirmed and refined its position regarding DM&R measurement and reporting.
- A6. Two external reports served as the initial basis for the scope of the Task Force's work.¹⁴ The first report was a critique of the deferred maintenance definition in Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards 6, Accounting for Property, Plant, and Equipment (SFFAS 6). This report was prepared by the Federal Facilities Council under the auspices of The National Academies. The report was reviewed by the Task Force and provided a foundation for the proposed amendment(s) contained in SFFAS 40. The second report was a GAO study specific to federal real property repair and maintenance backlog issues. In that study, the GAO discussed the need for comparability and realistic estimates of deferred maintenance so that the government's fiscal exposure could be revealed.
- A7. It is important to note that the Task Force's work was not constrained by either of these external reports. Task Force members contributed entity specific information which also included input from internal and external audit communities.

Refining the Goal of DM&R

- A8. The goal of DM&R is to provide reliable information on the estimated cost of the PP&E maintenance and repairs that have been deferred. To that end, the proposed standards would no longer require that condition information be

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.63"

¹⁴ During 2008 FASAB established a task force to address deferred maintenance and asset impairment issues. The task force consists of government and non-government representatives from various disciplines such as: real property/facilities management, personal property management, appraisal & valuation services, engineering, architecture, accounting, internal auditing, external auditing, finance and budgeting.

reported. Although condition reporting is important and is the basis of an entity's DM&R estimate, it is not an essential component of financial reports. The Board's rationale for this decision is that condition assessment methods and reporting continue to evolve and there are no federal-wide uniform assessment or measurement methods that would increase comparability and understandability. Therefore, summarized condition information may not provide meaningful information to users. The Board believes the wide variation among entities in condition assessment methods and reporting (i.e., different condition ratings/rankings) could obscure user understanding of the government's fiscal exposure (realistic DM&R estimate). The Board believes that this is an area where entity administrative burden can be alleviated given the questionable benefits of summarized condition information.

- Deleted:** in fulfilling an entity's stewardship obligation, it
- Deleted:** ancillary to
- Deleted:** reporting
- Deleted:** .
- Deleted:** basis
- Deleted:** (1)
- Deleted:** , (2) at this time,
- Deleted:** , (3) diverse condition assessment methods for discrete asset classes could skew
- Deleted:** results, (4)
- Deleted:** agencies
- Deleted:** would detract from
- Deleted:**), (5) DM&R costs may very well be incurred regardless of condition, and (6) this

Assessment Method Factors & Selection Criteria

A9. Entities are free to choose among assessment methods described in this Statement. The Board realizes that entities need to consider many factors when selecting assessment methods. Such factors could include:

- a. health and safety considerations,
- b. cost versus benefit,
- c. mission requirements,
- d. changes in economic outlook,
- e. project management strategy,
- f. nature, size & complexity of the PP&E portfolio,
- g. nature or type of asset to be inspected,
- h. asset-specific condition assessment requirements,
- i. environmental or weather conditions,
- j. availability of commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) software,
- k. availability of government-off-the-shelf (GOTS) software,

- Formatted:** Outline numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 9 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.5" + Tab after: 1" + Indent at: 1"
- Deleted:** Agencies
- Deleted:** as prescribed
- Deleted:** costs
- Deleted:** s

- l. software scalability & related vendor support, and
- m. regulatory requirements.

For example, an entity may elect to use a life-cycle method to assess its PP&E as part of its overall project management strategy to enhance its ability to predict future maintenance and repair requirements. Another entity may elect to use a parametric¹⁵ method due to the size and complexity of its portfolio and to realize efficiencies and cost savings while another entity requiring asset-specific condition information may select the condition assessment survey method.

Deleted:
Deleted: selects

A10. In order to obtain greater consistency and comparability the Statement provides that once selected, condition standards, related assessment methods and reporting formats should be consistently applied. Some general selection criteria management could use in evaluating different assessment methods include the following:

Formatted: Outline numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 9 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.5" + Tab after: 1" + Indent at: 1"
Deleted: proposed Standards require
Deleted: determined
Deleted: and

VISUAL (i.e. physical) INSPECTIONS

PROS

- Generates DM&R estimates
- More timely identification of health & safety issues
- Usually identifies and prioritizes work items / specific repairs
- Modified surveys are affordable
- Knowledge-based surveys (e.g., risk management strategies) eliminate over- and under-inspection

¹⁵ Parametric cost estimating is an accepted technique used in planning, budgeting, and performance stages of the acquisition process. The technique expedites the development of cost estimates and is appropriate when discrete estimating techniques would require inordinate amounts of time and resources, without leading to significant improvements in estimate accuracy or probability of obtaining additional resources. This process of documenting DM&R by using parametric cost estimates is designed to be a simplified approach based on existing empirical data. The method assumes that: condition assessments are performed at the system level rather than the component level; simple condition levels are used; there are a limited number of systems to assess; and the current replacement value (CRV) of the systems and the facility they support are available. Source: National Institute of Building Sciences, *Whole Building Design Guide*.

