FY 2008: Results at a Glance

Federal Offices of Inspector General (OIG) promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in government operations and help prevent and detect fraud and abuse. In fiscal year 2008, more than 12,300 employees at 69 OIGs conducted audits, inspections, evaluations, and investigations, which resulted in:

$14.2 billion in potential savings from audit recommendations;
$4.4 billion in potential savings from investigative receivables and recoveries;

6,647 indictments and criminal informations;
6,866 successful prosecutions;
1,206 successful civil actions;
4,986 suspensions or debarments;
5,712 personnel actions;
337,916 hotline complaints processed;
6,935 audit, inspection, and evaluation reports issued; and
32,143 investigations closed.

This report was prepared on behalf of the CIGIE by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and Federal Communications Commission Offices of Inspector General. Copies of this publication may be obtained by contacting (703) 562-6386. It also is available on the Inspectors General Web site at www.ignet.gov.
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Fiscal Year 2008
Foreword

The Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, established independent and objective units within most Federal departments and agencies, and placed accountability professionals at the center of many of the important challenges facing our nation. It is somewhat fitting that nearly 30 years to the day, President George W. Bush signed the Inspector General (IG) Reform Act of 2008, further validating IG independence, enhancing IG operations, and creating a significant milestone in IG history by combining two former IG Councils, the President’s Council on Integrity and Efficiency (PCIE) and the Executive Council on Integrity and Efficiency (ECIE).

In this report, we discuss the IG community’s activities from multiple perspectives. First, in Looking Back, we highlight key accomplishments of Federal OIGs during fiscal year (FY) 2008 as they worked to ensure the economy, efficiency, effectiveness, and integrity of government operations and prevent fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement. We also capture some defining moments in our 30-year evolution as a community and outline key provisions of the IG Reform Act. In Going Forward, we show how we have begun to implement the Act and look to the future. We are now operating as one Council with revised goals and priorities as we take on new responsibilities and proactively address new challenges, while leveraging our expertise and using lessons learned from our past efforts as we do so.

We thank the former Chair of the two Councils, Clay Johnson III, former Deputy Director for Management at the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), and the Vice Chairs of the PCIE and ECIE, Gregory H. Friedman and Christine C. Boesz, respectively, for their leadership of the community. In this 30th anniversary year, we also recognize the efforts of countless leaders in the IG community, colleagues in OMB, the Congress, the Government Accountability Office (GAO), other Federal agencies, law enforcement and other professional organizations, and private sector supporters who have helped make our community strong and equal to the tasks confronting us today.

Most especially, we sincerely thank the more than 12,300 members of the OIG workforce for their enduring commitment to the IG mission and their dedication to ensuring good government through public service.

Phyllis K. Fong
Chairperson

Carl A. Clinefelter
Vice Chairperson

Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency
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Thirty 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 IG. The IGs became independent forces for promoting economy, efficiency, and effectiveness, while preventing and detecting fraud and abuse in their agencies’ programs.

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 OIGs’ most noteworthy recent activity and management’s action on significant IG recommendations, are examples of this reporting responsibility.

In those early years, the 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 establish IGs in most agencies of the Federal government and convey additional authorities. The 1988 amendments established IGs in certain independent agencies, corporations, and other Federal entities.

Today, 69 IGs provide audit and investigative oversight across government and seek to prevent problems before they materialize. Depending on their agency, most IGs are either nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, or are appointed by their agency head. They are selected without regard to political affiliation and solely 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, President Ronald Reagan, 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. OMB’s Deputy Director for Management chaired both Councils and reported to the President on their activities. Senior officials from other selected agencies were also members of both Councils.

On October 14, 2008, the IG Reform Act of 2008 established the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE) as the unified council of all statutory IGs to provide government-wide coordination of, and focus on, the activities of the OIGs. OMB’s Deputy Director for Management serves as the Executive Chairperson, and IGs serve as the Chairperson and Vice Chairperson and collectively manage the Council’s day-to-day activities. The Chairperson is elected by the CIGIE members, and the Vice Chairperson is appointed by the Chairperson. An Executive Council, comprised of selected IGs, provides corporate leadership and long-term planning, and standing committees exist to examine important issues and promote integrity, accountability, and excellence in government.

A more complete discussion of the former PCIE and ECIE begins on page 9. An overview of the newly created CIGIE starts on page 15, and a listing of CIGIE members is available in Appendix C.
Looking Back

During FY 2008, OIGs achieved impressive results within their own agencies and in partnership with agency management to address issues of national and international significance. Through the conduct of audits, investigations, inspections, and evaluations, the community identified potential cost savings; made hundreds of non-monetary recommendations for program improvements; and successfully conducted thousands of criminal, civil, and administrative investigative activities. In addition, the OIGs met common challenges as they conducted work pursuant to several very important 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. The community also began to contemplate its future direction in anticipation of possible passage of the IG Reform Act, which occurred on October 14, 2008, and which combined the two former IG councils—the PCIE and the ECIE.

Addressing Government Challenges in FY 2008

The sections that follow summarize the community’s results during the year and demonstrate how IGs across the government continued to fulfill the IG mission through their efforts to meet the requirements of the IG Act and other statutory mandates.

Producing Results

During FY 2008, Federal OIGs provided independent oversight of trillions of dollars in Federal programs and operations. These programs include health care, transportation, financial services, the environment, homeland security, national defense, agriculture, housing, information security, and many more too numerous to detail. Such programs provide taxpayers and others with government services and support 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 prevent and detect fraud and abuse. As independent “agents of positive change” within their respective agencies, OIGs seek to prevent problems before they occur.

During FY 2008, IG community efforts accounted for over $18.6 billion in potential savings from agency action on current and prior recommendations as well as investigative recoveries. Table 1 presents the community’s statistical accomplishments for the fiscal year.

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 2008, the OIGs collectively issued over 6,200 audit reports and testified before the Congress 94 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, in whole or in part, with these recommendations. For this fiscal year, agency management agreed to $14.2 billion in potential savings from these audit recommendations.

**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 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 Council’s committees and working groups. The Web site can be reached at www.ignet.gov.

Under the IG Act, OIGs are authorized to investigate criminal matters and civil or administrative wrongdoing involving their agencies’ programs and operations. During FY 2008, OIGs closed over 32,000 investigations. The most frequent subjects of OIG investigations include benefit recipients, contractors, grantees, and Federal employees. The PCIE/ECIE Quality Standards for Investigations, issued in December 2003, provides guidelines for OIG investigations that help ensure their professional quality and integrity.

Investigative work often involves several law enforcement agencies working on 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 potential receivables and recoveries that stem from this investigative work during FY 2008 amount to about $4.4 billion.

