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Results at a Glance

Federal Offices of Inspector General (OIGs) promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in
government operations and help detect and deter fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement.

In FY 2018, approximately thirteen-thousand employees at seventy-three OIGs conducted audits,
inspections, evaluations, and investigations. Together, the work of the OIG community resulted
in significant improvements to the economy and efficiency of programs governmentwide, with
potential savings totaling approximately $49.3 billion.\(^1\) With the OIG community’s aggregate
FY 2018 budget of approximately $2.5 billion,\(^2\) these potential savings represent an approximate
$20 return on every dollar invested in the OIGs. The potential savings total includes:

- $34 billion in potential savings from audit recommendations, and
- $15.3 billion from investigative receivables and recoveries.

In FY 2018, OIGs also considerably strengthened programs through:

- 2,664 audit, inspection, and evaluation reports issued;
- 19,858 investigations closed;
- 585,596 hotline complaints processed;
- 4,462 indictments and criminal informations;
- 1,160 successful civil actions;
- 3,785 suspensions or debarments; and
- 4,664 personnel actions.

---

\(^1\) This report reflects the total monetary amount of OIG recommendations, consistent with the
methodology applied in the FY 2018 report.

\(^2\) This total does not include amounts associated with Intelligence Community (IC) OIGs due to the
classified nature of IC budgets.

Copies of this publication may be obtained by visiting the Inspectors General Web site at www.ignet.gov.
Cover photo: Photo by Andy Feliciotti on Unsplash.com.
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Foreword

On behalf of the members of the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE or Council), we are pleased to present the Annual Report to the President and Congress, Fiscal Year (FY) 2018. The Council, which was established by Congress in 2008, proudly celebrated its ten-year anniversary as an organization dedicated to addressing integrity, economy, and effectiveness issues that transcend individual government agencies and aid in the establishment of a professional, well-trained, and highly skilled workforce in the Offices of Inspectors General. CIGIE and its members were also honored to play a leading role in commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the passage of the Inspector General Act (1978–2018), a transformational piece of legislation that served to drive transparency, effectiveness, and efficiency throughout the Federal Government.

Membership consists of seventy-three individual Federal Inspectors General (IGs) and six integrity-related senior officials from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), the Office of Special Counsel, the Office of Government Ethics, the Office of Personnel Management, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Together, CIGIE and its member organizations played a critical oversight role involving matters of national interest and importance as well as less publicized but equally important cross-cutting efforts at the agency level that combine to foster an open and higher performing Federal Government in service of the American people. Through this report, we present CIGIE’s accomplishments in FY 2018 reflecting our efforts in meeting our mandate.

First, in Background, we summarize the Council’s history and the Inspector General Empowerment Act of 2016, the most recent enhancement to the Inspector General Act of 1978. We also highlight some of the accomplishments of CIGIE’s standing committees in FY 2018. Then, in Strategic Plan Business Goal Accomplishments, we describe CIGIE’s accomplishments under FY 2018’s four major strategic business goals. Next, we summarize current issues of concern to CIGIE members in Key Legislation Affecting the IG Community and Shared Management and Performance Challenges. We then offer perspective on IG Community Accomplishments and provide Contact Information for CIGIE Members. Finally, we recognize the recipients of the most noteworthy 2018 Annual CIGIE Awards.

CIGIE’s ongoing efforts to support the IG community and fulfill its statutory mission are strengthened by the efforts of leaders in the IG community; OMB; Congress; the Government Accountability Office; other Federal agencies, law enforcement, and professional organizations; and private-sector supporters who share the IG community’s commitment to improve the effectiveness and efficiency in Federal Government programs and to identify waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement. We appreciate the continuing support and interest of all in our work.

Most especially, we express our sincere thanks to the approximately thirteen-thousand professionals who make up the Federal IG community, whose tireless efforts on behalf of the public they serve continue to improve the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of the Federal Government.
Launched in beta during FY 2017 and officially launched on October 2, 2017, CIGIE’s Oversight.gov site consolidates in one place all public Federal Inspector General (IG) reports to improve the public’s access to independent and authoritative information about the Federal Government. The site includes a publicly accessible, text searchable repository of reports published by participating Federal IGs. The site is also used by Congressional staffers. Enhanced with functionality in mind, the site includes filters that enable users to search by date range, report geographic location, report type, agency reviewed, OIG, report number, and keywords. Plans are underway to add enhanced capabilities beginning in FY 2019.
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The Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency's year-long effort to educate the public and commemorate the impact of the Inspector General Act of 1978 and the work of Federal Inspectors General (IG) in the forty years since passage of the Act included major events at the U.S. Capitol and the Jimmy Carter Library in Atlanta, Georgia. Meanwhile, the work of IGs continued during this period, as represented by the Top Management and Performance Challenges Report (TMPC) and the Government Purchase Card Report (GPCR). The TMPC, for the first time, provided information about, analyses of, and links to the sixty-one publicly available TMPC reports issued by the Federal IGs in the prior year. The GPCR provided recommendations to strengthen the monitoring and oversight of purchase cards and mitigate risks from potentially illegal, improper, or erroneous transactions.
Background

IG History
The Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended (IG Act), initially consolidated the audit and investigative functions in twelve Federal agencies under their respective Inspectors General (IGs). The Offices of Inspector General (OIGs) became independent forces for promoting economy, efficiency, and effectiveness while preventing and detecting fraud, waste, and abuse in their agencies’ programs. The IG Act established a dual reporting responsibility, whereby IGs report both to the head of their respective agencies and to Congress. The OIGs’ semiannual reports to Congress, which summarize noteworthy activity and management action on significant IG recommendations, are examples of this reporting responsibility, as are the testimonies on various matters that IGs provide to Congress. This relationship with Congress provides a legislative safety net that helps protect IG independence and objectivity.

After the passage of the IG Act, OIGs made an impact in those early years by helping agencies repair serious and widespread internal control weaknesses. Recognizing OIGs’ effectiveness, Congress expanded the IG concept beyond the original twelve agencies. The 1988 amendments to the IG Act established IGs in most agencies of the Federal Government, including certain independent agencies, corporations, and other Federal entities. Subsequent legislation has established IGs in additional agencies, including IGs to oversee specific initiatives (e.g., war efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan, financial institution reform, and mortgage industry regulation).

Today, CIGIE has seventy-three IG members that provide audit and investigative oversight to agencies across the government and seek to prevent problems before they materialize. IGs are either nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate or appointed by their respective agency head. One IG is appointed by the President but Senate confirmation is not required. By statute, IGs are required to be selected without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of personal integrity and professional expertise.

In 1981, President Ronald Reagan, by Executive Order 12301, created the President’s Council on Integrity and Efficiency (PCIE) to provide a forum for the presidentially appointed, Senate-confirmed IGs to coordinate their professional activities. In May 1992, President George H. W. Bush’s Executive Order 12805 created the Executive Council on Integrity and Efficiency (ECIE) for agency-appointed IGs to work together. Both councils were chaired by OMB’s Deputy Director for Management, who reported to the President on their activities.

The IG Reform Act of 2008, enacted October 14, 2008, amended the IG Act to further strengthen IG independence and enhance IG operations. It also created the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE) by combining the two former IG councils, PCIE and ECIE, into one. The legislation also provided CIGIE with authorities and responsibilities beyond those of the PCIE and ECIE, including recommending candidates for vacant IG positions and overseeing an Integrity Committee that was responsible for handling allegations of misconduct by IGs and high-level OIG officials.

In December 2016, the President signed into law the Inspector General Empowerment Act of 2016 (IGEA), a landmark piece of legislation welcomed by IGs and all advocates of government accountability and efficiency.

Among its provisions, the IGEA confirms that Federal IGs are entitled to full and prompt access to agency records, thereby eliminating any doubt about whether agencies are legally authorized to disclose potentially sensitive information to IGs. In so doing, the IGEA ensures that IGs have the ability to conduct audits, reviews, and investigations in an independent and efficient manner. This provision was necessary because of refusals by a few agencies to provide their IGs with independent access to certain information that was available to the agency and relevant to ongoing oversight work by the agency IG. Further, it was necessary because of a Department of Justice Office of Legal Counsel (OLC) opinion in July 2015 asserting that the IG Act did not entitle IGs to all records available to an agency. As a result of the IGEA, this OLC opinion is no longer applicable.
Other important provisions allow IGs to match data across agencies to help uncover wasteful spending and enhance the public’s access to information about misconduct among senior government employees.

CIGIE has long advocated for these measures and welcomed the passage of the IGEA.

**Community**

The IG Reform Act of 2008 established CIGIE as the unified council of all statutory IGs to provide governmentwide coordination of and focus on OIG activities. CIGIE consists of seventy-three Federal IGs and the following six Federal leaders:

- Deputy Director for Management (DDM), OMB, who serves as the Council’s Executive Chairperson;
- Deputy Director, Office of Personnel Management (OPM);
- Special Counsel, Office of the Special Counsel;
- Assistant Director of the Criminal Investigative Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI);
- Director, Office of Government Ethics; and
- Controller of the Office of Federal Financial Management, OMB.

