



OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
U.S. GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

SEMIANNUAL REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

OCTOBER 1, 1998 - MARCH 31, 1999

Foreword

This report, submitted pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, summarizes the activities of the Office of Inspector General (OIG) for the 6-month reporting period that ended March 31, 1999.

This semiannual reporting period has been a very productive time for both the OIG and GSA. We continued to work closely with GSA management to find ways to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the Agency's programs and to identify sound business management and operational improvements. In our most significant audits, we found that time delays in the year 2000 conversion for a vital computer system might lead to inadequate testing of the conversion efforts. We also reported that although significant improvements have been made in security upgrades at Federal facilities, GSA still does not have reliable management information for tracking and reporting on the installed and operational security equipment inventory. We pointed out the need to reevaluate current policy regarding the public's access to Federal buildings' blueprints after learning that design plans are often made available without any restrictive language to safeguard the plans. Lastly, we reported that data in the new information system designed to enhance the Agency's ability to manage vacant space in GSA's building inventory is not accurate. In each case, management has responded favorably to our reports and is taking steps to address the issues raised.

We continued to offer non-traditional audit services including advisory and consulting reviews and to assess Agency performance measures for the Government Performance and Results Act.

We identified over \$347 million in financial recommendations on how funds could be put to better use and in other program savings. Also, we made 139 referrals for criminal prosecution, civil litigation, and administrative action. Criminal cases originating from OIG referrals resulted in 6 successful prosecutions. Savings achieved from management decisions on audit financial recommendations, civil settlements, and investigative recoveries totaled over \$356 million.

I want to take this opportunity to thank the GSA Administrator, GSA's senior managers, and the Congress for their support. I also want to commend the accomplishments of all OIG employees for their continued professionalism, dedication, and willingness to accept new challenges.

William R. Barton

WILLIAM R. BARTON
Inspector General
April 30, 1999

Table of Contents

	Page
Summary of OIG Performance	v
Executive Summary	vi
OIG Profile	1
Reviews of GSA Programs	2
Working with the Government Performance and Results Act	15
Procurement Activities	19
Prevention Activities	24
Review of Legislation and Regulations	28
Statistical Summary of OIG Accomplishments	30
Appendices	
Appendix I - Significant Audits from Prior Reports	37
Appendix II - Audit Report Register	40
Appendix III - Audit Reports over 12 Months Old with Final Action Pending	49
Appendix IV - Delinquent Debts	57
Appendix V - Reporting Requirements	58

This semiannual report may be accessed on the Internet at the following address: <http://www.gsa.gov/staff/ig/>

Summary of OIG Performance

OIG Accomplishments

October 1, 1998 - March 31, 1999

Total financial recommendations \$347,482,649

These include:

• Recommendations that funds be put to better use \$342,565,274

• Questioned costs \$4,917,375

Audit reports issued 91

Referrals for criminal prosecution, civil litigation, and administrative action 139

Results Attained

Management decisions agreeing with audit recommendations, civil settlements, and court-ordered and investigative recoveries \$356,817,636

Indictments and informations on criminal referrals 6

Cases accepted for criminal prosecution 13

Cases accepted for civil action 4

Successful criminal prosecutions 6

Civil settlements 4

Contractors debarred 3

Employee actions taken on administrative referrals involving GSA employees 8

Executive Summary

During this period, we offered our traditional services, including program evaluations, contract and financial auditing, management control reviews, investigative coverage, and litigation support in contract claims, civil fraud and enforcement actions, and criminal prosecutions. In addition, we provided professional assistance through enhanced consulting services designed to help management address potentially serious deficiencies or other concerns.

Program/Operational Reviews

Y2K

The OIG continued its ongoing reviews of major programs and operations throughout GSA's various components. We focused on GSA's efforts to convert its National Electronic Accounting and Reporting system (NEAR) to be Y2K compliant. The NEAR system is GSA's backbone accounting and financial information system which provides all GSA components the management information needed to operate and to ensure fiscal responsibility. We determined that the Agency has experienced conversion delays that have resulted in compressed testing time frames. This increases the risk that NEAR may not be adequately tested and could experience problems in the year 2000. We also noted that GSA has not maintained test documentation nor used an independent source to review and validate the tests. Agency management is taking steps to address these issues (page 2).

Security of Federal
buildings

We continued our efforts to review GSA's progress in improving the security of Federal buildings and to correct previously identified problems with the reporting of security equipment installations and the proper use of enhancement funding. We found that GSA has substantially enhanced the security at GSA-controlled facilities since our initial review. However, problems still remain with the accuracy of installation reporting. Consequently, management does not have the data necessary to properly administer its overall security enhancement program (page 3). In a related review, we learned that design plans for building construction and major renovation projects are too accessible to the general public. These plans frequently detail structure and interior space. We expressed concern that free access to these plans could create undue security risks to lives and property (page 4). Additionally, we conducted a review of security standards for siting and constructing new and renovated Federal buildings. We concluded that GSA is applying the enhanced security standards where possible. However, not enough time has elapsed for the standards to be applied to all phases of ongoing building projects (page 5).

During this reporting period, we conducted a review of the documentation used to substantiate the pricing of change orders associated with a new lease build-out in Washington, D.C. Our review disclosed that over a 3-year period, there were inconsistencies in documentation and

Executive Summary

Change orders on leased space improvements	justifications supporting over \$15 million in change orders. Overhead fees and lessor profits were substantially higher than those found in similar GSA lease agreements, and GSA had authorized the change orders without first establishing the source of funds. OIG recommended that GSA management re-emphasize the need for complete and accurate documentation of contract files, and that change orders should not be initiated until the source of funding is firmly established (page 6).
Information systems; management controls	In other program reviews, we reported on a wide range of GSA's programs and operations. For example, we recommended that the Public Buildings Service information system data be updated to reflect accurate space usage (page 7), and reported that management controls need to be strengthened to ensure the reliability of building financial statements (page 8). Furthermore, our review of vacant space revealed that corrective measures must be taken to ensure the reliability of the information system (page 9).
Customer satisfaction	Our review of customer satisfaction as it pertains to the use of reimbursable work authorizations found that customers are now more satisfied with services provided. However, there are needs to provide customers with timely billings, as well as a prompt recovery of funds owed to GSA (page 9). We reviewed regional general and administrative expense details and recommended that GSA management periodically provide data files to verify the accuracy and completeness of the income statement data (page 10).
Building income statements Negotiated leases	We reported that controls over negotiated lease procurements need to be strengthened (page 11), and that improvements were needed in documenting, collecting, depositing and reconciling of proceeds from personal property sales (page 12). In addition, we reported that customer agencies were unable to obtain information concerning alternative fuel use. We advised management that issues needed to be resolved before reliable alternative fuel purchase information could be obtained (page 13).
Surplus property sales	
Alternative fuels usage	

Working with Government Performance and Results Act

In accordance with the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA), we performed reviews of selected GSA performance measures and have made preliminary risk assessments of the internal controls over data supporting these performance measures. This period, we reviewed the Interagency Fleet Management System (IFMS) and the overall design and operation of the internal control system over performance measures reported in the Fiscal Year (FY) 1998 Annual Report. We reported that IFMS' performance measures do not assess performance in terms of mission accomplishments, and are not sufficiently expressed in measurable results to be achieved to enable adequate evaluation. We also reported that, because there is no clear understanding of responsibilities for ensuring that performance

Executive Summary

data are verified at the service levels and for GSA overall, the Agency's ability to collect, process, record, and summarize performance information and report performance measures in accordance with management's criteria could be adversely affected. We have also made our services available to Agency managers in other ways. We have benchmarked with other Federal agencies and the private sector to identify various best practices that GSA could use to improve its overall strategic and performance planning (page 15).

