RESULTS IN BRIEF
In 2005, over 11,600 audit, investigation, inspection, and other professionals at 57 Federal Offices of Inspector General conducted audits, inspections, evaluations, and investigations. These activities promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness by addressing fraud, waste, and abuse. Their successes include:

- $20 billion in potential savings from audit recommendations and investigative recoveries,
- 6,800 indictments and criminal informations,
- 7,700 successful prosecutions,
- 550 successful civil actions,
- 9,900 suspensions or debarments,
- 2,800 personnel actions, and
- 216,000 hotline complaints processed.

This report was prepared jointly by the Offices of Inspector General of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the National Science Foundation. Copies of this publication may be obtained by calling (202)720-6979. It is also available on the Inspectors General Website, www.ignet.gov.
On behalf of the members of the President’s Council on Integrity and Efficiency and the Executive Council on Integrity and Efficiency, we are pleased to present A Progress Report to the President, Fiscal Year 2005. The report summarizes the most significant activities and accomplishments of the Federal Inspectors General community for fiscal year 2005.

During this reporting period, the community continued to focus its efforts on assisting agencies and departments in addressing the Nation’s most critical challenges, including responding to natural disasters, such as Hurricane Katrina; fighting terrorism; and, ensuring financial accountability in the Federal sector. As a result of these activities, the Inspectors General identified significant opportunities for operational efficiencies, cost savings and preventing fraud in government programs. The community’s overall 2005 performance exceeded its 2004 results in nearly every category, including: $20 billion in potential savings—an 11-percent increase in potential savings; 9,900 suspensions and debarments of business and persons for inappropriate activities with the Government—nearly doubling the number of suspensions and debarments; 7,700 successful prosecutions—a 19-percent increase; and, 2,800 personnel actions—a 40-percent increase. Specific detailed information on the activities of individual Inspector General Offices is extremely important and may be found at www.ignet.gov. We encourage readers to avail themselves of this information.

The 11,600 people of the President’s Council on Integrity and Efficiency and the Executive Council on Integrity and Efficiency remain committed to addressing future challenges facing the Federal government and to continuing our record of service to the people of this Nation.

Gregory H. Friedman
Vice Chair
President’s Council on Integrity and Efficiency

Barry Snyder
Vice Chair
Executive Council on Integrity and Efficiency
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The Inspector General Community

Inspector General Act

The Inspector General Act of 1978 (IG Act) — the first Governmentwide legislation of its kind — created OIGs in 13 Cabinet-level departments and agencies. It established the IGs heading these offices as Presidentially appointed, Senate-confirmed officials selected on the basis of their professional qualifications. The IG Act consolidated each agency’s audit and investigative functions under an OIG for that agency. In most cases, these functions had been fragmented among the very offices audited or investigated. OIGs also received dual reporting responsibility — both to the head of their agencies and to Congress — through a semiannual reporting system. Further, the IG Act contained provisions that effectively afforded OIGs operational and administrative independence within their agencies. Thus, each OIG became a powerful, independent force for promoting integrity and efficiency while combating fraud, waste, and abuse in Government programs.

Despite initial opposition from some of the agencies covered by the original IG Act, OIGs established their effectiveness as contributors to improved economy, accountability, and oversight of Government management. As a reflection of this success, Congress has amended the IG Act several times since 1978, progressively broadening the authority of the IGs and extending the statute to cover more Federal agencies. The largest single extension was the 1988 amendment which, in addition to creating more Presidentially appointed IGs, established OIGs in some independent regulatory agencies and Government corporations. This latter group of IGs has most of the same authorities as the Presidentially appointed IGs, but they are appointed by their respective agencies. Today, 57 agencies have statutorily authorized IGs (29 Presidentially appointed) that provide audit and investigative oversight for Government programs.

Mission and Roles of the Inspectors General

In the broadest sense, OIGs have two principal roles. First, they identify fraud, waste, and abuse in their agencies’ programs and recommend actions to address the issues — both on a case-by-case basis and systemically. Second, they report their findings and accomplishments to their agencies, Congress, and the public, not only through specific written reports, but also by fostering initiatives to improve integrity, accountability, and excellence in Government. Within their respective agencies, OIGs:

- Conduct or oversee audits, investigations, inspections, and evaluations of their respective agencies’ programs.
- Review existing or proposed laws and regulations to determine their effect on the economy, efficiency, and integrity of programs.
- Sponsor or lead initiatives that seek to identify systemic means of addressing weaknesses that leave Federal programs vulnerable to fraud, waste, and abuse.
- Inform their agency heads and Congress of program-related problems and the progress of corrective actions.

More specifically, OIGs have the following roles and responsibilities.

- **Audits**: The IG Act mandates that each OIG be responsible for auditing programs and activities of its agency, and for overseeing and reviewing related audit work performed by outside parties. The statute also requires all such audits to conform to the Government Auditing Standards published by the Comptroller General of the United States (often referred to as the Yellow Book). These standards embody the principle that auditors must possess the necessary competence, integrity, objectivity, and independence to effectively carry out their work. The most recent Yellow Book revisions (2003) broaden the standards to include prospective analyses and studies, and add guidance to ensure consistency in fieldwork and reporting methods for all types of audits.

- **Investigations**: OIGs are authorized to investigate both criminal matters and civil or administrative wrongdoing involving their agencies’ programs and operations. The OIG jurisdiction extends to any person or entity that may have committed a program-related violation. The most frequent subjects of OIG investigations include benefit recipients, contractors, grantees, and Federal employees. In 2003, the Homeland Security Act granted law enforcement powers to OIGs with Presidentially appointed IGs that, within their jurisdiction, are equal to those of other Federal law enforcement agencies. The execution of these authorities in criminal investigations is subject to Department of Justice guidelines and is coordinated with the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other law enforcement organizations. Similar to the Yellow Book standards for audits, the President’s Council on Integrity and Efficiency...
(PCIE) and Executive Council on Integrity and Efficiency (ECIE) have developed guidelines for OIG investigations that help ensure their professional quality and integrity.

- **Inspections and Evaluations:** Although the IG Act does not require OIGs to establish inspection and evaluation components, the statute does provide authority for the offices to conduct analytical reviews that may be methodologically distinct from audits or investigations. Accordingly, many OIGs have created inspection and evaluation units to conduct broad reviews, program evaluations, and focused inspections that analyze the effectiveness of agency activities. The PCIE and ECIE have issued quality standards for conducting and reporting OIG inspections and evaluations.

- **OIG Hotlines:** Most OIGs operate hotlines that receive complaints of fraud, waste, and abuse in their agencies. Most hotlines involve dedicated, toll-free telephone lines, the existence of which is publicized among agency employees and private sector participants in the agencies’ programs. Hotlines can receive complaints involving healthcare fraud, misuse of Federal grant funds, contract fraud, abuse of authority, and mismanagement by Federal officials. Criminal cases and civil or administrative actions often are generated by hotline complaints. During 2005, OIGs processed approximately 216,000 complaints and allegations received through their hotlines. The appendix to this report provides PCIE and ECIE members’ hotline numbers.

- **Improving Agency Operations:** All OIGs are aware of the need to maintain both the fact and appearance of independence within their respective agencies. As a significant component of their agencies, though, they also contribute to initiatives that improve agency operations. Most OIGs seek out and incorporate the input of agency leadership and the stakeholders of programs subject to review when developing operational and strategic plans. OIGs often participate as interested observers in agency-led projects that address critical projects or issues. When it does not compromise their independence or subsequent ability to evaluate a program, OIG personnel may also provide technical advice on such issues as security, safety, financial management, reporting, contracting, and law enforcement.