While OIGs are not required to establish inspection and evaluation components, the IG Act 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, in accordance with the PCIE/ECIE Quality Standards for Inspections, broad reviews, program evaluations, and focused inspections that analyze and report on the effectiveness of agency activities. During FY 2008, OIGs issued over 680 inspection and evaluation reports.¹

Most OIGs operate dedicated, toll-free and online 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 2008, OIGs processed nearly 338,000 complaints and allegations received through their hotlines. Appendix C, the CIGIE member directory, 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 A presents these productivity indicators in an overall context by providing a 5-year comparison for each reporting category.

**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 of the most 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 or agency financial reports. As discussed below, during FY 2008, 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 identify and address challenges facing their agencies.

**OIGs Play Key Role in Government Financial Statement Audit Work**

Consistent with the CFO Act, OIGs across the government undertook the challenging task of ensuring their agency financial statements were audited by the accelerated year-end reporting deadline. In conducting such work, OIG auditors and the contractors they oversee are vital 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 its Federal Financial Management Report (2009), Federal agencies achieved unprecedented results in their ongoing efforts to improve the timeliness and reliability of government financial reporting. Specifically, of the

---

¹ As required by the IG Reform Act of 2008, OIGs with inspection and evaluation components will be required to report, beginning in FY 2009, on the quantitative results of their activities, according to a uniform set of statistical categories.

| Table 1. FY 2008 Performance Profile: Summary of Combined IG Community Accomplishments |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------|
| Recommendations Agreed to by Management: Funds For Better Use | $9,753,263,909 |
| Recommendations Agreed to by Management: Questioned Costs | $4,419,333,800 |
| Investigative Receivables and Recoveries | $4,444,654,455 |
| Successful Criminal Prosecutions | 6,866 |
| Indictments and Criminal Informations | 6,647 |
| Successful Civil Actions | 1,206 |
| Suspensions and Debarments | 4,986 |
| Personnel Actions | 5,712 |
24 CFO Act agencies, 20 received clean opinions, reflecting the highest total in the past 6 years. These 20 agencies represent more than 75 percent of all Federal outlays. The total number of material weaknesses government-wide declined by 18 percent, from 39 to 32. FY 2008 is the fifth year in a row that material weaknesses have declined, with nearly a 50 percent decrease in weaknesses since FY 2001.

Also, for the fourth consecutive year, 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 decisionmakers and requires agencies to employ strict disciplines throughout the year to ensure readiness for year-end reporting.

**FY 2008 Material Weaknesses**

A material weakness is a significant deficiency, or combination of significant deficiencies, in internal controls that increases the odds that a material misstatement of the financial statements will go undetected or not be prevented. The existence of material weaknesses does not necessarily mean the financial statements are unreliable. However, their existence suggests the likelihood that the financial statements include material misstatements has increased.

In examining auditors’ identification of material weaknesses, great strides were made in the area of financial systems and security, where the number of weaknesses was reduced by almost 50 percent. However, challenges still remain. Nearly 70 percent of the material weaknesses are attributable to three agencies and are predominately in the areas of financial management and reporting and financial systems and security. OMB states that these key areas continue to be a challenge across all agencies.

Financial management and reporting material weaknesses were found in seven agencies, primarily as a result of control issues over the financial reporting process. Financial auditors found the controls over the financial statement preparation needed to be improved in various areas, including oversight, data integrity, reconciliations, updating of policies and procedures, and training. By improving controls over the reporting process, agencies are better positioned to prepare reliable, useful, and timely financial information for decision making.

Financial systems and security material weaknesses were found in five agencies and primarily were a result of control issues in information technology (IT) security. Auditors found the controls over IT security needed to be improved in areas such as updating risk assessments, providing IT security training, strengthening password controls, and enhancing controls over system software modification. By improving IT security, agencies can prevent unauthorized access to, and increase the reliability of, financial information.

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 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.

**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 programs and practices and to report the results of the evaluation to OMB. OMB then uses the data to assist in its oversight activities and to report to the Congress on agency compliance with FISMA. To ensure privacy protections for personally identifiable information (PII), agencies must also report on metrics related to their privacy management programs. The IG community devotes substantial resources to the FISMA evaluations and numerous other audits and evaluations that feed into their comprehensive FISMA reporting.

As OMB reported in its *Fiscal Year 2008 FISMA Report to Congress*, Federal agencies spent $6.2 billion securing the government’s total IT investment of approximately $68 billion, or about 9.2 percent of the total IT portfolio. The funds used to ensure security target both cross-cutting
and system-specific activities, such as certification and accreditation (C&A) of systems, testing of controls, and user awareness training.

For FY 2008, based on FISMA results, OMB reported that 25 major Federal agencies continue to improve information security with respect to C&A rates and testing of contingency plans for current operational systems identified in their systems inventory, which totaled 10,679 for FY 2008, according to agency reports. OMB noted that testing of security controls had decreased slightly by 2 percent, from 95 percent in FY 2007 to 93 percent in FY 2008. Ninety-two percent of agency IGs reported the overall quality of the C&A process to be satisfactory or better, an increase from 76 percent in FY 2007. Twenty-one of the 25 major agency IGs responded affirmatively when asked if the agency had ensured security training and awareness for all employees, including contractors with significant IT responsibilities.

Of note, OMB’s report indicates that when IGs were asked to confirm whether the agency ensures that information systems used or operated by contractors on behalf of the agency met security requirements of FISMA, OMB, and the National Institute of Standards and Technology, 2008 affirmative responses of “Almost Always” were lower than in the past, declining 47 percent from FY 2006-2008. Also of interest, based on OMB’s analysis of IG responses in FISMA reports, 84 percent of agencies demonstrated they have an effective plan of action and milestones process in place to identify and correct weaknesses.

As for progress in meeting key privacy performance measures, the FY 2008 agency FISMA reports indicate improvements. In 2008, 92 percent of applicable systems within 25 major agencies had publicly posted privacy impact assessments, and in 24 of 25 cases, IGs rated the process as satisfactory or better—an improvement over FY 2007. Also of note, in FY 2008, 93 percent of information systems government-wide with Privacy Act records had published current system of records notices.

Going forward, OMB challenged agencies to focus management attention on (1) achieving 100 percent C&A levels for all operational systems, (2) properly identifying and providing oversight of contractor systems, and (3) maintaining privacy impact assessments and system of records notices for 100 percent of applicable systems. The IG community will continue its efforts to help agencies meet these challenges.

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 have worked to make sure OIG staff have the necessary skills, training, and technical expertise to perform quality work under this requirement. The community is committed to continuous close coordination with OMB and the Chief Information Officers Council to ensure meaningful IT security and privacy evaluation and reporting processes.

OIGs Identify Top Management and Performance Challenges Facing Our Nation

Annually, in keeping with the Reports Consolidation Act of 2000, the IG community identifies and reports the top management and performance challenges in its Progress Report to the President. The identified challenges highlight high-risk activities and performance issues that impact agency operations or strategic goals.

During FY 2008, the OIGs identified certain common significant management challenges facing their agencies. A table showing individual OIG reporting on these challenges appears as Appendix B; 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 more
than 10,000 information systems to manage its programs and operations and carry out its critical missions. IT is a significant management challenge for most Federal agencies.