In FY 2018, Margaret Weichert served as Acting Director of OPM, DDM of OMB, and CIGIE’s Executive Chairperson.

In FY 2018, CIGIE was led by its elected Chairperson, Michael E. Horowitz, IG, U.S. Department of Justice; its Vice Chairperson, Allison C. Lerner, IG, National Science Foundation; and the members of the Executive Council. CIGIE’s Executive Council provides leadership, collaborative vision, and long-term planning for the IG community. For a current listing of CIGIE’s Executive Council, see Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. CIGIE Executive Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael E. Horowitz, U.S. Department of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison C. Lerner, National Science Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Howard, Amtrak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Ochoa, General Services Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammy Whitcomb, United States Postal Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel R. Levinson, Department of Health and Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott S. Dahl, Department of Labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl W. Hoecker, U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy A. Buller, Peace Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Westbrooks, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis K. Fong, U.S. Department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Tighe, Department of Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The IG Reform Act of 2008 also established an Integrity Committee whose chair, by law, is the CIGIE member who represents the FBI. The IGEA, as previously noted was enacted in early FY 2017, changed the composition of the Integrity Committee and changed the chair from the FBI representative to an IG selected by the members of the Integrity Committee. The Integrity Committee serves a vital role as an independent investigative mechanism for allegations of IG misconduct, which it reviews and refers for investigation when warranted.
CIGIE Committee Accomplishments

As shown in Table 2, in FY 2018, CIGIE’s committees undertook a variety of noteworthy projects to benefit the OIG community.

### Table 2. FY 2018 CIGIE Committee Accomplishments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee and Purpose</th>
<th>FY 2018 Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Audit**—Provides leadership to, and serves as a resource for, the Federal audit community. Sponsors and coordinates audits that address multi-agency or governmentwide issues, develops and maintains professional standards for OIG audit activities, and provides oversight of auditor training. | • Continued administration of CIGIE’s audit peer review program to promote OIG compliance with Government Accountability Office’s [Government Auditing Standards](https://www.gao.gov) and CIGIE’s [Guide for Conducting External Quality Control Reviews of the Audit Operations of Offices of Inspector General](https://www.cigie.gov).
  • Represented the IG community in initiatives and workgroups on various issues, including DATA Act implementation planning, improper payments, and CFO Council.
  • Continued to participate in the Office of Personnel Management’s priority initiative to close critical skills gaps in the Federal workforce, specifically within the auditor job series. Activities included facilitating meetings of FAST (Federal Action Skills Team) group, executing an action plan to address the skills gap identified, participating in quarterly briefings to OPM Director, and coordinating accountability community comments on draft changes to the OPM job series. Provided community comments on 0511 Auditor Series to OPM, as well as additional information on IT Auditor needs.
  • Sponsored training and development for the audit community with the CIGIE Training Institute’s Audit, Inspection, and Evaluation Academy, as well as participated in the FAEC annual conference.
  • Oversaw the annual audit of CIGIE’s financial statements. |
| **Budget**—Provides leadership in the development of the Council’s annual Congressional appropriation request by coordinating a transparent process to assess current CIGIE activities and—in consultation with the Chairperson, Vice Chairperson, and Executive Council—presenting a proposed budget to the membership for discussion and adoption. | • Developed the FY 2019 budget proposal after soliciting input from the IG community and CIGIE committee chairs; presented the FY 2019 budget to members and subsequently received approval.
  • Oversaw the implementation of membership-approved recommendations for the drawdown of CIGIE’s budget reserve. |
### Table 2. FY 2018 CIGIE Committee Accomplishments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee and Purpose</th>
<th>FY 2018 Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Information Technology (IT)**—Facilitates effective OIG IT audits, inspections, evaluations, and investigations, and provides a vehicle for expressing the IG community's perspective on governmentwide IT operations. | • Completed the first cross-cutting review using data analytics to evaluate purchase card transactions in the Federal Government. The report identified weaknesses in policy, monitoring, and training that reduced program efficiency and increased the risk of unauthorized purchases on government credit cards. The report made one recommendation to reduce this risk.  
• In coordination with OMB and DHS, developed the first iteration of a FISMA evaluation guide to assist auditors conducting annual FISMA reviews.  
• Surveyed the CIGIE community on vulnerability scanning and penetration testing and reported out on the survey results.  
• Held training event on Scenario Testing and Data Analysis for Cyber Threats in IT Audits in May 2018. This event was very well attended as we had more than eighty people from thirty-nine different organizations.  
• Held IT Audit Training event on “ABCs to Building and Running Your Own Test Lab” in September 2018. This event was also very well attended and provided valuable guidance as well as networking opportunities for IT Audit staff. |
| **Inspection and Evaluation (I&E)**—Provides leadership to, and serves as a resource for, the Federal IG I&E community. Sponsors and coordinates inspections and evaluations that address multi-agency or governmentwide issues, develops and maintains professional standards for OIG I&E community activities, and provides oversight of I&E training. | • Conducted the first two rounds of the new mandatory I&E Peer Review process, which will be conducted in three-year cycles with two rounds each year. In these two rounds, a total of six OIGs had their I&E units reviewed and a total of twelve OIGs participated by providing peer reviewers.  
• Working with the CIGIE Training Institute’s Audit, Inspection, and Evaluation Academy, delivered training on the I&E Peer Review process to peer review teams and I&E units being reviewed.  
• Administered the I&E Peer Review process through the I&E Peer Review Implementation Working Group, which developed the peer review schedule, answered questions that arose during peer reviews, and clarified guidance, as necessary.  
• Supported the CIGIE Training Institute’s Audit, Inspection, and Evaluation Academy’s efforts to deliver meaningful training, including the I&E Fundamentals training program, as well as training on a variety of topics such as critical thinking, writing, interviewing techniques, and data analytics. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee and Purpose</th>
<th>FY 2018 Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Investigations**—Advises the IG community on issues involving criminal investigations, investigative personnel, and investigative standards and guidelines. | • Created the Threat Investigations Working Group, which focuses on efforts to help foster “best practices” in conducting threat investigations throughout the OIG community while creating efficiencies and encouraging the sharing of information.  
• Conducted three Whistleblower Investigations Learning Forums.  
• Created the Investigative Data Analytics Working Group whose priorities will be to increase data analytics collaboration, work to address/eliminate duplicative data analytics efforts, create data analytics community of practice events, and address issues like quality standards for data analytics efforts.  
• Sponsored the second annual joint meeting for CIGIE Deputies/Assistant IGs for Investigations, Audit, and Evaluations for a discussion on working together.  
• Investigations Committee and Assistant Inspector General for Investigations Committee completed an annual training event that had speakers on a variety of topics including a four-hour block by FBI/CJIS on the National Instant Check System (NICS), a session on Whistleblower protection, and a very interesting presentation from the Bureau of Fiscal Services Do Not Pay and improper payments programs.  
• Issued a new Peer Review schedule.  
• Facilitated NICS updating and quality checks across the OIGs with law enforcement authority. |
| **Legislation**—Ensures that CIGIE members are kept abreast of IG-related matters in Congress. Develops, coordinates, and represents the official IG community positions on legislative issues. | • Chair of the CIGIE Legislation Committee testified in November 2017 before the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee on the CIGIE Legislation Priorities, including legislative priorities not addressed through the IGEA.  
• Proactively engaged Congress to further enhance the roles of OIGs and CIGIE in educating and protecting whistleblowers, resulting in the Whistleblower Protection Coordination Act.  
• Provided technical assistance to Congress regarding how OIG testimonial subpoena authority would benefit from government oversight, resulting in H.R. 4917, the IG Subpoena Authority Act, passing the House of Representatives by unanimous consent. |
Table 2. FY 2018 CIGIE Committee Accomplishments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee and Purpose</th>
<th>FY 2018 Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Professional Development** — Provides educational opportunities, through the Training Institute, for members of the IG community and ensures the development of competent personnel. Receives input from the Audit Committee, Investigations Committee, and Inspection and Evaluation Committee on the training and development needs of the CIGIE community. Seeks opportunities to improve training methods, enhance the development of OIG staff, and establish training to meet continuing educational requirements. | • Oversaw the CIGIE Interagency Fellows Program, designed to develop leadership competencies for IG professionals. Twelve fellows from the IG community completed the program, which included a six-month rotational assignment and developmental activities that align with OPM’s SES Executive Core Qualifications.  
  • Adopted the “IG 101” new IG orientation program that was piloted last year. This included convening a working group of IGs to review the program and recommend improvements. Two newly appointed IGs participated in the program, which provides information on IG authorities, the CIGIE community, Congress, the Federal budget process, independence, and other related issues.  
  • Held the 4th Annual CIGIE Leadership Forum in October 2017 at NASA Headquarters. The Forum included presentations and panels on organizational culture and change that included several IG. Nearly seven hundred OIG professionals participated in-person and online.  
  • Issued a report on the Review of CIGIE-Sponsored Leadership Programs. Hundreds of past participants and supervisors were surveyed, and the results provided some recommendations for improvements, but also showed that participants and their supervisors overwhelmingly found the learning objectives to be relevant. They also indicated that the training improved their performance in the six dimensions of leadership that are at the core of the programs: vision, integrity, self-knowledge, communication, competency, and empowerment. |
| **Integrity** — The statutory mission of the Integrity Committee is to receive, review, and refer for investigation allegations of wrongdoing made against an Inspector General (IG), certain designated senior members of an Office of Inspector General (OIG), and the Special Counsel and Deputy Special Counsel of the U.S. Office of Special Counsel (OSC). | • Received 385 incoming complaints:  
  • Opened sixty-three cases  
  • Closed: nineteen  
  • Referred to the Committee’s chair for investigation: five (one investigation combined two cases)  
  • Referred to another agency for investigation and closed: twenty-eight  
  Pending review: ten |
| **Inspector General Candidate Review and Recommendation Panel** — Per the IG Reform Act of 2008, CIGIE, in its function as an advisor to the President on IG matters, makes recommendations to the President of qualified candidates for IG vacancies. To aid this goal, it has established a panel led by the CIGIE Vice Chair with four other IGs to examine applications and identify candidates on an ongoing basis. | • Enhanced the candidate identification process by interviewing individuals interested in Presidentially Appointed/Senate Confirmed IG positions and making recommendations for the President’s consideration as he works to fill such vacancies.  
  • Provided support to agency heads filling non-PAS IG positions, including reviewing applications, providing questions for interview panels, and participating in interview panels. |
Strategic Plan Business Goal Accomplishments

