

**NEW DEAL**

**STUDY DIRECTIVE**

---

**MODERNIZATION**

**OF THE**

**FUNDING & MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS**

**FOR**

**NON-PUBLIC PROPERTY**

**PROGRAMS,**

**ACTIVITIES,**

**AND**

**CAPITAL INFRASTRUCTURE**

---

**25 July 2008**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

{ TOC \o "1-3" \h \z \u }

## **I - BACKGROUND**

At the 18 September 2007 Non-Public Property Board (NPPB) meeting, the CFPSA Chief Financial Officer (CFO) indicated that the current Non-Public Property (NPP) funding, administration, management and operational arrangements for Morale and Welfare (MW) programs and activities and NPP capital infrastructure do not assure that CF members, former members and their families have equitable and enduring access to NPP MW programs wherever they serve. He also stated that these same arrangements have led to many costly undertakings that subsequently have proven unaffordable resulting in requests for loan forgiveness and/or write-offs, as well as increased costs for other programs and activities.

The case for a conceptual approach for a comprehensive re-structuring of these funding, administration, management and operational arrangements was made and was well received by Board members who generally agreed that the “New Deal” was a bold and well thought out package that needed to be seriously considered. The scope and depth of the proposed changes have the potential to revitalize a number of morale and welfare programs, services, and activities that are in financial difficulty or have actually become drains on national and local non-public funds.

CEO CFPSA requested and the NPP Board authorized the initiation of a consultation process for the “New Deal” that would involve Board Members and the Base and Wing Commanders. The Board cautioned against proceeding too fast and recommended that the project management framework include both a validation process at regular intervals and off-ramps for each initiative. It was understood that the final recommendations of this consultation process would have to be endorsed by the chain of command through the NPP Board and approved by the CDS and that changes would have to be carefully planned and gradually implemented.

New Deal information packages were circulated on 16 November 2007 to Board members who provided written input. Base and Wing Commanders gathered in Toronto during the period 29 - 31 January 2008 to discuss the various proposals. A consensus was reached for the problem definition and the thrust of the various initiatives noting the requirement for impact assessment and the development of a more detailed action plan to determine the way ahead. The Base and Wing Commanders input was reflected in the Draft Study Directive which was circulated to the ECSs for comment on 31 March 2008. This final Study Directive reflects Base and Wing Commander input, ECS review and other comments provided in response to the Draft Study Directive.

On 31 March 2008, the Canadian Forces Personnel Support Agency ceased to exist as an administrative construct and its responsibilities were taken over by the newly established Director General Personnel and Family Support Services (DGPFS).

## **II - OBJECTIVES**

The overarching objectives of the New Deal concept are:

- to give military personnel and their families equitable access to morale and welfare programs, services and activities;
- to enhance the value of NPP programs and activities for the military community at all locations;
- to increase administrative efficiency and effectiveness with a view to reduce overhead and to redirect resources to program delivery;
- to implement a more viable national NPP capital infrastructure management approach; and
- to enhance performance management through establishing clearly articulated goals and milestones, and measuring and reporting results.

### **III - PROPOSED METHODOLOGY**

This study directive provides a framework for the consultation process needed to develop the action plan to modernize the funding and management arrangements for non-public property programs, activities, and capital infrastructure.

The document is primarily based on the consensus developed at the Base / Wing Commanders meeting in Toronto and is organized as follows:

- Section IV: general findings on key principles, the way ahead, and sequencing;
- Section V: more specific information with respect to each of the seven “New Deal” initiatives.

Each of the seven initiatives will be pursued through a consultative working group process involving representatives from the ECSs (including Bases / Wings), DGPFS, and other staff as required. The working groups will be overseen by a New Deal Steering Committee chaired by Assoc DGPFS and a representative from each ECS and ADM (Fin CS). This Steering Committee will provide guidance, review the progress, ensure harmonization of the various initiatives, and review and adjust the timelines for each working the group. The Steering Group will arrange for regular updates to DGPFS, the chain of command and the NPP Board. The process will be paced to ensure that the right representation and personnel are available. Where necessary, the working groups will be augmented with outside assistance.

Note: The requirement for the allocation of resources and funding in support of each of the New Deal initiatives is acknowledged and will be addressed at a later date when the development phase of the various initiatives is underway. At this time, it is acknowledged that internal and external resources will need to be dedicated or contracted to meet requirements.

