

Memorandum

P3 – Phase II

March 27, 2024

To: Members of the Board
From: Domenic N. Savini, Assistant Director
Thru: Monica R. Valentine, Executive Director
Subject: **Public-Private Partnerships: Measurement and Recognition** (Topic E)

INTRODUCTION

Public-Private Partnerships (P3s) was added to the agenda because federal agencies have increasingly turned to these risk sharing arrangements or transactions to accomplish their goals, partly considering budget pressures. **The overall objective of the project is to make the full costs of such partnerships transparent.**

Project discussions began in April 2012 and resulted in the Board approving a dual-phased approach. The first phase would consist of establishing disclosure requirements, followed by measurement and recognition guidance in the second phase. Active work on this project's first phase began in FY2013 and culminated with the issuance of SFFAS 49, *Public-Private Partnerships: Disclosure Requirements*, on April 27, 2016.

BACKGROUND

OCTOBER 2023 BOARD MEETING

At the October 2023 Board meeting, staff provided an overview of the in-process, preliminary task force results: (1) a decision flow diagram along with accompanying instructions to help bring consistency to preparer implementation and entity reporting formats, (2) sample questions and answers, and (3) case study illustrations and related note disclosures. Members made the following points:

1. Further task force work and analysis may lead the Board to make necessary scope changes and identify additional areas for study.
2. Given that some preparers will follow the case studies or illustrations and, in so doing, fail to meet the disclosure requirements, the Board should ascertain if the case studies or illustrations should be non-authoritative.
3. The board should exercise care when referencing SFFAS 47 because it is a principles-based document that requires significant agency judgment for effective implementation.

-
4. The Board should clarify distinctions between related party disclosures and P3 disclosures.
 5. The focus on capturing risk and the barriers to properly disclosing risk loom large in the task force's rankings.
 6. There is confusion about the relationship between SFFAS 47, *Reporting Entity*, SFFAS 49, *Public-Private Partnerships: Disclosure Requirements*, and SFFAS 54, *Leases*.
 7. The Board should clarify descriptions of qualitative factors (some mentioned within SFFAC 9, *Materiality*).

NOVEMBER 2023 AAPC MEETING

In connection with Board input from that meeting, staff provided an overview of the task force results to the Accounting and Auditing Policy Committee (AAPC) on November 16, 2023. AAPC committee members noted the following:

1. Review the most current P3 disclosures, keeping cost-benefit considerations in mind.
2. Consider materiality in connection with cost-benefit considerations.
3. Ensure that decisions concerning materiality are predicated on representative P3 reporting; and kept under preparer-auditor purview as per the Board's historical practice.
4. Keep in mind that implementation guidance may need to be parsed between authoritative and non-authoritative to include amendments to not only SFFAS 49, but possibly to other standards.
5. Highlight paragraphs 6-8 of SFFAS 49 for identifying risks and possibly link to the risk-based characteristics at paragraphs 20 and 21.
6. Additional member comments included that materiality can be qualitatively important given a program's visibility, such as Congressional interests, and some risks may be mitigated by contract (Federal Acquisition Regulation) clauses.
7. A concluding comment was that a need for clarification and implementation guidance is in fact needed.

Staff has concluded an internal review of the questions and answers (Q&A) section of the draft Technical Release. As you may recall, the task force developed the draft Q&As to reflect matters preparers have expressed concerns with: SFFAS 49 integration with SFFAS 47, *Reporting Entity*, and SFFAS 54, *Leases*.

This session's purpose is to provide staff with feedback and direction based on the AAPC comments, the Task Force's review of those comments, and Staff's recommendation.

REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK BY April 12, 2024

Please review the attached material and background information including attachments and respond to the five questions in Attachment 5 by **April 12, 2024**.

For additional information, questions, or suggestions, please contact Dom as early as possible at savinid@fasab.gov with a cc to Monica at valentinem@fasab.gov.

ATTACHMENTS

1. **Historical Overview** (recent project refresher)

- a. SFFAS 49 P3 Training and Outreach Activity
- b. Twelve Areas Requiring Attention
- c. Summary of Highest Priority Implementation Challenges
- d. Summary of Medium Priority Implementation Challenges

2. **Proposed Deliverables** (proposed Technical Release)

- a. Decision Tree Flowchart
- b. Sample Questions and Answers
- c. Case Study Illustrations

3. **Review of FASAB Board and AAPC Comments**

4. **Proposed Next Steps**

5. **Questions for the Board**

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 - Measurement and Recognition Issues Log

Appendix 2 – October 2023 Topic B Briefing Material *Public-Private Partnerships: Measurement and Recognition* (Topic B) dated September 29, 2023

SFFAS 49 P3 Training and Outreach Activity

- **Agency Outreach** - During the last calendar quarter of 2021 staff interviewed selected entities (DoD, NGIA, VA, USDA/Forest Service, Justice, Treasury, Energy, HUD/Ginnie Mae, and NASA) to obtain an understanding concerning existing policies and procedures used to identify eligible P3s for reporting and potential areas to improve SFFAS 49 implementation,
- **Pan-governmental Training** - Staff and selected task force members conducted SFFAS 49 training beginning in January 2022 and running through June 2023. Over thirteen training sessions were held attended by nearly 1000 attendees (~957) representing agency personnel from approximately 28 agencies/bureaus including Inspectors General. Written survey results as well as Question and Answer sessions identified participant challenges to implementing SFFAS 49, and
- **Subject Matter Expert Meetings** – Staff held meetings with two federal Inspectors General, a public accounting (audit) firm and two financial policy accountants to help identify challenges they see requiring attention.

Twelve Areas Requiring Attention

A compilation of the problematic areas derived via our training and outreach efforts include the following:

1. **Applying materiality and identifying remote risks:** difficulty in considering qualitative factors
2. **Using contractual periods and not “expected life”** criterion; that is, the failure to consider economic incentives
3. **Inter-relationships between SFFAS 47, *Reporting Entity*** and SFFAS 49 primarily distinguishing between their respective disclosure requirements
4. **Insufficient program office involvement** and lack of CFO relationships or understanding with/of program area operations
5. Concerning cash flows: (1) **difficulty in quantifying estimates related to risks**, (2) application of materiality, and (3) uncertainty if dollar estimates should be discounted
6. **Failure in identifying overall P3 risk**
7. **Only focusing on reporting entity P3 risk** (see related comment 6 above), and applying measurement and recognition guidance using SFFAS 5 for disclosing remote risks
8. Misinterpreting that because debt arrangements may pose less risk than equity arrangements, SFFAS 49 risk-sharing is non-existent; **subjective assessments of risk make it difficult to conclude that SFFAS 49 risk**

- exists**; and lack of agency expertise and resources creates an inordinate amount of preparer burden
9. **Database "flags" to identify P3s are absent**; and conflating contract periods as expected life indicators.
 10. **CFO personnel are not involved from the beginning of the P3** award creating a lack of awareness/knowledge; and inadequate (sub) contractor access to records.
 11. **Need for additional agency-wide training** beyond finance and accounting personnel.
 12. **Expand training to cover additional P3 examples** (e.g., donated assets) of P3s (note: training currently covers DoD MHPI, VA medical center construction, NASA solar generation, WMATA, and IN-Q-TEL).

In January 2023, the Task Force finalized its analysis of the ICs deemed within the Board's scope and developed a possible FASAB action plan for those ICs ranked Highest and Medium priority. A listing of the 15 ICs can be found at Attachment 3a immediately following this section. A summary of their review follows in the below Table:

Table 1.0
Summary of Highest Priority Implementation Challenges
As Ranked/Rated by Task Force

Highest Priority ICs ¹	Areas of Concern
9. Risk Assessments	<p>Qualitative assessments are extremely subjective and can lead to disagreements about fair presentation. For example, entities required to have greater risk appetites which are commonly well known and understood, have a different materiality threshold that should be considered when developing disclosures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Par. 11 and 24d (ii), Applying qualitative materiality / Remote Risks.• Par. 24d (i) and (ii) and A35, Distinguish between uncertainty and risks.
6. Identifying P3 Risk	<p>Paragraph 24d (ii) - clarify that although disclosure of remote risks of loss are limited to those included in the terms of the contractual P3 arrangements or transactions, this does not abrogate the need to identify the contractual risks of loss the P3 partners are undertaking.</p>

¹ The Lowest ranked/rated ICs are not listed in the tables given that some are (1) deemed out of the Board's scope by the Task Force - (5. *CFO Leadership and Understanding*; 10. *Resources and Expertise*; and 15. *Congressional Appropriations*) and (2) the Task Force's assessment that although some of the lowest ranked/rated ICs are worthy of consideration (14. *Exclusions*; 11. *Data Retrieval from Numerous and Disparate Data-sets*; and 12. *Access to Private Partner Data*), they are not considered as significant as the other higher ranked/rated ICs. **Please note that to the extent practical, ICs 14, 11, and 12 will be incorporated into the case study illustrations as appropriate to help ensure coverage.**

Highest Priority ICs ¹	Areas of Concern
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifying P3 partner risk per paragraph 24d Entities may be unable or precluded from identifying P3 partner risk for a variety of reasons including: contractual or legal prohibitions; lack of access to information; public relations concerns.
1. Materiality and Remote Risk	See 9.and 6 Above
3. Reporting Entity and Leases	There is confusion between the relationship between SFFAS 49 and SFFAS 47, <i>Reporting Entity</i> and SFFAS 54, <i>Leases</i> . How should preparers harmonize disclosures?

Table 2.0
Summary of Medium Priority Implementation Challenges
As Ranked/Rated by Task Force

Medium Priority ICs ¹	Areas of Concern
8. Identifying and Understanding Risk Sharing	See 9.and 6 Above
4. Cash Flow Estimates	<p>Clarify that the exception noted in paragraph 24b. is limited to that specific disclosure and should not be used for other disclosure requirements.</p> <p>Provide illustrative examples of cash flow reporting.</p>
7. Remote Risk	<p>Certain practitioners believe that the disclosure of remote risk isn't required (1) if they are unable to identify the private partner's absorption of risk and (2) because remote risk is optional as it falls under SFFAS 5, <i>Accounting for Liabilities of The Federal Government</i>. As such, they avoid complying with this requirement. However, Paragraph 24 d clearly requires the disclosure of risks, including remote, <i>"Identification of the contractual risks of loss the P3 partners are undertaking."</i></p>
2. Expected Life	<p>Using contractual periods and not "expected life" criterion and failure to consider economic incentives results in entities under-reporting P3s. Conflating contract periods as expected life indicators.</p>
13. Training	<p>Need for additional agency-wide training that includes other functional areas such as program offices, facilities, logistics, and operations.</p>

ATTACHMENT 1: Historical Overview

The Task Force finalized its analysis of the ICs as prepared by the formed three teams comprised of subject matter experts who studied and recommend the following technical guidance:

1. Teams 1 and 2 Studied SFFAS 47 and SFFAS 54 Inter-play with P3s

- Drafted Implementation Guidance to include a Q&A format and a Flowchart/Decision Tree Diagram

2. Team 3 Studied and Refined In-Process Illustrative Case Studies and Sample Note Disclosures

In consultation with external auditors and an inspector general during the Fall of 2022, staff developed sample case studies and illustrative note disclosures. Currently, the Task Force is refining this work focusing on the following ICs:

- Highest Priority - 9. Risk Assessments, 6. Identifying P3 Risk, 1. Materiality and Remote Risk, 3. Reporting Entity and Leases
- Medium Priority - 8. Identifying and Understanding Risk Sharing, 4. Cash Flow Estimates, 7. Remote Risk 2. Expected Life, 13. Training

Please note that proposed solutions to the Highest and Medium ranked ICs can be found in the October 2023 Briefing Materials located at Appendix 2 and are identified as Proposed FASAB Deliverables.

PLEASE NOTE THAT SFFAS 49 IS INCLUDED IN APPENDIX 2 FOR YOUR READING EASE.

END ATTACHMENT 1

ATTACHMENT 2: Preliminary Task Force Solutions to Address ICs

The Task Force has developed a proposed implementation guidance framework that includes the following three main components:


1. **Draft Decision Tree Flowchart** to address SFFAS 47, *Reporting Entity* and SFFAS 54, *Leases* harmonization,
2. **Sample Questions and Answers** to provide guidance on how to apply the SFFAS 49 (1) risk-based characteristics (RBCs) and (2) accounting and financial reporting requirements to reporting entity (SFFAS 47) and leases (SFFAS 54), and
3. **Sample Case Study Illustrations and Disclosures** employing simple to complex hypothetical circumstances which demonstrate compliance with each of the SFFAS 49 disclosure requirements.

The following pages within this section will briefly demonstrate and outline each of these main components that are intended to serve as the basis for the Board's forthcoming implementation guidance.

NOTE AND CAUTION – Please be advised that the following information is still under review by the Task Force and is subject to change. Nevertheless, the information provides Members with an understanding of the Task Force's thinking and preliminary technical direction and forthcoming recommendations.

ATTACHMENT 2: Preliminary Task Force Solutions to Address ICs

1. Draft Decision Tree Flowchart to address SFFAS 47, Reporting Entity and SFFAS 54, Leases harmonization



2. **Sample Questions and Answers to provide guidance on how to apply the SFFAS 49 (1) risk-based characteristics (RBCs) and (2) accounting and financial reporting requirements to reporting entity (SFFAS 47) and leases (SFFAS 54).**

Preliminary Guidance on Applying SFFAS 49 RBCs

- Q1. **Should agencies only examine arrangements for the conclusive and suggestive risk-based characteristics described in Pars. 20-21 when considering the need for disclosures? Or as part of their analysis of contractual agreements, guarantees, insurance, and indemnification strategies, along with their review of private partner debt and equity, should entities also consider specific risks that might give rise to conclusive and suggestive risk characteristics?**

Placeholder Answer – To be deliberated by AAPC

Preliminary SFFAS 47, Reporting Entity Q&As

- Q1. If an entity is consolidated and thus treated as being part of the overall reporting entity's operations, does SFFAS 49 apply?**
- a. **Placeholder Answer** – To be deliberated by AAPC
- Q2. Since consolidation basically results in a reporting entity (parent) treating another entity (child, subsidiary, etc.) as part of its economic reporting entity, does the consolidation process change a private entity into a public entity? If so, then wouldn't the SFFAS 49 requirements not apply?**
- a. **Placeholder Answer** – To be deliberated by AAPC
- Q3. What's the difference between a Disclosure entity and a Related Party?**
- a. **Placeholder Answer** – To be deliberated by AAPC
- Q4. If you have a P3 arrangement or transaction that meets the SFFAS 47 inclusion criteria (consolidated or disclosed) or is deemed a related party, which SFFAS 49 disclosures apply? That is, how do you harmonize disclosures?**
- a. **Placeholder Answer** - To be deliberated by AAPC
- Q5. How should a reporting entity assess a P3 against SFFAS 47 to determine the ability to exercise existence of significant influence, by either party, over policy decisions to ascertain if the SFFAS 47 requirements for a related party have been met?**
- a. **Placeholder Answer** - To be deliberated by AAPC

Preliminary SFFAS 54, Leases Q&As

Q1. What are the required disclosures if a P3 arrangement or transaction identifies as a lease or contains a lease component as defined in SFFAS 54?

a. **Placeholder Answer** - To be deliberated by AAPC

Q2. How can I tell if a P3 contains an SFFAS 54 lease as opposed to another type of contract or arrangement that permits use of an asset similar to a lease?

a. **Placeholder Answer** - To be deliberated by AAPC

Q3. What are some key characteristics to help distinguish a lease only meeting SFFAS 54 reporting requirements versus a lease meeting both SFFAS 54 and SFFAS 49 reporting requirements?

a. **Placeholder Answer** - To be deliberated by AAPC

Q4. Are Energy Savings Performance Contracts and Utility Energy Service Contract leases and/or P3s?

a. **Placeholder Answer** - To be deliberated by AAPC

3. Sample Case Study Illustrations and Disclosures employing simple to complex hypothetical circumstances which demonstrate compliance with each of the SFFAS 49 disclosure requirements.

It is important to note that some of the illustrations discuss identification and reporting of (1) the contractual risks of loss and related cash flows to include remote risks and related cash flows that the P3 partners are undertaking. As such, in order to achieve the learning outcomes or objectives, robust and fairly complex fact patterns have been developed. Such fact patterns are reflective of the complex nature of P3s and demonstrate the need for preparers and auditors to become as engaged and knowledgeable as possible concerning the reporting entity's P3 arrangements or transactions.

In practice, it may take more than one reporting cycle for the reporting entity to adequately identify and report (material) contractual risks of loss and related cash flows. In these cases, entities may disclose the circumstances behind the partial identification and reporting of the contractual risks of loss and related cash flows, so that financial statement users can consider this in their decision-making.

Proposed case study illustrations

#1. Par. 24a - The purpose, objective, and rationale for the P3 arrangement or transaction and the relative benefits/revenues being received in exchange for the government's consideration, monetary and non-monetary; and the entity's statutory authority for entering into the P3.

Summary of Case Study Assumptions. Reporting entity ABC accomplishes its mission through the activities of various bureaus, grants to research institutions, and contracts with universities and not-for-profit organizations. ABC's desired mission outcomes include (1) increasing the number of venture capital firms investing in renewable energy, (2) fostering scientific collaboration among industry competitors, and (3) creating manufacturing hubs especially in economically depressed areas. Although ABC relies on appropriated public funds to conduct its operations, it has received Congressional approval via its Title 15 authority to enter into an alternative financing arrangement to best execute its mission.

Case Study Learning Objectives. Assist practitioners in composing a Disclosure meeting the paragraph 24a requirements.

Level of Complexity - Low

ATTACHMENT 2: Preliminary Task Force Solutions to Address ICs

#2. Par. 24b - A description of federal and non-federal funding of the P3 over its expected life, including the mix and, where available, the amounts of such funding. For any amounts that are not available, the disclosures should indicate such.

Summary of Case Study Assumptions. The Congress and the President established Alpha Corporation as an independent government corporation (note: Alpha is considered a federal organization) to ensure consumer funds placed in-trust with certain types of institutions. Notably, legislation limits how Alpha can invest proceeds from premiums and, to help ensure that Alpha remains financially viable, legislation requires Alpha to have a reserve fund. The board of directors is responsible for determining the level of the reserve fund and if Alpha encounters a shortfall, the organization may borrow a limited amount from the U.S. Department of the Treasury (Treasury), but any additional funding requirements must come from premium assessments.

A recent OIG audit revealed the existence of a public-private partnership with Omega Holdings, a well-respected investment brokerage firm. The P3 created is a limited liability partnership (LLP) that has an expected life of 15 years with total expected cash outflows (non-discounted) of \$5 billion. The auditors are questioning Alpha's inclusion of the LLP's capital account holdings in the corporation's reserve fund calculations and Alpha's overall financial viability.

Case Study Learning Objectives. Assist practitioners in composing a Disclosure meeting the paragraph 24b requirements.

Level of Complexity – Moderate

#3. Par. 24c - The operational and financial structure of the P3 including the reporting entity's rights and responsibilities, including:

- i. A description of the contractual terms governing payments to and from the government over the expected life of the P3 arrangement or transaction to include:
 - 1. explanation of how the expected life was determined
 - 2. the time periods payments are expected to occur
 - 3. whether payments are made directly to each partner or indirectly through a third-party, such as, military housing allowances
 - 4. in-kind contributions/services and donations.)

ATTACHMENT 2: Preliminary Task Force Solutions to Address ICs

- ii. The amounts received and paid by the government during the reporting period(s) and the amounts estimated to be received and paid in aggregate over the expected life of the P3.

Summary of Case Study Assumptions. The Congress and the President established Enigma Association (Enigma) as a not-for-profit, primarily non-taxpayer funded organization to research, develop and market innovative U.S. nanotechnology worldwide and to respond to any claims of damage arising from this new technology. Its mission statement is “to open new markets for the adoption of U.S. nanotechnology through a cooperative marketing strategy and risk-sharing approach for market participants.” All of Enigma’s contractual and grant agreements are exempt from both the Federal Acquisition Regulation and OMB grant requirements.

Enigma has been administratively assigned to the Department of Science and Technology (DST) and is expected to support DST’s mission for at least 10 years. Payments between Enigma and DST will be done annually subject to a Defense Contract Audit Agency incurred cost audit and subsequent negotiations. DST has authorized Enigma to redesign DST’s logo on promotional materials, but related trademark and marketing costs related to the logo redesign will not be reimbursed by DST. Enigma has agreed to absorb these costs. Costs are estimated to be \$12,000,000.00 and considered material in this regard.

Based on the assumed facts and circumstances and pursuant to SFFAS 47, *Reporting Entity*, DST management determined, and the auditor concurred that Enigma should be included in the government-wide GPFFR because it meets the third inclusion principle (control with expected benefits or risk of loss). Further, given that Enigma is a non-appropriated entity, relatively financially independent, and insulated from political influence, management determined that Enigma is a disclosure entity.

Case Study Learning Objectives. Assist practitioners in composing a Disclosure meeting the paragraph 24c requirements.

Level of Complexity - Moderate

#4. Par. 24d. Identification of the contractual risks of loss the P3 partners are undertaking

- i. Identification of such contractual risks of loss should include a description of (1) the contractual risk and (2) the potential effect on cash flows if the risks were realized (for example, early termination requirements including related exit amounts and other responsibilities such as asset condition (hand-back))

ATTACHMENT 2: Preliminary Task Force Solutions to Address ICs

requirements, minimum payment guarantees, escalation clauses, contingent payments, or renewal options).

- ii. **Disclosure of remote risks of loss should be limited** to those included in the terms of the contractual P3 arrangements or transactions. If remote risks of loss are disclosed, an explanation should be included that **avoids the misleading inference that there is more than a remote chance of a loss.**

Summary of Case Study Assumptions. The Department of Cyberspace Security (DCS) organized Newark Laboratory to conduct specialized engineering research that supports DCS' mission related to information technology infrastructure leading to improved global cyber security and network services. Early in the fiscal year, DCS authorized Newark to enter into a public-private partnership with a non-governmental foreign consortium to jointly finance, build, operate and maintain a research facility consistent with established program goals.

DCS officials ordered Newark to take certain actions that immediately brought a breach of contract suit by the consortium (i.e., violating the terms of the P3 arrangement).

Both internal and Department of Justice attorneys were consulted, and they noted the following concerning the potential litigation:

1. **Violating the terms of the P3 arrangement** – “We believe that DCS and Newark will be able to defend this action successfully given that in our opinion, the plaintiff's case is without merit. A memorandum of understanding does not have equivalent status to a contractual agreement and therefore, cannot abrogate or supersede contractual terms safeguarding data.”
2. **Failure abiding to the terms of U.S. Treaties** – “This matter involves unique characteristics wherein authoritative legal precedents do not seem to exist. If asserted, we believe that the foreign parties to the non-governmental consortium will have serious problems establishing DCS' or Newark's liability under the Treaties cited; nevertheless, should they be successful, the award may be substantial.”

Case Study Learning Objectives. Assist practitioners in composing a Disclosure meeting the paragraph 24d (i) and (ii) requirements.

Level of Complexity – Complex

ATTACHMENT 2: Preliminary Task Force Solutions to Address ICs

#5. Par. 24d. Identification of the contractual risks of loss the P3 partners are undertaking

- i. Identification of such contractual risks of loss should include a description of (1) the contractual risk and (2) the potential effect on cash flows if the risks were realized (for example, early termination requirements including related exit amounts and other responsibilities such as asset condition (hand-back) requirements, minimum payment guarantees, escalation clauses, contingent payments, or renewal options).
- ii. Disclosure of remote risks of loss should be limited to those included in the terms of the contractual P3 arrangements or transactions. If remote risks of loss are disclosed, an explanation should be included that avoids the misleading inference that there is more than a remote chance of a loss.

Summary of Case Study Assumptions. The Office of Fair Trade and Internet Safety (OFTIS) (the reporting entity) entered into a P3 by forming an LLC (Troy LLC)² with Adversa, a company specializing in trawling the deep web, investigating peer-to-peer networks, and helping businesses counteract data breaches and other cybersecurity risks. Unknown to OFTIS, Adversa's high-profile work that attracted the intelligence community's attention was not in reality the result of its *Hawkeye* software but instead, as the result of the proprietary software actually developed by the National Bureau of Investigations (NBI).

In a well devised scheme, Adversa disregarded the terms of the contract with the NBI and used the proprietary software to boost its private business. Its corrupt revenue model used the *HawkEye* to "discover" a cybersecurity breach, and Adversa would offer its potential clients to remedy the data breach at exorbitant rates using NBI's proprietary software. Based on a resulting lawsuit, a court ruled that, "The resulting injury to the parties caused by the defamation and unconstitutional agency authorized actions is immediate and irreparable." The court ordered that the LLC and its partners, including OFTIS pay the plaintiff \$100.0 million.

Case Study Learning Objectives. Assist practitioners in composing a Disclosure meeting the paragraph 24d (i) and (ii) requirements.

Level of Complexity - Complex

END ATTACHMENT 2

² An LLC is a limited liability company, which is a type of legal entity that can be used when forming a business that offers protection to the owner(s) from personal liability for debts and other obligations that a business might incur. In other words, the personal assets of the owner cannot be used for legal claims against the business. Source accessed 7 July 2022: <https://www.investopedia.com/articles/personal-finance/011216/s-corp-vs-llc-which-should-i-choose.asp>

ATTACHMENT 3: Review of FASAB Board and AAPC Comments

<u>Common Themes</u>	<u>Oct 2023 Board Comments</u>	<u>Nov 2023 AAPC Comments</u>
Project Scope Changes including amendments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Further task force work and analysis may lead the Board to make necessary scope changes and identify additional areas for study. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Keep in mind that implementation guidance may need to be parsed between authoritative and non-authoritative to include amendments to not only SFFAS 49, but possibly to other standards.
Distinguish between Authoritative and Non-authoritative guidance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Given that some preparers will follow the case studies or illustrations and, in so doing, fail to meet the disclosure requirements, the Board should ascertain if the case studies or illustrations should be non-authoritative. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Keep in mind that implementation guidance may need to be parsed between authoritative and non-authoritative to include amendments to not only SFFAS 49, but possibly to other standards.
Clarifying SFFAS 47, 49, and 54 Relationship	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The Board should clarify distinctions between related party disclosures and P3 disclosures. 4. The board should exercise care when referencing SFFAS 47 because it is a principles-based 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. A concluding comment was that a need for clarification and implementation guidance is in fact needed.

ATTACHMENT 3: Review of FASAB Board and AAPC Comments

<u>Common Themes</u>	<u>Oct 2023 Board Comments</u>	<u>Nov 2023 AAPC Comments</u>
<p>(continued)</p> <p>Clarifying SFFAS 47, 49, and 54 Relationship</p>	<p>document that requires significant agency judgment for effective implementation.</p> <p>5. There is confusion about the relationship between SFFAS 47, <i>Reporting Entity</i>, SFFAS 49, <i>Public-Private Partnerships: Disclosure Requirements</i>, and SFFAS 54, <i>Leases</i>.</p>	<p>2. A concluding comment was that a need for clarification and implementation guidance is in fact needed.</p>
<p>Clarifying Risk</p>	<p>3. The focus on capturing risk and the barriers to properly disclosing risk loom large in the task force's rankings.</p>	<p>3. Highlight paragraphs 6-8 of SFFAS 49 for identifying risks and possibly link to the risk-based characteristics at paragraphs 20 and 21.</p>
<p>Clarifying Materiality</p>	<p>4. The Board should clarify descriptions of qualitative factors (some mentioned within SFFAC 9, <i>Materiality</i>).</p>	<p>4. Additional member comments included that materiality can be qualitatively important given a program's visibility, such as</p>


ATTACHMENT 3: Review of FASAB Board and AAPC Comments

<u>Common Themes</u>	<u>Oct 2023 Board Comments</u>	<u>Nov 2023 AAPC Comments</u>
(continued) Clarifying Materiality		Congressional interests, and some risks may be mitigated by contract (Federal Acquisition Regulation) clauses. 5. Consider materiality in connection with cost-benefit considerations.
N/A	N/A	6. Review the most current P3 disclosures, keeping cost-benefit considerations in mind.
N/A	N/A	7. Ensure that decisions concerning materiality are predicated on representative P3 reporting; and kept under preparer-auditor purview as per the Board's historical practice.

END ATTACHMENT 3




Option A – Forward Pass





Option B – End Run



SFFAS47 / SFFAS 54 Flowchart - Non-Authoritative



Questions& Answers - Authoritative



Eliminate Case Study Illustrations and only release Q&As and Flowchart for exposure. Handle entity cases via our TI process.