**Financial Management and Performance.** Federal agencies continue to face challenges providing timely, accurate, and useful financial information and managing for results. Better 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 given increasing workloads in many Federal agencies at a time when 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 results-oriented goals at a time when the Congress and the American taxpayers are demanding accountability for Federal programs and related spending.

**Procurement and Grants Management.** Procurement and grants historically have been areas subject to fraud and waste throughout the government, and effectively managing them is a continuing challenge. As discussed later in this report, with new contracting and grant activities related to recent legislation, for example, vigilant oversight mechanisms become all the more important. Poor oversight, lax controls, and fraudulent billing schemes are just a few examples of the Federal government’s vulnerability to procurement 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, as shown in Table 2. These challenges reflect the far-reaching span of issues that OIGs identify and address in their work.

### Table 2. Examples of Agency-Specific Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMTRAK</td>
<td>Capital Improvements and Financial Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Commerce</td>
<td>Overcome the Setbacks Experienced in Reengineering Decennial Processes and Conduct a Successful 2010 Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
<td>Equipping and Training Iraqi and Afghan Security Forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Energy</td>
<td>Reliability of the Nation’s Weapons Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Health and Human Services</td>
<td>Medicaid and Children’s Health Insurance Program Integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Homeland Security</td>
<td>Border Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Justice</td>
<td>Restoring Confidence in the Department of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Labor</td>
<td>Protecting the Safety and Health of Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Veterans Affairs</td>
<td>Health Care Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>Chesapeake Bay Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Credit Administration</td>
<td>Ensuring Farm Credit Administration’s Ability to Withstand Economic Swings in the Agriculture System Through Effective Examination and Regulatory Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation</td>
<td>Ensuring the Viability of the Deposit Insurance Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Archives and Records Administration</td>
<td>Electronic Records Archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security Administration</td>
<td>Management of the Disability Process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In highlighting these areas for their agency management’s attention, OIGs demonstrate their individual commitments to helping their agencies address mission-critical programs and operations and successfully achieve their agency’s goals.

**Council Structure 1981-2008**

On March 26, 1981, President Ronald Reagan 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, President George H.W. Bush signed Executive Order 12805, which reconstituted the PCIE and created the ECIE for the IGs from designated Federal entities.

According to the Executive Order, OMB’s Deputy Director for Management chaired both the PCIE and ECIE and reported to the President on the Councils’ activities. In addition, five senior government officials were ex officio members of both the PCIE and ECIE. These officials included 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 Office of Personnel Management, and Assistant Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s (FBI) Criminal Investigative Division.

In FY 2008, Clay Johnson III chaired both the PCIE and ECIE. Gregory Friedman, Department of Energy IG and PCIE member, served as the PCIE Vice Chair. Dr. Christine Boesz, former National Science Foundation IG and ECIE member, served as the ECIE Vice Chair. The Vice Chairs, who were chosen by the Chair from among the members of their respective Councils, provided executive direction to their councils and managed their day-to-day activities.

*A Strategic Framework*, adopted by the PCIE and ECIE members in 2001, established an Executive Council, comprised of the Vice Chairs of the PCIE and the ECIE, Chairs of IG-led Committees, and an At-Large Member, to provide corporate leadership, centralize external communications and relationships on behalf of the IG community, compile and distribute information regarding common priorities, and provide long-term planning. Table 3, on the following page, presents the FY 2008 Executive Council members.

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

- Providing a forum in which the IG community discussed government-wide issues and addressed shared concerns;
- Developing uniform standards for conducting audit, investigative, and inspection and evaluation activities of OIGs;
- Sponsoring and operating training programs to support the professional and management development of OIG auditors, investigators, and evaluators;
- Conducting or advocating projects that addressed issues of common concern or interest among OIGs; and
- Representing the IG community among its Federal counterparts, such as CFOs, Chief Information Officers, and Federal Acquisition Councils.

Also, as created by President William J. Clinton through an Executive Order in March 1996, the Integrity Committee received and reviewed allegations of misconduct against IGs and certain staff members. The committee ensured that these allegations were appropriately and expeditiously reviewed, and where appropriate, investigated and resolved. The Integrity Committee was a fact-finding committee that presented its findings to the PCIE and ECIE Chair. Kenneth W. Kaiser, Assistant Director, Criminal Investigative Division, FBI, chaired the Integrity Committee during FY 2008. The other Committee members, as defined by the Executive Order, included the Director of the Office of Government Ethics, Special Counsel of the Office of Special Counsel, and three IGs.
representing the PCIE and ECIE. The Chief of the Public Integrity Section of the Department of Justice Criminal Division, or his designee, served as an advisor.

During FY 2008, the PCIE, in conjunction with the ECIE, maintained six 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 was comprised of PCIE and ECIE OIGs, with the committee chairs selected by the PCIE membership through periodic elections. Table 4 explains the purpose of these standing committees and their accomplishments during the past fiscal year.

Over the years, PCIE and ECIE members have also seen the need to form additional groups to help manage current issues and address future challenges. Three of the standing committees have established organizations with a broader membership to discuss policy matters and to conduct specific projects under the committee’s leadership. These organizations include:

- The **Federal Audit Executive Council**, which is comprised of senior audit officials from the IG community, discusses and coordinates issues affecting the Federal audit community, with special emphasis on financial statement auditing, information security auditing, contracting, audit training, and other policy and operational issues.

- The **Assistant IGs for Investigations** collaborate on community-wide investigative and law enforcement issues, including training, professional standards, peer reviews, and investigative operations.

- The **Inspection and Evaluation Roundtable**, made up of Assistant IGs who conduct evaluations and inspections within their respective OIGs, conducts projects and surveys related to the inspection and evaluation functions.

In addition, members have formed other groups to address specialized issues of widespread interest within the IG community that do not fit readily within the committee structure. The Homeland Security Roundtable coordinates efforts to review the performance of agency programs and operations that impact homeland security. 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.
### Table 4. Standing PCIE Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee and Purpose</th>
<th>Accomplishments During FY 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Audit Committee**   | • Co-hosted with GAO the Financial Statement Audit Conference.  
                        | • Developed the 2009-2010 peer review schedule and began the update process for the peer review guide.  
                        | • Along with GAO, updated and issued the Financial Audit Manual.  
                        | • Continued its efforts in the Single Audit arena by testifying on the National Single Audit Sampling Project report and coordinating with OMB and the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants on its recommendations. |
| **Human Resources Committee** | • Developed and continued to support the OIG's leadership course through American University. The course includes individual executive coaching, creating high-performance organizations, team-building, and ethics. |
| **Information Technology Committee** | • Conducted IG Digital Forensics Lab survey to assess current capacity and needs.  
                                        | • Sponsored guest speakers and learning forums to promote learning and information-sharing. |
| **Inspection and Evaluation Committee** | • Issued results from the inspection and evaluation units in the Federal IG community survey, which captured the community's current profile. The report revealed significant changes within the inspection and evaluation community since the 2003 survey. |
| **Investigations Committee** | • Initiated the project to update the peer review guide and created the peer review schedule through 2014.  
                               | • Developed the model policy for issuing credentials to retired OIG agents.  
                               | • Continued to oversee investigative training. |
| **Legislation Committee** | • Represented the IG community during consideration of the IG Reform Act.  
                           | • Monitored legislation affecting individual OIGs and the IG community at-large. |
## The First 30 Years of the IG Act