The New Deal initiatives have been arranged into two phases, reflecting the overall priorities suggested by the Base and Wing Commanders and ECS response to the Draft Study Directive.

Section V provides an overview approach for the working groups to pursue each initiative, organized as follows:

1. summary of the issue;
2. consensus;
3. objectives;
4. context;
5. approach;
6. consultative process (normally at the LCol / Maj or PSP Mgr level); and
7. initial conceptual timetable.

## **IV – GENERAL FINDINGS**

### ***Equitability***

The requirement for more equitable access to Morale and Welfare Programs was endorsed by the Base and Wings Commanders who pointed out that equitability does not mean equality, sameness, or identicalness. Clearly, all Bases and Wings Commanders are faced with different situations and the same cookie cutter approach cannot be adopted to deal with the variety of geographical, demographic, economic, and social environment factors encountered where military personnel are posted. The principles that give meaning to the concept of equitability need to be articulated and serve as a foundation for the deliberations of each working group. The Steering Committee will expand on the concept of equitability.

### ***Standards - Morale and Welfare Programs***

It was generally agreed that morale and welfare programs and services should be tailored to meet the needs of the military community and not the specific needs of each individual. The requirement for standards was endorsed to ensure an equitable availability of programs and services where military personnel are employed. It was suggested that lists of core and non-core programs be developed to help Bases and Wings assign resources in accordance with the conditions prevalent at their particular location.

### ***Allocation of resources***

The majority of Base and Wing Commanders agreed that the current funding distribution method and capital expenditure management model were not efficient and that they did not support a level playing field. The requirement for a more modern resource allocation formula was generally endorsed to ensure a more equitable application of NPP resources.

## ***Context***

The New Deal proposal represents a timely opportunity to engage the chain of command on morale and welfare requirements and to focus on the important role played by non-public property to deliver these programs and services. Good communications with the Bases and Wings and applicable NDHQ staff will be required to ensure that all key players have a chance to influence the way ahead and to eliminate surprises down the road. The scope of the changes being contemplated is wide but the importance of local factors will need to be kept in mind to ensure the success of this renewal initiative.

## ***Conclusion***

The need for change was generally recognized and it was determined that sufficient consensus on key issues existed to start developing workable alternatives to the status quo for staffing through the chain of command.

## ***Sequence of events***

The Base and Wing Commanders weighed the importance and urgency of the seven proposed New Deal initiatives against practical factors such as complexity of the issue, level of cross-environmental consensus, and resource implications, in order to direct the organization of workflow. The development of the New Deal initiatives will be undertaken in two phases:

### **Phase 1**

- Reporting and Performance measures;
- Deployed Operations;
- Funding Distribution (analysis phase can start ASAP);
- CANEX capitalization and operations;
- NPP Infrastructures (analysis phase can start ASAP);

### **Phase 2**

- Specialty interests activities / facilities (opportunities for further standardization);
- Messes (opportunities for further standardization);

Note: Back-office systems and standardized procedures can continue to be implemented for messes and specialty interests in accordance with the spirit of the approved Customer Relationship Management (CRM) initiative. The CRM project team will provide regular

progress reports to the New Deal Steering Committee and solicit the Steering Committee's input to help guide CRM implementation.

# **V – NEW DEAL INITIATIVES**

## **PHASE 1**

### ***1. Reporting and Performance Measures***

#### **Issue**

NPP performance management criteria for equitable access, program funding / distribution or capital administration are not well defined. The relationships and responsibilities among Public and Non-Public, national and base/wing, while discernable by wading through a number of policy documents, have not been captured in a performance management framework.

#### **Consensus**

The Base and Wing Commanders agreed that improvements are required. Operational performance measures need to be developed to modernize the management of programs and activities and to more judiciously allocate resources.

#### **Objectives**

To provide for better-informed decision making and improve the transparency and effectiveness of that decision making process by implementing an efficient reporting model for morale and welfare programs and services that will be based on meaningful operational and financial performance measures.

#### **Context**

More rigor must be introduced to the decision making process to ensure a more equitable distribution of operations & maintenance and capital funds. A modernized reporting model will have to cover both financial and operational performance measures without becoming an administrative burden on the field and HQ staff.

