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Results at a Glance

In fiscal year 2007, more than 12,000 employees at 64 federal Offices of Inspector General conducted audits, inspections, evaluations, and investigations. These activities help promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in government operations and help detect and deter waste, fraud, and abuse. OIG activities resulted in:

$11.4 billion in potential savings from audit recommendations;
$5.1 billion from investigative recoveries and receivables;
6,805 indictments and criminal informations;
8,961 successful criminal prosecutions;
1,277 successful civil actions;
4,296 suspensions or debarments;
5,807 personnel actions;
309,561 hotline complaints processed;
7,080 audit, inspection, and evaluation reports issued; and
33,740 investigations closed.
A Progress Report
to the President
Fiscal Year 2007
The Inspector General (IG) Act of 1978, as amended, established independent and objective units within most Federal departments and agencies, and placed accountability professionals at the vanguard of many of the important challenges facing our government. This year’s report highlights key accomplishments of the IG community in ensuring the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of government operations and deterring fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement.

As discussed in this report, during fiscal year 2007, Offices of Inspector General (OIGs) identified potential dollar savings from audits, investigations, evaluations, and inspections, and successfully prosecuted individuals and entities who threaten government integrity and public trust. The IG community also continued to commit a substantial portion of its resources to auditing agency financial statements. Taken collectively, this effort is one of the largest financial statement audit engagements ever undertaken. Similarly, OIGs played a key role in performing annual evaluations of agency information system security and privacy protection. Finally, by identifying and helping their agencies address management and performance challenges, OIGs fostered accountability and transparency.

This year our report also focuses on the many collaborative efforts of IGs across the government, particularly those instances where IGs help fellow IGs in the true sense and spirit of “community.” By joining forces to tackle issues of mutual concern, we have leveraged resources to better address current problems and proactively prevent future ones. We recognize that the work of safeguarding public resources is not limited to the Federal IG community alone. In that regard, our report references some of the many contributions of our partners, dedicated public servants who perform the critical missions of our nation and share our commitment to good government.

As we approach the 30th anniversary of the IG Act in October 2008, it is fitting to thank the more than 12,000 dedicated members of the OIG workforce for their enduring commitment to the IG mission. We also appreciate the support of our agency management and the Congress. Much work has been done, but more remains, and we look forward to new challenges in the coming year.

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

Christine C. Boesz
Vice Chair
Executive Council on Integrity and Efficiency
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Nearly 30 years ago, the Congress passed the Inspector General Act of 1978 (IG Act). In doing so, the IG Act consolidated the audit and investigative functions in 12 Cabinet-level agencies under their respective Inspector General (IG). The IGs became independent forces for promoting economy, efficiency, and effectiveness, while detecting and preventing fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement in their agency’s programs. As independent “agents of positive change” within their respective agencies, Offices of Inspector General (OIG) seek to prevent problems before they materialize.

The IG Act established a dual reporting responsibility, whereby OIGs report both to the head of their respective agencies and to the Congress. This unique relationship provides the legislative safety net that protects IG independence and objectivity. The IGs’ semiannual reports to the Congress, which summarize the OIG’s most significant recent reports and management’s action on significant IG recommendations, are examples of this reporting responsibility.

In those early years, OIGs had a quick and significant impact in helping agencies repair serious and widespread internal control weaknesses and enhance efficiency and effectiveness. Recognizing the OIGs’ effectiveness, the Congress has amended the IG Act several times to include IGs in most agencies of the Federal government. The 1988 amendment established IGs in certain independent agencies, corporations, and other Federal entities.

Today, 64 IGs provide audit and investigative oversight across government. Depending on their agency, Inspectors General are either nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, or are appointed by their agency head. They are selected on the basis of personal integrity and professional expertise in accounting, auditing, financial analysis, law, management analysis, public administration, or investigations.

Shortly after the enactment of the IG Act, the President, through Executive Order 12301, *Integrity and Efficiency in Federal Programs*, created the President’s Council on Integrity and Efficiency (PCIE) to provide a forum for the presidentially appointed, Senate-confirmed IGs to work together and coordinate their professional activities. In May 1992, Executive Order 12805 reconstituted the PCIE and created the Executive Council on Integrity and Efficiency (ECIE) for the agency-appointed IGs to work together and coordinate their professional activities. Senior officials from other selected agencies are also members of both Councils.

The PCIE and ECIE provide government-wide coordination of, and focus on, the activities of the OIGs. The Deputy Director for Management of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) chairs both the PCIE and ECIE and reports to the President on the Councils’ activities. An IG, representing the members of that Council, serves as the Vice Chair of that particular Council and manages its day-to-day activities. An Executive Council, comprised of selected IGs, provides corporate leadership and long-term planning. The PCIE, in conjunction with the ECIE, maintains seven standing committees to examine important issues and assist the Councils in their ongoing efforts to promote integrity, accountability, and excellence in government.

A more complete discussion of the PCIE and ECIE can be found in Appendix A; a listing of PCIE and ECIE members can be found in Appendix D.
As we reflect on the fiscal year (FY) 2007 activities of the 64 Federal OIGs, several basic themes emerge. First, in carrying out their mission, individual OIGs achieved impressive results within their own agencies and in partnership with agency management to address issues of national and international significance. Second, the OIGs successfully met common challenges as they conducted work pursuant to several significant statutory mandates, among those the Chief Financial Officers (CFO) Act, Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002 (FISMA), and the Reports Consolidation Act of 2000. Third, in addition to individual OIG successes, OIGs benefited greatly from collaborating with one another to successfully pursue issues of common interest. In countless instances, OIGs joined forces and leveraged their expertise to tackle issues crossing agency boundaries and had a stronger impact than they might have had if working alone. And finally, in the interest of enhancing the efficiency, effectiveness, and quality of their own internal operations, OIGs from across the government engaged in various activities, including information sharing and best practices exchanges, working groups, and other learning forums.

The sections that follow summarize the community’s activities and accomplishments during the year and provide examples of the collaborative working relationships we pursued to better fulfill our IG mission government-wide.

Producing Results

During FY 2007, Federal OIGs provided the independent oversight of trillions of dollars in Federal programs and operations. These programs include health care, transportation, homeland security, national defense, agriculture, housing, information security, and many more too numerous to detail. Such programs provide taxpayers and others with government services that they need and have come to expect.

The Congress created OIGs to oversee the operations and activities of their agencies to ensure the accountability of government dollars and performance. OIGs accomplish their oversight roles and responsibilities in many ways. Specifically, they conduct audits, investigations, inspections, evaluations, and other reviews that allow
them to promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in government operations and help detect and deter fraud, waste, and abuse. During FY 2007, IG community efforts accounted for over $16.5 billion in potential savings from agency action on current and prior recommendations as well as investigative recoveries and receivables.

Over the past fiscal year, OIGs conducted audits of their agencies’ programs, operations, and activities and, as appropriate, oversaw and reviewed related audit work performed by outside parties. These audits identified inefficiencies and ineffectiveness in government programs and operations and offered many non-monetary recommendations for management improvements.

The IG Act requires that OIG audits 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. These standards also provide that OIGs generally share report drafts with their agencies and respond to agency comments in final reports.

During FY 2007, the OIGs collectively issued over 6,500 audit reports and testified before the Congress about 130 times. OIG reports generally provide agency management with recommendations for improving management practices and procedures, better using agency funds, and questioning the actual spending of funds. Agency management either agrees or disagrees with these recommendations. For this fiscal year, agency management agreed to $11.4 billion in potential savings from these audit recommendations.

Under the IG Act, OIGs are authorized to investigate criminal matters and civil or administrative wrongdoing involving their agencies’ programs and operations. During FY 2007, OIGs closed 33,740 investigations. The most frequent subjects of OIG investigations include benefit recipients, contractors, grantees, and Federal employees. The PCIE and ECIE have developed guidelines for OIG investigations that help ensure their professional quality and integrity.

Investigative work often involves several law enforcement agencies working the same case. OIGs typically conduct cases with other OIGs, other Federal law enforcement agencies, and state or local law enforcement entities. This investigative work results in criminal indictments and informations, criminal prosecutions, and successfully resolved civil actions. Some results of the OIGs’ investigative work, such as personnel actions and recommendations for suspensions and debarments, go to agency management for their consideration and final resolution. In total, the investigative recoveries and receivables that stem from this investigative work done during FY 2007 amount to about $5.1 billion.

---

CONNECTING TO THE IG COMMUNITY

IGnet, the Federal Inspectors General Web site, is the most readily available link to the IG community. In addition to its role as a central repository for key PCIE, ECIE, and OIG reports, statistics, publications, related legislation, and other information, IGnet serves as a springboard to electronically connect with the Federal OIGs and the issues they are addressing. IGnet also houses links to the work of the Councils’ committees and working groups. The Web site can be reached at www.ignet.gov.
Although the IG Act does not require OIGs to establish inspection and evaluation components, the statute provides 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 the conduct and reporting of OIG inspections and evaluations. During FY 2007, OIGs issued nearly 550 inspection and evaluation reports.

Most OIGs operate dedicated, toll-free hotlines that receive complaints of fraud, waste, and abuse in their respective agencies. Complaints received through the hotlines often generate OIG criminal cases and civil or administrative actions. During FY 2007, OIGs processed nearly 310,000 complaints and allegations received through their hotlines. Appendix D, the PCIE and ECIE member directories, provides OIG hotline contact information.

Table 1 provides a summary of the IG community’s statistical accomplishments over the last year. Taken together, these statistics offer an objective measure of the collective, government-wide impact of OIGs. Appendix B presents these productivity indicators in an overall context by providing a 5-year running total for each reporting category.