### Timeline of Key Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>On October 12, 1978, the IG Act passes the House of Representatives by a vote of 388 to 6, is approved by the Senate without opposition, and becomes law. President Jimmy Carter signs the act into law and describes the new statutory IGs as “perhaps the most important new tools in the fight against fraud.” The President charges the IGs to always remember that their ultimate responsibility is not to any individual but to the public interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>On Inauguration Day, President Ronald Reagan calls for a plan to decrease the fraudulent activities in Federal agencies. The PCIE, for the presidentially appointed IGs, is established by President Reagan on March 26, 1981 by Executive Order 12301.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>IG Act amended to create 30 additional OIGs at “designated agencies.” Most of the designated agencies are relatively small agencies, boards, or commissions. The IGs have essentially the same powers and duties as those appointed by the President; however, these IGs are appointed by and can be removed by the agency head.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Executive Order 12805, signed by President George H.W. Bush on May 11, 1992, establishes the ECIE, for agency-head appointed IGs and reconstitutes the PCIE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Premier edition of the <em>Journal of Public Inquiry</em> is issued, a semiannual publication of the IG community that provides a forum to share professional ideas, suggest new approaches, and chronicle changes over the years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>In an effort to investigate allegations of wrongdoing by individual IGs, President William J. Clinton issues Executive Order 12993 on March 21, 1996, which establishes procedures for a special Integrity Committee to handle these proceedings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>IGs come together to contribute to efforts to address the protection of the Nation’s physical and information infrastructure as part of an overall initiative in the aftermath of the September 11, 2001 tragedy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Homeland Security Act of 2002 signed by President George W. Bush, transferring the Federal Emergency Management Agency functions to the Department of Homeland Security and granting law enforcement powers to OIG criminal investigators in certain establishments. That is, a section in the Act amended the IG Act to statutorily authorize the exercise of law enforcement authority, including carrying firearms, making arrests, and executing warrants, to special agents of 24 presidentially appointed OIGs. The Act further included provisions to enable other OIGs to qualify for law enforcement authority. Four other OIGs possessed such authority pursuant to separate, prior legislation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>IGs government-wide celebrate the 25th anniversary of the IG Act. As part of the commemoration, the Vice Chairs of the PCIE and ECIE, along with the OMB Deputy Director for Management testify before the House Government Reform Subcommittee on Government Efficiency and Financial Management; President George W. Bush meets with IGs; and the IG community updates and issues the Silver Book—<em>Quality Standards for Federal Offices of Inspector General</em>. The President signs S.J. Res 18, on December 1, 2003, a joint Congressional Resolution, commending IGs for their efforts to prevent and detect waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement and to promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in the Federal government during the past 25 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Coalition Provisional Authority is abolished and its IG converted to the Special IG for Iraq Reconstruction. This concept of creating a “Special IG” is subsequently used again to address emerging risks twice in 2008 (see page 19).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>IGs join together to play a key part in oversight of activities and expenditures directly linked to recovery from the devastating Gulf Coast 2005 hurricane season.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>On October 14, 2008, the IG Reform Act of 2008 establishes the CIGIE as the unified council of all statutory IGs to provide government-wide coordination of, and focus on, the activities of the OIGs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Provisions of the IG Reform Act of 2008

On October 14, 2008, the IG Reform Act of 2008 was signed into law (P.L. 110-409). With the exception of amendments over the years to add new IGs, this legislation was the first major action on IG reform since the passage of the 1988 amendments, which occurred nearly 20 years to the day. The goal of the IG Reform Act of 2008 was to further enhance IG independence, create the CIGIE, and improve operations. Provided below are the Act’s major provisions:

IG Independence

Appointment and Removal of IGs: IGs are to be appointed without regard to political affiliation, and solely on the basis of integrity and demonstrated ability in accounting, auditing, financial analysis, law, management analysis, public administration, or investigations. Before an IG can be removed or transferred, the President or agency head, as appropriate, must provide the Congress with a 30-day advance written notice, which would include the reasons for removal or transfer.

IG Pay: Salary adjustments were made for IGs who are presidentially appointed and Senate-confirmed, and IGs who are appointed by their agency head. IGs are prohibited from receiving cash awards or cash bonuses.

Separate Counsel for IGs: Each IG will obtain legal advice from a counsel either reporting directly to the IG or another IG.

Submission of Budget Requests: IGs will send to the heads of their respective agencies their budget request, which will specify the amount requested for IG training and identify resources necessary to support the CIGIE. Further, the President’s budget will include any comments from an IG who concludes that the budget submitted by the President would substantially inhibit the IG from performing the duties of the office.

OIGs Established as Discrete Agencies: OIGs are defined as separate agencies, and the IGs will have the functions, powers, and duties of an agency head for voluntary separation/buyouts, early outs, reemploying annuitants, waiving mandatory separation for law enforcement officers, and all provisions relating to the Senior Executive Service.

CIGIE

New Council: The Act, by statute, combines the former PCIE and ECIE into one council, and includes legislative IGs and other officials. The Act established the Council as “an independent entity” in the executive branch and provided it with the ability to financially support its activities. An Integrity Committee, which would receive, review, and refer for investigation allegations of wrongdoing that are made against IGs or senior staff, was also established. A more detailed discussion of the CIGIE and Integrity Committee can be found on pages 15 through 18.

Operational Improvements

Subpoena Power: The Act clarifies subpoena power as extending to information in any medium (including electronically stored information, as well as any tangible things such as hard drives and computers).

OIG Web Site: Reports (or portions of reports) must be posted on the OIG Web site not later than 3 days after the report is made publicly available. Any posted report must include a summary of OIG findings and be searchable and downloadable. Further, a direct link for the OIG’s hotline must be on the OIG homepage.2

IG Recommendations: CIGIE is required to submit recommendations for the appointment of IGs.

Statistics for Evaluations/Inspections: Statistical results from evaluation and inspection reports are to be included in OIG semiannual reports in connection with audit report statistics.

Extending Authorities to Agency-Appointed IGs: Provisions under the Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act and the law enforcement authority under the IG Act, as amended, were extended to include agency-appointed IGs.

2 The Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009, P.L. 111-08, contains provisions that conflict with the Web site provisions in the IG Reform Act. The provisions are at Section 526 of Division B, Title V, and Section 744 of Division D, Title VII. Similar provisions were in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2008, and were expressly repealed in the IG Reform Act.
Going Forward

The IG community responded promptly to the passage of the IG Reform Act and took immediate steps to formulate the CIGIE’s charter, establish an effective governance structure, and carry out the Council’s work. Building on past IG tradition and guided by a set of forward-looking strategic goals, the members of the former PCIE and ECIE have joined forces to successfully confront the government-wide challenges ahead.