"I'm from Kansas, so there were a lot of vacant lots and open fields to tackle each other in so we could avoid tackling each other on the street. But running on the street and trying not to get taken down on the concrete, that will make you fast, that's for sure." - Barry Sanders

https://www.azquotes.com/author/12950_-Barry_Sanders/tag/running#google_vignette
More about Sanders: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Barry_Sanders

ATTACHMENT 4: Proposed Next Steps

April 2024

- Board decides how best to communicate its results; for example,
 - Options A or B
 - SFFAS amendment; interpretation, Technical Bulletin and/or Technical Release

April 2024 – August 2024

- Board and AAPC review Task Force finalized results
 - SFFAS 49 Decision Tree Flowchart
 - Sample Questions and Answers
 - If applicable: Illustrative Case Studies and Sample Note Disclosures

October 2024 – February 2025

- Issue Exposure Draft for a minimum 90-day comment period

April 2025 – October 2025

- Review comment letters and redeliberate key issues
- Finalize guidance and issue accordingly

NOTE CONCERNING AMENDMENTS: Although the Board vote is final, there is a 90-day clearance for OMB and GAO to offer an objection. Therefore, we should not anticipate release of an amending Statement before the spring of 2025.

***** END ATTACHMENT 4 *****

Question 1: Overall Strategy – Does the Board have a general preference for any one of the two proposed options? If so, which one would Members suggest pursuing? Lastly, would Members like to see any option modified? If so, please explain your rationale.

Staff conducted extensive SFFAS 49 P3 Training and Outreach Activity during the last calendar quarter of 2021 through most of 2022 that included (1) Agency Outreach, (2) Pan-governmental Training, and (3) Subject Matter Expert Meetings.

A total of fifteen (15) Implementation Challenges (ICs) were identified and at the October 2022 Board meeting, the Board agreed with (1) validating and prioritizing implementation challenges with the task force, (2) coordinating with the CFO Council as appropriate, and (3) seeking task force consultation on what types of implementation guidance they would recommend issuing.

As a result, the ICs were studied by the Board and those deemed appropriate for Board action were then further analyzed by the task force resulting in a draft Technical Release (Level C GAAP).

Current Issue – How do we best communicate guidance? Since the draft Technical Release contains proposed implementation guidance consisting of a flowchart with accompanying narrative, selected Questions and Answers and Case Study illustrations, some may view it as complex, dense, or even proscriptive. As such, staff has recommended two possible options for the Board to consider:

- Option A – Forward Pass: Stay the course and release one comprehensive package.
- Option B – End Run: Only release Flowchart and selected Q&As. Handle complex issues via or Technical Inquiry process.

Question 1 – Does the Board have a general preference for any one of the two proposed options? If so, which one would Members suggest pursuing? Lastly, would Members like to see any option modified? If so, please explain your rationale.

Question 2: Decision Tree - Does the Board generally agree with the Decision Tree Flowchart to address SFFAS 47, *Reporting Entity* and SFFAS 54, *Leases* harmonization? If not, what specific changes or edits Members would like to propose?

In SFFAS 49 the Board noted that it had previously addressed various types of long-term arrangements or transactions in which the government participates (for example, leases or guarantees). As such, accounting standards exist that provide for recognition and measurement of assets/liabilities and revenues/expenses as well as disclosures of certain risks in these long-standing types of arrangements or transactions.

Nevertheless, the Board made clear that SFFAS 49 supplements existing guidance to help ensure adequate disclosure of those arrangements/transactions that either form the basis of or are part of a P3. Therefore, existing accounting standards that govern the various types of long-term arrangements/transactions continue to apply.

To that end, the Board noted the following risks associated with P3s:

1. Where actual costs will be greater than budgeted costs,
2. The entity may have to absorb part or all of the project's private debt,
3. The entity will not achieve expected returns on its investments in limited partnerships,
4. Conditions may lead to a government-acknowledged event where an entity assumes financial responsibility for the event, and
5. The public purpose or public value will not be fulfilled or achieved.

In conclusion, the Board stated that because of the risks involved in entering into such long-term agreements, some of which involve government assets, specific disclosures regarding P3s are needed. These disclosures foster accountability and improve understanding of (1) the general risks inherent in P3 arrangements by revealing their purpose, objective, funding, operational and financial structures; and (2) contractual risks of loss such as early termination requirements. Disclosures should generally accompany the related asset and/or liability display contained within the financial statements.

Question 2 - Does the Board generally agree with the Decision Tree Flowchart to address SFFAS 47, *Reporting Entity* and SFFAS 54, *Leases* harmonization? If not, what specific changes or edits Members would like to propose?

ATTACHMENT 5: Questions for the Board

Question 3: Sample Q&As – Does the Board generally agree with the Task Force developed Sample Questions and Answers? If not, please suggest specific changes or suggested edits. Are there any additional questions Members believe need addressing?

Sample SFFAS 49 Risk Based Characteristic Question

Q1. Should agencies only examine arrangements for the conclusive and suggestive risk-based characteristics described in Pars. 20-21 when considering the need for disclosures? Or as part of their analysis of contractual agreements, guarantees, insurance, and indemnification strategies, along with their review of private partner debt and equity, should entities also consider specific risks that might give rise to conclusive and suggestive risk characteristics??

Sample SFFAS 47 Questions	Sample SFFAS 54 Questions
Q1. If an entity is consolidated and thus treated as being part of the overall reporting entity's operations, does SFFAS 49 apply?	Q1. What are the required disclosures if a P3 arrangement or transaction identifies as a lease or contains a lease component as defined in SFFAS 54?
Q2. Since consolidation basically results in a reporting entity (parent) treating another entity (child, subsidiary, etc.) as part of its economic reporting entity, does the consolidation process change a private entity into a public entity? If so, then wouldn't the SFFAS 49 requirements not apply?	Q2. How can I tell if a P3 contains an SFFAS 54 lease as opposed to another type of contract or arrangement that permits use of an asset similar to a lease?
Q3. What's the difference between a Disclosure entity and a Related Party?	Q3. What are some key characteristics to help distinguish a lease only meeting SFFAS 54 reporting requirements versus a lease meeting both SFFAS 54 and SFFAS 49 reporting requirements?
Q4. If you have a P3 arrangement or transaction that meets the SFFAS 47 inclusion criteria (consolidated or disclosed) or is deemed a related party,	Q4. Are Energy Savings Performance Contracts and Utility Energy Service Contract leases and/or P3s?

ATTACHMENT 5: Questions for the Board

Sample SFFAS 47 Questions	Sample SFFAS 54 Questions
which SFFAS 49 disclosures apply? That is, how do you harmonize disclosures?	
Q5. How should a reporting entity assess a P3 against SFFAS 47 to determine the ability to exercise existence of significant influence, by either party, over policy decisions to ascertain if the SFFAS 47 requirements for a related party have been met?	N/A

Question 3 - Does the Board generally agree with the Task Force developed Sample Questions and Answers? If not, please suggest specific changes or suggested edits. Are there any additional questions Members believe need addressing?

Question 4 – Does the Board generally agree with the Sample Case Study Illustrations and Disclosures approach employing simple to complex hypothetical circumstances which demonstrate compliance with each of the SFFAS 49 disclosure requirements?

Please refer to Attachment 2, pages 16-20.

Question 4 - Does the Board generally agree with the Sample Case Study Illustrations and Disclosures approach employing simple to complex hypothetical circumstances which demonstrate compliance with each of the SFFAS 49 disclosure requirements?

ATTACHMENT 5: Questions for the Board

Question 5 – Are there any other issues or concerns that Members would like for staff to consider? Please note in your response what changes you would recommend be made.

Question 5 - Are there any other issues or concerns that Members would like for staff to consider? Please note in your response what changes you would recommend be made.

END ATTACHMENT 5

APPENDIXES

Appendix 1 – Measurement and Recognition Issues Log

Appendix 2 – October Topic B Briefing Materials; Public-Private Partnerships: Measurement and Recognition (Topic B) dated September 29, 2023

Appendix 1 – Measurement and Recognition Issues Log

Issue Log: P3 Project - Phase 2 Measurement and Recognition

ID	Brief Name	Description	Impact	Importance	Owner	Date Added	Follow up Date	Status	Close Date	Notes on Closure
Issue Number	Brief 3-5 word description of the issue	Description of the issue	Notes on this issue's impact on the project or other activities	Importance of this issue: 1-High, 2-Medium, 3-Low	Person who is responsible for evaluating and resolving this issue	Date this issue was added to this list	Date to review issue	Status of item: 1-Open, 2-In Progress, resolved 3-Closed	Date this issue was resolved	Notes or results on the resolution of this issue, such as final decision document location, results of implementing requested fix, etc
1	Balance sheet presentation and valuation (refer to next sheet: M&R Blance Sheet Approaches)	Asset and Liability recognition of P3s. What should be valued? Underlying asset or entire P3 arrangement?	This is central and key to Phase 2. Not all P3s should be treated the same so different approaches will need to be adopted.	1	Dom Savini	4/27/2022	To be decided by Board.	1		At the February 2022 Board meeting the members re-affirmed not to begin Phase 2 until we address implementation issues arising from SFFAS 49; e.g., why so few P3 disclosures and Note variability.
2	Interest in an SPE/SPV	Some P3s have either equity interests or financial interests in the partnerships. E.g., DoD's MHPI.	Practitioners such as DoD are using FASB ASC 323 Investments–Equity Method and Joint Ventures to account for its investments in LPs and LLCs engaged in MHPI projects.	1	Dom Savini	4/27/2022	To be decided by Board.	1		At the February 2022 Board meeting the members re-affirmed not to begin Phase 2 until we address implementation issues arising from SFFAS 49; e.g., why so few P3 disclosures and Note variability.
3	Single or Unitary Payments	Some vendor/operator payments may be lump sum and not readily identify construction, operator or financing costs thus adversely affecting asset measurement.		2	Dom Savini	4/27/2022	To be decided by Board.	1		At the February 2022 Board meeting the members re-affirmed not to begin Phase 2 until we address implementation issues arising from SFFAS 49; e.g., why so few P3 disclosures and Note variability.

Issue Log: P3 Project - Phase 2 Measurement and Recognition

ID	Brief Name	Description	Impact	Importance	Owner	Date Added	Follow up Date	Status	Close Date	Notes on Closure
Issue Number	Brief 3-5 word description of the issue	Description of the issue	Notes on this issue's impact on the project or other activities	Importance of this issue: 1-High, 2-Medium, 3-Low	Person who is responsible for evaluating and resolving this issue	Date this issue was added to this list	Date to review issue	Status of item: 1-Open, 2-In Progress, resolved 3-Closed	Date this issue was resolved	Notes or results on the resolution of this issue, such as final decision document location, results of implementing requested fix, etc
4	Asset Capitalization	What is the asset? Is it the underlying PP&E, the right-of-use, or is it the entire arrangement? What should be valued for balance sheet purposes?	This is a critical question that must be answered along with Issue#1 above; balance sheet recognition.	1	Dom Savini	4/27/2022	To be decided by Board.	1		At the February 2022 Board meeting the members re-affirmed not to begin Phase 2 until we address implementation issues arising from SFFAS 49; e.g., why so few P3 disclosures and Note variability.
5	Reversionary or Residual Interests	If an asset reverts back to the sponsor, what should its value be, if any on the balance sheet? Is the reversion likely, guaranteed or conditional? RE: residual interest - should this amount be adjusted each year for depreciation or recaps?	Even if rare, a reversionary or residual approach would be essential especially absent any interim reporting.	2	Dom Savini	4/27/2022	To be decided by Board.	1		At the February 2022 Board meeting the members re-affirmed not to begin Phase 2 until we address implementation issues arising from SFFAS 49; e.g., why so few P3 disclosures and Note variability.

Issue Log: P3 Project - Phase 2 Measurement and Recognition

ID	Brief Name	Description	Impact	Importance	Owner	Date Added	Follow up Date	Status	Close Date	Notes on Closure
Issue Number	Brief 3-5 word description of the issue	Description of the issue	Notes on this issue's impact on the project or other activities	Importance of this issue: 1-High, 2-Medium, 3-Low	Person who is responsible for evaluating and resolving this issue	Date this issue was added to this list	Date to review issue	Status of item: 1-Open, 2-In Progress, 3-Closed	Date this issue was resolved	Notes or results on the resolution of this issue, such as final decision document location, results of implementing requested fix, etc
6	Non-monetary exchanges	Should guidance for non-monetary exchanges be expanded?	Should the guidance at SFFAS 7 paragraph 297 be explained?	3	Dom Savini	4/27/2022	To be decided by Board.	1		At the February 2022 Board meeting the members re-affirmed not to begin Phase 2 until we address implementation issues arising from SFFAS 49; e.g., why so few P3 disclosures and Note variability.
7	In-kind Consideration (Donated assets)	Should guidance for donated assets be expanded?	Should the guidance at SFFAS 6 paragraph 30 to fair value donated assets and SFFAS 7 paragraph 361 concerning Donations of PP&E that are expensed (stewardship/heritage assets) be expanded or changed?	3	Dom Savini	4/27/2022	To be decided by Board.	1		At the February 2022 Board meeting the members re-affirmed not to begin Phase 2 until we address implementation issues arising from SFFAS 49; e.g., why so few P3 disclosures and Note variability.

Issue Log: P3 Project - Phase 2 Measurement and Recognition

ID	Brief Name	Description	Impact	Importance	Owner	Date Added	Follow up Date	Status	Close Date	Notes on Closure
Issue Number	Brief 3-5 word description of the issue	Description of the issue	Notes on this issue's impact on the project or other activities	Importance of this issue: 1-High, 2-Medium, 3-Low	Person who is responsible for evaluating and resolving this issue	Date this issue was added to this list	Date to review issue	Status of item: 1-Open, 2-In Progress, 3-Closed	Date this issue was resolved	Notes or results on the resolution of this issue, such as final decision document location, results of implementing requested fix, etc
8	Unearned Revenue	Should guidance for unearned revenue be expanded?	Should the guidance at SFFAS 7 paragraph 37 noncerning unearned revenues be expanded or changed?	3	Dom Savini	4/27/2022	To be decided by Board.	1		At the February 2022 Board meeting the members re-affirmed not to begin Phase 2 until we address implementation issues arising from SFFAS 49; e.g., why so few P3 disclosures and Note variability.

Issue Log: Balance Sheet Approaches

ID	Brief Name	Description	Impact	Importance	Owner	Date Added	Follow up Date	Status	Close Date	Notes on Closure
Unique identifier	Brief 3-5 word description of the issue	Description of the issue	Notes on this issue's impact on the project or other activities	Importance of this issue: 1-High, 2-Medium, 3-Low	Person who is responsible for evaluating and resolving this issue	Date this issue was added to this list	Date to review issue	Status of item: 1-Open, 2-In Progress, 3-Closed	Date this issue was resolved	Notes or results on the resolution of this issue, such as final decision document location, results of implementing requested fix, etc
1	Capital Asset Classification	Treat as a fee-simple acquisition	In the 1990's this was an early OMB MHPI consideration before CBO convinced OMB to treat MHPI as an Investment. Also, SFFAS 7 refers to PP&E acquisitions via exchanges @ Par. 297. Acquisition of property, plant, and equipment through exchange. Refer to TI Inquiry 2020-20 (Savini/Simms) dated 1 September 2020. DM # 875357 v1 Final TI Response 1 September 2020	1	Dom Savini	4/27/2022	To be decided by Board.	1		At the February 2022 Board meeting the members re-affirmed not to begin Phase 2 until we address implementation issues arising from SFFAS 49; e.g., why so few P3 disclosures and Note variability.
2	Capital Asset Classification	Treat as PP&E acquired through an Exchange	In the 1990's this was an early OMB MHPI consideration before CBO convinced OMB to treat MHPI as an Investment. Also, SFFAS 7 refers to PP&E acquisitions via exchanges @ Par. 297. Acquisition of property, plant, and equipment through exchange. Refer to TI Inquiry 2020-20 (Savini/Simms) dated 1 September 2020. DM # 875357 v1 Final TI Response 1 September 2020	1	Dom Savini	4/27/2022	To be decided by Board.	1		At the February 2022 Board meeting the members re-affirmed not to begin Phase 2 until we address implementation issues arising from SFFAS 49; e.g., why so few P3 disclosures and Note variability.
3	Capital Asset Classification	Treat as a leased asset acquisition	In the 1990's this was an early OMB MHPI consideration before CBO convinced OMB to treat MHPI as an Investment. Also, SFFAS 7 refers to PP&E acquisitions via exchanges @ Par. 297. Acquisition of property, plant, and equipment through exchange. Refer to TI Inquiry 2020-20 (Savini/Simms) dated 1 September 2020. DM # 875357 v1 Final TI Response 1 September 2020	1	Dom Savini	4/27/2022	To be decided by Board.	1		At the February 2022 Board meeting the members re-affirmed not to begin Phase 2 until we address implementation issues arising from SFFAS 49; e.g., why so few P3 disclosures and Note variability.

Issue Log: Balance Sheet Approaches

ID	Brief Name	Description	Impact	Importance	Owner	Date Added	Follow up Date	Status	Close Date	Notes on Closure
Unique identifier	Brief 3-5 word description of the issue	Description of the issue	Notes on this issue's impact on the project or other activities	Importance of this issue: 1-High, 2-Medium, 3-Low	Person who is responsible for evaluating and resolving this issue	Date this issue was added to this list	Date to review issue	Status of item: 1- Open, 2- In Progress, 3-Closed	Date this issue was resolved	Notes or results on the resolution of this issue, such as final decision document location, results of implementing requested fix, etc
4	Investment Asset Classification	Cost approach – initial plus future investments	In the 1990's this was an early OMB MHPI consideration before CBO convinced OMB to treat MHPI as an Investment. Also, SFFAS 7 refers to PP&E acquisitions via exchanges @ Par. 297. Acquisition of property, plant, and equipment through exchange. Refer to TI Inquiry 2020-20 (Savini/Simms) dated 1 September 2020. DM # 875357 v1 Final TI Response 1 September 2020	1	Dom Savini	4/27/2022		To be decided by Board.	1	At the February 2022 Board meeting the members re-affirmed not to begin Phase 2 until we address implementation issues arising from SFFAS 49; e.g., why so few P3 disclosures and Note variability.
5	Investment Asset Classification	Fair value approach – percentage of P3 partnership net assets	In the 1990's this was an early OMB MHPI consideration before CBO convinced OMB to treat MHPI as an Investment. Also, SFFAS 7 refers to PP&E acquisitions via exchanges @ Par. 297. Acquisition of property, plant, and equipment through exchange. Refer to TI Inquiry 2020-20 (Savini/Simms) dated 1 September 2020. DM # 875357 v1 Final TI Response 1 September 2020	1	Dom Savini	4/27/2022		To be decided by Board.	1	At the February 2022 Board meeting the members re-affirmed not to begin Phase 2 until we address implementation issues arising from SFFAS 49; e.g., why so few P3 disclosures and Note variability.

Issue Log: Balance Sheet Approaches

ID	Brief Name	Description	Impact	Importance	Owner	Date Added	Follow up Date	Status	Close Date	Notes on Closure
Unique identifier	Brief 3-5 word description of the issue	Description of the issue	Notes on this issue's impact on the project or other activities	Importance of this issue: 1-High, 2-Medium, 3-Low	Person who is responsible for evaluating and resolving this issue	Date this issue was added to this list	Date to review issue	Status of item: 1-Open, 2-In Progress, 3-Closed	Date this issue was resolved	Notes or results on the resolution of this issue, such as final decision document location, results of implementing requested fix, etc
6	Investment Asset Classification	Equity approach – adjust investment yearly for profits /losses, dividends, etc.	In the 1990's this was an early OMB MHPI consideration before CBO convinced OMB to treat MHPI as an Investment. Also, SFFAS 7 refers to PP&E acquisitions via exchanges @ Par. 297. Acquisition of property, plant, and equipment through exchange. Refer to TI Inquiry 2020-20 (Savini/Simms) dated 1 September 2020. DM # 875357 v1 Final TI Response 1 September 2020	1	Dom Savini	4/27/2022		To be decided by Board.	1	At the February 2022 Board meeting the members re-affirmed not to begin Phase 2 until we address implementation issues arising from SFFAS 49; e.g., why so few P3 disclosures and Note variability.
7	Reporting Entity Classification	Consolidation	Refer to TI Inquiry 2020-20 (Savini/Simms) dated 1 September 2020. DM # 875357 v1 Final TI Response 1 September 2020	1	Dom Savini	4/27/2022		To be decided by Board.	1	At the February 2022 Board meeting the members re-affirmed not to begin Phase 2 until we address implementation issues arising from SFFAS 49; e.g., why so few P3 disclosures and Note variability.

Issue Log: Balance Sheet Approaches

ID	Brief Name	Description	Impact	Importance	Owner	Date Added	Follow up Date	Status	Close Date	Notes on Closure
Unique identifier	Brief 3-5 word description of the issue	Description of the issue	Notes on this issue's impact on the project or other activities	Importance of this issue: 1-High, 2-Medium, 3-Low	Person who is responsible for evaluating and resolving this issue	Date this issue was added to this list	Date to review issue	Status of item: 1-Open, 2-In Progress, 3-Closed	Date this issue was resolved	Notes or results on the resolution of this issue, such as final decision document location, results of implementing requested fix, etc
8	Subsidy Classification	Net Present value of cash flows	SFFAS 2, <i>Accounting for Direct Loans and Loan Guarantees</i> , could be adapted for those P3s employing Loans and Guarantees. Would conceivably ease preparer burden.	1	Dom Savini	4/27/2022	To be decided by Board.	1		At the February 2022 Board meeting the members re-affirmed not to begin Phase 2 until we address implementation issues arising from SFFAS 49; e.g., why so few P3 disclosures and Note variability.
9	Intangible Asset Classification	GASB 51, Accounting and Financial Reporting for Intangible Assets	Employing the private partner's expertise and access to capital could be considered a "right-of-use" or "right-of-access" wherein we are borrowing our leasing their skill sets and access to financing.	1	Dom Savini	4/27/2022	To be decided by Board.	1		At the February 2022 Board meeting the members re-affirmed not to begin Phase 2 until we address implementation issues arising from SFFAS 49; e.g., why so few P3 disclosures and Note variability.

APPENDIX 2 – October Topic B Briefing Material Public-Private Partnerships: Measurement and Recognition (Topic B) dated September 29, 2023

Memorandum

P3 – Phase II

September 29, 2023

To: Members of the Board
From: Domenic N. Savini, Assistant Director
Thru: Monica R. Valentine, Executive Director
Subject: **Public-Private Partnerships: Measurement and Recognition** (Topic B)

INTRODUCTION

Public-Private Partnerships (P3s) was added to the agenda because federal agencies have increasingly turned to these risk sharing arrangements or transactions to accomplish their goals, partly in light of budget pressures. The overall objective of the project is to make the full costs of such partnerships transparent.

Project discussions began in April 2012 and resulted in the Board approving a dual-phased approach. The first phase would consist of establishing disclosure requirements, followed by measurement and recognition guidance in the second phase. Active work on this project's first phase began in FY2013 and culminated with the issuance of SFFAS 49, *Public-Private Partnerships: Disclosure Requirements*, on April 27, 2016.

At the October 2022 Board meeting, the Board agreed to form an implementation working group. Members provided an array of advice and consultation best captured and underscored by one member's question, "*What are the Board's goals and are we achieving them?*" For example, if the goal is to report risk or off-balance sheet activity, is this being done? The example of energy savings or utility contracts reported by some agencies was raised. In the end, what do these disclosures mean to the users?

The Board agreed with (1) validating and prioritizing implementation challenges (ICs) with the task force, (2) coordinating with the CFO Council as appropriate, and (3) seeking task force consultation on what types of implementation guidance they would recommend issuing. Lastly, one member noted the importance of public-private partnerships in light of recent legislative and administration efforts in dealing with major infrastructure initiatives. The member noted the importance of keeping this in mind and maintaining a forward-looking posture relative to P3 accounting and reporting.

This session's purpose is to provide an update concerning the types of implementation guidance the task force recommends issuing in accordance with the Board's October 2022 direction as noted above.

RELATED CLIPPINGS ARTICLE

TITLE: White House makes case for renewed Quantum Initiative Act

SUB-TITLE: As funding under the National Quantum Initiative Act is set to expire, OSTP official Charles Tahan outlined several priority areas for the U.S. quantum sciences ecosystem.

SOURCE: NextGov.com – JUNE 9, 2023

HYPERLINK: <https://www.nextgov.com/emerging-tech/2023/06/white-house-makes-case-renewed-quantum-initiative-act/387318/>

SUMMARY OF ARTICLE: Speaking during a House Science, Space and Technology hearing to reauthorize the National Quantum Initiative Act on the eve of its expiration, Charles Tahan, the director of the National Quantum Coordination Office at the White House's Office of Science and Technology Policy, introduced a series of new funding goals for the burgeoning U.S. quantum tech ecosystem.

- “We need to incorporate much more universities, community colleges, other places of learning and training...that means investing in infrastructure equipment, even small labs so people can be trained up,” he said.
- Tahan also emphasized the importance of maintaining international partnerships to help delegate certain research aspects across the broad QIST field, but noted that investments from the reauthorization of the NQIA will keep the U.S. competitive among the countries augmenting their state-granted QIST funding significantly.

P3 MACRO ECONOMIC UPDATE

According to a 2023 PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP TRENDS REPORT published by Husch Blackwell in March 2023¹, major infrastructure projects progressed ahead at a rate higher than other types of construction activity. Construction starts for power plants and the telecommunications grid increased 27 percent higher than 2022 and highways and bridges increased by 23 percent over 2022. Other points in the report relevant to federal SFFAS 49 reportable P3s include:

- **The Biden administration** in its October 2022 “*Action Plan for Accelerating Infrastructure*” specifically called out the use of “alternative delivery approaches” for their potential to reduce lifecycle costs and compress project timelines,

¹ <https://www.huschblackwell.com/newsandinsights/2023-public-private-partnership-trends-report>. Accessed 6 Jul 2023.

-
- **Hybrid and progressive P3s attempt to rebalance risk** - as the scope of P3 projects has widened to include social infrastructure and next-generation technologies, traditional P3 models have proven insufficient
 - **Progressive P3s attempt to compress timelines** for the evaluation and award of a P3 partner(s) by stacking the design-build, pricing, and financing diligence in a concurrent manner where the government selects a team based on qualifications and then jointly develops the P3 agreement in an iterative and dynamic process.
 - The economics of fixed-price, committed-financing projects have been impeded by the run-up in project costs, which in turn caused strains on the component agreements of P3 deals
 - In response, progressive P3s are able to adjust and to allow for a more equitable distribution of risk particularly when paired with financing options such as conduit financing (debt) which reduces interest-rate risk or lowers the cost of money.
 - **Refinancing Gains** - Given the current (higher) interest rate environment, refinancing gains which reduce debt service or financing costs require that the parties come to an agreement as to the amount, timing and split of any refinancing gains

REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK BY October 13, 2023

Please review the attached material and background information including attachments and respond to the three questions in Attachment 5 by **October 13, 2023**.

For additional information, questions, or suggestions, please contact Dom as early as possible at savinid@fasab.gov with a cc to Monica at valentinem@fasab.gov.

ATTACHMENTS

1. SFFAS 49 P3 Task Force Composition
2. SFFAS 49 P3 Training and Outreach Activity
3. Prioritizing and Proposing Solutions to the Implementation Challenges (ICs)
 - a. ICs Comparison Matrix
 - b. Preliminary Task Force Solutions to Address ICs
4. Proposed Next Steps
5. Questions for the Board

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Memorandum P3: Phase II, *Public-Private Partnerships: Measurement and Recognition* (Topic C) dated September 30, 2022

Appendix 2 – SFFAS 49: Public-Private Partnerships: Disclosure Requirements

Appendix 3 – Memorandum P3: Phase II, Public-Private Partnerships: Measurement and Recognition (Topic C) dated August 9, 2021


ATTACHMENT 1: P3 Task Force Composition

P3 Task Force Composition

We have received a fair amount of interest in this project from both federal and private communities. Thirty five people have asked to either join the Task Force or become active followers of our work. In all, we have held well over a dozen meetings which include the following three different Task Force working teams: *Team 1 – SFFAS 47 Reporting Entity*; *Team 2 – SFFAS 54 Leases*; and *Team 3 – Case Study Illustrations and Sample Note Disclosures*.


Chart 1.0 provides a break-out of the P3 Task Force Representation, whereas Chart 2.0 on the next page shows the specific professional disciplines represented on the Task Force.

Chart 1.0
P3 Task Force Representation



ATTACHMENT 1: P3 Task Force Composition

Chart 2.0
P3 Task Force Professional Disciplines



As you may recall, in order to best identify implementation challenges (ICs), the Board approved a training and outreach initiative that included:

- **Agency Outreach** - During the last calendar quarter of 2021 staff interviewed selected entities (DoD, NGIA, VA, USDA/Forest Service, Justice, Treasury, Energy, HUD/Ginnie Mae, and NASA) to obtain an understanding concerning existing policies and procedures used to identify eligible P3s for reporting and potential areas to improve SFFAS 49 implementation,
- **Pan-governmental Training** - Staff and selected task force members conducted SFFAS 49 training beginning in January 2022 and running through June 2023. Over thirteen training sessions were held attended by nearly 1000 attendees (~957) representing agency personnel from approximately 28 agencies/bureaus including Inspectors General. Written survey results as well as Question and Answer sessions identified participant challenges to implementing SFFAS 49, and
- **Subject Matter Expert Meetings** – Staff held meetings with two federal Inspectors General, a public accounting (audit) firm and two financial policy accountants to help identify challenges they see requiring attention.