- **Inspector General Semiannual Reports:** The IG Act requires that each OIG report to Congress semiannually about its activities and accomplishments. The semiannual reports have become a centerpiece of the OIG community and exemplify the offices’ dual-reporting responsibilities. For example, although the report is prepared by OIG for Congress, the IG Act specifies that it be submitted initially to the agency head, who transmits it with the agency’s management report. By law, the completed reports become publicly available once they are sent to Congress. The IG Act also establishes categories in which information must be reported.
On August 29, 2005, Hurricane Katrina hit Louisiana with Category 3 winds that devastated the Gulf Coast. In response, Congress initially appropriated over $62 billion to the region for disaster relief; however, effecting full recovery from this unprecedented disaster may end up costing over $200 billion. Within a week of the hurricane, OIGs were on the ground helping citizens and businesses in the Gulf Coast. We initially responded with over 300 special agent volunteers to assist the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives in enforcing the law to protect people and property. We subsequently undertook additional collaborative efforts to ensure accountability of the money being spent (i.e., ensuring funds were expended for their intended purposes), and to deter fraud, waste, and abuse. These efforts were coordinated through the PCIE-ECIE Homeland Security Roundtable, headed by the Department of Homeland Security IG. The roundtable members also developed an aggressive plan to maximize the scope and effectiveness of the response and recovery efforts.

It is anticipated that OIG efforts related to the hurricane will continue for a number of years. Appropriate to the scope of these disasters, the IG community responded by coordinating crosscutting, collaborative efforts, which include:

- **The Katrina Contract Audit Task Force** is a joint effort among OIGs to improve audit coverage of Katrina procurement and includes OIGs from several agencies. The task force has developed a comprehensive risk assessment of hurricane recovery oversight and identified areas of focus for future audits, which include contract reimbursement, sole source contracts, and high-value contracts.

- **The Disaster Preparedness Guide** was drafted by the Inspections and Evaluation Committee and the Disaster Preparedness working group as part of a multiagency OIG project. This best practices guide is intended to help members of the IG community oversee Federal disaster and emergency preparedness efforts. It will highlight key areas of concern, lessons learned from recent OIG work, and important reference materials.

- **The Hurricane Katrina Fraud Task Force** was established by the Attorney General to investigate and prosecute hurricane-related fraud and includes all the Federal OIG investigative offices. The task force focuses on specific areas of fraud common in post-disaster environments such as fraudulent charities, identity theft, disaster relief benefit fraud, insurance fraud, and procurement/contract fraud.

Individual OIGs have planned 122 audits and 219 investigations in addition to ongoing and completed work to help the Government respond efficiently and effectively. Examples include:

- **The United States Postal Service (USPS) OIG** deployed more than 60 people after Hurricane Katrina to assist with recovery operations. These personnel helped locate employees, assess damage, and ensure the security of postal operations. In addition, OIG established a task force to identify fraud, waste, and abuse in connection with potentially $69 million in postal facility rebuilding contracts.

- **The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) OIG** provided a core group of auditors, investigators, and inspectors with emergency experience to a Special Inspector General established to oversee Gulf Coast recovery. In addition, OIG auditors are monitoring operations at DHS’ Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) operations center. The OIG’s continuing objective is to help FEMA officials consider internal controls and the potential ramifications of their precedent-setting decisions during emergency response and recovery activities.

- **The Amtrak (National Railroad Passenger Corporation) OIG** assisted law enforcement in Louisiana by providing qualified marshals to give around-the-clock police support for the State’s depleted law enforcement agencies. OIG personnel also provided security to both the United States Army Mortuary Affairs Unit and the Kenyon International Emergency Services as they recovered bodies. Additional staff helped victims find missing relatives by answering phone lines at the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

- **The Department of Defense (DoD) OIG**’s investigative branch, the Defense Criminal Investigative Service, responded to the Hurricane Katrina disaster with a team of special agents who augmented local law enforcement in the greater New Orleans area. The Service is investigating allegations of crimes associated with the reconstruction efforts. Immediately following the disaster, the OIG announced 5 audit projects regarding relief and recovery efforts. In addition, the Defense OIG Hotline operated the Hurricane Relief Fraud Hotline for the Government.
The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) OIG enabled timely, dedicated, and on-the-spot response by establishing a new regional office in the Gulf Coast area and also by creating Headquarters-level offices for hurricane fraud oversight. In addition, the OIG participated in the roundtable task force for disaster relief contracts and temporary housing.

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) OIG has focused on examining contractor invoices submitted to EPA to ensure that the agency is getting the best value for its relief dollar. EPA has undertaken a large-scale relief effort—a total of nearly $123 million in contracts have been awarded—and the OIG continues to provide timely and effective reviews.

The General Services Administration (GSA) OIG has concentrated on reviewing $1 billion in GSA contracts awarded on behalf of FEMA for hurricane relief. The OIG is also reviewing the GSA’s efforts to mitigate damage to 83 GSA-controlled facilities affected by the disaster and to assist agencies in continuing their operations.

The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) OIG immediately began monitoring the disaster food stamp application process, reviewed fraud prevention reports, and developed information about electronic benefit transaction contracts in response to the hurricane relief effort. In addition, approximately 10 audits will be initiated in the first half of FY 2006 pertaining to USDA actions responding to hurricane relief efforts and focusing on those disaster relief programs most vulnerable to fraud. The OIG is also working closely with other Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies to conduct investigations into fraud associated with the hurricane relief and reconstruction efforts. Based on referrals from the Attorneys’ Offices in Louisiana and Mississippi, the OIG has several ongoing investigations of individuals who filed false benefit applications.
OIGs Help Protect the Nation Against Terrorism

Since the terrorist attacks against the United States on September 11, 2001, the Administration has implemented a number of preventive measures to protect our Nation, including the Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA) and a Homeland Security Policy Directive (HSPD-12). FISMA requires that all Federal agencies provide security for information and information systems that support agency operations, including those managed by other agencies or contractors. To help implement the Act, OIGs developed surveys to assist the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in developing both current and future year FISMA reporting instructions and requirements for evaluating how agencies implemented the Act. The OIGs are also responsible for assessing the implementation of HSPD-12, which requires a common identification verification system.

The collective actions of the IG community have been coordinated through the Audit Committee. Examples of individual OIG work in these areas include:

- **The Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) OIG** audits of laboratories storing dangerous biological agents (pathogens) have identified vulnerabilities in areas such as physical security, access control, and accountability. The OIG's consequent recommendations have had a broad impact by providing information critical to revising and finalizing regulations detailing procedures for securing and controlling the pathogens.

- **The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) OIG** has initiated several audits of information technology security and physical security at agency facilities. In FY 2005, FCC management agreed to 38 recommendations, including (1) improved password procedures, (2) security patch management, (3) access management, (4) continuity of operations, and (5) physical security improvements. The OIG plans to follow up its audits of physical security as well as to evaluate the agency's progress in developing contingency plans in the event of an attack.