CIGIE Structure: 2008 and Beyond

The new CIGIE charter, adopted in February 2009, lays out basic tenets of the Council’s membership, governance, duties, planning and decision-making processes, and funding and administration.

The mission of the Council is to address integrity, economy, and effectiveness issues that transcend individual government agencies; and increase the professionalism and effectiveness of personnel by developing policies, standards, and approaches to aid in the establishment of a well-trained and highly skilled workforce in the OIGs.

Council Membership

- All IGs whose offices are established under either section 2 or section 8G of the IG Act.
- The IGs of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence and the Central Intelligence Agency.
- The Controller of OMB’s Office of Federal Financial Management.
- A senior-level official of the FBI designated by its Director.
• The Director of the Office of Government Ethics.
• The Special Counsel of the Office of Special Counsel.
• The Deputy Director of the Office of Personnel Management.
• The OMB Deputy Director for Management.

Additionally, the Chairperson, after considering advice from the members, may periodically invite representatives of other government organizations to attend, observe, or contribute to Council meetings and activities.

The governance structure of the new Council includes the following:

• The OMB Deputy Director for Management, Jeffrey Zients, serves as the Executive Chairperson. The Executive Chairperson presides over Council meetings; provides summary reports of Council activities to the heads of agencies and entities represented on the Council; and provides to the Council information relating to the agencies and entities represented on the Council to assist the Council in performing its functions.

• Chairperson Phyllis Fong, IG from the United States Department of Agriculture, who was elected for a 2-year term as Chairperson from among the IGs whose offices are established under either section 2 or section 8G of the IG Act or from the IGs at the Office of the Director of National Intelligence or the Central Intelligence Agency. The Chairperson convenes meetings of the Council and, in the absence of the Executive Chairperson, presides over meetings; appoints the Vice Chairperson; exercises the functions and duties of the Council; manages the administrative and business functions of the Council, including making payments, executing contracts, and managing Council staff; establishes standing committees of the Council (in consultation with the membership); serves as an ex officio member of each of the standing committees; and prepares and transmits an annual report to the President and the Congress on the activities of the Council.

• Vice Chairperson Carl Clinefelter, IG at the Farm Credit Administration, appointed by the Chair, assists the Chair in carrying out the functions of the Council and acts in the absence of the Chairperson.

**What’s Next for the Council?**

The Council is focusing its attention on a number of key activities as it looks to the future. Among those, the Council will

• Continually identify, review, and discuss areas of weakness and vulnerability in Federal programs and operations with respect to fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement;

• Develop plans for coordinated, government-wide activities to address these problems and promote economy and efficiency in Federal programs and operations, including interagency and inter-entity audit, investigation, inspection, and evaluation projects to address issues that exceed the capability or jurisdiction of an individual agency or entity;

• Develop policies that will aid in the maintenance of a corps of well-trained and highly skilled OIG personnel;

• Maintain an Internet Web site and other electronic systems for the benefit of all IGs as the Council determines are necessary or desirable;

• Maintain one or more professional academies as the Council considers
desired for the professional training of auditors, investigators, inspectors, evaluators, and other OIG personnel;

- Submit recommendations of individuals to the appropriate appointing authority for any IG appointment under sections 2 or 8G of the IG Act or an open IG appointment at the Office of the Director of National Intelligence or the Central Intelligence Agency;

- Make reports to the Congress as the Chairperson determines are necessary or appropriate; and

- Perform other duties within the authority and jurisdiction of the Council, as appropriate.

CIGIE Strategic Planning Builds on IG Tradition

Under the CIGIE Charter, the Council will periodically prepare strategic and business plans that set forth its vision and goals. These plans will contain specific objectives and performance measures, as appropriate, to enable an assessment of results. In December 2004, the IG community adopted A Strategic Framework 2005 – 2010, setting forth the mission, vision, and goals for the community for a 6-year period. The IG Reform Act of 2008 reaffirmed much of that future direction for the new CIGIE.

CIGIE has charted its future path by establishing strategic business goals, supporting objectives, and performance measures that will guide its activities over the next 2 years. The Council committed to achieving three main goals by December 2010. Each goal will be met through a series of specific activities involving all components of the community—audits, investigations, inspections, evaluations, IT, Counsel, and others—with measurable outcomes that will be monitored closely and coordinated extensively throughout the next 2 years.

Goal 1: Contribute to improvements in program integrity, efficiency, and cost-effectiveness government-wide by providing cross-agency analysis of OIG findings and recommendations in areas of vulnerability confronting multiple government programs.

Recognizing that the Council’s success will be judged by Administration and congressional stakeholders largely on the Council’s ability to contribute to improvements in Federal operations, the Council will annually identify and perform a minimum of two original cross-cutting studies or combined analyses of work performed by OIGs in their individual agencies.

Goal 2: Increase the professionalism and effectiveness of the IG community workforce.

To reach this goal, the Council will work to establish an IG community-wide training structure, consisting of one or more professional academies,

Longstanding Focus on IG Integrity

The IG community takes seriously allegations of misconduct in its own offices. Since March 1996, the IG community has had an Integrity Committee to receive and review its 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 IG Reform Act saw fit to establish the Integrity Committee in statute, and maintain the basic processes and committee structure. The CIGIE member representing the FBI chairs the Committee, which is made up of the Director of the Office of Government Ethics, Special Counsel of the Office of Special Counsel, and four IGs appointed by the CIGIE Chair. The Chief of the Public Integrity Section of the Department of Justice’s Criminal Division, or designee, serves as an advisor. The IG Reform Act also established the Integrity Committee’s reporting requirements and financial support.
going forward

presenting high-quality, cost-efficient professional training to IG staff. Building on already existing efforts and keeping a close eye on costs, the Council will work through its committee structure to review existing training opportunities available to OIG staff and identify opportunities for Council members to work together to fill currently unmet training needs.

**Goal 3: Create an effectively functioning Council able to meet its vision, mission, and goals.**

For the Council to deliver the results expected of it, it must be effectively organized in terms of budget, staff, and membership committees. The priority work to be accomplished in this area in the next 2 years includes establishing permanent Council operations to effectively support Council goals in a manner that promotes cost-efficiency and integrity. Additionally, the current committee leadership will work together to update the committee structure and charters, with special attention paid to meeting new requirements (e.g., Integrity Committee provisions regarding coverage of senior OIG staff, investigation procedures, and reports) set in the IG Reform Act, and will also work through the Committee structure to review the Strategic Framework, Charter, and Strategic Business Plan, and recommend updates and changes.

**ENSURING SUCCESS**

The Executive Council is committed to continually monitoring progress on the activities necessary to reach the community’s goals. During the first year of operations, the Executive Council will track certain key measures in order to establish a baseline of operations. Using this information, the Executive Council will then set performance targets for each of the measures for the second year of operation. Targets and performance measures will be revised by the Executive Council annually and shared with the full membership.