Procurement Integrity

An important part of the OIG's work is to provide support to the Agency's contracting officers and to protect the integrity of GSA's procurement programs and operations by detecting and preventing fraud, waste, and abuse. Based on our audit and investigative work this period, the Government entered into two settlement agreements in which companies agreed to pay nearly \$5 million to resolve potential civil liability under the False Claims Act. These contractors provided construction equipment and road clearing and repair equipment. The settlements involved allegations that they had misrepresented their commercial discount practices in seeking and performing under GSA contracts in violation of the False Claims Act and other statutory and contractual provisions (page 19).

We also successfully completed a number of criminal investigations. These included an investigation that resulted in an individual pleading guilty to conspiracy and trafficking in stolen telephone access devices. It was determined that the individual sold stolen calling card numbers to persons in the United States and abroad, who then used the numbers to illegally obtain free long distance service (page 20). Other investigations resulted in convictions involving making false statements in connection with a GSA contract (page 20), impersonating Federal officials (page 21), and a double billing scheme on GSA contracts (page 21). Furthermore, we made recommendations to improve controls when using agency credit cards for customer service center procurements (page 22). A regional review of operations at a property management center recommended improvements in the preventive maintenance program (page 22).

Summary of Results

The OIG made over \$347 million in financial recommendations to better use Government funds, and in other program costs savings; made 139 referrals for criminal prosecution, civil litigation, and administrative actions; reviewed 140 legislative and regulatory actions; and received 1,551 Hotline calls and letters. This period, we achieved savings from management decisions on financial recommendations, civil settlements, and investigative recoveries totaling over \$356 million. (See page v for a

Executive Summary

summary of this period's performance.) Despite attaining significant financial results this period, we are extremely concerned about a new trend where disappointing contract negotiation results are occurring within the Multiple Award Schedule program. During this period savings realized have markedly declined from historical experience. The OIG is working closely with management to determine the causes and explore ways to improve contract pricing (page 24).

OIG Profile

The GSA OIG was established on October 1, 1978 as one of the original 12 OIGs created by the Inspector General Act of 1978. The OIG's five components work together to perform the missions mandated by the Congress.

Organization

The OIG provides nationwide coverage of GSA programs and activities. It consists of:

- **The Office of Audits**, an evaluative unit staffed with auditors and analysts who provide comprehensive audit coverage of GSA operations through program performance reviews, internal controls assessments, and financial and mandated compliance audits. It also conducts external reviews in support of GSA contracting officials to ensure fair contract prices and adherence to contract terms and conditions. The office has added advisory and consulting services to its service offerings.
- **The Office of Investigations**, an investigative unit that manages a nationwide program to prevent and detect illegal and/or improper activities involving GSA programs, operations, and personnel.
- **The Office of Counsel to the Inspector General**, an in-house legal staff that provides legal advice and assistance to all OIG components, represents the OIG in litigation arising out of or affecting OIG operations, and manages the OIG legislative/regulatory review functions.
- **The Internal Evaluation Staff**, an in-house staff that plans and directs field office appraisals and conducts internal affairs reviews and investigations.
- **The Office of Administration**, an in-house staff that provides information systems, budgetary, administrative, personnel, and communications services.

Office Locations

The OIG is headquartered in Washington, D.C., at GSA's Central Office building. Field audit and investigations offices are maintained in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Atlanta, Chicago, Kansas City, Fort Worth, San Francisco, and Washington, D.C. Sub-offices are also maintained in Auburn, Cleveland, and Los Angeles.

Staffing and Budget

As of March 31, 1999, our on-board strength was 274 employees. The OIG's FY 1999 budget was approximately \$32 million.

Reviews of GSA Programs

GSA is a central management agency that sets Federal policy in such areas as Federal procurement, real property management, and telecommunications. GSA also manages diversified Government operations involving buildings management, supply facilities, real and personal property disposal and sales, data processing, and motor vehicle and travel management. Our audits examine the efficiency, effectiveness, and integrity of GSA programs and operations, and result in reports to management. Our internal audits program is designed to facilitate management's evaluation and improvement of control systems by identifying areas of vulnerability and providing informational and advisory services.

Significant OIG Accomplishments

*Conversion delays
result in shortened
testing time frames.*

Year 2000 Conversion Efforts

We are continuing to review GSA's Year 2000 computer systems conversion efforts. In two prior audits, we reported that the Agency's initial planning for conversion was not adequate and conversion schedules had not been developed. During this 6-month reporting period, we focused on the Office of the Chief Financial Officer (CFO) efforts in converting mission-critical systems to effectively operate in the year 2000, with particular emphasis on the National Electronic Accounting and Reporting (NEAR) system. This system performs vital functions for the Agency such as controlling, recording, classifying, and summarizing financial transactions to meet Federal accounting requirements.

GSA had set an internal deadline for conversion of systems by January 31, 1999. In assessing the status of the NEAR system conversion, we found it difficult to quantify the CFO's progress because NEAR is a complex system, consisting of multiple software and hardware components that are in various stages of conversion, but is nevertheless reported as a single system. The CFO has experienced conversion delays that have resulted in compressed testing time frames. Initially, 5 months were allowed for testing; however, much of that time was consumed by delays. This increases the risk that the NEAR system may not be adequately tested and could experience problems in the year 2000.

We also noted that the CFO has not maintained test documentation and has not used an independent source to review and validate the tests. In addition, the CFO needs to determine that its data exchanges will operate correctly and that it develops business continuity and contingency plans to ensure that vital functions continue in the event that all NEAR system conversions are not completed on time.

Reviews of GSA Programs

In our December 16, 1998 report, we recommended that the Chief Financial Officer:

- Develop measurement tools to monitor and evaluate the progress of remaining work.
- Review and analyze the adequacy of testing performed to date.
- Use an independent validation and verification organization to assess conversion and testing efforts.
- Ensure that all data exchanges will operate correctly.
- Complete development of a business continuity and contingency plan.

Management agreed with our recommendations. The report is still in the resolution process.

Security Enhancements in Federal Buildings

On April 19, 1995, a bomb destroyed the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Office Building in Oklahoma City. This terrorist act resulted in the death of 168 Federal employees and visitors, and significant injuries to hundreds of individuals. The next day, President Clinton directed the Department of Justice (DOJ) to assess the vulnerability of Federal office buildings in the United States, particularly to acts of terrorism and other forms of violence. The United States Marshals Service coordinated the study, based on its expertise in court security.

On June 28, 1995, DOJ issued the Vulnerability Assessment of Federal Facilities Report. DOJ's principal recommendation was that, where feasible, each Federal facility should be brought up to the appropriate minimum security standards. Depending on the security level and feasibility of installation, security upgrade countermeasures could include: x-ray screening of all mail and packages, closed circuit television, perimeter lighting, contract guards, and magnetometer or x-ray screening at public entrances. Over \$140 million was available to fund the capital costs of security equipment upgrades alone. GSA allocated the funds to its regions based on specific countermeasures requested by individual building security committees. GSA was also tasked with creating a physical security database covering all Federal office buildings. To accomplish this, GSA designed and implemented a nationwide automated tracking system called the Building Security Committee System. Regional offices were responsible for inputting information into the system and transferring it to headquarters, where the security information is maintained in a nationwide database.

Security improvements made but information system still needs attention.