#### **Approach**

Evaluate the current reporting mechanisms and performance measures;  
Determine the performance measures that would enhance the decision making process;  
Develop performance measures that can be introduced in the short, medium, and long term;  
Develop a simple, efficient, meaningful, high level, and comprehensive reporting framework.

## **Consultative process**

A working group chaired by the Associate DGPFS will gather to develop a project approach based on the final version of this study directive. Membership will include two representatives from each ECS (HQ and B/W), one representative from the CMP Group, and divisional representation from DGPFS functional areas.

A draft proposal will be circulated to the Base and Wings and applicable NDHQ staff.

## **Timetable**

- Oct 08: Initiate review of current reporting tools;
- Dec 08: Start development of operational performance measures;
- Mar 09: Staff proposal to Bases / Wings and applicable NDHQ staff;
- Sep 09: Finalize package and request approval;
- Oct 09: Start development and testing of reporting tools;
- Jan 10: Communicate new procedures and initiate training;
- Apr 10: Implement new reporting model.

## **2. Deployed Ops**

### **Issue**

Traditionally, NPP operations supporting deployed forces have been financed by an interest free CFCF loan and operated by the deployed unit(s) with any 'revenues' at the end of the rotation accruing to the Unit Fund (and returning to Canada outside the established NPP accountability framework) and any losses / write-offs being absorbed by the CFCF (and in some cases, revenues were accrued to the unit fund and the CFCF absorbed losses and write-offs). In recent years, the accountability, management and administration of deployed NPP operations has improved significantly with the deployment of NPF staff to operate in-theatre retail services. Notwithstanding the operational improvements, deployed NPP operations remain financed through interest free CFCF loans, funding support to in-theatre NPF clubs and recreational activities (including departure gifts) is provided from in-theatre retail operations, and residual end-of-rotation 'revenues' are distributed 1/3 to the Base / Wing Funds from which the personnel were deployed, 1/3 to Unit Funds from which the personnel were deployed, and 1/3 remaining in theatre to capitalize the operation and enhance programs and activities. Liabilities remain with the CFCF. While this approach has evolved over the years, the scale of NPP re-sale activities has increased significantly and the approach is not consistent with the prescribed approach for units under altered circumstances. The not insignificant residual end-of-rotation 'revenues' are not being applied to maximize the benefit of NPP to the CF.

### **Consensus**

The requirement for a national system was generally recognized to ensure a more equitable distribution of revenues. There was agreement that attention is needed and that this initiative could be dealt with on a priority basis.

### **Objectives**

Develop a national system to support morale and welfare activity on deployed operations that will be:

- Responsive to needs of deployed personnel;
- Efficiently administered to optimize overhead costs;
- Ensure that revenues are more equitably distributed in theatre, across all deployed formations, and for the greater good of all military personnel and their families;
- Provide financial incentives for all deployed personnel to use the retail outlets;
- Create provisions to mitigate risks for the CFCF.

## **Context**

The national approach will have to be designed in a manner that will leave no doubt about it's overall fairness. Communications must clearly show that the status quo on revenue distribution was not an option and that the equitability issue had to be addressed.

## **Approach**

Determine how the needs of deployed personnel will be factored in the national system;  
Determine how incentives to support retail activities will be created;  
Suggest a revenue sharing model that is more equitable;  
Suggest basic elements of the communication plan.

## **Consultative process**

The consultative process will involve the Force Generators, CEFCOM, DGPFSS (PSP / CANEX / and Finance), and ADM (Fin CS) staff.

A draft proposal will be circulated to the Base and Wings and applicable NDHQ staff.

## **Timetable**

Nov 08: Start data analysis and in-depth review of current system;  
Feb 09: Develop revenue sharing model options;  
Jun 09: Circulate proposal for input by B/W Comds and NDHQ staff;  
Sep 09: Finalize model and staff for approval;  
Nov 09: Initiate development and testing of new system;  
Feb 09: Communicate changes;  
Apr 10: Migrate to new deployed operations morale and welfare program system.

