

**A** *udit*



**R** *eport*

GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE AND RESULTS ACT  
REPORTING ON DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS  
NET OPERATING RESULTS

Report No. D-2001-021

January 10, 2001

Office of the Inspector General  
Department of Defense

## Form SF298 Citation Data

<b>Report Date</b> <i>("DD MON YYYY")</i> 10Jan2001	<b>Report Type</b> N/A	<b>Dates Covered (from... to)</b> <i>("DD MON YYYY")</i>
<b>Title and Subtitle</b> Government Performance and Results Act Reporting on Defense Working Capital Funds Net Operating Results		<b>Contract or Grant Number</b>
		<b>Program Element Number</b>
<b>Authors</b>		<b>Project Number</b>
		<b>Task Number</b>
		<b>Work Unit Number</b>
<b>Performing Organization Name(s) and Address(es)</b> OAIG-AUD (ATTN: AFTS Audit Suggestions) Inspector General, Department of Defense 400 Army Navy Drive (Room 801) Arlington, VA 22202-2884		<b>Performing Organization Number(s)</b> D-2001-021
<b>Sponsoring/Monitoring Agency Name(s) and Address(es)</b>		<b>Monitoring Agency Acronym</b>
		<b>Monitoring Agency Report Number(s)</b>
<b>Distribution/Availability Statement</b> Approved for public release, distribution unlimited		
<b>Supplementary Notes</b>		
<b>Abstract</b> The Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 requires agencies to submit annual performance reports in March of each year. The DoD annual performance report is published in the Annual Report to the President and Congress (Annual Defense Report). This audit relates to DoD Subordinate Performance Goal 2.3, i.Streamline the DoD infrastructure by redesigning the Departments support structure and pursuing business practice reforms.It The Defense Working Capital Fund provides support services to the Military Departments. The support services include supply management, depot maintenance, finance and accounting, information services, and commissary. Performance indicators are used to determine whether performance goals are met. The net operating result is one of the performance indicators included in the Annual Defense Report for each activity group of the Defense Working Capital Fund. Performance Measure 2.3.8, i.Defense Working Capital Fund Net Operating Results,ls includes a schedule showing net operating results for Defense Working Capital Fund activity groups and a short narrative. The net operating result is defined as the difference between an individual funds revenue and its costs. The Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller/Chief Financial Officer) compiles the revenue and cost information.		
<b>Subject Terms</b>		

<b>Document Classification</b> unclassified	<b>Classification of SF298</b> unclassified
<b>Classification of Abstract</b> unclassified	<b>Limitation of Abstract</b> unlimited
<b>Number of Pages</b> 21	

### **Additional Copies**

To obtain additional copies of this audit report, visit the Inspector General, DoD Home Page at [www.dodig.osd.mil](http://www.dodig.osd.mil) or contact the Secondary Reports Distribution Unit of the Audit Followup and Technical Support Directorate at (703) 604-8937 (DSN 664-8937) or fax (703) 604-8932.

### **Suggestions for Future Audits**

To suggest ideas for or to request future audits, contact the Audit Followup and Technical Support Directorate at (703) 604-8940 (DSN 664-8940) or fax (703) 604-8932. Ideas and requests can also be mailed to:

OAIG-AUD (ATTN: AFTS Audit Suggestions)  
Inspector General, Department of Defense  
400 Army Navy Drive (Room 801)  
Arlington, VA 22202-4704

### **Defense Hotline**

To report fraud, waste, or abuse, contact the Defense Hotline by calling (800) 424-9098; by sending an electronic message to [Hotline@dodig.osd.mil](mailto:Hotline@dodig.osd.mil); or by writing to the Defense Hotline, The Pentagon, Washington, DC 20301-1900. The identity of each writer and caller is fully protected.

### **Acronyms**

DWCF	Defense Working Capital Fund
GPRA	Government Performance and Results Act
USD	Under Secretary of Defense



**INSPECTOR GENERAL  
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
400 ARMY NAVY DRIVE  
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22202-2884**

January 10, 2001

**MEMORANDUM FOR UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE  
(COMPTROLLER/CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER)**

**SUBJECT: Audit Report on Government Performance and Results Act Reporting on  
Defense Working Capital Funds Net Operating Results  
(Report No. D-2001-021)**

We are providing this audit report for review and comment. We considered management comments on a draft of this report in preparing the final report.

