



MIAMIBEACH

BUDGET AND PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT
Internal Audit Division

INTERNAL AUDIT REPORT

TO: Kathie G. Brooks, Interim City Manager
FROM: James J. Sutter, Internal Auditor 
DATE: August 3, 2012
AUDIT: Fleet Management Division Internal Service Charge Billings Audit
PERIOD: October 1, 2008 through July 31, 2011

This report is the result of a regularly scheduled audit of the methodology applied and the processes implemented in the documenting and recording of fuel disbursed, depreciation charges levied and vehicle repair work performed by Fleet Management Division personnel and the accuracy of the corresponding internal service charges billed to its participating user City departments/divisions. The vehicle repair services provided to the Village of Key Biscayne were excluded from our testing.

INTRODUCTION

The Fleet Management Division's daily operations of fuel availability and distribution to City vehicles and locations, consumption activity processing, and reporting of all information associated with these processes is primarily controlled through the RNI FuelOmat System (RNI). This system keeps track of unleaded gasoline and diesel fuel dispensed at the Fleet Management pumps or by its tanker truck. Additionally, they utilize the FASTER system for asset management, automotive parts, mechanic labor and fuel consumption tracking. The RNI and FASTER systems are integrated through a computer interface that allows daily uploads of RNI records of fuel distributed from the pumps and tanker truck.

Most City vehicles are equipped with a Vehicle Identification Unit (VIU) and a coil/ring installed around the fuel inlet which operate together allowing fuel to be dispensed from Fleet Management's pumps or from the tanker truck. A programmable fuel key is used as an alternative device for vehicles and equipment not outfitted with a VIU and coil/ring, so they also may be fueled at the Fleet Management's pumps or the tanker truck. Any fuel purchased at the pumps or tanker truck is currently marked up by \$.10 per gallon to help offset administrative costs.

Fuel is also obtained for the City's fleet through the usage of credit cards issued to City employees for special fueling needs. The City vehicles that use these issued credit cards include the Fire Department and Fire Rescue trucks stationed at the northern end of the City because of the distance from Fleet Management; Police Department motorcycles because they require premium gasoline not available at Fleet Management's pumps; and off-road vehicles such as ATVs because they need to be fueled at the closest and safest location.

These credit card fuel purchases are reviewed monthly when the account statements are received by Fleet Management. They trace all the receipts provided by City personnel to the charges identified on the credit card statements. For record keeping and charge back purposes, these purchases are manually entered in the RNI or FASTER systems to be

We are committed to providing excellent public service and safety to all who live, work, and play in our vibrant, tropical, historic community.

Internal Audit Report
Fleet Management Division Internal Service Charge Billings Audit
August 3, 2012

subsequently allocated to the respective user departments/divisions.

The Fleet Management Division also develops vehicle/equipment bid specification packages so that approved items may be purchased for departments/divisions. Afterwards, they use the straight line depreciation method with no salvage value to charge back the vehicles entire cost to the user through the FASTER system. Most vehicles are depreciated over a five or six year estimated useful life while boats are typically depreciated over ten years. Consequently, Fleet Management will charge back an equal amount each month to the user over the vehicles determined useful life (ex. \$30,000 purchase price/60 months useful life = \$500 per month). These depreciation charges are reversed at fiscal year end on the City's Financial System so that only the debt service is actually charged back to the user departments/divisions.

The Fleet Management Division's Warehouse Operation also orders, stocks and issues automotive parts required for the operation and maintenance of the City's fleet. The distribution of warehouse parts begins when a work order is opened for repair service or scheduled maintenance of vehicles and equipment, or when warehouse personnel identifies the need to re-order parts. A work order is initially prepared by the Fleet Service Representative in the FASTER System upon a vehicle complaint/request for service form completed by the person bringing the vehicle in for service.