Reviews of GSA Programs

In FY 1997, the OIG reviewed GSA's upgrading of security at Federal facilities and noted several items of significant concern that we felt warranted immediate reporting to management. Our reports described discrepancies in the database used for tracking and reporting the status of security upgrade countermeasures, such as equipment reported as installed but found to be either missing or non-operational, equipment installed but not recorded in the database, and countermeasure descriptions that did not sufficiently describe what was actually done. We also found countermeasures completed despite Central Office disapproval, security equipment in storage but with no plan for installation, and security enhancement funds used for non-security related purposes or not used efficiently.

This year, we agreed to perform a follow-up audit to assess how the corrective actions were proceeding. In the interim, we issued our final report on the security upgrade program. The Commissioner, Public Buildings Service, in response to our reported findings, directed that the regions certify to the accuracy of the database used to track security equipment upgrades by October 1998. Our follow-up effort started shortly thereafter.

We concluded that the security upgrade program has significantly enhanced the security at GSA-controlled facilities since our initial review. We did identify a few problems concerning the physical installation of equipment. Site inspections found some uninstalled or non-operational countermeasures that had been reported as completed. In addition, management information is still not reliable despite ongoing corrective measures. This has occurred because officials have not placed sufficient emphasis on the need for accuracy in the security countermeasure tracking system. Consequently, management still lacks accurate data critical to administering the security program and assessing regional accomplishments. We also noted instances where regional officials inappropriately used security enhancement funds.

Since the Agency is in the process of implementing the action plan pertaining to recommendations contained in the initial program report, our March 18, 1999 report to the Commissioner, Public Buildings Service did not include formal recommendations. However, we suggested that Federal Protective Service Central Office re-emphasize to regional officials the importance of GSA's security equipment inventory responsibility.

Access to Building Design Plans

GSA, as the primary landlord and property manager for the Government, is involved with the construction and major repair and alterations of many Federal facilities. Integral to such construction work is the development of design plans, frequently detailing the physical layout of the structure and interior space.

Reviews of GSA Programs

Easy access to public building plans may create undue risks.

We initiated this review upon learning that Federal-building blueprints had been provided to a trust for a municipal revitalization project. The plans were released without any restrictive language regarding release to third parties or physical safeguarding of the plans. With further research, we learned that Federal building design plans are, in many cases, available to the general public through several sources. More disconcerting was the fact that some of these sources were considering including actual drawings on the Internet. Clearly, this would present a heightened exposure to physical security risks.

During our audit, a number of questions surfaced which needed to be addressed:

- Should GSA provide Federal building design plans to outside parties without specific provisions for physically safeguarding the plans?
- Should recipients of the plans be required to agree to any non-disclosure requirements?
- To what extent are plans available to the public?

A number of factors and differing opinions by various agency groups exist with regard to the need to make design plans available to accomplish necessary work without materially increasing security risks.

We concluded that GSA needs to reevaluate current policy to determine when public access to plans is a security threat, and decide if policy changes should be made in light of the Agency's responsibility to safeguard property and lives in today's environment of more heightened security concerns.

In our December 1, 1998 report, we recommended that management assess and update existing policy for dissemination of design plans. Responsive management action plans were provided for implementing the report recommendations.

Security Standards for New Buildings

In October 1995, following the bombing of the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, President Clinton issued an Executive Order that created the Interagency Security Committee (Committee). Chaired by GSA's Administrator, the Committee was formed to establish policies for developing and evaluating security standards for Federal facilities, ensuring compliance with such standards, and overseeing the implementation of appropriate security measures in Federal facilities. GSA focused on developing enhanced security standards for planning, designing, and constructing new buildings, and for major renovation projects. GSA adopted a draft of the standards in January 1997. The Committee approved the enhanced standards, with minor modifications, in November 1998.

Enhanced security standards are applied in construction phases of new buildings where possible.

Reviews of GSA Programs

We conducted a review of security standards for new and renovated Federal buildings. Our evaluation concluded that GSA is applying the enhanced security standards where possible; however, not enough time has elapsed for the standards to be applied to all phases of ongoing building projects. Since new construction projects take a number of years from the time the actual need for a building is identified to the actual construction, current projects were planned prior to the development of the standards. In addition, most projects currently underway are for border stations, which are unique buildings exempted from the new standards, and for courthouses. While courthouse construction would be subject to the standards, GSA and the Administrative Office of the Courts have agreed, in a memorandum of understanding, that new courthouses will follow prearranged protection levels which obviate the need for an individual threat assessment as prescribed by GSA's standards. Finally, GSA has not adopted assessment standards for properties under consideration for new leases of space.

In our March 24, 1999 report, we recommended that the Commissioner, Public Buildings Service:

- Develop a policy that defines the roles and responsibilities of individuals involved in implementing the enhanced security standards for new construction and major renovation projects.
- Create security standards for newly acquired leased space.

The Commissioner agreed with the recommendations in the report. The report is still in the resolution process.

Costly Lease Space Alterations

GSA entered into a lease for a significant amount of space to be occupied by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) in a newly constructed building in Washington, D.C. known as Portals II. As the space was being customized to meet the needs of FCC, GSA issued a number of change orders valued at over \$15 million as of March 1998. The OIG initiated a review of these change orders to determine if there was adequate supporting file documentation to substantiate the basis for the reasonableness of the negotiated prices.

Our review disclosed that major change order files did not consistently identify contract records documenting the analysis, actions, and justifications leading to the change order awards. Overhead fees and profits added by the lessor to the base costs of the change orders were substantially higher than those in other GSA lease agreements, and may not be reasonable for the level of effort necessary to accomplish the task.

The Federal Buildings Fund may pay for costly space alterations.

Reviews of GSA Programs

However, because these rates were established in the original lease contract it would be very difficult to renegotiate lower markup percentages. We made no recommendations on the markups, but did encourage the Agency to make every effort to contain costs.

Also, GSA had authorized above standard space improvements requested by FCC without first establishing the source of the funds. In a nearly 3-year period, GSA incurred costs for above standard improvements, architectural and engineering services, and interest in excess of \$15 million. These costs were funded through supplemental lease agreements, allowing GSA to amortize the incurred costs over the lease term, thus increasing total costs to over \$25 million. As a result, the monthly rental payment will increase by \$260,828. Congress has not approved FCC's request for funds that it considered necessary to prepare the building for occupancy, and GSA agreed to fund the agency's costs.

As a consequence, GSA will be required to fund the payments using the Federal Buildings Fund if FCC is unsuccessful in obtaining the appropriations necessary to cover the higher rent payments in the supplemental lease agreements. If this occurs, additional burdens will be placed on the already financially strapped Federal Buildings Fund.

Management indicated this lease was a unique transaction, and that funding tenant space improvements was legal and prudent under the circumstances. While this lease does not reflect typical transactions, we pointed out that regardless of the complexity of a project it is necessary to establish and document the source of the funds for above standard improvements prior to initiating the change orders. The report is still in the resolution phase.

Inaccurate Warehouse Space Billing

The Public Buildings Service (PBS) provides space to Federal agencies. PBS charges agencies rent, set at commercially comparable rates, in order to generate revenue and make agencies accountable for the resources they consume.

While reviewing PBS's information system data as part of an ongoing nationwide audit on vacant space, we noted that the GSA supply depot in Franconia, Virginia reportedly had significant vacant space. Over 578,000 square feet of space was categorized as vacant. Upon physical inspection of the site, we saw that the space was almost fully occupied, primarily by the GSA Federal Supply Service (FSS). Officials of both PBS and FSS acknowledged that the information system was incorrect and needed to be updated.

*Annual rent charges
at warehouse
understated by at
least \$1 million.*

Reviews of GSA Programs

The impact of this discrepancy is that the FSS is not being billed for all of its space at the depot, and the PBS is inappropriately subsidizing the depot program at the expense of the Federal Buildings Fund. Although there is disagreement over the exact amount of space occupied by FSS, we estimated that the rent charged is understated by at least \$1 million per year.

