

Master Document – Audit Program

Activity Code 19500	Cost Impact Statement (Price Adjustment)
Version 4.8, dated January 2012	
B-1	Planning Considerations
Purpose and Scope	
To provide general objectives to be considered in auditing cost impact proposals. Additional detailed audit steps should be prepared to satisfy unique contractor circumstances or proposal submissions. This program does not replace auditor judgment. It should be tailored to the audit scope of the particular assignment. The revised audit program must reflect a mutual understanding between the auditor and supervisor as to the scope required to meet audit standards and objectives.	
References	
1. CAM 10-809, Audit Reports - Cost Impact Statements	
2. CAM 8-500, Audit of Cost Impact Proposals Submitted Pursuant to the Cost Accounting Standards Clause	
3. CAS Board Regulations (Especially 9903.201-6 and 9903.306)	
4. DoD CAS Working Group Guidance Papers (WG 76-4, 76-5, 76-6, and 76-9)	
5. CAS Clauses: FAR 52.230-2, FAR 52.230-3, FAR 52.230-4, FAR 52.230-5, and FAR 52.230-6	
6. FAR 30.604, and FAR 30.605	

B-1	Preliminary Steps	WP Reference
Version 4.8, dated January 2012		
	1. Determine the reason for the proposed cost impact (see clauses below). Include copies of pertinent audit reports, such as the noncompliance report, in the audit file. Obtain a copy of the cognizant Federal agency official's (CFAO), who is usually the ACO, final noncompliance determination, if applicable.	
	a. FAR 52.230-2(a)(4)(i). Required change. Equitable adjustment under CAS clause.	
	b. FAR 52.230-2(a)(4)(ii) and -2(a)(5). Unilateral change. No	

Master Document – Audit Program

increased cost to the Government in the aggregate.	
c. FAR 52.230-2(a)(4)(iii) and -3(a)(3)(ii). Desirable change. Change with which the Government agrees. Equitable adjustment under CAS clause.	
d. FAR 52.230-2(a)(5), -3(a)(4), and -4. Noncompliance with CAS or disclosed practice. Downward adjustment for any increased cost in the aggregate.	
2. Diagram the chronological events showing all pertinent dates, such as effective date, applicability date, date of triggering contract, CFAO determination dates, etc.	
3. Determine if separate impacts for each change have been provided. When multiple changes are involved separate impacts should be calculated for each change. If this is not practical and changes are combined, coordinate this with the contractor and CFAO.	
4. Coordinate with contractor and obtain a walk-through of the proposal to gain an understanding of the basis of the proposal and related supporting documentation. Invite the cognizant procurement and administrative contracting officers. As part of this walk-through, require the contractor to identify any information needed to complete the adequacy review.	
5. Evaluate the adequacy of the contractor's proposal. If the submission is not adequate, advise the CFAO and recommend that a proper proposal be obtained.	
a. Verify that the proposal was approved by an appropriate level of management.	
b. A General Dollar Magnitude (GDM) proposal should contain an estimate of the aggregate impact on CAS-covered contracts by contract type and by various departments/agencies.	
c. A detailed cost impact proposal should have data at the contract/subcontract level that should include, where appropriate:	
(1) fixed price,	
(2) target/estimated cost,	
(3) accumulated cost to date,	
(4) estimate to complete,	
(5) target profit or fee,	
(6) sharing ratio,	
(7) ceiling price,	
(8) period of performance,	

Master Document – Audit Program

(9) profit or fee impact,	
(10) total increased/(decreased) cost to the Government.	
d. Verify the universe of CAS-covered contracts and subcontracts that will be affected by the change or noncompliance.	
(1) Evaluate the adequacy of the contractor's procedures for identifying accurately and completely all contracts and subcontracts containing the CAS clause.	
(2) Perform limited tests of contract listings to assure continuing effectiveness of the contractor's system.	
(3) For smaller contractors, test the listing of CAS-covered contracts against FAO files of active cost reimbursable contracts and listing of CAS-covered fixed price procurement actions available within DoD.	
(4) Alternatively, try to obtain confirmation from the CFAO that the proposal includes all affected prime contracts and subcontracts.	
<p>6. In planning and performing the examination, consider the fraud risk indicators specific to the audit. The principal sources for the applicable fraud indicators are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Handbook on Fraud Indicators for Contract Auditors, Section II (IGDH 7600.3, APO March 31, 1993) located at http://www.dodig.mil/PUBS/igdh7600.doc (To access the handbook, copy and paste the web address shown above into the address block in Internet Explorer.) • CAM 4-702.3 and Figure 4-7-3. <p>Document in working paper B any identified fraud risk indicators and your response/actions to the identified risks (either individually, or in combination). This should be done at the planning stage of the audit, as well as during the audit, if risk indicators are disclosed. If no risk indicators are identified, document this in working paper B.</p>	
7. Hold an entrance conference to discuss the cost impact proposal and obtain additional information or data. Determine if the contractor is contemplating any modifications to the proposed cost impact. If so, coordinate with the contractor and CFAO to avoid unnecessary audit effort.	
8. Examine the ICQ or relevant ICAPS (whichever is applicable) to obtain information regarding accounting system adequacy, identify any known outstanding system deficiencies, and perform preliminary	

