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Please Read

This presentation has been prepared for information purposes and general guidance only and does not constitute professional advice. You should not act upon the information contained in this publication without obtaining specific professional advice.

No representation or warranty (express or implied) is made as to the accuracy or completeness of the information contained in this publication, and CohnReznick LLP, its members, employees and agents accept no liability, and disclaim all responsibility, for the consequences of you or anyone else acting, or refraining to act, in reliance on the information contained in this publication or for any decision based on it.

This presentation and its content are the property of CohnReznick LLP and are protected by applicable copyright laws. Any unauthorized use of the information herein will be considered a violation of CohnReznick LLP’s intellectual property rights. Unless stated otherwise herein, no part of this presentation may be copied, distributed, or published, in whole or in part, without the prior written agreement of CohnReznick LLP.
Objectives

• FAR Part 31 Requirements for Allowable Employee Compensation

• Reporting Requirements for Executive Compensation and First-Tier Subcontract Awards

• Methods the DCAA and Other Civilian Audit Agencies Use to Determine the Reasonableness of Employee Compensation

• Strict Requirements Placed on Compensation for Owners

• Best Practices
FAR Part 31 Requirements for Allowable Employee Compensation
What’s Included in FAR 31.205-6

- (a) General
- (b) Reasonableness
- (d) Form of Payment
- (e) Income Tax Differential Pay
- (f) Bonuses and Incentive Compensation
- (g) Severance Pay
- (h) Backpay
- (i) Compensation Related to Changes in Prices of Corporate Securities/Ownership
- (j) Pension
- (k) Deferred Compensation Other Than Pensions
- (l) Compensation Incidental to Business Acquisitions
- (m) Fringe Benefits
- (n) Employee Rebate and Purchase Discount Plans
- (o) Postretirement Benefits Other Than Pensions
- (p) Limitation on Allowability of Compensation
- (q) ESOP
FAR 31.205-6 Exec Comp Focus Areas

- **General**
  - “Total compensation for individual employees or job classes of employees must be reasonable for the work performed…specific restrictions on individual compensation elements apply when prescribed”
  - “Compensation must be based upon and confirm to the terms and conditions of the contractor’s established compensation plan or practice followed so consistently as to imply, in effect, an agreement to make the payment”
  - Major changes to plan should be presented to cognizant ACO to review allowability
  - Because you call it compensation, it doesn’t make unallowable costs allowable (e.g. Entertainment Allowance)
FAR 31.205-6 Exec Comp Focus Areas

• General (continued)
  
  – Special Consideration

• Owners of closely held corporations/members of LLC/partners/
  sole proprietors or members of their immediate families

• Those contractually committed to acquire a substantial financial
  interest in the contractor’s enterprise

• In above cases, compensation must be reasonable for services
  rendered and not be a distribution of profits
FAR 31.205-6 Exec Comp Focus Areas

- **Reasonableness**
  - The aggregate of each measurable and allowable compensation element must sum to a reasonable total
  - Evaluation must be based on allowable elements
  - Test of reasonableness based on factors determined relevant by the contracting officer to include conformity with compensation practices of others:
    - Of the same size
    - In the same industry
    - In the same geographic area; and
    - Engaged in similar non-government work under comparable circumstances
FAR 31.205-6 Exec Comp Focus Areas

- **Bonuses/Incentive Compensation**
  - Awards are paid/accrued as per an agreement before the services are rendered or pursuant to an established plan or policy
  - Award basis must be supported

- **Compensation Related to Changes in Prices of Corporate Securities/Ownership**
  - Unallowable!
  - Examples include: stock options, stock appreciation rights, phantom stock plans, and junior stock conversions
  - Does NOT include ESOPs
Exelis (ASBCA No. 58966, March 29, 2017)

- In FY06, Contractor claimed millions of dollars paid to 51 executives via a Long-Term Incentive Plan that was based on a “Total Shareholder Return,” which included an evaluation of stock price change and dividends paid and how that compared to its competitors.
- DCAA questioned these costs as expressly unallowable
- DACO sustained and applied penalties
- Exelis appealed stating that the calculation was determined by company performance relative to competitors and TSR would not be paid if other companies did better.
- ASBCA denied the appeal stating that TSR still significantly depended on stock price one way or another
## FAR 31.205-6 Exec Comp Focus Areas