DoD Directive 7650.3 requires that all recommendations be resolved promptly. We request that the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller/Chief Financial Officer) reconsider his position on the report recommendations. We request that additional comments on the report be provided by March 12, 2001.

We appreciate the courtesies extended to the audit staff. Questions on the audit should be directed to Mr. James L. Kornides at (614) 751-1400, extension 11, (jkornides@dodig.osd.mil) or Mr. Stuart D. Dunnett at (614) 751-1400, extension 14, (sdunnett@dodig.osd.mil). See Appendix D for the report distribution. The audit team members are listed inside the back cover.

*David K. Steensma*

David K. Steensma  
Deputy Assistant Inspector General  
for Auditing

## Office of the Inspector General, DoD

Report No. D-2001-021

January 10, 2001

(Project No. D2000FJ-0105)

### Government Performance and Results Act Reporting on Defense Working Capital Funds Net Operating Results

#### Executive Summary

**Introduction.** The Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 requires agencies to submit annual performance reports in March of each year. The DoD annual performance report is published in the Annual Report to the President and Congress (Annual Defense Report). This audit relates to DoD Subordinate Performance Goal 2.3, "Streamline the DoD infrastructure by redesigning the Department's support structure and pursuing business practice reforms." The Defense Working Capital Fund provides support services to the Military Departments. The support services include supply management, depot maintenance, finance and accounting, information services, and commissary.

Performance indicators are used to determine whether performance goals are met. The net operating result is one of the performance indicators included in the Annual Defense Report for each activity group of the Defense Working Capital Fund. Performance Measure 2.3.8, "Defense Working Capital Fund Net Operating Results," includes a schedule showing net operating results for Defense Working Capital Fund activity groups and a short narrative. The net operating result is defined as the difference between an individual fund's revenue and its costs. The Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller/Chief Financial Officer) compiles the revenue and cost information.

**Objectives.** The overall objective of the audit was to determine whether the net operating results for the activity groups of the Defense Working Capital Fund were consistently and accurately compiled. We also assessed internal controls to determine whether management complied with the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993.

**Results.** In reporting Net Operating Results for the Defense Working Capital Funds, the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller/Chief Financial Office) chose to include performance results for eight activity groups that compile net operating results. The information included for the eight activity groups was not consistent and did not accurately reflect operating results. Also, no explanation was provided for significant differences between budgetary information used to measure performance and information in the accounting records. As a result, the FY 2000 Annual Defense Report contained incomplete and inconsistent net operating results for the Defense Working Capital Funds and the value of the metric was unclear. Implementing the recommendations will provide a more informative indication of Defense Working Capital Fund operating results. See the Finding section for the audit results and Appendix A for the audit process used.

**Summary of Recommendations.** We recommend that the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller/Chief Financial Officer) disclose the effect of non-recoverable losses on net operating results, use budgetary reports consistently in reporting net operating results, and disclose the differences between net operating results used to set customer rates and those used for financial reporting purposes.

**Management Comments.** The Director of Program Analysis and Evaluation, Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller/Chief Financial Officer), nonconcurred with the draft recommendations. The Director stated that it was not meaningful to compare operating results reported on accounting reports to operating results reported on budgetary reports and disagreed with the example we used. A discussion of management comments is in the Finding section of the report, and the complete text is in the Management Comments section.

**Auditor Comments.** The Director's comments are partially responsive, and we modified the report and deleted two recommendations and revised one recommendation based on them. We continue to believe the DoD needs to use budgetary information consistently. We also believe that DoD needs to disclose in the Annual Defense Report that official accounting reports were not used in the compilation of net operating results and explain why. Accordingly, we request that the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller/Chief Financial Officer) provide additional comments in response to the final report by March 12, 2001.