- Engineered-based surveys provide consistent & credible results

CONS

- Traditional surveys are expensive
- Does not always identify or prioritize work items / specific repairs
- Wasteful over-inspection, risky under-inspection
- Inspector bias could distort results

LIFE CYCLE COSTING METHODS (i.e., modeling)

PROS

- Generates DM&R estimates
- Affordable
- Efficient
- Focuses on buildings and systems
- Facilitates evaluation of large portfolios

CONS

- Does not identify or prioritize work items / specific repairs
- Not always appropriate for smaller portfolios
- Could require expensive updating of initial procurement information
- Credibility issues

Consistency and Comparability

A11. Because consistency in measurement and reporting significantly adds to the informational value of DM&R estimates (i.e., trend information is useful to decision makers), management must use consistent assessment techniques, measurement methods and reporting formats from year-to-year. However, if management decides to change methods or formats such changes should be accompanied by an explanation documenting the rationale for the change, and any related impact to the DM&R estimate(s). This is consistent with Task Force concerns that (1) entities be allowed to adopt new and improved methods or technologies that might be brought about in the area of asset management and (2) greater rigor and

Deleted: Additional Information¶
Although flexibility is still necessary in the areas of determining asset condition

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Appendix Bullet, Tabs: Not at 1.13"

Deleted: defining acceptable condition,

Deleted: Board believes that additional narrative disclosures are required in order to increase comparability, consistency, and

Deleted: reliability

Deleted: relevance of

- discipline is needed in the area of DM&R measurement and reporting.
- A12. Staff research found that some agencies have interpreted SFFAS 6 requirements to apply only to unfunded DM&R activities.¹⁶ As a result, inaccurate reporting and increased lack of consistency and comparability has resulted. The Board notes whether funded or not, DM&R should be reported. For example, if funding exists but competing demands cause a schedule slippage and result in a delay to a future period, such costs should be reported as DM&R.
- A13. Staff research also found that some entities have not reported DM&R because they have not distinguished between needed capital improvements (e.g., activities which extend the useful life of PP&E) and needed repairs (e.g., activities which allow PP&E to attain the original useful life). SFFAS 34, *The Hierarchy of Generally Accepted Accounting Principles, Including the Application of Standards Issued by the Financial Accounting Standards Board*, states that “[g]enerally accepted accounting principles recognize the importance of reporting transactions and events in accordance with their substance. Consideration should be given to whether the substance of transactions or events differs materially from their form.”¹⁷ For DM&R amounts to be comparable, entities must consider the substance of rather than the form—that is, the terms applied by management—of future activities relating to PP&E.
- A14. Measuring DM&R related to active and inactive PP&E helps ensure that DM&R estimates capture reliable information on the estimated cost of the PP&E maintenance and repairs that have been deferred. For example, entities are often required by law or regulation to obtain approval(s) prior to disposing real property deemed inactive or excess. In such cases where agencies continue to measure DM&R on PP&E pending disposition, DM&R estimates may be overstated. As a result, DM&R

Deleted: . Specifically, agencies should explain:

Deleted: their M&R policies and how they are applied in practice. For example, an entity should clearly disclose if it excludes deferred M&R activity from the reporting requirements because the entity defines these activities as meeting the exclusionary conditions specified in the last sentence of the revised DM&R definition at SFFAS 6, as amended paragraph 78. ¶
 <#>its policies for ranking and prioritizing M&R activities. The Board believes that in order to enhance the relevance and reliability of the entity’s estimated DM&R amount, an entity should explain how it decides to allocate its (available) resources. For example, entities commonly give top priority to maintenance and repair activities that maintain employee or constituent health and safety or are required to satisfy regulatory mandates. Once this is accomplished, entity rankings may be adjusted for asset condition assessments, and management considerations that include: capital improvement plans, asset disposal plans, and budgetary funding outlook. ¶
 <#>factors the entity considers in selecting acceptable condition standards. Regardless of whether agencies report condition information, the underlying rationale an entity uses in making this managerial judgment enhances the relevance and reliability of the entity’s estimated DM&R amount. For example, an entity might set different acceptable condition standards for identical assets because of geographical or environmental factors specific to each. ¶
 <#>identification of unfunded and funded Maintenance & Repair (M&R) activities which are deferred. It has come to the Board’s attention that some agencies have interpreted SFFAS 6 requirements to apply only to unfunded DM&R activities. As a result, inaccurate¹⁸ reporting and increased lack of consistency a [4]

Deleted: of increased emphasis in the reporting of real property information, it has come to the Board’s attention that in addition to capitalized general and stewardship PP&E, agencies track and report

¹⁶ DoD Inspector General Report dated September 25, 2009, *Deferred Maintenance on the Air Force C-130 Aircraft* (Report No. D-2009-112.)
¹⁷ SFFAS 34, footnote 5.
¹⁸ June 17, 2010, Appendix 4 of Chapter 4700 in Vol. 1 of the Treasury Financial Manual, Other Financial Report (FR) Notes Data and Instructions. “Critical deferred maintenance is urgently needed, absolutely

A14. that has a lower probability of occurrence due to an asset's inactive status may be separately identified in order to provide for a more realistic DM&R estimate, if deemed material.