- **Limitation on Allowability of Compensation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract award date</th>
<th>Applicable agencies</th>
<th>Covered employees</th>
<th>31.205-6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before June 24, 2014</td>
<td>Executive Agencies Other than DoD, NASA and Coast Guard</td>
<td>Senior Executive</td>
<td>(p)(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before December 31, 2011</td>
<td>DoD, NASA, and Coast Guard</td>
<td>Senior Executive</td>
<td>(p)(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On/after December 31, 2011 and before June 24, 2014</td>
<td>DoD, NASA, and Coast Guard</td>
<td>All Employees</td>
<td>(p)(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On/after June 24, 2014</td>
<td>All Executive Agencies</td>
<td>All Employees</td>
<td>(p)(4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FAR 31.205-6 Exec Comp Focus Areas

- Limitation on Allowability of Compensation (Cont.)

OFPP determines cap for FY 2010*
Apr 15, 2010 $693,951

On Dec 31, 2011, cap applies to employees working on contracts with DOD, NASA & CG, excludes other Federal agencies

Cap applies to different groups of contractor employees

OFPP determines cap for FY 2012* and subsequent FYs
Dec 4, 2010 $952,308

In a letter dated Oct 24, 2014, Secretary of Defense authorizes blended rates

Bureau of Labor Statistics calculates the Employment Cost Index used to adjust the $487,000 cap annually


Section 803, NDAA of 2012, enacted on Dec 31, 2011, increased the number of contractor employees subject to the cap for contracts with DOD, NASA and CG

All agencies and all employees are subject to the cap
FY 2014
Jun 24, 2014 $487,000

OFPP determines cap for FY 2011*
Apr 23, 2012 $763,029

Dec 26, 2013 Section 702, BBA of 2013** deleted the section 1127 statutory formula cap for new contract awarded as of June 24, 2014

* The Office of Federal Procurement Policy, (OFPP) Administrator determines the benchmark compensation amount as required by Section 39 of the OFPP Act, as amended (41 U.S.C 1127)

** Section 702 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 (BBA; Pub. L. 113-67, December 26, 2013)
FAR 31.205-6 Exec Comp Focus Areas

- Limitation on Allowability of Compensation (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory Formula Cap Amount</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>For Costs Incurred After</th>
<th>Federal Register Notice</th>
<th>FR Date Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,144,888</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Jan 1, 2014</td>
<td>81 FR 13833</td>
<td>March 15, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$980,796</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Jan 1, 2013</td>
<td>81 FR 13833</td>
<td>March 15, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$693,951</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Jan 1, 2010</td>
<td>75 FR 19661</td>
<td>Apr 15, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$684,181</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Jan 1, 2009</td>
<td>74 FR 23893</td>
<td>May 21, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$546,689</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Jan 1, 2006</td>
<td>71 FR 26114</td>
<td>May 3, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$473,318</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Jan 1, 2005</td>
<td>70 FR 23888</td>
<td>May 5, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$432,851</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Jan 1, 2004</td>
<td>69 FR 26897</td>
<td>May 14, 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So I Can Claim Up to the Cap, Right?

• Probably not…

• Remember the reasonableness requirements and the need to have plans in place **prior** to determining compensation and bonuses/incentive payments

• You may use multiple G&A rates for covered contracts let prior to June 24, 2014, if it helps and you can support it
Future of FAR 31.205-6

- Top U.S. Government Salaries
  - President - $400,000
  - Chief Justice - $263,300
  - Vice-President - $230,700
  - Speaker of the House - $223,500
  - Senator/Representative - $174,000

- FAR 31.205-6 - More than 32 revisions in 34 years
Reporting Requirements for Executive Compensation and First-Tier Subcontract Awards
The Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA) was signed on September 26, 2006. The intent is to empower every American with the ability to hold the government accountable for each spending decision. The end result is to reduce wasteful spending in the government. The FFATA legislation requires information on federal awards (federal financial assistance and expenditures) be made available to the public via a single, searchable website, which is www.USASpending.gov.