### Table 1. FY 2007 Performance Profile: Summary of Combined IG Community Accomplishments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations Agreed to by Management: Funds For Better Use</td>
<td>$7,313,756,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations Agreed to by Management: Questioned Costs</td>
<td>$4,087,941,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative Recoveries and Receivables</td>
<td>$5,122,754,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful Criminal Prosecutions</td>
<td>8,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indictments and Criminal Informations</td>
<td>6,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful Civil Actions</td>
<td>1,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspensions and Debarments</td>
<td>4,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Actions</td>
<td>5,807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responding to Statutory Mandates

OIGs share a common interest in addressing several key statutory requirements. Efforts undertaken in this regard serve to unify the community as the OIGs work with a common purpose to carry out the statutory mandates. Two significant IG responsibilities include the financial statement audits of their agencies and evaluations conducted pursuant to FISMA. Additionally, most OIGs are responsible under the Reports Consolidation Act of 2000 for identifying the most significant management and performance challenges facing their agencies. Agencies, in turn, include the OIGs’ assessments in their annual performance and accountability reports. As discussed below, during FY 2007, Federal OIGs met these responsibilities and, in so doing, devoted substantial resources to the efforts; called agency attention to significant financial, information security, and other matters; and worked closely with their agency management to seek solutions.

OIGs Play Key Role in Government Financial Statement Audit Work

In line with the CFO Act, OIGs across the government undertook the arduous task of ensuring their agency financial statements were audited. Taken together, during FY 2007, over 600 OIG staff performed such work, along with
contractor resources, representing an effort totaling more than $179 million. In conducting such work, OIG auditors and the contractors they oversee are key in helping to ensure that the Federal government’s financial information and reporting is transparent, valid, and useful to agency decision-makers and other stakeholders.

As OMB reported in January 2008, for the third year in a row, all major Federal agencies successfully met the 45-day financial audit deadline as required by the rigorous reporting guidelines set by OMB. Such a deadline results in more immediate availability of financial information to agency decision-makers and requires agencies to employ rigorous disciplines throughout the year to ensure readiness for year-end reporting.

The results from FY 2007 indicate that the Federal government continues to improve the validity of its financial information. Specifically, of the 24 major Federal agencies, 19 received clean opinions, equaling the number of clean opinions reported in FY 2006. The total number of material weaknesses government-wide declined from 41 to 39.

As OMB pointed out in summarizing the government-wide financial statement audit results, the decrease in weaknesses this year is more notable in light of recent changes to government auditing standards that lower materiality thresholds and have the effect of characterizing more audit findings as material weaknesses. So, while auditing standards are getting tougher, Federal agencies are more than keeping pace by continuing to decrease the number of material weaknesses.

The area of financial management and performance has been identified over the years by many agencies as a significant management challenge. The IG community remains committed to helping improve financial audits and has been working with OMB and the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) to develop processes and procedures to ensure timely audit opinions, help agencies produce useful financial information, and improve agency financial and internal control systems. One such effort was jointly sponsoring with GAO the fifth annual Federal Financial Accounting and Auditing Update Conference, also known as the GAO/PCIE Roundtable, which included speakers from OMB, GAO, the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board, and a number of representatives from the Federal CFO and IG communities. In another case, the community worked with OMB to update financial audit guidance and with GAO to revise the GAO/PCIE Financial Audit Manual. This manual is used by Federal auditors and independent public accounting firms to perform financial statement audits of Federal entities in accordance with professional standards.

In a related vein, OMB issued the revised PCIE/CFO Council’s Best Practice Guide for Coordinating the Preparation and Audit of Federal Financial Statements. The document, which was originally published in 2001, fosters constructive working relationships between CFOs and OIGs, which in turn leads to improved financial management.

OIGs Address Information Security and Privacy Issues through FISMA Work

FISMA requires Federal agencies to have an annual independent evaluation performed of their information security program and practices and to report the results of the evaluation to OMB. During FY 2007, approximately 375 OIG staff were involved in FISMA evaluations of their agencies, reflecting a $12.2 million investment of resources. An additional expenditure of $8.5 million for contractor support of these efforts equates to a total investment of
$20.7 million by the IG community to evaluate agency information security and privacy programs.

In OIG reports communicating FISMA results, many OIGs credit their agencies for taking specific actions to improve their information security and privacy programs and practices and comply with FISMA, National Institute of Standards and Technology, OMB, and other applicable requirements. However, in most instances, OIGs point out areas where additional actions and improvements are needed to better ensure the confidentiality, integrity, and availability of information systems and the effectiveness of privacy programs and practices. Such areas include, for example, access controls, configuration management, certification and accreditation, security awareness and training, protection of personally identifiable information, incident detection, and contingency plan testing.

As discussed below, information security is a top management and performance challenge across the government and will continue to be a priority area for OIGs into the future. To ensure the community’s readiness to evaluate and report on agency progress, the PCIE and ECIE work to make sure OIG staff have the necessary skills, training, and technical expertise to perform quality work under this requirement. Examples illustrating the community’s commitment to strong oversight of information security and privacy issues are found elsewhere in this report.

OIGs Identify Top Management and Performance Challenges Facing Our Nation

Annually, the PCIE and ECIE identify and report the top management and performance challenges in our Progress Report to the President. The identified challenges highlight high-risk activities and performance issues that impact agency operations or strategic goals.

During FY 2007, the OIG community identified six common management and performance challenges facing their agencies. A table showing individual OIG reporting on these challenges appears as Appendix C; a brief discussion of the significance of each area follows:

Homeland Security and Disaster Preparedness. One of the most critical challenges facing the Federal government is combating terrorism and preparing for the unexpected. Initiatives underway include border security, transportation security, identity theft protection, continuity of operations planning, limiting bioterrorism threats, and infrastructure protection.

Information Technology Management and Security. The Federal government relies on approximately 11,000 information systems to manage its programs and operations and carry out its critical missions. Information technology is a significant management challenge for most Federal agencies, and is currently the primary challenge at a number of agencies.

Financial Management and Performance. Federal agencies have historically faced challenges providing timely, accurate, and useful financial information and managing for results. Effective budget and performance integration has become even more critical for results-oriented management and efficient allocation of scarce resources among competing needs.

Human Capital Management. Ensuring a competent, well-trained, and motivated workforce remains a critical challenge across government. This challenge continues to intensify as employees in key positions increasingly become eligible to retire, are lost through attrition, or migrate to other business opportunities.
Performance Management and Accountability. Reliable performance information is critical to making informed decisions and achieving the maximum public benefit. Agencies continue to face challenges in establishing and measuring the results-oriented goals through the Program Assessment Rating Tool initiative, which assesses the strengths and weaknesses of various agency programs.

Procurement and Grant Management. Procurement, contracts, and grants historically have been areas subject to fraud and waste throughout the government, and effectively managing them is a continuing challenge. Poor oversight, lax controls, and fraudulent billing schemes are just a few examples of the Federal government’s vulnerability to procurement, contract, and grant fraud.

While OIGs identified common challenges, it is important to note that OIGs also identify management and performance challenges unique to their agencies. Table 2 shows agency challenges cited by various OIGs.

In highlighting these areas for their agency management’s attention, OIGs demonstrate their individual commitments to partnering with and helping their agencies address mission-critical programs and operations and successfully achieve their agency’s goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Examples of Agency-Specific Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Aeronautics and Space Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Archives and Records Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Personnel Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Postal Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collaborating for Success

During FY 2007, OIGs across the government and throughout the country came together in conducting joint audits, investigations, evaluations, inspections, and other activities. Such efforts sometimes involved two or more OIGs and other partners like state and local law enforcement or audit organizations, GAO, OMB, and Congressional parties. Other times, large groups from a number of OIGs convened for meetings or symposiums to take action or share information on pressing issues. In all cases, these efforts reflect the community’s overarching responsibility under the IG Act to promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in government programs and operations, and to detect and prevent fraud, waste, and abuse to ensure integrity throughout the government.

Taken together, and as illustrated in the representative examples that follow, these activities attest to the community’s focus and far-reaching impact on critical issues affecting the American people. These issues include contracting, disaster recovery, efforts abroad, employment, health services, housing, information security, and veterans affairs.

Contracting

Multi-Million Dollar Bribery Scheme: As a result of an extensive collaborative effort, a Federal grand jury in the U.S. District Court, Western District of Texas, indicted six individuals in connection with a multi-million dollar bribery scheme centered on fixing U.S. government contracts for work at the U.S. Army Medical Department located at Fort Sam Houston. The defendants allegedly committed acts of bribery, kickbacks, disclosure, and fraud to ensure that a company owned by one of the defendants ultimately received the contracts. During the period of the scheme, the defendants allegedly corrupted more than $18 million in Federal contracts. Involved in the investigation were the Department of Interior (DOI) OIG, General Services Administration (GSA) OIG, Department of Defense (DOD) IG Defense Criminal Investigative Service (DCIS), Small Business Administration (SBA) OIG, Department of Justice (DOJ), Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), Internal Revenue Service (IRS) Criminal Investigations Division (CID), and Department of the Army Criminal Investigation Command.

Metal Distribution Company Contractor Fraud: The Department of Energy (DOE) OIG, National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) OIG, Department of Transportation (DOT) OIG, DOD IG DCIS, and Air Force Office of Special Investigations collaborated as a task force to substantiate allegations that owners and employees of a metal distribution company orchestrated a company-wide scheme to provide fraudulent test certifications and substandard metals to the government and its contractors in the defense, nuclear, and aerospace industry. The two owners of
the company were sentenced to a total of 51 months’ incarceration, 4 years’ supervised release, and assessed $397,360 in restitution and fines. Also, five individuals pled guilty to multiple counts, including false statements, false claims, and conspiracy. The company and its owners have been debarred from government contracting for 3 years, and the company’s employees were suspended indefinitely pending debarment action.

**Kickbacks and Fraudulent Contracting Practices:**

The GSA OIG Northeast and Caribbean Regional Investigations Office led a joint criminal investigation with the DOD IG DCIS, the IRS CID, and the Department of the Army Criminal Investigations Command related to irregularities in the award of information technology contracts by the Department of the Army using the GSA/Federal Technology Service’s (FTS) Multiple Award Schedule contract program.

The investigation uncovered a scheme involving the award of over $800,000 in phony GSA/FTS Multiple Award Schedule contracts funded by the Department of the Army to a woman-owned small business by a senior Department of the Army contracting official and the Deputy Director of a regional GSA FTS office. The investigation resulted in the indictment and felony convictions of the Army and GSA contracting officials and the GSA FTS official’s daughter, all of whom were sentenced to incarceration and restitution. The owner of the small, woman-owned business consented to a civil forfeiture as a result of the investigation.

