

DOCUMENT RESUME

02479 - [A1732718] (Restricted)

[Settlement of Noncompliance Cases Involving Cost Accounting Standards at Northrop Corporation]. March 1, 1977. 2 pp.

Report to Brig. Gen. M. W. Baker, Commander, Headquarters, Department of the Air Force: Air Force Contract Management Div. Kirtland AFB, NM; by J. T. Hall, Jr., Regional Manager, Field Operations Div.: Regional Office (Los Angeles).

Issue Area: Accounting and Financial Reporting (2800).
Contact: Field Operations Div.: Regional Office (Los Angeles).
Budget Function: Miscellaneous: Financial Management and Information Systems (1002).
Authority: A.S.P.R. 3-1212.

A determination was made of whether the administrative contracting offices of the Air Force Plant Representative Office, Northrop Corporation, took timely and appropriate action in settling reported cases of contractor noncompliance with cost accounting standards. Findings/Conclusions: The administrative contracting officer indicated noncompliance on two Air Force contracts in the preparation of cost performance reports (CPR) for aircraft sales to Saudi Arabia. Specifically, proposed labor and related expenses were accounted as direct, rather than indirect, costs. Air Force legal counsel determined that noncompliance was unwarranted and should not be issued. The contractor was then informed by the administrative contracting officer that direct charging of preparation costs was acceptable to the Saudi Arabia effort. If the Saudi Arabia requirement had been negotiated with Northrop on a separate Air Force contract, the costs of the CPR would have been accounted for as an indirect expense, in line with the company's normal procedures. Recommendations: The Air Force should reconsider this matter, and should advise GAO of any action taken. (DJM)



UNITED STATES GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

REGIONAL OFFICE

SUITE 1010, WORLD TRADE CENTER

280 SOUTH FIGUEROA STREET

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90071

Code 950300
Hudson
Jones

02479-2778

Do not make available to public reading **MAR 1 1977**

Brigadier General M. W. Baker
Commander, Headquarters
Air Force Contract Management Division
Kirtland Air Force Base
New Mexico 87117

Dear General Baker:

The Los Angeles Regional Office has recently completed a survey of the settlement of noncompliance cases involving Cost Accounting Standards (CAS) at the Air Force Plant Representative Office, Northrop Corporation, Hawthorne, California. The objective of the survey was to determine whether the administrative contracting officer (ACO) took timely and appropriate action to settle reported cases of contractor noncompliance with CAS during 1975 and 1976.

We found that timely and appropriate action had been taken by the ACO in processing noncompliance cases in accordance with the requirements of the Armed Services Procurement Regulation 3-1212. One case, however, was settled on the basis of direction from higher headquarters, which we believe requires reconsideration by your staff. The details of the noncompliance case is presented as follows:

The ACO had requested that the resident Defense Contract Audit Agency determine whether expenses incurred in the preparation of cost performance reports (CPR's) for F-5E/F aircraft under Foreign Military Sales contracts for delivery to Saudi Arabia were recorded in a manner consistent with applicable CAS requirements. The auditor advised the ACO on May 7, 1976, that the contractor was in noncompliance with CAS 402, Consistency in Allocating Costs Incurred for the Same Purpose. The noncompliance involved two Air Force contracts in which proposed labor and related expenses for preparation of CPR's was estimated as direct costs. The contractor's established practice was to account for such expenses as indirect costs.

The ACO made an initial determination of noncompliance on May 17, 1976. In commenting on this matter, the contractor stated that the CPR's in question were special requirements directed by the Air Force and were in addition to the cost reports provided on other contracts.

MAR 1 1977

Since the contracts in question required splitting one CPR into two reports, the contractor felt justified in proposing and accounting for the expenses of the second set of reports as direct costs.

Subsequently, the ACO prepared a draft determination of non-compliance and submitted it to the AFCEM Staff Judge Advocate for recommendation and guidance. The matter was then referred to the Air Force Systems Command Staff Judge Advocate. The ACO was advised by Systems Command on October 7, 1976, that the noncompliance was unwarranted and should not be issued. The basis for the decision was that CPR's relating to aircraft sales to Saudi Arabia were specifically required by the contracts to serve a peculiar purpose. The ACO promptly notified the contractor that direct charging of the CPR preparation costs was acceptable for the Saudi Arabia effort, provided that the CAS Disclosure Statement was revised and consistently followed.

File documentation obtained from your resident contract administration personnel at Northrop strongly supports the view that the CPR's serve the same purpose, that is, to enhance Air Force management capability in the identification and analysis of program problems. If the Saudi Arabian requirements had been negotiated with Northrop on a separate Air Force contract, the costs of the CPR would have been accounted for as an indirect expense in accordance with the company's normal procedures. We would appreciate it if your staff would reconsider this matter and advise us of any action taken or planned.

We would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the courtesy and cooperation provided by your resident staff during this survey. A copy of this letter is being provided to the Regional Manager, Defense Contract Audit Agency, Los Angeles, and Air Force Plant Representative, Northrop, for information purposes.

Sincerely yours,

J. T. Hall, Jr.
Regional Manager

cc: Regional Manager, DCAA, Los Angeles
AFPR, Northrop