What the Financial Management Community (FMC) Says Are Areas Requiring Attention

A compilation of the problematic areas derived via our training and outreach efforts include the following:

1. Applying materiality and identifying remote risks: difficulty in considering qualitative factors
2. Using contractual periods and not “expected life” criterion; that is, the failure to consider economic incentives
3. Inter-relationships between SFFAS 47, *Reporting Entity* and SFFAS 49 primarily distinguishing between their respective disclosure requirements
4. Insufficient program office involvement and lack of CFO relationships or understanding with/of program area operations
5. Concerning cash flows: (1) difficulty in quantifying estimates related to risks, (2) application of materiality, and (3) uncertainty if dollar estimates should be discounted
6. Failure in identifying overall P3 risk
7. Only focusing on reporting entity P3 risk (see related comment 6 above), and applying measurement and recognition guidance using SFFAS 5 for disclosing remote risks

8. Misinterpreting that because debt arrangements may pose less risk than equity arrangements, SFFAS 49 risk-sharing is non-existent; subjective assessments of risk make it difficult to conclude that SFFAS 49 risk exists; and lack of agency expertise and resources creates an inordinate amount of preparer burden
9. Database "flags" to identify P3s are absent; and conflating contract periods as expected life indicators.
10. CFO personnel are not involved from the beginning of the P3 award creating a lack of awareness/knowledge; and inadequate (sub) contractor access to records.
11. Need for additional agency-wide training beyond finance and accounting personnel.
12. Expand training to cover additional P3 examples (e.g., donated assets) of P3s (note: training currently covers DoD MHPI, VA medical center construction, NASA solar generation, WMATA, and IN-Q-TEL).

What the FMC Identified as Best Practices

Staff uncovered the following best-practices:

1. Agency internal SFFAS 49 training programs
2. CFO shop "brainstorming" sessions pre-identifying P3s prior to data-calls
3. Establishing SFFAS 49 inter-departmental working groups
4. Pro-active CFO shop inquiries containing spread-sheet data-fill requirements
5. Agency-wide data calls extending beyond program office inquiries to include such offices as legal counsel, facilities, public/congressional affairs, leasing, procurement, etc.
6. CFO shop P3 agreement reviews independent of bureau or program reviews or assertions
7. CFO shop review of additional memoranda such as budget justifications, leasing agreements, newsletters, etc.
8. Coordination with external auditors, IG auditors and legal counsel

ATTACHMENT 3: Prioritizing and Proposing Solutions to the ICs

In January 2023, the Task Force finalized its analysis of the ICs deemed within the Board's scope and developed a possible FASAB action plan for those ICs ranked Highest and Medium priority. A listing of the 15 ICs can be found at Attachment 3a immediately following this section. A summary of their review follows in the below Table:

Table 1.0
Highest Priority Implementation Challenges
As Ranked/Rated by Task Force

Highest Priority ICs²	Areas of Concern	Proposed FASAB Deliverable
9. Risk Assessments	<p>Qualitative assessments are extremely subjective and can lead to disagreements about fair presentation. For example, entities required to have greater risk appetites which are commonly well known and understood, have a different materiality threshold that should be considered when developing disclosures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Par. 11 and 24d (ii), Applying qualitative materiality / Remote Risks.• Par. 24d (i) and (ii) and A35, Distinguish between uncertainty and risks.	Technical Release Implementation Guidance to develop relevant Q&As and sample case studies/illustrations.

² The Lowest ranked/rated ICs are not listed in the tables given that some are (1) deemed out of the Board's scope by the Task Force - (5. *CFO Leadership and Understanding*; 10. *Resources and Expertise*; and 15. *Congressional Appropriations*) and (2) the Task Force's assessment that although some of the lowest ranked/rated ICs are worthy of consideration (14. *Exclusions*; 11. *Data Retrieval from Numerous and Disparate Data-sets*; and 12. *Access to Private Partner Data*), they are not considered as significant as the other higher ranked/rated ICs. **Please note that to the extent practical, ICs 14, 11, and 12 will be incorporated into the case study illustrations as appropriate to help ensure coverage.**

ATTACHMENT 3: Prioritizing and Proposing Solutions to the ICs

Highest Priority ICs ²	Areas of Concern	Proposed FASAB Deliverable
6. Identifying P3 Risk	<p>Paragraph 24d (ii) - clarify that although disclosure of remote risks of loss are limited to those included in the terms of the contractual P3 arrangements or transactions, this does not abrogate the need to identify the contractual risks of loss the P3 partners are undertaking.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifying P3 partner risk per paragraph 24d Entities may be unable or precluded from identifying P3 partner risk for a variety of reasons including: contractual or legal prohibitions; lack of access to information; public relations concerns. 	Technical Release Implementation Guidance to develop relevant Q&As and sample case studies/illustrations.
1. Materiality and Remote Risk	See 9.and 6 Above	See 9. And 6 Above
3. Reporting Entity and Leases	There is confusion between the relationship between SFFAS 49 and SFFAS 47, <i>Reporting Entity</i> and SFFAS 54, <i>Leases</i> . How should	Technical Release Implementation Guidance to develop relevant Q&As; a Flowchart/Decision Tree Diagram; and sample case studies/illustrations.

ATTACHMENT 3: Prioritizing and Proposing Solutions to the ICs

Highest Priority ICs ²	Areas of Concern	Proposed FASAB Deliverable
	preparers harmonize disclosures?	See related Board Member Question 2b.

Table 2.0
Medium Priority Implementation Challenges
As Ranked/Rated by Task Force

Medium Priority ICs ¹	Areas of Concern	Proposed FASAB Deliverable
8. Identifying and Understanding Risk Sharing	See 9.and 6 Above	See 9. And 6 Above
4. Cash Flow Estimates	<p>Clarify that the exception noted in paragraph 24b. is limited to that specific disclosure and should not be used for other disclosure requirements.</p> <p>Provide illustrative examples of cash flow reporting.</p>	Technical Release Implementation Guidance to develop relevant Q&As and sample case studies/illustrations.
7. Remote Risk	<p>Certain practitioners believe that the disclosure of remote risk isn't required (1) if they are unable to identify the private partner's absorption of risk and (2) because remote risk is optional as it falls under SFFAS 5, <i>Accounting for Liabilities of The Federal Government</i>. As such, they avoid complying with this requirement. However, Paragraph 24 d clearly requires the disclosure of risks, including remote,</p>	Technical Release Implementation Guidance that (1) clarifies that SFFAS 49 is a disclosure and not measurement and recognition standard and (2) helps preparers and auditors properly distinguish between Paragraph 24d requirements apart from Paragraph 24d (ii) requirements addressing remote risks.

ATTACHMENT 3: Prioritizing and Proposing Solutions to the ICs

Medium Priority ICs ¹	Areas of Concern	Proposed FASAB Deliverable
	<i>"Identification of the contractual risks of loss the P3 partners are undertaking."</i>	
2. Expected Life	<p>Using contractual periods and not "expected life" criterion and failure to consider economic incentives results in entities under-reporting P3s.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Conflating contract periods as expected life indicators.	Technical Release Implementation Guidance to develop relevant Q&As and sample case studies/illustrations.
13. Training	<p>Need for additional agency-wide training that includes other functional areas such as program offices, facilities, logistics, and operations.</p>	<p>Respond on an as-required basis by continuing our Training and Outreach.</p> <p>Task Force representatives have been asked to coordinate training requests within their agencies to ensure coverage is as broad as possible.</p>

Once the Task Force finalized its analysis of the ICs, staff formed three sub-groups or teams comprised of subject matter experts to further study and recommend technical guidance as follows:

1. Teams 1 and 2 Studied SFFAS 47 and SFFAS 54 Inter-play with P3s

- Draft Implementation Guidance to include a Q&A format and a Flowchart/Decision Tree Diagram













2. Team 3 Studied and Refined In-Process Illustrative Case Studies and Sample Note Disclosures

In consultation with external auditors and an inspector general during the Fall of 2022, staff developed sample case studies and illustrative note disclosures. Currently, the Task Force is refining this work focusing on the following ICs:





- Highest Priority - 9. Risk Assessments, 6. Identifying P3 Risk, 1. Materiality and Remote Risk, 3. Reporting Entity and Leases
- Medium Priority - 8. Identifying and Understanding Risk Sharing, 4. Cash Flow Estimates, 7. Remote Risk 2. Expected Life, 13. Training

Please note that proposed solutions to the Highest and Medium ranked ICs can be found immediately above in the Attachment 3 Tables 1.0 and 2.0 and are identified as Proposed FASAB Deliverables.









ATTACHMENT 3a: Implementation Challenges Comparison Matrix

Implementation Challenges Comparison Matrix						
Challenge	Brief Description	One-on-One Meetings	P3 Training Sessions	Auditor Interviews	Policy Office Interviews	Total 
1. Materiality and Remote Risk	Difficulty in applying materiality and identifying remote risks: difficulty in considering qualitative factors. Distinguishing between uncertainty and risks.					2
2. Expected Life	Using contractual periods and not “expected life” criterion; failure to consider economic incentives. Conflating contract periods as expected life indicators.					2
3. Reporting Entity and Leases	Inter-relationships between SFFAS 47, <i>Reporting Entity</i> and SFFAS 54, <i>Leases to</i> (1) primarily distinguish between related party disclosures and P3 disclosures and (2) know when to apply leases guidance when a lease is material to a P3.					2
4. Cash Flow Estimates	Difficulty in quantifying estimates related to risks, application of materiality (see above), and uncertainty if dollar estimates should be discounted. Clarifying that cash flow estimates are tied to risks and not to uncertainties.					2
5. CFO Leadership and Understanding	Lack of CFO relationships or understanding with/of program area operations. CFO personnel are not involved from the beginning of the P3 award creating a lack of awareness/knowledge.					1
6. Identifying P3 Risk	Failure in identifying overall P3 risk and only focusing on entity P3 risk.					2

ATTACHMENT 3a: Implementation Challenges Comparison Matrix

Implementation Challenges Comparison Matrix						
Challenge	Brief Description	One-on-One Meetings	P3 Training Sessions	Auditor Interviews	Policy Office Interviews	Total
7. Remote Risk	Applying measurement and recognition guidance using SFFAS 5 for disclosing remote risks.					1
8. Identifying and Understanding Risk Sharing	Misinterpreting that because debt arrangements may pose less risk than equity arrangements, SFFAS 49 risk-sharing is non-existent.					1
9. Risk Assessments	Subjective assessments of risk make it difficult to conclude that SFFAS 49 risk exists.					1
10. Resources and Expertise	Lack of agency expertise and resources creates an inordinate amount of preparer burden.					1

ATTACHMENT 3a: Implementation Challenges Comparison Matrix

Implementation Challenges Comparison Matrix						
challenge	Brief Description	One-on-One Meetings	P3 Training Sessions	Auditor Interviews	Policy Office Interviews	Total 
11. Data Retrieval from Numerous and disparate Data-sets	Database “flags” to identify P3s are absent.					2
12. Access to Private Partner Data	Inadequate (sub) contractor access to records.					1
13. Training	Need for additional agency-wide training beyond finance and accounting personnel.					2
14. Exclusions	Paragraph 15 exclusions are not in all cases being considered by program office personnel.					1
15. Congressional Appropriations	Concerns that risk-of-loss disclosures would require unforeseen Congressional reviews that may question an entity’s expenditures as being out-of-scope and either withdraw or not fund the activity in question.					1
Total		4	9	2	7	22

ATTACHMENT 3b: Preliminary Task Force Solutions to Address ICs

Consistent with Tables 1.0 and 2.0 above that identify Proposed FASAB Deliverables to serve as solutions to the identified ICs, the Task Force has developed a proposed implementation guidance framework that includes the following three main components:

1. **Decision Tree Flowchart** to address SFFAS 47, *Reporting Entity* and SFFAS 54, *Leases* harmonization,
2. **Sample Questions and Answers** to provide guidance for applying the accounting and financial reporting requirements for reporting entity and leases in accordance with SFFAS 47 and SFFAS 54, respectively, and
3. **Sample Case Study Illustrations and Disclosures** employing simple to complex hypothetical circumstances which demonstrate compliance with each of the SFFAS 49 disclosure requirements.

ATTACHMENT 4: Proposed Next Steps

October 2023 – December 2023

- Board reviews an overview of Task Force Technical results
- Brief AAPC as appropriate

January/February 2024 – April 2024

- Task Force Finalizes work per AAPC and Board guidance
- Staff briefs Board on Task Force results
- Board decides on how best to communicate results; e.g., SFFAS amendment; interpretation, Technical Bulletin and/or Technical Release.

May 2024 – Forward

- Issue Exposure Draft Documents(s) - Pending Board decision on how best to communicate results; i.e., Amendments, Interpretations, Technical Bulletins, Technical Releases, Training. (See Note below)

NOTE CONCERNING AMENDMENTS: Although the Board vote is final, there is a 90-day clearance for OMB and GAO to offer an objection. Additionally, if the Board decides to amend SFFAS 49, given that it relates to capital assets, the CFO Act requires a 45-day Congressional review period. Therefore, we should not anticipate release of an amending Statement before the summer of 2024.

ATTACHMENT 5: Questions for the Board

Question 1 – Does the Board generally agree with the direction and scope of the Task Force’s work thus far? If so, are there any areas Members would like to see either broadened, narrowed or changed? Are there any additional areas that the Task Force should research and study?

At the October 2022 Board meeting, the Board agreed to form an implementation working group. Members provided an array of advice and consultation best captured and underscored by one member’s question, “*What are the Board’s goals and are we achieving them?*” For example, if the goal is to report risk or off-balance sheet activity, is this being done? The example of energy savings or utility contracts reported by some agencies was raised. In the end, what do these disclosures mean to the users?

The Board agreed with (1) validating and prioritizing implementation challenges with the task force, (2) coordinating with the CFO Council as appropriate, and (3) seeking task force consultation on what types of implementation guidance they would recommend issuing. Lastly, one member noted the importance of public-private partnerships in light of recent legislative and administration efforts in dealing with major infrastructure initiatives. The member noted the importance of keeping this in mind and maintaining a forward-looking posture relative to P3 accounting and reporting.

Please note that on January 10, 2023 staff provided a high-level briefing to the CFO Council that covered (1) the Board’s overarching goal of making the full costs of P3’s transparent, (2) review of the FY2020 CFO Act and Significant Entities use of the P3 term and/or actual reporting of P3s, (3) the 15 implementation challenges, and (4) Board member observations.

Question 1 –Does the Board generally agree with the direction and scope of the Task Force’s work thus far? If so, are there any areas Members would like to see either broadened, narrowed or changed? Are there any additional areas that the Task Force should research and study?

Question 2 – Does the Board generally agree with the staff recommendations describing the proposed FASAB action plan for those ICs ranked Highest and Medium priority?

Please refer to Attachment 3, Table 1.0, page 9; Table 2.0, page 12 and the following brief synopsis of Technical Releases.

Technical Releases (TRs) (Lever C GAAP) - Per FASAB's Rules of Procedure, *"TRs provide guidance for applying existing Statements and Interpretations but may not promulgate new accounting standards."*

In short, TRs:

1. Are a lower level, third-tier GAAP,
2. Are issued by the AAPC,
3. Are reviewed by the Board and issued when a majority of the Board members do not object to its issuance,
4. May not amend existing standards or promulgate new standards.

Question 2 - Does the Board generally agree with the staff recommendations describing the proposed FASAB action plan for those ICs ranked Highest and Medium priority?

Question 3 – Are there any other issues or concerns that Members would like for staff to consider? Please note in your response what changes you would recommend be made.

Question 3 - Are there any other issues or concerns that Members would like for staff to consider? Please note in your response what changes you would recommend be made.

APPENDIXES

Appendix 1 – Measurement and Recognition Issues Log (FY22 All Staff DM# 530488)

Appendix 2 – SFFAS 49: *Public-Private Partnerships: Disclosure Requirements*

Appendix 3 – Memorandum P3: Phase II, Public-Private Partnerships: Measurement and Recognition (Topic C) dated August 9, 2021

Appendix 1 – Measurement and Recognition Issues Log

(FY22 All Staff DM# 530488)

Issue Log: P3 Project - Phase 2 Measurement and Recognition

ID	Brief Name	Description	Impact	Importance	Owner	Date Added	Follow up Date	Status	Close Date	Notes on Closure
Issue Number	Brief 3-5 word description of the issue	Description of the issue	Notes on this issue's impact on the project or other activities	Importance of this issue: 1-High, 2-Medium, 3-Low	Person who is responsible for evaluating and resolving this issue	Date this issue was added to this list	Date to review issue	Status of item: 1-Open, 2-In Progress, resolved 3-Closed	Date this issue was resolved	Notes or results on the resolution of this issue, such as final decision document location, results of implementing requested fix, etc
1	Balance sheet presentation and valuation (refer to next sheet: M&R Blance Sheet Approaches)	Asset and Liability recognition of P3s. What should be valued? Underlying asset or entire P3 arrangement?	This is central and key to Phase 2. Not all P3s should be treated the same so different approaches will need to be adopted.	1	Dom Savini	4/27/2022	To be decided by Board.	1		At the February 2022 Board meeting the members re-affirmed not to begin Phase 2 until we address implementation issues arising from SFFAS 49; e.g., why so few P3 disclosures and Note variability.
2	Interest in an SPE/SPV	Some P3s have either equity interests or financial interests in the partnerships. E.g., DoD's MHPI.	Practitioners such as DoD are using FASB ASC 323 Investments–Equity Method and Joint Ventures to account for its investments in LPs and LLCs engaged in MHPI projects.	1	Dom Savini	4/27/2022	To be decided by Board.	1		At the February 2022 Board meeting the members re-affirmed not to begin Phase 2 until we address implementation issues arising from SFFAS 49; e.g., why so few P3 disclosures and Note variability.
3	Single or Unitary Payments	Some vendor/operator payments may be lump sum and not readily identify construction, operator or financing costs thus adversely affecting asset measurement.		2	Dom Savini	4/27/2022	To be decided by Board.	1		At the February 2022 Board meeting the members re-affirmed not to begin Phase 2 until we address implementation issues arising from SFFAS 49; e.g., why so few P3 disclosures and Note variability.

Issue Log: P3 Project - Phase 2 Measurement and Recognition

ID	Brief Name	Description	Impact	Importance	Owner	Date Added	Follow up Date	Status	Close Date	Notes on Closure
Issue Number	Brief 3-5 word description of the issue	Description of the issue	Notes on this issue's impact on the project or other activities	Importance of this issue: 1-High, 2-Medium, 3-Low	Person who is responsible for evaluating and resolving this issue	Date this issue was added to this list	Date to review issue	Status of item: 1-Open, 2-In Progress, 3-Closed	Date this issue was resolved	Notes or results on the resolution of this issue, such as final decision document location, results of implementing requested fix, etc
4	Asset Capitalization	What is the asset? Is it the underlying PP&E, the right-of-use, or is it the entire arrangement? What should be valued for balance sheet purposes?	This is a critical question that must be answered along with Issue#1 above; balance sheet recognition.	1	Dom Savini	4/27/2022	To be decided by Board.	1		At the February 2022 Board meeting the members re-affirmed not to begin Phase 2 until we address implementation issues arising from SFFAS 49; e.g., why so few P3 disclosures and Note variability.
5	Reversionary or Residual Interests	If an asset reverts back to the sponsor, what should its value be, if any on the balance sheet? Is the reversion likely, guaranteed or conditional? RE: residual interest - should this amount be adjusted each year for depreciation or recaps?	Even if rare, a reversionary or residual approach would be essential especially absent any interim reporting.	2	Dom Savini	4/27/2022	To be decided by Board.	1		At the February 2022 Board meeting the members re-affirmed not to begin Phase 2 until we address implementation issues arising from SFFAS 49; e.g., why so few P3 disclosures and Note variability.

Issue Log: P3 Project - Phase 2 Measurement and Recognition

ID	Brief Name	Description	Impact	Importance	Owner	Date Added	Follow up Date	Status	Close Date	Notes on Closure
Issue Number	Brief 3-5 word description of the issue	Description of the issue	Notes on this issue's impact on the project or other activities	Importance of this issue: 1-High, 2-Medium, 3-Low	Person who is responsible for evaluating and resolving this issue	Date this issue was added to this list	Date to review issue	Status of item: 1-Open, 2-In Progress, 3-Closed	Date this issue was resolved	Notes or results on the resolution of this issue, such as final decision document location, results of implementing requested fix, etc
6	Non-monetary exchanges	Should guidance for non-monetary exchanges be expanded?	Should the guidance at SFFAS 7 paragraph 297 be expanded?	3	Dom Savini	4/27/2022	To be decided by Board.	1		At the February 2022 Board meeting the members re-affirmed not to begin Phase 2 until we address implementation issues arising from SFFAS 49; e.g., why so few P3 disclosures and Note variability.
7	In-kind Consideration (Donated assets)	Should guidance for donated assets be expanded?	Should the guidance at SFFAS 6 paragraph 30 to fair value donated assets and SFFAS 7 paragraph 361 concerning Donations of PP&E that are expensed (stewardship/heritage assets) be expanded or changed?	3	Dom Savini	4/27/2022	To be decided by Board.	1		At the February 2022 Board meeting the members re-affirmed not to begin Phase 2 until we address implementation issues arising from SFFAS 49; e.g., why so few P3 disclosures and Note variability.

Issue Log: P3 Project - Phase 2 Measurement and Recognition

ID	Brief Name	Description	Impact	Importance	Owner	Date Added	Follow up Dat	Status	Close Date	Notes on Closure
Issue Number	Brief 3-5 word description of the issue	Description of the issue	Notes on this issue's impact on the project or other activities	Importance of this issue: 1-High, 2-Medium, 3-Low	Person who is responsible for evaluating and resolving this issue	Date this issue was added to this list	Date to review issue	Status of item: 1-Open, 2-In Progress, 3-Closed	Date this issue was resolved	Notes or results on the resolution of this issue, such as final decision document location, results of implementing requested fix, etc
8	Unearned Revenue	Should guidance for unearned revenue be expanded?	Should the guidance at SFFAS 7 paragraph 37 noncerning unearned revenues be expanded or changed?	3	Dom Savini	4/27/2022	To be decided by Board.	1		At the February 2022 Board meeting the members re-affirmed not to begin Phase 2 until we address implementation issues arising from SFFAS 49; e.g., why so few P3 disclosures and Note variability.

Issue Log: Balance Sheet Approaches

ID	Brief Name	Description	Impact	Importance	Owner	Date Added	Follow up Date	Status	Close Date	Notes on Closure
Unique identifier	Brief 3-5 word description of the issue	Description of the issue	Notes on this issue's impact on the project or other activities	Importance of this issue: 1-High, 2-Medium, 3-Low	Person who is responsible for evaluating and resolving this issue	Date this issue was added to this list	Date to review issue	Status of item: 1-Open, 2-In Progress, 3-Closed	Date this issue was resolved	Notes or results on the resolution of this issue, such as final decision document location, results of implementing requested fix, etc
1	Capital Asset Classification	Treat as a fee-simple acquisition	In the 1990's this was an early OMB MHPI consideration before CBO convinced OMB to treat MHPI as an Investment. Also, SFFAS 7 refers to PP&E acquisitions via exchanges @ Par. 297. Acquisition of property, plant, and equipment through exchange. Refer to TI Inquiry 2020-20 (Savini/Simms) dated 1 September 2020. DM # 875357 v1 Final TI Response 1 September 2020	1	Dom Savini	4/27/2022	To be decided by Board.	1		At the February 2022 Board meeting the members re-affirmed not to begin Phase 2 until we address implementation issues arising from SFFAS 49; e.g., why so few P3 disclosures and Note variability.
2	Capital Asset Classification	Treat as PP&E acquired through an Exchange	In the 1990's this was an early OMB MHPI consideration before CBO convinced OMB to treat MHPI as an Investment. Also, SFFAS 7 refers to PP&E acquisitions via exchanges @ Par. 297. Acquisition of property, plant, and equipment through exchange. Refer to TI Inquiry 2020-20 (Savini/Simms) dated 1 September 2020. DM # 875357 v1 Final TI Response 1 September 2020	1	Dom Savini	4/27/2022	To be decided by Board.	1		At the February 2022 Board meeting the members re-affirmed not to begin Phase 2 until we address implementation issues arising from SFFAS 49; e.g., why so few P3 disclosures and Note variability.
3	Capital Asset Classification	Treat as a leased asset acquisition	In the 1990's this was an early OMB MHPI consideration before CBO convinced OMB to treat MHPI as an Investment. Also, SFFAS 7 refers to PP&E acquisitions via exchanges @ Par. 297. Acquisition of property, plant, and equipment through exchange. Refer to TI Inquiry 2020-20 (Savini/Simms) dated 1 September 2020. DM # 875357 v1 Final TI Response 1 September 2020	1	Dom Savini	4/27/2022	To be decided by Board.	1		At the February 2022 Board meeting the members re-affirmed not to begin Phase 2 until we address implementation issues arising from SFFAS 49; e.g., why so few P3 disclosures and Note variability.

Issue Log: Balance Sheet Approaches

ID	Brief Name	Description	Impact	Importance	Owner	Date Added	Follow up Date	Status	Close Date	Notes on Closure
Unique identifier	Brief 3-5 word description of the issue	Description of the issue	Notes on this issue's impact on the project or other activities	Importance of this issue: 1-High, 2-Medium, 3-Low	Person who is responsible for evaluating and resolving this issue	Date this issue was added to this list	Date to review issue	Status of item: 1-Open, 2-In Progress, 3-Closed	Date this issue was resolved	Notes or results on the resolution of this issue, such as final decision document location, results of implementing requested fix, etc
4	Investment Asset Classification	Cost approach – initial plus future investments	In the 1990's this was an early OMB MHPI consideration before CBO convinced OMB to treat MHPI as an Investment. Also, SFFAS 7 refers to PP&E acquisitions via exchanges @ Par. 297. Acquisition of property, plant, and equipment through exchange. Refer to TI Inquiry 2020-20 (Savini/Simms) dated 1 September 2020. DM # 875357 v1 Final TI Response 1 September 2020	1	Dom Savini	4/27/2022		To be decided by Board.	1	At the February 2022 Board meeting the members re-affirmed not to begin Phase 2 until we address implementation issues arising from SFFAS 49; e.g., why so few P3 disclosures and Note variability.
5	Investment Asset Classification	Fair value approach – percentage of P3 partnership net assets	In the 1990's this was an early OMB MHPI consideration before CBO convinced OMB to treat MHPI as an Investment. Also, SFFAS 7 refers to PP&E acquisitions via exchanges @ Par. 297. Acquisition of property, plant, and equipment through exchange. Refer to TI Inquiry 2020-20 (Savini/Simms) dated 1 September 2020. DM # 875357 v1 Final TI Response 1 September 2020	1	Dom Savini	4/27/2022		To be decided by Board.	1	At the February 2022 Board meeting the members re-affirmed not to begin Phase 2 until we address implementation issues arising from SFFAS 49; e.g., why so few P3 disclosures and Note variability.

Issue Log: Balance Sheet Approaches

ID	Brief Name	Description	Impact	Importance	Owner	Date Added	Follow up Date	Status	Close Date	Notes on Closure
Unique identifier	Brief 3-5 word description of the issue	Description of the issue	Notes on this issue's impact on the project or other activities	Importance of this issue: 1-High, 2-Medium, 3-Low	Person who is responsible for evaluating and resolving this issue	Date this issue was added to this list	Date to review issue	Status of item: 1-Open, 2-In Progress, 3-Closed	Date this issue was resolved	Notes or results on the resolution of this issue, such as final decision document location, results of implementing requested fix, etc
6	Investment Asset Classification	Equity approach – adjust investment yearly for profits /losses, dividends, etc.	In the 1990's this was an early OMB MHPI consideration before CBO convinced OMB to treat MHPI as an Investment. Also, SFFAS 7 refers to PP&E acquisitions via exchanges @ Par. 297. Acquisition of property, plant, and equipment through exchange. Refer to TI Inquiry 2020-20 (Savini/Simms) dated 1 September 2020. DM # 875357 v1 Final TI Response 1 September 2020	1	Dom Savini	4/27/2022		To be decided by Board.	1	At the February 2022 Board meeting the members re-affirmed not to begin Phase 2 until we address implementation issues arising from SFFAS 49; e.g., why so few P3 disclosures and Note variability.
7	Reporting Entity Classification	Consolidation	Refer to TI Inquiry 2020-20 (Savini/Simms) dated 1 September 2020. DM # 875357 v1 Final TI Response 1 September 2020	1	Dom Savini	4/27/2022		To be decided by Board.	1	At the February 2022 Board meeting the members re-affirmed not to begin Phase 2 until we address implementation issues arising from SFFAS 49; e.g., why so few P3 disclosures and Note variability.