A mechanic is assigned to evaluate the needed repairs and/or perform the required service work. The mechanic comes to the on-site warehouse and identifies what work is required. If a non-stock part is needed, a form is completed and the purchase order placed. Conversely, if the needed part is in stock, the warehouse employee enters the information in the work order, pulls the part from the storeroom and gives it to the mechanic. The part number is entered on a warehouse log sheet and signed by the mechanic as evidence of receipt.

Non-stock parts charges are based on the cost at the time of purchase, while stock part charges represent an average cost based on the last three purchase prices paid for the part. The current 20% mark-up percentage levied by Fleet Management is analyzed annually based on the total of warehouse employees' salary and benefits and overhead expenses for the warehouse location and the cost of parts, tires, etc. issued. All marked-up parts along with \$75 per hour labor charges needed to perform the vehicle repair are to be entered in the FASTER system under the designated work order so that they can be subsequently charged back to the user department/division.

Shortly after the conclusion of each month, the Fleet Analyst generates RNI and FASTER system reports of the fuel disbursed, eligible depreciation charges and vehicle repair costs for each City department/division. Any associated vehicle costs incurred internally by the Fleet Management Division are also included and allocated to the other users.

An Excel spreadsheet is prepared summarizing each City departments/divisions monthly costs for fuel disbursed, depreciation and vehicle repairs (excluding those pertaining to accidents, abuse, vandalism or major repairs). Fleet Management calls these 503 charges because they are billed to the user through their designated general ledger account ending in 000503. For example, any vehicle charges relevant to the City Manager's Office would be charged to general ledger account number 011-0310-000503. Once this spreadsheet is completed, it is forwarded to the Finance Department for entry into the City's Financial System through monthly journal entry number 001. The user departments/divisions do not receive this spreadsheet so they do not get an itemized breakdown on the individual components, nor is there any year-to-date data

Internal Audit Report
 Fleet Management Division Internal Service Charge Billings Audit
 August 3, 2012

available by component for the departments being charged.

Meanwhile, any remaining costs resulting from accidents, abuse, vandalism or major repairs are tabulated similarly in another Excel spreadsheet. The Finance Department receives this finalized spreadsheet and charges back the listed departments/divisions through the corresponding general ledger accounts ending in 000513 (513 charges) via monthly journal entry number 001.

Internal Audit randomly selected transactions (excluding those involving the Village of Key Biscayne) occurring during the months of March 2009, July 2010 and April 2011 for testing. The following table provides a summary of the dollar amounts tested separated by 503 and 513 charges:

	March 2009	July 2010	April 2011	Total
Fuel Disbursed	\$138,764	\$196,939	\$286,758	\$622,461
Depreciation	\$229,002	\$251,740	\$256,668	\$737,410
Vehicle Repairs	\$224,462	\$177,965	\$220,178	\$622,605
Total 503 Charges	\$592,228	\$626,644	\$712,279	\$1,931,151
Accidents, etc.	\$21,510	\$12,541	\$15,732	\$49,783
Total 513 Charges	\$21,510	\$12,541	\$15,732	\$49,783
Total	\$613,738	\$639,185	\$728,011	\$1,980,934

OVERALL OPINION

As a result of our testing during the audit we were able to determine that the Fleet Management Division maintains an adequate level of internal controls over fuel disbursement, depreciation charges and vehicle repairs. However, inherent concerns whether all vehicle repair information is correctly and timely entered into the FASTER System could not be satisfied as all subsequent calculations are based on the accuracy of the mechanics' inputs. If incorrect or incomplete entries are made, then inaccurate amounts will be charged back to the user departments/divisions. Consequently, all testing was performed under the assumption that all vehicle repairs' parts and labor were billed correctly by the mechanics.

