



August 18, 2017

Memorandum

To: Members of the Board

From: *Wendy M. Payne /s/*
Wendy M. Payne, Executive Director

Subj: **Intragovernmental Exchange Transactions – Tab G¹**

MEMBER ACTIONS REQUESTED:

- Respond to staff question (p.2) by August 24th

MEETING OBJECTIVES

- Review the attached draft Technical Bulletin on Intragovernmental Exchange Transactions

BRIEFING MATERIAL

This memo provides background information regarding the attached draft Technical Bulletin (Attachment 1).

Attachment 2 provides the letter requesting guidance in this area.

BACKGROUND

As you may recall, at the June 2017 Board meeting, the Board considered a request for guidance from the Department of Defense (DoD) regarding several DoD intragovernmental transactions. Staff provided the Board with a draft exposure draft (ED) that would have proposed certain flexibilities for the DoD. However, the Board concluded the provisions should not be limited to DoD. Staff concluded it would be best to handle each of the issues in separate documents.

This proposed Technical Bulletin, *Intragovernmental Exchange Transactions*, addresses the fourth issue area discussed at the June 2017 meeting. This area related to classification of transactions as transfers-in/out (nonexchange) or revenue/expense (exchange).

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.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff reviewed existing standards and believes there is insufficient guidance on identifying exchange transactions between component entities. Since Tab B2 also presents a proposed technical bulletin, information regarding the process and appropriate use of technical bulletins is not repeated here.

A technical bulletin on intragovernmental exchange transactions would clarify existing standards without causing a major change in current practice. The relevant existing standards are Statements of Federal Financial Accounting Standards (SFFAS) 4, *Managerial Cost Accounting Standards and Concepts*; SFFAS 5, *Accounting for Liabilities of the Federal Government*; and SFFAS 7, *Accounting for Revenue and Other Financing Sources*. Those standards establish:

- The goal of reporting full cost in each entity's financial statements (both providing entity and receiving entity in exchange transactions)
- Definitions of exchange and non-exchange transactions
- Definitions and recognition requirements for exchange revenue and transfers-in/out

The existing standards do not refer to "exchange-like" transactions; those for which the amounts exchanged are not equivalent and the benefits are not exclusively for the parties to the transaction. The Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) addressed exchange-like transactions as follows:

The difference between exchange and exchange -like transactions is a matter of degree. In contrast to a "pure" exchange transaction, an exchange -like transaction is one in which the values exchanged, though related, may not be quite equal or in which the direct benefits may not be exclusively for the parties to the transaction. **Nevertheless, the exchange characteristics of the transaction are strong enough to justify treating the transaction as an exchange for accounting recognition.** GASB Statement 33, footnote 1.

Intragovernmental transactions are not arms-length transactions. This makes confirming that the value exchanged is approximately equal challenging and burdensome. Yet, the absence of guidance regarding the status of exchange-like transactions has raised questions regarding the need to compare the values received and sacrificed. The standards do not require such a comparison and this technical bulletin would clarify that.

Because DoD requested guidance on an issue raised in the FY2016 audit and expects more such issues to arise in the future, staff believes guidance is warranted. The 2016 issue relates to one entity arranging contracts on behalf of another entity. The question was whether the entire transaction qualified as an exchange transaction due to the relatively small amount of value (cost) associated with the administration of the contract. This technical bulletin would clarify that the entire transaction should be treated as an exchange transaction if it otherwise qualifies as one. (See the DoD letter at attachment 2.)

Staff believes this technical bulletin will help resolve issues regarding intragovernmental exchange transactions in a cost-effective manner.

QUESTIONS FOR THE BOARD

Q1. Do members agree that a technical bulletin on this topic is appropriate?

Q2. Do members object to the attached draft technical bulletin?

Please contact me as soon as possible to convey your questions or suggestions. Communication before the meeting will help make the meeting more productive. You can contact me by telephone at 202-512-7357 or by e-mail at paynew@fasab.gov



Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board

INTRAGOVERNMENTAL EXCHANGE TRANSACTIONS

STAFF DRAFT – Comments are not requested.

Technical Bulletin 2017-2

Exposure Draft

Written comments are requested by [15- 30 days after issuance]

[Month day, year]

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 of the United States 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.