Interdisciplinary and Integrated Approach

A15. Staff research found that at some entities, DM&R information is not being obtained directly from asset management feeder systems but rather, via data gathering processes. As a result, DM&R estimates are not always reflective of the underlying data contained in the entity's asset management systems. Differing amounts of DM&R reported by the same entity in different venues, contribute to the perception that DM&R estimates are not reliable and therefore, not relevant. Additionally, information not consistently derived from the appropriate management information system leads to lack of consistency and comparability in addition to being an inefficient use of resources.

A16. Joint Financial Management Improvement Program (JFMIP) requirements contained at JFMIP-SR-00-4, dated October 2000, require that financial management systems must be designed with effective and efficient interrelationships between software, hardware, personnel, procedures, controls and data contained within the systems. Such systems are planned and managed together, operated in an integrated fashion, and linked together electronically in an efficient and effective manner to provide agency-wide financial system support necessary to carry out the agency's mission and support the agency's financial management needs.

A17. Consistent with the JFMIP goal of integrated systems, entities should use an interdisciplinary and integrated approach to best meet the goals of DM&R reporting. This includes communicating among and considering input from diverse disciplines, such as engineering, facilities management, finance, budgeting, and accounting. Such input should be considered together when determining acceptable condition and related costs to remedy assets. Such an approach will help to (1) ensure the increased

Deleted: on expensed or fully depreciated general PP&E; i.e., all accountable (infrastructure) PP&E. ¶
<#>identification of PP&E for which management does not measure and/or report DM&R and the rationale for the exclusion. Management should clearly disclose this fact and provide rationale for the exclusion. For example, PP&E designated as excess and subject to disposal or considered unserviceable may not have any associated DM&R. ¶
<#>Because consistency in measurement and reporting significantly adds to the informational value of DM&R estimates (i.e., trend information is useful to decision makers), management should use consistent assessment techniques, DM&R measurement methods and reporting formats from year-to-year. However, if management decides to change practices or methods such changes should be accompanied by an explanation. This is consistent with Task Force concerns that (1) agencies be allowed to adopt new and improved methods or technologies that might be brought about in the area of asset management and (2) greater rigor and discipline is needed in the area of DM&R measurement and reporting. ¶
¶
Interdisciplinary and Holistic Approaches ¶ ... [5]

Formatted: Outline numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 15 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.5" + Tab after: 1" + Indent at: 1"

Deleted: agencies

Deleted: ,

Deleted: Such conditions

Formatted: Appendix Bullet, Outline numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 9 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.5" + Tab after: 1" + Indent at: 1"

Deleted: Agencies are required to

Deleted: holistic entity

Deleted: fields

Deleted: , social sciences (i.e. economics, Congressional relations, public affairs)

value and efficacy of the reported information, (2) meet diverse user needs, and (3) foster system and process improvements via continual integration and interaction among entity staff.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Additional Narrative Information

- A18. Although flexibility is necessary in the areas of determining asset condition and defining acceptable condition, the Board believes that additional disclosures are required in order to increase consistency, comparability, and the reliability and relevance of DM&R estimates. Consequently, the Board believes that:
- a. disclosing M&R policies and how they are applied in practice assists users in understanding how an entity manages its DM&R.
 - a. disclosing policies for ranking and prioritizing M&R activities assists users in understanding how an entity efficiently and effectively manages its M&R resources. Additionally, the Board believes that in order to enhance the relevance and reliability of the entity's estimated DM&R amount, an entity should explain how it decides to allocate its (available) resources. For example, entities frequently give top priority to maintenance and repair activities that maintain employee or constituent health and safety or are required to satisfy regulatory mandates. Once this is accomplished, entity rankings may be adjusted for asset condition assessments, and management considerations that include: capital improvement plans, asset disposal plans, and budgetary funding outlook.
 - b. identifying factors the entity considers in selecting acceptable condition standards assists users in understanding the unique nature of the entity's mission and operating environment and how these affect asset management. Regardless of whether entities report condition information, the underlying rationale an entity uses in making this managerial judgment enhances the relevance and reliability of the entity's estimated DM&R. For example, an entity might set different acceptable condition standards for identical assets because of

- geographical or environmental factors specific to each.
- c. disclosing whether DM&R relates solely to capitalized general PP&E and stewardship PP&E or also includes amounts relating to non-capitalized or fully depreciated general PP&E assists users in understanding how an entity manages its DM&R. Partially as a result of increased emphasis in the reporting of real property information, it has come to the Board's attention that in addition to capitalized general and stewardship PP&E, entities track and report DM&R on expensed or fully depreciated general PP&E; i.e., all accountable PP&E.
- d. identifying PP&E for which management does not measure and/or report DM&R and the rationale for the exclusion assists users in understanding how an entity efficiently and effectively manages its M&R resources. Management should clearly disclose this fact and provide its rationale for the exclusion. For example, PP&E designated as excess and subject to disposal or considered unserviceable may not have any associated DM&R.