Issue Log: Balance Sheet Approaches

ID	Brief Name	Description	Impact	Importance	Owner	Date Added	Follow up Date	Status	Close Date	Notes on Closure
Unique identifier	Brief 3-5 word description of the issue	Description of the issue	Notes on this issue's impact on the project or other activities	Importance of this issue: 1-High, 2-Medium, 3-Low	Person who is responsible for evaluating and resolving this issue	Date this issue was added to this list	Date to review issue	Status of item: 1-Open, 2-In Progress, 3-Closed	Date this issue was resolved	Notes or results on the resolution of this issue, such as final decision document location, results of implementing requested fix, etc
8	Subsidy Classification	Net Present value of cash flows	SFFAS 2, <i>Accounting for Direct Loans and Loan Guarantees</i> , could be adapted for those P3s employing Loans and Guarantees. Would conceivably ease preparer burden.	1	Dom Savini	4/27/2022	To be decided by Board.	1		At the February 2022 Board meeting the members re-affirmed not to begin Phase 2 until we address implementation issues arising from SFFAS 49; e.g., why so few P3 disclosures and Note variability.
9	Intangible Asset Classification	GASB 51, Accounting and Financial Reporting for Intangible Assets	Employing the private partner's expertise and access to capital could be considered a "right-of-use" or "right-of-access" wherein we are borrowing our leasing their skill sets and access to financing.	1	Dom Savini	4/27/2022	To be decided by Board.	1		At the February 2022 Board meeting the members re-affirmed not to begin Phase 2 until we address implementation issues arising from SFFAS 49; e.g., why so few P3 disclosures and Note variability.

Appendix 2 – SFFAS 49: *Public-Private Partnerships: Disclosure Requirements*



Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board

PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS

Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards 49

April 27, 2016

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, 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.

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
Mail stop 6H19
Washington, DC 20548
Telephone 202-512-7350
FAX – 202-512-7366
www.fasab.gov

SUMMARY

This Statement establishes principles to ensure that disclosures about Public-Private Partnerships (P3s) are presented in the reporting entity's general purpose federal financial reports (GPFFRs). The principles guide financial reporting by establishing a P3 definition and identifying risk-based characteristics that need to exist before considering the P3 arrangement or transaction for disclosure.

This Statement exempts certain arrangements or transactions from the P3 disclosure requirements contained herein. Such exempt arrangements or transactions are subject to existing disclosure requirements in other Statements of Federal Financial Accounting Standards (SFFAS) applicable to such arrangements or transactions.

This Statement provides for first determining those arrangements or transactions that are exempt from the provisions of this Statement before proceeding to the P3 definition. Federal P3s are defined as “risk-sharing¹ arrangements or transactions lasting more than five years between public and private sector entities.” Arrangements or transactions meeting the P3 definition are then evaluated against risk-based characteristics referred to as “Conclusive Characteristics.” Should the arrangement or transaction not meet any one of the Conclusive Characteristics required for disclosure, the arrangement or transaction should then be evaluated against the “Suggestive Characteristics” before concluding whether disclosure is required. If an arrangement or transaction warrants reporting, the disclosures should be provided.

Disclosure requirements comprise quantitative and qualitative information to assist users in understanding the nature of P3s such as the relative benefits/revenues being received in exchange for the government's consideration, the contractual terms governing payments to and from the government, and related risks including those deemed remote. Disclosures can be provided by individual P3 or summarized; for example, by an entity's strategic objectives, departmental or bureau categorizations, or program budget classifications.

This Statement helps achieve the operating performance and budgetary integrity objectives outlined in Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Concepts (SFFAC) 1, *Objectives of Federal Financial Reporting*, by making P3s more understandable. P3 information is important to meeting these objectives because the federal government is accountable to citizens for the proper administration of its resources. Moreover, because P3s are a form of investment, they should be adequately disclosed in order to assist report users in determining: (a) the important assets of the U.S. government and how effectively they are being managed and (b) the identification of risks.

This Statement is effective for periods beginning after September 30, 2018. Earlier implementation is permitted.

¹ Risk-sharing exists when a public sector entity shares risks and rewards with a private sector entity whenever the benefits of the arrangement or transaction accrue to both the private sector entity and the public sector entity and (1) the public sector entity is at risk of loss, or (2) the private sector entity's ability to perform is at risk and success of the arrangement or transaction depends upon the public sector's intervention.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary	3
Introduction.....	5
Standards	8
Scope.....	8
Definition.....	9
Identification of P3's Requiring Disclosure	10
Disclosure Requirements.....	14
Effective Date.....	16
Appendix A: Basis for Conclusions	17
Appendix B: Flowchart.....	33
Appendix C: Abbreviations	34
Appendix D: Glossary	35

INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE

1. To meet challenges such as those brought about by limited budgetary resources governments are increasingly establishing risk-sharing arrangements or transactions² with the private sector. Some of these arrangements or transactions may also involve private financing and enable governmental agencies to fulfill their missions to their constituents that would otherwise not be possible without such arrangements or transactions.
2. These risk-sharing arrangements or transactions are commonly referred to as **Public-Private Partnerships (P3s)**³ but may also be referred to as Alternative Financing Arrangements, or Privatization Initiatives, some of which are extremely complex. For example, P3s may involve the use of appropriated funds, non-appropriated funds, third-party financing, or significant amounts of private capital or investment. Furthermore, P3s can (1) be so long-term in nature that costs along with the accompanying benefits may not be distributed equitably across generations, (2) exclude contractual protections afforded the government by the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) such as, but not limited to: termination rights and obligations, contract by negotiation, cost accounting administration, and contract cost allowability, and (3) require the government to provide resources or absorb losses greater than other alternative procurement methods or competing in-house⁴ performance. Lastly, P3s may involve the transfer of government assets, including intellectual property, into private hands for extended periods of time.
3. As a result, the Board recognizes that the accounting and reporting issues related to risk-sharing can also be extremely complex, involving a wide array of assets and liabilities. P3s by their very design transfer or share various forms of risk among the P3 partners. Such risk allocation strategies are in essence the very incentives that serve as the foundation or building blocks for P3s. Therefore, an entity should understand how much (total) risk resides in an arrangement or transaction and how much of that risk has been (1) transferred to the private partner, (2) shared with the private partner, and (3) retained by the entity (that is, the government sponsor). Such an understanding relies on a thorough analysis of the underlying contractual agreements, guarantees, insurance, and indemnification strategies as well as the existence and nature of any underlying private party capital buffer that might exist; that is, the extent of any debt (for example, bonds, loans and notes) and equity (for

² Risk-sharing can be either structural or transactional. P3 Structural Arrangements are external to the government entity's operations and often involve the creation of a Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV), Trust, or Limited Partnership (LP). For example, military base housing. P3 Transactional Arrangements are internal to the government entity's operations. For example, work-share programs not involving the creation of a SPV, Trust, or LP.

³ Terms defined in the Glossary are shown in bold-face the first time they appear.

⁴ In-house refers to using government facilities and personnel as opposed to relying on commercial sources to supply the products and services the government needs.

example, stocks, and other securities representing an ownership interest) participation.

4. Entities can execute P3s via **structural arrangements** through the use of **special purpose vehicles (SPV's)** and/or directly as **program transactional arrangements**. Furthermore, many P3s are either discrete (long-term) leases or involve aspects of leasing.
5. The Board has previously addressed various types of long-term arrangements or transactions in which the government participates (for example, leases or guarantees). As such, accounting standards exist that provide for recognition and measurement of assets/liabilities and revenues/expenses as well as disclosures of certain risks in these long-standing types of arrangements or transactions. This Statement supplements existing guidance to help ensure adequate disclosure of those arrangements/transactions that either form the basis of or are part of a P3. Therefore, existing accounting standards that govern the various types of long-term arrangements/transactions continue to apply.
6. To that end, the Board notes that there are risks associated with P3s. For example, risks (1) where actual costs will be greater than budgeted costs, (2) the entity may have to absorb part or all of the project's private debt, (3) the entity will not achieve expected returns on its investments in limited partnerships, (4) conditions may lead to a government-acknowledged event where an entity assumes financial responsibility for the event, and (5) the public purpose or public value will not be fulfilled or achieved. Because of the risks involved in entering into such long-term agreements, some of which involve government assets, specific disclosures regarding P3s are needed. Such disclosures foster accountability and improve understanding of (1) the general risks inherent in P3 arrangements by revealing their purpose, objective, funding, operational and financial structures; and (2) contractual risks of loss such as early termination requirements. Disclosures should generally accompany the related asset and/or liability display contained within the financial statements.
7. A contingency is an existing condition, situation, or set of circumstances involving uncertainty as to possible gain or loss to an entity. Some risks associated with P3s may result in the incurrence of losses and applying Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards 5 (SFFAS 5): *Accounting for Liabilities of the Federal Government* would be appropriate. For recognition of losses, SFFAS 5 requires that a past event has occurred for which a future outflow or other sacrifice of resources is probable and measurable. Disclosure should be provided for reasonably possible losses and probable losses that are not measureable.
8. Due to their very nature, P3s are used to manage risks, some of which may be risks of loss included in the terms of the contractual P3 arrangements or transactions that are deemed remote but are nonetheless material and may require disclosure. For example, excluding contractual protections afforded the government by the FAR⁵ inherently increases the entity's risk as does a

⁵ For example, contractual protections afforded the government by the FAR include but are not limited to: termination rights and obligations, contract by negotiation, cost accounting administration, and contract cost allowability.

relationship with an industry or private partner that may require the government to provide resources or absorb losses beyond what was contemplated. It is the Board's opinion that remote risks of loss included in the terms of the contractual P3 arrangements or transactions that are material should be disclosed. Therefore, consideration should be given to those risks that management does not expect to be likely yet could represent a risk of loss to the entity. With this being said, the Board also recognizes that (1) certain remote risks may have a reasonably high materiality threshold and (2) not all individual remote risks in a P3 arrangement or transaction need to be disclosed to satisfy the requirements of this Statement. As such, remote risks should not be dismissed from disclosure without further consideration of user needs and the qualitative and quantitative characteristics when applying materiality.

9. Disclosures comprise quantitative and qualitative information and not all P3 risks can be readily or sufficiently measured. However, federal financial reports are most likely to meet reporting objectives and, therefore, user's needs when disclosures help readers understand complex arrangements or transactions and the associated risk. To this end, qualitative disclosures are as important as quantitative disclosures. Further, both quantitative and qualitative factors should be considered in assessing materiality as well as the nature and content of information to be disclosed.
10. Because the Board has identified the need for clarity with respect to questions that arise concerning the full costs including risk of these complex arrangements or transactions, this Statement is a first step toward developing principles-based guidance and identifying potential gaps in existing guidance. The Board is working and will continue to work closely with stakeholders interested in improving the accounting and reporting of these complex arrangements or transactions. By addressing disclosure issues as a first step, the Board will facilitate continued cooperation and greater interest in identifying areas requiring attention while minimizing preparer burden. It should be noted that the Board also plans to address measurement, recognition, and reporting issues through continued consultation with stakeholders. This could lead to the issuance of additional guidance.

MATERIALITY

11. The provisions of this Statement need not be applied to immaterial items. However, materiality should be applied cumulatively or in the aggregate by the entity. 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. Refer to paragraphs 8 and 9 above for related comments.

STANDARDS

SCOPE

12. This Statement applies to federal entities that present general purpose federal financial reports, including the consolidated financial report of the U.S. Government (CFR), in conformance with generally accepted accounting principles, 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*.
13. This Statement is applicable to public-private partnerships (P3s) and this term is used to refer to a wide variety of service, management, operating, and research and development arrangements or transactions meeting the definition of P3s presented in paragraphs 16 through 18.⁶ Such arrangements and transactions may include contracts, grants, reimbursable agreements, alternative financing arrangements, privatization initiatives, and other arrangements or transactions.
14. Some P3s can result in risk of loss and therefore should be assessed against the risk based (conclusive and suggestive) characteristics at paragraphs 20 and 21 to identify those that should be disclosed.
15. The following arrangements and transactions are not subject to the provisions of this Statement:
 - a. Non-lease acquisitions of property, plant, and equipment (PP&E) that are subject to the Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) and the private entity is not directly financing, operating, or maintaining the PP&E as part of an overall risk-sharing arrangement or transaction
 - b. Leases⁷ that are not bundled⁸ and are entered into using General Services Administration (GSA)-delegated authority (This Statement does not amend

⁶ For purposes of this Statement, the private sector refers to individuals and entities acting in their private capacities outside of the authority and control of federal, state, or local governments and encompasses for-profit businesses and non-profit organizations that are outside of the authority and control of federal, state or local governments.

⁷ The term leases includes enhanced use leases and both capital and operating leases, as defined under current FASAB standards.

⁸ A bundled lease typically arises when parties to a leasing arrangement agree to include additional products or services in the leasing arrangement, some of which might be related or tied directly to the underlying leased product or services (for example, software updates or maintenance). Although these additional products or services are not always expressly identified in the underlying lease agreement and may be documented in other agreements, they are nonetheless considered “bundled” with the underlying lease agreement.

existing standards applicable to leases and those standards remain applicable to all such arrangements/transactions.)

- c. Acquisition of supplies and services, including construction, research and development, and commercial items, made pursuant to the FAR *Simplified Acquisition Procedures* (FAR Part 13)
- d. Formal and informal arrangements or transactions that do not share risks or rewards and are solely designed to foster goodwill, encourage economic development, promote research and innovation, or coordinate and integrate strategic initiatives
- e. Grants to state, local, and Indian tribal governments and other public institutions and arrangements or transactions with foreign governments
- f. Arrangements or transactions in which private entities voluntarily contribute nominal resources or provide incidental resources without expectation of compensation or government indemnification for any possible risk of loss

DEFINITION

- 16. Subject to the exclusions noted in paragraph 15 and for the purposes of this Statement, federal public-private partnerships (P3s) are risk-sharing⁹ arrangements or transactions with expected lives greater than five years between public and private sector entities. Such arrangements or transactions provide a service or an asset for government and/or general public use where in addition to the sharing of resources, each party shares in the risks and rewards of said arrangements or transactions.
- 17. A public sector entity shares risks and rewards with a private sector entity whenever the benefits of the arrangement or transaction accrue to both the private sector entity and the public sector entity and (1) the public sector entity is at risk of loss, or (2) the private sector entity's ability to perform is at risk and success of the arrangement or transaction depends upon the public sector's intervention.
- 18. The expected life of a P3 is the term or period for which the entity, including consideration of economic incentives, is likely to participate in the P3. The expected life is initially determined at the inception of the P3 arrangement when the economic incentives are identified and considered in the formation of the P3. Economic incentives considered may include expected significantly reduced costs or increased efficiencies if contracts are renewed or if the P3 approach is continued realization of return on investment, continuity of mission critical services, flexibility, and significant

⁹ Risk-sharing can be either structural or transactional. P3 Structural Arrangements are external to the government entity's operations and often involve the creation of a Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV), Trust, or Limited Partnership (LP); for example, military base housing. P3 Transactional Arrangements are internal to the government entity's operations; for example, work-share programs not involving the creation of a SPV, Trust, or LP.

costs associated with nonrenewal, such as required payments at the end of the contract to compensate the private party for significant capital investments. Typically, expected life is documented in budget justifications, cost benefit or value for money analyses, or other analyses. Expected life may extend beyond the current contract period (including options or renewals). Expected life is re-evaluated as P3 contracts are renewed and when the entity identifies significant changes in circumstances during the contract period that may affect the expected life.¹⁰

19. Arrangements or transactions which are not excluded by paragraph 15 and meet the definition in paragraphs 16 through 18 should be assessed against the risk based characteristics in paragraphs 20 and 21.

IDENTIFICATION OF P3'S REQUIRING DISCLOSURE

20. The following risk characteristics are conclusive evidence that P3s possess risk of loss indicating that disclosures should be provided. If any one of the following conclusive risk characteristics is met, the P3 arrangement or transaction should be disclosed.

Conclusive Risk Characteristics	Risk Rationale ¹¹
1. The arrangement or transaction results in the conveyance or creation of a long-lived asset or long-term financing ¹² liability.	Not all P3s result in the conveyance or construction of an asset. However, in those that do, the government's risk may be significantly increased because of costs that accompany asset ownership or control. Further, financing may be provided in whole or shared in part by private sector entities. Note that some private partners may incur substantial financing liabilities in preparation for delivering services even if an asset is not created.
2. The federal entity participates in, helps sponsor, or is party to a Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV), partnership, trust, and other such arrangements.	Entities such as SPVs, partnerships, trusts, and other such arrangements can be established for a variety of strategic and/or tactical reasons. Generally speaking, they are commonly considered risk-containment vehicles and are more often than not, purposefully not included in

¹⁰ The Basis for Conclusions (BFC) paragraph A41 provides examples regarding determination of a P3's expected life.

¹¹ The rationale presented herein explains why the Board believes there is or may be risk of loss when the characteristic is present. The rationale discusses risk broadly and is not intended to create specific disclosure requirements. The disclosures are articulated in paragraph 23. Please refer to BFC paragraphs A37 through A44 for related comments.

¹² Contractors routinely finance operations while awaiting payment of invoices. Such routine financing is not indicative of a P3 in and of itself.

Conclusive Risk Characteristics	Risk Rationale ¹¹
	<p>budgets or balance sheets. P3s employing SPVs, partnerships, trusts, and other such arrangements can be or most often become borrowing arrangements/transactions or alternative financing mechanisms. Therefore, the risk rests in the fact that because SPVs, partnerships, trusts, and other such arrangements can facilitate funding/financing, an agency's explicit or implicit long-term debt or promise to pay the established entity is not appropriately recognized in either budget or financial reports.</p>
<p>3. The arrangement or transaction covers a significant portion of the economic life of a project or asset.</p>	<p>Those P3 procurement or contract arrangements/transactions that cover a significant portion of the economic life of a project or asset pose greater risk to the federal entity because there is often no re-procurement or re-negotiation opportunity for the agency. As a result, changed conditions that could warrant a fair and reasonable re-negotiation or re-competition cannot be exercised and increased costs that would otherwise be avoided are incurred for the duration of the arrangement/transaction.</p>
<p>4. The principal arrangement or transaction is exempt from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. if a contract, the FAR; or b. if a grant, Office of Management and Budget (OMB) requirements (2 C.F.R. Title 2, Part 200). 	<p>The FAR for contracts and OMB requirements for grants govern the administrative framework and include procurement, accounting, and legal requirements to help safeguard taxpayer dollars. Therefore, those P3s exempt from such requirements are at an increased-risk because well-established safeguards and contract resolution mechanisms are absent.</p>

21. The following risk characteristics are evidence that P3s may possess risk of loss and require disclosure. The following suggestive risk characteristics should be considered in the aggregate. Each suggestive risk characteristic will require entity judgment as each characteristic is analyzed in connection with the other suggestive risk characteristics.

Suggestive Risk Characteristics	Risk Rationale ¹¹
1. A Value for Money ¹³ (VfM) analysis is performed.	The term VfM is commonly used in connection with P3 arrangements or transactions. VfM analyses are broader in scope emphasizing qualitative factors, as opposed to the more traditional quantitatively based cost-benefit analyses most often performed. If an entity conducts a VfM analysis it may indicate that the project in question is a P3. VfM's are typically more subjective than traditional cost-benefit analyses and are sometimes prepared ex-post facto, thus increasing potential risk to the agency.
2. The consideration or items given up in an arrangement/transaction or their value are not readily apparent.	Generally under common law, consideration from both parties is required in order to have what constitutes a binding contract. Some courts have ruled that in those cases where the exchange appears excessively one sided, no quid-pro-quo exists and the contract may be void by law. Therefore, in those cases where consideration or its value from either party is not readily apparent, such cases could lead to recourse or remedies that have adverse financial ramifications to the agency.
3. Significant work force duties, activities, or knowledge are cross-shared between public and private sector P3 parties.	As federal entities face under-utilization and skill retention issues, with Congressional approval, some entities are entering into P3 arrangements/transactions to put both infrastructure and government personnel to

¹³ In its publication "The Value for Money Analysis: A Guide for More Effective PSC and PPP Evaluation," the National Council of Public Private Partnerships adopted the United Kingdom's, Her Majesty's Treasury Value for Money definition as contained in Her Majesty's Value Assessment Guide:

VfM is defined as the optimum combination of whole-of-life costs and quality (or fitness for purpose) of the good or service to meet the user's requirement. VfM is not the choice of goods and services based on the lowest cost bid. To undertake a well-managed procurement, it is necessary to consider upfront, and at the earliest stage of procurement, what the key drivers of VfM in the procurement process will be.

Suggestive Risk Characteristics	Risk Rationale ¹¹
	<p>heightened work. However, there is a concern that the analyses used to justify these arrangements or transactions often exclude government personnel costs, including associated legacy costs (for example, pension and OPEB). Therefore, increased risk exists in those cases where such costs are excluded from cost-benefit or VfM analyses because the government (1) is left absorbing these costs with no related activity base, (2) is exposed to potential liabilities arising from union and/or employee litigation, and (3) may lose governmental skill-sets that would lead to costlier procurement options.</p>
<p>4. The focus is more on collaboration and informal, real-time, resolution processes than on formal, contractual, administrative processes.</p>	<p>Due to their very nature, P3 arrangements or transactions involve risk-sharing and in some cases, issues such as contract disputes are resolved informally. However, such informal resolution processes could lead to potential liability when contracting, procurement, or legal personnel are not involved. Therefore, the risk rests in the potential liability arising from informal resolution of what otherwise would require more formal contractual administrative processes.</p>
<p>5. The government relies on either the private sector partner's or a third party's determination of a P3's performance or return on investment/equity without performing its own verification of performance or return on investment/equity.</p>	<p>Agencies often rely on 3rd party experts to assist in performing various types of analyses. It has been noted that conflicts of interest often exist because there are only a few firms who practice in this highly sophisticated area. As a result, some firms have provided advisory services to both the private partner and government sponsor of a P3 arrangement/transaction. In addition, fees are often based on the dollar volume of the arrangement/transaction creating what some believe are self-serving incentives. Therefore, the risk in those P3 arrangements/transactions rests where an agency does not or cannot perform its own independent analysis, thus relying solely on either the private partner or a third party determination of a P3's performance or return on investment/equity without performing its own verification. Such analyses may belie the significant risk the government has or will incur.</p>

DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS

COMPONENT REPORTING ENTITY DISCLOSURES

22. The P3 disclosures at paragraph 24 below specify the inclusion of qualitative and quantitative information and may be aggregated or grouped by an entity's strategic objectives, departmental or bureau categorizations, program budget classifications, or other means.
23. Disclosures should generally accompany the related asset and/or liability display contained within the financial statements. Depending on the circumstances, some of the required information may be disclosed due to other requirements. The resultant disclosures should be integrated so that concise, meaningful, and transparent information is provided and information is not repetitive.
24. Disclosures should be provided for the initial period and all annual periods thereafter where an entity is party to a P3 arrangement/transaction. The following information should be disclosed:
 - a. The purpose, objective, and rationale for the P3 arrangement or transaction and the relative benefits/revenues being received in exchange for the government's consideration, monetary and non-monetary; and the entity's statutory authority for entering into the P3.
 - b. A description of federal and non-federal funding of the P3 over its expected life, including the mix and, where available, the amounts of such funding. For any amounts that are not available, the disclosures should indicate such.
 - c. The operational and financial structure of the P3 including the reporting entity's rights and responsibilities, including:
 - i. A description of the contractual terms governing payments to and from the government over the expected life of the P3 arrangement or transaction to include:
 1. explanation of how the expected life was determined
 2. the time periods payments are expected to occur
 3. whether payments are made directly to each partner or indirectly through a third-party, such as, military housing allowances
 4. in-kind contributions/services and donations

- ii. The amounts received and paid by the government during the reporting period(s) and the amounts estimated to be received and paid in aggregate over the expected life of the P3
- d. Identification of the contractual risks of loss the P3 partners are undertaking
 - i. Identification of such contractual risks of loss should include a description of (1) the contractual risk and (2) the potential effect on cash flows if the risks were realized (for example, early termination requirements including related exit amounts and other responsibilities such as asset condition (hand-back) requirements, minimum payment guarantees, escalation clauses, contingent payments, or renewal options).
 - ii. Disclosure of remote risks of loss should be limited to those included in the terms of the contractual P3 arrangements or transactions. If remote risks of loss are disclosed, an explanation should be included that avoids the misleading inference that there is more than a remote chance of a loss.
- e. As applicable:
 - i. Associated amounts recognized in the financial statements such as gains or losses and capitalized items
 - ii. Significant instances of non-compliances with legal and contractual provisions governing the P3 arrangement or transaction
 - iii. Whether the private partner(s), including any Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV), have borrowed or invested capital contingent upon the reporting entity's promise to pay whether implied or explicit
 - iv. Description of events of termination or default

FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE US GOVERNMENT DISCLOSURES

25. The U.S. government-wide financial statements should disclose:
- a. a general description of P3 arrangements or transactions
 - b. the consolidated amounts the government received and paid during the reporting period(s) and estimated to be received and paid in aggregate over the expected life of the P3s
 - c. a reference(s) to applicable component entity report(s) for additional information

EFFECTIVE DATE

26. The requirements of this Statement are effective for reporting periods beginning after September 30, 2018. Early adoption is permitted.

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 enunciated in this Statement not the material in this appendix should govern the accounting for specific transactions, events, or conditions.

PROJECT HISTORY

- A1. This project was added to the FASAB's technical agenda in April 2012 because federal agencies have increasingly turned to public-private partnerships to accomplish goals and in light of budget pressures likely to further increase their use. Although federal generally accepted accounting principles are fairly robust, the Board noted that due to the complex nature of P3s significant study would be required regarding a host of issues dealing with the definition, measurement, and recognition of P3s. In December 2012, the project plan was adopted with the overall goal of recognizing the full costs of P3s in the financial statements. In addition, a P3 task force was formed and held its first meeting in February 2013.
- A2. Final standards or guidance were expected to follow a three year effort. Specific project objectives include:
 - a. Defining terms
 - b. Providing guidance (that is, identifying gaps) for the recognition and measurement of:
 - i. assets and liabilities
 - ii. revenues and expenses
 - iii. establishing disclosure requirements
 - c. Considering guidance for other arrangements/transactions related to P3s (for example, sale-leaseback or other long-term arrangements)
- A3. Early in its deliberations the Board was clear that forthcoming guidance must be consistently applied and covered by an overarching principle(s). The Board noted its concern is with the risks to which the government is exposed and related disclosures. As a result, members decided that because P3s often involve innovative operational and complicated accounting practices, accompanied by sophisticated financing agreements, these complexities necessitate the establishment of disclosure requirements as a first step to (1) developing uniform, principles-based guidance, and (2) identifying potential gaps in existing guidance. To that end, the Board decided that a broad P3 definition accompanied by risk-based characteristics should be pursued to establish a framework for determining which P3s should be disclosed. The Board believes that the resulting disclosures will inform the need for and development of future standards providing recognition

and measurement guidance specific to P3s. Therefore, any further work will be undertaken after these disclosures become effective.

- A4. P3 task force meetings for this phase of the project were held between February 2013 and May 2014. All meetings were well attended with representation from federal agencies, commercial sector(s), and citizens. Participants came from diverse disciplines such as accounting, auditing, facilities management, financial reporting, housing, information technology (IT), commercial and investment banking, procurement, and program management. To best meet the project goals and objectives, staff, in addition to engaging in task force discussions, initiated fact-finding meetings with experts and practitioners both within and external to government. Staff met with federal agency representatives, public policy experts, consultants, private equity participants, and a private IT/Cloud/Software development firm.

Common Themes and Other Matters

- A5. The most common themes arising from task force and fact finding meetings considered in developing the Statement include:
- a. At a minimum, participants expect continued use if not growth in P3s.
 - b. Government employee legacy & relocation costs are not presently considered in Value for Money (VfM)¹⁴ analyses.
 - c. Long-term nature of P3s is accepted, but concerns include
 - i. lack of transparency in the solicitation and award processes along with the lack of competition hinders accountability and fair and reasonable pricing,
 - ii. not applying the Federal Acquisition Regulation¹⁵ (FAR) increases government risk, and
 - iii. some P3s circumvent procurement administration.

¹⁴ VfM is a much broader concept than typical cost-benefit analysis because it emphasizes “value” in more of a qualitative than quantitative manner. Quantitatively, some VfM models use a project’s Internal Rate of Return (IRR) to help determine project acceptability. The VfM concept has drawn criticisms not only because of its subjectivity and lack of rigor in application, but because in some cases (1) cash flows can be easily managed to meet desired expectations and (2) VfM results are used as ex-post facto justifications for qualitatively made project and/or award decisions. It is important to note that the same criticisms can be made of the more traditional cost-benefit analyses used in management decision making.

¹⁵ The FAR is the primary regulation for use by all Federal Executive agencies in their acquisition of supplies and services with appropriated funds. It became effective on April 1, 1984, and is issued within applicable laws under the joint authorities of the Administrator of General Services, the Secretary of Defense, and the Administrator for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, under the broad policy guidelines of the Administrator, Office of Federal Procurement Policy, Office of Management and Budget.

- d. In-kind contributions are difficult to value or are overvalued and not always reported.
- e. P3 financial reporting is generally supported but agencies and participants vary in the what, how, and where of disclosures. For example, relative to significant and material P3 arrangements or transactions, some believe that property, plant, and equipment (PP&E) note disclosure would be sufficient whereas others believe that MD&A discussion is more appropriate because of the SFFAS 15, *Management's Discussion and Analysis*, requirement to address the future effects of existing, currently-known demands, risks, uncertainties, events, conditions and trends, while others suggest reporting in both locations.