**The Lower Manhattan Construction Integrity Team:** This team seeks to ensure that funds dedicated for construction in Lower Manhattan are used for their intended purpose. Founded in early 2004, the working group is comprised of Federal, state, and local OIGs and other oversight agencies. The group was proactively established in recognition of the large fraud risks inherent in the unprecedented situation of contemporaneous mega- and large-scale capital projects in a very compact area of New York City, post 9-11. These projects include, but are not limited to, several major transportation projects. The DOT Federal Transit Administration has oversight of $4.55 billion in projects in Lower Manhattan that several different grantee agencies handle. The group established a number of fraud prevention measures, including an active fraud hotline and online complaint process; standards recommending background screening for contractor staff; fraud awareness training; and processes for vetting potential contractors. DOT OIG is a founding member of the team; Department of Labor (DOL) and Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) OIGs are also involved in these activities.

**Disaster Recovery**

**Federal Response to 2005 Gulf Coast Hurricanes:**

In response to the Gulf Coast hurricanes in 2005, the IG community launched an aggressive, coordinated oversight effort to ensure that Federal response and recovery funds were spent appropriately. These efforts are being coordinated through the PCIE Homeland Security Roundtable chaired by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) IG. Examples include the following:

DHS OIG established a Gulf Coast recovery program in five locations throughout the Gulf Coast region to coordinate Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) fraud investigations. Working with the U.S. Attorney’s office, FBI, HUD OIG,
SBA OIG, IRS CID, Postal Inspection Service, and others, hundreds of arrests and recoveries were made. As part of this anti-fraud initiative, a joint disaster hotline was established in Baton Rouge, LA, which receives, documents, and disburses complaints nationwide to participating OIGs, other Federal agencies, and state and local law enforcement entities to combat the fraud, waste, and abuse stemming from Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. As of the end of FY 2007, the Hurricane Katrina Fraud Task Force had handled nearly 17,000 complaints.

For its part, HUD OIG’s Gulf Coast Region has been working jointly with Federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies to prevent, detect, and combat fraud, waste, and abuse of HUD program disaster funds in the Gulf for relief of the victims of Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Wilma. HUD OIG’s collaborative efforts with other OIGs have detected and prevented waste, fraud, and abuse of HUD disaster funds, FEMA disaster funds, and other Federal agency disaster funds in the Gulf Coast. Examples include subjects pleading guilty to making false statements and claims, theft of government funds, unauthorized acquisition of food stamps, embezzlement, and mail fraud.

In addition, DOL OIG investigations involving fraudulent claims for Unemployment Insurance and Disaster Unemployment Assistance benefits have resulted in over 75 indictments and 40 convictions. DOL OIG continues to concentrate on labor racketeering schemes that were initially directed at debris removal and currently involve reconstruction.

Finally, the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) OIG is auditing all HHS hurricane-related contractual procurements over $100,000. As of August 31, 2007, HHS OIG issued 51 audit reports with an audited value of $79.5 million. Of the 51 reports, 48 concluded that the awarding agencies had complied with procurement requirements. The remaining three reports had administrative findings. HHS OIG also audited costs billed to the largest contract awarded by HHS to assist hurricane victims. This contract provided $21 million to transport returning evacuees requiring en route medical care. The audit found that $2 million of the $5.8 million in costs billed did not fully comply with the contract terms.

Education

Audits of Schools and Libraries Program: The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) OIG collaborated with the Department of Education (ED) and DOI OIGs to conduct audits of entities receiving funds from the FCC’s Universal Service Fund Schools and Libraries program—in New York City and in Indian schools and territories. ED OIG audited funding received by the New York City Department of Education. DOI OIG performed several audits at Indian schools and territories. FCC OIG provided funding, training, and audit guidance. ED OIG identified unsupported costs of more than $47 million and more than $570,000 in unallowable costs. DOI’s work resulted in over $2.9 million in unsupported costs. Efforts are underway to recover misspent funds.

LONG-STANDING FOCUS ON IG INTEGRITY

The IG community takes seriously allegations of misconduct in our own offices. To address such allegations, the Integrity Committee, formalized by Executive Order 12993, in March 1996, was created to receive and review allegations of misconduct against IGs and certain staff members, and ensure that these allegations are appropriately and expeditiously reviewed, and where appropriate, investigated and resolved.

The Integrity Committee is a fact-finding committee that presents its findings to the PCIE and ECIE Chair. Kenneth W. Kaiser, Assistant Director, Criminal Investigative Division, FBI, chaired the Integrity Committee during FY 2007. The other Committee members, as defined by the Executive Order, included the Director of the Office of Government Ethics; Special Counsel of the United States; and three IGs representing the PCIE and ECIE. The Chief of the Public Integrity Section of DOJ’s Criminal Division, or his designee, serves as an advisor.
Efforts Abroad

Interagency Assessments of U.S. Programs in Afghanistan: OIGs from the Department of State and Broadcasting Board of Governors (DOS) and DOD collaborated to evaluate the U.S. government effort to train and develop the Afghan National Police. The assessment focused on the plans and programs in place for training the police and an examination of the effectiveness of coordination and cooperation between those DOS and DOD organizations responsible for developing, implementing, and conducting police training. The assessment judged that the U.S.-funded program to train and equip the police was generally well-conceived and well-executed; however, additional action will be required to institutionalize the police force and establish a self-sustaining program.

In another assessment, DOJ OIG joined the DOS and DOD OIGs to assess the counternarcotics programs in Afghanistan that are funded, directed, managed, or contracted by DOJ, DOS, and DOD, and to evaluate the overall effectiveness of U.S. strategy, management structure, and interagency cooperation and coordination. The DOD and DOS OIGs issued a joint report assessing both the strengths and weaknesses of the government’s role in the counternarcotics program in Afghanistan and provided recommendations for program improvements.

Collaborative Learning Opportunities for Iraqi IGs: The Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction (SIGIR) has offered opportunities for Iraqi IGs and their staffs to collaborate on inspections of relief and reconstruction projects. SIGIR representatives have met with the IGs of the Iraqi Ministry of Defense, Ministry of Oil, and Ministry of Municipalities and Public Works to discuss collaborative assessments involving ongoing and completed relief and reconstruction projects. The benefits of such efforts are two-way and include familiarization and on-the-job training of Iraqi IGs’ inspections staffs and feedback to SIGIR on any concerns with U.S.-funded relief and reconstruction projects.

The International Contract Corruption Task Force, Joint Operations Center: U.S. funding in support of the Global War on Terrorism and reconstruction efforts has been susceptible to corruption and fraud by government employees and contractors at the individual and corporate level. The mission of the Joint Operations Center is to provide operational, intelligence, and logistical support and coordination to ongoing investigations and deployed agents supporting the task force. These investigations involve matters regarding corruption and contract fraud related to the U.S. government war and reconstruction efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the Global War on Terrorism. The Joint Operations Center is serving as a force multiplier in the investigation and prosecution of corruption and contract fraud. Participants include the SIGIR, DOD IG DCIS, DOS OIG, U.S. Agency for International Development (AID) OIG, FBI, and Department of the Army Criminal Investigation Command Major Procurement Fraud Unit.

Employment

Illegal Immigrants’ Alleged Use of False Identities: The GSA and DOL OIGs, assisted by the Social Security Administration (SSA) OIG and Immigration and Customs Enforcement, investigated allegations of illegal immigrants who used false identification to gain employment as subcontractors working on Federal construction renovation projects. Having illegal, undocumented aliens work on such Federal projects could impact security and violates GSA contract requirements and Federal labor laws. As a result of the effort, there have been 10 arrests of illegal aliens, with criminal prosecutions anticipated and possible prosecution of the company that hired them.

Illegal Labor Conspiracy: A joint investigation by the OIGs from DOL, DHS, and SSA, and Immigration and Customs Enforcement of the president of a national air cargo company uncovered a conspiracy to permit hundreds of undocumented workers to illegally obtain jobs and circumvent the foreign labor certification program. The scheme involved encouraging, inducing, and aiding and abetting illegal immigrants to reside or remain in the United States for commercial advantage or private financial gain by the company owner and others. The president was sentenced to
incarceration and ordered to forfeit illegal proceeds of $12 million and interest in land and property.

Energy

Improper Sale of Equipment Restricted for Government Use: A joint task force investigation by the DOE OIG, DOD IG DCIS, Food and Drug Administration, and FBI substantiated allegations that a DOE courier had sold Department equipment restricted for use by government, law enforcement, and military personnel. Couriers are responsible for moving nuclear weapons, special nuclear material, selected non-nuclear weapons components, limited-life components, and other materials requiring secure transport. The subject was sentenced to 30 months’ incarceration and 3 years’ supervised release and was ordered to pay restitution and fines. His employment was subsequently terminated.

Financial Services

Financial Regulatory Agency Emerging Issues Symposium: The Department of the Treasury (Treasury), the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC), the Federal Reserve Board (FRB), and the National Credit Union Administration (NCUA) OIGs co-hosted the fifth annual symposium on emerging issues in banking. This year’s theme was Consumer, Credit, and Capital Issues in a Changing Economy. Much of the focus was the subprime mortgage crisis. Presenters included FRB’s Director of Consumer and Community Affairs, FDIC’s Chief Economist, and a panel on emerging risks as seen by senior supervisory officials from the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Office of Thrift Supervision, FDIC, and FRB. The symposium also featured a panel on congressional perspectives with staff from the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs. The symposium provided an opportunity for up-to-date information sharing on risk areas and training for over 150 personnel from 10 different Federal agencies, including GAO.