- **The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) OIG** evaluated NRC's implementation of FISMA in FY 2005. The assessment gave the agency information necessary to determine the effectiveness of its overall security program and to develop strategies for improving information security—critical measures in preventing terrorist access to highly sensitive and potentially dangerous information. The assessment found weaknesses, including a (1) lack of appropriate security training, (2) inadequate oversight of contractors, and (3) inaccurate and incomplete information system inventories. In response to the assessment, management agreed to take action to enhance its implementation of FISMA.

- **The Department of Justice (DOJ) OIG** documented significant deficiencies in the FBI's handling of intelligence information prior to terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001. In response to the report, the FBI has taken corrective actions, which include upgrading the physical infrastructure in FBI field offices to handle classified information, establishing centralized intelligence components, and providing training on subjects such as disseminating threat-related information. In addition, the OIG conducted an extensive review of five counterterrorism task forces. Following up on the OIG's recommendations, DOJ developed national training strategies, outcome-oriented performance measures and strategies to improve information sharing with law enforcement agencies and first responders in remote areas.

- **The USDA OIG** audited the Agricultural Research Service's (ARS) controls over transferring sensitive research and technology. Based on the OIG's recommendations, ARS agreed to seek guidance from other authoritative scientific sources, to identify its sensitive research, and to implement the appropriate controls (e.g., determining who has access and what can be disclosed).

- **The Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration (TIGTA)** determined that IRS did not have a process to regularly review its inventory of critical assets. Accurate knowledge of these assets is necessary to developing appropriate measures to protect against terrorist attacks. As a result of TIGTA's recommendations, IRS agreed to annually confirm the completeness of its critical assets list.

- **The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) OIG** contracted with independent public accounting firms to conduct audits of contractors and grantees. These audits are designed to ensure that Government funds are not being funneled to terrorist organizations.

- **The Government Printing Office (GPO) OIG** conducted a series of reviews that identified a number of weaknesses in passport production relating to security and internal control over the process. In these reviews, the OIG made a number of recommendations to improve passport production, including (1) increased management oversight of contractors, (2) enhanced physical security over passport
production, and (3) strengthened internal controls. GPO’s management has generally concurred with the reviews’ recommendations and has timely implemented them.

- **The Department of the Treasury OIG** assessed the central repository for suspicious activity reports filed by financial institutions. The repository provides financial information critical to combating terrorism, money laundering, and other crimes. The OIG determined that the program could be made more effective by increasing the quality and amount of its information. Agreeing with the recommendations, management undertook: (1) to improve the quality of financial institution reporting, (2) to encourage institutions to make greater use of the program, and (3) to increase its scope by registering money service businesses (e.g., money transfer businesses).

- **The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) OIG** reviewed the FDIC’s supervision of an institution’s compliance with the Bank Secrecy Act (BSA) and recommended that the FDIC take steps to ensure institution management’s accountability for BSA compliance and improve its BSA examination and supervisory processes. FDIC management agreed with the recommendations and is making significant improvements to its supervision of BSA compliance programs.

- **The Department of the Interior (DOI) OIG** assessed the security and law enforcement program for DOI’s Bureau of Reclamation dams. Because a number of these dams are a major component of the Nation’s critical infrastructure, the Bureau developed a formal security and law enforcement program where it formerly had limited responsibilities in these areas. The OIG made recommendations for improving the management of security and law enforcement activities throughout the Bureau and Bureau officials agreed to implement the recommendations.

- **The Department of Transportation (DOT) OIG** worked to strengthen the Federal Aviation Administration’s (FAA) security over aviation en route developmental systems (equipment and software designed to replace current air traffic control systems). The OIG found specific weaknesses that FAA management has undertaken to correct by securing outside entities’ connections to its network, eliminating computer vulnerabilities, improving access controls to the computer laboratory and developmental systems, and enhancing contingency planning.

- **The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) OIG** audited the process of granting external access to NASA’s network perimeter to determine whether the process was adequate to reduce the risk of unauthorized access and compromise the center’s computer system. The OIG identified three opportunities to strengthen the process for approving and tracking computer systems that have access outside the center’s network and reduce the risks inherent in allowing external access. Management agreed to implement the recommendations.

- **The Social Security Administration (SSA) OIG** assessed how some immigrants are assigned Social Security numbers when they enter the United States. Control over these numbers is important to national security since they can serve as a foundation from which terrorists can build the documentation necessary to establish themselves as legal residents (e.g., driver’s license, work permits, etc.). The OIG identified weaknesses in existing controls, and SSA’s management addressed these issues by agreeing to enhance its edits to provide greater protection against assigning multiple Social Security numbers to the same person, and to work with the Departments of State and Homeland Security to resolve data compatibility issues.

- **The Department of State (DOS) OIG** investigations established the Passport Sentinel identity theft initiative and formed the Passport Sentinel Alliance to ensure a comprehensive law enforcement approach to identifying passport fraud and prosecuting violators. Passport Sentinel addresses systemic aspects relating to the subversion of the Nation’s passport system by individuals, terrorists, domestic or transnational criminal organizations. Between April and September 2005, the OIG’s efforts have yielded three arrests and other cases that have been referred for prosecution.

- **The Amtrak OIG** brought together senior transportation officials from Spain and the United States in a workshop — “The Madrid Train Bombing: Hard Lessons Learned” — to ascertain ways to secure Amtrak from similar terrorist attacks. The OIG also reached out to the British transport police in the aftermath of the July 2005 transit bombing. In conjunction with this effort, the OIG met with representatives from Scotland Yard in an information-gathering session to reinforce and improve on knowledge needed to strengthen Amtrak’s counter-terrorism efforts.

- **The DoD OIG** assessed information presented to the 9/11 Commission by DoD officials to determine if it was factually correct. The OIG concluded that some of the information was inaccurate due to inadequate forensics and insufficient verification. In response to the OIG’s recommendations, DoD agreed to establish standardized forensics and to develop procedures for investigating such events.

- **The DHS OIG** reported that the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement found problems in identifying, locating, and apprehending aliens based on leads produced by the three major entry/exit control systems in use. These leads form part of a first line of defense against terrorists who have entered or are trying to enter the United States. As a result of OIG’s work, management agreed to address data quality issues and establish timeliness standards for evaluating leads.
Along with their response to national emergencies, OIGs continued their mission of detecting fraud, waste, and abuse through their audit and investigative work in order to ensure that taxpayers’ money is spent wisely. One of the IG community’s challenges is to assist in meeting the priorities of the Nation while exercising fiscal restraint.

Towards this end, OIGs closely monitor Government financial management through audits of financial statements required by the Chief Financial Officers Act (CFO Act) and the Accountability of Tax Dollars Act (ATD Act), which mandates that OIGs conduct financial statement audits for 23 CFO agencies and 75\(^1\) ATD agencies. PCIE agencies make up the 23 CFO agencies, and 20 ECIE and 3 PCIE agencies are included in the ATD agencies. The positive trends related to these audits include:

- Between FYs 1996 and 2005, unqualified audit opinions for the 23 CFO Act agencies rose from 6 to 18.
- From FYs 2001 to 2005, auditor-reported material weaknesses decreased from 57 to 48.
- In FY 2005, the 75 ATD agencies had 43 unqualified opinions including 1 PCIE and 13 ECIE agencies.

CFO Act agencies have been held to an accelerated reporting date of November 15, 2005, for their audited financial statements—just 45 days after the end of the fiscal year. Issuing their statements by this date represented a significant challenge for the agencies since the previous deadline had been March 31, over 180 days after the fiscal year. Despite having only one-fourth as much time in FY 2005, all 23 CFO Act agencies issued their reports by the deadline.