A6. Other matters arising during task force and fact finding meetings included:

- a. **Increased Risk to Citizens.** A few participants noted that P3s erode (1) the notion of public service (for example, what is inherently governmental) and (2) in many cases, belief in good government. This increased risk is evidenced by those entities that:
 - i. purposefully avoid capital acquisition budgeting requirements
 - ii. absorb “availability” risk¹⁶ absent sufficient private partner consideration
 - iii. lose control of assets
 - iv. lock into long-term arrangements/transactions that cannot be re-competed or re-negotiated
 - v. are constrained by contract modification restrictions
 - vi. are constrained by proximity and/or right-to-compete restrictions
 - vii. ignore government employee personnel (legacy) costs
- b. **Financing costs.** To enable private financing to work, P3's must be longer-term in nature to allow for sufficient time to liquidate debt and achieve return on investment targets. This is significantly different than traditional procurement contract periods that are typically 5 years or less.
- c. **Performance Metrics.** Financial reporting would be enhanced by incorporating performance metrics that could point to both risks and potential liabilities as they arise.

¹⁶ Availability risks or project completion risks exist when for example, defects in construction or quality shortfalls within the control of the private partner occur that preclude the asset or service from being available for its intended use requiring the government sponsor to intervene.

Summary of Outreach Efforts

- A7. The ED was issued October 1, 2014 with comments requested by January 2, 2015. Upon release of the exposure draft, notices and press releases went to the following organizations:
- a. The Federal Register
 - b. *FASAB News*
 - c. *The Journal of Accountancy, AGA Today, the CPA Journal, Government Executive and the CPA Letter*
 - d. The CFO Council, the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency, the Financial Statement Audit Network; and members of both the Federal Real Property Council and Federal Facilities Council
 - e. Committees of professional associations generally commenting on exposure drafts in the past
- A8. This broad announcement was followed by electronic mailings of the exposure draft followed up by several reminder notices.to:
- a. Relevant congressional committees
 - i. House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform
 - ii. Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
 - b. Public interest and labor union groups
 - i. In the Public Interest
 - ii. American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees
- A9. The Board did not rely on the number in favor of or opposed to a given position. Information about the respondents' majority view is provided only as a means of summarizing the comments. The Board considered the arguments in each response and weighed the merits of the points raised. The following paragraphs discuss significant issues identified by respondents followed by Board decisions.

Respondents' Comments on the Exposure Draft

- A10. The exposure draft was issued with an alternative view that expressed concerns over the (1) breadth of the general definition, (2) disclosures related to certain remote risks, and (3) clarity of "significant exposure." Specific comments regarding respondent concerns and Board re-deliberations are noted in the following paragraphs as appropriate.

Definition: Public-Private Partnerships

- A11. In consultation with constituents to include respondent comments received and related outreach concerning the breadth and scope of the definition, the Board has further developed and refined the definition proposed in the exposure draft. The Board desired establishing a definition that (1) reflected actual federal P3 practices, (2) covered the wide breadth and diverse scope of federal assets, and (3) focused on the risk-sharing or risk transfer strategies that are the very essence of these complicated arrangements or transactions. The definition is intended for general application to be applied uniformly across the federal government.
- A12. In reviewing the P3 definitions of other standard-setters, the Board notes that their guidance is largely focused on service concession arrangements (that is, a subset of P3s) that directly benefit the general public. The definition contained in this Statement is much broader given the wide breadth and diverse scope of federal assets being managed. It is important to note that (1) federal preparers and auditors have identified accounting topics that extend beyond those typically found in service concession arrangements, (2) oversight entities such as the Congressional Budget Office, GAO, and inspectors general have defined and identified P3 arrangements or transactions to be more than just service concessions, and (3) service concession accounting guidance primarily reflects economic development initiatives such as new roads, toll roads, highways, airports, railways, and hospitals, whereas federal initiatives extend well beyond economic development such as the common defense and general welfare of the nation thus necessitating accounting guidance to best fit these federal initiatives.
- A13. In developing the definition, the Board primarily relied on (1) the task force's review of existing definitions from several authoritative sources, (2) various respondent comments to the definition contained in the exposure draft, and (3) an ad-hoc working group comprised of selected respondents. The task force identified the more common characteristics of P3s which are believed to exist in the federal government. Some of the more common P3 characteristics identified include: existence of very long-term contractual agreements (for example, anywhere from five to 99 years), shared or transferred financing, agreements covering a significant portion of the project's or asset's life, shared risks, shared rewards, shared skills and expertise, conveyance or creation of real and personal property, and the use of SPVs. Those respondents specifically commenting on the definition as well as the ad-hoc working group primarily suggested better linkage between the definition and the risk-based characteristics. Accordingly, the broad definition contained in the exposure draft was further refined and is as follows:

Subject to the exclusions noted in paragraph 15 and for the purposes of this Statement, federal public-private partnerships (P3s) are risk-sharing¹⁷ arrangements or transactions with

¹⁷ A public sector entity shares risks and rewards with a private sector entity whenever the benefits of the arrangement or transaction accrue to both the private sector entity and the public sector entity and (1)

expected lives greater than five years between public and private sector entities. Such arrangements or transactions provide a service or an asset for government and/or general public use where in addition to the sharing of resources, each party shares in the risks and rewards of said arrangements or transactions.

Scope, Applicability and Exclusions

Scope

- A14. The Board recognizes that establishing a P3 definition reflecting the breadth and diverse scope of entity missions, operational strategies, available leasing authorities, and other variables might capture activities which are already being recognized or disclosed in the entity's financial statements. Specifically, this is because the Board has previously addressed various types of long-term arrangements/transactions in which the government participates (for example, leases and guarantees). As such, existing accounting standards provide for recognition and measurement of assets/liabilities and revenues/expenses as well as disclosures of certain risks in these long-standing types of arrangements or transactions. However, the Board believes that there is a need for disclosure requirements specific to the risks existing in P3s for which there is no current accounting guidance. The requirements herein do not replace existing disclosure requirements in other SFFASs for similar arrangements or transactions such as leases. P3s are complex arrangements/transactions and an entity would apply all applicable standards to report relevant information in the notes.

Applicability

- A15. To help ensure achievement of the federal reporting objectives while minimizing unwarranted disclosure of P3 arrangements or transactions, the Board has established filters at several decision points to aid preparers in this regard. The filters are categorized as follows:
- a. Definitional Features Indicative of Risk – After careful study the Board initially identified four major features of federal P3 arrangements or transactions that were embodied in the proposed definition: (1) agreements covering a significant portion of the economic life of a project or asset, and/or lasting more than five years, (2) financing provided in whole or shared in part by the private partner, (3) conveyance or transfer of real property, personal property, or multi-sector skills and expertise, and (4) formation of SPV's. However, as a result of respondent comments concerning linkage between the definition and the risk-based characteristics and a working group recommendation, the Board (1) realigned the four major features by incorporating them directly into the risk-based characteristics and (2) within the definition, specifically excluding arrangements or transactions which are not more than 5 years in duration.

the public sector entity is at risk of loss, or (2) the private sector entity's ability to perform is at risk and success of the arrangement or transaction depends upon the public sector's intervention.

- b. Risk-based Characteristics – The Board has identified and refined during its re-deliberations certain key characteristics discussed later that reflect varying degrees of risk that exist in federal P3s. Therefore, should these characteristics be absent in a P3, the disclosure requirements of this Statement would generally not apply.
- c. Materiality – As is the custom with all Statements issued by the Board, only those P3s that are material (qualitatively and quantitatively) in nature, more thoroughly discussed later, should be subject to the requirements of this Statement. The Board notes that because materiality assessments require both qualitative and quantitative judgments, specific guidance limiting preparer and auditor considerations of information would not be appropriate.

Exclusions

A16. As a result of respondent comments concerning the breadth of the proposed definition, the ad-hoc working group recommended and the Board adopted three additional exclusions. The three additional exclusions are:

- a. grants to state, local, and Indian tribal governments and other public institutions,
- b. arrangements or transactions with foreign governments, and
- c. arrangements or transactions sharing nominal or incidental resources.

The first two exclusions identified above reflect that this Statement only applies when a federal entity is in a risk-sharing arrangement or transaction with the private sector¹⁸ and not a public sector institution. Risks associated with public-to-public partnerships (for example, federal to state or federal to local) and those associated with foreign governments (1) are significantly different when compared to risks arising in public-private partnerships and (2) warrant extensive research far beyond the scope of this Statement. Moreover, arrangements or transactions with Indian tribal governments or foreign governments are closely governed by selected agencies and Congressional committees and are also beyond the scope of this Statement. Lastly, arrangements or transactions in which private entities voluntarily contribute nominal resources or provide incidental resources without expectation of compensation or government indemnification for any possible risk of loss are also excluded from the requirements of this Statement.

A17. In summary, the following arrangements or transactions are excluded from the requirements of this Statement:

¹⁸ For purposes of this Statement, the private sector refers to individuals and entities acting in their private capacities outside of the authority and control of federal, state or local governments and encompasses for-profit businesses and non-profit organizations that are outside of the authority and control of federal, state or local governments.

- a. non-lease acquisitions of property, plant, and equipment that are subject to the FAR and the private entity is not directly financing, operating, or maintaining the PP&E as part of an overall risk-sharing arrangement or transaction,
 - b. leases meeting certain conditions,
 - c. acquisitions made using Simplified Acquisition Procedures (FAR Part 13),
 - d. formal and informal arrangements or transactions that do not share risks or rewards and are solely designed to foster goodwill, encourage economic development, promote research and innovation, or coordinate and integrate strategic initiatives,
 - e. grants to state, local, and Indian tribal governments and other public institutions and those with foreign governments, and
 - f. arrangements or transactions sharing nominal or incidental resources.
- A18. Concerning leases, in consultation with the P3 Task Force and after careful consideration, the Board concluded:
- a. to exclude leases¹⁹ that meet the following two conditions: a) they are not bundled and b) they are entered into using GSA delegated authority. Such leases (1) have no significant P3 risk of loss, (2) are already subject to existing FASAB guidance, (3) have well defined FAR-based contractual processes and remedies in place to address risks associated with landlord-tenant relationships, (4) have contractually capped payments for termination liabilities, and (5) have termination payments that are indemnified by GSA's Building Fund. The Board believes that if a lease is either bundled or not entered into using GSA delegated authority, the provisions of this Statement should apply.
 - b. to not broadly exclude Enhanced Use Leases (EULs) except for those meeting the two conditions cited above because they are more oriented towards P3s as a result of (1) possessing special authorities and not being subject to the FAR, (2) often operating under a risk-reward model as opposed to those entity leases that are basically a landlord-tenant relationship and not a risk-sharing partnership, and (3) possibly including ancillary services and in-kind consideration as part of the arrangement or transaction. Because the Board believes that EULs could be encompassed by this Statement, a

¹⁹ The term leases includes enhanced use leases (EULs) which are typically long-term lease agreements that allow public or private entities to use an agency's property. Agency EUL programs have allowed entities to develop or occupy federal properties such as power plants, housing and healthcare facilities, office space, and parking facilities, and in return, federal agencies receive cash or in-kind consideration. Please note that there is no government-wide definition of EULs. Source: GAO-13-14 Federal Real Property: Improved Cost Reporting Would Help Decision Makers Weigh the Benefits of Enhanced Use Leasing, December 2012).

determination should be made as to whether disclosures are required via the application of the risk-based characteristics.

Risk-based Characteristics

- A19. Although federal P3s are varied and complex, the Board believes there are some common characteristics that can be used to identify those P3s that create risk of loss and should be disclosed. Because the Board is aware of the administrative burdens agencies face day-to-day and that some P3 portfolios might be voluminous, in addition to identifying those P3s that create risk of loss, the risk-based characteristics can also be applied to assist a federal entity in determining which P3 arrangements or transactions do not require disclosure.
- A20. The risk-based characteristics have been developed, refined, and categorized from an initial comprehensive list of characteristics that distinguishes federal P3s from traditional procurement actions. With the assistance of the task force, the Board further analyzed and then selected risk-based characteristics which indicate significant P3 risk of loss. These risk-based characteristics are intended to: (1) apply to all types of P3s: construction, housing, utilities, military depots, and others, and (2) assist a federal entity in ascertaining which P3 arrangements or transactions should be disclosed. Once a P3 is identified for disclosure, such arrangements or transactions would then be evaluated in light of the entity's materiality considerations including quantitative and qualitative threshold(s).
- A21. As a result of respondent comments concerning linkage between the definition and the risk-based characteristics, the working group recommended and the Board adopted an additional risk-based characteristic for grants and other arrangements. Specifically, OMB requirements (2 C.F.R. Title 2, Part 200) for grants govern the administrative framework and include requirements to help safeguard and protect taxpayer dollars. Therefore, those P3s exempt from such requirements are at an increased-risk because well-established safeguards and resolution mechanisms are absent.

Conclusive and Suggestive Characteristics

- A22. The majority of respondents agreed with the risk-based characteristics, their related classification, and their proposed application. However, as mentioned above, the working group recommended and the Board adopted an additional risk-based characteristic for grants and other arrangements. Moreover, the Board clarified the two categories of risk-based characteristics (conclusive and suggestive) pursuant to respondent concerns. Conclusive characteristics are those that existence of any one characteristic means the P3 arrangement or transaction should be disclosed. However, existence of any one of the suggestive characteristics is evidence that the P3 arrangement or transaction may possess risk of loss and require disclosure. Such a suggestive characteristic should be considered in the aggregate with all the other suggestive characteristics before a final decision is made. Each conclusive characteristic is meant to be definitive whereas each suggestive characteristic requires entity judgment as each one is analyzed in connection with the other suggestive characteristics.

- A23. If a P3 arrangement or transaction is subject to disclosure, it should be further evaluated in light of materiality considerations that include both qualitative and quantitative assessments. Additionally, materiality should be applied cumulatively or in the aggregate by the entity.

Materiality

Considering User Needs

- A24. As the standards-setting body for the federal government, the Board has stated that there are two fundamental values that provide the foundation for governmental accounting and financial reporting: “accountability” and its corollary, “decision usefulness.”²⁰ Concepts explain that “Because a democratic government should be accountable for its integrity, performance, and stewardship, it follows that the government must provide information useful to assess that accountability.” The Board believes that P3 disclosures are an essential element in establishing accountability.
- A25. In applying the concept of materiality,²¹ the needs of the users of the annual financial report should be considered. Specific to P3s for example, users are interested in: (1) assessing the costs and related risks of entering into such long-term agreements; (2) assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of these risk-sharing agreements as well as the government’s management of its assets and liabilities; and (3) determining how financial resources, budgetary or otherwise, have been obtained and used and whether their acquisition and use were in accordance with the entity’s legal authorization. As a result, the Board believes that the P3 disclosures required by this Statement will help answer these questions while achieving the associated reporting objectives.

Qualitative and Quantitative Assessments Require Judgment

- A26. In connection with concerns over the breadth and scope of the definition, some respondents suggested that the Board develop a clear and objective materiality standard that would limit the disclosure requirement to those transactions that present substantial financial risk to the government. The Board believes that refining the definition and adding additional exclusions best addresses respondent concerns in this regard. Respondents are reminded that “materiality” has not been formally defined in the accounting community; rather, it is a matter of judgment on the part of preparers of financial statements and the auditors who attest to them. The determination of whether an item is material:

²⁰ SFFAC 1, par. 105 states, “The federal government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed. It therefore has a special responsibility to report on its actions and the results of those actions. ...Providing this information to the public, the news media, and elected officials is an essential part of accountability in government.”

²¹ 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.

- a. requires the exercise of considerable judgment, based on consideration of specific facts and circumstances, and
 - b. depends on the degree to which omitting or misstating information about this 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.
- A27. The Board believes that preparers and auditors are in the best position to exercise this judgment predicated on their direct knowledge of the specific facts and circumstances and user needs. Furthermore, the Board believes that specific guidance concerning materiality assessments would limit preparer and auditor considerations and are therefore inappropriate.
- A28. The Board notes that while a P3 arrangement or transaction might not be considered material from a quantitative standpoint, it may be considered qualitatively material and subject to this Statement's disclosure requirements if the disclosures would influence or change the judgment of the financial statement user. Exclusive reliance on certain quantitative benchmarks or thresholds to assess materiality should be avoided.

Materiality Includes Probability Assessments

- A29. Decisions whether to recognize or, in the case of this Statement, disclose a P3 arrangement or transaction may take into account considerations that include uncertainties. Uncertainties can be expressed as a measurement of an appropriate attribute (for example, historical cost, fair value, expected value, or some other attribute) which may include an assessment of the probability of future flows of economic benefits or services (emphasis added). Furthermore, uncertainties are often subjected to assessments of the materiality of the item, and the benefit versus the cost of recognition or, in this Statement's case, disclosure.
- A30. Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards 5 (SFFAS 5), *Accounting for Liabilities of the Federal Government*, states that "probable" refers to that which
- a. can reasonably be expected, or
 - b. is believed to be more likely than not on the basis of available evidence or logic with the exception of pending or threatened litigation and unasserted claims.
- A31. The Board notes that the concept of probability is imprecise and may be difficult to apply with respect to certain P3 activities such as economic stabilization payments, in addition to other matters that could arise during the life of the P3 arrangement or transaction. However, the "more likely than not" phrase in SFFAS

5 accommodates the assessment of the probability of those uncertainties often associated with P3s due to their long-term nature and project variability.

- A32. Historically, some studies including work done by GAO suggest that, in practice, preparers and auditors in the private sector often interpret "probable" to mean a subjective assessment of probability considerably in excess of 50%. However, FASAB has defined "probable" as "more likely than not," that is, a subjective assessment of probability greater than 50% (51% or more).

Risks that are Deemed Remote

- A33. Most of the respondents agreed with the Alternative View that stated (1) disclosure of remote contingencies is not limited to the terms of contractual arrangements, (2) the concept of "significant exposure" is not sufficiently clear to result in consistent disclosures, and (3) risks related to entity operations or performance (referred to in the Alternative View as business risks) would be included in the risk disclosure. As such, respondents were concerned that such additional disclosures could overwhelm or mislead users. The Board believes that it has addressed respondent concerns in this regard by refining the definition contained in the Exposure Draft, adding additional exclusions, eliminating references to "significant exposure," and in emphasizing at paragraph 24d that remote risks of loss should be limited to those that are included in the terms of the contractual P3 arrangements or transactions. The Board is of the opinion that remote risks can and should be reported where appropriate as explained below.
- A34. SFFAS 5 provides that contingencies deemed remote (that is, the chance that a loss has been incurred is slight) are not recognized as a contingent liability or disclosed.²² However, SFFAS 5 requires that a contingent liability should be disclosed if any of the conditions for liability recognition are not met and there is at least a reasonable possibility that a loss or an additional loss may have been incurred.
- A35. The Board believes that some risks of loss associated with P3s may be consistent with contingencies in SFFAS 5 that arise because of an existing condition, situation, or set of circumstances involving uncertainty as to possible gain or loss to an entity, including the concepts of probable, reasonably possible, and remote. It is this uncertainty, or risk in other words, that prompts entities to seek private partners who can best manage and/or contain the effects of the uncertainty that could ultimately lead to a loss. In applying SFFAS 5 some contingencies may be

²² Per SFFAS 5, paragraph 38, a contingent liability should be recognized when all of these three conditions are met:

- A past event or exchange transaction has occurred (for example, a federal entity has breached a contract with a nonfederal entity).
- A future outflow or other sacrifice of resources is probable (for example, the nonfederal entity has filed a legal claim against a federal entity for breach of contract and the federal entity's management believes the claim is likely to be settled in favor of the claimant).
- The future outflow or sacrifice of resources is measurable (for example, the federal entity's management determines an estimated settlement amount).

identified for which the degree of uncertainty is so great that no reporting (that is, recognition or disclosure) is required by that Statement. However, the Board notes that (1) reporting such contingencies is not inconsistent with the provisions of SFFAS 5 and (2) as discussed above at paragraph A32, because FASAB has defined "probable" as "more likely than not," the FASAB framework suggests that "reasonably possible" and "remote" risks be assessed for disclosure at the remaining (more narrow) band.

- A36. Due to their very nature, P3s can also possess risks of loss that may be considered remote but material. For example, excluding contractual protections afforded the government by the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) inherently increases the entity's risk as does a relationship with an industry or private partner that may require the government to provide resources or absorb losses beyond what was contemplated. The Board believes such P3 arrangements or transactions should be disclosed, subject to materiality, even though the risks of loss included in the terms of the contractual P3 arrangements or transactions may be deemed remote. The Board further notes that enterprise risk management frameworks often focus on remote risks because of the magnitude of any potential adverse effects that might arise. Therefore, consideration should be given to those risks that management does not expect to be likely, but represent a material risk of loss to the government if they were to occur. With this being said, the Board also notes that such remote risks may have a reasonably high materiality threshold balanced by whether the omission is such that it is probable that the judgment of a reasonable person would have been changed or influenced by the disclosure. As such, remote risks should not be dismissed from disclosure without further consideration of user needs and the qualitative and quantitative characteristics when applying materiality.

Disclosure Requirements of P3s

- A37. The task force conducted research and identified examples of disclosures surrounding P3s from a variety of international and national authoritative sources which address P3 information needs for different types of users. Additionally, the task force considered fact-finding meetings with public and private representatives regarding the types of information that diverse users believe are important. As a result, the task force overwhelmingly agreed with requiring disclosures concerning (1) why the government selects a P3 model to conduct business, (2) the solicitation and procurement processes used, (3) how the P3 is structured, (4) the expected benefits, and (5) the total amounts expected to be paid. Although it was noted that requiring a description of the solicitation and procurement processes is unusual in financial reporting, the task force reached that conclusion because P3s fall outside the routine way governments procure services and such disclosures reveal the potential risk that governments assume, which can ultimately lead to liability recognition.
- A38. In analyzing the task force's recommendations the Board considered 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 and budgetary integrity objectives are identified as being most important for P3 reporting. The Board agreed that P3 reporting is important to meeting these objectives because the federal government is accountable to citizens for the proper administration of its resources. As such, the Board agreed with the majority of the task force's recommendations. However, requiring disclosure of an entity's solicitation and procurement processes falls outside the realm of financial reporting. Furthermore, the Board questioned the informational value of such a disclosure and concluded that its cost also exceeded potential benefits identified by the task force.

- A39. P3s are a form of investment and they should be adequately disclosed in order to assist report users in determining: (a) the important assets of the U.S. government and how effectively they are being managed and (b) whether the government's financial position improved or deteriorated over the period of the P3. P3s often involve innovative operational and complicated accounting practices, accompanied by sophisticated financing agreements. These complexities necessitate the establishment of disclosure principles as a first step to (1) developing uniform principles-based guidance, and (2) identifying potential gaps in existing guidance.
- A40. Respondents were mixed regarding disclosures with some stating that the disclosures are onerous and burdensome and the others in agreement with the proposed disclosures or seeking additional disclosures. As a result of considering the overall financial reporting objectives, and in light of certain respondent comments regarding administrative burden, the Board decided to not require disclosure of amounts estimated to be received and paid during each of the succeeding five years. That is, only the amounts received and paid by the government during the reporting period(s) and the amounts estimated to be received and paid in aggregate over the expected life of the P3 need be reported. In determining the expected life of the P3 arrangement or transaction the entity's economic incentives (that is, its risks and/or rewards) should be considered.
- A41. The Board offers two examples regarding the determination of a P3s expected life. First, consider an infrastructure arrangement containing a master ground lease of 50 years where in exchange for an up-front payment the entity out-leases (government-owned) land for the construction of an office building and at the same time enters into an occupancy lease which can be renewed for up to 75 years. The expected life of the P3 should be limited to 50 years given the fact that the entity's economic incentive at year 50 changes due to the master ground lease's expiration. That is, at such time the entity may decide to renew the master ground lease and renegotiate its occupancy lease or sell the land and not renew the occupancy lease. As a result, the amounts estimated to be received and paid in aggregate over the 50 years would be reported. Second, consider a spare parts sustainment program where an entity partners with an inventory logistics firm to handle the entire supply chain management function of a major weapons system expected to remain in service for the next 25 years. Although by statute the entity can only enter into a 5 year (for example, base year with 4 renewable options) contract, it has an economic incentive to maintain the relationship beyond 5 years. This is primarily due to the fact that the private partner is likely to incur a

substantial investment to manage the supply chain and the investment will need to be recovered over time. As a result, the amounts estimated to be received and paid in aggregate over the 25 years would be reported.

Aggregation

- A42. Due to the relative complexity and potential voluminous nature of P3s that an entity might be party to, the Statement permits entities to aggregate disclosures by providing broad and summarized information instead of unique or discrete arrangement or transaction detail. However, entities are permitted to disclose information related to individually significant P3 arrangements or transactions separately if entity management believes that such disclosure would better meet user needs.
- A43. For example, disclosures of P3 arrangements or transactions could be aggregated by an entity's strategic objectives, departmental or bureau categorizations, program budget classifications, or other means. In this way users are presented with information that is comprehensive and material to an entity's financial statements without placing an undue burden on preparers to provide P3 specific or granular level information. Respondents generally supported the aggregation of information.


Reporting Period

- A44. Disclosures should be provided for the initial period and all annual periods thereafter where an entity is party to a material P3 arrangement/transaction.

BOARD APPROVAL AND DISSENT

- A45. This Statement was approved for issuance by 8 members of the Board. One member dissented. The written ballots are available for public inspection at the FASAB's offices. The dissent of the member who opposed the issuance of this Statement is presented in paragraphs A46 and A47.
- A46. Ms. Ho dissents to the issuance of this Statement. She believes that the increased use of P3s in the federal government makes the need for clarity in the accounting for P3s vitally important. Ms. Ho acknowledges that the taxpayer has the right to know what obligations the government has agreed to and what the total cost is for a P3 project. Ms. Ho commends FASAB for their thorough examination of the issue, which encompassed several years.
- A47. Ms. Ho strongly supports more transparency in financial reporting of federal taxpayers' dollars. However, she shares the concerns voiced by many agencies in response to the exposure draft that the disclosures required by this Statement will create a burden that does not justify the cost required to collect, analyze, report and audit the information needed to comply with this Statement's requirements. In particular, Ms. Ho feels that the expected life requirement will result in inconsistent application by agencies throughout government, which is contrary to the goal of the Statement.

APPENDIX B: FLOWCHART²³



²³ The standards enunciated in this Statement and not the material in this appendix should govern the accounting for specific transactions, events, or conditions.

APPENDIX C: ABBREVIATIONS

AGA	Association of Government Accountants
BFC	Basis for conclusions
CFR	Consolidated financial report of the U.S. government
C.F.R.	Code of federal regulations
CPA	Certified public accountant
ED	Exposure draft
EUL	Enhanced Use Lease
FAR	Federal Acquisition Regulation
FASAB	Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board
GAAP	Generally Accepted Accounting Principles
GAO	Government Accountability Office
GPFFR	General purpose federal financial reports
GSA	General Services Administration
IRR	Internal rate of return
IT	Information Technology
LP	Limited Partnership
MD&A	Management's discussion and analysis
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
OPEB	Other postemployment benefits
P3	Public-Private Partnership
PP&E	Property, Plant, and Equipment
PPP	Public-Private Partnership
PSC	Public Sector Comparator
SFFAC	Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Concepts
SFFAS	Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards
SPV	Special Purpose Vehicle
U.S.	United States
VfM	Value for Money

APPENDIX D: GLOSSARY

The standards enunciated in this Statement not the material in this appendix should govern the accounting for specific transactions, events, or conditions.

Public-private partnerships - Federal public-private partnerships (P3s) are risk-sharing arrangements or transactions with expected lives greater than five years between public and private sector entities. Such arrangements or transactions provide a service or an asset for government and/or general public use where in addition to the sharing of resources, each party shares in the risks and rewards of said arrangements or transactions.

P3 Structural Arrangement - P3s that are external to the government sponsor's or entity's operations and often involve the creation of an SPV, Trust, or Limited Partnership (LP), and other such arrangements. For example, military base housing.

P3 Program Transactional Arrangement - P3s that are internal to the government sponsor's or entity's operations. For example, work-share programs not involving the creation of a SPV, Trust, or LP, etc.

Special Purpose Vehicles (SPVs) - also commonly called Special Purpose Entities (SPEs), are entities created for a specific, limited and normally temporary purpose. An SPV can be a corporation, trust, partnership, limited-liability company or some type of Variable Interest Entity (VIE). They are often an integral part of public private partnerships because of their risk-containment nature of isolating participating entities from financial risk.

Value for Money (VfM) - VfM is defined as the optimum combination of whole-of-life costs and quality (or fitness for purpose) of the good or service to meet the user's requirement. VfM is not the choice of goods and services based on the lowest cost bid. To undertake a well-managed procurement, it is necessary to consider upfront, and at the earliest stage of procurement, what the key drivers of VfM in the procurement process will be. In other words, VfM is a much broader concept than typical cost-benefit analysis because it emphasizes "value" in more of a qualitative than quantitative manner. Quantitatively, some VfM models use a project's Internal Rate of Return (IRR) to help determine project acceptability.