Reducing Confusion and Increasing Relevance & Reliability

A19. The stratification between critical and non-critical DM&R at SFFAS 6, paragraph 84 was intended to be optional and not an unnecessary burden to entities. It has come to the Board's attention that the Federal Real Property Guidelines define "critical", at the asset level (i.e., asset classification defines if M&R is critical or not) whereas the SFFAS 6 guidelines have been interpreted to apply to the discrete M&R activity (i.e., the nature of the work defines if M&R is critical or not). Furthermore, some entities are following Treasury guidelines which define "critical", as a matter of consequence or exigency (i.e., impact of not performing the M&R work/activity).¹⁹ Consistent with the Task Force's recommendation, it is the Board's opinion that having three separate definitions for "critical" has led to confusion, increased lack of comparability, and estimates that are not necessarily reflective of what entities expect to incur. The Board believes that the reporting of critical and non-critical

Deleted: ¶

Formatted: Tabs: 0.63", Left

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Space After: 6 pt

Formatted: Outline numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 19 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.5" + Tab after: 1" + Indent at: 1"

Deleted: agencies.

Deleted: criticality

Deleted: .

Deleted: agencies

Deleted: seem to

Deleted: criticality

Deleted: agencies

~~DM&R is not useful, can lead to inconsistency, and therefore should be not be addressed in the Statement.~~

A20. Permitting ~~entities~~ to provide a range of DM&R estimates (i.e., high and low), was in recognition of the fact that assessment methods and practices were fairly new and still evolving at the time SFFAS 6 was issued. However, as ~~the~~ GAO noted in ~~its~~ October 2008 report, DM&R estimates do not necessarily reflect the cost that agencies expect to incur ~~owing, at least in part, to the methodological flexibility permitted by~~ SFFAS 6. The identification of low and high dollar DM&R estimates contributes to the lack of comparability and hinders the transparent reporting of a more realistic estimate. A single DM&R estimate is more appropriate and informative. Moreover, an analysis of a seven-year (2004 through 2010) time span at the government-wide level reveals that there is very little distinction between low and high dollar estimates. Consistent with the Task Force's recommendation that DM&R estimates be derived directly from asset management systems and be consistent with FRPP reporting requirements, the Board believes that by eliminating the reporting of a dollar range, financial reporting of DM&R is significantly improved and administrative burdens can be reduced.

Deleted: Since the Task Force has specifically noted, such a distinction provides little, if any, operational benefit the Board believes paragraph 84 of SFFAS 6 should be eliminated.

Formatted: Space After: 0 pt, Outline numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 19 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.5" + Tab after: 1" + Indent at: 1"

Deleted: agencies

Deleted: their

Deleted: partly as a result of the amount of

Deleted: in

Presenting DM&R Balances and Discussing Significant Changes

A21. The Board believes that users need to know how much the maintenance and repairs requirements increased (decreased) and how ~~many~~ of the requirements have been addressed. ~~Moreover, it is important for users to (1) understand what events occurred during the year and why they brought about significant increases or decreases and (2) whether or not DM&R levels have improved.~~ To that end, federal ~~entities are~~ required to present their DM&R beginning and ending balances. As a minimum and as illustrated in Appendix B, ~~entities~~ should present these balances ~~by category (i.e., general PP&E, heritage assets, and stewardship land)~~, and explain ~~significant~~ changes by major asset category. The Board believes that this will ~~increase comparability and the relevance and reliability of the DM&R estimates and~~ will significantly enhance entity-specific consistency from year to year.

Formatted: Outline numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 19 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.5" + Tab after: 1" + Indent at: 1"

Deleted: much

Deleted: agencies will be

Deleted: agencies

Deleted: not only

Deleted: , it

Appendix B: Sample Illustration

Deleted: <sp>

30

Formatted

Appendix B: Sample Illustration

Deleted: ¶
¶
¶
¶
¶
¶
¶
Section Break (Next Page)

Appendix B

Deferred Maintenance and Repairs Illustration

This appendix illustrates paragraphs 13-14. The examples shown here are for illustrative purposes only. Different entities may develop different asset classes and descriptive terminology consistent with the set categories of General PP&E, Heritage assets, and Stewardship Land. The following narrative discussion and Illustration #1, *General Purpose Display* meet the minimum requirements of the proposed standards. Please note that the various illustrations are not meant to articulate with one another and should be viewed on a stand-alone basis.

Deleted: -15.

Deleted: categories or

XYZ Entity

Deferred Maintenance and Repairs for Fiscal Year 20x2

Deleted: Years 20xx – 20x1

The XYZ entity operates over 1,300 facilities throughout the world, preserves nearly 300 national historical landmarks of natural, cultural, educational, or artistic importance, and is responsible for maintaining over 80,000 acres of stewardship land. Most of the facilities are predominantly used for office space and warehousing defense assets. Additionally, the entity operates a hospital at one of its remote sites. It is entity policy to ensure that medical equipment and critical equipment systems are maintained and managed in a safe and effective manner; therefore, deferred maintenance and repairs do not arise for these two types of equipment and no periodic assessment is performed. Additionally, since (1) it is entity policy to maintain and preserve all fixed property, plant and equipment (PP&E) regardless of recorded values and (2) accounting and asset management systems do not differentiate M&R between PP&E capitalized (i.e., items whose cost exceeds the capitalization threshold) versus those expensed, DM&R estimates reported herein relate to all PP&E whether capitalized or not or fully depreciated.