**Facing New Challenges**

As history has proven, the IG community can be a powerful force in addressing some of the nation’s most daunting challenges. IGs bring an independent perspective to bear on numerous significant issues and can readily coordinate to leverage the community’s resources, thus strengthening oversight activities and maximizing effectiveness. The following section of this report highlights recent examples where the community has been called upon to carry out additional responsibilities and help ensure success in new government programs and operations.

**RECOVERY ACT POSES NEW CHALLENGES TO THE IG COMMUNITY**

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Recovery Act) creates a vital oversight role for the IG community, and the IGs at the agencies that are receiving stimulus funds are actively engaged in meeting their responsibilities. Currently, 28 IGs are involved in activities brought on by the Act. The Recovery Act creates new responsibilities for the Federal IGs in three main areas: oversight of agency stimulus-funded programs, participation on the new oversight accountability board, and investigations of whistleblower complaints.

**Oversight of Stimulus Expenditures**

Under the IG Act, IGs generally have broad oversight responsibility and authority for their parent entities’ programs and operations. Recovery Act-funded activities at each Federal entity have become significant additions to this portfolio. IGs are giving high priority to oversight of stimulus activities due to the Act’s requirements for mandatory reviews, investigations, reports, and—most importantly—the joint governmental and public interest in ensuring that expedited stimulus funds are spent properly. Agencies must promptly develop plans for allocating stimulus funds, including identifying and assessing any risks regarding the responsible disbursement and ultimate usage of the monies involved and appropriate risk mitigation strategies. IGs must also report on funds spent on their oversight activities.

Section 1514 of the Recovery Act mandates that an IG shall review, as appropriate, any concerns raised by the public about specific investments of stimulus funds. Unless criminal proceedings are involved,
the OIG must relay its findings immediately to the agency head and post them on the OIG’s Web site (subject to privacy laws). The Recovery Act also provides new authority to OIGs to examine records and interview the employees of entities that receive stimulus funds. At this time, the volume and substance of the public complaints individual IGs will receive regarding stimulus activities—and the level of OIG resources required to address them—is difficult to predict. It is certainly an element of the Recovery Act, however, that the IG community must plan for and closely monitor.

The Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board

The Recovery Act creates a new Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board to coordinate and conduct oversight of stimulus programs. The Board is comprised of 10 Cabinet-level agency IGs and is chaired by Earl Devaney, former IG at the Department of the Interior. The Board has a number of functions and is required to coordinate its work with individual IGs and the Council to avoid duplication of effort. Congress provided the Board with extensive audit and program review powers, but not investigative authority; allegations requiring investigations of a criminal nature must be referred to the appropriate OIG. The authorization for the Board expires on September 30, 2013.

Assessing Whistleblower Complaints Related to Stimulus Activities

The third element of the Recovery Act that may significantly impact the IG community is the new protections from reprisal provided to whistleblowers who are State and local government employees, contractors, or employees of grantees and other Federal recipients. When such individuals present

SPECIAL IGs CALLED UPON TO FACE NEW CHALLENGES

During extraordinary times, the Congress has looked to the IG community for assistance by creating special IGs to address emerging conditions where there is an immediate need for vigilant oversight to ensure economy and efficiency and to protect against fraud, waste, and abuse. The first such instance involved creation of the Special IG for Iraq Reconstruction in October 2004, an office held by Stuart W. Bowen, Jr. This office is the successor to the Coalition Provisional Authority OIG and is mandated to provide independent and objective oversight of all funds appropriated or otherwise made available for the reconstruction of Iraq.

During 2008, an additional two Special IGs were created. In January 2008, under the authority of section 1229 of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2008, the Special IG for Afghanistan Reconstruction was created. This office provides for the independent and objective conduct and supervision of audits and investigations related to the programs and operations funded with amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the reconstruction of Afghanistan. Major General Arnold Fields, U.S. Marine Corps (Ret.), heads that office.

Later in 2008, in light of the turmoil in the nation’s economic and financial systems, the Office of the Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program was established by the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008. Neil M. Barofsky heads this office. The Special IG is responsible for conducting, supervising, and coordinating audits and investigations of the purchase, management, and sale of assets under this program. To further facilitate its coordination role, the Special IG formed an IG Council made up of the Comptroller General and those IGs whose oversight functions are most likely to touch on Troubled Asset Relief Program issues.

The CIGIE is proud to count these special IGs among its membership and is committed to providing ongoing support to ensure the success of their undertakings.
Federal officials with information they believe is evidence of gross mismanagement, waste, or illegality related to stimulus expenditures, IGs are required to investigate any reprisal complaints that may result. IGs are required to complete these whistleblower investigations within 180 days, subject to certain extensions. While employees of grantees and other Federal recipients are covered under the Recovery Act, the whistleblower mandates present a broad new area of potentially substantial investigative obligations for IGs regarding non-Federal employees and contractors.

**Past Lessons Will Help in the Future**

During the Recovery Act’s implementation, the IG community will continually explore effective, common oversight approaches among IGs, and will emphasize proactive, preventive measures that can be taken before public funds are expended. The IG community will coordinate closely with OMB and GAO on Recovery Act activities to best work together to perform the rigorous oversight desired by the Congress and the public. The community will draw from lessons learned from past challenges. For example, while the amount and scope of the Recovery Act’s expenditures are unprecedented, the multi-agency, expedited nature of the Federal response to Hurricane Katrina resulted in important “lessons learned” for IGs and program officials that could apply to stimulus-funded activities.
History of Statistical Accomplishments

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 2008 and preceding fiscal years. In the case of monetary statistics, amounts represent both actual and potential savings. The statistical performance of an individual OIG can be found in its semiannual reports, which are available on its Web site. (See Appendix C 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, in whole or in part, with these recommendations.

Many recommendations are qualitative and do not specify quantitative savings. However, other recommendations are quantitative and associated dollar amounts can be captured from year to year. Section 5 of the IG Act establishes a uniform set of statistical categories under which OIGs must report the quantitative results of their audit activities. The categories used in the next two tables correspond to the IG Act’s reporting requirements.

The total accomplishments also include results associated with audits performed by the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) under agreements with OIGs and agencies. Due to reporting processes, the results of audits performed by DCAA and corresponding management decisions may be reported by more than one OIG.

Recommendations that Funds be Put to Better Use

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.
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 2008</td>
<td>$23,566,673,218</td>
<td>$9,753,263,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
<td>$21,151,726,355</td>
<td>$7,313,756,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
<td>$16,434,386,326</td>
<td>$9,982,235,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>$13,851,596,950</td>
<td>$15,708,882,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2004</td>
<td>$14,938,468,879</td>
<td>$12,503,502,362</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 an 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 2008</td>
<td>$6,308,035,525</td>
<td>$4,419,333,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
<td>$5,464,017,707</td>
<td>$4,087,941,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
<td>$5,334,641,555</td>
<td>$3,955,711,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>$4,353,684,456</td>
<td>$4,458,011,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2004</td>
<td>$4,429,644,538</td>
<td>$2,063,504,412</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 an 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 on 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 investigations that were worked on 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 the Department of Justice.