# Table of Contents

---

<b>Executive Summary</b>	i
<b>Introduction</b>	
Background	1
Objectives	2
<b>Finding</b>	
Compiling Defense Working Capital Fund Net Operating Results	3
<b>Appendixes</b>	
A. Audit Process Scope and Methodology	7
B. Performance Indicator 2.3.8	8
C. Report Distribution	10
<b>Management Comments</b>	
Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller/Chief Financial Officer)	13

---

## Background

The Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) of 1993 requires agencies to submit annual performance in March of each year. The GPRA seeks to improve Government-wide program effectiveness, Government accountability, and public confidence by requiring agencies to identify measurable annual performance goals against which achievements can be compared. The DoD annual performance report is published in the Annual Report to the President and Congress (Annual Defense Report). This audit relates to DoD Subordinate Performance Goal 2.3, "Streamline the DoD infrastructure by redesigning the Department's support structure and pursuing business practice reforms." The Defense Working Capital Fund (DWCF) provides support services to the Military Departments. The support services include supply management, depot maintenance, finance and accounting, information services, and commissary.

Performance indicators are used to determine whether performance goals are met. The net operating result is one of the performance indicators included in the Annual Defense Report for each DWCF activity group. Performance Measure 2.3.8, "DWCF Net Operating Results," includes a schedule showing net operating results for DWCF activity groups and a short narrative. The net operating result is defined as the difference between an individual fund's revenue and its costs.

DWCF customer rates are used to finance selected DoD activity groups on a break even basis. During budget execution, activity groups record either a positive or a negative net operating result. As a result, customer rates are set to make up actual or projected losses or to return actual or projected gains in the budget year(s) as required by DoD Regulation 7000.14-R, "Financial Management Regulation," volume 11b, "Reimbursable Operations, Policy and Procedures-Working Capital Funds," February 1998. DWCF activity groups must break even over the long term.

The net operating result for a given year is reported for rate setting on Fund-14, "Statement of Revenue and Expenses." It is also reported on Accounting Report 1307 (AR 1307), "Statement of Operations," for financial reporting. Military Departments and Defense agencies consolidate net operating result information during the rate-setting process. Each month, the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller/Chief Financial Officer) (USD) (Comptroller) checks the consolidated reports for accuracy by comparing results to target amounts. The USD (Comptroller) sets rates so that the accumulated operating result is zero.

The USD (Comptroller) is responsible for compiling net operating results of the DWCF for the Annual Defense Report.

---

## **Objectives**

The overall objective of the audit was to determine whether the net operating results for the activity groups of the DWCF were consistently and accurately compiled. We also assessed internal controls to determine whether management complied with the GPRA. See Appendix A for the audit scope and methodology.

---

## **Compiling Defense Working Capital Fund Net Operating Results**

In reporting Net Operating Results for the Defense Working Capital Funds, the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller/Chief Financial Office) chose to include performance results for eight activity groups that compile net operating results. The information included for the eight activity groups was not consistent and did not accurately reflect operating results. Also, no explanation was provided for significant differences between budgetary information used to measure performance and information in the accounting records. These conditions existed because the USD (Comptroller) chose not to:

- Present net operating results for activity groups that were verifiable to budgetary reports, or to accounting reports;
- Explain that non-recoverable losses affected net operating results; and
- Provide information on the significant differences between the net operating results used for rate setting and those used for financial reporting.

As a result, the FY 2000 Annual Defense Report contained incomplete and inconsistent net operating results for the Defense Working Capital Funds and the value of the metric was unclear.

## **Compiling Net Operating Results**

The USD (Comptroller) prepared Appendix I of the FY 2000 Annual Defense Report to comply with the GPRA. The Appendix contained the DoD performance measures and indicators that the USD (Comptroller) decided to present in order to meet the reporting requirements of the GPRA. The Appendix also included a schedule that showed net operating results for FYs 1997 through 1999, projected net operating results for FY 2000 and FY 2001, and a short narrative. The narrative states: “The Department obtained the data needed to calculate net operating result from the DWCF financial records maintained by the Services and Defense agencies.” It also stated: “The Department’s net operating result calculations conformed to the auditing requirements established by DoD Regulation 7000.14-R and by the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990.” See Appendix B of this report for the complete text.