Accounting standards are typically formulated initially as a proposal after considering the financial and budgetary information needs of citizens (including the news media, state and local legislators, 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 standards 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

Copyright Information

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.

Contact us:

Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board
441 G Street, NW, Suite 6814
Mailstop 6H19
Washington, DC 20548
Telephone 202-512-7350
FAX 202-512-7366
www.fasab.gov



Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board

ISSUE DATE

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

Your comments on the exposure draft of a proposed Technical Bulletin, entitled *Intragovernmental Exchange Transactions*, are requested. Specific questions for your consideration appear on page 3 but you are welcome to comment on any aspect of this proposal. If you do not agree with the proposed approach, 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 **DUE DATE**.

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.

Mail delivery is delayed by screening procedures. Therefore, please provide your comments in electronic form by e-mail to fasab@fasab.gov. If you are unable to e-mail your responses, we encourage you to fax the comments to (202) 512-7366. Alternatively, you may mail your comments to:

Wendy M. Payne, Executive Director
Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board
Mailstop 6H19
441 G Street, NW, Suite 6814
Washington, DC 20548

We will confirm receipt of your comments. If you do not receive confirmation, please contact our office at 202.512.7350 to determine if your comments were received.

Sincerely,

Wendy M. Payne
Executive Director

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

WHAT GUIDANCE IS BEING PROPOSED?

This Technical Bulletin (TB) is intended to clarify existing standards regarding intragovernmental exchange transactions. Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards (SFFAS) 5, *Accounting for Liabilities of the Federal Government*, and SFFAS 7, *Accounting for Revenue and Other Financing Sources*, define exchange transactions and exchange revenue respectively. However, neither fully addresses the unique nature of intragovernmental transactions. This TB provides guidance helpful in determining whether value has been sacrificed and received by the parties to a transaction. Further, this technical bulletin emphasizes that full cost information is relevant for both the providing and receiving entity in exchange transactions.

HOW WOULD THIS PROPOSAL IMPROVE FEDERAL FINANCIAL REPORTING AND CONTRIBUTE TO MEETING THE FEDERAL FINANCIAL REPORTING OBJECTIVES?

This proposal would improve the reporting of revenue and cost information by ensuring that transactions are appropriately classified. It would also reduce the barriers to and cost of adopting generally accepted accounting principles.

The provisions of this TB 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.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	1
What Guidance is being proposed?	1
How would this proposal improve federal financial reporting and contribute to meeting the federal financial reporting objectives?	1
Questions for Respondents	3
Proposed Technical Guidance.....	4
Scope.....	4
Disclosure Requirements.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Effective Date	7
Appendix A: Basis for Conclusions	8
Project history	8
Appendix B: Illustration.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Appendix C: Abbreviations	11

QUESTIONS FOR RESPONDENTS

FASAB staff encourages you to become familiar with all proposals in the technical bulletin before responding to the questions in this section. In addition to the questions below, staff also would welcome your comments on other aspects of the proposed technical bulletin. Because the proposals may be modified before a final technical bulletin 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.

FASAB staff believes that this proposal would improve federal financial reporting and contribute to meeting the Federal financial reporting objectives. Staff 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.

The questions in this section are available in a Word file for your use at <http://www.fasab.gov/documents-for-comment/>. Your responses should be sent by e-mail to fasab@fasab.gov. If you are unable to respond by e-mail, please fax your responses to (202) 512-7366. Alternatively, you may mail your responses to:

Wendy M. Payne, Executive Director
Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board
Mailstop 6H19
441 G Street, NW, Suite 6814
Washington, DC 20548

All responses are requested by **[insert date]**.

- Q1. The proposed Technical Bulletin provides guidance to aid in determining whether intragovernmental arrangements are exchange transactions.

Do you agree or disagree with the proposed guidance? Please provide the rationale for your answers.

PROPOSED TECHNICAL GUIDANCE

SCOPE

1. **What reporting entities are affected by this technical bulletin?**
2. This guidance applies to all reporting entities that present general purpose federal financial reports (GPFRRs) in conformance with generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP) as defined by paragraphs 5 through 8 of Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards (SFFAS) 34, *The Hierarchy of Generally Accepted Accounting Principles, Including the Application of Standards Issued by the Financial Accounting Standards Board*.
3. **What accounting practices are addressed in this technical bulletin?**
4. This technical bulletin guides identification of intragovernmental exchange transactions.