Food Safety

Customs and Border Protection’s Agricultural Inspection Activities: The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) OIG and DHS OIG collaborated to conduct an audit to assess how well U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) communicated and cooperated with USDA on issues relating to agricultural inspection policies and procedures, complied with established procedures for agricultural inspections of passengers and cargo, and accurately tracked agricultural inspection activities. The audit also assessed the effectiveness of USDA’s Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service in providing CBP with the necessary policy and procedural guidance to perform agricultural inspection activities. CBP generally conducted agricultural inspection activities in compliance with procedures at ports visited; however, improvements were needed in operational areas at the ports of entry.
Grants Management

National Single Audit Sampling Project: Under the auspices of the PCIE Audit Committee, the IG community launched a government-wide initiative in November 2004 to assess the quality of annual single audits performed by state auditors or independent public accountants and required by the Single Audit Act of 1984. A number of Federal agencies had raised concerns about these audits, which report on billions of dollars in Federal grants each year. The project was overseen by an advisory board representing six Federal OIGs—HHS, HUD, ED, DOL, DOT, and the National Science Foundation (NSF)—OMB, and three state auditors. In June 2007, the IG community issued its Report on National Single Audit Sampling Project on the quality of annual audits. This report established that improvements in performance of these single audits are needed. Implementation of the recommendations in this report is expected to have a significant impact on future performance of these audits and enhance the enforcement process when they are substandard.

Health Services

Health Services

Medicare Fraud: A joint investigation uncovered a scheme in which a former Federal Bureau of Prisons physician, a former physician assistant, and three civilians established a medical clinic in Hialeah, Florida, and used the clinic to defraud the Medicare program. The clinic fraudulently billed Medicare for HIV infusion therapy treatment that it was not actually providing. The clinic received approximately $2 million in fraudulent Medicare proceeds. The former physician was sentenced to 3 years’ imprisonment and 3 years’ supervised release for conspiracy to commit healthcare fraud, and was ordered to pay a fine and restitution. The others involved pled guilty and await sentencing. The DOJ OIG’s Miami Field Office, HHS OIG, Florida Department of Law Enforcement, and the FBI collaborated on this case.

Joint Review of Research Process: In a review done jointly with HHS OIG, the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) OIG reviewed a complaint alleging that six individuals were members of one particular VA research merit review subcommittee and several National Institutes of Health review panels, and in several instances reviewed each others’ proposals despite real or apparent conflicts of interest. VA OIG substantiated that researchers named in the complaint had certain professional and personal relationships. However, VA's policies do not define personal or professional relationships constituting a conflict of interest in terms applicable to peer review and do not specify the extent and nature of the Veteran Health Administration’s responsibility to identify these conflicts. VA OIG recommended changes in the Veteran Health Administration policies regarding conflicts of interest and ethics to better ensure integrity of the review process.

The presentation is posted at www.grants.gov, a comprehensive Web site managed by HHS, which allows applicants to apply for and ultimately manage grant funds online.
Improper Pharmaceutical Company Activities: An investigation worked jointly by the HHS OIG and VA OIG determined that a pharmaceutical company had improperly promoted several of its drugs for uses that were not approved by the Food and Drug Administration and had offered or paid kickbacks to physicians to prescribe those drugs. A sales subsidiary of the company pled guilty to conspiracy to make false statements. The sales subsidiary was sentenced to pay a $180 million criminal fine and a special assessment fee, in addition to a $255 million civil settlement that the subsidiary, along with the company, agreed to pay as part of a $435 million settlement agreement that was signed with DOJ.

Housing

“Operation Rain Check”: The HUD and SSA OIGs initiated a multi-defendant, proactive fraud investigation covering a number of geographic locations in Michigan. The two OIGs compared potential Social Security fraud subjects with HUD’s Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher tenant lists to determine whether the subjects involved in Social Security fraud were also underreporting their income to HUD. Agents examined whether or not the tenant reported the income earned from supplemental Social Security checks that were fraudulently requested and subsequently cashed. Agents then added the amount of the fraudulent checks to the tenant’s income and recalculated how the rent would have changed if the income had been accurately reported to the housing authorities as required. In several instances, the tenants failed to report this supplemental Social Security income to the housing authorities. “Operation Rain Check” has resulted in 587 individuals being charged with violations involving Social Security, Federal housing, state larceny, and fraud. So far,

CONGRESS CONTEMPLATES IG REFORM

During the 110th Congress, both the House and the Senate introduced bills to amend the Inspector General Act and enhance IG activities and operations. Congressman Jim Cooper introduced H.R. 928, Improving Government Accountability Act, in February 2007, and the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform reported the bill, as amended, in late September. In early October, the House passed the bill and referred it to the Senate for further consideration.

On the Senate side, two bills were originally introduced to address IG matters. On November 8, 2007, Senators Claire McCaskill and Susan Collins consolidated the provisions from the two original bills and introduced S. 2324, Inspector General Reform Act. The Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs reported S, 2324, as amended, in mid-November, and it is awaiting consideration by the full Senate.

The two pieces of legislation share many common provisions and include several key differences. Both bills would establish in statute a unified IG council and Integrity Committee; address IG pay, nomination, and qualification issues; and clarify items unique to IGs appointed by their agency head. The key differences in the two bills include establishing term limits and removal for cause provisions, funding for the unified council, and OIG operational issues. These operational issues involve ways of obtaining legal advice and submitting annual budgets, requirements for managing Web sites and posting reports, and production of an annual report on agency performance.
9 of these individuals have been convicted and 60 were referred for eviction.

Document and Benefit Fraud Task Force: The HUD OIG, SSA OIG, and Immigration and Customs Enforcement collaborated as part of the Document and Benefit Fraud Task Force, which was formed to identify, prosecute and/or remove from the United States undocumented aliens fraudulently obtaining benefits meant for U.S. citizens and legal immigrants. This task force assists HUD in its efforts to improve the integrity of the Single Family Insurance Program by identifying and prosecuting borrowers, loan officers, and real estate agents who defraud the Federal Housing Administration program. During the life of the task force there have been 92 indictments and 30 convictions, with 29 indictments and 23 convictions occurring in FY 2007.

Information Security

Summary Report on Protection of Sensitive Information: The PCIE Audit Committee, in conjunction with the former PCIE Information Technology Roundtable, collected and consolidated data on the IG community’s efforts in assessing agencies’ compliance with OMB Memorandum M-06-16, Protection of Sensitive Agency Information, which requires agencies to take steps to ensure that personally identifiable information and other sensitive information is protected. Fifty OIGs responded to the data call and the responses were combined into a summary report provided to OMB in October 2006.

Collaborative FISMA Evaluation: Treasury’s OIG audit organizations collaborated on the 2007 FISMA independent evaluation of the Treasury. To meet FISMA requirements, the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration (TIGTA) performs an evaluation of the effectiveness of information security at the IRS. The Treasury OIG performs this evaluation for the other, non-IRS, Treasury bureaus. For several years, the two OIG organizations have coordinated their FISMA evaluations to apply a consistent review methodology to all Treasury bureaus and to ensure uniform results that can be combined to form one consolidated independent Treasury evaluation.

Natural Resources and the Environment

Tribal Environmental Successes: An interagency team from the DOI OIG and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) OIG worked with 14 Indian tribes to identify how the tribes successfully met environmental and natural resource challenges, ranging from cleaning up hazardous waste to restoring degraded lands. The primary purpose of this unique effort was to provide models that would inspire others to successfully implement their own natural resource and environmental programs. EPA and DOI officials also could use the models to expand tribal capability and capacity in the arena of environmental program implementation. The scope and outcome of this type of approach are such that they can be applied across a broad spectrum of stakeholders, including all levels of government, tribal entities, and any other organization committed to achieving sustainable conservation and environmental protection.

Veterans Affairs

Partnering on Multiple Investigations to Address Drug Thefts: The type of case that the VA OIG most frequently works jointly with the U.S. Postal Service (USPS) OIG involves theft of drugs that VA mails to veterans. Drugs most often stolen are narcotics; however, in their search for narcotics, subjects in these cases intercept, open, and often discard packages containing non-narcotic medications. These actions cause disruption in patient care as veterans are not receiving necessary medications. The two OIGs collaborated on 43 joint investigations in FY 2007.
investigations during 2007. As a result of their efforts, numerous individuals perpetrating such crimes have been convicted and received stiff sentences.

Valuable Analytical Database of Service Members: The DOD OIG and VA OIG entered into an interagency agreement to evaluate the medical care transition process for injured Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom service members from DOD to VA. Prior to the evaluation, only a very limited quantitative characterization of care transition issues was possible using available government data. In order to describe the care transition process quantitatively, VA OIG used relevant data files from both DOD and VA sources to create an analytical database that incorporates details about all 494,147 service members discharged between July 1, 2005, and September 30, 2006. The database will be used to better understand, interpret, and address issues related to veteran care transition.

Enhancing OIG Efficiency and Effectiveness

As discussed above, while OIGs collaborate closely in carrying out the IG mission with respect to external issues of mutual concern, they take their responsibility to the IG mission seriously when it comes to their own internal operations as well. During FY 2007, in numerous instances, OIGs sought means to enhance their own economy, efficiency, and effectiveness; adopt creative approaches to their assignments; work smarter; leverage resources; develop qualified, highly trained employees and future leaders; and ensure quality and integrity in OIG operations and products. A brief discussion of examples of such endeavors follows.

Working Smarter

New Prevention Tool—Critical Point Evaluations: As a problem prevention tool, the DOI OIG has developed and shared with the IG community its concept of Critical Point Evaluations (CPEs) to focus on major DOI projects or initiatives. CPEs are proactive, limited-scope evaluations, conducted under PCIE Inspection Standards, of planned or on-going major DOI projects or initiatives, such as the acquisition of a new financial system, a large construction project, or a new cross-cutting initiative. The objective of a CPE is to identify problems that could result in wasted resources or limit project or initiative effectiveness before such consequences occur. The OIG works with a DOI project management team to identify critical decision points when CPEs should be conducted. Where possible, and to achieve maximum benefit, a member of the relevant DOI management team is included on the CPE team, together with multi-disciplined OIG staff and independent subject-matter experts.

Exchanging Best Practices: The Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) OIG led an initiative to establish a protocol for OIGs who wished to participate in a formalized best practices exchange program. The exchanges have resulted in improved processes and better office morale, but more importantly, they have enabled the participating offices to better serve their agencies and to add more value as a part of the IG community. Participating OIGs included TVA, the Smithsonian Institution, NASA, EPA, USPS, and FDIC.