Examples of OIGs’ success in promoting fiscal responsibility include:

- The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) OIG identified poor cash management practices used to manage hundreds of millions of dollars obtained by the FTC for restitution to fraud victims. As a result of these practices, the program lost interest income exceeding $100,000. The OIG accordingly recommended that the contractors manage funds to maximize interest, and the agency agreed to move only a portion of funds from interest-bearing savings to non-interest-bearing checking accounts when checks are mailed, and to monitor canceled checks so that additional funds are moved only when needed.

- The Smithsonian Institution OIG reviewed major revitalization and construction projects to determine whether effective measures were in place to control contract changes and the consequent changes to projects’ cost. The OIG concluded that $2.4 million in changes were made by agency representatives who had exceeded their authority. Smithsonian management agreed to implement the OIG’s recommendations to strengthen controls over contract changes and to assign a contracting officer to work on site for large-scale projects.

- The Department of Education (ED) OIG investigations uncovered a student aid fraud scheme wherein a woman and 6 co-conspirators used 41 identities to obtain over $400,000 in student loans. The leader was sentenced to over 7 years in prison and ordered to pay over $400,000 in restitution. The co-conspirators, including her mother and sisters, received probation or prison sentences up to 27 months and were ordered to pay restitution ranging from $10,000 to $141,000.

- The USDA OIG conducted a nationwide audit of the bulk mail center's highway transportation routes. Between September 2004 and February 2006, the OIG issued proposals that Postal Service cancel or modify trips with low mail volume, which the OIG estimated would save the agency over $40.6 million. The Postal Service agreed with almost all of the OIG’s recommendations, and began implementing the cost-saving changes before the report was issued.

- The Railroad Retirement Board (RRB) OIG completed 3 compliance audits that identified $5.4 million in improper payments or delayed processing of earnings in disability, survivor, and retired employee annuities’ work deductions. Agency management agreed to amend processing and monitoring procedures to reduce potential errors in the future.

\(^1\) The Commission on Ocean Policy was one of the original ATD agencies. The commission went out of business in December 2004: thus only 75 agencies were required to comply with the ATD Act in FY 2005.
$33.4 million of the contractor's claims and recommended concerns about the reasonableness of contract prices. OIG is preparing a detailed action plan to guide implementation.

Management generally concurred with the OIG's 32 recommendations and benefits after they were able to return to work. DOE found that the agency significantly strengthened how it monitored contractor costs and discontinued the labor classification. As a result, TVA disallowed over $1 million of the company paid $1.6 million to settle a claim.

The OIG identified contracting vulnerabilities that raised concerns about the reasonableness of contract prices.

Based on voluntary price reductions that were received from contractors, the OIG determined that VA's contracting costs could be reduced by as much $6.8 million over 5 years. VA provided responsive comments and acceptable implementation plans to replace the existing contracts and to strengthen regional contract management and oversight.

The EPA OIG collaborated with several Federal organizations to investigate allegations that a contractor had submitted false claims. The contractor paid the Government $41.9 million to settle allegations that it had made false claims for travel reimbursement.

The National Science Foundation (NSF) OIG audited a contractor providing support for the U.S. Antarctic Program from 2000 to 2002. The OIG questioned $33.4 million of the contractor's claims and recommended that the agency significantly strengthen how it monitored its largest contractors. The NSF agreed to take steps to improve its oversight of the contractor's financial charges, which include performing quarterly reviews of vouchers and having an authorized official to sign vouchers.

The Department of Energy (DOE) OIG found that the National Nuclear Security Administration incurred and will continue to incur unreasonable costs related to contractor employee post-retirement health benefits. According to the OIG's audit work, DOE will incur costs of approximately $460,000 for currently retired contactors and will accrue a future liability of more than $7 million. In response to the OIG's recommendations, DOE established a council to serve as a policy- and decision-making body on post-retirement health benefits.

The Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) OIG, from April to September 2005, completed 10 contract compliance audits that identified over $6.4 million in ineligible and unsupported costs and another $1.2 million in costs to be avoided. The OIG's work determined, for example, that one contractor overbilled $1.5 million and that TVA could save another $1 million by discontinuing use of an unauthorized labor classification. As a result, TVA disallowed over $1 million of the questioned costs and discontinued the labor classification.

The Department of Commerce (DOC) OIG reviewed the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act program. The OIG concluded that while DOC paid over $14.4 million in workers' compensation benefits for roughly 1,275 employees, managing the program has given rise to problems. These include overpayments, continued payments to deceased claimants, and claimants who continued to receive benefits after they were able to return to work. Management generally concurred with the OIG's 32 recommendations and is preparing a detailed action plan to guide implementation.

The Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) OIG identified contracting vulnerabilities that raised concerns about the reasonableness of contract prices. Based on voluntary price reductions that were received from contractors, the OIG determined that VA's contracting costs could be reduced by as much $6.8 million over 5 years. VA provided responsive comments and acceptable implementation plans to replace the existing contracts and to strengthen regional contract management and oversight.

The FDIC OIG examined FDIC's purchase of laptop computers through a contractor and determined that the contractor had not passed along price decreases as required, which resulted in the agency overpaying $1.9 million. Agency management agreed to recover the money from the contractor.

The Department of Labor (DOL) OIG audited the Employee Benefits Security Administration's ERISA Filing and Acceptance System and determined that electronic filing of Form 5500 data could save $5 million annually in contract costs. The OIG recommended mandating electronic filing of Form 5500, and withholding contractor payments if accuracy standards are not met. Agency management welcomed the OIG's support to mandate electronic filing.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) OIG audited the administration of funds provided to the State of New York to help it recover from the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001. While the funds were generally well-administered, the OIG determined that $2 million was disbursed that should not have been. The agency responsible agreed with the OIG's recommendation to reimburse the Government.

The GSA OIG investigations have led to a significant amount of money being returned to the Government. In one case, a company paid $1.6 million to settle a claim that alleged, in effect, that it had underpaid GSA administrative fees. In another, three companies paid approximately $15 million to settle a claim that they had violated the Trade Agreements Act by selling products to the Government that had been obtained from impermissible countries.

The Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS) OIG concluded an audit of grants awarded to a State commission that resulted in $1.4 million in questioned costs and awards. As a result of the audit's recommendations, the commission agreed to strengthen its operations and is negotiating with CNCS to resolve the problems.

The Small Business Administration OIG and Federal Bureau of Investigation worked together to uncover a loan agent's fraud scheme wherein the loan agent provided forged purchase contracts to his customers knowing that the properties in question were already under contract with another client or were not even for sale. Six individuals were sentenced to a total of 116 months and ordered to pay total restitution of $19.5 million. Additionally, an attorney involved in the scheme has been debarred from Federal contracting.
OIGs Dollar Savings and Criminal Prosecutions

The information on the following pages has been compiled from data reported by each member of the Inspector General community. Taken together, these statistics offer an objective measure of the collective, Governmentwide impact of PCIE and ECIE OIGs. We have placed these productivity indicators in an overall context by providing a 5-year running total for each reporting category.

To streamline the report, we are listing only one combined PCIE and ECIE number for each category. The statistical performance of an individual OIG can be found in its semiannual reports, which are available on its Website. (Links to individual OIG Websites are in the appendix.)