Deleted: facility

Deleted: facility

Deleted: does

Deleted: apply to

Deleted: .

Defining and Implementing M&R Policies in Practice.

As permitted under FASAB SFFAS XX, the entity employs a parametric estimating method for the largest portion of its portfolio (real property such as office and warehouse space) and the condition assessment method for its hospital facility, defense and stewardship assets. With the exception of the hospital facility which is inspected on a yearly basis, the entity's real property portfolio is assessed on a 3 to 5 year rotating calendar. Both methods measure current real property asset condition and document real property deterioration.

Deleted: In accordance with

Real property assessment methods produce both a cost estimate of deferred maintenance and repairs, and a Facility Condition Index (FCI). Both measures are indicators of the overall condition of the entity's facilities. The parametric estimating methodology involves an independent, rapid visual assessment of nine different systems within each facility to include: structure, roof, exterior, interior finishes, HVAC, electrical, plumbing, conveyance, and program support equipment. The parametric estimating method is designed to be cost effective and appropriate for application to a large population of facilities; results are not necessarily applicable for individual facilities or small populations of facilities.

Deleted: Specific to the

Deleted: , it

The entity's hospital is inspected on a yearly basis employing a physical inspection method which focuses on component as well as system distresses in addition to identifying deficiencies. The entity's defense assets are routinely surveyed by unit and depot maintenance personnel and stewardship assets are routinely surveyed by on-site personnel and regional inspection teams.

As stated above, it is entity policy to ensure that medical equipment and critical facility equipment systems are maintained and managed in a safe and effective manner. Therefore, deferred maintenance and repairs assessment methods are generally not applied to equipment assigned to hospitals as any DM&R would be negligible.

Deleted: is

Deleted: applicable

Ranking and Prioritizing M&R Activities.

Maintenance and repair activities are first prioritized via health, safety and regulatory considerations at all facilities. Once this is accomplished, the FCI values are then ranked based on the ratings obtained during the condition assessment site visits. Rankings are generally adjusted to take into account current capital improvement efforts underway, future capital improvement plans, asset disposal plans, and budgetary funding outlook.

Deleted: due

Deleted: management considerations that include:

Factors Considered in Setting Acceptable Condition.

For office and warehouse space, the entity defines acceptable condition in accordance with standards comparable to those used in private industry. For example, industry standards for administrative buildings can vary substantially depending upon their classification as either a Class A, B or C property. Such classifications are affected by building location, design, and age. Condition standards for warehouses are primarily set by local jurisdictions and consider factors such as accommodating loads, materials to be stored, the associated handling equipment, the receiving and shipping operations and associated trucking, and the needs of the operating personnel. Acceptable condition for the hospital facility is in accordance with federal statutory requirements and requirements adopted by the health care facilities industry substantially comparable to the requirements at 42 C.F.R. Part 483 entitled, *Requirements for States and Long Term Care Facilities.*

Appendix B: Sample Illustration

Military specifications and standards for defense assets vary greatly depending upon numerous factors such as the nature and type of equipment and mission expectations. Acceptable condition standards for defense assets are set at levels deemed to be mission capable or serviceable. Heritage assets and stewardship land adopt scientific conservation standards to preserve assets in a manner that fulfills the entity's obligation to stabilize, protect, and preserve the assets.

Significant Changes from Prior Year.

The overall net increase of \$2.0 billion in DM&R is a result of the \$3.0 billion increase in General PP&E, offset by a \$1.0 billion DM&R decrease in heritage assets.

Funded DM&R decreased by \$1.0 billion as result of the entity's strategic initiative to repair and restore many of its historical landmarks. However, unfunded DM&R pertaining to inactive/excess General PP&E increased by \$3.0 billion as a result of (1) the transfer of properties from other federal entities, (2) newly identified properties and equipment no longer needed by the entity, and (3) continued degradation of properties awaiting final disposition. Management policy is to comply with legal requirements to maintain inactive/excess property in safe condition and to pursue cost-beneficial measures to preserve the value of properties. The entity in collaboration with other entities and members of Congress is in the process of finalizing plans to either dispose of or find alternate uses for the aforementioned properties. For such properties, DM&R include those M&R activities management believes are warranted but not necessarily the M&R appropriate for an equivalent active property.

Deleted: Identification of Funded and Unfunded M&R.

The entity's FY20x2 M&R requirements were significantly greater than the available funding and as a result, the unfunded DM&R amount (related to General PP&E) increased by \$3.0 billion leaving an unfunded DM&R balance of \$18.0 billion at year-end.

Deleted: Significant changes in amounts and balances represent the consistent application of entity methodologies.