Conflict of Interest and Ethics Violations Summit: HHS OIG sponsored a Conflict of Interest and Ethics Violations Summit that brought together over 200 individuals from the IG, ethics program and policy, and enforcement communities to discuss a variety of issues related to operation of government ethics programs and violations of Federal conflict of interest statutes. Participants included senior officials from HHS OIG; the Securities and Exchange Commission; Office of Government Ethics; DOJ; and the Chief Investigative Counsel, Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions. This summit resulted in an active dialogue among agencies with different roles and responsibilities related to ethics issues and provided participants with the opportunity to share best practices and experiences related to preventing, detecting, and prosecuting Federal ethics violations.
Promoting OIG Training and Development

PCIE and ECIE Conference: The PCIE and ECIE held their annual conference in April 2007, with a conference theme of Making a Difference in a Challenging World. The conference provided the members with an opportunity to look internally at their activities and think strategically about their future direction. The conference also allowed the members to collaborate on various initiatives and exchange pertinent and valuable information. The OIGs from USDA and the Federal Election Commission served as planning partners for the conference.

Leadership Development Programs: The Human Resources Committee worked with the American University’s Institute for the Study of Public Policy on an OIG-specific leadership program. Working with an OIG expert panel, the university developed a three-part, graduate-level leadership program leading to a Key Executive Leadership Certificate for OIG managers. A second leadership program offers senior OIG management teams a 2-day concentrated leadership course and team-building experience.

Instructional Program for New Auditors: The IG audit community undertook a collaborative effort to provide introductory training during FY 2007. The Introductory Training Task Force focused on basic training in professional competencies for entry-level audit personnel and a comprehensive simulated audit case study. Nearly 200 entry-level personnel from 22 Federal OIG and Defense audit organizations were trained during the year. OIGs participating on the Task Force included DOD, EPA, FDIC, ED, USDA, Treasury, NSF, and HUD.

Criminal Investigator Training: Under the oversight of the Investigations Committee, the Inspector General Criminal Investigator Academy provided required basic and refresher training to 369 members of the IG community and worked toward increasing the quality and quantity of its future course offerings. In early FY 2007, the Academy conducted a needs assessment survey to determine the training requirements of the IG community. As a result, a training program was designed to satisfy the periodic refresher training requirements specified in the Attorney General’s Guidelines for OIGs with Statutory Law Enforcement Authority and the PCIE and ECIE Quality Standards for Investigations. The Academy also established a curriculum review committee of experienced investigators from PCIE and ECIE agencies to periodically review and revise the Academy’s basic training programs.

Annual Workshop on Grant Fraud Investigations: For the past 6 years, the NSF OIG has sponsored a grant fraud forum to disseminate methods and ideas for the detection and prevention of grant fraud. Recent workshops have drawn from the expertise that resides within various OIGs and have featured speakers from the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center and other law enforcement experts. This year’s workshop attracted nearly 120 attendees from over 35 Federal agencies. The program serves as a leading source of grant fraud training and enables those who work to identify and stop grant fraud to network with one another and discuss current trends and issues.

The forum promotes the goals of the National Procurement Fraud Task Force in raising the awareness of grant fraud within the IG community.

Professional Journal: Since 1995, The Journal of Public Inquiry, a semiannual publication of the IG community, has continued to address issues and topics important to its audience. The Journal provides a forum to share professional ideas, suggest new innovations, and chronicle changes over the years. The DOD OIG
Ensuring Quality

**IG Community Peer Reviews:** *Government Auditing Standards* require that audit organizations conducting audits of Federal agencies undergo peer reviews every 3 years. The IG community has implemented a process to meet this requirement. The purpose of the peer review is to determine whether the reviewed audit organization’s internal quality control systems are adequate and provide reasonable assurance that applicable auditing standards, policies, and procedures are met. In FY 2007, 17 PCIE OIGs and 9 ECIE OIGs underwent peer reviews conducted by a fellow OIG or had such peer reviews in process at the end of the fiscal year. All completed peer reviews resulted in unmodified opinions.

Similarly, investigative peer reviews are conducted to ensure compliance with the requirements of the *Quality Standards for Investigations* and determine whether adequate internal safeguards and management procedures exist to ensure that law enforcement powers are properly exercised. During FY 2007, six OIGs underwent peer reviews and received a favorable rating. Two reviews were in process at the end of FY 2007. Both the audit and investigative communities have formed working groups to update their respective peer review guides to keep current with changes to professional standards and other applicable guidelines.

**Other Quality Assurance Efforts:** The IG community’s inspections and evaluations function does not have a formal peer review process at this time. However, on an informal basis, some inspection and evaluation units have conducted external reviews. For example, at the request of the DOS OIG, the VA and HHS OIGs performed a joint peer review of DOS’s Inspections group. Similarly, to better ensure audit quality, smaller OIGs are collaborating together, as is the case with the Federal Maritime Commission and Federal Trade Commission OIGs who provide quality assurance services for one another other, thereby ensuring independent quality control reviews at a fraction of what it would cost to contract out this function.

**Leveraging Resources**

**Assistance to New IG:** The first IG for the Export-Import Bank of the United States was confirmed by the Senate in the summer of 2007. The FDIC OIG detailed an auditor and an investigative agent to help conduct audit work and investigations for the new IG, until that office is more fully staffed. The FDIC OIG is also providing counsel support for the newly created office.

**Supporting IT Processes:** The NASA OIG provides centralized access to an electronic work papers solution for 300 VA OIG audit and inspection staff by leveraging its existing information technology infrastructure and assuring data integrity between users, groups, offices, and agencies, thus providing substantial cost savings. The NASA OIG also provides application and support services to the SIGIR Office of Investigations so that SIGIR users both in the U.S. and Baghdad, Iraq, efficiently access a Web-based investigative case management system customized for their own use by NASA OIG.

**Sharing Counsel Resources:** The Federal Housing Finance Board (FHFB) IG obtains professional legal and other related services from the FDIC OIG Counsel’s office. The FDIC IG and the FHFB IG have entered into an annual agreement for FDIC OIG Counsel to provide the services on a reimbursable basis. Because the FDIC, like FHFB, is a financial regulatory agency, sharing these services gives FHFB OIG access to lawyers with diverse experiences in legal issues relevant to FHFB OIG activities. In similar fashion, the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) and FRB provided legal consultation for the Federal Labor Relations Authority (FLRA) OIG Investigations group because the FLRA OIG does not have its own legal counsel.

**Sharing Information**

**Interagency Investigative Data Mining Working Group:** The Working Group was established to facilitate effective data mining techniques and tools.
and to share information on using data mining to facilitate investigations. Agencies participating in the work group include OIGs from NASA, DOS, ED, USPS, DOD, HUD, and NLRB; Air Force Office of Special Investigations; Naval Defense Information System Agency; and Criminal Investigative Service.

**Regional IG Activities:**
On a regular basis, OIGs come together in specific geographic locations to exchange information, discuss possible joint investigative initiatives, and develop joint training programs. In the case of the Chicago IG Council, for example, some 17 Federal OIGs regularly participate, including HHS, VA, ED, DHS, DOJ, HUD, DOL, USDA, EPA, SSA, GSA, SBA, TIGTA, USPS, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Railroad Retirement Board, and Amtrak. The OIGs from the State of Illinois and Chicago are regular participants. The U.S. Attorney’s Office for the Northern District of Illinois and the FBI also regularly participate. As another example, Federal OIGs and senior officials from U.S. Attorneys’ Offices in New Jersey convene regularly as part of the New Jersey Government Fraud Task Force.

**Federal Regulatory IG Working Group:** Several years ago, the financial regulatory IGs determined that because they share similar missions and face common challenges in carrying out the IG mission at their agencies, it would be beneficial to meet monthly to engage in dialogue, exchange information, share best practices, and contemplate joint efforts. This practice of monthly meetings has continued over the years. Financial regulatory Inspectors General are from FRB, FDIC, FHFB, NCUA, Treasury, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, Farm Credit Administration, Securities and Exchange Commission, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and Export-Import Bank.

**Iraq Working Groups:** OIGs involved in oversight of Iraq relief and reconstruction efforts meet quarterly to identify areas of mutual interest, resolve conflicting approaches, and plan for collaborative work efforts. Coordinated by the SIGIR, the working group includes representatives from the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA), Defense Intelligence Agency, Department of the Army, U.S. Army Audit Agency, Department of Commerce, DOD, DOS, AID, and GAO. The SIGIR also coordinates quarterly meetings of an Iraq Accountability Working Group to discuss ongoing and new audit work for all U.S. audit groups in Baghdad. Those participating are from SIGIR; Multi-National Force-Iraq IG; Multi-National Security Transition Command-Iraq IG; United States Army Corps of Engineers, Gulf Region Division; Joint Contracting Command-Iraq; DOD OIG; DOS OIG; and AID OIG.

**Council of Counsels to the IGs:** Independent Counsels to IGs from the PCIE and ECIE face common challenges and legal issues in providing legal advice to their respective OIGs. Monthly meetings of the Council foster enhanced communications, shared approaches, information sharing, and networking opportunities for attendees. One example of the benefit of this coordinated effort is the development of a unified response on proposed legislation that affects the IG community and IG authority in general. As another example, the Council presented a unified view to DOJ regarding a directive to U.S. Attorneys on the use of the non-custodial advice and warnings in OIG investigations and subsequent prosecutions.
On March 26, 1981, the President signed Executive Order 12301, *Integrity and Efficiency in Federal Programs*, and created the PCIE. The purpose of this Council was to provide a forum for the presidentially appointed, Senate-confirmed IGs to work together and coordinate their professional activities. On May 11, 1992, the President signed Executive Order 12805, which reconstituted the PCIE and created the ECIE for the IGs from designated Federal entities.

Today, 30 IGs are members of the PCIE, and 34 IGs are members of the ECIE. OMB’s Deputy Director for Management chairs both the PCIE and ECIE and reports to the President on the Councils’ activities. In addition, five senior government officials are ex officio members of both the PCIE and ECIE. These officials include the Controller of OMB’s Office of Federal Financial Management, Special Counsel of the Office of Special Counsel, Director of the Office of Government Ethics, Deputy Director of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management, and Assistant Director of the FBI’s Criminal Investigative Division. Appendix D provides a current list of all PCIE and ECIE members.