**Reporting All Activity Groups.** When compiling Appendix I for the FY 2000 Annual Defense Report, the USD (Comptroller) did not fully present the net operating results for the overall DWCF. The report provided information on only eight activity groups. The USD (Comptroller) personnel told us that there were 27 activity groups in the DWCF, but the USD (Comptroller) did not choose to present a comprehensive listing of the activity groups in the GPRA report.

USD (Comptroller) personnel informed us that they decided to report only a select sample of the large working capital fund activity groups. They stated that the other 19 DWCF activity groups were omitted in order to present only the most significant activity groups. The USD (Comptroller) personnel stated they believed that a comprehensive listing would confuse the reader.

**Consistent and Accurate Information.** The information that was presented for the eight activity groups was not verifiable to accounting reports or budgetary reports. USD (Comptroller) personnel stated that the net operating results reported for GPRA should be the same as those reported during budget execution on Fund-14, "Statement of Revenue and Expenses." However, the net operating results for four of the eight activity groups were not verifiable to Fund-14 reports, and five were not verifiable to the accounting reports. Specifically, the Annual Defense Report showed that the eight activity groups lost \$78 million during FY 1999. However, budgetary reports showed that the eight activity groups made a profit of \$116.5 million and AR 1307 reports showed that the 8 activity groups lost \$2.2 billion. Details follow in Table 1.

**Table 1. Net Operating Results for FY 1999  
(Dollars in millions)**

<u>DWCF Activity Group</u>	GPRA Net Operating Results <sup>1</sup>	Fund-14 Net Operating Results	AR 1307 Net Operating Results <sup>2</sup>
Army supply management	\$ 47.6	\$ 47.6	\$ (508.0)
Army depot maintenance	71.1	19.1	19.1
Navy supply management	(102.1)	(102.1)	(1,186.5)
Navy aviation depot maintenance	(40.7)	(40.7)	(40.7)
Navy shipyard maintenance	(22.5)	(22.5)	(22.5)
Air Force supply management	(13.1)	87.8	(593.5)
Air Force depot maintenance	43.4	178.5	195.8
USTRANSCOM <sup>3</sup>	(61.7)	(51.2)	(61.7)
<b>Total Operating Results</b>	<b>\$ (78.0)</b>	<b>\$ 116.5</b>	<b>\$(2,198.0)</b>

---

<sup>1</sup> See FY 1999 Actual column, Appendix B  
<sup>2</sup> Recoverable Operating Results from Part V of AR 1307  
<sup>3</sup> U.S. Transportation Command

The Annual Defense Report did not disclose that budgetary reports were used to compile the operating results for the DWCF activity groups instead of the official accounting reports used to support the requirements of the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990. We believe the reason this was done merits mention and explanation. USD (Comptroller) personnel stated that AR 1307 reports were not used for GPRA because those accounting reports included large losses that were not recoverable and were written off.

DoD Regulation 7000.14-R, the “DoD Financial Management Regulation,” volume 2B, “Budget Formulation and Presentation,” June 2000, prohibits the recovery of extraordinary losses and gains that affect inventory and capital accounts. In addition, on July 3, 1996, the USD (Comptroller) issued a memorandum, “Measuring Operating Results in the Supply Management Business Area.” The memorandum stated that accounting reports would not be used to measure operating results for supply management activity groups for a variety of reasons. Those reasons included changes in inventory values caused by returns, disposals, and transfers that were outside management control and inadequate logistics feeder systems used to control inventory costs.

Although DoD followed the established procedures to treat the accounting of non-recoverable losses, no explanation was provided in the GPRA reports to describe those events, which would explain the significant differences between what DoD reports as operating results and what is displayed in the accounting reports. We concluded that the USD (Comptroller) should provide this information in future Annual Defense Reports and disclose that there are significant differences between net operating results for rate setting and those for financial reporting and the reasons for them.

## **Recommendations, Management Comments, and Audit Response**

**Deleted, and Renumbered Recommendations.** As a result of management comments we deleted draft Recommendations 1 and 2 related to cumulative operating results. Consequently Draft Recommendations 3 and 4 are renumbered as Recommendations 1 and 2 respectively. We revised Recommendation 2 to address the consistent use of budgetary information.