During Fiscal Year (FY) 2018, the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE or Council) approved its annual performance plan to guide its activities for the year. The performance plan is associated with CIGIE’s 2018–2022 Five-Year Strategic Plan and aligns with the goals, objectives, and performance measures associated with the Strategic Plan. CIGIE’s performance plan sets out four major business goals and supporting objectives. These goals are (1) enhanced integrity and strength of Federal programs and operations; (2) a well-trained and highly skilled Office of Inspector General (OIG) community; (3) acting as a focal point for collaboration, best practices, and outreach; and (4) function as an efficient, well-managed organization. Most of the measures in this plan are new and, therefore, require that baseline data must be gathered, rather than setting arbitrary targets. Hence, the targets are not set; rather, they are to be measured in a baseline, with numeric targets set in following years.

Goal 1: Enhanced Integrity and Strength of Federal Programs and Operations

During FY 2018, the Council approved its annual performance plan associated with its five-year Strategic Plan to track goals, objectives, and performance measures. In addition, CIGIE commissioned or continued the following cross-cutting studies and projects:

- **Issued Critical—Issues Involving Multiple OIG’s Report**—Identified in the FY 2017 Annual Report to the President as a work in progress, this report was published as expected in the first quarter of FY 2018. Highlighted therein were six high-impact issues where coordination and collaboration would continue to be most beneficial: Strengthen cybersecurity; Safeguarding national security; Ensuring integrity and efficiency in contracting and subcontracting; Modernizing information technology (IT) infrastructure; Enhancing oversight of grants; and Preventing fraudulent benefit claims and improper payments. The report also identified a set of best practices for collaborative projects that included the following: Clearly articulating the costs and benefits of a project; Selecting effective leadership for collaborative projects; Planning in detail; Ensuring consistent expectations and standards; and Forging collaborative project teams and communities of interest.

- **Issued Vulnerabilities and Resulting Breakdowns: A review of A, E, & I focus on services and findings for American Indians and Alaskan Natives**—Inspectors General have found significant weaknesses affecting Federal programs serving American Indian and Alaska Native (AI/AN) communities. This report compiles information from recent OIG audits, evaluations, and investigations to identify vulnerabilities and breakdowns that cut across departments. CIGIE chose this area for study given the level of Federal funding and number of agencies involved, as well as the Federal Government’s special obligation to protect AI/AN interests and fund vital services. Throughout the report, we highlight examples of past OIG findings and recommendations to illustrate these common themes.

CIGIE expects this report to serve two purposes: (1) to draw attention to challenges facing agencies and programs serving AI/AN communities and (2) to help CIGIE prioritize future work in this area.

CIGIE is committed to building on past OIG work focused on AI/AN programs. By sharing information and resources across departments, CIGIE can plan work that addresses the challenges highlighted in this report. CIGIE will identify opportunities for cross-department reviews, along with training, outreach, and legal guidance to agencies and programs that serve
the AI/AN community. Ultimately, CIGIE’s goal is to help strengthen oversight, reduce improper payments, and improve Federal agencies’ ability to fulfill their trust responsibilities.

- Lack of Internal Controls—Agencies and grantees did not develop or use adequate safeguards, such as those related to contracting and procurement, awarding Federal funds, and restricting access to sensitive systems.
- Lack of monitoring and reviews—Agencies and grantees failed to assess the quality and effectiveness of their programs and develop monitoring systems.
- Poor recordkeeping and documentation—Agencies and grantees did not sufficiently document their expenditures and activities.
- Staffing challenges—Agencies were unable to maintain sufficient staff, and agency and grantee staff lacked necessary expertise or training.
- Lack of established policies and procedures—Agencies and grantees' written policies, procedures, and staff guidance were missing, outdated, or unclear.
- Other significant, though less commonly identified, vulnerabilities included infrastructure limitations for both agencies and grantees as well as lack of coordination among Federal and State agencies.

- Management and Performance Challenges—The objective of this report is to consolidate and provide insight into the most frequently reported management and performance challenges identified by OIGs based on work conducted in FY 2017.

To accomplish this objective, we reviewed the sixty-one publicly available top management and performance challenges reports that were issued by Federal, statutory OIGs in 2017. Once we identified the most frequently reported challenges by category, we reviewed each individual challenge within the broader category to determine whether we could also identify any common themes or key areas of concern.

Based on our review of the sixty-one publicly available Top Management and Performance Challenges reports, IGs reported a wide range of challenges, including those related to national security, public safety, and public health. The challenges most frequently reported by the sixty-one IGs are:

- Information Technology Security and Management
- Performance Management and Accountability
- Human Capital Management
- Financial Management
- Procurement Management
- Facilities Maintenance
- Grant Management

Although the underlying reasons why these issues were more frequently reported could not be conclusively determined, or whether systemic governmentwide issues caused or exacerbated the identified challenges, it was noted that many of the challenges were negatively impacted by resource issues, both human and budgetary, and Federal agencies' failure to use performance-based metrics to assess the success of their programs and operations. The goal in consolidating these challenges is to assist policymakers in determining how best to address these challenges in the future by highlighting common issues in order to foster improvements across government.

- Report on Government Purchase Card Initiative—The objective of the CIGIE purchase card initiative was to analyze and review government purchase card data to determine the risks associated with purchase card transactions.

To accomplish this objective, twenty participating OIGs reviewed Federal agencies that processed more than 1.8 million purchase card transactions totaling more than $941 million from October 1, 2016, through March 31, 2017. The participating OIGs selected and then tested a random
sample of 1,255 high-risk purchase card transactions of more than $1.3 million to identify transactions that were potentially illegal, improper, or erroneous.

Twenty Federal OIGs conducted an analysis of government purchase card transactions identified as high risk.

The General Services Administration (GSA) administers the government purchase card program, which provides the government’s charge card services to Federal agencies. The purpose of the program is to streamline the payment process for small purchases, minimize paperwork, and generally simplify the administrative efforts associated with procuring goods and services under certain thresholds. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) provides government-wide policy to Federal agencies on purchase card use.

Of the 1,255 high-risk transactions the twenty participating OIGs selected for review, they found 501 transactions that did not comply with applicable policies in these top five categories—split transactions, sales tax transactions, transactions from unauthorized third-party merchants, transactions from prohibited merchant category codes (MCCs), and transactions from questionable MCCs. While the OIGs did not find evidence of fraudulent behavior, they found weaknesses in certain areas—such as policy, monitoring, and training—that reduced program efficiency and increased the risk of unauthorized purchases on government purchase cards. The OIGs found that agencies’ cardholders need additional training in properly using their cards; agencies need to develop additional policies and procedures for the cards; and approving officials need to better review transactions. By strengthening these controls, Federal agencies can reduce the risk of potentially illegal, improper, or erroneous transactions and generally improve their use of government purchase cards.

To strengthen monitoring and oversight of purchase cards, OMB should remind agencies of their responsibilities over purchase card activities as detailed in OMB Circular No. A-123. Specifically, agencies should take steps to improve controls such as training, policies and procedures, separation of duties, and supervisory reviews to mitigate risks from potentially illegal, improper, or erroneous transactions.

- **Vulnerability Scanning and Penetration Testing Usage Survey Report**—The CIGIE Information Technology Committee conducted a vulnerability and penetration testing usage survey in March 2018, which was a follow-up to a previous survey in February 2012. Thirty-eight OIGs completed the survey and the results of the survey were internally reported to the OIG community in August 2018.