In our January 5, 1999 report to the Regional Administrator, we recommended that the Assistant Regional Administrator of the Public Buildings Service direct the region to determine the appropriate amount of rent to be recouped, pursue collection, and correct the data in the information system. A responsive management action plan was provided for implementing the report recommendation.

Controls Over Direct Building Costs

As GSA continues to redirect its efforts to operate in a more business-like manner, it has emphasized the importance of managing its real property asset portfolio by managing costs. Costs can be classified into two general categories, direct and indirect costs. Direct costs are specifically incurred for, or benefit, a particular final cost objective or operation. Conversely, indirect costs, often referred to as general and administrative expenses, benefit multiple cost objectives.

We reviewed direct building operating costs in one region to determine whether the controls over the recording and processing of those costs provide reasonable assurance that they are accurately reported on building income statements. Our results demonstrate a need to strengthen management controls to ensure the reliability of building financial statements. Over 85 percent of the sampled transactions were posted in the wrong fiscal year, to the wrong account, and/or to the wrong building, causing the direct costs, as presented on the buildings' financial statements, to be materially misstated.

Our March 31, 1999 report recommended that the Assistant Regional Administrator:

- Reaffirm the need for accurate building income statements.
- Ensure that complete supporting data is provided to the Office of Finance for building-related transactions.
- Clarify GSA's capitalization policies.
- Instruct regional personnel to periodically verify and reconcile building income statement data to supporting documentation.

*Need to improve
reliability of regional
building financial
statements.*

Reviews of GSA Programs

Management generally agreed with the report recommendations. The report is still in the resolution process.

Controlling Vacant Space

GSA acts as a clearinghouse for vacant space, allowing agencies to return unneeded space with short notice. The Agency can then try to backfill this space with another tenant, dispose of Government-owned property, or terminate leases. Vacant space has a significant impact on GSA's ability to maximize revenue. The potential revenue from vacant space was about \$544 million in FY 1998.

GSA has taken action to mitigate the impact of the vacant space by implementing new initiatives directed toward improving overall asset management. The Agency is installing a new information system that it believes will enhance its ability to manage the inventory. It has also implemented new performance measures and management controls to improve asset performance.

During our review of vacant space, we noted some issues that warrant management's attention. We pointed out that the accuracy of the data in the new information system should be improved. Information was transferred from the prior systems and much of that inaccurate data has yet to be corrected. Also, the data elements used in PBS's performance measure for non-revenue producing space needs clarification. Regional offices were not able to trace back to the supporting data used by the national office to evaluate this measure. Finally, the lines of authority over regional space inventory should be better defined. Revenue managers and asset managers depend on other groups to carry out their plans or meet revenue targets. We found confusion at the regional level as to the responsibilities and authorities of these managers, which, consequently, made it difficult for them to initiate change.

Once these issues are addressed, the Agency will be in a better position to minimize the impact of vacant space on the Federal Buildings Fund.

We issued our report to the Commissioner, Public Buildings Service, on March 18, 1999. Since PBS is actively pursuing the issues we discussed, our report did not contain formal recommendations. The Commissioner agreed and indicated that the region has started corrective action.

Initiatives to Improve Space Alterations

In November 1996, GSA introduced a series of initiatives aimed at improving the process by which it delivers space alteration services to customer agencies. The initiatives offered options on how to have alterations performed,

A new information system holds promise but needs improvement.

Reviews of GSA Programs

Customers are happier but feel billings should be more timely and accurate.

provided flexibility in obtaining the goods and services necessary to accomplish alterations, and presented techniques to reduce the administrative burden while increasing performance. From July 1997 to March 1998, GSA initiated over 5,000 reimbursable work authorizations (RWAs) valued at less than \$100,000 each, but with a combined value of about \$64 million.

We performed a review and determined that the Agency did not have a reliable mechanism to measure customers' satisfaction with the RWA process. Therefore, we surveyed these customers to see how satisfied they were with the timeliness, quality, cost, and ease of doing business with GSA. We concluded that GSA has improved its focus on the customer and that customers are generally satisfied with the process. However, customers felt that billing was either untimely or inaccurate. Since anticipated management support systems have not evolved and program performance cannot be measured accurately, management may not be able to readily identify program successes or weaknesses.

In our March 24, 1999 report, we recommended that the Commissioner, Public Buildings Service:

- Re-evaluate the program performance measures and correct design deficiencies for those measures to be retained, or develop alternative performance measures.
- Define and standardize the core data requirements for effective program management and oversight.
- Provide customers with timely and accurate billings and ensure timely recovery of funds owed to GSA.

The Commissioner agreed with the recommendations in the report. The report is still in the resolution process.

Building Income Statement Reliability

Prudent business practice dictates that managers have the necessary tools to permit periodic analysis of identifiable expenditures supporting their financial statements, including general and administrative (G&A) expense details. It is particularly important for managers to analyze G&A expenses because, by definition, these costs are not directly related to producing a product or service. As such, G&A expenses may be harder for managers to control.

GSA recognizes the importance of having accurate financial data for business decisions. However, the Agency's accounting system does not have the capability to readily or easily provide a means for identifying the

Reviews of GSA Programs

Absence of financial details makes general and administrative balances unreliable.

detail of transactions that comprise the regional G&A balances on the income statements for individual buildings. Therefore, GSA is unable to ensure the reliability of these balances.

The Agency's accounting system is being replaced with a new, integrated financial management system. One of its objectives is to provide easy, on-line access to the supporting detail of financial information. The new system should aid in identifying the transactional detail supporting G&A expenses, but will not be fully operational for several years.

During a recent audit, we identified a methodology by which detailed regional G&A transactions can be isolated and, therefore, analyzed for accuracy while the new financial management system is being implemented. By using two data source files from the accounting system, analysts can reconcile transactional details to the lump sum regional G&A total presented in the income statement.

Our February 8, 1999 report recommended that GSA management make available and accessible, on a periodic basis, the data source files to the personnel responsible for verifying the accuracy and completeness of the income statement data. This data can then be verified for accuracy and completeness.

Management agreed with the recommendations in the report. The audit is still in the resolution process.

Negotiated Lease Procurements

GSA management has embarked on an effort to redesign and streamline the leasing program with a greater emphasis toward meeting customer needs, along with improving the leasing process. However, some of the guidance available to leasing specialists has been suspended and specialists are encouraged to be more creative, attendant with associated risks. Lease specialists are nevertheless still required to comply with basic control elements to ensure that fair and reasonable rent rates are negotiated.

As part of a multi-regional management control review, we reported that, in one region, controls were weak because leasing personnel did not adequately document lease files, and control procedures had not been established to ensure that the required level of documentation was maintained. The region needs to provide, on a regular basis, justification for other than full and open competition. Non-competitive leases were being awarded beyond certain thresholds without the approval of the competition advocate as required by regulation.

Inadequate management controls can expose lease procurements to possible criticisms.

Reviews of GSA Programs

The absence of required documentation exposes the Agency to undue risk in award disputes and potential legal actions. By not implementing basic controls to ensure that the leasing files support the actions taken to achieve open market competition, or clearly justify the approval to waive this requirement, regional leasing may be criticized for not fully protecting taxpayers' interests.

In our February 22, 1999 report to the Regional Administrator, we recommended that the Assistant Regional Administrator:

- Reiterate to his staff the basic documentation requirements established by regulations.
- Establish positive management control procedures for the purpose of ensuring that lease files contain documentation necessary to support the leasing action.

The Regional Administrator agreed with the recommendations in the report. The report is still in the resolution process.