### **3. Funding Distribution**

#### **Issue**

The current Non-Public Property revenue distribution and capital expenditure / management models do not support fair and equitable access to the benefits of Non-Public Property programs and activities as required by the National Defence Act (NDA) and CDS guidance (Jan 04). There are significant disparities among bases/wings both in terms of funding received and facilities, programs and activities offered. Many undertakings, while serving only a small sector of the military community, have become cash drains both at the local and national level. The following inter-related problems / challenges persist:

- **Focus on Base/Wing vice CF member** – Currently bases/wings compete to have the most resources (funds, personnel, and infrastructure). There are ‘have’ and ‘have not’ bases/wings. The overarching CDS guidance requires that, while the different circumstances and requirements of location (geography, demographics and deployment status) must be reflected in the Morale and Welfare(MW) programs offered, CF members should have equitable access to MW programs and activities wherever they serve.
- **Distribution of nationally generated funds (and services) to Bases/Wings** – CANEX, SISIP FS, and CFCF generated funds are distributed to Base/Wing Funds through the CANEX/SISIP Morale and Welfare Grant program and subsidized services (NPF accounting, NPF Staff HR services, property, liability and other insurance, and IM/IT services). The CANEX/SISIP Grant program has two components – per capita funding based on the CF Regular Force military population at a base/wing, and royalties payments based on local CANEX sales and net 30% concession revenues. The calculation formulae are relatively complex and not easily explained or understood. While centrally provided accounting, HR, insurance and IM/IT services deliver the same level of service to all bases/wings and the provision of these services is partially subsidized by the CFCF, the level of user fees charged to base/wing funds are inconsistent as they are based on a combination of actual cost, historical charges and allocation formulae.

When service user fees are netted out from CANEX/SISIP Grant distributions, over \$1.6M of net revenue is distributed to Base/Wing Funds; however, at the individual Base/Wing Fund level, the net distribution ranges from a high of over \$235K to a low of minus \$120K. Clearly these core-funding arrangements contribute to a very un-level playing field.

#### **Consensus**

The requirement for change to a more equitable and transparent funding distribution model was endorsed. Base and Wing Commanders indicated that they need a multi-year funding model with flexibility to adjust to major changes in circumstances.

A number of suggestions were made with respect to factors to be considered in designing a new model, including:

- Model needs to be simplified, clearly defined, and transparent;
- Equitability is key;
- Model not take into consideration the Concentration Bank Account (CBA);
- Not every Base is the same (mission, size and type, demographics);
- Need to reinforce success, not failure (incentives to use NPF outlets and programs);
- Need to define a core and non-core baseline of programs, services, and activities;
- Focus to be on community and recreation;
- Net funding level for Bases and Wings needs to remain or increase;
- Model start-state may be different than steady-state.
- Working capital should continue to be set aside for special events (seed money);

## **Objectives**

Develop a more equitable, simple and transparent funding distribution model.

## **Context**

This is a complex task that will have to be completed in a manner that will leave no doubt as to the fairness and thoroughness of the consultation process and results. Factors such as the diversity of the Bases and Wings (in terms of mission, size, and geographical locations) and the fact that traditional support infrastructures / services are sometimes located too far away from a unit will have to be addressed to ensure that the morale and welfare needs of the majority of CF personnel are equitably addressed.

## **Approach**

Core and non-core morale and welfare programs will have to be defined along with the extent to which a responsibility exists to provide smaller formations access to these programs and services. A more equitable funding distribution model will have to be designed based on the standards established and affordability over the long term.

## **Consultative process**

A working group composed of DGPFSS staff (PSP, SISIP FS, CANEX, Finance), two representatives from each ECS (HQ and B/W), one representative from the CMP Group) will gather to develop a project approach based on the final version of this study directive.

A draft proposal will be circulated to the Base and Wings and applicable NDHQ staff.

## **Timetable**

- Oct 08: Formally initiate consulting process (define core and non-core programs, standards of service, criteria for funding allocation, affordability issues);
- Feb 09: Circulate proposal for input by B/W Comds and NDHQ staff;
- Jun 09: Approval;
- Jul 09: Initiate development - new net funding distribution model;
- Nov 09: Test, approve, and communicate new procedures;
- Apr 10: Migrate to net funding distribution system.

## **4. CANEX Capital Programs & Operations**

### **Issue**

Notwithstanding the fact that CANEX was established as a national line operation in 1989, each outlet is still treated as an individual financial entity and operational decision making is based on outlet profitability as opposed to a national system approach. This approach can lead to store closures on the basis of local lack of profitability, even though there may be a positive contribution from a system perspective, and also leads to a 'micro' investment approach (both capital and operational/inventory).