---

**Goal 2: A Well-trained and Highly Skilled OIG Community**

Seeking to further enhance the quality of training provided to the IG Community, CIGIE applied a technique known as Rapid Workflow Analysis (RWA) to map the processes associated with work production across the four major IG career fields: Inspections and Evaluation; Financial Audits; Performance Audits; and Criminal Investigations. The RWA engaged top Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) in each field to identify and group tasks, and in addition, document the requisite knowledge to effectively perform those tasks. The resulting output will serve as the foundation for evaluating existing curricula to ensure its recency and relevance, developing new programs as needed, and establishing performance support resources to aid the OIG workforce in the execution of their duties.

In parallel to this effort, CIGIE’s normal training efforts proceeded apace, and results relative to traditional measures of training success remain quite strong. For example, student participant evaluations indicating satisfaction with the training experience continue, as in past years, to average approximately 95 percent across the Institute as a whole.

From a program perspective, CIGIE continued to focus much of its training efforts on developing and providing leadership and management training programs to the OIG community. In total, twelve different program offerings spanning twenty-five iterations were delivered to 461 participants.
from across the community to very favorable reviews. These programs were designed to both sharpen experienced managers’ skills and equip new and future leaders with the vital tools they need to become effective public administrators. Further, CIGIE held its Annual Leadership Forum, which attracted more than 694 in-person and virtual participants, a 35 percent increase in attendance over the 2017 Forum.

In broadening professional development opportunities within the IG community, CIGIE launched its third cohort of the interagency fellowship program for the OIG community in FY 2018. Fellows in the program participate in a six-month rotational assignment with another OIG; these assignments are designed to enhance specific leadership skills aligning with the Office of Personnel Management’s Senior Executive Service executive core qualifications. Further, the program provides fellows with engaging cohort activities designed to provide additional developmental opportunities and foster collaboration and cohesion among the cohort.

In FY 2018, the Audit, Inspection and Evaluation Academy delivered thirty-one iterations of a variety of introductory, intermediate, and advanced classes, achieving a total enrollment of 848. Furthermore, in support of the I&E community, CIGIE delivered four learning forums on the topics of Writing to Elements of a Finding; The New I&E Peer Review Process (two sessions); and Asking the Right Questions on Non-monetary Return on Investment. Combined, these forums attracted nearly one thousand participants from across the community. Of note, CIGIE continued to award National Association of State Boards of Accountancy (NASBA) continuing professional education (CPE) credits for its audit, inspection, and evaluation managed training programs during the fiscal year.

CIGIE also provides training to OIG investigators and other professionals. In FY 2018, CIGIE delivered basic, refresher, and advanced investigator training programs along with more specialized instruction, such as the Public Corruption Investigations Training Program. In total, CIGIE delivered more than thirty-one training courses in more than nineteen locations across the country that were attended by more than 833 students, representing nearly every Federal OIG, in addition to agents from State and local entities.

Drawing from historical lessons learned as well as current challenges facing today’s leaders, the Training Institute provided a total of eighty-seven training programs that were attended by more than 3,843 OIG professionals in FY 2018.

**Goal 3: A Focal Point for Collaboration, Best Practices, and Outreach**

On October 1, 2017, CIGIE launched Oversight.gov, a Web site that aggregates public reports from the Federal OIGs that are members of CIGIE. Oversight.gov provides a “one stop shop” to follow the ongoing oversight work of all IGs that publicly post reports. With the launch of Oversight.gov, users can now sort, search, and filter the site’s database of public reports across agencies to find oversight areas of interest. Led by the U.S. Postal Service OIG and the U.S. Department of Justice OIG, a CIGIE working group developed this intuitive Web site that now has more than ten thousand OIG reports. Additionally, CIGIE started its first Twitter account that provides the public the opportunity to follow the work of the OIG community and since its launch it now has more than sixteen thousand followers.

Through CIGIE’s outreach efforts to better inform the public of the mission, responsibilities, and efforts of the OIGs, a working group was formulated in FY 2018 to develop methods of communicating such information through the avenue of recognizing forty years since the signage of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (IG Act). Through the work of this CIGIE group, two conferences were held, one in Washington, D.C., at the Capitol Visitors Center, and one in Atlanta, Georgia, at the Jimmy Carter Presidential Library and Museum/The Carter Center, that commemorated the enactment of the IG Act, subsequent amendments to the Act, the establishment of CIGIE, and the importance of the work of the OIGs. Through these conferences, and additional information that has been posted on CIGIE’s Web site, we have further educated our stakeholders regarding the OIGs mission, priorities, and challenges.
CIGIE continued its work toward reviewing and ensuring its quality standards, and quality assessment peer review guides were updated for the IG community. CIGIE’s Audit, Inspection and Evaluation, and Investigations committees continued to ensure that the quality standards for those professions were current and that changes are made when necessary during the year. CIGIE also continued its efforts toward reviewing and updating, when necessary, its quality assessment peer review guides.

CIGIE implemented additional information security policies and procedures in FY 2018, further strengthening CIGIE’s cybersecurity posture. These included CIGIE’s Information Security policy, our IT Information Categorization policy, Mobile Device Security policy, and updated IT Rules of Behavior policy. Additionally, CIGIE has made efforts to further mitigate potential cybersecurity risks through continued upgrading and deploying additional security hardware and software, and by implementing best practices for cybersecurity management and protection controls.

Several CIGIE working groups have begun deploying collaborative environments with the use of technology. Three such working groups, the IG Ombudsman working group, the Enterprise Risk Management working group, and the Federal Hotline working group, have used MAX.gov, an internal government Web presence to establish respective sites that provide a means to better collaborate among their members.

Further, CIGIE conducted a survey of its member offices to assist in establishing a baseline measurement relating to several of its Strategic Plans objectives. The results of this survey provided members perspectives relating to the success of CIGIE’s efforts in meeting the measures established in our first Annual Plan associated with the new Strategic Plan. This baseline information will be used to assist CIGIE in striving for continued advancement in its efforts to meet those goals it has set out for the future.

**Goal 4: An Efficient, Well-managed Organization**

With the enactment of the IG Empowerment Act in December 2016, operational responsibilities associated with CIGIE’s statutorily mandated Integrity Committee shifted from the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) to CIGIE. Accordingly, CIGIE immediately began to develop a staffing plan and associated budget to address the needs resulting from this new responsibility. In FY 2018, CIGIE finalized and implemented these plans, including the selecting and hiring of additional staff, and transitioned the Integrity Committee operational responsibilities from the FBI to CIGIE. The transition also required CIGIE to undertake updating the Integrity Committee Policies and Procedures, CIGIE Freedom of Information Act regulations, CIGIE Privacy Act regulations, and the public facing Web page associated with the Integrity Committee, as well as to develop and publish a new Privacy Act System of Records and work with the National Archives and Records Administration to begin development of a records disposition schedule for Integrity Committee records. Furthermore, CIGIE identified the need to develop a case management system that would provide a more efficient way to manage CIGIE’s Integrity Committee records and implemented the same.

CIGIE continues to efficiently administer its financial resources as reflected through its FY 2018 Financial Statement audit, in which an unmodified opinion was received.

In addition to these accomplishments, CIGIE continued to meet its statutory responsibilities in FY 2018, to include:

- Coordinating OIG activities governmentwide, including producing cross-cutting studies that mitigate common vulnerabilities and increase economy, efficiency, and effectiveness;
- Increasing the professionalism and effectiveness of OIG personnel by developing policies, standards, and approaches to aid in establishing a well-trained and highly skilled OIG workforce;
• Maintaining public and business Web sites for the benefit of the public, stakeholders, and the OIG community;
• Responding to inquiries from the public and stakeholders about CIGIE and OIG activities, including complaints and allegations against IGs;
• Administering peer review programs that assess OIG compliance with professional standards; and
• Recommending individuals to the appointing authority when IG vacancies occur.
Key Legislation Affecting the IG Community

CIGIE’s Legislation Committee is responsible for providing regular and ongoing communication regarding legislative issues and other matters of common interest between Congress and the IG community. The Legislation Committee achieves this by providing timely information about Congressional initiatives to the IG community, soliciting the views and concerns of the IG community about legislative issues, and informing Congress and other stakeholders on matters of interest to our community. Congress has demonstrated interest in strengthening IG independence and authorities to help IGs more effectively carry out their oversight mission. The Legislation Committee continues to advise Congress on legislative proposals that enhance the work of IGs. Such advice includes providing technical guidance on legislation to address issues of interest to the IG community and assisting with other Congressional requests pertaining to the programs and operations that the IG community oversees.