GUIDANCE

5. **When one federal agency (the providing entity) arranges for a third-party to perform services (for example, outsourcing such as arranging for an office lease for another federal entity) for another federal entity (the receiving entity) and both the providing and the receiving entity sacrifice and receive value in the transaction, is the entire transaction an exchange transaction?**
6. Yes, if it is an exchange transaction then the entire transaction is an exchange transaction. Therefore, the providing entity should record exchange revenue for the full amount billed to the receiving entity and the receiving entity should record expense and/or a capitalized asset consistent with GAAP for the full amount payable to the providing entity. This is true even if the providing entity does not fully recover its administrative costs or plays only a minor role in the transaction. For example, the service provided may be limited to coordinating funding, negotiating contracts, and/or providing other related arrangements.
7. SFFAS 7, paragraph 33 defines exchange revenue as “inflows of resources to a Government entity that the entity has earned. They arise from exchange transactions, which occur when each party to the transaction sacrifices value and receives value in return.” The full amount billed to customers should be recognized as exchange revenue.¹ Even when the service is limited and involves being an intermediary to third-parties such as commercial vendors or other federal entities, amounts received are appropriately classified as exchange revenue when the providing entity must meet criteria specified by the receiving entity in order to earn funds received. The providing entity earns the full amount of the payment by ensuring that the receiving entity’s criteria are met. Exchange transactions contrast with nonexchange transactions where no value is received by one of the parties.

¹ Consistent with guidance in SFFAS 4, *Managerial Cost Accounting Standards and Concepts*, the receiving entity may also recognize imputed cost to the extent full cost exceeds amounts billed.

8. Further, both the providing and receiving entity should report the full cost of the transaction. Generally, SFFAS 4, *Managerial Cost Accounting Standards and Concepts*, requires entities to recognize the full cost. Paragraph 108 adds that “If an entity provides goods or services to another entity, regardless of whether full reimbursement is received, the providing entity should continue to recognize in its accounting records the full cost of those goods or services.” Recognizing the full cost facilitates an assessment of the performance of both entities. For example, the full cost of outsourced services is relevant to assessing how well the providing entity performed its role regarding the outsourced services. For the receiving entity, the full cost is relevant to assessing the efforts undertaken during the reporting period.
- 9. Is it necessary to consider whether the overall value to each party in the arrangement is approximately equal or whether the value to each party is approximately equal to the cost in determining whether the transaction is an exchange transaction?**
10. No. SFFAS 7 requires only that some value is received and sacrificed by both parties. Also, SFFAS 7 acknowledges that intragovernmental arrangements are between parties under common control; such arrangements are non-market transactions.² For non-market transactions, the value received in return for the revenue given may not be equivalent. Generally, if both parties agree that value has been exchanged (that is, each asserts that value is received and sacrificed), identify the nature of the value received and sacrificed, and demonstrate exchange of something of value then the transaction should be considered an exchange transaction. This is true even if there is potentially a significant difference in the value exchanged or between the value and the cost incurred to obtain the value. Further, whether or not the providing entity incurs net revenue or net cost as a result of the transaction does not affect the classification.

SFFAS 7, paragraph 111 recognizes that exchange transactions may “occur between entities within the Government, sometimes as stipulated by law and in other cases by mutual agreement.” Consequently, classification as an exchange transaction is not dependent on whether the transaction is stipulated by law or policy or by mutual agreement of the parties.

11. What does “sacrifice value” mean?

12. Value may be sacrificed in many ways including by:

- a. Making a payment
- b. Transferring something of value (such as an item of property)
- c. Performing a service (such as advising or informing another party)
- d. Arranging a contract or agreement on behalf of another party

13. In some cases, the value sacrificed may not be measurable. In addition, the act of sacrificing value may provide value to both parties. For example, a consulting service may result in knowledge of benefit to both parties to the transaction as well as to others. The inability to

² SFFAS 7, par. 46(b).

measure the value sacrificed and the fact that the good or service is of continuing value to the provider, and possibly to others, does not mean the transaction is not an exchange transaction. As an exchange transaction, the amounts recognized for cost and revenue should be based on the applicable standards. That is, it is not necessary to establish the “value” exchanged in order to recognize cost and/or revenue.