FASAB Board Members

Tom L. Allen, Chair

Robert F. Dacey

Michael H. Granof

Christina Ho

Sam M. McCall

Mark Reger

D. Scott Showalter

Graylin E. Smith

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 6H19
Washington, DC 20548
Telephone 202-512-7350
FAX 202-512-7366
www.fasab.gov

Appendix 3 – Memorandum P3: Phase II, Public-Private Partnerships: Measurement and Recognition (Topic C) dated August 9, 2021

Memorandum

P3 – Phase II

August 9, 2021

To: Members of the Board
From: Domenic N. Savini, Assistant Director
Thru: Monica R. Valentine, Executive Director
Subject: **Public-Private Partnerships: Measurement and Recognition** (Topic C)

INTRODUCTION

The project covering Public-Private Partnerships (P3s) was added to the agenda because federal agencies have increasingly turned to these risk sharing arrangements or transactions to accomplish their goals. Given that budget pressures are likely to further increase the use of P3s, the Board agreed that the overall objective of the project would be making the full costs of such partnerships transparent.

Project discussions began in April 2012 and resulted in the Board approving a dual-phased approach. The first phase would consist of establishing disclosure requirements, followed by measurement and recognition guidance in the second phase.

Active work on this project's first phase began in FY2013 and culminated with the issuance of SFFAS 49, *Public-Private Partnerships: Disclosure Requirements*, on April 27, 2016.

At the June 2021, meeting the majority of the members generally agreed with the major measurement and recognition issues identified by staff, however, they noted that reviewing a greater sampling of the entity disclosures would be most beneficial before activating a task force and commencing Phase 2.

This session's purpose is to provide insight into the FY2020 entity disclosures to help address the varying member concerns and noted observations.¹

¹ Some members noted that the complexity around P3s raises a need to define where and how such reporting should be presented. Other members noted the importance of clarifying the types of losses or exposures (e.g., exposure beyond the balance sheet; losses from natural disasters) the Board believes should be identified and specifically addressing the SFFAS 49 term, "risk-of-loss." Members also discussed reviewing what other standards-setters are doing in regards to P3s, identifying lessons-learned from preparers, canvassing views from auditors and users concerning SFFAS 49, disclosures overload, and cost/benefit considerations.

REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK BY August 23, 2021

Please review the attached material and background information included in the seven attachments and respond to the four questions in attachment 7 by **August 23, 2021**.

For additional information, questions, or suggestions, please contact Dom as early as possible at savinid@fasab.gov with a cc to Monica at valentinem@fasab.gov.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Federal Reporting Entities Addressing P3s in FY 2020
2. Analysis of FY 2020 SFFAS 49 Disclosures
 - a. Disclosure Reporting Percentages
 - b. Entity Reporting Percentages
3. Most Commonly Reported P3: ESPCs and UESCs
4. Example of a Comprehensively Reported P3: MHPIs
5. Identification of Measurement and Recognition Displays
6. Proposed Next Steps
7. Questions for the Board


APPENDIX - Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards 49: *Public-Private Partnerships: Disclosure Requirements*

ATTACHMENT 1: Federal Reporting Entities Addressing P3s in FY 2020

At the Board's request, staff reviewed additional federal financial reports for fiscal year (FY) 2020 SFFAS 49 disclosures. To that end, all 24 Chief Financial Officer (CFO) Act agencies and 16 significant entities were reviewed.

More than half (14 or 58.0%) of the CFO Act agencies address public-private partnerships (P3s) in their annual financial reports whereas nearly all (15 or 94.0%) of the significant entities do not.

Roughly speaking, from the 40 entities reviewed, more than one in three (15 out of 40) entities report some type of P3 activity. Below is a summary of the P3 reporting identified in the FY 2020 federal financial reports:



Eight instances (re: light blue, orange, grey) were significant enough to be reported in Management's Discussion and Analysis (MD&A) and two of these instances (re: orange) warranted SFFAS 49 disclosure. Five instances (re: yellow) were solely reported in the Notes whereas the remaining two instances (re: dark blue and green) were reported in an Other² category and combination Note and Other category, respectively. A visual analysis highlighting the 15 federal entities along with their reported P3 activities follows on the next page.

² Other category consists of: Secretary's Message; Payment Integrity Report; Other Information.

24 CFO Act Agencies & 16
Significant Entities



15 mention P3s in some fashion = 14 CFO Act Agencies & 1 *Significant Entity* (MCC)

MD&A




1. Rural Infrastructure
2. Academia, Industry, etc
3. Consortiums
4. Disease & Pharma
5. Blended finance

MD&A
& Note




6. Infrastructure, ESPCs, UESCs, Brand USA
7. ESPCs, UESCs, & consortiums

MD&A
& Other




8. Infrastructure protection, financial Assistance, Identity theft

Note only



9. Military housing
10. ESPCs
11. Not identified
12. EULs, ESPCs, UESCs
13. Out-leases, ESPCs

Other only



14. COVID Testing, Dialysis Innovations, Fraud Prevention

Note &
Other



15. Housing Assistance*

* = OMB A-136
excluded loans, loan
guarantees and
insurance programs.

ATTACHMENT 2: Analysis of FY 2020 SFFAS 49 Disclosures

Paragraph 24 of SFFAS 49, *Public-Private Partnerships: Disclosure Requirements* identifies 14 disclosures that could apply to a reportable P3. They are as follows:


	<u>Paragraph</u>	<u>Disclosure Requirement</u>
1	24a	Purpose, objective, rationale, relative benefits/revenues, and statutory authority
2	24b	Federal and non-federal funding
3	24c	Expected life determination
4	24c	Time periods payments are expected to occur
5	24c	Whether payments are made directly to each partner or indirectly
6	24c	In-kind contributions/services and donations
7	24c	Amounts received and paid by the government during the reporting period(s)
8	24c	Amounts estimated to be received and paid in aggregate over the expected life of the P3
9	24d	Contractual risk and potential effect on cash flows
10	24d	Remote risks of loss
11	24e	Associated amounts recognized in the financial statements
12	24e	Significant instances of non-compliances
13	24e	Whether the P3 borrowed or invested capital contingent upon the reporting entity's promise to pay whether implied or explicit
14	24e	Description of events of termination or default

Staff notes that requirements one through ten are considered “main body” disclosures for purposes of the following analyses to differentiate requirements 11 through 14 which are “As applicable” disclosures. The following analyses display Disclosure Reporting Percentages and Entity Reporting Percentages. Disclosure reporting percentages reveal how often a discrete requirement was reported whereas entity-reporting percentages illustrate how many of the total (14) and main-body (10) requirements were reported by entities. The analyses follow:

ATTACHMENT 2a: Disclosure Reporting Percentages


Disclosure Reporting Percentages

These two elements (i.e., significant instances of non-compliance and potential effect on cash flows) were not reported.



ATTACHMENT 2b: Entity Reporting Percentages

Entity Reporting Percentages



Disclosure items 1 through 10 (par. 24a – 24d) can be considered “main-body” disclosures. Please note that 24d potential effect on cash flows was not reported by any entity.

When including disclosure items 11 through 14, the “As applicable” disclosures, staff notes that disclosures are dependent upon unique entity situations that may or may not require disclosure. The “As applicable” follow –

- 24ei - Associated amounts recognized in the financial statements
- 24eii - Significant instances of non-compliances
- 24eiii - Whether the P3 borrowed or invested capital contingent upon the reporting entity's promise to pay whether implied or explicit
- 24eiv - Description of events of termination or default

Most Commonly Reported P3: ESPCs and UESCs

Department of Commerce

FY20 AFR, Note 26 Public Private Partnerships, Page 130

Key financial data for this contract, as amended, is shown below:


	FY 2020
Award Amount ¹	\$ 44,656
Principal Financed ²	\$ 49,998
Total Estimated Cost Savings ³	\$ 112,141
Total Guaranteed Cost Savings ³	\$ 105,119
Total Payments to Contractor ³	
Principal	\$ 49,998
Performance Period Expenses (includes Contractor Profit)	34,629
Interest Expense	19,808
Total	\$ 104,435

¹ Total Implementation Costs.

² Total Implementation Costs plus Total Financing Procurement Price.

³ Implementation Period plus Post-acceptance Performance Period (19 Years).

Savings of \$105.1 minus
P3 Vendor Payment of
\$104.4 = \$700K Net
savings divided by 19
years = Annual net
savings of \$36,842.10



Note 16, page 96 - Unfunded Portion of ESPC & UESC Liability = \$74.4

So, \$74.4 less P3 Vendor Payment of \$104.4 = \$30.0 contingent liability payments.

Department of Energy

FY20 AFR, Note 14 Other Liabilities, Page 74

14. Other Liabilities


This P3 is separately identified in the Other Liability note and refers readers to Note 11, Liabilities Not Covered By Budgetary Resources

(\$ IN MILLIONS)	FY 2020	FY 2019
Intragovernmental		
Oil held for Department of Defense ^(Notes 2 and 8)	\$ 123	\$ 123
Future reimbursements to the Treasury Judgment Fund ^(Note 11)	407	393
Negative subsidies and downward re-estimates on loans outstanding	168	172
Other	191	74
Total other intragovernmental liabilities	\$ 889	\$ 762
Environment, safety, and health compliance activities ^(Note 11)	\$ 1,436	\$ 1,436
Accrued payroll, benefits, and withholding taxes	1,909	1,551
Residential exchange ^(Note 11)	1,910	2,093
Asset retirement obligations	891	821
Energy savings performance contracts and utility energy service contracts ^(Note 11)	462	504
Oil held for others ^(Notes 2 and 8)	149	-
Other	273	274
Subtotal	\$ 7,030	\$ 6,679
Total other liabilities	\$ 7,919	\$ 7,441

Department of Energy

FY20 AFR, Note 14 Other Liabilities, Page 76

Unlike Commerce,
program information
such as anticipated
savings or payment
details are not
displayed.



(\$ IN MILLIONS)	ESPCs	UESCs	Total
Non-federal partners' implementation amount	\$ 619	\$ 20	\$ 639
Total amount of payments to be made by DOE over life of arrangement	1,979	24	2,003
Total cumulative payments made as of 9/30/20	721	13	734
Total payments made in FY 2020	107	2	109
Total amount of scheduled payments remaining to be made in FY 2021+	1,258	11	1,269

Note 11, page 71 - ESPC & UESC liabilities not covered by budgetary resources = \$462.0. So, \$462.0 less remaining P3 Vendor Payment of \$1,269 = \$807.0 contingent liability payments.

Department of Veterans Affairs

FY20 AFR, Note 25 Public-Private Partnerships, Page 98

NOTE 25. PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS

VA is engaged in various collaborative relationships with private sector entities in which the governance, roles and responsibilities were determined to produce a risk-sharing arrangement. These relationships are referred to as public-private partnerships (P3). While many of VA's relationships may be referred to as a P3, only those meeting the disclosure requirements outlined in SFFAS No. 49 are disclosed below.

<i>(dollars in millions)</i>	Actual Amount Received	Actual Amount Paid	Estimated Amount to be Received	Estimated Amount to be Paid
As of September 30, 2020				
EUL	\$ 2	\$ -	\$ 71	\$ 11
ESPC	-	63	-	966
UESC	-	33	-	29
Total	\$ 2	\$ 96	\$ 71	\$ 1,006

Department of Veterans Affairs

FY20 AFR, Note 25 Public-Private Partnerships, Page 100

The benefits of ESPCs and UESCs include:

- Infrastructure improvements that pay for themselves over time; and,
- Ability to install longer payback energy and water conservation measures by bundling savings with shorter payback measures.

<i>(dollars in millions)</i> As of September 30, 2020	Total Cumulative Funding by VA over life of Arrangement	Total Cumulative Funding by Private Sector over life of Arrangement
ESPC	\$ 108	\$ 624
UESC	102	72
Total	\$ 210	\$ 696

General Services Administration

FY20 AFR, Note 19 Public-Private Partnerships, Page 113

In the table below, of the total \$1,511 million shown as the amount to be paid in future periods, \$657 million has been recognized as installment contract liability as of September 30, 2020; \$239 million is for the future interest costs associated with the long-term financing of that liability; and \$615 million represents the contractual estimate of operations and maintenance support costs to be incurred over the life of the ESPCs.

19 . Public - Private Partnerships (P3s) Revenues and Expenses *(Dollars in Millions)*

Agreements/Contracts	2019		2020		Future Periods	
	Actual Amount Received	Actual Amount Paid	Actual Amount Received	Actual Amount Paid	Estimated Amount to be Received	Estimated Amount to be Paid
Outleases	\$19	\$—	\$21	\$—	\$255	\$—
ESPCs	\$—	\$90	\$—	\$94	\$—	\$1,511

ATTACHMENT 4: Example of a Comprehensively Reported P3: MHPIs

The DoD FY 2020 disclosure comprehensively reports information regarding its Military Housing Privatization Initiative (MHPI). In addition to providing substantial disclosures as required by SFFAS 49, the DoD Note 25 on page 191 [afr2020 \(defense.gov\)](#) embodies many, if not most of the qualitative characteristics³ of financial information:

Understandability – The information is expressed clearly and simply enough for a first-time reader to grasp the operational and financial aspects of the MHPI. Examples:

- Operational – *“These entities allow the Department to work with the private sector to build, renovate and sustain military housing by obtaining private capital to leverage government dollars.”*
- Financial – *“The Military Departments are assessing their MHPI agreements and contracts to provide actual and estimated amounts paid and received by the Department for future periods, in compliance with OMB A-136’s significant entity disclosure requirement. The Components continue to assess agreements using criteria from SFFAS 49 to determine if they have P3s to disclose. The Department will report these agreements as soon as these assessments are complete.”*

Reliability – In part, to be reliable, financial reporting should be free from bias and should faithfully represent what it purports to represent. Examples:

- *“The Government Accountability Office Report, GAO-20- 280T, Preliminary Observations on DoD’s Oversight of the Condition of Privatized Military Housing, provides information about the Department’s governance activities, and the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) 2020 Sections 3001-3064 prescribes the authoritative guidance which defines the accountability and oversight measures of the MHPI projects, the protections and responsibilities for tenants, and any additional requirements relating to contracts and management of MHPI projects.”*
- *“Beginning in FY2020, the Department adopted FASB ASC 323 Investments – Equity Method and Joint Ventures to account for its investments in LPs and LLCs engaged in MHPI projects. This treatment was chosen in the absence of specific FASAB accounting standards for the MHPI financial arrangement. The Department subsequently rescinded the policy requiring FASB ASC 323 and, instead, required Military Departments to provide details of the MHPI agreements and associated financial activity in the footnote disclosures.”*

Relevance - Information is relevant if it is capable of making a difference in a user’s assessment of a problem, condition, or event.

- *“From January 1, 2020 forward, Pub. L. 116-92 §§ 3036 and 3037 require the Military Departments to make monthly direct payments to the MHPI entities of*

³ SFFAC 1, *Objectives of Federal Financial Reporting*.

ATTACHMENT 4: Example of a Comprehensively Reported P3: MHPIs

- *2.5% of BAH and “underfunded” projects may receive up to an additional 2.5% of BAH monthly at the determination of the Chief Housing Officer of the Department of Defense and Secretaries of the Military Departments until Congress modifies or rescinds this direction.”*

Timeliness - In some instances, timeliness may be so essential that it requires sacrificing a certain amount of precision or detail.

- *“The Military Departments are assessing their MHPI agreements and contracts to provide actual and estimated amounts paid and received by the Department for future periods, in compliance with OMB A-136’s significant entity disclosure requirement. The Components continue to assess agreements using criteria from SFFAS 49 to determine if they have P3s to disclose. The Department will report these agreements as soon as these assessments are complete.”*

Consistency - If accounting principles have changed or if the financial reporting entity has changed, the nature and reason for the change, as well as the effect of the change, should be disclosed.

- *“Beginning in FY2020, the Department adopted FASB ASC 323 Investments - Equity Method and Joint Ventures to account for its investments in LPs and LLCs engaged in MHPI projects. This treatment was chosen in the absence of specific FASAB accounting standards for the MHPI financial arrangement. The Department subsequently rescinded the policy requiring FASB ASC 323 and, instead, required Military Departments to provide details of the MHPI agreements and associated financial activity in the footnote disclosures.”*

Comparability - Financial reporting should help report users make relevant comparisons among similar federal reporting units, such as comparisons of the costs of specific functions or activities.

- The Private Partner’s potential risks are (1) inability to recover initial cash contributions, (2) inability to repay bonds and/or loans, and (3) loss of a long-term revenue source. The Private Partner is not entitled to the return of its capital contribution, or to be paid interest on its capital contribution. The Department’s potential risks are (1) loss of the initial cash contribution to the program, (2) default by the Private Partner on a government direct loan, (3) guarantee threshold event, such as the need to request additional funds above the initial threshold amount, triggered under a loan guarantee agreement, (4) need to provide direct management support and financial contribution to the project until its completion if the Private Partner fails to comply with contractual terms, and (5) failure to deliver quality housing services to Military Personnel. Likewise, when unpredicted events occur, such as natural disasters and severe weather events, the Military Departments are required to provide direct intervention by restoring and rebuilding military housing.

Department of Defense

FY20 AFR, Note 25 Public Private Partnerships, Page 191

TABLE 25: CUMULATIVE CONTRIBUTIONS

Cumulative as of September 30
(\$ in millions)

2020

Military Department Contributions to the DoD MHPI Program*

Funding Contributions to DoD MHPI Program	\$3,081.8
Real Property Contributions to the LLCs & LPs (value of Real Property Assets (RPA) Conveyed, per OMB Scoring Documents)	7,617.5
DoD Direct Payments as Required by Pub. L. 115-91 § 603 (1% BAH through August 2018), and 15-232 § 606 (5% BAH through December 2019), and 116-92 §§ 3036 and 3037 (2.5% BAH and 2.5% for underfunded projects)	176.2
Basic allowance for housing (BAH) under § 403 of Title 37 to members living in privatized housing	3,140.3

DoD Contributions from the MHPI Program to the LLCs/LPs*

Direct Cash Contributions	1,607.2
Differential Lease Payments	16.5
Direct Loans Disbursed	1,891.9

Contributions by Private Partners to the MHPI Partnership

Direct Cash Contributions	606.2
Bonds/Loans Contributed	11,259.0
Real Property and Land Contributions	1.6

Contributions by the LLCs/LPs

Bonds/Loans Contributed	51.7
-------------------------	------

*The disclosures above are currently presented in the DoD's consolidated financial statements and are not presented within the Military Department's financial statements.

Staff notes: DoD cannot yet identify current period amounts as it needs to rely on the individual MILDEPS for information.

Nevertheless, Table 25 comprehensively displays cumulative amounts contributed by the parties.

Department of Defense

FY20 AFR, Note 25 Public Private Partnerships, Page 191

FUNDING AND CONTRIBUTIONS

The Department provides funding to the LLC or LP through:

- **Equity Investments** - Provision of cash and transfer of real property ownership (land, housing units, and other structures) to a project and, in return, the DoD receives a portion of that project's profits and losses. In addition, the DoD also receives compensation if the investment is sold;
- **Government Direct Loans** - Provision of cash to a project with the expectation of future payment;
- **Government Loan Guarantees** - Agreement to pay a percentage of the outstanding balance on a non-Government loan in the event of nonpayment by the project;
- **Differential Lease Payments** - Provision of monthly payments to a project above the Basic Allowance for Housing (BAH) paid by the military personnel.

See Note 7, *Direct Loan and Loan Guarantees, Non-Federal Borrowers*.

Staff notes: DoD's disclosure identifies assets and (contingent) liabilities used in its MHPI P3: Equity Investments, Loans Receivable, Loan guarantees, and Differential (additional) lease payments.

ATTACHMENT 5: Identification of Measurement and Recognition Displays

United States Government Balance Sheets as of September 30, 2020, and 2019

(In billions of dollars)	2020	Restated 2019
Assets:		
Cash and other monetary assets (Note 2)	1,926.9	524.6
Accounts receivable, net (Note 3)	321.2	238.0
Direct loans and loan guarantees receivable, net (Note 4)	1,577.4	1,425.8
Inventory and related property, net (Note 5)	379.7	355.7
General property, plant and equipment, net (Note 6)	1,145.0	1,106.9
Securities and investments (Note 7)	121.9	118.3
Investments in special purpose vehicles (Note 8)	108.4	-
Investments in government-sponsored enterprises (Note 9)	108.9	112.1
Other assets (Note 10)	261.3	110.6
Total assets	5,950.7	3,992.0
Stewardship property, plant and equipment (Note 25)		
Liabilities:		
Accounts payable (Note 11)	105.1	98.0
Federal debt and interest payable (Note 12)	21,082.9	16,861.0
Federal employee and veteran benefits payable (Note 13)	9,409.3	8,440.3
Environmental and disposal liabilities (Note 14)	602.7	595.4
Benefits due and payable (Note 15)	256.3	223.6
Loan guarantees liability (Note 4)	520.1	21.7
Insurance and guarantee program liabilities (Note 16)	199.3	194.5
Other liabilities (Note 17)	568.2	510.3
Total liabilities	32,743.9	26,944.8
Commitments (Note 19) and Contingencies (Note 20)		

ATTACHMENT 5: Identification of Measurement and Recognition Displays

Note 7. Securities and Investments

Securities and Investments as of September 30, 2020, and 2019			
(In billions of dollars)	2020		Book Value
	Cost	Adjustment	
Held-to-Maturity			
Debt securities:	0.1	-	0.1
Equity securities:	3.5	-	3.5
Total held-to-maturity (net investment)	3.6	-	3.6
Available-for-Sale:			
Debt securities:	1.3	0.2	1.5
Total available-for-sale (fair value)	1.3	0.2	1.5
Trading Securities:			
Debt securities:			
Non-U.S. government.....	9.4	0.1	9.5
Commercial	0.4	-	0.4
Mortgage/asset backed	5.7	0.2	5.9
Corporate and other bonds	23.2	2.9	26.1
All other debt securities	1.7	6.4	8.1
Equity securities:			
Unit trust	13.8	7.9	21.7

FY 2020 Consolidated Financial Report of the United States, page 92 Note 7

NOTE 5: INVESTMENTS AND RELATED INTEREST

TABLE 5: INVESTMENTS AND RELATED INTEREST

As of September 30 (\$ in millions)		2020			
	Cost	Amortization Method	Amortized (Premium)/Discount	Investments, Net	Market Value Disclosure
Intragovernmental Securities					
Non-Marketable, Market-Based					
Military Retirement Fund	\$1,013,708.9	Eff. Int.	\$(40,106.4)	\$973,602.5	\$1,218,732.9
Medicare Eligible Retiree					
Health Care Fund	305,586.8	Eff. Int.	(17,785.7)	287,801.1	363,974.1
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	9,280.8	Eff. Int.	20.5	9,301.3	9,341.5
Other Funds	2,993.8	Eff. Int.	(23.0)	2,970.8	3,052.1
Total Non-Marketable, Market-Based	1,331,570.3		(57,894.6)	1,273,675.7	1,595,100.6
Accrued Interest	8,091.4	Eff. Int.	N/A	8,091.4	8,091.4
Total Intragovernmental Securities	1,339,661.7		(57,894.6)	1,281,767.1	1,603,192.0
Other Investments	\$3,511.6		\$-	\$3,511.6	N/A

Legend for Amortization Methods:
Eff. Int. = Effective Interest Method

FY 2020 DoD Financial Report, page 125 Note 5

DoD Note 5 – “Other Investments consists of Military Housing Privatization Initiative (MHPI) limited partnerships (LP) and limited liability companies (LLC). These business enterprises are designed as public-private partnerships, which are defined as long-term contractual arrangements between the government and the private sector whereby the private partner delivers and funds public services using a capital asset, and sharing the associated risks. The Department invests in non-governmental entities involved in the acquisition or construction of family housing and supporting facilities at Army, Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps installations. The Department provides cash, land, or facilities as equity, and the Department’s involvement in the operations and management of the LP/LLC is governed by evaluating the percentage of ownership interest, along with analyzing the indicators of control, which determines the level of influence over the partnership. Total Other Investments is currently reporting cash investments only. See Note 25, *Public- Private Partnerships* for additional information on cash and non-cash contributions to the MHPI limited partnerships.”

ATTACHMENT 5: Identification of Measurement and Recognition Displays

Note 8. Investments in Special Purpose Vehicles

Investments in Special Purpose Vehicles as of September 30, 2020

(In billions of dollars)	Gross Investments	Cumulative Valuation Gain (Loss)	Fair Value
Corporate Credit Facilities	37.5	(0.1)	37.4
Main Street Lending Programs	37.5	(4.3)	33.2
Municipal Liquidity Facility	17.5	(0.2)	17.3
Term Assets Lending Facility	10.0	(0.1)	9.9
Commercial Paper Funding Facility	10.0	0.1	10.1
Total investments in Special Purpose Vehicles	112.5	(4.6)	107.9
Common stock warrants ¹			0.5
Total			108.4

¹ Investments in common stock warrants are included due to the nature of funding and purpose of financial assistance to provide payroll support to aviation workers during the pandemic. Common stock warrants gross investment cost is \$4 billion

Staff note – unlike the Special Purpose Vehicles discussed above in the DoD example, these entities are “intervention entities” and not considered to be in a permanent or long-term relationship with the government. As such, these entities are classified as disclosure entities. Nevertheless, the value of the investments in these entities, changes in value, and related activity with these entities are included in the U.S. government’s consolidated financial statements.

FY 2020 Consolidated Financial Report of the United States, page 95 Note 8

H. Investments in Special Purpose Vehicles

Treasury invested in common stock warrants and equity investments in SPVs for the purpose of enhancing the liquidity of the U.S. financial system. These equity investments are reported at fair value. In addition to SPV investments, warrants are held for the purchase of common stock received as compensation from recipients of financial assistance to support ongoing employment of aviation workers during the pandemic under Section 4117 of the CARES Act. The warrants are assets of the U.S. government and Treasury is precluded from using the cash proceeds realized from the financial instruments received. These investment holdings are also reported at fair value.

The valuation to estimate the investment’s fair value incorporates forecasts, projections, and cash flow analyses. Changes in valuation, including impairments, are deemed usual and recurring and thus are recorded as exchange transactions on the Statement of Net Cost and investments in SPVs on the Balance Sheet. See Note 8—Investments in Special Purpose Vehicles for additional information.

Staff note - equity investments are reported at fair value per Note 1, page 76.

ATTACHMENT 5: Identification of Measurement and Recognition Displays

Investments in Private-Sector Entities

Investments in private-sector entities are the result of FHA's Risk Sharing Debentures. Multifamily Risk Sharing Debentures [Section 542(c)] is a program available to lenders where the lender shares the risk in the property by issuing debentures for the claim amount paid by FHA on defaulted insured loans.

94/ HUD FY 2020 Agency Financial Report
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
www.hud.gov



Staff note – HUD does not specify either in Note 5 partially shown here or in Note 1f on pages 71-72 the measurement basis for investments with the private sector. Presumably, debentures if held to maturity would be measured and recognized at an amortized cost.

Financial Information

The following table presents financial data on FHA's investments in Risk Sharing Debentures as of September 30, 2020:

Investments						
(Dollars in Millions)	2020					
	Beginning Balance	Net Acquisitions	Share of Earnings or Loss	Return of Investment	Redeemed	Ending Balance
Securities Held Outside of Treasury	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
601 Program	-	-	-	-	-	-
Risk Sharing Debentures	6	-	-	-	(6)	-
Total	\$ 6	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ (6)	\$ -

FY 2020 HUD Financial Report, pages 94-95 Note 5 Investments

ATTACHMENT 6: Proposed Next Steps

September 2021

Form Task Force

October 2021 – March 2022

Conduct meetings covering:

1. Balance sheet presentation and valuation
2. Interest in an SPE/SPV
3. Single or Unitary Payments
4. Asset Capitalization
5. Reversionary or Residual Interests
6. Non-monetary exchanges
7. In-kind Consideration (Donated assets)
8. Unearned Revenue

April – May 2022

Staff drafts Measurement and Recognition Exposure Draft (ED)

June – December 2022

Board ED deliberations

January – April 2023

Board issues ED for 90-day comment period

May – December 2023

Board redeliberates and issues final SFFAS

ATTACHMENT 7: Questions for the Board

Question 1 – As noted in Attachment 1, eight reports addressed P3s in their MD&A wherein five were MD&A only, two were MD&A accompanied by a P3 note, and one was MD&A accompanied by an “other” presentation. Such disparate reporting may be indicative of how the P3 definition, exclusions, risk-based characteristics, and materiality guidance is being used or understood by preparers and their auditors.

Question 1 - Do Members desire additional insight and research into how the P3 definition, exclusions, risk-based characteristics, and materiality guidance is being used or understood by preparers and their auditors?

Question 2 – As noted at Attachment 2, two disclosure requirements (elements) (i.e., significant instances of non-compliance (24e) and potential effect on cash flows (24d)) were not reported by any entity. The 24e disclosure is an “As applicable” disclosure dependent upon unique entity situations that may or may not require disclosure. However, the 24d disclosure is a “main-body” disclosure that was not reported by any entity. Given that (1) this disclosure is intended to reflect the contractual risks in monetary terms, (2) is a corollary to the contractual risk disclosure, and (3) entities did disclose contractual risks, such non-disclosure could be indicative of measurement or recognition concerns or difficulties preparers may have.