Sale of Surplus Personal Property

GSA disposes surplus personal property for Federal agencies. Such items include vehicles, computer equipment, furniture, and a variety of other products. Sales can be conducted by sealed bid, spot bid, negotiation, fixed price sale, or auction. GSA's regional sales offices plan and conduct the sale, collect and deposit proceeds, and transfer title to purchasers. For its services, the Agency is usually reimbursed by either a fixed fee per item sold or a percentage of the sales proceeds. In FY 1998, sales exceeded \$250 million.

The OIG reviewed the management controls over the documenting, collecting, depositing, and reconciling of proceeds from personal property sales. We conducted our review in four separate regional sales offices and at the Central Office, and issued a nationwide and four regional reports.

We concluded that management controls were generally sufficient, although in a few instances improvements were needed to implement prescribed practices. Specifically, former Agency employees retained access to the sales automation system, ownership forms used to transfer title to a vehicle were poorly controlled, physical security within cash handling areas and during transport of bank deposits was lax, and separation of duties during sealed bid sales was not adequate.

Although management controls were generally sufficient, improvements in physical security and cash handling activities are needed.

Reviews of GSA Programs

In our March 12, 1999 program-wide report, we recommended that the Commissioner, Federal Supply Service:

- Re-evaluate the proceeds deposit threshold triggering the security escort requirements, and initiate a change in the regulations, as appropriate.
- Delete names of departing employees from the sales automation system at the time of departure; account for and properly secure ownership transfer forms; make deposits of cash amounts above specified dollar thresholds only with a security escort, and adequately secure cash handling areas; and separate duties among employees when transporting, opening, and examining sealed bids.

The Commissioner agreed with the recommendations in the report. The report is still in the resolution process.

Two of the four regional reports recommended that management improve its physical security control practices over cash handling activities and accountability over title transfer documents. The Assistant Regional Administrator in each region agreed with the report recommendations. These reports are still in the resolution process. The other two regional reports had no recommendations.

Reporting Alternative Fuels Usage

One of the provisions of the 1992 Energy Policy Act requires Federal agencies to make greater use of alternative fuel vehicles. Starting in FY 1996, an ever-increasing portion of vehicles acquired for use in metropolitan areas with populations of 250,000 or more had to use alternative fuels. For FY 1999 and beyond, at least 75 percent of new acquisitions must meet this standard. The law requires that, "to the extent practicable, agencies shall use alternative fuels in all vehicles capable of using them," and annually report the agency's compliance with the law. Customer agencies are looking to the Interagency Fleet Management System (IFMS) to supply alternative fuel usage information for vehicles leased from IFMS.

At the Agency's request, we looked to see if the amount of alternative fuel consumed by the IFMS customer agencies can be determined from the electronic data available in the IFMS computer systems. We concluded that fuel consumption could not be identified in total or by customer agency.

Reviews of GSA Programs

We advised management of three issues that will need to be resolved before reliable alternative fuel purchase information can be obtained:

- Credit card coding errors will need to be reduced to an acceptable level.
- Credit card information collected will need to be stored in a format that segregates customer agencies' alternative fuel purchases so it can be periodically compiled.
- The amount of alternative fuel purchased through cross service agreements and commercial invoices certified by Fleet Management Center personnel will need to be recorded in a manner that allows periodic summarization of customer agencies' purchases.

We provided suggestions for possible ways of addressing the issues. The March 24, 1999 report was advisory in nature and did not contain any formal recommendations.

Working with the Government Performance and Results Act

One of the most significant pieces of legislation passed to improve the effectiveness of Government programs is the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA). The focus of the Act is to hold public managers more accountable for achieving desired program outcomes. The Congress also envisions that the Offices of Inspector General will play a key role in fostering sound implementation of GPRA.

GPRA requires each Federal agency to develop: (1) a strategic plan covering a period of not less than 5 years, (2) an annual performance plan consistent with the strategic plan, and (3) program performance reports.

Each agency's strategic plan must contain, among other elements, a comprehensive mission statement, general goals and objectives, and a description of how the goals and objectives are to be achieved.

The performance plans establish measurable goals and indicators to provide a basis for comparing actual program results with the established performance goals for each program activity set forth in the budget of the agency. No later than March 31, 2000, and no later than March 31 of each year thereafter, the head of each agency is required to prepare and submit to the President and the Congress a report on program performance for the previous fiscal year.

We are aware that the Congress seeks the active involvement of the Offices of Inspector General (OIGs) in fostering sound implementation of GPRA through audit work in each agency. Primarily, the OIGs have been requested to:

- Review agency efforts to develop and use performance measures for determining progress toward achieving the performance goals and program outcomes described in the agency's annual performance plans and performance reports under GPRA.
- Verify and validate selected data sources and information collection and accounting systems that support the agency's GPRA strategic and performance plans and its performance reports.

During recent years, the OIG has been performing selective reviews of GSA's performance measures as reported by the Office of the Chief Financial Officer (CFO) in the Agency's Annual Reports. Since FY 1994, we have made preliminary risk assessments of the internal controls over the data supporting ten performance measures.

GSA received low acceptance ratings from the Congress and General Accounting Office on its strategic plan and its performance plan for FY 1999. To assist the Agency with its efforts to implement GPRA, we have offered

The OIG is actively involved in fostering sound implementation of GPRA through audit and consulting work within the Agency.

our consulting services to Agency managers to assist them in whatever ways possible. Also, we benchmarked with three other Federal agencies, whose GPRA products had been better received by the Congress, to identify “best practices” that GSA could adopt. We reported, in June 1998, that the Agency could improve its implementation process by getting a higher degree of senior management involvement and more clearly articulating roles and responsibilities of the officials at all levels of the organization. We further reported, on March 31, 1999, that we believe that personnel have improved their understanding of the underlying fundamentals of GPRA and are now focusing on measuring their more important operations. The Agency has made significant improvements in its latest GPRA submissions.

Continuing our efforts in reviewing Agency progress with GPRA requirements, we plan to assess whether the data and systems supporting six selected performance measures (two in each of GSA’s major Services) exist and are accurate and complete to ensure reliable reporting.

Interagency Fleet Management System

This period, we completed one of the selective performance measure reviews of a specific program, the Interagency Fleet Management System. We wanted to observe problems being faced by managers in implementing GPRA and see how well managers understood the Act’s requirements.

The GSA mission relating to motor vehicles is to “...provide for an economical and efficient system for transportation of Government personnel and property.” The current GSA FY 1999-2000 Annual Performance Plan identifies five performance measures relating to IFMS operations:

- savings per vehicle consolidated into IFMS;
- percentage of Federal fleet operated by IFMS (market share);
- rate of increase in per-mile charge compared to inflation rate;
- percentage of respondents giving a “highly satisfied” rating (customer satisfaction); and
- percent of requests filled (alternative fuel vehicles).

Our report noted that the consolidation and market penetration performance measures do not assess IFMS’s performance in terms of mission accomplishment. Rather, they are geared toward evaluating performance against the GSA strategic goals of promoting responsible asset management and competing effectively for the Federal market.

While we believe the rate of increase in per-mile charge is an appropriate measure, the performance goal to “Hold annual increase in per mile charges for interagency fleet vehicles close to the inflation rate,” is not adequate. IFMS would not be able to adequately evaluate its performance because it does not communicate a measurable result to be achieved.

Finally, the performance goals for the customer satisfaction and the alternative fuel vehicle measurements are based on the combined performance of the vehicle acquisition and leasing functions. We pointed out, however, that the performance baseline for the customer satisfaction performance measure was established using only the leasing function. The differences in service provided by the acquisition and leasing functions are so diverse that it may not be possible for a customer to make a proper distinction when answering survey questions.