While the testimony by the chair of the CIGIE Legislation Committee in November 2017 before the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee was previously reported on, the CIGIE Legislation Committee has continued to brief Congress on the CIGIE Legislation Priorities. Like the testimony, briefings have focused on the oversight work that the IG community was performing and the legislative priorities not addressed, through the Inspector General Empowerment Act (IGEA).\(^1\) Regarding the priorities, the CIGIE Legislation Committee advised Congress about the benefits to government oversight of (1) testimonial subpoena authority (TSA) for IGs; (2) how the inappropriate use of paid or unpaid nonduty status in cases involving an IG may conflict with fundamental independence concerns; (3) the need to protect sensitive but unclassified information if disclosure could reasonably be expected to lead to or result in unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification or destruction of agency information systems; and (4) amendments to the Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act that would increase the use of the statute and deter fraud.

A matter of great interest to both CIGIE and Congress is the strengthening of whistleblower rights and protections, including through educating agency employees and others who may become whistleblowers. The Legislation Committee, with the expert assistance of the CIGIE Whistleblower Ombudsman Working Group, productively engaged with Congress to further enhance the role of OIGs in educating and protecting whistleblowers. Through the Whistleblower Protection Coordination Act,\(^2\) Congress repealed the sunset provision for the Establishment IG Whistleblower Ombudsman function enacted through the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act. The law also enhanced the role of Ombudsman, retitled the Whistleblower Protection Coordinator, to emphasize that function’s role in (1) assisting the IG to better educate whistleblowers, (2) promoting the timely and appropriate handling of protected disclosures, and (3) facilitating communication and coordination between the IG and other relevant groups regarding key aspects of whistleblower protections and remedies. Finally, CIGIE’s role in supporting OIGs was expanded to explicitly facilitate the work of Whistleblower Ombudsman Coordinators and help IGs to share best practices.

The CIGIE Legislation Committee was pleased with Congressional support for the Legislative Priority to provide Inspectors General with TSA. The Legislation Committee had engaged extensively with Congressional stakeholders to help explain how providing TSA would assist OIGs in providing the robust oversight that Congress and the taxpayer expect of the IG community. We also provide extensive technical assistance in demonstrating how the authority would be used judiciously and appropriately.

---

subpoena authority to all IGs—H.R. 4917, the IG Subpoena Authority Act—and looks forward to continuing the productive conversation with both chambers during the 116th Congress.

Additionally, the CIGIE Legislation Committee has focused efforts on helping Congress to recognize the importance of allowing IGs to take a risk-based approach to oversight. The IG community welcomes Congressional interest in the oversight we provide, and appreciates knowing about particular areas of interest or concern held by our stakeholders. The CIGIE Legislation Committee continues to engage Congress to ensure that legislatively mandated reviews and congressional requests for information are tailored to meet the oversight needs of Congress while allowing for the most efficient use of OIG resources, given that IG resources are finite, and that this issue is of particular importance to the IG community.

Finally, the CIGIE Legislation Committee continued to provide assistance to Congressional stakeholders as it explores providing CIGIE with a direct appropriation. CIGIE supports those efforts, and believes that a stable, transparent funding stream would enable CIGIE to perform more effective long-term planning and to better fulfill its statutory mission.

In conclusion, the Legislation Committee has enjoyed productive dialogue with Congressional stakeholders during FY 2018 and looks forward to continuing these dialogues in the future.
Shared Management and Performance Challenges

Each year, Inspectors General (IGs) identify and report on top management and performance challenges facing their individual agencies pursuant to the Reports Consolidation Act of 2000. These challenges focus on high-risk activities and performance issues that affect agency operations or strategic goals.

As noted previously, and for the first time in its history, the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE or Council) issued a formal report on the top management and performance challenges facing Federal agencies:

- **Information Technology (IT) Security and Management**—This refers to (1) the protection of Federal IT systems from intrusion or compromise by external or internal entities and (2) the planning and acquisition for replacing or upgrading IT infrastructure. This is a long-standing, serious, and ubiquitous challenge for Federal agencies across the government, because agencies depend on reliable and secure IT systems to perform their mission-critical functions. The security and management of government IT systems remain challenges due to significant impediments faced by Federal agencies, including resource constraints and a shortage of cybersecurity professionals. Key areas of concern are safeguarding sensitive data and information systems, networks, and assets against cyber-attacks and insider threats; modernizing and managing Federal IT systems; ensuring continuity of operations; and recruiting and retaining a highly skilled cybersecurity workforce.

- **Performance Management and Accountability**—Pertains to challenges related to managing agency programs and operations efficiently and effectively to accomplish mission-related goals. Although Federal agencies vary greatly in size and mission, they face some common challenges in improving performance in agency programs and operations. Key areas of concern include collecting and using performance-based metrics; overseeing private-sector corporations’ impact on human health, safety, and the economy; and aligning agency component operations to agency-wide goals.

- **Human Capital Management**—Relates to recruiting, managing, developing, and optimizing agency human resources. Human capital management is a significant challenge that impacts the ability of Federal agencies to meet their performance goals and to execute their missions efficiently. Consistent with the findings of the IG community, Government Accountability Office has identified strategic human capital management within the Federal Government as a high-risk area since 2001. Key areas of concern include inadequate funding and staffing; recruiting, training, and retaining qualified staff; agency cultures that negatively impact the agency’s mission; and the impact of the lack of succession planning and high employee turnover.

- **Financial Management**—Spans a broad range of functions, from program planning, budgeting, and execution to accounting, audit, and evaluation. Weaknesses in any of these functional areas limit an agency’s ability to ensure that taxpayer funds are being used efficiently and effectively and constitute a significant risk to Federal programs and operations. Key areas of concern include both the need for agencies to improve their financial reporting and systems, and the significant amount of dollars Federal agencies lose through improper payments.

- **Procurement Management**—The procurement management challenge encompasses the entire procurement process, including pre-award planning, contract award, and post-award contract administration. Given that the Federal Government awarded more than $500 billion in contracts in FY 2017, the fact that many Federal agencies face challenges in Procurement Management indicates that billions of taxpayer dollars may be at increased risk for fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement. Further, many Federal agencies rely heavily on contractors
to perform their missions and, as a result, the failure of a Federal agency to efficiently and effectively manage its procurement function could also impede the agency’s ability to execute its mission. Key areas of concern for this challenge include weaknesses with procurement planning, managing and overseeing contractor performance, and the training of personnel involved in the procurement function.

- **Facilities Maintenance**—Federal agencies face challenges ensuring that their facilities stay in proper condition and remain capable of fulfilling the government’s needs. Throughout the Federal Government, Offices of Inspector General (OIGs) have identified insufficient funding as the primary reason why agencies fail to maintain and improve their equipment and infrastructure. Without additional funding for required maintenance and modernization, it is unclear how agencies will manage the challenges of equipment and infrastructure that are simultaneously becoming more costly and less effective. Key areas of concern related to facilities maintenance are the increased likelihood of mission failure and the higher overall cost of deferred maintenance.

- **Grant Management**—Involves the process used by Federal agencies to award, monitor, and assess the success of grants. Deficiencies in any of these areas can lead to misspent funds and ineffective programs. As proposed in the President’s budget for FY 2018, Federal agencies will spend more than $700 billion through grants to State and local governments, nonprofits, and community organizations to accomplish mission-related goals. However, the increasing number and size of grants has created complexity for grantees and made it difficult for Federal agencies to assess program performance and conduct oversight. Key areas of concern are ensuring grant investments achieve intended results, overseeing the use of grant funds, and obtaining timely and accurate financial and performance information from grantees.
Significant Work Accomplishments

Every Office of Inspector General (OIG) works diligently on behalf of Congress, the President, and the American taxpayer. Each year, the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE or Council) recognizes the most outstanding work by members of the IG community at its annual awards ceremony. The keynote speaker at the 2018 CIGIE Award Ceremony was Rod Rosenstein, Deputy Attorney General, Department of Justice, and the Special Category Award winners are identified on page 31 of this report. Additionally, below are selected work accomplishments from several OIGs that demonstrate the type and scope of work that CIGIE members regularly perform to serve our stakeholders.

Management Weaknesses Delayed Response to Flint Water Crisis
In July 2018, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA’s) OIG issued a report on the EPA’s response to the drinking water crisis in Flint, Michigan. The circumstances and response to Flint’s drinking water contamination involved implementation and oversight lapses at the EPA, the State of Michigan, the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ), and the city of Flint. Since January 21, 2016, the EPA has overseen the implementation of its emergency administrative order and amendment issued in response to the drinking water contamination. EPA Region 5 and EPA headquarters officials have worked with the MDEQ and Flint personnel to help improve the city’s water system. As of May 2018, the state of Michigan and city of Flint have completed some actions and are working on remaining actions.

Innovative Use of Data Matching to Identify Lifeline Program Fraud
The Lifeline program provides Federally subsidized phone service to qualifying low-income individuals. Lifeline providers are telecommunications companies who are paid a monthly subsidy by the Federal Government for each qualifying low-income subscriber enrolled. In FY 2018, Federal Communications Commission-Office of Inspector General (FCC-OIG) pioneered the use of data matching to determine Lifeline providers have sought reimbursement for nearly fifty thousand deceased individuals since 2014. Lifeline providers have received millions of Federal dollars for providing phone service to individuals who often have been deceased for more than ten years—a single Lifeline provider received more than $2.6 million in 2015 and 2016 for providing service to “subscribers” who died prior to 2013.