Question 2 - Do Members desire additional insight and research into why this corollary disclosure wasn’t provided by any entity?

Question 3 – As noted in Attachment 3, ESPCs and UESCs are the most commonly reported P3. As a result, the Board may wish to explore whether measurement and recognition guidance should be developed for these types of arrangements/transactions

Question 3 - Do Members wish to explore whether measurement and recognition guidance should be developed for ESPCs and UESCs?

Question 4 – As evidenced at Attachments 4 and 5, entities are reporting investments in P3s (e.g., DoD) or P3-like arrangements (e.g., HUD). As a result, the Board may wish to explore whether measurement and recognition guidance should be developed for investments in P3s or P3-like arrangements/transactions.

Question 4 - Do Members wish to explore whether measurement and recognition guidance should be developed for Investments in P3s or P3-like arrangements?

APPENDIX

Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards 49: Public-Private Partnerships: Disclosure Requirements



Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board

PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS

Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards 49

April 27, 2016

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, 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.

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
Mail stop 6H19
Washington, DC 20548
Telephone 202-512-7350
FAX – 202-512-7366
www.fasab.gov

SUMMARY

This Statement establishes principles to ensure that disclosures about Public-Private Partnerships (P3s) are presented in the reporting entity's general purpose federal financial reports (GPFFRs). The principles guide financial reporting by establishing a P3 definition and identifying risk-based characteristics that need to exist before considering the P3 arrangement or transaction for disclosure.

This Statement exempts certain arrangements or transactions from the P3 disclosure requirements contained herein. Such exempt arrangements or transactions are subject to existing disclosure requirements in other Statements of Federal Financial Accounting Standards (SFFAS) applicable to such arrangements or transactions.

This Statement provides for first determining those arrangements or transactions that are exempt from the provisions of this Statement before proceeding to the P3 definition. Federal P3s are defined as “risk-sharing¹ arrangements or transactions lasting more than five years between public and private sector entities.” Arrangements or transactions meeting the P3 definition are then evaluated against risk-based characteristics referred to as “Conclusive Characteristics.” Should the arrangement or transaction not meet any one of the Conclusive Characteristics required for disclosure, the arrangement or transaction should then be evaluated against the “Suggestive Characteristics” before concluding whether disclosure is required. If an arrangement or transaction warrants reporting, the disclosures should be provided.

Disclosure requirements comprise quantitative and qualitative information to assist users in understanding the nature of P3s such as the relative benefits/revenues being received in exchange for the government's consideration, the contractual terms governing payments to and from the government, and related risks including those deemed remote. Disclosures can be provided by individual P3 or summarized; for example, by an entity's strategic objectives, departmental or bureau categorizations, or program budget classifications.

This Statement helps achieve the operating performance and budgetary integrity objectives outlined in Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Concepts (SFFAC) 1, *Objectives of Federal Financial Reporting*, by making P3s more understandable. P3 information is important to meeting these objectives because the federal government is accountable to citizens for the proper administration of its resources. Moreover, because P3s are a form of investment, they should be adequately disclosed in order to assist report users in determining: (a) the important assets of the U.S. government and how effectively they are being managed and (b) the identification of risks.

This Statement is effective for periods beginning after September 30, 2018. Earlier implementation is permitted.

¹ Risk-sharing exists when a public sector entity shares risks and rewards with a private sector entity whenever the benefits of the arrangement or transaction accrue to both the private sector entity and the public sector entity and (1) the public sector entity is at risk of loss, or (2) the private sector entity's ability to perform is at risk and success of the arrangement or transaction depends upon the public sector's intervention.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary	3
Introduction.....	5
Standards	8
Scope.....	8
Definition.....	9
Identification of P3's Requiring Disclosure	10
Disclosure Requirements.....	14
Effective Date.....	16
Appendix A: Basis for Conclusions	17
Appendix B: Flowchart.....	33
Appendix C: Abbreviations	34
Appendix D: Glossary	35

INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE

1. To meet challenges such as those brought about by limited budgetary resources governments are increasingly establishing risk-sharing arrangements or transactions² with the private sector. Some of these arrangements or transactions may also involve private financing and enable governmental agencies to fulfill their missions to their constituents that would otherwise not be possible without such arrangements or transactions.
2. These risk-sharing arrangements or transactions are commonly referred to as **Public-Private Partnerships (P3s)**³ but may also be referred to as Alternative Financing Arrangements, or Privatization Initiatives, some of which are extremely complex. For example, P3s may involve the use of appropriated funds, non-appropriated funds, third-party financing, or significant amounts of private capital or investment. Furthermore, P3s can (1) be so long-term in nature that costs along with the accompanying benefits may not be distributed equitably across generations, (2) exclude contractual protections afforded the government by the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) such as, but not limited to: termination rights and obligations, contract by negotiation, cost accounting administration, and contract cost allowability, and (3) require the government to provide resources or absorb losses greater than other alternative procurement methods or competing in-house⁴ performance. Lastly, P3s may involve the transfer of government assets, including intellectual property, into private hands for extended periods of time.
3. As a result, the Board recognizes that the accounting and reporting issues related to risk-sharing can also be extremely complex, involving a wide array of assets and liabilities. P3s by their very design transfer or share various forms of risk among the P3 partners. Such risk allocation strategies are in essence the very incentives that serve as the foundation or building blocks for P3s. Therefore, an entity should understand how much (total) risk resides in an arrangement or transaction and how much of that risk has been (1) transferred to the private partner, (2) shared with the private partner, and (3) retained by the entity (that is, the government sponsor). Such an understanding relies on a thorough analysis of the underlying contractual agreements, guarantees, insurance, and indemnification strategies as well as the existence and nature of any underlying private party capital buffer that might exist; that is, the extent of any debt (for example, bonds, loans and notes) and equity (for

² Risk-sharing can be either structural or transactional. P3 Structural Arrangements are external to the government entity's operations and often involve the creation of a Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV), Trust, or Limited Partnership (LP). For example, military base housing. P3 Transactional Arrangements are internal to the government entity's operations. For example, work-share programs not involving the creation of a SPV, Trust, or LP.

³ Terms defined in the Glossary are shown in bold-face the first time they appear.

⁴ In-house refers to using government facilities and personnel as opposed to relying on commercial sources to supply the products and services the government needs.

example, stocks, and other securities representing an ownership interest) participation.

4. Entities can execute P3s via **structural arrangements** through the use of **special purpose vehicles (SPV's)** and/or directly as **program transactional arrangements**. Furthermore, many P3s are either discrete (long-term) leases or involve aspects of leasing.
5. The Board has previously addressed various types of long-term arrangements or transactions in which the government participates (for example, leases or guarantees). As such, accounting standards exist that provide for recognition and measurement of assets/liabilities and revenues/expenses as well as disclosures of certain risks in these long-standing types of arrangements or transactions. This Statement supplements existing guidance to help ensure adequate disclosure of those arrangements/transactions that either form the basis of or are part of a P3. Therefore, existing accounting standards that govern the various types of long-term arrangements/transactions continue to apply.
6. To that end, the Board notes that there are risks associated with P3s. For example, risks (1) where actual costs will be greater than budgeted costs, (2) the entity may have to absorb part or all of the project's private debt, (3) the entity will not achieve expected returns on its investments in limited partnerships, (4) conditions may lead to a government-acknowledged event where an entity assumes financial responsibility for the event, and (5) the public purpose or public value will not be fulfilled or achieved. Because of the risks involved in entering into such long-term agreements, some of which involve government assets, specific disclosures regarding P3s are needed. Such disclosures foster accountability and improve understanding of (1) the general risks inherent in P3 arrangements by revealing their purpose, objective, funding, operational and financial structures; and (2) contractual risks of loss such as early termination requirements. Disclosures should generally accompany the related asset and/or liability display contained within the financial statements.
7. A contingency is an existing condition, situation, or set of circumstances involving uncertainty as to possible gain or loss to an entity. Some risks associated with P3s may result in the incurrence of losses and applying Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards 5 (SFFAS 5): *Accounting for Liabilities of the Federal Government* would be appropriate. For recognition of losses, SFFAS 5 requires that a past event has occurred for which a future outflow or other sacrifice of resources is probable and measurable. Disclosure should be provided for reasonably possible losses and probable losses that are not measureable.
8. Due to their very nature, P3s are used to manage risks, some of which may be risks of loss included in the terms of the contractual P3 arrangements or transactions that are deemed remote but are nonetheless material and may require disclosure. For example, excluding contractual protections afforded the government by the FAR⁵ inherently increases the entity's risk as does a

⁵ For example, contractual protections afforded the government by the FAR include but are not limited to: termination rights and obligations, contract by negotiation, cost accounting administration, and contract cost allowability.

relationship with an industry or private partner that may require the government to provide resources or absorb losses beyond what was contemplated. It is the Board's opinion that remote risks of loss included in the terms of the contractual P3 arrangements or transactions that are material should be disclosed. Therefore, consideration should be given to those risks that management does not expect to be likely yet could represent a risk of loss to the entity. With this being said, the Board also recognizes that (1) certain remote risks may have a reasonably high materiality threshold and (2) not all individual remote risks in a P3 arrangement or transaction need to be disclosed to satisfy the requirements of this Statement. As such, remote risks should not be dismissed from disclosure without further consideration of user needs and the qualitative and quantitative characteristics when applying materiality.

9. Disclosures comprise quantitative and qualitative information and not all P3 risks can be readily or sufficiently measured. However, federal financial reports are most likely to meet reporting objectives and, therefore, user's needs when disclosures help readers understand complex arrangements or transactions and the associated risk. To this end, qualitative disclosures are as important as quantitative disclosures. Further, both quantitative and qualitative factors should be considered in assessing materiality as well as the nature and content of information to be disclosed.
10. Because the Board has identified the need for clarity with respect to questions that arise concerning the full costs including risk of these complex arrangements or transactions, this Statement is a first step toward developing principles-based guidance and identifying potential gaps in existing guidance. The Board is working and will continue to work closely with stakeholders interested in improving the accounting and reporting of these complex arrangements or transactions. By addressing disclosure issues as a first step, the Board will facilitate continued cooperation and greater interest in identifying areas requiring attention while minimizing preparer burden. It should be noted that the Board also plans to address measurement, recognition, and reporting issues through continued consultation with stakeholders. This could lead to the issuance of additional guidance.

MATERIALITY

11. The provisions of this Statement need not be applied to immaterial items. However, materiality should be applied cumulatively or in the aggregate by the entity. 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. Refer to paragraphs 8 and 9 above for related comments.

STANDARDS

SCOPE

12. This Statement applies to federal entities that present general purpose federal financial reports, including the consolidated financial report of the U.S. Government (CFR), in conformance with generally accepted accounting principles, 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*.
13. This Statement is applicable to public-private partnerships (P3s) and this term is used to refer to a wide variety of service, management, operating, and research and development arrangements or transactions meeting the definition of P3s presented in paragraphs 16 through 18.⁶ Such arrangements and transactions may include contracts, grants, reimbursable agreements, alternative financing arrangements, privatization initiatives, and other arrangements or transactions.
14. Some P3s can result in risk of loss and therefore should be assessed against the risk based (conclusive and suggestive) characteristics at paragraphs 20 and 21 to identify those that should be disclosed.
15. The following arrangements and transactions are not subject to the provisions of this Statement:
 - a. Non-lease acquisitions of property, plant, and equipment (PP&E) that are subject to the Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) and the private entity is not directly financing, operating, or maintaining the PP&E as part of an overall risk-sharing arrangement or transaction
 - b. Leases⁷ that are not bundled⁸ and are entered into using General Services Administration (GSA)-delegated authority (This Statement does not amend

⁶ For purposes of this Statement, the private sector refers to individuals and entities acting in their private capacities outside of the authority and control of federal, state, or local governments and encompasses for-profit businesses and non-profit organizations that are outside of the authority and control of federal, state or local governments.

⁷ The term leases includes enhanced use leases and both capital and operating leases, as defined under current FASAB standards.

⁸ A bundled lease typically arises when parties to a leasing arrangement agree to include additional products or services in the leasing arrangement, some of which might be related or tied directly to the underlying leased product or services (for example, software updates or maintenance). Although these additional products or services are not always expressly identified in the underlying lease agreement and may be documented in other agreements, they are nonetheless considered “bundled” with the underlying lease agreement.

existing standards applicable to leases and those standards remain applicable to all such arrangements/transactions.)

- c. Acquisition of supplies and services, including construction, research and development, and commercial items, made pursuant to the FAR *Simplified Acquisition Procedures* (FAR Part 13)
- d. Formal and informal arrangements or transactions that do not share risks or rewards and are solely designed to foster goodwill, encourage economic development, promote research and innovation, or coordinate and integrate strategic initiatives
- e. Grants to state, local, and Indian tribal governments and other public institutions and arrangements or transactions with foreign governments
- f. Arrangements or transactions in which private entities voluntarily contribute nominal resources or provide incidental resources without expectation of compensation or government indemnification for any possible risk of loss

DEFINITION

- 16. Subject to the exclusions noted in paragraph 15 and for the purposes of this Statement, federal public-private partnerships (P3s) are risk-sharing⁹ arrangements or transactions with expected lives greater than five years between public and private sector entities. Such arrangements or transactions provide a service or an asset for government and/or general public use where in addition to the sharing of resources, each party shares in the risks and rewards of said arrangements or transactions.
- 17. A public sector entity shares risks and rewards with a private sector entity whenever the benefits of the arrangement or transaction accrue to both the private sector entity and the public sector entity and (1) the public sector entity is at risk of loss, or (2) the private sector entity's ability to perform is at risk and success of the arrangement or transaction depends upon the public sector's intervention.
- 18. The expected life of a P3 is the term or period for which the entity, including consideration of economic incentives, is likely to participate in the P3. The expected life is initially determined at the inception of the P3 arrangement when the economic incentives are identified and considered in the formation of the P3. Economic incentives considered may include expected significantly reduced costs or increased efficiencies if contracts are renewed or if the P3 approach is continued realization of return on investment, continuity of mission critical services, flexibility, and significant

⁹ Risk-sharing can be either structural or transactional. P3 Structural Arrangements are external to the government entity's operations and often involve the creation of a Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV), Trust, or Limited Partnership (LP); for example, military base housing. P3 Transactional Arrangements are internal to the government entity's operations; for example, work-share programs not involving the creation of a SPV, Trust, or LP.

costs associated with nonrenewal, such as required payments at the end of the contract to compensate the private party for significant capital investments. Typically, expected life is documented in budget justifications, cost benefit or value for money analyses, or other analyses. Expected life may extend beyond the current contract period (including options or renewals). Expected life is re-evaluated as P3 contracts are renewed and when the entity identifies significant changes in circumstances during the contract period that may affect the expected life.¹⁰

19. Arrangements or transactions which are not excluded by paragraph 15 and meet the definition in paragraphs 16 through 18 should be assessed against the risk based characteristics in paragraphs 20 and 21.

IDENTIFICATION OF P3'S REQUIRING DISCLOSURE

20. The following risk characteristics are conclusive evidence that P3s possess risk of loss indicating that disclosures should be provided. If any one of the following conclusive risk characteristics is met, the P3 arrangement or transaction should be disclosed.

Conclusive Risk Characteristics	Risk Rationale ¹¹
1. The arrangement or transaction results in the conveyance or creation of a long-lived asset or long-term financing ¹² liability.	Not all P3s result in the conveyance or construction of an asset. However, in those that do, the government's risk may be significantly increased because of costs that accompany asset ownership or control. Further, financing may be provided in whole or shared in part by private sector entities. Note that some private partners may incur substantial financing liabilities in preparation for delivering services even if an asset is not created.
2. The federal entity participates in, helps sponsor, or is party to a Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV), partnership, trust, and other such arrangements.	Entities such as SPVs, partnerships, trusts, and other such arrangements can be established for a variety of strategic and/or tactical reasons. Generally speaking, they are commonly considered risk-containment vehicles and are more often than not, purposefully not included in

¹⁰ The Basis for Conclusions (BFC) paragraph A41 provides examples regarding determination of a P3's expected life.

¹¹ The rationale presented herein explains why the Board believes there is or may be risk of loss when the characteristic is present. The rationale discusses risk broadly and is not intended to create specific disclosure requirements. The disclosures are articulated in paragraph 23. Please refer to BFC paragraphs A37 through A44 for related comments.

¹² Contractors routinely finance operations while awaiting payment of invoices. Such routine financing is not indicative of a P3 in and of itself.

Conclusive Risk Characteristics	Risk Rationale ¹¹
	<p>budgets or balance sheets. P3s employing SPVs, partnerships, trusts, and other such arrangements can be or most often become borrowing arrangements/transactions or alternative financing mechanisms. Therefore, the risk rests in the fact that because SPVs, partnerships, trusts, and other such arrangements can facilitate funding/financing, an agency's explicit or implicit long-term debt or promise to pay the established entity is not appropriately recognized in either budget or financial reports.</p>
<p>3. The arrangement or transaction covers a significant portion of the economic life of a project or asset.</p>	<p>Those P3 procurement or contract arrangements/transactions that cover a significant portion of the economic life of a project or asset pose greater risk to the federal entity because there is often no re-procurement or re-negotiation opportunity for the agency. As a result, changed conditions that could warrant a fair and reasonable re-negotiation or re-competition cannot be exercised and increased costs that would otherwise be avoided are incurred for the duration of the arrangement/transaction.</p>
<p>4. The principal arrangement or transaction is exempt from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. if a contract, the FAR; or b. if a grant, Office of Management and Budget (OMB) requirements (2 C.F.R. Title 2, Part 200). 	<p>The FAR for contracts and OMB requirements for grants govern the administrative framework and include procurement, accounting, and legal requirements to help safeguard taxpayer dollars. Therefore, those P3s exempt from such requirements are at an increased-risk because well-established safeguards and contract resolution mechanisms are absent.</p>

21. The following risk characteristics are evidence that P3s may possess risk of loss and require disclosure. The following suggestive risk characteristics should be considered in the aggregate. Each suggestive risk characteristic will require entity judgment as each characteristic is analyzed in connection with the other suggestive risk characteristics.

Suggestive Risk Characteristics	Risk Rationale ¹¹
1. A Value for Money ¹³ (VfM) analysis is performed.	The term VfM is commonly used in connection with P3 arrangements or transactions. VfM analyses are broader in scope emphasizing qualitative factors, as opposed to the more traditional quantitatively based cost-benefit analyses most often performed. If an entity conducts a VfM analysis it may indicate that the project in question is a P3. VfM's are typically more subjective than traditional cost-benefit analyses and are sometimes prepared ex-post facto, thus increasing potential risk to the agency.
2. The consideration or items given up in an arrangement/transaction or their value are not readily apparent.	Generally under common law, consideration from both parties is required in order to have what constitutes a binding contract. Some courts have ruled that in those cases where the exchange appears excessively one sided, no quid-pro-quo exists and the contract may be void by law. Therefore, in those cases where consideration or its value from either party is not readily apparent, such cases could lead to recourse or remedies that have adverse financial ramifications to the agency.
3. Significant work force duties, activities, or knowledge are cross-shared between public and private sector P3 parties.	As federal entities face under-utilization and skill retention issues, with Congressional approval, some entities are entering into P3 arrangements/transactions to put both infrastructure and government personnel to

¹³ In its publication "The Value for Money Analysis: A Guide for More Effective PSC and PPP Evaluation," the National Council of Public Private Partnerships adopted the United Kingdom's, Her Majesty's Treasury Value for Money definition as contained in Her Majesty's Value Assessment Guide:

VfM is defined as the optimum combination of whole-of-life costs and quality (or fitness for purpose) of the good or service to meet the user's requirement. VfM is not the choice of goods and services based on the lowest cost bid. To undertake a well-managed procurement, it is necessary to consider upfront, and at the earliest stage of procurement, what the key drivers of VfM in the procurement process will be.

Suggestive Risk Characteristics	Risk Rationale ¹¹
	<p>heightened work. However, there is a concern that the analyses used to justify these arrangements or transactions often exclude government personnel costs, including associated legacy costs (for example, pension and OPEB). Therefore, increased risk exists in those cases where such costs are excluded from cost-benefit or VfM analyses because the government (1) is left absorbing these costs with no related activity base, (2) is exposed to potential liabilities arising from union and/or employee litigation, and (3) may lose governmental skill-sets that would lead to costlier procurement options.</p>
<p>4. The focus is more on collaboration and informal, real-time, resolution processes than on formal, contractual, administrative processes.</p>	<p>Due to their very nature, P3 arrangements or transactions involve risk-sharing and in some cases, issues such as contract disputes are resolved informally. However, such informal resolution processes could lead to potential liability when contracting, procurement, or legal personnel are not involved. Therefore, the risk rests in the potential liability arising from informal resolution of what otherwise would require more formal contractual administrative processes.</p>
<p>5. The government relies on either the private sector partner's or a third party's determination of a P3's performance or return on investment/equity without performing its own verification of performance or return on investment/equity.</p>	<p>Agencies often rely on 3rd party experts to assist in performing various types of analyses. It has been noted that conflicts of interest often exist because there are only a few firms who practice in this highly sophisticated area. As a result, some firms have provided advisory services to both the private partner and government sponsor of a P3 arrangement/transaction. In addition, fees are often based on the dollar volume of the arrangement/transaction creating what some believe are self-serving incentives. Therefore, the risk in those P3 arrangements/transactions rests where an agency does not or cannot perform its own independent analysis, thus relying solely on either the private partner or a third party determination of a P3's performance or return on investment/equity without performing its own verification. Such analyses may belie the significant risk the government has or will incur.</p>

DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS

COMPONENT REPORTING ENTITY DISCLOSURES

22. The P3 disclosures at paragraph 24 below specify the inclusion of qualitative and quantitative information and may be aggregated or grouped by an entity's strategic objectives, departmental or bureau categorizations, program budget classifications, or other means.
23. Disclosures should generally accompany the related asset and/or liability display contained within the financial statements. Depending on the circumstances, some of the required information may be disclosed due to other requirements. The resultant disclosures should be integrated so that concise, meaningful, and transparent information is provided and information is not repetitive.
24. Disclosures should be provided for the initial period and all annual periods thereafter where an entity is party to a P3 arrangement/transaction. The following information should be disclosed:
 - a. The purpose, objective, and rationale for the P3 arrangement or transaction and the relative benefits/revenues being received in exchange for the government's consideration, monetary and non-monetary; and the entity's statutory authority for entering into the P3.
 - b. A description of federal and non-federal funding of the P3 over its expected life, including the mix and, where available, the amounts of such funding. For any amounts that are not available, the disclosures should indicate such.
 - c. The operational and financial structure of the P3 including the reporting entity's rights and responsibilities, including:
 - i. A description of the contractual terms governing payments to and from the government over the expected life of the P3 arrangement or transaction to include:
 1. explanation of how the expected life was determined
 2. the time periods payments are expected to occur
 3. whether payments are made directly to each partner or indirectly through a third-party, such as, military housing allowances
 4. in-kind contributions/services and donations

- ii. The amounts received and paid by the government during the reporting period(s) and the amounts estimated to be received and paid in aggregate over the expected life of the P3
- d. Identification of the contractual risks of loss the P3 partners are undertaking
 - i. Identification of such contractual risks of loss should include a description of (1) the contractual risk and (2) the potential effect on cash flows if the risks were realized (for example, early termination requirements including related exit amounts and other responsibilities such as asset condition (hand-back) requirements, minimum payment guarantees, escalation clauses, contingent payments, or renewal options).
 - ii. Disclosure of remote risks of loss should be limited to those included in the terms of the contractual P3 arrangements or transactions. If remote risks of loss are disclosed, an explanation should be included that avoids the misleading inference that there is more than a remote chance of a loss.
- e. As applicable:
 - i. Associated amounts recognized in the financial statements such as gains or losses and capitalized items
 - ii. Significant instances of non-compliances with legal and contractual provisions governing the P3 arrangement or transaction
 - iii. Whether the private partner(s), including any Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV), have borrowed or invested capital contingent upon the reporting entity's promise to pay whether implied or explicit
 - iv. Description of events of termination or default

FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE US GOVERNMENT DISCLOSURES

25. The U.S. government-wide financial statements should disclose:
- a. a general description of P3 arrangements or transactions
 - b. the consolidated amounts the government received and paid during the reporting period(s) and estimated to be received and paid in aggregate over the expected life of the P3s
 - c. a reference(s) to applicable component entity report(s) for additional information

EFFECTIVE DATE

26. The requirements of this Statement are effective for reporting periods beginning after September 30, 2018. Early adoption is permitted.

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 enunciated in this Statement not the material in this appendix should govern the accounting for specific transactions, events, or conditions.

PROJECT HISTORY

- A1. This project was added to the FASAB's technical agenda in April 2012 because federal agencies have increasingly turned to public-private partnerships to accomplish goals and in light of budget pressures likely to further increase their use. Although federal generally accepted accounting principles are fairly robust, the Board noted that due to the complex nature of P3s significant study would be required regarding a host of issues dealing with the definition, measurement, and recognition of P3s. In December 2012, the project plan was adopted with the overall goal of recognizing the full costs of P3s in the financial statements. In addition, a P3 task force was formed and held its first meeting in February 2013.
- A2. Final standards or guidance were expected to follow a three year effort. Specific project objectives include:
 - a. Defining terms
 - b. Providing guidance (that is, identifying gaps) for the recognition and measurement of:
 - i. assets and liabilities
 - ii. revenues and expenses
 - iii. establishing disclosure requirements
 - c. Considering guidance for other arrangements/transactions related to P3s (for example, sale-leaseback or other long-term arrangements)
- A3. Early in its deliberations the Board was clear that forthcoming guidance must be consistently applied and covered by an overarching principle(s). The Board noted its concern is with the risks to which the government is exposed and related disclosures. As a result, members decided that because P3s often involve innovative operational and complicated accounting practices, accompanied by sophisticated financing agreements, these complexities necessitate the establishment of disclosure requirements as a first step to (1) developing uniform, principles-based guidance, and (2) identifying potential gaps in existing guidance. To that end, the Board decided that a broad P3 definition accompanied by risk-based characteristics should be pursued to establish a framework for determining which P3s should be disclosed. The Board believes that the resulting disclosures will inform the need for and development of future standards providing recognition

and measurement guidance specific to P3s. Therefore, any further work will be undertaken after these disclosures become effective.

- A4. P3 task force meetings for this phase of the project were held between February 2013 and May 2014. All meetings were well attended with representation from federal agencies, commercial sector(s), and citizens. Participants came from diverse disciplines such as accounting, auditing, facilities management, financial reporting, housing, information technology (IT), commercial and investment banking, procurement, and program management. To best meet the project goals and objectives, staff, in addition to engaging in task force discussions, initiated fact-finding meetings with experts and practitioners both within and external to government. Staff met with federal agency representatives, public policy experts, consultants, private equity participants, and a private IT/Cloud/Software development firm.

Common Themes and Other Matters

- A5. The most common themes arising from task force and fact finding meetings considered in developing the Statement include:
- a. At a minimum, participants expect continued use if not growth in P3s.
 - b. Government employee legacy & relocation costs are not presently considered in Value for Money (VfM)¹⁴ analyses.
 - c. Long-term nature of P3s is accepted, but concerns include
 - i. lack of transparency in the solicitation and award processes along with the lack of competition hinders accountability and fair and reasonable pricing,
 - ii. not applying the Federal Acquisition Regulation¹⁵ (FAR) increases government risk, and
 - iii. some P3s circumvent procurement administration.

¹⁴ VfM is a much broader concept than typical cost-benefit analysis because it emphasizes “value” in more of a qualitative than quantitative manner. Quantitatively, some VfM models use a project’s Internal Rate of Return (IRR) to help determine project acceptability. The VfM concept has drawn criticisms not only because of its subjectivity and lack of rigor in application, but because in some cases (1) cash flows can be easily managed to meet desired expectations and (2) VfM results are used as ex-post facto justifications for qualitatively made project and/or award decisions. It is important to note that the same criticisms can be made of the more traditional cost-benefit analyses used in management decision making.

¹⁵ The FAR is the primary regulation for use by all Federal Executive agencies in their acquisition of supplies and services with appropriated funds. It became effective on April 1, 1984, and is issued within applicable laws under the joint authorities of the Administrator of General Services, the Secretary of Defense, and the Administrator for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, under the broad policy guidelines of the Administrator, Office of Federal Procurement Policy, Office of Management and Budget.

- d. In-kind contributions are difficult to value or are overvalued and not always reported.
- e. P3 financial reporting is generally supported but agencies and participants vary in the what, how, and where of disclosures. For example, relative to significant and material P3 arrangements or transactions, some believe that property, plant, and equipment (PP&E) note disclosure would be sufficient whereas others believe that MD&A discussion is more appropriate because of the SFFAS 15, *Management's Discussion and Analysis*, requirement to address the future effects of existing, currently-known demands, risks, uncertainties, events, conditions and trends, while others suggest reporting in both locations.