One of the basic tenets of the Act’s legislation is for an agency to define its core missions and to provide to the President and Congress, through a systematic method of evaluation, an annual assessment of the success it has had in performing those missions. It appears that the IFMS has structured its performance measures around the GSA strategic goals and objectives, but it now needs to define program success in terms of accomplishing GSA’s mission.

Our report of March 31, 1999 suggests several methods for focusing the performance measures on the basic GSA mission. We also make suggestions to improve the implementation of several measures.

Internal Controls Over Performance Measures

Also, we examined the overall design and operation of the internal controls over performance measures reported in the Agency’s FY 1998 Annual Report. In our report on overall internal controls, dated February 25, 1999, we concluded that there is no clear understanding of who is responsible for verifying performance data at the individual service level and for GSA overall. GSA has not adequately defined and documented its system of controls to ensure that appropriate levels of management understand and are performing the necessary reviews of performance data. This would enable managers to make an assertion of completeness and existence of the data and systems supporting the measures. In our judgement, this condition could adversely affect GSA’s ability to collect, process, record, and summarize performance information. We recommended that GSA establish a process to ensure that appropriate levels of management understand and are performing the necessary reviews of performance data, which would enable them to make an assertion of completeness and existence of the data and systems supporting the measures.

Working with the Government Performance and Results Act

Finally, our reviews identify performance results and provide recommended improvements, and will continue to do so in the future. As part of our continuing focus on GPRA, we intend that, as an integral part of any program review, an appropriate inquiry will be made to identify and assess the program or activity's performance measures.

Procurement Activities

GSA is responsible for providing working space for almost 1 million Federal employees. GSA, therefore, acquires buildings and sites, constructs facilities, and leases space, and also contracts for repairs, alterations, maintenance, and protection of Government-controlled space. GSA also operates a Governmentwide service and supply system. To meet the needs of customer agencies, GSA contracts for billions of dollars worth of equipment, supplies, materials, and services each year. We review these procurements both on a preaward and postaward basis to ensure that the taxpayers' interests are protected.

Significant OIG Accomplishments

Nearly \$5 Million in Civil Fraud Recoveries

During this period, the Government entered into 2 settlement agreements in which companies agreed to pay a total of nearly \$5 million to resolve their potential civil liabilities under the False Claims Act. These agreements, negotiated by representatives of the Department of Justice and the GSA OIG, reflect the ongoing efforts of the OIG to pursue cases involving procurement fraud and other practices that threaten the integrity of the Government's procurement process.

Many of these cases involved procurements under GSA's Multiple Award Schedule (MAS) program. Under this program, GSA negotiates contracts with a number of vendors who may then sell contract authorized products to Federal agencies at established contract prices. Consistent with the provisions of the Truth in Negotiations Act and the Competition in Contracting Act, the process is based on the principles of full and open disclosure and fair negotiations. Vendors must provide current, accurate, and complete pricing information--including information about discounts granted their most favored commercial customers--during contract negotiations. Relying on this information, GSA contracting personnel then seek to obtain the best possible prices for the Government. In cases where vendors fail to provide current, accurate, or complete information, the Government may pay artificially inflated prices for products and services purchased. Highlights of these cases follow.

- In a settlement of a case brought under the *qui tam* provisions of the False Claims Act, Clark Equipment Company, a wholly-owned subsidiary of Ingersoll-Rand Company and supplier of construction equipment, agreed to pay \$3,000,000 to settle allegations that it failed to provide current, accurate, and complete information to GSA contracting officials when it negotiated two MAS contracts. These *qui tam* provisions allow individuals to bring suit, on behalf of themselves and the Federal Government, against contractors who submit false claims to the Government. The private citizen who initiated this action on behalf of the Government received \$550,000 of the settlement amount.

Procurement Activities

- Case Corporation, a supplier of road clearing and repair equipment, agreed to pay \$1,900,000 to settle the Government's claims that it over-billed Federal customers, failed to pass on price reductions, and did not provide current, accurate, or complete data to GSA contracting officials. The Government alleged that Case's actions caused Federal customers to pay more for products than they otherwise would have. The problems with the MAS contract were discovered in the course of a postaward audit.

Individual Pleads Guilty to Theft and Fraudulent Use of Government Telephone Cards

On February 9, 1999, an individual pled guilty in U.S. District Court to conspiracy and trafficking in stolen telephone access devices. Sentencing is scheduled for May 18, 1999.

The investigation was initiated when the New York Electronic Crimes Task Force alerted the OIG of the theft of phone card numbers, including Government phone cards. The investigation found that the theft of these numbers was accomplished by intercepting public telephone calls using a dial number recorder.

The individual used the stolen numbers to execute a call-sell operation. A call-sell operation is a form of illegal reselling of telephone service by using stolen calling card numbers for access to telephone networks. He used the three-way calling feature to connect the call-sell customer to a party in the foreign country or he provided the stolen number to co-conspirators in a foreign country, who then used the numbers to illegally obtain free long distance service from service providers like AT&T, MCI, and Sprint. The OIG is working with GSA Information Technology program managers to alert internal Agency and external Government phone card users of the existence of this fraud and to advise them of precautions that can be taken to prevent becoming a victim.

Company President Sentenced in Fraud Scheme

On March 22, 1999, the president of an automated data processing (ADP) services company was sentenced in U.S. District Court to 30 months incarceration, 36 months of probation, and ordered to pay a \$3,000 fine and \$1,254,000 in restitution for making false statements in connection with a GSA contract. Previously, on April 13, 1998, a former Navy employee pled guilty to making false statements in connection with the same GSA contract and his sentencing is scheduled for April 1999.

Theft of Government phone card numbers was accomplished by intercepting public telephone calls. OIG works with Agency management to assist Government employees in avoiding victimization.

Procurement Activities

The OIG investigation was initiated when the Naval Criminal Investigative Service provided information alleging that the company was inflating charges to the Government on a contract for ADP technical support services. The investigation found that the company overcharged the Government by including fictitious employees' names on summary reports and inflating the number of hours worked on Government tasks. The company president conspired with the former Navy employee from 1993 through 1997 to make false statements that resulted in the company being overpaid \$1,103,037.

Two Office Supply Company Principals Sentenced for Impersonating Federal Officials

Two principals of office supply companies were sentenced in U.S. District Court after pleading guilty to impersonating Federal officials. One principal was sentenced on March 19, 1999 to 2 years probation and ordered to pay a \$10,000 fine. The other individual was sentenced on February 26, 1999 to 3 years probation and ordered to pay a \$1,000 fine.

An OIG investigation was initiated when it was alleged that Xerox Corporation products were being sold at GSA-negotiated Government discount prices to a commercial office supply company that deceived Xerox into believing the sales were to Government agencies. The investigation determined that the two individuals conspired by impersonating various GSA, Internal Revenue Service, and Department of Defense officials while purchasing over \$800,000 in Xerox products at GSA Multiple Award Schedule prices. Since GSA prices are considerably lower than commercial prices, the scheme provided for substantial profits.

GSA Contractor Pleads Guilty to Theft of Public Money

On February 24, 1999, the owner of a consulting firm that contracted with GSA to provide assistance to small and minority firms on Government contracts pled guilty in U.S. District Court to theft of public money. Sentencing is scheduled for May 7, 1999.

The investigation was initiated upon receipt of information that the firm engaged in false and double billing of its clients, including GSA and city agencies. The investigation determined that the owner fraudulently billed clients for work not performed and multiple-billed clients for the same hours.