---

**We recommend that the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller/Chief Financial Officer):**

- 1. Disclose the effects of non-recoverable losses on Defense Working Capital Fund net operating results when compiling future Annual Defense Reports.**
- 2. Use budgetary reports consistently in reporting net operating results and disclose significant differences between the net operating results for rate setting and those for financial reporting in future Annual Defense Reports.**

**Management Comments.** The Director of Program Analysis and Evaluation, Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller/Chief Financial Officer), nonconcurrent with the report's recommendations. The Director stated there are 27 activity groups in the Defense Working Capital Fund instead of the 35 identified in our draft report. The Director also stated that the net operating results presented for 8 of the 27 activity groups represented a sample of the largest and most complex activity groups. He added that the draft report stated that the Department should have used cumulative operating results in lieu of annual net operating results, but the purpose of Net Operating Results as a GPRA metric is to set annual operational and financial goals and measure progress against these goals. The Director also stated that it was not meaningful to compare cumulative operating results reported on accounting reports with cumulative operating results reported on budgetary reports and disagreed with the example we used. A discussion of management comments is in the Finding section of the report, and the complete text is in the Management Comments section.

**Audit Response.** The Director's comments are partially responsive. We based our review on 35 working capital fund budgetary reports that were provided to us by the Military Departments and Defense agencies during the audit. However, based on a review of a draft of this report the Director informed us that we should have consolidated the 35 budgetary reports to 27 activity groups. We changed the report to correct the number of activity groups. We believe that budgetary reports need to be used consistently in the GPRA report. We also continue to believe the Director needs to disclose in the GPRA report that official accounting reports were not used in the compilation of net operating results and explain why. Accordingly, we request that the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller/Chief Financial Officer) provide additional comments in response to the final report.

---

## Appendix A. Audit Process

### Scope and Methodology

**Work Performed.** We determined whether the USD (Comptroller) consistently and accurately compiled net operating results for eight Defense Working Capital Funds to the FY 2000 Annual Defense Report. We reviewed Fund-14, “Revenue and Expense” reports for FY 1999. We also reviewed AR 1307, “Statement of Operations” for FY 1999. We relied on the data presented in the summary reports.

**Use of Computer-Processed Data.** We completed analytical review procedures on DWCF summary accounting information from FY 1992 through FY 1999. The information was compiled from diverse DoD financial and logistics systems. We tested the reliability and accuracy of the summary information.

**Audit Type, Dates, and Standards.** We performed this financial-related audit from May 2000 through August 2000, in accordance with auditing standards issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, as implemented by the Inspector General, DoD.

**Contacts During the Audit.** We visited or contacted individuals and organizations within the DoD. Further details are available on request.

### Management Control Program

Our review of management controls over GPRA reporting will be discussed in a summary report upon completion of the current reviews.

### Prior Audits

No prior coverage has been conducted on the compilation of operating results for the Government Performance and Results Act during the last 5 years.

## Appendix B. Performance Indicator 2.3.8

The following information was presented in Appendix I of the FY 2000 Annual Defense Report.

	FY 1997		FY 1998		FY 1999		FY 2000	FY 2001
	Goal/Actual		Goal/Actual		Goal/Actual		Goal	Goal
Army								
Supply Maintenance	-13.0	-27.9	9.8	21.9	-4.9	47.6	-3.3	-27.7
Depot Maintenance	47.6	-136.3	18.3	133.7	9.6	71.1	-26.7	6.0
Navy								
Supply Maintenance	-69.4	-209.5	87.5	26.3	65.9	-102.1	42.7	-68.3
Aviation Depot	-10.3	18.7	-21.8	-18.3	-13.8	-40.7	+1.2	
Maintenance								28.9
Shipyards Maintenance	30.8	-3.4	83.1	83.4	4.0	-22.5	-9.9	3.5
Air Force								
Supply Maintenance	21.1	28.6	36.6	316.7	-216.2	-13.1	-169.5	-129.5
Depot Maintenance	156.3	-236.3	200.1	-34.6	133.2	43.4	-79.5	-34.4
USTRANSCOM <sup>1</sup>								
Transportation	42.7	-18.2	80.7	287.8	8.7	-61.7	-155.3	23.9

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Transportation Command

**Metric Description.** Defense working capital funds are used to finance selected DoD activities. Customers purchase products and services at prices that reflect all the direct and indirect costs of a given DWCF budget activity. Customer accounts are financed through direct appropriations, at a level commensurate with expected purchases from the respective fund. In addition to selling products and services to customers, DWCF budget activities may make purchases from one another, using sales revenue. As the DWCFs cover widely differing areas of DoD business operations, they each have unique management goals, which are reflected in their budget submissions.