A6. Other matters arising during task force and fact finding meetings included:

- a. **Increased Risk to Citizens.** A few participants noted that P3s erode (1) the notion of public service (for example, what is inherently governmental) and (2) in many cases, belief in good government. This increased risk is evidenced by those entities that:
 - i. purposefully avoid capital acquisition budgeting requirements
 - ii. absorb “availability” risk¹⁶ absent sufficient private partner consideration
 - iii. lose control of assets
 - iv. lock into long-term arrangements/transactions that cannot be re-competed or re-negotiated
 - v. are constrained by contract modification restrictions
 - vi. are constrained by proximity and/or right-to-compete restrictions
 - vii. ignore government employee personnel (legacy) costs
- b. **Financing costs.** To enable private financing to work, P3's must be longer-term in nature to allow for sufficient time to liquidate debt and achieve return on investment targets. This is significantly different than traditional procurement contract periods that are typically 5 years or less.
- c. **Performance Metrics.** Financial reporting would be enhanced by incorporating performance metrics that could point to both risks and potential liabilities as they arise.

¹⁶ Availability risks or project completion risks exist when for example, defects in construction or quality shortfalls within the control of the private partner occur that preclude the asset or service from being available for its intended use requiring the government sponsor to intervene.

Summary of Outreach Efforts

- A7. The ED was issued October 1, 2014 with comments requested by January 2, 2015. Upon release of the exposure draft, notices and press releases went to the following organizations:
- a. The Federal Register
 - b. *FASAB News*
 - c. *The Journal of Accountancy, AGA Today, the CPA Journal, Government Executive and the CPA Letter*
 - d. The CFO Council, the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency, the Financial Statement Audit Network; and members of both the Federal Real Property Council and Federal Facilities Council
 - e. Committees of professional associations generally commenting on exposure drafts in the past
- A8. This broad announcement was followed by electronic mailings of the exposure draft followed up by several reminder notices.to:
- a. Relevant congressional committees
 - i. House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform
 - ii. Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
 - b. Public interest and labor union groups
 - i. In the Public Interest
 - ii. American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees
- A9. The Board did not rely on the number in favor of or opposed to a given position. Information about the respondents' majority view is provided only as a means of summarizing the comments. The Board considered the arguments in each response and weighed the merits of the points raised. The following paragraphs discuss significant issues identified by respondents followed by Board decisions.

Respondents' Comments on the Exposure Draft

- A10. The exposure draft was issued with an alternative view that expressed concerns over the (1) breadth of the general definition, (2) disclosures related to certain remote risks, and (3) clarity of "significant exposure." Specific comments regarding respondent concerns and Board re-deliberations are noted in the following paragraphs as appropriate.

Definition: Public-Private Partnerships

- A11. In consultation with constituents to include respondent comments received and related outreach concerning the breadth and scope of the definition, the Board has further developed and refined the definition proposed in the exposure draft. The Board desired establishing a definition that (1) reflected actual federal P3 practices, (2) covered the wide breadth and diverse scope of federal assets, and (3) focused on the risk-sharing or risk transfer strategies that are the very essence of these complicated arrangements or transactions. The definition is intended for general application to be applied uniformly across the federal government.
- A12. In reviewing the P3 definitions of other standard-setters, the Board notes that their guidance is largely focused on service concession arrangements (that is, a subset of P3s) that directly benefit the general public. The definition contained in this Statement is much broader given the wide breadth and diverse scope of federal assets being managed. It is important to note that (1) federal preparers and auditors have identified accounting topics that extend beyond those typically found in service concession arrangements, (2) oversight entities such as the Congressional Budget Office, GAO, and inspectors general have defined and identified P3 arrangements or transactions to be more than just service concessions, and (3) service concession accounting guidance primarily reflects economic development initiatives such as new roads, toll roads, highways, airports, railways, and hospitals, whereas federal initiatives extend well beyond economic development such as the common defense and general welfare of the nation thus necessitating accounting guidance to best fit these federal initiatives.
- A13. In developing the definition, the Board primarily relied on (1) the task force's review of existing definitions from several authoritative sources, (2) various respondent comments to the definition contained in the exposure draft, and (3) an ad-hoc working group comprised of selected respondents. The task force identified the more common characteristics of P3s which are believed to exist in the federal government. Some of the more common P3 characteristics identified include: existence of very long-term contractual agreements (for example, anywhere from five to 99 years), shared or transferred financing, agreements covering a significant portion of the project's or asset's life, shared risks, shared rewards, shared skills and expertise, conveyance or creation of real and personal property, and the use of SPVs. Those respondents specifically commenting on the definition as well as the ad-hoc working group primarily suggested better linkage between the definition and the risk-based characteristics. Accordingly, the broad definition contained in the exposure draft was further refined and is as follows:

Subject to the exclusions noted in paragraph 15 and for the purposes of this Statement, federal public-private partnerships (P3s) are risk-sharing¹⁷ arrangements or transactions with

¹⁷ A public sector entity shares risks and rewards with a private sector entity whenever the benefits of the arrangement or transaction accrue to both the private sector entity and the public sector entity and (1)

expected lives greater than five years between public and private sector entities. Such arrangements or transactions provide a service or an asset for government and/or general public use where in addition to the sharing of resources, each party shares in the risks and rewards of said arrangements or transactions.

Scope, Applicability and Exclusions

Scope

- A14. The Board recognizes that establishing a P3 definition reflecting the breadth and diverse scope of entity missions, operational strategies, available leasing authorities, and other variables might capture activities which are already being recognized or disclosed in the entity's financial statements. Specifically, this is because the Board has previously addressed various types of long-term arrangements/transactions in which the government participates (for example, leases and guarantees). As such, existing accounting standards provide for recognition and measurement of assets/liabilities and revenues/expenses as well as disclosures of certain risks in these long-standing types of arrangements or transactions. However, the Board believes that there is a need for disclosure requirements specific to the risks existing in P3s for which there is no current accounting guidance. The requirements herein do not replace existing disclosure requirements in other SFFASs for similar arrangements or transactions such as leases. P3s are complex arrangements/transactions and an entity would apply all applicable standards to report relevant information in the notes.

Applicability

- A15. To help ensure achievement of the federal reporting objectives while minimizing unwarranted disclosure of P3 arrangements or transactions, the Board has established filters at several decision points to aid preparers in this regard. The filters are categorized as follows:
- a. Definitional Features Indicative of Risk – After careful study the Board initially identified four major features of federal P3 arrangements or transactions that were embodied in the proposed definition: (1) agreements covering a significant portion of the economic life of a project or asset, and/or lasting more than five years, (2) financing provided in whole or shared in part by the private partner, (3) conveyance or transfer of real property, personal property, or multi-sector skills and expertise, and (4) formation of SPV's. However, as a result of respondent comments concerning linkage between the definition and the risk-based characteristics and a working group recommendation, the Board (1) realigned the four major features by incorporating them directly into the risk-based characteristics and (2) within the definition, specifically excluding arrangements or transactions which are not more than 5 years in duration.

the public sector entity is at risk of loss, or (2) the private sector entity's ability to perform is at risk and success of the arrangement or transaction depends upon the public sector's intervention.

- b. Risk-based Characteristics – The Board has identified and refined during its re-deliberations certain key characteristics discussed later that reflect varying degrees of risk that exist in federal P3s. Therefore, should these characteristics be absent in a P3, the disclosure requirements of this Statement would generally not apply.
- c. Materiality – As is the custom with all Statements issued by the Board, only those P3s that are material (qualitatively and quantitatively) in nature, more thoroughly discussed later, should be subject to the requirements of this Statement. The Board notes that because materiality assessments require both qualitative and quantitative judgments, specific guidance limiting preparer and auditor considerations of information would not be appropriate.

Exclusions

A16. As a result of respondent comments concerning the breadth of the proposed definition, the ad-hoc working group recommended and the Board adopted three additional exclusions. The three additional exclusions are:

- a. grants to state, local, and Indian tribal governments and other public institutions,
- b. arrangements or transactions with foreign governments, and
- c. arrangements or transactions sharing nominal or incidental resources.

The first two exclusions identified above reflect that this Statement only applies when a federal entity is in a risk-sharing arrangement or transaction with the private sector¹⁸ and not a public sector institution. Risks associated with public-to-public partnerships (for example, federal to state or federal to local) and those associated with foreign governments (1) are significantly different when compared to risks arising in public-private partnerships and (2) warrant extensive research far beyond the scope of this Statement. Moreover, arrangements or transactions with Indian tribal governments or foreign governments are closely governed by selected agencies and Congressional committees and are also beyond the scope of this Statement. Lastly, arrangements or transactions in which private entities voluntarily contribute nominal resources or provide incidental resources without expectation of compensation or government indemnification for any possible risk of loss are also excluded from the requirements of this Statement.

A17. In summary, the following arrangements or transactions are excluded from the requirements of this Statement:

¹⁸ For purposes of this Statement, the private sector refers to individuals and entities acting in their private capacities outside of the authority and control of federal, state or local governments and encompasses for-profit businesses and non-profit organizations that are outside of the authority and control of federal, state or local governments.

- a. non-lease acquisitions of property, plant, and equipment that are subject to the FAR and the private entity is not directly financing, operating, or maintaining the PP&E as part of an overall risk-sharing arrangement or transaction,
 - b. leases meeting certain conditions,
 - c. acquisitions made using Simplified Acquisition Procedures (FAR Part 13),
 - d. formal and informal arrangements or transactions that do not share risks or rewards and are solely designed to foster goodwill, encourage economic development, promote research and innovation, or coordinate and integrate strategic initiatives,
 - e. grants to state, local, and Indian tribal governments and other public institutions and those with foreign governments, and
 - f. arrangements or transactions sharing nominal or incidental resources.
- A18. Concerning leases, in consultation with the P3 Task Force and after careful consideration, the Board concluded:
- a. to exclude leases¹⁹ that meet the following two conditions: a) they are not bundled and b) they are entered into using GSA delegated authority. Such leases (1) have no significant P3 risk of loss, (2) are already subject to existing FASAB guidance, (3) have well defined FAR-based contractual processes and remedies in place to address risks associated with landlord-tenant relationships, (4) have contractually capped payments for termination liabilities, and (5) have termination payments that are indemnified by GSA's Building Fund. The Board believes that if a lease is either bundled or not entered into using GSA delegated authority, the provisions of this Statement should apply.
 - b. to not broadly exclude Enhanced Use Leases (EULs) except for those meeting the two conditions cited above because they are more oriented towards P3s as a result of (1) possessing special authorities and not being subject to the FAR, (2) often operating under a risk-reward model as opposed to those entity leases that are basically a landlord-tenant relationship and not a risk-sharing partnership, and (3) possibly including ancillary services and in-kind consideration as part of the arrangement or transaction. Because the Board believes that EULs could be encompassed by this Statement, a

¹⁹ The term leases includes enhanced use leases (EULs) which are typically long-term lease agreements that allow public or private entities to use an agency's property. Agency EUL programs have allowed entities to develop or occupy federal properties such as power plants, housing and healthcare facilities, office space, and parking facilities, and in return, federal agencies receive cash or in-kind consideration. Please note that there is no government-wide definition of EULs. Source: GAO-13-14 Federal Real Property: Improved Cost Reporting Would Help Decision Makers Weigh the Benefits of Enhanced Use Leasing, December 2012).

determination should be made as to whether disclosures are required via the application of the risk-based characteristics.

Risk-based Characteristics

- A19. Although federal P3s are varied and complex, the Board believes there are some common characteristics that can be used to identify those P3s that create risk of loss and should be disclosed. Because the Board is aware of the administrative burdens agencies face day-to-day and that some P3 portfolios might be voluminous, in addition to identifying those P3s that create risk of loss, the risk-based characteristics can also be applied to assist a federal entity in determining which P3 arrangements or transactions do not require disclosure.
- A20. The risk-based characteristics have been developed, refined, and categorized from an initial comprehensive list of characteristics that distinguishes federal P3s from traditional procurement actions. With the assistance of the task force, the Board further analyzed and then selected risk-based characteristics which indicate significant P3 risk of loss. These risk-based characteristics are intended to: (1) apply to all types of P3s: construction, housing, utilities, military depots, and others, and (2) assist a federal entity in ascertaining which P3 arrangements or transactions should be disclosed. Once a P3 is identified for disclosure, such arrangements or transactions would then be evaluated in light of the entity's materiality considerations including quantitative and qualitative threshold(s).
- A21. As a result of respondent comments concerning linkage between the definition and the risk-based characteristics, the working group recommended and the Board adopted an additional risk-based characteristic for grants and other arrangements. Specifically, OMB requirements (2 C.F.R. Title 2, Part 200) for grants govern the administrative framework and include requirements to help safeguard and protect taxpayer dollars. Therefore, those P3s exempt from such requirements are at an increased-risk because well-established safeguards and resolution mechanisms are absent.

Conclusive and Suggestive Characteristics

- A22. The majority of respondents agreed with the risk-based characteristics, their related classification, and their proposed application. However, as mentioned above, the working group recommended and the Board adopted an additional risk-based characteristic for grants and other arrangements. Moreover, the Board clarified the two categories of risk-based characteristics (conclusive and suggestive) pursuant to respondent concerns. Conclusive characteristics are those that existence of any one characteristic means the P3 arrangement or transaction should be disclosed. However, existence of any one of the suggestive characteristics is evidence that the P3 arrangement or transaction may possess risk of loss and require disclosure. Such a suggestive characteristic should be considered in the aggregate with all the other suggestive characteristics before a final decision is made. Each conclusive characteristic is meant to be definitive whereas each suggestive characteristic requires entity judgment as each one is analyzed in connection with the other suggestive characteristics.

- A23. If a P3 arrangement or transaction is subject to disclosure, it should be further evaluated in light of materiality considerations that include both qualitative and quantitative assessments. Additionally, materiality should be applied cumulatively or in the aggregate by the entity.

Materiality

Considering User Needs

- A24. As the standards-setting body for the federal government, the Board has stated that there are two fundamental values that provide the foundation for governmental accounting and financial reporting: “accountability” and its corollary, “decision usefulness.”²⁰ Concepts explain that “Because a democratic government should be accountable for its integrity, performance, and stewardship, it follows that the government must provide information useful to assess that accountability.” The Board believes that P3 disclosures are an essential element in establishing accountability.
- A25. In applying the concept of materiality,²¹ the needs of the users of the annual financial report should be considered. Specific to P3s for example, users are interested in: (1) assessing the costs and related risks of entering into such long-term agreements; (2) assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of these risk-sharing agreements as well as the government’s management of its assets and liabilities; and (3) determining how financial resources, budgetary or otherwise, have been obtained and used and whether their acquisition and use were in accordance with the entity’s legal authorization. As a result, the Board believes that the P3 disclosures required by this Statement will help answer these questions while achieving the associated reporting objectives.

Qualitative and Quantitative Assessments Require Judgment

- A26. In connection with concerns over the breadth and scope of the definition, some respondents suggested that the Board develop a clear and objective materiality standard that would limit the disclosure requirement to those transactions that present substantial financial risk to the government. The Board believes that refining the definition and adding additional exclusions best addresses respondent concerns in this regard. Respondents are reminded that “materiality” has not been formally defined in the accounting community; rather, it is a matter of judgment on the part of preparers of financial statements and the auditors who attest to them. The determination of whether an item is material:

²⁰ SFFAC 1, par. 105 states, “The federal government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed. It therefore has a special responsibility to report on its actions and the results of those actions. ...Providing this information to the public, the news media, and elected officials is an essential part of accountability in government.”

²¹ 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.

- a. requires the exercise of considerable judgment, based on consideration of specific facts and circumstances, and
 - b. depends on the degree to which omitting or misstating information about this 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.
- A27. The Board believes that preparers and auditors are in the best position to exercise this judgment predicated on their direct knowledge of the specific facts and circumstances and user needs. Furthermore, the Board believes that specific guidance concerning materiality assessments would limit preparer and auditor considerations and are therefore inappropriate.
- A28. The Board notes that while a P3 arrangement or transaction might not be considered material from a quantitative standpoint, it may be considered qualitatively material and subject to this Statement's disclosure requirements if the disclosures would influence or change the judgment of the financial statement user. Exclusive reliance on certain quantitative benchmarks or thresholds to assess materiality should be avoided.

Materiality Includes Probability Assessments

- A29. Decisions whether to recognize or, in the case of this Statement, disclose a P3 arrangement or transaction may take into account considerations that include uncertainties. Uncertainties can be expressed as a measurement of an appropriate attribute (for example, historical cost, fair value, expected value, or some other attribute) which may include an assessment of the probability of future flows of economic benefits or services (emphasis added). Furthermore, uncertainties are often subjected to assessments of the materiality of the item, and the benefit versus the cost of recognition or, in this Statement's case, disclosure.
- A30. Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards 5 (SFFAS 5), *Accounting for Liabilities of the Federal Government*, states that "probable" refers to that which
- a. can reasonably be expected, or
 - b. is believed to be more likely than not on the basis of available evidence or logic with the exception of pending or threatened litigation and unasserted claims.
- A31. The Board notes that the concept of probability is imprecise and may be difficult to apply with respect to certain P3 activities such as economic stabilization payments, in addition to other matters that could arise during the life of the P3 arrangement or transaction. However, the "more likely than not" phrase in SFFAS

5 accommodates the assessment of the probability of those uncertainties often associated with P3s due to their long-term nature and project variability.

- A32. Historically, some studies including work done by GAO suggest that, in practice, preparers and auditors in the private sector often interpret "probable" to mean a subjective assessment of probability considerably in excess of 50%. However, FASAB has defined "probable" as "more likely than not," that is, a subjective assessment of probability greater than 50% (51% or more).

Risks that are Deemed Remote

- A33. Most of the respondents agreed with the Alternative View that stated (1) disclosure of remote contingencies is not limited to the terms of contractual arrangements, (2) the concept of "significant exposure" is not sufficiently clear to result in consistent disclosures, and (3) risks related to entity operations or performance (referred to in the Alternative View as business risks) would be included in the risk disclosure. As such, respondents were concerned that such additional disclosures could overwhelm or mislead users. The Board believes that it has addressed respondent concerns in this regard by refining the definition contained in the Exposure Draft, adding additional exclusions, eliminating references to "significant exposure," and in emphasizing at paragraph 24d that remote risks of loss should be limited to those that are included in the terms of the contractual P3 arrangements or transactions. The Board is of the opinion that remote risks can and should be reported where appropriate as explained below.
- A34. SFFAS 5 provides that contingencies deemed remote (that is, the chance that a loss has been incurred is slight) are not recognized as a contingent liability or disclosed.²² However, SFFAS 5 requires that a contingent liability should be disclosed if any of the conditions for liability recognition are not met and there is at least a reasonable possibility that a loss or an additional loss may have been incurred.
- A35. The Board believes that some risks of loss associated with P3s may be consistent with contingencies in SFFAS 5 that arise because of an existing condition, situation, or set of circumstances involving uncertainty as to possible gain or loss to an entity, including the concepts of probable, reasonably possible, and remote. It is this uncertainty, or risk in other words, that prompts entities to seek private partners who can best manage and/or contain the effects of the uncertainty that could ultimately lead to a loss. In applying SFFAS 5 some contingencies may be

²² Per SFFAS 5, paragraph 38, a contingent liability should be recognized when all of these three conditions are met:

- A past event or exchange transaction has occurred (for example, a federal entity has breached a contract with a nonfederal entity).
- A future outflow or other sacrifice of resources is probable (for example, the nonfederal entity has filed a legal claim against a federal entity for breach of contract and the federal entity's management believes the claim is likely to be settled in favor of the claimant).
- The future outflow or sacrifice of resources is measurable (for example, the federal entity's management determines an estimated settlement amount).

identified for which the degree of uncertainty is so great that no reporting (that is, recognition or disclosure) is required by that Statement. However, the Board notes that (1) reporting such contingencies is not inconsistent with the provisions of SFFAS 5 and (2) as discussed above at paragraph A32, because FASAB has defined "probable" as "more likely than not," the FASAB framework suggests that "reasonably possible" and "remote" risks be assessed for disclosure at the remaining (more narrow) band.

- A36. Due to their very nature, P3s can also possess risks of loss that may be considered remote but material. For example, excluding contractual protections afforded the government by the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) inherently increases the entity's risk as does a relationship with an industry or private partner that may require the government to provide resources or absorb losses beyond what was contemplated. The Board believes such P3 arrangements or transactions should be disclosed, subject to materiality, even though the risks of loss included in the terms of the contractual P3 arrangements or transactions may be deemed remote. The Board further notes that enterprise risk management frameworks often focus on remote risks because of the magnitude of any potential adverse effects that might arise. Therefore, consideration should be given to those risks that management does not expect to be likely, but represent a material risk of loss to the government if they were to occur. With this being said, the Board also notes that such remote risks may have a reasonably high materiality threshold balanced by whether the omission is such that it is probable that the judgment of a reasonable person would have been changed or influenced by the disclosure. As such, remote risks should not be dismissed from disclosure without further consideration of user needs and the qualitative and quantitative characteristics when applying materiality.

Disclosure Requirements of P3s

- A37. The task force conducted research and identified examples of disclosures surrounding P3s from a variety of international and national authoritative sources which address P3 information needs for different types of users. Additionally, the task force considered fact-finding meetings with public and private representatives regarding the types of information that diverse users believe are important. As a result, the task force overwhelmingly agreed with requiring disclosures concerning (1) why the government selects a P3 model to conduct business, (2) the solicitation and procurement processes used, (3) how the P3 is structured, (4) the expected benefits, and (5) the total amounts expected to be paid. Although it was noted that requiring a description of the solicitation and procurement processes is unusual in financial reporting, the task force reached that conclusion because P3s fall outside the routine way governments procure services and such disclosures reveal the potential risk that governments assume, which can ultimately lead to liability recognition.
- A38. In analyzing the task force's recommendations the Board considered 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 and budgetary integrity objectives are identified as being most important for P3 reporting. The Board agreed that P3 reporting is important to meeting these objectives because the federal government is accountable to citizens for the proper administration of its resources. As such, the Board agreed with the majority of the task force's recommendations. However, requiring disclosure of an entity's solicitation and procurement processes falls outside the realm of financial reporting. Furthermore, the Board questioned the informational value of such a disclosure and concluded that its cost also exceeded potential benefits identified by the task force.

- A39. P3s are a form of investment and they should be adequately disclosed in order to assist report users in determining: (a) the important assets of the U.S. government and how effectively they are being managed and (b) whether the government's financial position improved or deteriorated over the period of the P3. P3s often involve innovative operational and complicated accounting practices, accompanied by sophisticated financing agreements. These complexities necessitate the establishment of disclosure principles as a first step to (1) developing uniform principles-based guidance, and (2) identifying potential gaps in existing guidance.
- A40. Respondents were mixed regarding disclosures with some stating that the disclosures are onerous and burdensome and the others in agreement with the proposed disclosures or seeking additional disclosures. As a result of considering the overall financial reporting objectives, and in light of certain respondent comments regarding administrative burden, the Board decided to not require disclosure of amounts estimated to be received and paid during each of the succeeding five years. That is, only the amounts received and paid by the government during the reporting period(s) and the amounts estimated to be received and paid in aggregate over the expected life of the P3 need be reported. In determining the expected life of the P3 arrangement or transaction the entity's economic incentives (that is, its risks and/or rewards) should be considered.
- A41. The Board offers two examples regarding the determination of a P3s expected life. First, consider an infrastructure arrangement containing a master ground lease of 50 years where in exchange for an up-front payment the entity out-leases (government-owned) land for the construction of an office building and at the same time enters into an occupancy lease which can be renewed for up to 75 years. The expected life of the P3 should be limited to 50 years given the fact that the entity's economic incentive at year 50 changes due to the master ground lease's expiration. That is, at such time the entity may decide to renew the master ground lease and renegotiate its occupancy lease or sell the land and not renew the occupancy lease. As a result, the amounts estimated to be received and paid in aggregate over the 50 years would be reported. Second, consider a spare parts sustainment program where an entity partners with an inventory logistics firm to handle the entire supply chain management function of a major weapons system expected to remain in service for the next 25 years. Although by statute the entity can only enter into a 5 year (for example, base year with 4 renewable options) contract, it has an economic incentive to maintain the relationship beyond 5 years. This is primarily due to the fact that the private partner is likely to incur a

substantial investment to manage the supply chain and the investment will need to be recovered over time. As a result, the amounts estimated to be received and paid in aggregate over the 25 years would be reported.

Aggregation

- A42. Due to the relative complexity and potential voluminous nature of P3s that an entity might be party to, the Statement permits entities to aggregate disclosures by providing broad and summarized information instead of unique or discrete arrangement or transaction detail. However, entities are permitted to disclose information related to individually significant P3 arrangements or transactions separately if entity management believes that such disclosure would better meet user needs.
- A43. For example, disclosures of P3 arrangements or transactions could be aggregated by an entity's strategic objectives, departmental or bureau categorizations, program budget classifications, or other means. In this way users are presented with information that is comprehensive and material to an entity's financial statements without placing an undue burden on preparers to provide P3 specific or granular level information. Respondents generally supported the aggregation of information.


Reporting Period

- A44. Disclosures should be provided for the initial period and all annual periods thereafter where an entity is party to a material P3 arrangement/transaction.

BOARD APPROVAL AND DISSENT

- A45. This Statement was approved for issuance by 8 members of the Board. One member dissented. The written ballots are available for public inspection at the FASAB's offices. The dissent of the member who opposed the issuance of this Statement is presented in paragraphs A46 and A47.
- A46. Ms. Ho dissents to the issuance of this Statement. She believes that the increased use of P3s in the federal government makes the need for clarity in the accounting for P3s vitally important. Ms. Ho acknowledges that the taxpayer has the right to know what obligations the government has agreed to and what the total cost is for a P3 project. Ms. Ho commends FASAB for their thorough examination of the issue, which encompassed several years.
- A47. Ms. Ho strongly supports more transparency in financial reporting of federal taxpayers' dollars. However, she shares the concerns voiced by many agencies in response to the exposure draft that the disclosures required by this Statement will create a burden that does not justify the cost required to collect, analyze, report and audit the information needed to comply with this Statement's requirements. In particular, Ms. Ho feels that the expected life requirement will result in inconsistent application by agencies throughout government, which is contrary to the goal of the Statement.

APPENDIX B: FLOWCHART²³



²³ The standards enunciated in this Statement and not the material in this appendix should govern the accounting for specific transactions, events, or conditions.

APPENDIX C: ABBREVIATIONS

AGA	Association of Government Accountants
BFC	Basis for conclusions
CFR	Consolidated financial report of the U.S. government
C.F.R.	Code of federal regulations
CPA	Certified public accountant
ED	Exposure draft
EUL	Enhanced Use Lease
FAR	Federal Acquisition Regulation
FASAB	Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board
GAAP	Generally Accepted Accounting Principles
GAO	Government Accountability Office
GPFFR	General purpose federal financial reports
GSA	General Services Administration
IRR	Internal rate of return
IT	Information Technology
LP	Limited Partnership
MD&A	Management's discussion and analysis
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
OPEB	Other postemployment benefits
P3	Public-Private Partnership
PP&E	Property, Plant, and Equipment
PPP	Public-Private Partnership
PSC	Public Sector Comparator
SFFAC	Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Concepts
SFFAS	Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards
SPV	Special Purpose Vehicle
U.S.	United States
VfM	Value for Money

APPENDIX D: GLOSSARY

The standards enunciated in this Statement not the material in this appendix should govern the accounting for specific transactions, events, or conditions.

Public-private partnerships - Federal public-private partnerships (P3s) are risk-sharing arrangements or transactions with expected lives greater than five years between public and private sector entities. Such arrangements or transactions provide a service or an asset for government and/or general public use where in addition to the sharing of resources, each party shares in the risks and rewards of said arrangements or transactions.

P3 Structural Arrangement - P3s that are external to the government sponsor's or entity's operations and often involve the creation of an SPV, Trust, or Limited Partnership (LP), and other such arrangements. For example, military base housing.

P3 Program Transactional Arrangement - P3s that are internal to the government sponsor's or entity's operations. For example, work-share programs not involving the creation of a SPV, Trust, or LP, etc.

Special Purpose Vehicles (SPVs) - also commonly called Special Purpose Entities (SPEs), are entities created for a specific, limited and normally temporary purpose. An SPV can be a corporation, trust, partnership, limited-liability company or some type of Variable Interest Entity (VIE). They are often an integral part of public private partnerships because of their risk-containment nature of isolating participating entities from financial risk.

Value for Money (VfM) - VfM is defined as the optimum combination of whole-of-life costs and quality (or fitness for purpose) of the good or service to meet the user's requirement. VfM is not the choice of goods and services based on the lowest cost bid. To undertake a well-managed procurement, it is necessary to consider upfront, and at the earliest stage of procurement, what the key drivers of VfM in the procurement process will be. In other words, VfM is a much broader concept than typical cost-benefit analysis because it emphasizes "value" in more of a qualitative than quantitative manner. Quantitatively, some VfM models use a project's Internal Rate of Return (IRR) to help determine project acceptability.

FASAB Board Members

Tom L. Allen, Chair

Robert F. Dacey

Michael H. Granof

Christina Ho

Sam M. McCall

Mark Reger

D. Scott Showalter

Graylin E. Smith

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 6H19
Washington, DC 20548
Telephone 202-512-7350
FAX 202-512-7366
www.fasab.gov