Procurement Activities

Purchase Card Transactions

GSA provides space and related services to Federal customers through its Customer Service Centers (CSC). Authorized CSC staff can procure supplies and services needed to carry out their official responsibilities using simplified acquisition procedures. Agency-issued purchase cards are the preferred means of purchase and are considered more time- and cost-effective. Although procedures are simplified, procurement officials are still required to comply with basic management controls mandated by GSA policy and guidelines.

In several recent reviews, we identified problems arising from a lack of management controls being exercised, particularly in the procurement arena. Procurement authority is commonly being delegated to employees who are neither experienced nor trained in procurement regulations. Accordingly, we performed a review of the management controls for CSC procurements.

In one region, we found that formal procurements were generally made in accordance with policy and guidance. However, our review concluded that improved controls were necessary in several areas. For example, controls need to be strengthened over small purchase bankcard transactions. Because of a reduction in staffing, key duties are not separated among individuals. In addition, the approving official does not monitor and verify card usage. Finally, cardholders are not performing monthly reconciliations of the card statements to the supporting documentation. Accordingly, the review pointed out that there is little to safeguard against potential misuse or waste, and no assurance that all procurements are valid to serve program needs.

In our December 31, 1998 report to the Regional Administrator, we recommended that:

- Approving officials monitor and verify all purchase card activities.
- Individual cardholders perform monthly reconciliations.

Responsive management action plans were provided for implementing the report recommendations.

Property Management Center

GSA has the responsibility to provide fully serviced space to house Government agencies in Federally-owned and leased buildings. Property Management Centers (PMCs), located throughout the country, fulfill the needs and requests of Government agencies that occupy space in the

Basic controls need to be exercised over small purchase bankcard transactions.

Procurement Activities

Building equipment may fail, causing costly repairs and inconvenienced tenants, if preventive maintenance services are delivered late.

buildings. In general, PMC activities include procurement, asset management, and contract and lease administration.

We conducted reviews of PMCs to see if GSA is getting what it pays for, and to assess the economy and efficiency of PMC operations, and their compliance with laws, regulations, and policies. One such regional review performed this reporting period showed that procurements were prudent and made in accordance with established policy and controls. Federally-owned space was cleaned satisfactorily, and tenant agencies were satisfied with the services provided by GSA's janitorial contractors.

We concluded, however, that the building equipment could be exposed to premature failure, with resultant costly repairs and inconvenience to building occupants, because preventive maintenance that was being performed was not in accordance with GSA policy and practices. We also examined repair and alteration projects. While the PMC inspected the quality and quantity of construction services before authorizing payment, timeliness of delivery of these services needs improvement.

The March 23, 1999 report directed recommendations to the Regional management. These included recommendations to:

- Reassess and adjust, as necessary, the PMC's delivery and management of the preventive maintenance program for the buildings' equipment.
- Ensure that all janitorial contractors develop and implement a quality control plan.
- Provide better reimbursable construction services to tenant agencies by establishing and meeting delivery dates.

The Regional Administrator agreed with the recommendations in the report. The report is still in the resolution process.

Prevention Activities

In addition to detecting problems in GSA operations, the OIG is responsible for initiating actions to prevent fraud, waste, and abuse and to promote economy and efficiency.

Significant Preaward and Other Audits

The OIG's preaward audit program provides information to contracting officers for use in negotiating contracts. The pre-decisional, advisory nature of preaward audits distinguishes them from other audits. This program provides vital and current information to contracting officers, enabling them to significantly improve the Government's negotiating position and to realize millions of dollars in savings on negotiated contracts. This period, the OIG performed preaward audits of 49 contracts with an estimated value of \$4.7 billion. The audit reports contained over \$342 million in financial recommendations.

This period, five of the more significant Multiple Award Schedule (MAS) contracts we audited had projected Governmentwide sales totaling nearly \$3.7 billion. The audit findings recommended that \$319.7 million in funds be put to better use. The audits disclosed that four of the vendors offered prices which were not either (1) fair and reasonable considering the overall volume of sales made under the MAS contracts, or (2) comparable to the prices other customers receive from these vendors, or both. The fifth vendor could substantially reduce its rates for services performed for MAS customers if instead of its own employees the vendor used subcontractors to perform the services, which it already does when it contracts with other Federal agencies.

We also audited several claims for increased costs allegedly caused by the Government during the construction and renovation of Federal buildings. Two of the more significant audits contained proposed prices totaling \$4 million, and recommended adjustments of \$2.7 million. In an audit of a claim for increased costs due to a Government-directed acceleration of the construction, we advised the contracting officer that a subcontractor's claim should be adjusted to eliminate duplications and unallowable contingencies. In an audit of another claim for additional costs during a contract extension, we advised the contracting officer that several subcontractors' costs were overstated because they duplicated expenses that were previously reimbursed, and the subcontractors had substantially completed their portion of the work before the start of the time extension.

Disappointing Contracting Results

Contracting officials achieved only 5 percent of the recommended cost avoidances of \$212 million for MAS preaward audits closed during this reporting period. In the 3 years preceding this period, 56 percent of our recommended MAS cost avoidances of \$384 million were achieved. We are extremely concerned with the sharp decline in the sustained cost

Prevention Activities

Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act Review

avoidances and the significant departure from historical experience. We have brought this issue to the attention of Federal Supply Services' senior procurement officials. They have pledged to work with us to review this matter in detail to determine the underlying causes and, where needed, to develop possible strategies for improving results.

The Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA), Section 2, requires GSA management to provide assurance to the President and the Congress that Agency resources are protected from fraud, waste, mismanagement, and misappropriation.

Each year, we review the Agency's FMFIA process to assess its completeness in reporting weaknesses and deficiencies. This year, we advised management of one material weakness that we believe should be included in the Administrator's assurance statement and a second issue of security for Agency computer systems.

The first issue is a material control weakness relating to the Federal Protective Service (FPS) program for upgrading security at Federal facilities. This program was started in response to a Department of Justice recommendation that Federal facilities be brought up to minimum standards through security upgrade countermeasures. We found that FPS did not establish adequate guidance in critical areas such as equipment procurement and installation, cost control, database control, and security countermeasure criteria. As a result, breakdowns at regional levels led to questionable practices. The completion status of many security countermeasures was misrepresented, other security equipment was unaccounted for, and program resources were not always wisely expended. The Commissioner of the Public Buildings Service appropriately reported this issue as a material weakness in his FMFIA letter.

The second issue concerns results from the GSA financial statement audit being conducted that indicate weaknesses in computer system controls over major GSA financial management systems. The Chief Financial Officer's submission for the assurance statement, and the Office of the Chief Information Officer agreed this was a weakness and should be included as a non-conformance with the requirements of Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-130 covering computer systems security.

We also advised management of six instances of a weakening of controls over the validity of selected payments made by various GSA Services and Staff Offices. We do not believe these questionable payments rise to the level of a material control weakness, but are symptomatic of a lessening in management oversight and control which is a cause of concern.

Prevention Activities

Integrity Awareness

The OIG presents Integrity Awareness Briefings nationwide to educate GSA employees on their responsibilities for the prevention of fraud and abuse, and to reinforce employees' roles in helping to ensure the integrity of Agency operations.

This period we presented 3 briefings attended by 58 regional employees. These briefings explain the statutory mission of the OIG and the methods available for reporting suspected instances of wrongdoing. In addition, through case studies and slides, the briefings make GSA employees aware of actual instances of fraud in GSA and other Federal agencies and thus help to prevent their recurrence. The briefings have in fact led to OIG investigations based on reports by GSA employees of suspected wrongdoing.

Hotline

The OIG Hotline provides an avenue for concerned employees and other concerned citizens to report suspected wrongdoing. Hotline posters located in GSA-controlled buildings, as well as brochures, encourage employees to use the Hotline. During this reporting period, we received 1,551 Hotline calls and letters. Of these, 63 complaints warranted further GSA action, 5 warranted other Agency action, and 1,483 did not warrant action.