The following internal service charges billing shortcomings in need of improvement were noted:

- The Fleet Management Division's 510 fund sustained total net operating losses of \$3,536,512 during the audit period thereby decreasing the July 31, 2011 fund balance to \$6,539,749.
- Fleet Management is currently charging user departments/divisions \$25 per month for fully depreciated vehicles that remain in active service.
- Differences were identified between the amounts listed on the FASTER system generated reports and those amounts actually charged back to user departments/divisions.
- The Fleet Management Division's vehicles monthly fuel disbursement allocations were not necessarily equitable and differed from those done for depreciation and vehicle repairs.
- Divisional policies and procedures are currently being updated to better reflect current monthly charge back operations but have not been completed to date.

Internal Audit Report
Fleet Management Division Internal Service Charge Billings Audit
August 3, 2012

As the result of our verification of departmental measures, Internal Audit noted inaccuracies in the March 2009 figures reported in the City's performance management software. A prior internal audit report entitled "Fuel Distribution" covered October 2006 through March 2009 and by coincidence it also identified this difference which the Fleet Management Division subsequently corrected and hence the other two tested months of July 2010 and April 2011 were accurately reported.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this audit is to determine whether provided labor and materials were properly documented and accurately charged back so that all associated costs are billed and reimbursed in compliance with division policies and procedures; whether internal controls are soundly developed and functioning and that provided documentation is sufficient to support tested monthly charge back amounts; and whether all tested transactions were correctly recorded in the City's Financial System and performance management software.

SCOPE

1. Confirm that documented updated operating policies exist, are known to staff and are closely followed.
2. Confirm that well organized, complete and sufficient documentation is maintained to adequately support all tested transactions.
3. Confirm that the internal control process implemented including a proper segregation of duties is adequate.
4. Confirm that the methodology for the internal service charge billing process is sufficient.
5. Confirm that the work requested and completed on a monthly basis is properly billed out to departments/divisions and that these charges include an overhead component which is sufficient.
6. Confirm that revenues and expenditures are being monitored to ensure that Fleet Management is operating within their established budget and that their fund balance is not negatively impacted.
7. Confirm that tested transactions were correctly recorded into the City's Financial System.
8. Confirm that tested data is accurately reported on the City's performance measurement software.

FINDINGS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND MANAGEMENT RESPONSES

1. Finding – *Fleet Management's 510 Fund Ending Fund Balance Decreased by \$3,536,512 or 35.10% During the Past Three Fiscal Years*

Internal Audit Report
 Fleet Management Division Internal Service Charge Billings Audit
 August 3, 2012

Fund 510 in the City's Financial System operates as an internal service fund meaning that it is used to account for the financing of goods or services provided by one City department to other City departments on a cost reimbursement basis. The fund is meant to be self supporting with a break even objective as Fleet Management should be billing or charging back other City user departments/divisions a sufficient amount (including designated mark-ups to offset administrative costs, overhead, etc.) to cover its costs.

The Fleet Management Division's 510 fund incurred the following net operating losses for the 2008/09, 2009/10 and 2010/11 fiscal years:

510 Fund (Fleet Management)	10/01/08 – 09/30/09	10/01/09 – 09/30/10	10/01/10 – 09/30/11 *
Beginning Fund Balance	\$10,076,261	\$8,535,793	\$7,199,685
Revenues	\$7,512,782	\$7,759,299	\$8,908,871
Expenditures	(\$9,053,250)	(\$9,095,407)	(\$9,568,907)
Net (Loss)/Gain	(\$1,540,468)	(\$1,336,108)	(\$659,936)
Ending Fund Balance	\$8,535,794	\$7,199,685	\$6,539,749

* Although the audit period ended on 07/31/11, the entire fiscal year was presented above as it included all year-end adjustments to show a truer representation of the ending fund balance.

As shown above, the 510 fund's ending fund balance decreased by \$3,536,512 (\$10,076,261 - \$6,539,749) or 35.10% during the last three fiscal year period as expenditures exceeded revenues accordingly. At this rate, the fund balance will be exhausted in approximately six years unless alternative approaches are implemented.