14. What types of value may be considered sacrificed and received for an intragovernmental transaction to be classified as an exchange transaction?

15. As noted earlier, intragovernmental transactions are neither market-based nor arms-length transactions. If the parties agree that value has been exchanged, identify the nature of the value exchanged, and demonstrate that the exchange occurred then the transaction qualifies as an exchange transaction. Government operations are increasingly integrated; particularly where common goals require a coordinated effort. Each party to a transaction should assess whether the transaction provides value.³
16. The party’s classification of the transaction is particularly important because exchange transactions affect the gross and net cost of each reporting entity. If a party improperly identifies the transaction as a non-exchange transaction, the amounts would be reported on the statement of changes in net position which would misstate net cost during the reporting period. To avoid misstating net cost, a reporting entity’s assertion that value was sacrificed and received when combined with identification of the nature and receipt of that value should result in classification as an exchange transaction.
17. Parties considering whether they sacrificed and received value may consider value that is:
- a. Direct (such as goods or services made available to them through the actions of the other party)
 - b. Indirect (such as goods or services made available to support their mission as a result of the actions of the other party)
 - c. Tangible (such as property, plant, or equipment)
 - d. Intangible (such as information systems, written materials, or information)
 - e. Quantitative (such as a specific amount of a good or service)
 - f. Qualitative (such as guidance that may not be measurable)

³ Note that this technical bulletin should be applied in determining whether a transaction is exchange or non-exchange for purposes of applying GAAP. It does not determine treatment for budgetary purposes. The budgetary term “transfer” is broad and may include transactions appropriately classified as exchange transactions for GAAP purposes. Treatment of a transaction as a budgetary transfer does not preclude its classification as an exchange transfer under GAAP. Guidance regarding classification for budgetary purposes is provided by the Office of Management and Budget.

- 18. The benefits of a transaction may not be exclusively for the parties to the transaction. Notwithstanding this fact, the transaction should be classified as an exchange transaction as long as the providing and receiving entities agree that they sacrifice and receive value of an identified nature as a result of the transaction.

- 19. Further, reimbursements for certain goods and services may be made by some but not all entities benefitting from such goods and services. The failure of some to make reimbursements does not affect the transaction between the parties.

EFFECTIVE DATE

- 20. The requirements of this Technical Bulletin are effective upon issuance.

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

APPENDIX A: BASIS FOR CONCLUSIONS

The Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board has authorized its staff to prepare technical bulletins to provide timely guidance on certain financial accounting and reporting problems, in accordance with the Board's rules of procedure, as amended and restated through December 2003, and the procedures described in FASAB Technical Bulletin 2000-1, "Purpose and Scope of FASAB Technical Bulletins and Procedures for Issuance." The provisions of technical bulletins need not be applied to immaterial items.

This appendix discusses some factors considered significant by staff in reaching the conclusions in this technical bulletin. It includes the reasons for accepting certain approaches and rejecting others. Some factors were given greater weight than other factors. The guidance enunciated in the technical guidance section – not the material in this appendix – should govern the accounting for specific transactions, events or conditions.

This guidance may be affected by later documents. The FASAB Handbook is updated annually and includes a status section directing the reader to any subsequent Statements that affect this guidance. Within the text of the documents, the authoritative sections are updated for changes. However, this appendix will not be updated to reflect future changes. The reader can review the basis for conclusions of the amending Statement for the rationale for each amendment.