The FFATA Subaward Reporting System (FSRS) is the reporting tool Federal prime awardees (i.e. prime contractors and prime grants recipients) use to capture and report subaward and executive compensation data regarding their first-tier subawards to meet the FFATA reporting requirements. Prime contract awardees will report against sub-contracts awarded and prime grant awardees will report against sub-grants awarded. The sub-award information entered in FSRS will then be displayed on www.USASpending.gov associated with the prime award furthering Federal spending transparency.
Reporting requirements for executive compensation and first-tier subcontract awards (FAR 52.204-10)

- **Prime**
  - As a part of its annual registration requirement in the System for Award Management (SAM) database (FAR provision 52.204-7), the Contractor shall report the names and total compensation of each of the five most highly compensated executives for its preceding completed fiscal year, if—
    - (i) In the Contractor’s preceding fiscal year, the Contractor received—
      - (A) 80 percent or more of its annual gross revenues from Federal contracts, and
      - (B) $25,000,000 or more in annual gross revenues from Federal contracts, and
    - (ii) The public does not have access to information about the compensation of the executives through periodic reports filed under section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m(a), 78o(d)) or section 6104 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.
Reporting requirements for executive compensation and first-tier subcontract awards (FAR 52.204-10)

- **First-tier subcontract information**
  - Unless otherwise directed by the contracting officer, or as provided in paragraph (g) of this clause, by the end of the month following the month of award of a first-tier subcontract with a value of $30,000 or more, the Contractor shall report the following information at http://www.fsrs.gov for that first-tier subcontract.
  - (i) In the subcontractor's preceding fiscal year, the subcontractor received
  - (A) 80 percent or more of its annual gross revenues from Federal contracts, and
  - (B) $25,000,000 or more in annual gross revenues from Federal contracts, and
  - (ii) The public does not have access to information about the compensation of the executives through periodic reports filed under section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m(a), 78o(d)) or section 6104 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.
Reporting requirements for executive compensation and first-tier subcontract awards (FAR 52.204-10)

- Exemption on reporting executive compensation on First-tier subcontracts
  - (g)(1) If the Contractor in the previous tax year had gross income, from all sources, under $300,000, the Contractor is exempt from the requirement to report subcontractor awards.
  - (2) If a subcontractor in the previous tax year had gross income from all sources under $300,000, the Contractor does not need to report awards for that subcontractor.
Total Compensation (FAR 52.204-10)

**Total compensation** means the cash and noncash dollar value earned by the executive during the Contractor's preceding fiscal year and includes the following (for more information see 17 CFR 229.402(c)(2)):

1. **Salary and bonus.**
2. **Awards of stock, stock options, and stock appreciation rights.** Use the dollar amount recognized for financial statement reporting purposes with respect to the fiscal year in accordance with the Financial Accounting Standards Board's Accounting Standards Codification (FASB ASC) 718, Compensation–Stock Compensation.
3. **Earnings for services under non-equity incentive plans.** This does not include group life, health, hospitalization or medical reimbursement plans that do not discriminate in favor of executives, and are available generally to all salaried employees.
4. **Change in pension value.** This is the change in present value of defined benefit and actuarial pension plans.
5. **Above-market earnings on deferred compensation which is not tax-qualified.**
6. **Other compensation,** if the aggregate value of all such other compensation (e.g., severance, termination payments, value of life insurance paid on behalf of the employee, perquisites or property) for the executive exceeds $10,000.
How Do DCAA/Other Audit Agencies Determine Reasonable Compensation?
Internal Control Questionnaire

- **Type of Organization**
  - **Corporation**
    - Closely Held?
    - Family?
    - Who are the major stockholders?
  - **Partnership**
    - Partner’s names/% Profits

- **Names/Titles of Executives, Time Devoted to Business, Salary**
ICE Model Supplemental Schedule B