Deleted: unfunded DM&R discussed above

Deleted: decreases

Deleted: agency's

Deleted: 2

Deleted: agencies

Deleted: agency

Deleted: agency

Deleted: agencies

Appendix B: Sample Illustration

The following illustration presents information on major PP&E categories experiencing material amounts of deferred maintenance and repairs and meets the basic illustration requirements of this proposed standard:

ILLUSTRATION 1 - GENERAL PURPOSE DISPLAY

Deferred Maintenance and Repair Costs
(Dollars in Millions)

<u>Asset Category</u>	<u>20x2</u> <u>Beginning Balance</u> <u>DM&R</u>	<u>20x2</u> <u>Ending Balance</u> <u>DM&R</u>
General PP&E	\$30,500	\$33,500
Heritage Assets	6,000	5,000
Stewardship Land	2,500	2,500
<u>Total</u>	<u>\$39,000</u>	<u>\$41,000</u>

ILLUSTRATION 1 - G

Deferred Maint
(Do

Asset Category

General PP&E
Heritage Assets
Stewardship Land
Total

Deleted:
¶

Appendix B: Sample Illustration

The following Illustration # 2 presents information on major PP&E categories experiencing material amounts of deferred maintenance and repairs with an emphasis on active versus inactive/excess assets:

ILLUSTRATION 2 - EMPHASIS ON ACTIVE vs. INACTIVE & EXCESS

Deferred Maintenance and Repair Costs
(Dollars in Millions)

<u>Asset Category</u>	<u>20x2</u> <u>Beginning Balance</u> <u>DM&R</u>	<u>20x2</u> <u>Ending Balance</u> <u>DM&R</u>
Active:		
General PP&E	\$30,000	\$31,250
Heritage Assets	1,000	0
Stewardship Land	1,000	1,000
<u>subtotal -active</u>	<u>32,000</u>	<u>32,250</u>
Inactive & Excess:		
General PP&E	7,000	8,750
<u>subtotal -inactive</u>	<u>7,000</u>	<u>8,750</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>\$39,000</u>	<u>\$41,000</u>

ILLUSTRATION 2 - EI

Deferred Maint
(Do

Asset Category

General PP&E
Heritage Assets
Stewardship Land
subtotal

Inac

General PP&E
Heritage Assets
Stewardship Land
subtotal

Unfunded M&R

Total

Deleted:
¶

Appendix B: Sample Illustration

35

The following Illustration # 3 presents information on major asset classes experiencing material amounts of deferred maintenance and repairs with an emphasis on active versus inactive/excess assets:

ILLUSTRATION 3 - EMPHASIS ON ACTIVE vs. INACTIVE & EXCESS BY ASSET CLASS

Deferred Maintenance and Repair Costs

(Dollars in Millions)

<u>Asset Category / Class</u>	<u>20x2 Beginning Balance DM&R</u>	<u>20x2 Ending Balance DM&R</u>
<u>Active:</u>		
<u>General PP&E:</u>		
<u>Structures</u>	<u>\$28,000</u>	<u>\$28,750</u>
<u>Aircraft</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>106</u>
<u>Missiles</u>	<u>117</u>	<u>279</u>
<u>Ships</u>	<u>1,873</u>	<u>2,115</u>
<u>subtotal - general PP&E active</u>	<u>30,000</u>	<u>31,250</u>
<u>Stewardship Land</u>	<u>1,000</u>	<u>1,000</u>
<u>Heritage Assets</u>	<u>1,000</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>subtotal - all active</u>	<u>\$32,000</u>	<u>\$32,250</u>
<u>Inactive & Excess:</u>		
<u>General PP&E</u>		
<u>Buildings</u>	<u>5,000</u>	<u>5,000</u>
<u>Structures</u>	<u>2,000</u>	<u>3,750</u>
<u>subtotal - general PP&E inactive & excess</u>	<u>7,000</u>	<u>8,750</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>\$39,000</u>	<u>\$41,000</u>

Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board
Deferred Maintenance and Repairs
June X, 2011

Working Draft - June 3, 2011 DM 1479634

Appendix B: Sample Illustration

The following Illustration # 4 presents information on major PP&E categories experiencing material amounts of deferred maintenance and repairs with an emphasis on funded and unfunded maintenance and repairs:

ILLUSTRATION 4 - EMPHASIS ON FUNDED & UNFUNDED M&R

Deferred Maintenance and Repair Costs
(Dollars in Millions)

<u>Asset Category</u>	<u>20x2</u> <u>Beginning Balance</u> <u>DM&R</u>	<u>20x2</u> <u>Ending Balance</u> <u>DM&R</u>
Funded M&R:		
General PP&E -active	\$15,000	\$13,250
General PP&E - inactive & excess	8,000	9,750
Heritage Assets	1,000	0
<u>subtotal</u>	<u>24,000</u>	<u>23,000</u>
Unfunded M&R:		
General PP&E -active	7,500	7,500
General PP&E - inactive & excess	0	3,000
Heritage Assets	5,000	5,000
Stewardship Land	2,500	2,500
<u>subtotal</u>	<u>15,000</u>	<u>18,000</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>\$39,000</u>	<u>\$41,000</u>