Using sophisticated algorithms and data normalization techniques, FCC-OIG compared the identities of all Lifeline subscribers enrolled in the program since 2014 against data derived from the Social Security Administration’s Death Master File, a list of individuals whose deaths have been reported to the agency. FCC-OIG designed the process to achieve a high level of confidence and found tens of thousands of deceased individuals among Lifeline subscribers with exact matches for first name, last name, date of birth, and last 4 digits of their social security number.

FCC-OIG immediately communicated its findings to the FCC and Universal Service Administrative Company (USAC) (the FCC-directed corporation responsible for administering the Lifeline program) and took steps to recover lost funds and prevent future losses. First, FCC-OIG and USAC coordinated the de-enrollment of thousands of deceased individuals actively enrolled in Lifeline. Second, on OIG’s recommendation, USAC made a “death check” mandatory in the Lifeline enrollment process—the death check prevented more than ten thousand attempted enrollments in FY 2018. These two measures alone saved millions of Federal dollars. FCC-OIG also made additional recommendations to the agency and USAC to further safeguard the Lifeline program based on collateral discoveries made during the deceased subscriber investigation. Finally, FCC-OIG and other law enforcement partners continue to investigate and seek administrative, civil, and criminal remedies against Lifeline providers and individuals associated with deceased subscriber losses.
Major Savings Resulting from Contract Pre-award Examinations

To support Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) management in negotiating contract actions in major procurements, the TVA OIG conducts pre-award examinations of cost proposals submitted by prospective contractors. These examinations are performed at the request of TVA management either prior to award of a contract or before extension of a contract. Our objective is generally to determine if a prospective contractor’s cost proposal is fairly stated. TVA management uses our findings to negotiate compensation provisions that help TVA avoid paying unnecessary costs.

From October 1, 2017, through September 30, 2018, at TVA management’s request, we completed ten pre-award examinations of cost proposals submitted by companies proposing to provide civil projects and coal combustion residual program management services through December 2026. These ten potential contracts had a combined estimated spend of $1.075 billion. Our examinations identified $97.1 million of potential savings opportunities for TVA to negotiate. This equates to an average of 9 percent in future savings opportunities on each of the potential contracts to span over nine years. As of November 29, 2018, TVA has negotiated potential cost savings of $45.9 million on seven contracts awarded and is negotiating three other contracts with potential cost savings of $25.2 million.

In addition to the potential cost savings, the Contract Audit team made suggestions to reduce TVA’s contracting risk such as (1) clarifying contractual terms and conditions, and (2) stressing the importance of proper invoice review and approval, contract management, and contract oversight. Our auditors also provided support to TVA management throughout the negotiation of the contracts. By utilizing the services and expertise of the OIG auditors, TVA management is able to conduct more effective contract negotiations to help ensure TVA is able to obtain pricing that is fair and reasonable.

Health Plan Benefit Overpayments

In February 2018, the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) OIG conducted a limited scope performance audit of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program (FEHBP) operations at all BlueCross Blue Shield (BCBS) plans. The audit covered claim payments from January 1, 2013, through October 31, 2015, as reported in the Association’s governmentwide Service Benefit Plan Annual Accounting Statements. Specifically, we identified claims from this period that were made to U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) medical providers where the amount paid to the provider was greater than or equal to the amount billed by the provider.

Our audit concludes that the overall processing of FEHBP VA claims by the BCBS plans does not appear to comply with the terms of its contract with OPM and the Federal Acquisition Regulation. The Association and the BCBS plans lack the necessary controls to ensure that reasonable rates are paid to VA providers on behalf of the FEHBP. We determined that the Association and/or plans paid 77 percent of the VA claims reviewed during our audit at or above the full amount billed by the provider—even though they had the option to pay the claims at a lower rate. Specifically, the BCBS plans could have paid these claims using the plan’s local “usual, customary, and reasonable” rate or by negotiating a lower payment rate with the VA.

This report questioned $58,023,161 in health benefit charges, the majority of which relate to the BCBS plans unreasonably paying VA claims.
Accomplishments Overview

Together, CIGIE’s member OIGs achieved considerable potential cost savings for programs governmentwide in FY 2018. OIG audits, investigations, inspections, and evaluations helped Federal agency managers strengthen program integrity and use funds more effectively and efficiently. Over the years, OIGs have compiled statistics to measure these accomplishments quantitatively, as presented in the following tables.

Table 3. FY 2018 Performance Profile: IG Community Accomplishments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations: Funds Be Put to Better Use</td>
<td>$34,010,145,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations Agreed to by Management: Funds Be Put to Better Use</td>
<td>$8,740,980,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations: Questioned Costs</td>
<td>$12,901,148,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations Agreed to by Management: Questioned Costs</td>
<td>$3,669,272,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative Receivables and Recoveries</td>
<td>15,334,105,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful Criminal Prosecutions</td>
<td>3,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indictments and Criminal Information</td>
<td>4,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful Civil Actions</td>
<td>1,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspensions and Debarments</td>
<td>3,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Actions</td>
<td>4,664</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Audit-Related Accomplishments

OIG audit reports generally provide agency management with recommendations on ways to improve their operations. These recommendations include enhancing management practices and procedures, offering ways to better use agency funds, and questioning actual expenditures.

Agency management either agrees or disagrees, in whole or in part, with these recommendations. Many recommendations are qualitative and do not specify quantitative savings. However, other recommendations are quantitative and associated dollar amounts can be captured from year to year. Section 5 of the IG Act establishes a uniform set of statistical categories under which OIGs must report the quantitative results of their audit activities.

The categories used in the next two tables correspond to the IG Act’s reporting requirements. The total accomplishments include results associated with audits performed by the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) under agreements with OIGs and agencies. Due to reporting processes, the results of audits performed by DCAA and corresponding management decisions may be reported by more than one OIG.

**Recommendations that Funds Be Put to Better Use** tell agency management that taking action to implement the recommendations would result in more efficient or effective use of funds. Such actions could include reducing outlays, de-obligating funds, and avoiding unnecessary expenditures.

**Table 4. Recommendations that Funds Be Put to Better Use**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Year</th>
<th>Recommendations that Funds Be Put to Better Use</th>
<th>Amount of Recommendations Agreed to by Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2018</td>
<td>$21,108,997,187</td>
<td>$8,740,980,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2017</td>
<td>$22,108,497,297</td>
<td>$7,462,708,570*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016</td>
<td>$22,652,457,701</td>
<td>$15,997,994,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015</td>
<td>$31,445,225,376</td>
<td>$17,705,315,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014</td>
<td>$51,588,190,596</td>
<td>$9,514,990,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013</td>
<td>$44,941,949,156</td>
<td>$31,983,770,454</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*FY 2017 amounts do not account for DCAA audit results not conducted on behalf an OIG, as prior years have included.

**Table 5. Questioned Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Year</th>
<th>Amount of Questioned Costs</th>
<th>Amount of Recommendations Agreed to by Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2018</td>
<td>$12,901,148,798</td>
<td>$3,669,272,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2017*</td>
<td>$10,560,234,785</td>
<td>$2,792,883,772*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016</td>
<td>$17,717,970,095</td>
<td>$9,214,046,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015</td>
<td>$16,657,413,296</td>
<td>$8,586,364,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014</td>
<td>$14,209,307,260</td>
<td>$4,289,324,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013</td>
<td>$35,122,368,188</td>
<td>$5,408,270,493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*FY 2017 amounts do not account for DCAA audit results not conducted on behalf an OIG, as prior years have included.
Investigation-Related Accomplishments

The following categories reflect the broad range of accomplishments generated by OIG investigative components. Unlike the specific reporting categories for audit reports, the IG Act did not create a uniform system for reporting the results of investigative activities. Over the years, OIGs have developed a relatively uniform set of performance indicators for their semiannual reports that include most of the data presented in this section.

Investigative work often involves several law enforcement agencies working on the same case. OIGs may conduct cases with other OIGs, other Federal law enforcement agencies, and State or local law enforcement entities. The following investigative statistics have been compiled using a methodology that attempts to eliminate duplicate reporting by multiple OIGs. As a result, these consolidated statistics differ from the collective totals for the equivalent categories in individual OIG semiannual reports. The joint OIG investigations statistics include investigations that were worked on with other Federal OIGs.