Subsequent discussions with Office of Budget and Performance Improvement personnel found that one of the causes of the declining fund balance was the changing of budgeting equipment replacement through debt service rather than through depreciation charges in the fund balance. Budgeting monies for depreciation has not occurred for at least the last three fiscal years. In addition, Fleet Management is budgeting for debt service charges, both interest and principal, but at a lower rate than needed to cover the loan repayment amounts originating from the purchase of the vehicles. Consequently, the unbudgeted total difference in the table below shows the amount that Fleet Management's budget is understated resulting in the corresponding City departments/divisions also not being properly charged:

	10/01/08 – 09/30/09	10/01/09 – 09/30/10	10/01/10 – 09/30/11
Budgeted Depreciation	\$0	\$0	\$0
Actual Depreciation included in Expenditures Total Above	\$3,237,442	\$2,986,353	\$2,802,532
Difference	(\$3,237,442)	(\$2,986,353)	(\$2,802,532)
Budgeted Debt Service	\$1,686,548	\$1,686,548	\$1,686,548
Actual Debt Service – Interest	\$201,246	\$187,539	\$173,995
Principal	\$1,801,586	\$1,656,001	\$1,718,166
Difference	(\$316,284)	(\$156,992)	(\$205,613)
Unbudgeted Total Difference	(\$3,553,726)	(\$3,143,345)	(\$3,008,145)

Recommendation(s)

The Fleet Management Division should coordinate with the Office of Budget and Performance Improvement's Budget Division to adjust future budgets to include more accurate amounts for depreciation and debt service so that they can take the appropriate steps to reverse this trend of a declining fund balance.

Management's Response

Fleet Management is presently working and coordinating with OBPI for FY 2012/2013 to more accurately represent debt services and depreciation. The use of the Fleet Management fund balance for other purposes requires investigation.

2. Finding – *Fleet Management Charges Users an Additional \$25 Per Month for Fully Depreciated Vehicles that Remain in Active Service*

Fleet Management uses the straight line depreciation method with no salvage value to charge back vehicles entire cost to the users through the FASTER system. Most vehicles are depreciated over a five or six year estimated useful life while boats are typically depreciated over ten years. Consequently, Fleet Management will charge back and receive an equal amount each month from the user over the vehicles determined useful life (ex. \$30,000 purchase price/60 months useful life = \$500 per month).

If the fully depreciated vehicle remains in active use by the City department/division, then Fleet Management charges the user \$25 per month thereby charging back more than the actual purchase price. It was determined that there were 21 affected fully depreciated vehicles in March 2009 which grew to 251 in July 2010 and finally to 274 in April 2011 as the City has delayed purchasing new vehicles whenever possible.

Recommendation(s)

The Fleet Management Division should not charge back user departments/divisions for more depreciation than the initial purchase price of the vehicle. The corresponding mark-up amounts for fuel, labor and vehicle parts may need to be adjusted going forward to compensate for this change.

Management's Response

The \$25 per month charge is a usage/inflation factor charge. The difference between the original cost of the vehicle and the new purchase price is the reason for the charge. In some cases new environmental technology to meet the new government standards requires additional charges. Interest rates have fallen, the cost of raw goods and oil based products have increased. A method needs to be reviewed and initiated to cover the difference for a Fire Engine that 15 to 20 years ago cost approximately \$250,000 and is now up to about \$750,000.

3. Finding – *Differences Identified Between the Amounts Listed on the System Generated Reports and those Actually Charged Back to Users*

RNI FuelOmat and FASTER System reports are generated shortly after the end of the month to be used in determining the user departments/divisions charge back amounts for 503 charges (fuel disbursement, depreciation and vehicle repairs excluding those pertaining to accidents, abuse, vandalism or major repairs) and 513 charges (vehicle repairs pertaining to accidents, abuse, vandalism or major repairs). 503 charges represent general ledger accounts ending in 000503 (ex. City Manager's Office would be 011-0310-000503) while 513 charges represent general ledger accounts ending in

Internal Audit Report
 Fleet Management Division Internal Service Charge Billings Audit
 August 3, 2012

000513 (eg. City Manager's Office would be 011-0310-000513). All calculations are performed by one Fleet Management Division employee as no one else reviews these figures for accuracy.