<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 2008</td>
<td>6,640</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>6,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
<td>8,348</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>8,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
<td>7,370</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>8,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>6,626</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>7,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2004</td>
<td>5,928</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>6,475</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>Reporting Year</th>
<th>OIG Investigations</th>
<th>Joint OIG Investigations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008</td>
<td>6,404</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>6,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
<td>6,232</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>6,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
<td>5,686</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>6,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>5,676</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>6,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2004</td>
<td>5,583</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>6,231</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 9. Civil Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Year</th>
<th>OIG Investigations</th>
<th>Joint OIG Investigations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008</td>
<td>1,168</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
<td>1,223</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2004</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>594</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 10. Suspensions and Debarments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Year</th>
<th>OIG Investigations</th>
<th>Joint OIG Investigations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008</td>
<td>4,957</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
<td>4,213</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>4,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
<td>7,125</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>7,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>9,715</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>9,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2004</td>
<td>4,891</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>5,045</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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Year</th>
<th>OIG Investigations</th>
<th>Joint OIG Investigations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008</td>
<td>5,657</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
<td>5,674</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>5,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
<td>4,092</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>2,686</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>2,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2004</td>
<td>1,954</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1,989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Investigative Receivables and Recoveries

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Year</th>
<th>OIG Investigations</th>
<th>Joint OIG Investigations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008</td>
<td>$3,335,353,638</td>
<td>$1,109,300,817</td>
<td>$4,444,654,455</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>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 2005</td>
<td>$2,777,558,301</td>
<td>$1,483,062,002</td>
<td>$4,260,620,303</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>
</tbody>
</table>
# Top Management and Performance Challenges Facing Our Nation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. 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>U.S. Department of Agriculture</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMTRAK</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian Regional Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Capitol Police</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Commerce</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Product Safety Commission</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation for National and Community Service</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Election Assistance Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Employment Opportunity Commission</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export-Import Bank of the United States</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Credit Administration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Communications Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Top Management and Performance Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Labor Relations Authority</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Maritime Commission</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Trade Commission</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Services Administration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</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></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Health and Human Services</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Homeland Security</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Housing and Urban Development</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of the Interior</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. International Trade Commission</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Justice</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Labor</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services Corporation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</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></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Archives and Records Administration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>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 GRANTS MANAGEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Science Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Regulatory Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Personnel Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Corps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal Regulatory Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Postal Service</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Retirement Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securities and Exchange Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of State</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of the Treasury</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Veterans Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Council of the
Inspectors General
on Integrity and Efficiency

Members

Donald A. Gambatesa
Inspector General
U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
Ronald Reagan Building
1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20523-6600
(202) 712-1150
http://www.usaid.gov/oig
Hotlines (202) 712-1023
(800) 230-6539

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

Lorraine Green
 Acting Inspector General
AMTRAK
10 G Street, NE, Suite 3W-300
Washington, DC 20002
(202) 906-4600
http://www.amtrakoig.com
Hotline (800) 468-5469

Clifford H. Jennings
Inspector General
APPLAHCAN REGIONAL COMMISSION
1666 Connecticut Avenue, NW
7th Floor
Washington, DC 20009-1068
(202) 884-7675
http://www.arc.gov/index.do?nodeId=2060
Hotlines (202) 884-7667
(800) 532-4611

Carol Bates
Inspector General
ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL
499 South Capitol Street, SW
Suite 518
Washington, DC 20515
202-593-0260
Email cbates@aoc.gov

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

Patricia A. Lewis
 Acting Inspector General
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
Room 2X30
New Headquarters Building
Washington, DC 20505
(703) 874-2555

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

A. Roy Lavik
Inspector General
COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION
Three Lafayette Centre
1155 21st Street, NW
Washington, DC 20581
(202) 418-5110
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 Bach  
*Acting Inspector General*  
CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE  
1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 830  
Washington, DC 20525  
(202) 606-9390  
[http://www.cnsc.gov](http://www.cnsc.gov)  
Hotline (800) 452-8210

Kenneth Konz  
*Inspector General*  
CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING  
401 9th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20004-2129  
(202) 879-9660  
[http://www.cpb.org/oig](http://www.cpb.org/oig)  
Hotlines (202) 783-5408  
(800) 599-2170

Gordon S. Heddell  
*Inspector General*  
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
400 Army Navy Drive  
Arlington, Virginia 22202  
(703) 604-8300  
[http://www.dodig.mil](http://www.dodig.mil)  
Hotline (800) 424-9098

Michael Marsh  
*Inspector General*  
DENALI COMMISSION  
Peterson Tower, Suite 410  
510 L Street  
Anchorage, Alaska 99501  
(907) 271-1414

Mary Mitchelson  
*Acting Inspector General*  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
400 Maryland Avenue, SW  
Washington, DC 20202-1500  
(202) 245-6900  
[http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig](http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oig)  
Hotline (800) 647-8733  
E-mail [oig.hotline@ed.gov](mailto:oig.hotline@ed.gov)

Curtis Crider  
*Inspector General*  
U.S. ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION  
1225 New York Avenue, NW  
Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 566-3125  
[http://www.eac.gov/eac_ig](http://www.eac.gov/eac_ig)  
Hotline (866) 552-0004

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

Bill Roderick  
*Deputy Inspector General*  
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Mailcode 2410T  
Washington, DC 20460-0001  
(202) 566-0847  
[http://www.epa.gov/oig](http://www.epa.gov/oig)  
Hotlines (202) 566-2476  
(888) 546-8740

Aletha L. Brown  
*Inspector General*  
EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION  
1801 L Street, NW, Suite 3001  
Washington, DC 20507  
(202) 663-4380  
Hotline (800) 849-4230

Michael W. Tankersley  
*Inspector General*  
EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES  
811 Vermont Ave. NW, Room 975  
Washington DC 20571  
(202) 565 3923  
Hotline (866) 571-1801

Carl A. Clinefelter  
*Inspector General*  
FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION  
1501 Farm Credit Drive  
McLean, Virginia 22102  
(703) 883-4030  
Hotlines (703) 883-4316  
(800) 437-7322

Kevin L. Perkins  
*Assistant Director, Criminal Investigative Division*  
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION  
935 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Room 5012  
Washington, DC 20535  
(202) 324-4260

David L. Hunt  
*Acting Inspector General*  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
445 12th Street, SW, Room 2-C762  
Washington, DC 20554  
(202) 418-0845  
Hotline (202) 418-0473

Jon T. Rymer  
*Inspector General*  
FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION  
3501 Fairfax Drive  
Arlington, VA 22226  
(703) 562-2166  
[http://www.fdicig.gov](http://www.fdicig.gov)  
Hotline (800) 964-3342  
E-mail [ighotline@fdic.gov](mailto:ighotline@fdic.gov)