**Investigative Receivables and Recoveries** reflect the results of criminal and civil cases that were ordered plus any voluntary repayments during the fiscal year. In criminal cases, the dollar value reflects the restitution, criminal fines, and special assessments resulting from successful criminal prosecutions. The dollar value in civil cases reflects the amount of damages, penalties, settlements, and forfeitures resulting from successful civil actions. Voluntary repayments include the amount paid by the subject of an investigation or the value of government property recovered before prosecutorial action is taken. These totals do not reflect the dollar amounts associated with recovered items, such as original historical documents and cultural artifacts, whose value cannot be readily determined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Year</th>
<th>OIG Investigations</th>
<th>Joint OIG Investigations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2018</td>
<td>$13,660,516,149</td>
<td>$1,673,589,091</td>
<td>$15,334,105,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2017</td>
<td>$19,095,404,779</td>
<td>$2,850,917,741</td>
<td>$21,946,322,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016</td>
<td>$8,702,641,738</td>
<td>$11,203,019,896</td>
<td>$19,905,661,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015</td>
<td>$7,295,377,088</td>
<td>$2,980,458,582</td>
<td>$10,275,835,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014</td>
<td>$28,739,457,754</td>
<td>$3,973,561,271</td>
<td>$32,713,019,025*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013</td>
<td>$6,156,153,069</td>
<td>$8,660,495,989</td>
<td>$14,816,649,058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This amount includes more than $27 billion reported by the OIG members of the Residential Mortgage Backed Securities Working Group whose work obtained judicial settlements with several financial institutions responsible for misconduct contributing toward the financial crises involving the pooling of mortgage loans.

**Successful Criminal Prosecutions** are included as follows when the subjects were convicted in Federal, State, local, or foreign courts or under the Uniform Code of Military Justice or were accepted for pretrial diversion agreements by the Department of Justice or other equivalents within State or local governments.
Table 7. Successful Criminal Prosecutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Year</th>
<th>OIG Investigations</th>
<th>Joint OIG Investigations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2018</td>
<td>3,520</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>3,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2017</td>
<td>3,534</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>4,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016</td>
<td>3,917</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>4,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015</td>
<td>4,778</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>5,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014</td>
<td>5,116</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>5,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013</td>
<td>5,956</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>6,705</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indictments and Criminal Informations comprise those filed in Federal, State, local, or foreign courts or under the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

Table 8. Indictments and Criminal Informations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Year</th>
<th>OIG Investigations</th>
<th>Joint OIG Investigations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2018</td>
<td>3,931</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>4,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2017</td>
<td>3,786</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>4,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016</td>
<td>4,139</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>5,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015</td>
<td>4,890</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>5,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014</td>
<td>4,656</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>5,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013</td>
<td>6,027</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>6,799</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Successful Civil Actions, resolved through legal or legal-related actions other than criminal prosecution, include civil judgments, settlements, agreements or settlements in cases governed by the Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act, or other agency-specific civil litigation authority, including civil money penalties.

Table 9. Successful Civil Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Year</th>
<th>OIG Investigations</th>
<th>Joint OIG Investigations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2018</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>1,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2017</td>
<td>1,304</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>1,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016</td>
<td>1,305</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>1,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015</td>
<td>1,533</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>1,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014</td>
<td>1,676</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013</td>
<td>1,249</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1,396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suspension and Debarment actions include proceedings by Federal agencies to suspend, debar, or exclude parties from contracts, grants, loans, and other forms of financial or nonfinancial transactions with the government.
Table 10. Suspensions and Debarments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Year</th>
<th>OIG Investigations</th>
<th>Joint OIG Investigations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2018</td>
<td>3,528</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>3,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2017</td>
<td>4,131</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>4,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016</td>
<td>6,101</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>6,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015</td>
<td>6,813</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>7,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014</td>
<td>4,976</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>5,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013</td>
<td>5,664</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>5,865</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personnel Actions include reprimands, suspensions, demotions, or terminations of Federal, State, or local government employees or of Federal contractors and grantees.

Table 11. Personnel Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Year</th>
<th>OIG Investigations</th>
<th>Joint OIG Investigations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2018</td>
<td>4,543</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>4,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2017</td>
<td>2,953</td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td>4,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016</td>
<td>4,201</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>4,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015</td>
<td>4,382</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>4,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014</td>
<td>3,884</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013</td>
<td>4,091</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>4,213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A: Contact Information for CIGIE Members

Ann Calvaresi Barr
Inspector General
U.S. Agency for International Development
(202) 712-1150
https://oig.usaid.gov/
Hotlines: (202) 712-1023
(800) 230-6539

Phyllis K. Fong
Inspector General
U.S. Department of Agriculture
(202) 720-8001
Hotlines: (202) 690-1622
(800) 424-9121
Hearing Impaired: (202) 690-1202

Tom Howard
Inspector General
AMTRAK
(202) 906-4600
https://www.amtrakoig.gov
Hotline: (800) 468-5469

Hubert Sparks
Inspector General
Appalachian Regional Commission
(202) 884-7675
https://www.arc.gov/about
/OfficeofInspectorGeneral.as
Hotlines: (202) 884-7667
(800) 532-4611

Christopher Failla
Inspector General
Architect of the Capitol
(202) 593-0260
https://www.aoc.gov/oig/inspector-general
Hotlines: (202) 593-1067
(877) 489-8583

Faye Ropella
Inspector General
U.S. Capitol Police
(202) 593-4800
https://www.uscp.gov/the-department
/office-inspector-general
Hotline: (866) 906-2446
Email: Oig@uscp.gov

Christopher Sharpley
Inspector General
Central Intelligence Agency
(703) 374-8050
https://www.cia.gov/index.html
Hotline: (703) 482-9500

Peggy E. Gustafson
Inspector General
Department of Commerce
(202) 482-4661
https://www.oig.doc.gov
Hotlines: (202) 482-2495
(800) 424-5197
Hearing Impaired: (800) 854-8407
(202) 482-5923

Thomas K. Lehrich
Inspector General
Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled (AbilityOne)
(703) 731-9149
https://www.abilityone.gov
Hotline: (844) 406-1536
Email: OIG@abilityone.gov

A. Roy Lavik
Inspector General
Commodity Futures Trading Commission
(202) 418-5110
https://www.cftc.gov/About
/OfficeoftheInspectorGeneral/index.htm
Hotline: (202) 418-5510

Christopher W. Dentel
Inspector General
Consumer Product Safety Commission
(301) 504-7644
https://www.cpsc.gov/OIG
Hotline: (301) 504-7906
(866) 230-6229

Deborah Jeffrey
Inspector General
Corporation for National and Community Service
(202) 606-9390
https://www.cnscsig.gov
Hotline: (800) 452-8210
Mary Mitchelson  
Inspector General  
Corporation for Public Broadcasting  
(202) 879-9604  
https://www.cpb.org/oig  
Hotlines: (202) 879-9728  
(800) 599-2170

Kristi Waschull  
Inspector General  
Defense Intelligence Agency  
(202) 231-1010  
Hotline: (202) 231-100  
Email: ig_hotline@dodiis.mil

Glenn Fine  
Acting Inspector General  
Department of Defense  
(703) 604-8300  
https://www.dodig.mil  
Hotline: (800) 424-9098

David Sheppard  
Inspector General  
Denali Commission  
(907) 271-3500  
https://www.oig.denali.gov

Kathleen S. Tighe  
Inspector General  
Department of Education  
(202) 245-6900  
https://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig  
Hotline: (800) 647-8733

Patricia L. Layfield  
Inspector General  
U.S. Election Assistance Commission  
(301) 734-3104  
https://www.eac.gov/inspector_general/  
Hotline: (866) 552-0004

April G. Stephenson  
Acting Inspector General  
Department of Energy  
(202) 586-4939  
https://www.ig.energy.gov  
Hotlines: (202) 586-4073  
(800) 541-1625

Arthur A. Elkins, Jr.  
Inspector General  
Environmental Protection Agency and the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board  
(202) 566-2391  
https://www.epa.gov/oig  
Hotlines: (202)566-2476  
(888) 546-8740

Milton A. Mayo, Jr  
Inspector General  
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission  
(202) 663-4327  
https://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/oig/index.cfm  
Hotline: (800) 849-4230

Terry Settle  
Acting Inspector General  
Export-Import Bank of the United States  
(202) 565-3974  
https://www.exim.gov/oig  
Hotline: (888)644-3946

Wendy Lagaurda  
Inspector General  
Farm Credit Administration  
(703) 883-4234  
https://www.fca.gov/home/inspector.html  
Hotlines: (703) 883-4316  
(800) 437-7322  
Hearing Impaired: (703) 883-4359

Catherine Brunno  
Acting Chief Compliance Officer  
Office of Integrity and Compliance Criminal Investigative Division  
Federal Bureau of Investigation  
(202) 324-4260

David L. Hunt  
Inspector General  
Federal Communications Commission  
(202) 418-1522  
https://www.fcc.gov/office-inspector-general  
Hotline: (202) 418-0473  
(888) 863-2244