The net operating result is a management measure common to all working capital funds. Net operating result is the difference between an individual fund's revenue and its costs. During the Planning Programming and Budgeting System process, net operating result goals are created to cancel out any shortages or surpluses from previous years. A net operating result that is higher than the assigned goal indicates that a fund may have exceeded expectations; conversely, one that is lower suggests a fund may have been less efficient than desired. If the net operating result target for a working capital fund is not met, the unique supporting measures for that fund (Table B.2) provide insights into the underlying causes.

**Table B.2. DWCF Supporting Measures**

<u>Activity Group</u>	<u>Timeliness</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Quality</u>
Army supply management	UMMIPS <sup>1</sup> standards set in DoD policy instruction	-Unit cost retail, wholesale -Net operating result	Fill rate
Army depot maintenance	Schedule conformance	-Unit cost per DLH <sup>2</sup> -Net operating result	Percentage of quality defects
Navy supply management	UMMIPS <sup>1</sup> standards set in DoD policy instruction	-Unit cost retail, wholesale -Net operating result	Fill rate
Navy depot maintenance	Schedule conformance	-Unit cost per DLH <sup>2</sup> -Net operating result	Percentage of quality defects
Navy shipbuilding	Schedule conformance	-Unit cost per DLH <sup>2</sup> -Net operating result	Percentage of quality defects
Air Force supply management	UMMIPS <sup>1</sup> standards set in DoD policy instruction	-Unit cost retail, wholesale -Net operating result	Fill rate
Air Force depot maintenance	Schedule conformance	-Unit cost per DLH <sup>2</sup> -Net operating result	Percentage of quality defects
USTRANSCOM <sup>3</sup>	UMMIPS <sup>1</sup> standards set in DoD policy instruction	-Net operating result -Variety of unit costs	On-time arrivals and departures

<sup>1</sup> Uniform Material Movement and issue and Priority System

<sup>2</sup> Direct Labor Hour

<sup>3</sup> U.S. Transportation Command

Source: Table I-6, Appendix I of the FY 2000 Annual Defense Report

**Validation and Verification Methodology.** The Department obtained the data needed to calculate net operating result from the DWCF financial records maintained by the Services and Defense agencies. The Department's net operating result calculations conformed to the auditing requirements established by DoD Regulation 7000.14-R and by the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990. Net operating result information is consolidated Service- and agency-wide, and sent to the respective headquarters for review. The USD (Comptroller) checks the consolidated reports monthly for accuracy, comparing the results to target amounts. During quarterly execution reviews, senior financial and logistic managers from the USD (Comptroller) and Service staffs jointly examine the data to identify positive or negative trends in productivity and to monitor operational and cost-efficiency trends.

**Actual and Projected Performance.** The FY 1999 net operating result performance was generally lower than planned at depot maintenance facilities and in the transportation fund due to smaller-than-expected workloads. The supply business areas had greater-than-expected returns that were due largely to the impact of contingency operations.