PROJECT HISTORY

- A1. In 2014, the Department of Defense (DoD) requested FASAB's consideration of a project after identifying several financial reporting areas of concern and related audit challenges. The Board agreed to undertake a project to address these areas by providing practical guidance within the framework of existing accounting standards and, where necessary, by providing the appropriate guidance to address issues not clearly addressed within the framework of existing accounting standards.
- A2. This technical bulletin is proposed in response to a request for guidance related to certain intragovernmental transactions. The guidance addresses transactions among components that DoD performs throughout execution of its mission that cannot be addressed effectively without further guidance.
- A3. This technical bulletin addresses how to identify intragovernmental exchange transactions. These questions were raised by DoD regarding receipts resulting from Economy Act.⁴ The main question is whether to record exchange revenue for only the portion of goods/services provided to other agencies that the agency performs itself or for the total cost recovered from other agencies including the reimbursement of costs of goods/services outsourced to other Federal agencies or vendors. This guidance is not limited to Economy Act orders because generally accepted accounting principles apply based on the substance of a transaction rather than the form. Also, it is believed that this guidance may assist other federal entities in applying existing accounting standards to similar transactions.

⁴ The Economy Act (31 U.S.C. 1535) authorizes agencies to enter into agreements to obtain supplies or services from another agency.

- A4. This technical bulletin does not address recognition and measurement of exchange transactions. Existing standards adequately address the timing of recognition as well as the amount to be recognized.

EXCHANGE TRANSACTIONS

- A5. SFFAS 5, *Accounting for Liabilities of the Federal Government*, paragraph 23 states that “an exchange transaction arises when each party to the transaction sacrifices value and receives value in return. There is a two-way flow of resources or of promises to provide resources.” In the specific case DoD refers to, DoD is arranging for a lease on behalf of another entity. Administrative services provided by DoD are a small part of the overall service associated with the lease.
- A6. Nonetheless, the providing entity (DoD) receives value through the payments from the receiving entity and sacrifices value through incurring the cost to acquire the good or service from the third-party for the receiving entity. The receiving entity receives value through the good or service provided by the providing entity and sacrifices value through payments to the providing entity. The full amount of the transaction qualifies as an exchange transaction.
- A7. The providing entity records the full amount billed as exchange revenue and the receiving entity should record the total amount it is billed as an expense or capitalized asset consistent with GAAP. The transaction does not qualify as a transfer-in/out – a nonexchange transaction - because some value is identified by both parties as being sacrificed and received. In contrast, per SFFAS 5, paragraph 24, “a nonexchange transaction arises when one party to a transaction receives value without directly giving or promising value in return.”
- A8. The specific case presented raises the question of whether the recovery of the cost of services the providing entity “outsources to other Federal agencies and/or commercial vendors” should be reported as a transfer-in rather than as exchange revenue. Presumably, if it was appropriate to classify the recovery of the cost as a transfer-in then the corresponding cost for the outsourced services would be classified as a transfer-out to ensure that all the outsourced amounts were excluded from the statement of net cost. This question is directly addressed in SFFAS 4, *Managerial Cost Accounting Standards and Concepts*, paragraphs 108-109. Specifically, paragraph 108 states that “If an entity provides goods or services to another entity, regardless of whether full reimbursement is received, the providing entity should continue to recognize in its accounting records the full cost of those goods or services. The full costs of the goods or services provided should also be reported to the receiving entity by the providing entity.”
- A9. SFFAS 4 does not make a distinction between full cost paid for administrative services versus costs paid to other federal agencies or commercial vendors. Treating the recovery of third-party amounts as transfers-in and the associated costs as transfers-out would be contrary to the guidance in SFFAS 4 intended to reveal the full costs on both the providing and receiving entities’ statements of net cost.
- A10. SFFAS 7 does not require an assessment of the value given and received by each party in exchange transactions because the standards do not define exchanges as being of approximately equal value. In intragovernmental transactions, the providing entity may or may not provide a significant amount of value in relation to the contract. Even when the value of the administrative services is small in relation to the third-party services or the providing entity is not reimbursed or not fully reimbursed for its administrative services, the

providing entity is to report the full cost of the transaction and recognize exchange revenue for any amounts billed. For example, the providing entity may simply place an order under an existing contract or prepare funding documents.