The data in this section generally correspond to equivalent categories in individual OIGs’ semiannual reports. However, due to data limitations, reporting practices that OIGs may have established, and the way that this report treats results generated by cooperative or interagency projects, some variation exists between our summary data and the collective totals of OIGs’ semiannual reports.

Audit-Related Accomplishments

Section 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (IG Act) establishes a uniform set of statistical categories under which OIGs must report the results of their audit activities. The categories below correspond to the IG Act’s categories. The total accomplishments also include results associated with audits performed by the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) under agreements with OIGs and agencies.

### Recommendations That Funds Be Put to Better Use

The IG Act defines a recommendation that funds be put to better use as follows:

- a recommendation by the Office [of Inspector General] that funds could be used more efficiently if management of an establishment took actions to implement and complete the recommendation, including (1) reductions in outlays; (2) de-obligation of funds from programs or operations; (3) withdrawal of interest subsidy costs on loans or loan guarantees, insurance, or bonds; (4) costs not incurred by implementing recommended improvements related to the operations of the establishment, a contractor, or grantee; (5) avoidance of unnecessary expenditures noted in pre-award reviews of contractor or grant agreements; or (6) any other savings which are specifically identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Year</th>
<th>Recommendations That Funds Be Put to Better Use</th>
<th>Amount of Recommendations Agreed to by Management¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2001</td>
<td>$89,226,582,927</td>
<td>$22,178,783,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2002</td>
<td>15,153,564,400</td>
<td>64,899,592,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2003</td>
<td>26,458,286,927</td>
<td>11,334,893,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2004</td>
<td>14,938,468,879</td>
<td>12,503,502,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>13,851,596,950</td>
<td>15,708,882,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYs 2001-2005</td>
<td>$159,628,500,083</td>
<td>$126,625,654,394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹The amounts in this column may exceed the amounts in the preceding column because either management agreed to a higher dollar amount than the OIG recommended amount or it includes recommendations issued in previous reporting periods that were accepted in the current fiscal year.
**Questioned Costs**

The IG Act defines a questioned cost as:

*a cost that is questioned by the Office [of Inspector General] because of (1) an alleged violation or provision of law, regulation, contract, grant, or cooperative agreement, or

other agreement or document governing the expenditure of funds; (2) a finding that, at the time of the audit, such cost is not supported by adequate documentation; or (3) a finding that the expenditure of funds for the intended purpose is unnecessary or unreasonable.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Year</th>
<th>Amount of Questioned Costs</th>
<th>Amount of Recommendations Agreed to by Management¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2001</td>
<td>$4,125,882,715</td>
<td>$2,341,932,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2002</td>
<td>3,007,702,351</td>
<td>2,419,882,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2003</td>
<td>3,112,677,749</td>
<td>1,989,689,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2004</td>
<td>4,429,644,538</td>
<td>2,063,504,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>4,353,684,456</td>
<td>4,458,011,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYs 2001-2005</td>
<td>19,029,591,809</td>
<td>$13,273,020,492</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹The amounts in this column may exceed the amounts in the preceding column because either management agreed to a higher dollar amount than the OIG recommended amount or it includes recommendations issued in previous reporting periods that were accepted in the current fiscal year.
Investigations-Related Accomplishments

The categories used in this report reflect the broad range of accomplishments generated by the OIGs’ investigative components. However, unlike the specific reporting categories for audit reports, the IG Act did not create a uniform system for recording the results of investigative activities. The OIGs, though, have developed a relatively uniform set of performance indicators for their semiannual reports that include most of the data presented below.

Investigative work often involves several law enforcement agencies working the same case. OIGs typically conduct cases with other OIGs, Federal law enforcement agencies, and State or local law enforcement entities. Consistent with the practices used in this section, these investigative statistics have been compiled using a methodology that eliminates duplicate reporting by multiple OIGs. Therefore, these consolidated statistics differ from the collective totals for the equivalent categories in individual OIG semiannual reports. Further, for each reporting category, we have developed a subtotal for joint investigations, identifying the results of cases in which an OIG played an active investigative role together with another Federal investigative organization(s), not including other OIGs.

Successful Criminal Prosecutions

A prosecution is considered successful when, as the result of OIG activities, its subject is convicted in Federal, State, local, or foreign government venues, under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, or is accepted for a pretrial diversion agreement by the Department of Justice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Year</th>
<th>From OIG Investigations</th>
<th>From Joint Investigations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2001</td>
<td>7,501</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>7,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2002</td>
<td>10,459</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>10,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2003</td>
<td>6,051</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>6,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2004</td>
<td>5,928</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>6,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>6,626</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>7,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYs 2001-2005</td>
<td>36,565</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>39,085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indictments and Criminal Informations

The totals reported in this category compose criminal indictments and informations filed in Federal, State, local, or foreign courts or under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, resulting from cases in which an OIG has had an active investigative role.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Year</th>
<th>From OIG Investigations</th>
<th>From Joint Investigations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2001</td>
<td>4,867</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>4,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2002</td>
<td>5,262</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>5,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2003</td>
<td>6,010</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>6,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2004</td>
<td>5,583</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>6,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>5,676</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>6,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYs 2001-2005</td>
<td>27,398</td>
<td>3,255</td>
<td>30,653</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Successful Civil Actions

Civil actions reflect the successful resolution of matters arising from OIG investigations, audits, and inspections/evaluations through legal or legal-related action other than criminal prosecution. They include:

- Civil judgments or forfeitures in favor of the United States in Federal, State, local, or foreign government legal systems,
- Settlements negotiated by a governmental authority prior to or following the filing of a formal civil complaint, and
- Settlements or agreements in cases governed by the Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act, or other agency-specific civil litigation authority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Year</th>
<th>From OIG Investigations</th>
<th>From Joint Investigations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2001</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2002</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2003</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2004</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYs 2001-2005</td>
<td>3,068</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>3,276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Suspensions and Debarments

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 non-financial transactions with the Government, based on findings produced by the OIGs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Year</th>
<th>From OIG Investigations</th>
<th>From Joint Investigations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2001</td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2002</td>
<td>7,668</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2003</td>
<td>7,510</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>7,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2004</td>
<td>4,891</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>5,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>9,715</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>9,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fy's 2001-2005</td>
<td>38,584</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>39,082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personnel Actions

Personnel actions include reprimands, suspensions, demotions, or terminations of the employees of Federal, state, or local governments, or of Federal contractors and grantees, as the result of OIG activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Year</th>
<th>From OIG Investigations</th>
<th>From Joint Investigations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2001</td>
<td>1,213</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2002</td>
<td>1,622</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2003</td>
<td>1,988</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2004</td>
<td>1,954</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>2,686</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>2,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fy's 2001-2005</td>
<td>9,463</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>9,644</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Investigative Receivables and Recoveries

Investigative receivables and recoveries reflect the total dollar value of the following amounts:

1. Criminal cases: The amount of restitution, criminal fines, and special assessments resulting from successful criminal prosecutions in cases where an OIG had an active investigative role.
2. Civil cases: The amount of damages, penalties, settlements, and forfeitures resulting from successful civil actions during the reporting period that were based on OIG activities.
3. Voluntary repayments: The amounts paid voluntarily or as the result of an agency’s administrative processes, by the subject of an investigation in which an OIG has an active role, or the value of government property recovered by an OIG during such an investigation before prosecutorial action is taken.