Master Document – Audit Program

assessment of risk. Document results.	
9. If the contractor is classified as non-major (where ICAPS have not been completed) and if the evidential matter to be obtained during the audit is highly dependent on computerized information systems, document on working paper B-2 the audit work performed that supports reliance on the computer-based evidential matter. Specifically, document or reference one or more of the following in working paper B-2:	
a. the audit assignment(s) where the reliability of the data was sufficiently established in other DCAA audits,	
b. the procedures/tests that will be performed in this audit to evaluate the incurred costs that will also support reliance on the evidential matter, and/or	
c. the tests that will be performed in this audit that will be specifically designed to test the reliability of the computer based data.	
d. When sufficient work is not performed to determine reliability (i.e., reduce audit risk to an acceptable level), qualify the audit report in accordance with CAM 10-210.4a and 10-809.4.	
10. Document the impact of the current assessment of the contractor’s internal control structure (control environment, accounting system, and relevant policies, procedures, and practices) on the audit scope.	
11. Coordinate the audit report due date with the CFAO based on the results of preliminary audit steps. Request technical assistance regarding the evaluation of estimates to complete, if needed.	

C-1	Change In Accounting Practice	WP Reference
Version 4.8, dated January 2012		
1.	Determine the basis of the cost impact amounts for the change and for the contractor's direct costs in the cost impact proposal.	
2.	For changes to accounting practices, verify the completeness of the cost impact proposal. Ensure that:	
a.	only those contracts and subcontracts awarded prior to the change are included in the cost impact proposal.	
b.	the cost impact extends through the performance period of all applicable CAS-covered contracts.	
c.	for changes required to implement a new standard, verify that only those contracts and subcontracts awarded prior to the standard's	

Master Document – Audit Program

effective date are included in the proposal.	
3. Perform a yearly reconciliation of firm and anticipated business base as identified in an appropriate forecast, to the direct costs in the cost impact proposal. This provides a check on the contractor’s calculations and should also reveal any impact resulting from changes other than the identified change in accounting practice (e.g., increased efficiency). Add additional audit steps if necessary.	
a. For GDM proposals, this would be done at the contract-type level.	
b. For detailed cost impact proposals, this would be done at the individual contract/subcontract level on a sampling of contracts/subcontracts.	
4. Compare actual direct costs to direct costs in the cost impact proposal to determine any significant differences. Differences may indicate contracts were shifted to different timeframes or other contracts may have been added or deleted since the time the cost impact proposal was prepared. Add additional audit steps, if necessary.	
a. For GDM proposals, this would be done at the contract-type level.	
b. For detailed cost impact proposals, this would be done at the individual contract/subcontract level on a sampling of contracts/subcontracts.	
5. Reconcile the cost shift by year to identify the overall impact on non-CAS covered contracts and anticipated business. This should not be done on an individual contract basis, but should be sufficient to identify the impact on commercial and other Government work separately.	
6. Verify the proposed cost impact calculations on a sampling of contracts and subcontracts. The following 5-step process (steps a through e) should be used to calculate audit recommended cost impacts. NOTE: Steps d and e (below) should be omitted for required and desirable accounting practice changes since increased costs may be allowed under those circumstances. Steps d and e must be performed in all other instances since payment of aggregate increased costs by the Government is prohibited.	
a. For each CAS-covered contract selected for evaluation, compute the increase/decrease in cost estimates or cost accumulations due to the accounting practice change as follows:	
(1) Calculate the difference between the estimated cost to complete (ETC) using the old accounting practice and the ETC using the new practice, from the date of the change to the end of the period of performance on the contract for all CAS covered contracts.	

Master Document – Audit Program

<p>(2) Consider the impact on negotiated profit and fee for all CAS covered contracts. Evaluate contract terms as necessary to ensure that all profit negotiated based on estimated or accumulated costs is identified and adjusted to ensure that it is not enlarged beyond that contemplated by the parties to the contract at negotiations.</p>	
<p>b. Combine the increases/(decreases) in cost accumulations and/or contract prices within each contract group (flexibly-priced and FFP).</p>	
<p>c. Calculate the increased/(decreased) cost paid by the Government for each contract group, using the net impact on cost accumulations or contract prices from step b. above.</p>	
<p>(1) For flexibly priced contracts: Increased costs to the Government occur when more costs are accumulated as the result of an accounting practice change. Conversely, decreased costs to the Government occur when fewer costs are accumulated as a result of an accounting practice change.</p>	
<p>(2) Fixed price contracts: Increased costs to the Government occur when fewer costs are accumulated as a result of an accounting practice change. Decreased costs to the Government occur when more costs are accumulated as a result of an accounting practice change.</p>	
<p>d. Combine increased and decreased costs to the Government (including profit/fee) for all contract groups to determine the aggregate increased or decreased costs paid by the Government as a result of the accounting practice change.</p>	
<p>e. Considering the settlement alternatives available to the CFAO, develop recommendations which will identify appropriate alternatives to the Government. In the case of a Unilateral change the recommendations must identify appropriate alternatives to preclude payment by the Government of the aggregate increased costs [9903.201-6(b) and 9903.306].</p>	