- A11. In fact, the parties to the transaction may not be permitted to establish fair value exchanges. When an entity provides goods and services that consist of arranging a contract, such as a lease agreement with a commercial vendor, the entity may be reimbursed for the contract cost as well as an administrative fee, for an amount less than these two cost components, or for an amount more than these two cost components. Nonetheless, the full reimbursement qualifies as exchange revenue. Therefore, the providing entity recognizes exchange revenue for the total amount billed. SFFAS 7 does not provide guidance regarding the value given or received. As noted above, intragovernmental transactions are not arms-length and, therefore, may present unique challenges regarding the sacrifice and receipt of value between entities under common control. This technical bulletin provides that the parties to the transaction should determine whether value was sacrificed and received, the nature of those values, and demonstrate the exchange occurred.
- A12. In addition, the technical bulletin discusses unique circumstances such as exchanges of value where other parties also benefit from the transaction. For example, the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board is funded by its sponsors in a joint effort to provide accounting standards for use by all federal reporting entities. Clearly, each sponsor believes value is provided but it would be pointless to determine whether that value equals the amount of funding made available to the Board and how that value might be affected by the fact that all reporting entities – including entities not providing funding to the Board - receive the accounting standards. Notwithstanding the delivery of accounting standards to all federal agencies, each sponsor should recognize the funding provided as a cost consistent with this being an exchange transaction. Treatment of the funding as a transfer-out, as if this was a non-exchange transaction, would misstate the cost to each party.

APPENDIX B: ABBREVIATIONS

CFR	Consolidated financial report of the U.S. government
DoD	Department of Defense
ED	Exposure draft
FASAB	Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board
GAAP	Generally Accepted Accounting Principles
SFFAC	Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Concepts
SFFAS	Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards
TB	Technical Bulletin

FASAB Board Members

D. Scott Showalter, Chair

Gila J. Bronner

Robert F. Dacey

George A. Scott

Michael H. Granof

Christina Ho

Patrick McNamee

Mark Reger

Graylin E. Smith

FASAB Staff

Wendy M. Payne, Executive Director

Melissa Batchelor, Assistant Director

Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board

441 G Street NW, Suite 6814

Mail Stop 6H19

Washington, DC 20548

Telephone 202-512-7350

FAX 202-512-7366

www.fasab.gov

Attachment 2 – Request for Guidance from DoD



COMPTROLLER

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
1100 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-1100

JAN 19 2017

Wendolyn M. Payne, Executive Director
Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board
441 G Street NW, Mailstop 6H19
Washington, DC 20548

Dear Ms. Payne:

Nature of Inquiry

As you are aware, the Department of Defense (Department or DoD) has initiated annual financial statement audits for large parts of the Department. During the Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 audit, the DoD Office of Inspector General (DoD OIG) identified an issue with the Department's application of accounting standards for a certain situation. Specifically, the DoD OIG issued a Notification of Finding and Recommendation (NFR) stating that DoD should only record exchange revenue for the portion of goods/services provided to other agencies that the agency performs itself for Economy Act orders—any goods/services outsourced to other Federal agencies should be recorded as a transfer in/out and not as exchange revenue.

For example, a Federal agency provides and manages office space for all its various organizations. The Federal agency obtains this office space through lease agreements with the General Services Administration (GSA) and commercial vendors. Currently, the Federal agency records exchange revenue for the full amount billed (\$105) and collected from its customers and those billings include both the cost of the rental space (\$100) that is provided by a third parties (GSA/commercial vendors), as well as an administrative fee (\$5) to recover the cost of managing that contractual and interagency relationships. In this example, the DoD OIG believes the Federal agency should only record \$5 as exchange revenue, and the remaining \$100 should be reported as a transfer-in (at the time of collection) and transfer-out (at the time of payment to GSA).

Question:

Requesting FASAB technical assistance with the following questions:

- Is it appropriate for a Federal agency to record exchange revenue for the full amount billed to customers regardless of whether an agency performs the service itself or outsources to other Federal agencies and/or commercial vendors?
- If not, what is the appropriate way to account for this activity?

Preliminary Conclusion to Inquiry:

Based on our review of the accounting standards applicable to Federal agencies, our preliminary conclusion is that it is appropriate to record the full amount Federal agencies bill



other agencies as exchange revenue, regardless of whether the agency performs the work itself, or outsources the work to other Federal agencies and/or commercial vendors.