Joint Investigations With Other Federal Investigation Offices

This category reflects the percentage of investigations in which OIGs had an active investigative role that included other Federal investigative organizations (not including other OIGs).

In FY 2005, 25 of the 29 PCIE OIGs reported conducting joint investigations. Of these, 5 OIGs indicated that 10 percent or less of their cases were joint; 16 stated that joint cases comprised between 10 and 50 percent of their investigations; and 4 OIGs conducted more than 50 percent of their cases jointly. The highest portion of joint cases reported by an OIG was 73 percent. The FY 2005 totals are consistent with FY 2004 joint case activity.

Among the ECIE OIGs, 5 of 28 offices reported conducting joint cases. Three OIGs reported that 10 percent or less of their cases were joint, and two indicated that joint cases did not exceed 30 percent of their investigations. The highest portion of joint cases reported by an OIG was 27 percent. The FY 2005 totals had fewer OIGs reporting joint case activity, but those that reported had increased activity in FY 2005.

### INVESTIGATIVE RECEIVABLES AND RECOVERIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Year</th>
<th>OIG Investigations</th>
<th>Joint Investigations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2001</td>
<td>$3,595,421,267</td>
<td>$152,729,630</td>
<td>$3,748,150,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2002</td>
<td>4,608,962,268</td>
<td>16,177,145</td>
<td>4,625,139,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2003</td>
<td>3,264,413,948</td>
<td>1,203,628,314</td>
<td>4,468,042,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2004</td>
<td>2,587,322,748</td>
<td>895,715,469</td>
<td>3,483,038,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>2,777,558,301</td>
<td>1,483,062,002</td>
<td>4,260,620,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fy’s 2001-2005</td>
<td>$16,833,678,532</td>
<td>$3,751,312,560</td>
<td>$20,584,991,092</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview of the PCIE and ECIE

Background and Mission

The mission of the PCIE and ECIE is to (1) continually identify, review, and discuss areas of weaknesses and vulnerability in Federal programs and operations to fraud, waste, and abuse; (2) develop plans for coordinated, Governmentwide activities that address these problems; and (3) promote economy and efficiency in Federal programs and operations.

The PCIE was created by Executive Order (E.O.) 12301 (March 26, 1981), later updated and expanded by E.O. 12625 in 1988 and E.O. 12805 in 1992. E.O. 12805 created the ECIE.

Leadership

In FY 2005, Clay Johnson III, Deputy Director for Management of OMB, chaired both the PCIE and ECIE.

The Vice Chairs of the Councils are chosen by the Chair from among the respective members. The Vice Chairs provide ongoing executive direction to their Councils and manage their day-to-day activities. During FY 2005, Gregory H. Friedman, Inspector General, DOE, served as Vice Chair of the PCIE. Barry R. Snyder, Inspector General, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, served as Vice Chair of the ECIE.

An Executive Council comprising the Vice Chairs of the PCIE and ECIE, the Chairs of the IG-led committees, and an at-large member works as a corporate leadership body, responsible for:

- Maintaining external relationships and communications on behalf of the IG community;
- Long-term planning and continuity of leadership; and
- Compiling and distributing information on common priorities of the Council’s membership.

Membership

IGs who are appointed by the President subject to Senate confirmation are members of the PCIE. IGs of the designated Federal entities are members of the ECIE. To facilitate policy coordination and collaboration between the two, the PCIE Vice Chair serves as an ex officio member of the ECIE, and the ECIE Vice Chair is an ex officio member of the PCIE.

The following are ex officio members of both Councils: the Controller of OMB’s Office of Federal Financial Management, the Special Counsel of the Office of Special Counsel, the Director of the Office of Government Ethics, the Deputy Director of OPM, and the Assistant Director of the FBI’s Criminal Investigative Division.

The appendix to this report provides a current list of all PCIE and ECIE members.

Roles and Activities

The PCIE and ECIE reach across agency boundaries to provide Governmentwide coordination of and focus on the activities of the OIGs. Among the functions they perform are:

- Providing a forum in which the IG community may discuss Governmentwide issues and address shared concerns.
- Improving professionalism through developing and implementing of uniform standards for conducting of audit, investigative, and inspection and evaluation activities of OIGs.
- Sponsoring and operating training programs to support the professional and management development of OIG auditors, investigators, and evaluators.
- Conducting or advocating projects that address issues of common concern or interest among OIGs.

The PCIE and ECIE are the IG community’s counterparts to similar groups representing other Federal communities, such as the Chief Financial Officers (CFOs), Chief Information Officers, and Federal Acquisition Councils. Designated PCIE members regularly attend the meetings of these other councils as observers and inform the PCIE and ECIE membership about relevant issues and initiatives.
PCIE Committees, Workgroups, and Roundtables

PCIE-ECIE Standing Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>FY 2005 Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audit Committee</td>
<td>John P. Higgins, Jr., Inspector General, ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigations Committee</td>
<td>Kenneth M. Donohue, Inspector General, HUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection and Evaluation Committee</td>
<td>Johnnie E. Frazier, Inspector General, DOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Committee</td>
<td>Nikki L. Tinsley, Inspector General, EPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation Committee</td>
<td>J. Russell George, Inspector General, TIGTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity Committee</td>
<td>Chris Swecker, Assistant Director, Criminal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investigative Division, FBI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The PCIE and ECIE maintain six standing committees that provide leadership for the Councils' activities in their respective areas and carry out or oversee much of the project-related work conducted under the Councils' auspices. Their membership is generally comprised of IGs, with at least one ECIE member sitting on each committee. The committee chairs are selected by the PCIE membership through periodic elections.

Several of the standing committees have established work groups with a broader membership to advise them about policy matters and to conduct specific projects under the committee's leadership. A number of forums and roundtables are affiliated with the PCIE and ECIE that address specialized issues of widespread interest within the IG community, but do not fit readily within the committee structure.

Below, we highlight the FY 2005 activities of the committees and their affiliated groups. Some of these activities represent the continuation or completion of work initiated in prior years.

**AUDIT COMMITTEE**

The Audit Committee provides leadership and serves as a resource for the audit community and provides oversight for what was formerly the IG Auditor Training Institute (IGATI, now the School for Audit and Inspections). The Committee sponsors audits that address multiagency or Governmentwide issues, and develops and maintains professional standards for OIG audit activities. The Committee works closely with the Federal Audit Executive Council and other professional groups. John P. Higgins, Jr., Inspector General, Department of Education, chairs the committee. FY 2005 activities include the following:

- **Peer Review Guidance.** In April 2005, the PCIE Audit Committee issued the Guide for Conducting External Peer Reviews of the Audit Operations of Offices of Inspector General. The guide helps members implement internal quality control systems and review programs, and gives general direction about the PCIE/ECIE external peer review process.

- **Internal Control over Financial Reporting.** In September 2005, the PCIE Audit Committee and CFO Council issued a joint study on the potential costs and benefits of requiring CFO Act agencies to obtain an audit opinion on their internal controls over financial reporting. The study concluded that because the estimates to render an opinion on internal control are so substantial, not all CFO Act agencies should be required to conduct such an audit. Instead, agencies should be given the opportunity to implement the revised OMB Circular A-123 and to obtain an internal control audit only where particular circumstances warrant it.
• The School of Audit and Inspections. In FY 2005, the Audit Committee provided oversight to the School of Audit and Inspections in meeting its goal of providing quality training to meet the needs of the OIG audit community. Notably, the School conducted 97 training classes for 1,437 students and the school achieved a surplus of nearly $40,000 from its operations last year. In FY 2004, the School had approximately 10 percent fewer classes and students and experienced a $53,000 shortfall. In FY 2006, the School will continue to provide quality training at a competitive price while working with the IG Criminal Investigator Academy and the IG Management Institute to consolidate all three groups under the IG Institute.