Jay N. Lerner  
Inspector General  
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation  
(703) 562-2035  
https://www.fdicig.gov  
Hotline: (800) 964-3342  
Email: ighotline@fdic.gov
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Hotline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Bialek</td>
<td>Inspector General</td>
<td>Federal Reserve Board and Consumer Financial Protection Bureau</td>
<td>(202) 973-5000</td>
<td><a href="https://www.oig.federalreserve.gov">https://www.oig.federalreserve.gov</a></td>
<td>(800) 452-6400 / (800) 827-3340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen M. Albert</td>
<td>Acting Inspector General</td>
<td>Department of Housing and Urban Development</td>
<td>(202) 708-0430</td>
<td><a href="https://www.hudoig.gov">https://www.hudoig.gov</a></td>
<td>(800) 347-3735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary L. Kendall</td>
<td>Acting Inspector General</td>
<td>Department of the Interior</td>
<td>(202) 208-5745</td>
<td><a href="https://www.doioig.gov">https://www.doioig.gov</a></td>
<td>(800) 424-5081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Michael E. Horowitz  
Chairperson, CIGIE  
Inspector General  
Department of Justice  
(202) 514-3435  
https://www.justice.gov/oig  
Hotline: (800) 869-4499

Ronald Stith  
Inspector General  
National Endowment for the Arts  
(202) 682-5774  
https://www.arts.gov/about/OIG/Contents.html  
Hotline: (202) 682-5479

Scott S. Dahl  
Inspector General  
Department of Labor  
(202) 693-5100  
https://www.oig.dol.gov  
Hotlines: (202) 693-6999  
(800) 347-3756

Laura M. H. Davis  
Inspector General  
National Endowment for the Humanities  
(202) 606-8574  
https://www.neh.gov/about/oig  
Hotline: (202) 606-8423  
(877) 786-7598

Jeffrey E. Schanz  
Inspector General  
Legal Services Corporation  
(202) 295-1677  
https://www.oig.lsc.gov/  
Hotline: (800) 678-8868

Cardell Richardson  
Inspector General  
National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency  
(571) 557-7500  
https://www.nga.mil  
Hotline: (800) 380-7729  
Email: IG@nga.mil

Kurt W. Hyde  
Inspector General  
Library of Congress  
(202) 707-8063  
https://loc.gov/about/oig/  
Hotline: (202) 707-6306

David P. Berry  
Inspector General  
National Labor Relations Board  
(202) 273-1960  
https://www.nlrb.gov/About_Us/inspector_general/index.aspx  
Hotline: (800) 736-2983

Paul K. Martin  
Inspector General  
National Aeronautics and Space Administration  
(202) 358-1220  
https://oig.nasa.gov  
Hotline: (800) 424-9183

Susan S. Gibson  
Inspector General  
National Reconnaissance Office  
(703) 808-1810  
Hotline: (703) 808-1644

James Springs  
Inspector General  
National Archives and Records Administration  
(301) 837-3018  
https://www.archives.gov/oig  
Hotlines: (301) 837-3500  
(800) 786-2551  
Email: oig.hotline@nara.gov

Robert P. Storch  
Inspector General  
National Security Agency  
(301) 688-6666  
https://oig.nsa.gov  
Hotline: (301) 688-6327  
Email: ighotline@nsa.gov

James Hagen  
Inspector General  
National Credit Union Administration  
(703) 518-635  
Hotlines: (703) 518-6357  
(800) 778-4806

Allison Lerner  
Vice Chairperson, CIGIE  
Inspector General  
National Science Foundation  
(703) 292-7100  
https://www.nsf.gov/oig  
Hotline: (800) 428-2189
Cathy Helm  
Inspector General  
Smithsonian Institution  
(202) 633-7050  
https://www.si.edu/oig/  
Hotline: (202) 252-0321

Gale Stallworth Stone  
Acting Inspector General  
Social Security Administration  
(410) 966-8385  
https://oig.ssa.gov  
Hotline: (800) 269-0271

John F. Sopko  
Inspector General  
Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction  
(703) 545-6000  
https://www.sigar.mil  
Hotline Email: hotline@sigar.mil

Christy Goldsmith Romero  
Special Inspector General  
Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program  
(202) 622-1419  
https://www.SIGTARP.gov/  
Hotlines: (877) 744-2009  
(877) SIG-2009  
Email: SIGTARP.Hotline@do.treas.gov

Steve A. Linick  
Inspector General  
Department of State and the Broadcasting Board of Governors  
(202) 663-0361  
https://oig.state.gov  
Hotlines: (202) 647-3320  
(800) 409-9926  
Email: oighotline@state.gov

Jill Matthews  
Acting Inspector General  
Tennessee Valley Authority  
(865) 633-7300  
https://oig.tva.gov  
Hotline: (855) 882-8585

Calvin L. Scovel III  
Inspector General  
Department of Transportation  
(202) 366-1959  
https://www.oig.dot.gov  
Hotline: (800) 424-9071

Eric M. Thorson  
Inspector General  
Department of the Treasury  
(202) 622-1090  
https://www.ustreas.gov/inspector-general  
Hotline: (800) 359-3898

J. Russell George  
Inspector General  
Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration  
Department of the Treasury  
(202) 622-6500  
https://www.treas.gov/tigta  
Hotline: (800) 366-4484

Michael Missal  
Inspector General  
Department of Veterans Affairs  
(202) 461-4720  
https://www.va.gov/oig  
Hotline: (800) 488-8244  
Email: vaoighotline@va.gov
## Appendix B: Acronyms and Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>Criminal Investigator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIGIE</td>
<td>Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFO</td>
<td>Chief Financial Officers Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJIS</td>
<td>Criminal Justice Information Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATA Act</td>
<td>Digital Accountability and Transparency Act of 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCAA</td>
<td>Defense Contract Audit Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>Department of Homeland Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDM</td>
<td>Deputy Director for Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECIE</td>
<td>Executive Council on Integrity and Efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAEC</td>
<td>Federal Audit Executive Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI</td>
<td>Federal Bureau of Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISMA</td>
<td>Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>Fiscal Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAO</td>
<td>Government Accountability Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I&amp;E</td>
<td>Inspection and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG</td>
<td>Inspector General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG Act</td>
<td>Inspector General Act of 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGEA</td>
<td>Inspector General Empowerment Act of 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIG</td>
<td>Office of Inspector General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMB</td>
<td>Office of Management and Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCIE</td>
<td>President’s Council on Integrity and Efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>Senior Executive Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recipients of the 2018 Annual CIGIE Awards

On October 17, 2018, the Inspector General (IG) community held its annual awards ceremony and recognized individuals and groups for their achievements and excellence over the preceding year. In addition to acknowledging a cross-section of Office of Inspector General (OIG) personnel, many of these awards recognized individuals from outside the IG community who collaborated with OIGs to promote efficiency and effectiveness and to ensure integrity in Federal programs and operations. The following list contains featured awards bestowed by the Executive Council.

The Alexander Hamilton Award, which recognizes achievements in improving the integrity, efficiency, or effectiveness of Executive Branch agency operations, was presented to:

Agency for International Development, Rebecca Giacalone, Special Agent, in recognition of sustained superior levels of performance, extreme courage, and investigative determination in furtherance of foreign assistance oversight in a war-torn region.

The Gaston L. Gianni, Jr., Better Government Award, which is open to those who contribute to the ideals of the IG Act and recognizes actions that improve the public’s confidence in government, was presented to:

U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, VA Secretary and Delegation Travel to Europe Investigation Team, in recognition of the OIG team’s highly scrutinized ethics investigation of the VA Secretary’s travel to Europe that resulted in leadership changes, employee retraining, and recovery of taxpayer dollars.

Individual Accomplishment Award, which recognizes sustained contributions to the IG community over a period of time or outstanding leadership of projects or events that contribute to the IG community’s mission, was presented to:

National Science Foundation, Alan F. Boehm, Assistant Inspector General for Investigations, in recognition of his singular contributions to the IG investigative community and his accomplishments as Chair and Vice Chair of the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency Assistant Inspector General for Investigations Committee.

The Glenn/Roth Exemplary Service to Congress Award recognizes achievements in furthering relations between a department or agency (or the community) and Congress. This award was named for former Senators John Glenn and William Roth (both deceased), who were considered by many to be the forefathers of the IG Act. It was presented to:

Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, Leahy Laws Team, in recognition of excellence in responding to Congressional queries about Afghan assault violations, resulting in enacting legislation to ensure better reporting of incidents, which may help to safeguard Afghan children.

The Sentner Award for Dedication and Courage recognizes uncommon selflessness, dedication to duty, or courage while performing OIG duties. This award was presented to:

Agency for International Development, Syria Investigations Team, in recognition of exceptional and sustained courage and investigative determination in overseeing foreign assistance in a war-torn region.

The June Gibbs Brown Career Achievement Award recognizes sustained and significant individual contributions to the mission of IGs throughout one’s career. This award was presented to:

U.S. Department of Transportation, Brian Dettelbach, Assistant Inspector General for Legal, Legislative and External Affairs, in recognition of innovative and impactful contributions to legislation to protect the independence of Inspectors General and benefit the entire OIG community.

The Barry R. Snyder Joint Award recognizes groups that have made significant contributions through a cooperative effort in support of the mission of the IG community. This award was presented to:

Office of Inspector General Community, Oversight.gov Team, in recognition of the creation of Oversight.gov, a groundbreaking public database of reports and information from Federal IGs. The initiative represents an important milestone in cooperation and transparency for the IG community.
Copies of this publication may be obtained from the Inspectors General Web site at www.ignet.gov.