In FY 2007, Clay Johnson III, chaired both the PCIE and ECIE. Gregory Friedman, DOE IG and PCIE member, served as the PCIE Vice Chair. Until his retirement in May 2007, Barry Snyder, FRB IG and ECIE member, served as the ECIE Vice Chair. Dr. Christine Boesz, NSF IG, is currently the ECIE Vice Chair. The Vice Chairs, who are chosen by the Chair from among the members of their respective Councils, provide executive direction to their councils, and manage their day-to-day activities.

An Executive Council, comprised of the Vice Chairs of the PCIE and ECIE, Chairs of IG-led Committees, and an At-Large Member, provides corporate leadership, centralizes external communications and relationships on behalf of the IG community, compiles and distributes information regarding common priorities, and provides long-term planning. Table 3 presents the FY 2007 Executive Council members.
The PCIE, in conjunction with the ECIE, maintains standing committees to examine important issues and assist the Councils in their ongoing efforts to promote integrity, accountability, and excellence in government. Over the years, PCIE and ECIE members have also seen the need to form various roundtables and working groups to help manage current issues and address challenges.

Through its organizational structures, the PCIE and ECIE reach across agency boundaries to provide government-wide coordination of and focus on the activities of the OIGs. Among the functions they perform are:

- Providing a forum in which the IG community discusses government-wide issues and addresses shared concerns;
- Developing uniform standards for conducting the 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; and
- 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 CFOs, Chief Information Officers, and Chief Acquisition Officers. Designated PCIE members regularly attend the meetings of these other groups as observers and inform the PCIE and ECIE membership about relevant issues and initiatives.

### Committees, Working Groups, and Roundtables

In FY 2007, the Councils maintained seven standing committees that provided leadership for activities in their respective areas and coordinated much of the project-related work conducted under the Councils’ auspices. The membership of these committees is comprised of PCIE and ECIE OIGs, with the committee chairs selected by the PCIE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. FY 2007 Executive Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Friedman, DOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Boesz, NSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Higgins, ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl Devaney, DOI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claude Kicklighter, DOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Levinson, HHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick O’Carroll, SSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis Fong, USDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne McFarland, FEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCIE Vice Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECIE Vice Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Committee Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Committee Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Committee Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection and Evaluation Committee Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigations Committee Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation Committee Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECIE At-Large Member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
membership through periodic elections. Table 4 explains the specific purpose of these standing committees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audit Committee</strong></td>
<td>Provides leadership to and serves as a resource for the Federal audit community. Sponsors and coordinates audits that address multi-agency or government-wide issues, develops and maintains professional standards for OIG audit activities, and provides oversight of auditor training. Works closely with the Federal Audit Executive Council, a subgroup of Assistant IGs for Audit, and other professional organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Resources Committee</strong></td>
<td>Provides educational opportunities for members of the IG community and ensures the development of competent personnel. Seeks opportunities to improve training methods, enhances the development of OIG staff, and establishes training to meet continuing educational requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Technology Committee</strong></td>
<td>Facilitates effective OIG information technology audits, evaluations, and investigations, and provides a vehicle for expressing the IG community’s perspective on government-wide information technology operations. This committee was established during FY 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inspection and Evaluation Committee</strong></td>
<td>Seeks to enhance the work of the IG community and improve the management of Federal programs by promoting effective practices, and improving methodologies and techniques. Works closely with the Inspection and Evaluation Roundtable, which is comprised of Assistant IGs who conduct evaluations and inspections in their respective agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrity Committee</strong></td>
<td>Receives and reviews allegations of misconduct by IGs and certain senior members of their staff. Ensures that complaints against IGs receive a thorough and timely review and, where appropriate, that the cases are investigated. The Committee is chaired by the Assistant Director of the FBI’s Criminal Investigative Division and includes IGs and non-IG members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investigations Committee</strong></td>
<td>Advises the IG community on issues involving criminal investigations, investigative personnel, and investigative guidelines and oversees the IG Criminal Investigator Academy. Works closely with the Assistant IGs for Investigations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legislation Committee</strong></td>
<td>Ensures that the PCIE is kept abreast of matters in the congressional arena of interest to the IG community. Develops, coordinates, and represents the official IG community positions on legislative issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Several of the committees have established working groups with a broader membership to discuss policy matters and to conduct specific projects under the committee’s leadership. In addition, several forums and roundtables affiliated with the Councils address specialized issues of widespread interest within the IG community but do not fit readily within the committee structure.

- The Federal Audit Executive Council (FAEC), a subgroup established by the PCIE and ECIE and under the auspices of the PCIE Audit Committee, discusses and coordinates issues affecting the Federal audit community. The FAEC is comprised of senior audit officials from the IG community, with special emphasis on financial statement auditing, information security auditing, contracting, audit training, and other policy and operational issues. During FY 2007, Mary Ugone, DOD Deputy IG for Audit, chaired the FAEC.

- The Assistant IGs for Investigations, working under the auspices of the PCIE Investigations Committee, routinely collaborate on community-wide investigative and law enforcement issues, including training, professional standards, peer reviews, and investigative operations. During FY 2007, for example, the group updated the peer review guidelines and coordinated closely with the FBI to pursue a more efficient process for implementing the Attorney General requirement for OIGs and the FBI to notify one another of open cases under their jurisdictions. During FY 2007, John Hartman, Assistant IG for Investigations at the DOE, chaired this group.

- The Inspection and Evaluation Roundtable, led by Stuart Wright, Deputy IG for Evaluation and Inspections, HHS, supports the work of the Inspection and Evaluation Committee by conducting projects and surveys related to the inspection and evaluation functions. The Roundtable is made up of Assistant IGs who conduct evaluations and inspections within their respective OIGs.

- The Homeland Security Roundtable coordinates efforts to review the performance of agency programs and operations that impact homeland security. Specifically, the Roundtable supports the IG community’s efforts to keep the nation safe by sharing information, identifying best practices, and working with other government entities and external organizations. During FY 2007, Richard L. Skinner, DHS IG, chaired the Homeland Security Roundtable.

- The Misconduct in Research Working Group shares information about specific audits, investigations, and other reviews that have implications for an agency’s misconduct in research policies and their practical application in investigations. The Working Group is also focusing on the increasing global nature of research and investigative techniques that can be successfully applied in resolving allegations that span international borders. Over time, misconduct in research erodes the integrity of federally funded research, and in the absence of diligent detection and prevention efforts, it can undermine the credibility of data and results derived from such research. During FY 2007, Christine C. Boesz, NSF IG, chaired the Misconduct in Research Working Group.
Over the years, the IG community has compiled statistics to measure its productivity and effectiveness. The tables on the following pages detail in a quantitative way the community’s audit and investigative accomplishments during FY 2007. We have placed these accomplishments in an overall context by providing a 5-year running total for each reporting category. The statistical performance of an individual OIG can be found in its semiannual reports, which are available on its Web site. (See Appendix D for individual OIG Web site addresses.)

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 the actual spending of funds. Agency management either agrees or disagrees 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 also include results associated with audits performed by 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

A recommendation that funds could be better used tells agency management that taking action to implement the recommendation would result in more efficient or effective use of funds. Such actions could include reducing outlays, deobligating funds, and avoiding unnecessary expenditures.
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Table 5. 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 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>FY 2006</td>
<td>$16,434,386,326</td>
<td>$9,982,235,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
<td>$21,151,726,355</td>
<td>$7,313,756,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYs 2003-2007</td>
<td>$92,834,465,437</td>
<td>$56,843,269,677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Questioned Costs

A recommendation questioning a cost tells agency management that the expenditure is questionable because it allegedly violated a law, regulation, contract, or grant; was not adequately documented; or was unnecessary or unreasonable.

Table 6. 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 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>FY 2006</td>
<td>$5,334,041,555</td>
<td>$3,955,711,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
<td>$5,464,017,707</td>
<td>$4,087,941,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYs 2003-2007</td>
<td>$22,694,666,005</td>
<td>$16,554,858,808</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Investigation-Related Accomplishments

The categories used below reflect the broad range of accomplishments generated by the OIGs’ 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, the 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 the same case. OIGs typically conduct cases with other OIGs, other Federal law enforcement agencies, and state or local law enforcement entities. The investigative statistics below 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 results from investigations that were worked jointly with other Federal OIGs.

Criminal Prosecutions

A criminal prosecution is included below when a subject is convicted in Federal, state, local, or foreign courts, under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, or is accepted for a pretrial diversion agreement by DOJ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7. Criminal Prosecutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYs 2003-2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indictments and Criminal Informations

The totals below include criminal indictments and informations filed in Federal, state, local, or foreign courts or under the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8. Indictments and Criminal Informations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYs 2003-2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Civil Actions

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9. Civil Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYs 2003-2007</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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10. Suspensions and Debarments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYs 2003-2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Personnel Actions

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 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 2006</td>
<td>4,092</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
<td>5,674</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>5,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYs 2003-2007</td>
<td>16,394</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>16,788</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Investigative Recoveries and Receivables

Investigative recoveries and receivables 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.

Table 12. Investigative Recoveries and Receivables

<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 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 2006</td>
<td>$3,348,177,094</td>
<td>$3,434,571,754</td>
<td>$6,782,748,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
<td>$3,856,379,659</td>
<td>$1,266,375,062</td>
<td>$5,122,754,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYs 2003-2007</td>
<td>$15,833,851,750</td>
<td>$8,283,352,601</td>
<td>$24,117,204,351</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Joint Investigations with Other Federal Investigative Offices

This category reflects the percentage of investigations in which OIGs had an active investigative role with other Federal investigative organizations, not including other OIGs. These other investigative organizations include, for example, the FBI, IRS, the Postal Inspection Service, and state and local law enforcement organizations.

In FY 2007, of the 28 PCIE OIGs that reported conducting investigations, 27 reported conducting joint investigations with other Federal investigative organizations. Of these, 10 OIGs indicated that 10 percent or fewer of their cases were joint, 15 stated that joint cases comprised between 10 to 50 percent of their investigations, and 2 OIGs conducted more than 50 percent of their cases jointly. The highest portion of joint cases reported by a PCIE OIG was 96 percent.