Federal Audit Executive Council

The Federal Audit Executive Council (FAEC) conducts interagency and inter-entity audit, inspection, and investigative projects to promote economy and efficiency and to address Governmentwide issues. The Council also develops policies, standards, and approaches to help establish a well-trained, highly skilled OIG workforce. The FAEC is composed of senior audit officials from the Federal OIGs. During FY 2005, the Council was headed by three successive chairs: Bruce Crandlemire, Acting Inspector General, USAID; Alexis M. Stefani, Assistant Inspector General for Audit, DOC; and Helen Lew, Assistant Inspector General for Auditing, ED. Highlights of FAEC’s activities for FY 2005 include:

• External Peer Review Schedule. The FAEC developed the external peer review schedule for the FY 2006-2007 cycle. Under the Government Auditing Standards, an audit organization’s system of quality control must have an external peer review of its auditing and attestation engagement practices at least once every 3 years. For Federal audit organizations, the IG Act requires these external reviews to be performed by another Federal audit organization.

• IGATI Curriculum Review Board. The FAEC created the IGATI Curriculum Review Board to ensure that classes offered by the School of Audit and Inspections meet the audit communities’ training needs. At least once every 3 years, the Board evaluates all classes and recommends ways to improve them.

• Financial Statement Audit Network. The Financial Statement Audit Network organized and hosted the third annual PCIE/GAO Roundtable in March 2006 to discuss issues associated with the FY 2005 financial statement audit process. FY 2005 was the second year that the due date was accelerated to 45 days after the end of the fiscal year both for agencies’ audited financial statements and for auditing special-purpose financial statements (closing packages). Presentations at the Roundtable focused on implementing and complying with the revised OMB Circular A-123, Management’s Responsibility for Internal Control, new audit and accounting standards, new antideficiency reporting requirements, and reporting the costs of pending or threatened litigation. Participants included representatives from the IG community, the certified public accountant community, GAO, OMB, the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board, the CFO community, and DOJ.

INVESTIGATIONS COMMITTEE

The Investigations Committee advises about investigative issues and personnel, and establishes investigative guidance. During FY 2005, the Committee was chaired by Kenneth M. Donohue, Inspector General, HUD. FY 2005 activities include:

• Garrity-Kalkines Warnings Advice of Rights Forms. OIG representatives and the DOJ’s Public Integrity Section formed a working group to examine the “Garrity–Kalkines advice of rights” forms that are used by OIGs. The group reviewed a number of different forms and from those developed suggested model forms which are available for use by the OIGs.

• Law Enforcement Officers Safety Act of 2004. The Investigations Committee drafted a memorandum to be sent by OIGs to their retirees about interpreting the Act. Retirees may now carry concealed weapons subject to specific State laws, but have no law enforcement authority. Each IG agency can issue credentials and identification cards to retirees.

• Liaison with External Agencies. The Investigations Committee has developed close working relationships with the FBI, U.S. Marshals Service, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and State IGs to address government fraud (both local and Federal), public corruption, and other common concerns.

INSPECTION AND EVALUATION COMMITTEE

The Inspection and Evaluation (I&E) Committee fosters information sharing, innovative methodologies, and effective professional practices among the I&E components of OIGs. Its working group, the I&E Roundtable, is comprised of the Assistant IGs responsible for inspection and evaluation in their respective agencies. The Committee is chaired by Johnnie E. Frazier, Inspector General, DOC. FY 2005 activities include:
A PROGRESS REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT

Disaster Preparedness Guide. The I&E Committee and the Disaster Preparedness working group drafted a disaster preparedness guide as part of a multiagency OIG project. The guide is intended to help OIGs oversee Federal disaster and emergency preparedness efforts. It will highlight key areas of concern, lessons learned from recent work, and important reference materials.

Inspection Standards. In January 2005, the Committee and the Roundtable published the revised PCIE Quality Standards for Inspections. The original standards had been in place for over a decade and did not reflect the fast pace at which the Federal I&E community has developed and matured. This past year, the Committee also issued its survey of Federal I&E units, which reported that units are growing in number and size.

Workers’ Compensation Program. The Committee and its workers’ compensation working group are making significant progress in coordinating projects on workers’ compensation programs in various Federal agencies. The annual cost of the Federal Employees’ Compensation Act program is approximately $2.3 billion, so the opportunity for savings is substantial. Several agencies have completed work in this area or have projects underway and are making tremendous strides in part because OIGs are working closely together to share cases, fraud indicators, best practices, patterns of abuse, and areas of mismanagement.

Shared Training Efforts. The Committee is continuing to increase its efforts to make good, economical training available to inspectors and evaluators throughout the IG community. The Roundtable successfully asked its members to open their in-house training to others in the I&E community. Sharing training in this way has provided excellent opportunities for extra training, sometimes at no cost to OIGs.

Core Competency Online Courses. The I&E Committee and Roundtable members worked with the Human Resource Committee’s PCIE Skillsoft working group to identify online courses especially useful in training I&E staff in core competency areas. The working group evaluated and recommended five courses: crisp composition, using data as a professional consultant, data mining, project planning, and presentation skills.

Inspection Manual Exchange. The Committee has established an inspection manual exchange to enable other I&E offices to have access to I&E manuals from other OIGs. These have been helpful to OIGs seeking to develop or update their own inspection manuals. The manuals also serve as a training guide and source of best practices.

HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE

The Human Resources (HR) Committee advocates effective human resource management programs within the PCIE and ECIE communities and sponsors activities to develop professional and management skills. During FY 2005, the HR Committee was chaired by Nikki L. Tinsley, Inspector General, EPA. The Committee delivered the following:

The Establishment of Core Curricula. For the first time in the history of the IG community, the PCIE/ECIE has published its core curricula. Based on our core competencies and built on our new career development framework (the networked talent model), the new curricula provide a common basis to train and develop OIG staff.

Inspector General E-Learning (IGEL). IGEL represents one of the most successful e-learning initiatives in the Government. The IGEL pilot includes 35 OIGs and over 6,000 members of the IG community. IGEL has custom-designed learning programs for auditors, evaluators, criminal investigators, human resources and information technology specialists, and administrative assistants. Custom content was developed to support criminal investigators. Current performance numbers document a highly successful pilot with customer satisfaction at over 85 percent and a use rate of over 30 percent. The pilot ended in March 2006, and is now being comprehensively evaluated.

Succession Planning/Succession Management. Given the importance placed on effective human resource management, the HR Committee presented a comprehensive model showing how best to assess, plan, and measure workforce capabilities, and to respond appropriately. Entitled “The Succession Planning/Succession Management Continuum,” the model has been accepted as one of the OIGs’ workforce planning tools.