---

## **Appendix C. Report Distribution**

### **Office of the Secretary of Defense**

Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics  
Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller/Chief Financial Officer)  
Deputy Chief Financial Officer  
Deputy Comptroller (Program/Budget)

### **Department of the Army**

Auditor General, Department of the Army

### **Department of the Navy**

Naval Inspector General  
Auditor General, Department of the Navy

### **Department of the Air Force**

Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Financial Management and Comptroller)  
Auditor General, Department of the Air Force

### **Non-Defense Federal Organizations**

Office of Management and Budget

---

## **Congressional Committees and Subcommittees, Chairman and Ranking Minority Member**

Senate Committee on Appropriations  
Senate Subcommittee on Defense, Committee on Appropriations  
Senate Committee on Armed Services  
Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs  
House Committee on Appropriations  
House Subcommittee on Defense, Committee on Appropriations  
House Committee on Armed Services  
House Committee on Government Reform  
House Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology,  
Committee on Government Reform  
House Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans Affairs, and International  
Relations, Committee on Governmental Reform



# Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) Comments



PROGRAM ANALYSIS  
AND EVALUATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE  
1800 DEFENSE PENTAGON  
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-1800



October 23, 2000

MEMORANDUM FOR DIRECTOR, READINESS AND SUPPORT DIRECTORATE,  
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF  
DEFENSE

SUBJECT: DoD Inspector General Draft Audit on "Compilation of Defense Working Capital  
Funds Net Operating Results." Project No. D2000FJ-0105

At your request, my office has reviewed the draft audit report, dated August 15, 2000, on the Performance Measure 2.3.8: Defense Working Capital Fund Net Operating Results, included in the Department's FY 1999 performance report.

Consistent with the requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA), the Department has designed its performance plan and report to provide an executive-level overview of how the Secretary of Defense manages performance across the Department to achieve the outcomes required by the defense strategy. The intention is to provide a clear picture of how the Department is progressing toward achieving performance objectives established by the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), which serves as the Department's strategic plan.

The Department nonconcur with recommendations made in this draft report. The report significantly misrepresents the Department's DWCF management practices. Specifically:

- The draft includes factual errors, including the assertion that there are 35 Defense Working Capital Fund (DWCF) activity groups. There are only 27 activity groups in the DWCF.
- The report contends that DoD did not accurately present the NOR data because data were reported for only eight of the 27 DWCF activity groups. However, the sample selected includes most of the largest and most complex of the activity groups. The DoDIG's discussion in this draft spends just a few words on the accuracy of the Net Operating Results (NOR) data for the selected sample and focuses, instead, on suggesting a change in methodology. As a result, the wording and tone are not appropriate and are somewhat misleading.
- The draft report only briefly mentions the actual operating results achieved against the goals established. Those results are indicative of excellent performance and vary only a small fraction of one percent from the goal established prior to the year of execution. Instead, the DoDIG contends that the Department should have used cumulative operating results in lieu of annual net operating results. Cumulative operating results measure the ability of the DWCFs to break even over the long term. The purpose of NOR as a GPRA metric is to set annual operational and financial goals, and then to measure progress against those goals during actual budget execution. The DoDIG's proposals to alter the underlying policies of GPRA or to



fundamentally change the metrics may be valid issues in another context, but should not be addressed in this audit report.

- The DoDIG also suggests that DoD should explain the variance between the cumulative operating results reported in the CFO Act and net operating results that are used for budgetary purposes. The DoDIG then references accounting reports for Air Force Supply which depict cumulative operating results (since inception) of \$-43 billion, against a reported loss of \$-8.7 million for budget purposes in FY 1999. This approach presents an inaccurate and imprecise picture, and attempts to draw managerially relevant links between two sets of data that have no relationship in the context of the DoDIG's analysis. The \$-43 billion represents all approved budgetary write-offs over an eight year period. The second number, \$-8.7 million, is the financial result of a single fiscal year of operations. It is not meaningful to compare these different data sets in this way. This section of the audit provides a distorted picture and should be deleted.

A key goal of the GPRA legislation is to increase confidence in government. We will continue to work with the Congress and the DoDIG as we present future GPRA strategic plans, performance plans, and performance reports, so that our GPRA activities reflect a full and effective implementation of the law.



Robert R. Soule  
Director  
Program Analysis and Evaluation

## **Audit Team Members**

The Finance and Accounting Directorate, Office of the Assistant Inspector General for Auditing, DoD, prepared this report. Personnel of the Office of the Inspector, DoD, who contributed to the report are listed below.

F. Jay Lane

Salvatore D. Guli

James L. Kornides

Stuart D. Dunnett

Curt W. Malthouse

John R. Williams

Jacqueline Pugh