GENERAL ORGANIZATIONAL INFORMATION AND EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION FOR THE FIVE MOST HIGHLY COMPENSATED EXECUTIVES

DCAA

CONTRACTOR DATA FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAO:</th>
<th>CONTRACTOR:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAO ASSIGNMENT #:</td>
<td>CFYE (Month and Year):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIC/NAICS CODE:</th>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CONTRACTOR DATA:</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDARY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXECUTIVE DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFY</th>
<th>EXEC POSITION</th>
<th>SALES SCOPE</th>
<th>% TIME DIRECT</th>
<th>BASE SALARY</th>
<th>BONUS</th>
<th>PENSION</th>
<th>HEALTH/LIFE INS.</th>
<th>AUTO</th>
<th>DEFERRED COMP.</th>
<th>LTI/OTHER*</th>
<th>VOL DELS.</th>
<th>CLAIMED COMP.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Traditional DCAA Approach

- Survey Median plus 10% Range of Reasonableness
- Uses many different surveys (weigh equally)
- Ignores geography
- Uses Area of Responsibility

- Notes about AASHTO and State Dept.'s Approach
COURT CASE WARNING!

- **J.F. Taylor (ASBCA No. 56105/56322, Jan 18, 2012)**
  - In FY’s 2002-2005, DCAA questioned $849,050 of unreasonable claimed compensation
  - DACO sustained the questioned costs and demanded repayment of about $600,000.
  - J.F. Taylor appealed based on DCAA’s methodology and alleged DCAA:
    - Ignored compensation survey data dispersion and employed an arbitrary 10% “range of reasonableness” allowance
    - Ignored differences in survey sizes
    - Failure to consider the company’s financial performance and other relevant factors
  - ASBCA sided with J.F. Taylor and deemed DCAA’s methodology to be unreasonable
COURT CASE WARNING!

- J.F. Taylor (ASBCA No. 56105/56322, Jan 18, 2012)

DCAA’s response to the case:

- The Board hears specific cases and makes decisions based upon the evidence presented.
- Board takes a case-dependent to these compensation claims
- Contractor’s expert witness deemed DCAA’s approach to be “fatally flawed” and not the Board.
- Board merely noted that, due to the government’s failure to present a statistics expert, the Contractor’s expert witness’ testimony was “unrebutted.”
Metron (ASBCA No. 55624/56751/56752 June 4, 2012)
- In FY’s 2004-2005, for 10 executives, DCAA questioned costs totaling $1.3M, stating the claimed compensation was unreasonable
- DACO sustained the questioned costs and demanded repayment of about $700,000 (DoD portion)
- Metron appealed based on DCAA’s methodology
- Metron used the Radford Survey which they deemed most relevant to its industry
- DCAA utilized multiple surveys and weighed them evenly, which resulted in a lower reasonableness determination
- DCAA selected specific percentiles solely based on revenue
- ASBCA deemed this methodology inappropriate based on the regulation
COURT CASE WARNING!

- Metron (ASBCA No. 55624/56751/56752 June 4, 2012)

DCAA’s response to the case:
- It’s a misconception that ASBCA endorsed using a single compensation survey
- Per the Board “the alternative surveys relied on by the government were less appropriate, comprehensive, technology-industry oriented, reliable, and/or persuasive…in this case”
## CohnReznick’s Audit Approach

### Starting Point

**Basic Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Client Title</th>
<th>Employee Name</th>
<th>Total Compensation</th>
<th>Direct Labor</th>
<th>Indirect Labor</th>
<th>Indirect Labor $ to Total %</th>
<th>Excess over 65th Percentile</th>
<th>Statutory Limitation</th>
<th>Unallowable Indirect Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>John Doe</td>
<td>$800,000.00</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
<td>$720,000.00</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>$600,000.00</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>$180,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$800,000.00</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
<td>$720,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$600,000.00</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td><strong>$180,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost Questioned due to Statutory Limit: 0.00%  
Cost Questioned due to Reasonableness: 100.00%