There are currently 135 CFCF loans in place for CANEX with an outstanding balance of \$12.5M. While CANEX is able to service this debt load, the large number of loans reflects the general undercapitalization situation that CANEX faces, the current state of the infrastructure, and the resultant requirement to undertake numerous 'band aid' projects rather than comprehensive store modernization. As fund distribution is determined on a local sales basis (royalties portion of the CANEX/SISIP Grant program) capital decisions are unduly influenced at the local level. There are several small units that have no CANEX facilities and no "local" ability to redress the situation.

### **Consensus**

The requirement for a national program and systems approach (operations and capitalization) was generally endorsed. While CANEX retail activities should continue to generate revenues in support of morale and welfare programs, the requirement for access to a minimum standard of NPP-managed retail facilities and services was endorsed. The Base / Wing Commanders recommended that incentives for supporting CANEX retail activities be retained.

### **Objectives**

Fully nationalize the management of CANEX operations and infrastructures to ensure equitable access by military personnel and their families across Canada to NPP retail goods and services by:

- Defining standards of services to ensure equitable access to CANEX goods and services;
- Proposing incentives for supporting CANEX retail programs and activities;
- Proposing criteria for evaluating and prioritizing infrastructure and capitalization needs.

### **Context**

CANEX controls the operations and manages the infrastructures / capital expenditures. Currently, most operational and investment decisions are made based on a decentralized, outlet based view, where each outlet is viewed as an independent financial entity. The New Deal proposal focuses on taking a national system view to decision making based on a contribution analysis at the outlet level. This change will make it possible to assess local

operations and make decisions (open / close a store, or expand / downsize a facility) based on contribution and need, approach within the context of a national operation.

## **Approach**

If the decision is made to nationalize the CANEX operations and infrastructure / capital management program in accordance with the New Deal proposal, the responsibility will rest primarily with CANEX to ensure that authorized patrons have access to the stated level of service. A consultation process will nevertheless be required to deal with important questions such as workable service levels, incentive to support retail activities, and criteria to prioritize capital expenditures.

## **Consultative process**

A working group composed of DGPFFS staff (CANEX, Finance, ) and from representatives from each ECS and CMP (HQ or B/W) will gather to develop a project approach based on the final version of this study directive.

A draft proposal will be circulated to the Base and Wings and applicable NDHQ staff.

## **Timetable**

Dec 08:	Initiate consulting process (standards, incentives, criteria for evaluating and prioritizing infrastructure and capitalization needs);
Mar 09:	Circulate proposal for input by B/W Comds and NDHQ staff;
Jun 09:	Approval;
Sep 09:	Initiate development - new financial operational statements for CANEX stores;
Jan 10:	Test, approve, and communicate changes;
Apr 10:	Migrate to new financial operational statements.

## **5. NPP Capital Expenditures**

### **Issue**

Currently, NPP capital projects are base/wing originated (ostensibly on a business case basis) and are financed through CFCF loans. There are wide variations in the type, quantity and quality of NPP infrastructure from base to base. There is no national NPP capital plan/program – projects are initiated, reviewed, approved and implemented based on local perception of need, not in response to a national approach to assuring appropriate, equitable NPP infrastructure at all bases/wings. Following are the most significant deficiencies with the current approach to administration of NPP capital expenditures –

- There is no NPP capital plan (either strategic long-term, or short-term).
- NPP capital infrastructure is not equitably distributed from location to location.
- There is inadequate re-investment to maintain the current NPP capital infrastructure.
- A large number of CFCF loans are in some type of default (cannot be serviced by the business operation underlying the capital project).
- A large number of NPP capital projects were overbuilt (based on unrealistic, overly optimistic business case projections, the whims of transitory local leadership, and the competitive nature of bases/wings trying to out-do each other), contributing to the inability to service the underlying CFCF loan, the inequitable distribution of NPP infrastructure, and the inadequate re-investment in existing NPP capital infrastructure.

### **Consensus**

The requirement for a national program was fully supported as long as the ECSs remain closely involved in prioritization process. The Base and Wing Commanders also recommended that:

- The program be designed to ensure a more equitable availability of facilities without penalizing success;
- The national system incorporated provisions for base and wings to deal effectively with minor construction and small scale local infrastructure improvements;
- The current facilities be inventoried as a baseline;
- New requirements be documented in preparation for a possible Recap II program; and
- The NPP capital program be synchronized with the Public;

## **Objectives**

Design a national NPP capital plan that will assure a systematic approach to developing and maintaining a fair and equitable distribution of NPP infrastructure in response to both national and local requirements.