Among the 15 ECIE OIGs that reported conducting investigations, 11 reported conducting joint cases. Of these 11, 7 indicated that 10 percent or fewer of their cases were joint, and 4 stated that joint cases comprised between 10 to 50 percent of their investigations.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>HOMELAND SECURITY AND DISASTER PREPAREDNESS</th>
<th>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT AND SECURITY</th>
<th>FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND PERFORMANCE</th>
<th>HUMAN CAPITAL MANAGEMENT</th>
<th>PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY</th>
<th>PROCUREMENT AND GRANT MANAGEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency for International Development</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian Regional Commission</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodity Futures Trading Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Product Safety Commission</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation for National and Community Service</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Commerce</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Energy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Health and Human Services</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Homeland Security</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Housing and Urban Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of the Interior</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Justice</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY</td>
<td>HOMELAND SECURITY AND DISASTER PREPAREDNESS</td>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT AND SECURITY</td>
<td>FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND PERFORMANCE</td>
<td>HUMAN CAPITAL MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY</td>
<td>PROCUREMENT AND GRANT MANAGEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Labor</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of State</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of the Treasury</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Veterans Affairs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Employment Opportunity Commission</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Credit Administration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Communications Commission</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Election Commission</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Housing Finance Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Labor Relations Authority</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Maritime Commission</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Trade Commission</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Services Administration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Printing Office</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services Corporation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library of Congress</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Aeronautics and Space Administration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Archives and Records Administration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Endowment for the Arts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Endowment for the Humanities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Labor Relations Board</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Regulatory Commission</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Science Foundation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Personnel Management</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Corps</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Retirement Board</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securities and Exchange Commission</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Administration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security Administration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Capitol Police</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Agriculture</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. International Trade Commission</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Postal Service</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Washington, DC 20585
(202) 586-4393
Web site  http://www.ig.energy.gov
Hotlines  (202) 586-4073
    (800) 541-1625
Hotline E-mail
ighetline@hq.doe.gov

Christine C. Boesz
Vice Chair, ECIE
Inspector General
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
4201 Wilson Blvd., Room 1135
Arlington, Virginia 22230
(703) 292-7100
Hotline  (800) 428-2189

Danny Werfel
Acting Controller, Office of Federal Financial Management
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
Eisenhower Executive Office Building
17th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Room 262
Washington, DC 20503
(202) 395-6059

Kenneth W. Kaiser
Assistant Director, Criminal Investigative Division
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
935 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Room 5012
Washington, DC 20535
(202) 324-4260

Robert I. (Ric) Cusick
Director
OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT ETHICS
1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 482-9300

Howard Weizmann
Deputy Director
OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT
1900 E Street, NW, Room 5018
Washington, DC 20415-0001
(202) 606-1000

Scott Bloch
Special Counsel
OFFICE OF SPECIAL COUNSEL
1730 M Street, NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20036-4505
(202) 254-3610
Disclosure hotline (800) 872-9855
Whistleblower protection
(800) 572-2249
Hatch Act information
(800) 854-2824
PCIE MEMBERS

Donald A. Gambatesa  
Inspection General  
U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT  
Ronald Reagan Building  
1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20523-6600  
(202) 212-1170  
Web site  
http://www.usaid.gov/oig  
Hotlines  
(800) 230-6539

John L. Helgerson  
Inspection General  
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY  
Room 2X30, New Headquarters Building  
Washington, DC 20505  
(703) 874-2555

Gerald Walpin  
Inspection General  
CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE  
1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 830  
Washington, DC 20525  
(202) 606-9390  
Web site  
http://www.cnsig.gov  
Hotline  
(800) 452-8210

Phyllis K. Fong  
Inspection General  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
Jamie L. Whitten Building  
1400 Independence Avenue, SW  
Room 117-W  
Washington, DC 20250-2301  
(202) 720-8001  
Web site  
http://www.usda.gov/oig  
Hotlines  
(202) 690-1622  
(800) 424-9121  
Hearing impaired  
(202) 690-1202

Todd J. Zinser  
Inspection General  
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
1401 Constitution Avenue, NW  
Suite 7898C  
Washington, DC 20230  
(202) 482-4661  
Web site  
http://www.oig.doc.gov/oig  
Hotlines  
(202) 482-2495  
(800) 424-5197  
Hearing impaired  
(800) 854-8407

Claude M. Kicklighter  
Inspection General  
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
400 Army Navy Drive  
Arlington, Virginia 22202  
(703) 604-8300  
Web site  
http://www.dodig.mil  
Hotline  
(800) 424-9098

Gregory H. Friedman  
Inspection General  
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY  
1000 Independence Avenue, SW  
Washington, DC 20585  
(202) 586-4393  
Web site  
http://www.ig.energy.gov  
Hotlines  
(202) 586-4073  
(800) 541-1625

John P. Higgins, Jr.  
Inspection General  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
400 Maryland Avenue, SW  
Washington, DC 20202-1500  
(202) 245-6900  
Web site  
http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig  
Hotline  
(800) 647-8733  
E-mail  
oig.hotline@ed.gov

Daniel R. Levinson  
Inspection General  
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES  
330 Independence Avenue, SW  
Room 5250  
Washington, DC 20201  
(202) 619-3148  
Web site  
http://oig.hhs.gov  
Hotline  
(800) 447-8477  
E-mail  
hhtips@oig.hhs.gov

Richard L. Skinner  
Inspection General  
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY  
245 Murray Drive, Building 410  
Washington, DC 20528  
(202) 254-4100  
Web site  
http://www.dhs.gov/xoig/index.shtm  
Hotline  
(800) 323-8603  
Hotline E-mail  
dhsioighotline@dhs.gov  
Hurricane Fraud Hotline  
(866) 720-5721  
Hurricane Fraud Hotline E-mail  
hkfrfs@leo.gov

Kenneth M. Donohue  
Inspection General  
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT  
451 7th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20410  
(202) 708-0430  
Web site  
http://www.hud.gov/offices/oig  
Hotlines  
(202) 708-4200  
(800) 347-3735

Earl E. Devaney  
Inspection General  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
1849 C Street, NW, Mail Stop 5341  
Washington, DC 20240  
(202) 208-5745  
Web site  
http://www.doioig.gov/  
Hotline  
(800) 424-5081
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Agency/Department</th>
<th>Address/Location</th>
<th>Phone/Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glenn A. Fine</td>
<td>Inspector General</td>
<td>Department of Justice</td>
<td>Washington, DC 20530</td>
<td>(202) 514-3435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon S. Heddell</td>
<td>Inspector General</td>
<td>Department of Labor</td>
<td>Washington, DC 20210</td>
<td>(202) 693-5100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William E. Todd</td>
<td>Deputy Inspector General</td>
<td>Department of State and the Broadcasting Board of Governors</td>
<td>Washington, DC 20522-0308</td>
<td>(202) 663-0361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin L. Scovel III</td>
<td>Inspector General</td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Washington, DC 20590</td>
<td>(202) 366-1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis S. Schindel</td>
<td>Acting Inspector General</td>
<td>Department of the Treasury</td>
<td>Washington, DC 20220</td>
<td>(202) 622-1090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Opfer</td>
<td>Inspector General</td>
<td>Department of Veterans Affairs</td>
<td>Washington, DC 20420</td>
<td>(202) 461-4720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Roderick</td>
<td>Deputy Inspector General</td>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>Washington, DC 20460-0001</td>
<td>(202) 566-0847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon T. Rymer</td>
<td>Inspector General</td>
<td>Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation</td>
<td>Arlington, VA 22226</td>
<td>(703) 562-2166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian D. Miller</td>
<td>Inspector General</td>
<td>General Services Administration</td>
<td>Washington, DC 20405</td>
<td>(202) 501-0450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert W. Cobb</td>
<td>Inspector General</td>
<td>National Aeronautics and Space Administration</td>
<td>Washington, DC 20546</td>
<td>(202) 358-1220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hubert T. Bell  
Inspector General  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
11555 Rockville Pike  
Mail Stop 05-E13  
Rockville, MD 20852  
(301) 415-5930  
Hotline (800) 233-3497

Patrick E. McFarland  
Inspector General  
OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT  
1900 E Street, NW, Room 6400  
Washington, DC 20415-0001  
(202) 606-1200  
Web site  http://www.opm.gov/oig  
Hotline Fraud/waste/abuse (202) 606-2423  
Hotline Healthcare fraud (202) 418-3300

ECIE MEMBERS

Fred E. Weiderhold, Jr.  
Inspector General  
AMTRAK  
10 G Street, NE, Suite 3W-300  
Washington, DC 20002  
(202) 906-4600  
Web site  http://www.amtrakoig.com  
Hotline (800) 468-5469

Carl W. Hoecker  
Inspector General  
U.S. CAPITOL POLICE  
499 S. Capitol Street, SW, Suite 345  
Washington, DC 20003  
(202) 593-4642  
Hotline (866) 906-2446  
E-mail Oig@cap-police.senate.gov

Clifford H. Jennings  
Inspector General  
APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION  
1666 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Suite 215  
Washington, DC 20009-1068  
(202) 884-7675  
Web site  http://www.arc.gov/index.do?nodeId=2060  
Hotlines (202) 884-7667  
(800) 532-4611

A. Roy Lavik  
Inspector General  
COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION  
Three Lafayette Centre  
1155 21st Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20581  
(202) 418-5110  
Web site  http://www.ignet.gov/internal/cftc/cftc.html  
Hotline (202) 418-5510

Christopher W. Dentel  
Inspector General  
CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION  
4330 East West Highway  
Bethesda, MD 20814-4408  
(301) 504-7644  
Hotline (301) 504-7906

Kenneth Konz  
Inspector General  
CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING  
401 9th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20004-2129  
(202) 879-9660  
Web site  http://www.cpb.org/oig  
Hotlines (202) 783-5408  
(800) 599-2170
Michael Marsh
Inspector General
DENALI COMMISSION
Peterson Tower, Suite 410
510 L Street
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
(907) 271-1414

Curtis Crider
Inspector General
U.S. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION
1225 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 566-3125
Web site http://www.fca.gov/oig.htm
Hotline (866) 552-0004