Deleted: <sp>

ILLUSTRATION 3 - EI

Deferred Maint
(Do

Asset Category / Class

General PP&E:
Buildings
Structures
Aircraft
Missiles
Ships
subtotal

Heritage Assets
Stewardship Land
subtotal - active

Inac

General PP&E
Buildings
Structures
Aircraft
Missiles
Ships
subtotal - General

Heritage Assets
Stewardship Land
Total Inactive & Ex

Unfunded M&R

Grand Total

Deleted: ... [6]

ILLUSTRATION 4 - EI

Deferred Maint
(Do

Asset Category

General PP&E -active
General PP&E - inactiv
Heritage Assets
Stewardship Land
subtotal

Un

General PP&E -active
General PP&E - inactiv
Heritage Assets
Stewardship Land
subtotal

Deleted: Total ... [7]

Appendix C: Abbreviations

Appendix C: Abbreviations

DoD	Department of Defense
DM&R	deferred maintenance and repair
FASAB	Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board
FRPP	Federal Real Property Profile (GSA Asset Management Database)
GAAP	generally accepted accounting principles
GAO	Government Accountability Office
M&R	maintenance and repair
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
PP&E	property, plant and equipment
RSI	required supplementary information
SFFAC	Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Concepts
SFFAS	Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards

Deleted: The following Illustration # 5 presents information on major asset classes experiencing material amounts of deferred maintenance and repairs in a comprehensive manner.

-----Section Break (Next Page)-----

ILLUSTRATION 5 - COMPRES

Deferred Maintenance :
(Dollars in M

Asset Category / Class

Active

General PP&E:
Buildings
Structures
Aircraft
Missiles
Ships
 subtotal

Heritage Assets
Stewardship Land
 subtotal

Total Active

Inactive & E

General PP&E
Buildings
Structures
 Total Inactive & Excess

Grand Total

-----Section Break (Next Page)-----

Formatted: Section start:
Continuous

FASAB Board Members

Tom L. Allen, Chair

Debra J. Bond

Robert F. Dacey

Michael H. Granof

Norwood J. Jackson, Jr.

Mark Reger

Alan H. Schumacher

D. Scott Showalter

Harold I. Steinberg

FASAB Staff

Wendy M. Payne, Executive Director

Project Staff

Domenic Nicholas Savini

Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board
441 G Street NW, Suite 6814
Mail Stop 6K17V
Washington, DC 20548
Telephone 202-512-7350
FAX 202-512-7366
www.fasab.gov

Deleted: ¶

Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board
Deferred Maintenance and Repairs
June X, 2011

Working Draft - June 3, 2011 DM 1479634

The proposed standards would eliminate the option to report low and high dollar DM&R estimates. Refer to paragraph 15 of the proposed standards and A16 in Appendix A - Basis for Conclusions for a discussion and related explanations..

Do you agree or disagree with eliminating the option to report low and high dollar estimates? Please provide the rationale for your answer.

The proposed standard would change the existing illustration in Appendix C and require that DM&R estimates for beginning and ending balances be presented yearly accompanied by an explanation of significant changes. Refer to paragraph 15.g of the proposed standard and paragraph A17 in Appendix A - Basis for Conclusions for a discussion and related explanation.

Do you agree or disagree that DM&R estimates for beginning and ending balances should be presented yearly? Please provide the rationale for your answer.

Do you agree or disagree with the requirement to explain significant DM&R changes? Please provide the rationale for your answer.

Since completing deliberations on *Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards (SFFAS 40): Definitional Changes Related to Deferred Maintenance and Repairs: Amending Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards 6, Accounting for Property, Plant, and Equipment*, the Board has continued working closely with stakeholders interested in improving management of and reporting on federal PP&E and related DM&R.

Two external reports served as the initial basis for the scope of the Task Force's work. The first report was a critique of the deferred maintenance definition in *Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards 6, Accounting for Property, Plant, and Equipment* (SFFAS 6). This report was prepared by the Federal Facilities Council under the auspices of The National Academies. The report was reviewed by the Task Force and provided a foundation for the proposed amendment(s) contained in *SFFAS 40*. The second report was a Government Accountability Office (GAO) study specific to federal real property repair and maintenance backlog issues. In that study, GAO discussed the need for comparability and realistic estimates of deferred maintenance so that the government's fiscal exposure could be revealed.

Issues with DM&R reporting have existed since the issuance of SFFAS 6. The two most common issues noted are (1) the lack of comparability in assessing asset condition both within and among agencies and (2) measurement and reporting practices and formats that vary greatly among agencies. As the Government Accountability Office (GAO) noted in a real property study, these issues largely result from agencies defining and estimating DM&R differently and the degree of flexibility afforded by both SFFAS 6 and the Federal Real Property Profile Reporting Guidelines. As a

result, these issues have contributed to confusion and ambiguity among interested users of DM&R information.

It is important to note that the Task Force's work was not constrained by either of these external reports. Task Force members contributed entity specific information which also included input from internal and external audit communities.