D-1	Noncompliance - Price Adjustment	WP Reference
Version 4.8, dated January 2012		
1.	Determine the basis of the cost impact amounts for the noncompliance and for the contractor’s direct costs in the cost impact proposal.	
2.	For noncompliances, the cost impact should be computed from the date the noncompliance first occurred until the date the noncompliance	

Master Document – Audit Program

was corrected.	
3. Perform a yearly reconciliation of firm and anticipated business base as identified in an appropriate forecast, to the direct costs in the cost impact proposal. This provides a check on the contractor’s calculations and should also reveal any impact resulting from changes other than the identified change in accounting practice (e.g., increased efficiency). Add additional audit steps if necessary.	
a. For GDM proposals, this would be done at the contract-type level.	
b. For detailed cost impact proposals, this would be done at the individual contract/subcontract level on a sampling of contracts/subcontracts.	
4. Compare actual direct costs to direct costs in the cost impact proposal to determine any significant differences. Differences may indicate contracts were shifted to different timeframes or other contracts may have been added or deleted since the time the cost impact proposal was prepared. Add additional audit steps, if necessary.	
a. For GDM proposals, this would be done at the contract-type level.	
b. For detailed cost impact proposals, this would be done at the individual contract/subcontract level on a sampling of contracts/subcontracts.	
5. Reconcile the cost shift by year to identify the overall impact on non-CAS covered contracts and anticipated business. This should not be done on an individual contract basis, but should be sufficient to identify the impact on commercial and other Government work separately.	
6. Verify the proposed cost impact calculations on a sampling of contracts and subcontracts. The following 5-step process (steps a through e) should be used to calculate audit recommended cost impacts.	
a. For each CAS-covered contract selected for examination, compute the increase/decrease in cost estimates or cost accumulations due to the noncompliance as follows:	
(1) For noncompliances in cost accumulation: Calculate the difference between costs accumulated using the noncompliant accounting practice and costs that would have been accumulated had a compliant practice been used for flexibly priced CAS covered contracts. This calculation should include only the periods during which the contractor accumulated costs using the noncompliant practice.	
(2) For noncompliances in cost estimating: Calculate the	

Master Document – Audit Program

<p>difference between the contract price estimated/negotiated using the noncompliant practice and what the contract price would have been had a compliant practice been used for all CAS covered contracts.</p>	
<p>(3) Consider the impact on negotiated profit and fee for all CAS covered contracts. Evaluate contract terms as necessary to ensure that all profit negotiated based on estimated or accumulated costs is identified and adjusted to ensure that it is not enlarged beyond that contemplated by the parties to the contract at negotiations.</p>	
<p>b. Combine the increases/(decreases) in cost accumulations and/or contract prices within each contract group (flexibly-priced and FFP).</p>	
<p>c. Calculate the increased/(decreased) cost paid by the Government for each contract group, using the net impact on cost accumulations or contract prices from step b. above.</p>	
<p>(1) For flexibly priced contracts: Increased costs to the Government occur when more costs are accumulated as the result of a CAS noncompliance. Conversely, decreased costs to the Government occur when fewer costs are accumulated as a result of a CAS noncompliance.</p>	
<p>(2) Fixed price contracts: Increased costs to the Government occur when higher costs were estimated and negotiated as a result of a noncompliant estimating practice. Decreased costs to the Government occur when fewer costs were estimated and negotiated as a result of a noncompliant estimating practice.</p>	
<p>d. Combine increased and decreased costs to the Government (including profit/fee) for all contract groups to determine the aggregate increased or decreased costs paid by the Government as a result of the CAS noncompliance.</p>	
<p>e. Considering the settlement alternatives available to the CFAO, develop recommendations which will identify appropriate alternatives to preclude payment by the Government of the aggregate increased costs [9903.201-6(d) and 9903.306]. The recommendations should include comments on the applicability of interest which is required by FAR 52.230-2(a)(5).</p>	

Master Document – Audit Program

A-1	Concluding Steps	WP Reference
Version 4.8, dated January 2012		
1.	Summarize results of audit and discuss with the Supervisor or the FAO technical specialist.	
2.	Prepare report in accordance with CAM 10-809	
3.	Hold an exit conference with the contractor in accordance with CAM 4-304.	
4.	Update permanent files.	