Aletha L. Brown
Inspector General
EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION
1801 L Street, NW, Suite 3001
Washington, DC 20507
(202) 663-4379
Web site http://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/eeoc.html
Hotline (800) 849-4230

Carl A. Clinefelter
Inspector General
FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION
1501 Farm Credit Drive
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 883-4030
Web site http://www.fca.gov/oig.htm
Hotlines (703) 883-4316 (800) 437-7322

Kent R. Nilsson
Inspector General
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
445 12th Street, SW, Room 2-C762
Washington, DC 20554
(202) 418-0470
Web site http://www.fcc.gov/oig
Hotline (202) 418-0473

Lynne A. McFarland
Inspector General
FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
999 E Street, NW, Room 940
Washington, DC 20463
(202) 694-1015
Hotline (202) 694-1015

Edward Kelley
Inspector General
FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE BOARD
1625 Eye Street, NW, Room 3095
Washington, DC 20006-4001
(202) 408-2544
Hotlines (202) 408-2900 (800) 276-8329

Francine C. Eichler
Inspector General
FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY
1400 K Street, NW, Room 250
Washington, DC 20424
(202) 218-7744
Web site http://www.flra.gov/ig/ig.html
Hotline (800) 331-3572

Adam Trzeciak
Inspector General
FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION
800 North Capitol Street, NW
Room 1054
Washington, DC 20573
(202) 523-5863
Hotline (202) 523-5865

Elizabeth A. Coleman
Inspector General
FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD
20th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW
Stop 300
Washington, DC 20551
(202) 973-5005
Web site http://federalreserve.gov/oig
Hotlines (202) 452-6400 (800) 827-3340

John M. Seeba
Inspector General
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20580
(202) 326-2743
Web site http://www.ftc.gov/oig/
Hotline (202) 326-2800

J. Anthony Ogden
Inspector General
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
North Capitol and H Streets, NW
Stop: IG
Washington, DC 20401
(202) 512-0039
Web site http://www.gpo.gov/oig
Hotline (800) 743-7574

Judith Gwynn
Acting Inspector General
U.S. INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION
500 E Street, SW, Room 515
Washington, DC 20436
(202) 205-3177
Web site http://www.usitc.gov/oig
Hotline (800) 500-0333

Jeffrey E. Schanz
Inspector General
LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION
3333 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20007
(202) 295-1650
Web site http://www.oig.lsc.gov/
Hotline (800) 678-8868
Karl W. Schornagel  
Inspector General  
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS  
101 Independence Avenue  
Suite LM-630  
Washington, DC 20540  
(202) 707-2637  
Web site http://loc.gov/about/oig/  

Paul Brachfeld  
Inspector General  
NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION  
8601 Adelphi Road  
College Park, MD 20740-6001  
(301) 837-1532  
Web site http://www.archives.gov/oig  
Hotlines (301) 837-3500 (800) 786-2551  
Hotline E-mail oig.hotline@nara.gov  

William A. DeSarno  
Inspector General  
NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION  
1775 Duke Street  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-3428  
(703) 518-6351  
Web site http://www.ncua.gov/oig  
Hotlines (703) 518-6357 (800) 778-4806  

Daniel L. Shaw  
Inspector General  
NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS  
1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Room 601  
Washington, DC 20506  
(202) 682-5402  
Web site http://www.nea.gov/about/OIG/Contents.html  
Hotline (202) 682-5402  

Sheldon L. Bernstein  
Inspector General  
NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES  
1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Room 419  
Washington, DC 20506  
(202) 606-8350  
Web site http://www.neh.gov/whoweare/oig.html  
Hotline (202) 606-8423  

Vacant  
Inspector General  
NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD  
1099 14th Street, NW, Room 9820  
Washington, DC 20570  
(202) 273-1960  
Web site http://www.nlrb.gov/About_Us/inspector_general/index.aspx  
Hotline (800) 736-2983  

Christine C. Boesz  
Inspector General  
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION  
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Room 1135  
Arlington, Virginia 22230  
(703) 292-7100  
Hotline (800) 428-2189  
E-mail oig@nsf.gov  

Geoffrey Johnson  
Acting Inspector General  
PEACE CORPS  
1111 20th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20526  
(202) 692-2916  
Hotline (800) 233-5874  

Deborah Stover-Springer  
Acting Inspector General  
PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION  
1200 K Street, NW, Suite 470  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 326-4030 x3437  
Web site http://oig.pbgc.gov/  
Hotline (800) 303-9737  

Jack Callender  
Inspector General  
POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION  
901 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 230  
Washington, DC 20268-0001  
(202) 789-6817  
Web site http://www.uspsoig.gov  
Hotline (202) 789-6817  

David C. Williams  
Inspector General  
U.S. POSTAL SERVICE  
1735 N. Lynn Street  
Arlington, Virginia 22209-2020  
(703) 248-2300  
Web site http://www.uspsoig.gov  
Hotline (888) 877-7644  

H. David Kotz  
Inspector General  
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION  
100 F Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20549-2736  
(202) 551-6037  
Web site http://www.sec.gov/about/oig.shtml  
Hotline (202) 551-6061  

Stuart W. Bowen, Jr  
Inspector General  
SPECIAL INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR IRAQ RECONSTRUCTION  
400 Army Navy Drive  
Arlington, Virginia 22202  
(703) 428-1100  
Web site http://www.sigir.mil/  
Hotline (866) 301-2003  

A. Sprightley Ryan  
Inspector General  
SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION  
MRC 524, P.O. Box 37012  
Washington, DC 20013-0712  
(202) 633-7050  
Web site http://www.si.edu/oig/  
Hotline (202) 252-0321
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AID</td>
<td>U.S. Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBP</td>
<td>U.S. Customs and Border Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFO</td>
<td>Chief Financial Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPE</td>
<td>Critical Point Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCAA</td>
<td>Defense Contract Audit Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCIS</td>
<td>Defense Criminal Investigative Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>Department of Homeland Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD</td>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>Department of Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOI</td>
<td>Department of the Interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOJ</td>
<td>Department of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOL</td>
<td>Department of Labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOS</td>
<td>Department of State and Broadcasting Board of Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOT</td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECIE</td>
<td>Executive Council on Integrity and Efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency</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>FCC</td>
<td>Federal Communications Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDIC</td>
<td>Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FECA</td>
<td>Federal Employees’ Compensation Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td>Federal Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHFB</td>
<td>Federal Housing Finance Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISMA</td>
<td>Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLRA</td>
<td>Federal Labor Relations Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRB</td>
<td>Federal Reserve Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTS</td>
<td>Federal Technology Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>fiscal year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAO</td>
<td>Government Accountability Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSA</td>
<td>General Services Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>Department of Health and Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUD</td>
<td>Department of Housing and Urban Development</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>IRS</td>
<td>Internal Revenue Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRS CID</td>
<td>IRS Criminal Investigations Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA</td>
<td>National Aeronautics and Space Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCUA</td>
<td>National Credit Union Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLRB</td>
<td>National Labor Relations Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF</td>
<td>National Science Foundation</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>SBA</td>
<td>Small Business Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGIR</td>
<td>Special Inspector General for Iraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>Social Security Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIGTA</td>
<td>Treasury Inspector General for Tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury</td>
<td>Department of the Treasury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVA</td>
<td>Tennessee Valley Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USPS</td>
<td>U.S. Postal Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Department of Veterans Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recipients of the 10th Annual PCIE and ECIE Awards

On October 23, 2007, the IG community held its 10th annual awards ceremony and bestowed 110 awards to individuals and groups for their achievements and excellence over the past year. In addition to acknowledging a cross-section of OIG personnel, many of these awards recognized individuals from outside the IG community who collaborated with the OIGs to promote efficiency and effectiveness and ensure integrity in Federal programs and operations. Listed below are the special category awards and their recipients.

★ **Alexander Hamilton Award** recognizes achievements in improving the integrity, efficiency, or effectiveness of Executive Branch agency operations.

**Nelnet Audit Team, ED OIG**

for efforts resulting in the termination of long-standing abusive over-billing practices by lenders; preventing billions of future improper payments

★ **Gaston L. Gianni, Jr. Better Government Award** recognizes those who contribute to the ideals of the IG Act and actions that improve the public’s confidence in government.

**Indian Lobbying Investigative Team, DOI OIG**

for methodically and tenaciously pursuing investigative leads to piece together a complex fraud scheme involving lobbyists, non-profit groups, and high-ranking government officials

★ **Glenn/Roth Exemplary Service to the Congress Award**, named for former Senators John Glenn and William Roth (deceased), recognizes achievements in furthering relations between a Department or Agency (or the community) and the Congress.

**Richard B. Jolliffe, Assistant IG for Acquisition and Contract Management, DOD OIG**

for outstanding service to the Congress by relentlessly pursuing legislation to improve the effectiveness of DOD acquisitions

★ **Sentner Award for Dedication and Courage** recognizes uncommon selflessness, dedication to duty, or courage while performing OIG duties. This award is given in memory of William “Buddy” Sentner, an agent with the Department of Justice OIG who lost his life while performing law enforcement duties.

**Forward Deployed Presence in Southwest Asia, DOD OIG**

for helping to establish a DOD OIG presence in Southwest Asia

★ **June Gibbs Brown Career Achievement Award** recognizes sustained and significant individual contributions to the mission of Inspectors General throughout one’s career.

**Judith Holtz-Rock, Director, Public Affairs, HHS OIG**

for outstanding leadership, exemplary commitment to public service, and lasting contributions to the HHS OIG

★ **Individual Accomplishment Award** recognizes sustained contributions to the PCIE or ECIE over a period of time or outstanding leadership of projects or events that contribute to the PCIE or ECIE mission.

**Susan C. Callahan, Senior Counsel, HHS OIG**

for 30 years of outstanding contributions to the OIG community

★ **Barry R. Snyder PCIE & ECIE Joint Awards** recognize groups that have made significant contributions through a cooperative effort in support of the mission of the PCIE/ECIE.

**National Single Audit Project Management Team**

for their outstanding collaborative effort to improve the quality of single audits, resulting in greater accountability over billions of dollars in Federal funds

**Federal Audit Executive Council Information Technology Committee**

for exceptional performance in evaluating and reporting on the protection of sensitive information government-wide