Primarily as a result of auditor concerns, SFFAS 14, *Amendments to Deferred Maintenance Reporting Amending SFFAS 6, Accounting for Property, Plant and Equipment and SFFAS 8, Supplementary Stewardship Reporting*, amended SFFAS 6 and SFFAS 8 to define deferred maintenance information as required supplemental information (RSI) rather than a disclosure in the notes to the financial statements.

their M&R policies and how they are applied in practice. For example, an entity should clearly disclose if it excludes deferred M&R activity from the reporting requirements because the entity defines these activities as meeting the exclusionary conditions specified in the last sentence of the revised DM&R definition at SFFAS 6, as amended paragraph 78.

its policies for ranking and prioritizing M&R activities. The Board believes that in order to enhance the relevance and reliability of the entity's estimated DM&R amount, an entity should explain how it decides to allocate its (available) resources. For example, entities commonly give top priority to maintenance and repair activities that maintain employee or constituent health and safety or are required to satisfy regulatory mandates. Once this is accomplished, entity rankings may be adjusted for asset condition assessments, and management considerations that include: capital improvement plans, asset disposal plans, and budgetary funding outlook.

factors the entity considers in selecting acceptable condition standards. Regardless of whether agencies report condition information, the underlying rationale an entity uses in making this managerial judgment enhances the relevance and reliability of the entity's estimated DM&R amount. For example, an entity might set different acceptable condition standards for identical assets because of geographical or environmental factors specific to each.

identification of unfunded and funded Maintenance & Repair (M&R) activities which are deferred. It has come to the Board's attention that some agencies have interpreted SFFAS 6 requirements to apply only to unfunded DM&R activities. As a result, inaccurate¹ reporting and increased lack of consistency and comparability has resulted. The Board notes whether funded or not, DM&R should be reported. For example, if funding exists but competing demands cause a schedule slippage and result in a delay to a future period, such costs should be reported as DM&R.

whether DM&R relates solely to capitalized general PP&E and stewardship PP&E or also includes amounts relating to non-capitalized general PP&E. Partially as

on expensed or fully depreciated general PP&E; i.e., all accountable (infrastructure) PP&E.

identification of PP&E for which management does not measure and/or report DM&R and the rationale for the exclusion. Management should clearly disclose this fact and provide rationale for the exclusion. For example, PP&E designated as excess and subject to disposal or considered unserviceable may not have any associated DM&R.

Because consistency in measurement and reporting significantly adds to the informational value of DM&R estimates (i.e., trend information is useful to decision makers), management should use consistent assessment techniques, DM&R measurement methods and reporting formats from year-to-year. However, if management decides to change practices or methods such changes should be accompanied by an explanation. This is consistent with Task Force concerns that (1) agencies be allowed to adopt new and improved methods or technologies that might be brought about in the area of asset management and (2) greater rigor and discipline is needed in the area of DM&R measurement and reporting.

Interdisciplinary and Holistic Approaches

It has come to the Board's attention

¹ DoD Inspector General Report dated September 25, 2009, *Deferred Maintenance on the Air Force C-130 Aircraft (Report No. D-2009-112.)*

ILLUSTRATION 3 - EMPHASIS ON ACTIVE vs. INACTIVE & EXCESS BY ASSET CLASS

Deferred Maintenance and Repair Costs
(Dollars in Millions)

<u>Asset Category / Class</u>	<u>20x2</u> <u>Beginning Balance</u> <u>DM&R</u>	<u>20x2</u> <u>Ending Balance</u> <u>DM&R</u>
<u>Active:</u>		
General PP&E:		
Buildings	\$0	\$0
Structures	\$13,000	\$10,700
Aircraft	\$10	\$10
Missiles	\$117	\$200
Ships	\$1,873	\$2,100
subtotal	\$15,000	\$13,200
Heritage Assets	\$1,000	\$0
Stewardship Land	\$0	\$0
subtotal - active	\$16,000	\$13,200
<u>Inactive & Excess:</u>		
General PP&E		
Buildings	\$6,000	\$6,000
Structures	\$2,000	\$3,700
Aircraft	\$0	\$0
Missiles	\$0	\$0
Ships	\$0	\$0
subtotal - General PPE	\$8,000	\$9,700
Heritage Assets	\$0	\$0
Stewardship Land	\$0	\$0
Total Inactive & Excess	\$8,000	\$9,700
Unfunded M&R	\$15,000	\$18,000
Grand Total	\$39,000	\$41,000

ILLUSTRATION 4 - EMPHASIS ON FUNDED & UNFUNDED M&R

Deferred Maintenance and Repair Costs
(Dollars in Millions)

<u>Asset Category</u>	20x2 Beginning Balance DM&R	20x2 Ending Balance DM&R
<u>Funded M&R:</u>		
General PP&E -active	\$15,000	\$13,200
General PP&E - inactive & excess	\$8,000	\$9,700
Heritage Assets	\$1,000	\$1,000
Stewardship Land	\$0	\$0
subtotal	<u>\$24,000</u>	<u>\$23,900</u>
<u>Unfunded M&R:</u>		
General PP&E -active	\$7,500	\$7,500
General PP&E - inactive & excess	\$0	\$3,000
Heritage Assets	\$5,000	\$5,000
Stewardship Land	\$2,500	\$2,500
subtotal	<u>\$15,000</u>	<u>\$18,000</u>
 Total	 <u>\$39,000</u>	 <u>\$41,900</u>