Internal Audit compared these system generated reports' listed figures to those amounts actually charged back to the user departments/divisions for the randomly sampled months of March 2009, July 2010 and April 2011 to find the following differences:

	March 2009	July 2010	April 2011
503 Charges			
Fuel Charge Back	\$138,764	\$196,939	\$286,758
Fuel per Reports	\$138,764	\$196,939	\$286,758
Difference	\$0	\$0	\$0
Vehicle Repairs Charge Back	\$453,463	\$429,705	\$476,846
Vehicle Repairs per Reports	\$466,226	\$429,534	\$476,846
Difference	(\$12,763)	\$171	\$0
Total 503 Charges Difference	(\$12,763)	\$171	\$0
513 Charges			
513 Charges Charge Back	\$21,510	\$12,541	\$15,732
513 Charges per Reports	\$21,873	\$12,712	\$15,732
Total 513 Charges Difference	(\$363)	(\$171)	\$0
Total Difference	\$13,126	\$0	\$0

Recommendation(s)

The Fleet Management Division should scan the supporting documents for fuel disbursed, depreciation and vehicle repairs under a designated place in the City's M drive. Therefore, the City departments/divisions that utilize their services have the ability to review and confirm the individual monthly transactions. Subsequently, the Fleet Management Division Director should review and attest to the accuracy of the corresponding charge back calculations. The implementation of these practices should help better ensure the accuracy of the charge back amounts billed to the user departments/divisions.

Management's Response

Fleet Management can place the scanned Excel Worksheet document that Finance receives monthly on a designated location on the "M" drive for review by the end user departments. The 513 difference is due to work orders that are not related to accident; vandalism; operator responsible or major repair. Those differences remain in the 503 account. The 503 difference is due to the Fire Department's depreciation being inadvertently omitted in the February 2009 Fleet Management chargeback for departments 1210 and 1220 which was subsequently corrected by being included in the March 2009 chargeback.

4. Finding – *The Fleet Management Division's Vehicles Monthly Fuel Disbursement Allocations Were Not Necessarily Equitable and Differed from Those Done for Depreciation and Vehicle Repairs*

During the 10/01/08 – 07/31/10 audit period, the fuel disbursed by the Fleet Management Division to their assigned vehicles was allocated evenly to each City

Internal Audit Report
Fleet Management Division Internal Service Charge Billings Audit
August 3, 2012

department/division that received fuel regardless of the amount purchased. Therefore, the user that hypothetically disbursed one gallon would be charged the same amount of Fleet Management's allocated fuel expenses as another that received 1,000 gallons.

This practice is not consistent with the allocation of Fleet Management Division's depreciation and vehicle repairs which is done proportionately based on the user's dollar amount of repairs performed in relation to the Citywide monthly total. For example, the department/division that incurred \$100 in vehicle repairs of the monthly Citywide total of \$10,000 would be charged 1% ($\$100/\$10,000$) of Fleet Management's depreciation and vehicle repairs. Following discussions with Internal Audit, Fleet Management agreed to change their fuel purchase allocation to be consistent with those for depreciation and vehicle repairs starting with August 2011.

In addition, the two City owned golf courses, Miami Beach Golf Club and Normandy Shores Golf Club, did not receive an allocation of Fleet Management's fuel disbursed despite receiving gasoline during each tested month. Yet, other similar City owned facilities operated by independent contractors such as the Miami Beach Convention Center and the Bass Museum received an allocation thereby slightly increasing their monthly fuel costs accordingly.