This preliminary conclusion was formed based on the following information from the standards, with most relevant text in **bold**:

Statement on Federal Financial Accounting Standard 7 - Accounting for Revenue and Other Financing Sources and Concepts for Reconciling Budgetary and Financial Accounting

2. Revenue is an inflow of resources that the Government demands, earns, or receives by donation. Revenue comes from two sources: exchange transactions and nonexchange transactions. Exchange revenues arise when a Government entity provides goods and services to the public or to another Government entity for a price. Another term for "exchange revenue" is "earned revenue."

3. These accounting standards recognize exchange revenue at the time that a Government entity provides goods or services to the public or to another Government entity. **The revenue is measured at the price likely to be received.** Thus, with some differences that are explained in the standard, the accounting for earned revenue is comparable to the private sector's accrual accounting for earned revenue. Exchange revenue includes most user charges other than taxes. Such user charges include regulatory user charges, in which the exchange is not wholly voluntary but the revenue is generally, but not always, related to the cost of providing service to identifiable groups. One example is the revenue derived from the Securities and Exchange Commission's registration fees. **Exchange transactions also include those intragovernmental transactions where the price serves as a full or partial reimbursement for the costs incurred.**

18. The concept of matching costs and revenue has little relevance in government except where there is an exchange transaction. **An exchange transaction occurs when one party sacrifices value and receives a valuable good or service in return.** The operations of an entity engaged in exchange transactions produce the revenue earned as well as the associated cost incurred. Therefore, financial accounting should relate the revenue to the cost for these transactions. The net effect—the gross cost minus the revenue, or the net cost—generally determines the extent to which taxpayers bear the cost of the operations.

33. **Exchange revenue and gains are inflows of resources to a Government entity that the entity has earned. They arise from exchange transactions, which occur when each party to the transaction sacrifices value and receives value in return. That is, exchange revenue arises when a Government entity provides something of value to the public or another Government entity at a price.**

34. **Revenue from exchange transactions should be recognized when goods or services are provided to the public or another Government entity at a price.**

36. Revenue from specific types of exchange transactions should be recognized as follows:

(a) When services are provided to the public or another Government entity (except for specific services produced to order under a contract), revenue should be recognized when the services are performed.

38. The measurement basis for revenue from exchange transactions should be the actual price that is received or receivable under the established pricing arrangements.

DISCLOSURES AND OTHER ACCOMPANYING INFORMATION

46. Each reporting entity that provides goods or services to the public or another Government entity should disclose the following:

(c) the nature of intragovernmental exchange transactions in which the entity provides goods or services at a price less than the full cost or does not charge a price at all, with explanations of the amount and reason for disparities between the billing (if any) and the full cost; and

APPENDIX A: BASIS FOR CONCLUSIONS

Exchange Revenue
Special Nature of Government Exchange Transactions

166. The appropriate basis for measuring revenue from intragovernmental exchange transactions is likewise the actual price (or reimbursement) that the seller receives from the buyer. Accounting systems should be able to provide the information needed to set the reimbursement at full cost, but often the full cost is not charged. In these cases, the amount of the reimbursement is an incomplete measure of the economic value of the transaction. When one entity receives goods or services from another without paying all related costs, the net operating cost of the receiving entity is understated if it does not recognize (by imputation) the additional cost paid by the providing entity.

167. Other Federal financial accounting standards require such inter-entity cost subsidies to be recognized by the receiving entity in certain cases. This Statement, in the section on "Other Financing Sources," provides standards to recognize other financing sources that are imputed to offset whatever subsidy costs those other standards require to be recognized and imputed. Accounting for the imputed cost of goods and services provided by one Government entity to another requires the exercise of judgment, based on the specific circumstances of each case. **Therefore, whether costs are imputed or not, the**

providing entity should disclose an explanation of the amount and reason for material disparities between the billing (if any) and the full cost.

Views of Others Involved

The DoD OIG does not agree with the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller)'s position on this issue. The DoD OIG cited the Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Concept 5 and the United States Standard General Ledger account definitions as criteria for the NFR issued regarding this issue. The DoD OIG believes that agencies should only record revenue for the portion of goods/services provided by the agency directly.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Alaleh A. Jenkins', with a horizontal line drawn through the middle of the signature.

Alaleh A. Jenkins
Assistant Deputy Chief Financial Officer