## **Context**

Again, this is a complex task that will have to be completed in a manner that will leave no doubt as to the fairness and thoroughness of the consultation process and results.

## **Approach**

Establishing standards and developing a national management framework that will include widely accepted prioritization criteria to support a Recap II type of initiative will go along way in addressing the “have and have-not” issue.

## **Consultative process**

A working group composed of representatives from ADM(Fin CS), ADM(IE), Force Generators, DGPFSS (PSP, Finance, SISIP FS,IT) and from representatives from seven bases (2 x Sea, 2 x Land, 2 x Air, 1 x Purple) will gather to develop a project approach based on the final version of this study directive.

A draft proposal will be circulated to the Base and Wings and applicable NDHQ staff.

## **Timetable**

Nov 08:	Formally initiate consulting process (define infrastructure standards and prioritization criteria, review baseline, estimate funding requirements, develop and test model, determine long term viability);
Mar 09:	Circulate proposal for input by B/W Comds and NDHQ staff;
Aug 09:	Approval;
Sep 09:	Initiate development – national NPP capital plan;
Jan 10:	Test, approve, and communicate new procedures;
Apr 10:	Migrate to national NPP capital plan.

## **PHASE 2**

### **6. Specialty Interest**

#### **Issue**

Specialty Interest activities and Messes are each operated as individual financial entities, independent of each other with operational (e.g. prices, hours of operation, types of services, stay-in business – shut down) and investment (new facilities, refurbishment, etc) decisions made within the context of the individual operation (of the financial situation of the particular base/wing), rather than from a system perspective. The issues are similar to those described for CANEX.

#### **Consensus**

The Base and Wing Commanders clearly indicated that the nature, scope and variety the specialty interest programs would make it virtually impossible to adopt a cookie-cutter approach. The service delivery model will vary from location to location and must therefore remain a local responsibility to ensure that programs are in tune with the needs of the military community and to encourage participation through ownership and commitment. Success depends on local control for front-end operations.

There was also wide agreement that there was a role to be played by the national office in terms of:

- Development of national standards;
- Development and implementation of standardized processes;
- Development and implementation of standardized back-office systems;
- Provision of national guidance (lessons learned and best practices);
- A solid Technical Assistance Visit (TAV) and Staff Assistance Visit (SAV) program;

#### **Approach**

This initiative has been assigned a lower priority with the understanding that efforts to develop program standards and common processes / back-office systems are welcome and should therefore continue.

#### **Timetable**

TBD

## **7. Messes**

### **Issue**

Messes are operated as individual financial entities, independent of each other with operational (e.g. prices, hours of operation, types of services, stay-in business – shut down) and investment (new facilities, refurbishment, etc) decisions made within the context of the individual operation (of the financial situation of the particular base/wing), rather than from a system perspective

### **Consensus**

The consensus on messes was similar to the recommendations on the management of specialty interest programs. The service delivery model must continue to be responsive to local needs and remain a local responsibility. There was nevertheless a great deal of openness with respect to national standards, processes, back-office systems, and the provision of national guidance on lessons learned and best practices.

### **Approach**

This initiative has been assigned a lower priority with the understanding that efforts to develop program standards and common processes / back-office systems are welcome and should therefore continue.

### **Timetable**

TBD

Filename: New Deal Study Directive - July 2008.doc  
Directory: C:\NEW DEAL  
Template: C:\Documents and Settings\jfazlic\Application  
Data\Microsoft\Templates\Normal.dot  
Title: STUDY DIRECTIVE  
Subject:  
Author: garchambault  
Keywords:  
Comments:  
Creation Date: 7/24/2008 8:09:00 AM  
Change Number: 9  
Last Saved On: 7/25/2008 1:33:00 PM  
Last Saved By: bsmith  
Total Editing Time: 70 Minutes  
Last Printed On: 5/12/2010 8:10:00 AM  
As of Last Complete Printing  
Number of Pages: 20  
Number of Words: 5,401 (approx.)  
Number of Characters: 30,787 (approx.)