### Key:

- **Sales**: $100,000,000
- **Location**: Arlington, VA
- **SIC**: 123456
Strict Requirements Placed on Compensation for Owners
Strict Requirements Placed on Compensation for Owners

- Government is concerned Owners will pay themselves and family members unreasonable compensation at the expense of the Government on Cost-reimbursement contracts. FAR 31.205-6(a)

(6)(i) Compensation costs for certain individuals give rise to the need for special consideration. Such individuals include:

(A) Owners of closely held corporations, members of limited liability companies, partners, sole proprietors, or members of their immediate families; and

(B) Persons who are contractually committed to acquire a substantial financial interest in the contractor’s enterprise.

(ii) For these individuals, compensation must—

(A) Be reasonable for the personal services rendered; and

(B) Not be a distribution of profits (which is not an allowable contract cost).

(iii) For owners of closely held companies, compensation in excess of the costs that are deductible as compensation under the Internal Revenue Code (26 U.S.C.) and regulations under it is unallowable.
Issues related to Compensation for Owners

- Contractor only had fixed price contracts and the owners don’t pay themselves a salary. One of the fixed price contracts is terminated which effectively converts that contract to a Cost-reimbursement contract and the owners are never compensated a reasonable amount for the work they performed on the contract.
- Profit sharing plans have been found unallowable when the majority of the profits were distributed to owners.
- When owners/employees are not compensated in the form of a salary, it creates an appearance of higher profits which can create an audit red flag.
Compensation and Benefits for Start-Up Companies

Many of the methods High Tech companies use to attract and retain top talent are unallowable cost for Government Contractors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Tech Startup</th>
<th>Government Contractor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stock options</td>
<td>Unallowable cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phantom Stock plans</td>
<td>Unallowable cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unannounced Bonuses</td>
<td>Unallowable cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred compensation upon sale of the business</td>
<td>Unallowable cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company-furnished automobiles</td>
<td>Unallowable cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Parties</td>
<td>Unallowable cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>Unallowable cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are Government Contractors doing to attract and retain employees

With DCAA’s main focus on questioning the reasonableness of Salary and Bonuses, they often overlook fringe benefits

- Flexible work schedule
- Defined-contribution pension plans
  - Increased 401K contribution
  - Increased Profit sharing plan (unallowable cost)
- Increased healthcare and dental contribution
- Creating Employee stock ownership plans (ESOP)
- Increased training and education costs
- Increased Paid Time Off (PTO)
Be Ready!

- Document, Document, Document
  - Compensation Plan and associated policies and procedures/employee handbook
  - Bonus Plan(s) – Employees and Officers/Executives
  - Maintain support for bonus/incentive compensation decisions
  - Salary Surveys – Pick one(s) that are most relevant to your industry, your geography (i.e., defensible!)
  - Carefully maintain all of the above documentation, you may not be audited until 6-7 years after you’ve documented the above
Get Set!

• Understand your business
  • Security Clearances
  • Demonstrated high-level performance (CPARS)
  • Unique skills sets
  • Local labor market

• Know your contracts
  • Mix of flexibly priced and fixed price
  • Unique requirements
Attack! (Well, if you must)

- Understand DCAA’s (Auditor’s) Basis for Questioning
  - Survey(s) used
  - Percentile/Range of Reasonableness
  - Position Descriptions
  - Composition of Compensation
    - Unallowables out?
    - Organizational Fringe benefits excluded?
    - Overtime/differentials excluded?
  - Absence of market data ≠ questioned costs/unreasonable compensation
    - Your contract(s) count
    - Your salary histories count
GovCon360 keeps you abreast of the ever-changing regulatory environment that is Government contracting. From reference materials, like searchable pdf copies of the FAR and DCAM, to our past Lunch and Learn seminar slide decks and thought pieces on industry matters, we’ve got it covered. Subscribe to our RSS feed to receive short alerts on recent industry changes. It’s always been our job to help our clients maintain a competitive advantage by staying ahead of the curve. This website is an extension of the services we’ve been providing for over 35 years by putting useful resources and up-to-date information at your fingertips.