Recommendation(s)

The Fleet Management Division should continue to allocate their monthly fuel disbursements proportionately based on each departments/divisions usage in relation to the Citywide total similar to the calculations performed for depreciation and vehicle repairs. Also, the two City owned golf clubs should be included in Fleet Management's future months' vehicles fuel allocations assuming that they receive fuel disbursements.

Management's Response

During the audit, the fuel distribution Excel Worksheet was changed to reflect proportionate billing to the end user department for the monthly fuel charge.

5. Finding – *Divisional Policies and Procedures Are In Need of Completion*

The Fleet Management Division is currently in the process of updating their policies and procedures. The provided monthly charge back billing operating policies and procedures completed to date were deemed comprehensive and sufficient but need to be finished and approved. The lack of updated procedures to ensure the uninterrupted operation of the process is a matter of concern, given the almost total dependence on one individual.

Recommendation(s)

The monthly charge back billing's operating policies and procedures should be completed as soon as possible since they serve both as a benchmark to measure individuals' performance and as an instruction manual in the event employees' change. Once completed, they should be distributed to all applicable personnel so that they can be read, understood and followed.

Management's Response

Fleet Management will try their best to update and complete the policies and procedures, but due to the extra work load placed on end user departments, makes it difficult to accomplish as a priority.

Internal Audit Report
 Fleet Management Division Internal Service Charge Billings Audit
 August 3, 2012

6. Finding – Review of Divisional Performance Measures

The Fleet Management Division's performance measurement scorecard was reviewed to determine the accuracy of the following five departmental performance indicators reported figures for the randomly sampled months of March 2009, July 2010 and April 2011:

Departmental Performance Measure	Tested Month	Reported	Audited	Difference
Police Patrol Gallons Used Monthly	March 2009 *	32,800	31,462	1,338
	July 2010	29,114	29,114	0
	April 2011	30,064	30,064	0
	Total	91,978	90,640	1,338
Fleet Fuel Charges Diesel Dispensed City Wide	March 2009 *	\$18,328	\$16,448	\$1,880
	July 2010	\$28,975	\$28,975	\$0
	April 2011	\$45,837	\$45,837	\$0
	Total	\$93,140	\$91,260	\$1,880
Fleet Fuel Charges Gasoline Dispensed City Wide	March 2009 *	\$128,436	\$125,962	\$2,474
	July 2010	\$171,493	\$171,493	\$0
	April 2011	\$240,966	\$240,966	\$0
	Total	\$540,895	\$538,412	\$2,474
Fleet Fuel Volume Gallons Diesel Dispensed	March 2009 *	10,473	9,399	1,074
	July 2010	11,195	11,195	0
	April 2011	11,892	11,892	0
	Total	33,560	32,547	1,074
Fleet Fuel Volume Gallons Gasoline Dispensed	March 2009 *	69,425	68,087	1,338
	July 2010	66,776	66,776	0
	April 2011	65,786	65,786	0
	Total	201,987	200,649	1,338

* The randomly selected month of March 2009 was by coincidence also included in the audit period for a previously conducted internal audit entitled "Fuel Distribution" that was issued on 11/19/09. One of the findings in this report also dealt with Fleet Management's cost allocations which caused the differences noted above for March 2009. The Fleet Management Division subsequently made the identified corrections and hence the remaining sampled months of July 2010 and April 2011 were reported correctly.

Consequently, Internal Audit concludes that the figures reported for the five departmental performance indicators listed are "certified" based on the criteria defined in Exhibit 1 located at the end of this audit report. All identified differences occurred during March 2009 were promptly corrected as identified in the footnote above so that the reported figures for July 2010 and April 2011 were deemed accurate based on the system reports provided.

Finally review of these five performance measures data entered in the City's performance measurement software system found that the measure description and data source were not present for the measure entitled "Police Patrol Gallons Used Monthly". Additionally, the calculation methodology was not included for any of the five performance measures tested.