LEGISLATION COMMITTEE

The Legislation Committee serves as the central coordinating point for legislative issues affecting the PCIE and ECIE communities. Using newsletters and its legislative tracking system, the Committee keeps the Inspectors General and their staff informed, on a continuing basis, of significant policy issues within the Executive Branch and legislative developments within Congress. J. Russell George, Inspector General, TIGTA, chairs the Committee.
The Committee reviewed and opined on the status of numerous bills introduced in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina that would either affect IG authorities or create OIGs with jurisdiction for Federal hurricane relief operations.

The Committee has played an integral role in coordinating the PCIE and ECIE efforts to assist Congress in its examining proposed legislation such as H.R. 2489, the “Improving Government Accountability Act,” a bill that focuses on the authorities and operations of the IGs. In FY 2005, the Legislation Committee conducted a survey of PCIE and ECIE members on H.R. 2489, focusing on its provisions to establish terms of office and removal for cause protections, statutory law enforcement authority, OIG budget requests to Congress, functions of the Integrity Committee, and subpoena and personnel authority.

INTEGRITY COMMITTEE

The Integrity Committee receives and reviews allegations of noncriminal misconduct by PCIE/ECIE IGs and certain senior members of their staff. When appropriate, the Committee refers the cases for investigation. The Committee ensures that complaints against IGs receive thorough and timely review. During FY 2005, Chris Swecker, Assistant Director, Criminal Investigative Division, FBI, chaired the Committee.

During FY 2005, the Committee opened 39 new allegations, initiated 2 investigations, and closed a total of 477 cases, some of which had been received during prior years. Of the closed cases, 28 were deemed to be outside the Committee’s purview and were referred elsewhere for consideration, while 8 others were determined to be unsubstantiated. One case resulted in findings that substantiated the allegations of misconduct. The cases remaining at the end of the reporting period were in various stages of the Integrity Committee’s process.

Competitive Sourcing Roundtable

The Competitive Sourcing Roundtable was established as a focal point for the PCIE and ECIE community’s roles and responsibilities concerning the competitive sourcing initiative of the President’s Management Agenda. Earl E. Devaney, Inspector General, DOI, has chaired the Roundtable since 2003. The Roundtable has promoted consistency across the IG community in interpreting and implementing the competitive sourcing initiative. Among the issues it addresses are:

- Complying with legislative and OMB requirements;
- Categorizing activities performed by OIG personnel as inherently governmental or commercial in nature; and
- Identifying potential oversight roles with respect to agencies’ implementation of the initiative.

In FY 2005, the Roundtable focused on competitive sourcing results reported by Federal OIGs. Specifically, the Roundtable identified a need to verify and validate cost savings and improvements periodically during the performance period. This issue was discussed in detail with representatives from OMB’s Office of Federal Procurement Policy. OMB’s guidance for reporting competitive sourcing efforts now requires that agencies identify cost projections for each performance period.

PCIE/ECIE Homeland Security Roundtable

In June 2005, the PCIE/ECIE IGs established the Homeland Security Roundtable. The Roundtable supports the IG community’s efforts to keep our Nation safe by sharing information, identifying best practices, and working with other Government entities and external organizations. Richard L. Skinner, Inspector General, DHS, chairs the Roundtable.

The first meeting was held in July 2005. Shortly thereafter, Hurricane Katrina devastated the Gulf Coast states. The PCIE/ECIE Homeland Security Roundtable became the natural vehicle to provide oversight and stewardship of the vast funding of response and recovery efforts. Through the Roundtable, the IGs undertook one of the most aggressive, coordinated oversight efforts in the history of the Federal IG community.

In the early stages of the Federal response and recovery activities following Hurricane Katrina, the PCIE and the ECIE promptly deployed more than 400 auditors, inspectors, and investigators to the Gulf Coast region to ensure that:

- Federal response and recovery funds were spent appropriately,
- Those attempting to defraud the Government were brought to justice, and
- Those responsible for the relief efforts are wise stewards in their efforts to assist those who were so significantly affected by the hurricanes and their aftermath.
IG representatives from 22 Federal agencies involved in hurricane relief have been working to ensure that:

1. Agency internal controls are in place to prevent fraud, waste, and abuse,
2. Inspector General investigative activities are coordinated with the Department of Justice’s Hurricane Katrina Fraud Task Force,
3. Agency stewardship plans for hurricane relief activities are in place and operating as intended, and
4. The Inspector General community is executing its hurricane relief oversight efforts in a coordinated fashion in order that its resources are utilized as efficiently and effectively as possible.

The total number of contracts awarded for hurricane relief efforts as of September 30, 2005, was more than 4,000, with a total dollar value of approximately $8.0 billion. In many cases, otherwise routine contract actions were legally bypassed in order to commit contractors to begin work immediately. As a result, some contracts may lack clear and definitive work statements, independent cost estimates, and various levels of competition, relying in many cases on an environment of good faith between agencies and contractors. The work of IGs became one of arbiter in contract reviews and management and a real-time deterrent in their field offices along the Gulf Coast against those contractors who might have improperly discharged their contract responsibilities during the crisis. The IGs have concentrated on large-dollar-value procurements, in an effort to ensure that contract requirements were well defined and contract payments were justified and supportable.

The PCIE/ECIE established the Individual Assistance/Housing subgroup to ensure efficient and effective use of relief resources. More than 2.5 million applications have been completed for individual disaster assistance. The large number of Federal agencies involved with providing assistance called for oversight efforts to be coordinated.

The subgroup has engaged the Government Accountability Office and various Federal IGs to exchange information on a periodic basis and to establish partnerships, where practical, to address cross-agency issues. For example, the DHS OIG is working in close partnership with the Housing and Urban Development OIG and the Small Business Administration OIG in on going efforts to identify potential duplication-of-benefits issues associated with rental assistance, travel trailers/mobile homes, sheltering, hotel/motel evacuees, and apartment leases.

**Government Performance and Results Act Roundtable**

The PCIE Government Performance and Result Act (GPRA) Roundtable was chaired by Nikki Tinsley, Inspector General, EPA. The Committee led a project to establish an electronic library of OIG policies, procedures, strategic plans, performance reports, and performance standards from OIGs. The purpose of the library is to create an easily accessible repository of shared products, processes, information, and approaches. This resource improves efficiency by reducing duplication in developing the products that most OIGs use.

The Roundtable also presented several programs featuring congressional staff members, GAO officials, and a member of the Mercatus Center (education research, and outreach program at George Mason University) Roundtable topics focused on best practices in agencies as well as opportunities and expectations for OIGs to serve their respective agencies and the public in performance measurement and reporting.

**Misconduct in Research Working Group**

The PCIE/ECIE Misconduct in Research Working Group (MIRWG) provides an OIG forum comprising agencies that fund research. The group also leads Federal OIGs’ efforts to address the growing problem of research misconduct. MIRWG members provide guidance about assessing agency research misconduct policies, the practical use of plagiarism detection software, and related matters. Dr. Christine C. Boesz, Inspector General, NSF, chairs the group.

The MIRWG met twice this year to report on the status of individual agencies’ efforts to establish research misconduct policies and to discuss individual cases. Specifically, the group (1) completed guidance for handling research misconduct cases with fraud elements, (2) reviewed data showing that at least one-third of all scientists engage in inappropriate scientific behaviors, and (3) examined an instance of research misconduct that was successfully pursued as a fraud case by DOJ. The group also reviewed a USDA OIG audit of USDA’s efforts to implement a research misconduct policy. Several other agencies have expressed interest in initiating similar efforts.
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