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  
*Acting Inspector General*  
**FEDERAL HOUSING**  
FINANCE AGENCY  
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  
[http://www.flra.gov/ig/ig.html](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) 973-5000  
Hotlines (202) 452-6400  
(800) 827-3340  

John M. Seeba  
*Inspector General*  
**FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION**  
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20580  
(202) 326-2020  
[http://www.ftc.gov/oig/](http://www.ftc.gov/oig/)  
Hotline (202) 326-2800  

Brian D. Miller  
*Inspector General*  
**GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION**  
18th and F Streets, NW, Room 5340  
Washington, DC 20405  
(202) 501-0450  
Hotlines (202) 501-1780  
(800) 424-5210  

Frances Garcia  
*Inspector General*  
**GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE**  
441 G Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20548  
(202) 512-5748  
Hotline (866) 680-7963  

J. Anthony Ogden  
*Inspector General*  
**GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE**  
North Capitol and H Streets, NW  
Stop: IG  
Washington, DC 20401  
(202) 512-0039  
Hotline (800) 743-7574  

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

Richard L. Skinner  
*Inspector General*  
**DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY**  
245 Murray Drive, Building 410  
Washington, DC 20528  
(202) 254-4100  
Hotline (800) 323-8603  
Hotline E-mail dhsoi@oig@dhs.gov  
Hurricane Fraud Hotline:  
(866) 720-5721  
E-mail: hhktf@leo.gov  

Kenneth M. Donohue  
*Inspector General*  
**DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT**  
451 7th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20410  
(202) 708-0430  
Hotlines (202) 708-4200  
(800) 347-3735  

Mary L. Kendall  
*Acting Inspector General*  
**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
1849 C Street, NW, Mail Stop 5341  
Washington, DC 20240  
(202) 208-5745  
Hotline (800) 424-5081  

Judith Gwynn  
*Acting Inspector General*  
**U.S. INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION**  
500 E Street, SW, Room 515  
Washington, DC 20436  
(202) 205-3177  
Hotline (800) 500-0333
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#### CIGIE Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Address 1</th>
<th>Address 2</th>
<th>Address 3</th>
<th>Address 4</th>
<th>Address 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IRAQ RECONSTRUCTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hotline (866) 301-2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil M. Barofsky</td>
<td>Inspector General</td>
<td>SPECIAL INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR THE</td>
<td>1801 L Street, NW, 6th</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>20036</td>
<td>(202) 622-1419</td>
<td><a href="http://www.SIGTARPgov/">http://www.SIGTARPgov/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TROUBLED ASSET</td>
<td>Floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hotline (877) 744-2009/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RELIEF PROGRAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(877) SIG-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS</td>
<td>8100, SA-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hotlines (202) 647-3320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(800) 409-9926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard W. Moore</td>
<td>Inspector General</td>
<td>TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY</td>
<td>400 West Summit Hill Drive</td>
<td>Knoxville, TN</td>
<td>37902-1401</td>
<td>(865) 633-7300</td>
<td><a href="http://oig.tva.gov">http://oig.tva.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hotline (877) 866-7840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.OIGempowerline.com">http://www.OIGempowerline.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin L. Scovell III</td>
<td>Inspector General</td>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>1200 New Jersey Avenue,</td>
<td>West Building-W70-300</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>20590</td>
<td>(202) 366-1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.oig.dot.gov">http://www.oig.dot.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hotline (800) 424-9071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric M. Thorson</td>
<td>Inspector General</td>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY</td>
<td>Main Treasury Building,</td>
<td>1500 Pennsylvania Avenue,</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>20220</td>
<td>(202) 622-1090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Room 4436</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>1500 Pennsylvania Avenue,</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ustreasury.gov">http://www.ustreasury.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hotline (800) 359-3898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FOR TAX ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hotline (800) 366-4484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Opfer</td>
<td>Inspector General</td>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS</td>
<td>810 Vermont Avenue, NW</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>20420</td>
<td>(202) 461-4720</td>
<td><a href="http://www.va.gov/oig">http://www.va.gov/oig</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hotline (800) 488-8244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hotline E-mail <a href="mailto:vaoighotline@va.gov">vaoighotline@va.gov</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recipients of the 11th Annual PCIE and ECIE Awards

On October 21, 2008, the IG community held its 11th annual awards ceremony and recognized 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 featured awards bestowed by the Executive Council.

★ **The Alexander Hamilton Award**, which recognizes achievements in improving the integrity, efficiency, or effectiveness of Executive Branch agency operations, was presented to:
- Marlene T. Evans, Deputy Inspector General for Audit, US Department of Agriculture (USDA) OIG
  in recognition of outstanding achievement in strengthening and improving USDA food safety efforts

★ **The Gaston L. Gianni, Jr. Better Government Award**, which is open to those who contribute to the ideals of the IG Act and recognizes actions that improve the public’s confidence in government, was presented to:
- Link Task Force, USDA OIG
  in recognition of excellence in detecting, investigating, and prosecuting electronic benefits transfer fraud, resulting in a large number of convictions, significant dollar recoveries, and changes to the program

★ **The June Gibbs Brown Career Achievement Award**, which recognizes sustained and significant individual contributions to the mission of Inspectors General throughout one’s career, was presented to:
- John P. Higgins, Jr., Inspector General, Department of Education
  in recognition of a lifetime of outstanding service and dedication to the U.S. Department of Education and the Inspector General Community

★ **Individual Accomplishment**, which 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, was presented to:
- James J. Noeth, Deputy Associate Inspector General for Audit, National Science Foundation (NSF) OIG
  in recognition of over 24 years of sustained superior contributions to improving the oversight and management of research grants at the NSF
- Edwin Bonano, Special Agent, NSF OIG
  in recognition of sustained outstanding performance and commitment to the goals and mission of the OIG

★ **The Glenn/Roth Exemplary Service to the Congress Award** recognizes achievements in furthering relations between a Department or Agency (or the community) and the Congress. This award was named for former Senators John Glenn and William Roth (deceased), who were considered by many to be the forefathers of the IG Act. This award was presented to:
- Southwest Airlines Oversight Team, DOT OIG
  in recognition of outstanding performance in conducting audits and preparing multiple congressional testimonies identifying lapses in the Federal Aviation Administration’s air carrier safety oversight and its implementation of regulatory partnership programs

★ **The 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, and was presented to:
- Paul Converse, Special IG for Iraq Reconstruction OIG
  awarded posthumously in recognition of his uncommon dedication and courage in the face of adversity

★ **The 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. These awards were presented to:
- Financial Statement Audit Network
  in recognition of the sustained contribution of the Network to positively improve Federal financial management by bringing together representatives from the PCIE/ECIE community
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Copies of this publication may be obtained by contacting (703) 562-6386. It also is available on the Inspectors General Web site at www.ignet.gov.