Recommendation(s)

The Fleet Management Division should try and identify the root cause for the March

Internal Audit Report
Fleet Management Division Internal Service Charge Billings Audit
August 3, 2012

2009 differences. Once completed, the necessary corrections should be made so that the figures reported in the City's performance measurement software system are accurate.

Among other items, the performance measurement software's definition and description fields should include a definition of the measure, as well as the methodology for deriving the measure, the data source, and references and/or sources of comparable benchmarks. The Fleet Management Division should make the necessary corrections for the five sampled performance measures so that these items are satisfied and then review all other owned measures for compliance.

Management's Response

Prior to this internal audit, a separate audit was completed on the fuel management system for the period October 2006 to March 2009. The outcome of that audit was to create a method to manually enter all outboard transaction in the RNI Fuelomat System for Hess; Shell; Chevron; BP Amoco and Miami Beach Marina. The RNI Fuelomat system has three (3) methods for entering data. First, the downloads from the dispenser pumps; second, the downloads from the Tanker Truck; and third by manually entering all the outboard receipts into the system.

EXIT CONFERENCE

An exit conference was held on April 11, 2012 in OBPI's Conference Room with Fleet Analyst George Fisher and Senior Auditor Mark Coolidge. Audit findings and recommendations were discussed, as were management responses, which are included herein. All were in agreement with the contents of this audit report.

JJS:LFR:lfr:MC:mc

(Audit performed by Laura Franco-Rubines and Mark Coolidge)

F:\OBPI\AUD\INTERNAL AUDIT FILES\DOC10-11\REPORTS - FINAL\FLEET MGMT INTERNAL SERVICE CHARGE BILLINGS RPT.docx

cc: Fred Beckmann, Public Works Director
Jay Fink, Assistant Public Works Director
Jorge Cano, Administrative and Business Officer
George Fisher, Fleet Analyst
Patricia D. Walker, Chief Financial Officer

EXHIBIT: 1 – Assessment Categories for Performance Measures Verification

Assessment Category	Criteria
Certified	If reported performance is 100% accurate and if it appears that controls are in place to ensure accuracy for collecting and reporting performance data. Measurement data is supported by source documents.
Certified with Qualifications	This category is assigned under either one of two conditions: 1. <i>Reported performance is within +/- 3%, but the controls over data collection and reporting are not adequate to ensure continued accuracy.</i> 2. <i>The department's calculation of actual performance deviates from the measure definition, but was still within an acceptable range.</i>
Factors Prevented Certification	Documentation is unavailable or incomplete and controls are not adequate to ensure accuracy. This category is also assigned when there is a deviation from the measure definition and the reviewer cannot determine the correct measure result.
Inaccurate	Actual performance is not within 3% of reported performance, or there is a greater than 5% error in the sample of documents tested.

EXHIBIT: 2 - Additional References for Performance Management Software's Description of Measure

- 1) **Measure Name:** Should list the name of the measure for which data is being collected and reported.
- 2) **Measure Type:** Should recognize whether the measure is an "Input", "Output", or "Outcome" measure. One must consider whether results are measured through input (Ex: Customer surveys), output (Ex: Number of contracts completed without change orders), or outcome (Ex: % of projects substantially completed or in beneficial use within 120 days).
- 3) **Measure Description:** Should describe the measure. Some measures are self explanatory and some may not; however, a description should always be included (Ex: The measure considers the % of change in the value of the change orders for a specific category divided by the original project cost).
- 4) **Measure Frequency:** Describes how often performance data is reported (Ex: Quarterly).
- 5) **Data Sources:** Should list sources used to collect performance data (Ex: System Software Names, Report Names, Schedules, etc.)
- 6) **Calculation Methodology:** Should explain how data reported was calculated (Ex: change orders for that quarter divided by the original total projects costs, projects substantially completed or in beneficial use within 120 days of the contract milestone date divided by the total number of projects completed during the same quarter).