Implementation Reviews

The OIG performs, on a selective basis, independent reviews of implementation actions to ensure that management's corrective actions in response to OIG recommendations are being accomplished according to established milestones. This period, the OIG performed two implementation reviews. In both of these reviews, all of the recommendations had been implemented.

Financial Statements Audit

The Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990 requires the OIG to conduct or arrange for an annual audit of the GSA consolidated financial statements. The Act also requires a report on the GSA system of internal accounting controls and compliance with laws and regulations. This audit was performed, as in past years, by an independent public accounting firm (IPA), with oversight and guidance from the OIG. This year, however, there are two significant differences between the level of work that will be performed under this contract and the previous contract, held by another IPA. The new contract incorporates:

- OMB Bulletin 97-01, which prescribes the form and content for agency financial statements that are required to be submitted to the Director of OMB.

Prevention Activities

- Audits of electronic data processing controls over the significant financial systems within GSA. These audits, which will take place over a 3-year cycle, will include tests of general and application controls using the General Accounting Office's Federal Information Systems Control Audit Methodology.

In the audit report dated February 25, 1999, GSA received unqualified opinions on its financial statements and on its system of internal accounting controls. The report on the internal control structure notes a condition where there is no clear understanding of who is responsible for verifying performance data at the individual service level and for GSA overall. GSA has not adequately defined and documented its system of controls to ensure that appropriate levels of management understand and are performing the necessary reviews of performance data to enable them to make an assertion of completeness and existence of the data and systems supporting performance measures. This condition could adversely affect GSA's ability to collect, process, record, and summarize performance information and report performance measures in accordance with management's criteria. Several conditions affecting other programs or operations were identified where steps should be taken to strengthen internal controls. None of these was considered material.

The OIG completed a review of the program performance measures for one program, assessing reasonableness of the control structure to generate reliable performance information as required by OMB 93-06. We pointed out that it appears that the program has structured its performance measures around GSA strategic goals and objectives, but it now needs to define program success in terms of accomplishing GSA's mission. We were able to suggest several methods for focusing the performance measures on the basic Agency mission. We also reported that GSA personnel have improved their understanding of the underlying fundamentals of the Government Performance and Results Act and are now focusing on measuring their more important operations.

Review of Legislation and Regulations

The Inspector General Act of 1978 requires the OIG to review existing and proposed legislation and regulations to determine their effect on the economy and efficiency of the Agency's programs and operations and on the prevention and detection of fraud and mismanagement.

During this period, the OIG reviewed 113 legislative matters and 27 proposed regulations and directives. The OIG provided significant comments on the following legislative items:

- *Draft Executive Order No. 1 on IT Training.* We commented that we strongly favor initiatives that would develop and promote technical training opportunities for Federal employees generally. However, we noted that the executive order would impose on organizations additional GPRA reporting requirements relating to information technology (IT) training plans and expenditures. In this regard, we noted that agencies already report IT-related expenditures periodically in both agency IT 5-year reporting requirements and in submissions to the Office of Management and Budget pursuant to Circular A-11. Thus, we commented that the GPRA reporting requirements at section three of the proposed executive order might be unnecessarily duplicative.
- *H.R. 391, Small Business Paperwork Reduction Act.* We provided the Department of Justice, Civil Division, Commercial Litigation Branch, with a GSA-related narrative to support its comments to Congress on the provision of this bill, which mandates that civil penalties for first-time violations of information collection requirements by small businesses are waived. We explained that we had concerns about this provision's potential impact on the Government's ability to collect civil penalties under the civil False Claims Act for fraudulent pricing of GSA's Multiple Award Schedule contracts.

In addition, the OIG provided comments on the following proposed regulations:

- *EEOC Draft Final Rule - Federal Employee EEO Complaint Processing.* Our comments related to the portion of the proposed changes to the Equal Employment Opportunity complaint processing procedures that would permit the award of attorney's fees, for the informal counseling stage, to complainants who eventually prevail before the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. We generally opposed the change on the grounds that it would make the informal counseling phase more formal, more adversarial, and less effective.

Review of Legislation and Regulations

- *Proposed Changes to GSAR Examination of Records Clause.* We advised against amending the General Services Acquisition Regulation (GSAR) to eliminate the requirement that the GSA Examination of Records clause be included in contracts both with economic price adjustment (EPA) clauses and in indefinite delivery-indefinite quantity, requirements, or letter contracts. We noted generally that, given the current trend towards using a variety of innovative contracting vehicles, it would be ill-advised to eliminate wholesale these two categories of contracts from the reach of this audit authority, solely for the purpose of streamlining the GSAR. In addition, we commented that the terms of GSA contracts are generally getting longer and it is reasonable to expect that EPA clauses will be used increasingly in the future. In this context, we would be reluctant to eliminate audit coverage for all such contracts.
- *GSA Proposed Comprehensive Acquisition Planning Item #641.* We commented that, in order to waive the proposed rule's acquisition planning requirements for major acquisitions, i.e., those valued at \$50 million or more, the approval of the Office of Acquisition Policy should be required. The draft circular required the approval only of the relevant Head of Service or Staff Office. We felt that approvals at the higher level should be required to provide sufficient management controls of such significant acquisitions.

Statistical Summary of OIG Accomplishments

Audit Reports Issued

The OIG issued 91 audit reports. The 91 reports contained financial recommendations totaling \$347,482,649, including \$342,565,274 in recommendations that funds be put to better use and \$4,917,375 in questioned costs. Due to GSA's mission of negotiating contracts for Governmentwide supplies and services, most of the savings from recommendations that funds be put to better use would be applicable to other Federal agencies.

Management Decisions on Audit Reports

Table 1 summarizes the status of the universe of audits requiring management decisions during this period, as well as the status of those audits as of March 31, 1999. Four reports more than 6-months old were awaiting management decisions as of March 31, 1999; all of them were preaward audits, issued before February 10, 1996, which are not subject to the 6-month management decision requirement. Table 1 does not include 2 reports issued to other agencies this period. Table 1 also does not include 22 reports excluded from the management decision process because they pertain to ongoing investigations.

Table 1. Management Decisions on OIG Audits

	No. of Reports	Reports with Financial Recommendations	Total Financial Recommendations
For which no management decision had been made as of 10/1/98			
Less than 6 months old	47	32	\$257,374,105
More than 6 months old	7	6	1,172,386
Reports issued this period	89	48	346,715,630
TOTAL	143	86	\$605,262,121
For which a management decision was made during the reporting period			
Issued prior periods	50	35	\$258,200,836
Issued current period	49	22	284,546,531
TOTAL	99	57	\$542,747,367
For which no management decision had been made as of 3/31/99			
Less than 6 months old	40	26	\$ 62,169,099
More than 6 months old	4	3	345,655
TOTAL	44	29	\$ 62,514,754

Statistical Summary of OIG Accomplishments

Management Decisions on Audit Reports with Financial Recommendations

Tables 2 and 3 present the audits identified in Table 1 as containing financial recommendations by category (funds to be put to better use or questioned costs).

Table 2. Management Decisions on OIG Audits with Recommendations that Funds be Put to Better Use

	No. of Reports	Financial Recommendations
For which no management decision had been made as of 10/1/98		
Less than 6 months old	21	\$250,038,864
More than 6 months old	6	1,172,386
Reports issued this period	40	341,798,255
TOTAL	67	\$593,009,505
For which a management decision was made during the reporting period		
Recommendations agreed to by management based on proposed		
•management action	—	\$337,564,735
•legislative action	—	—
Recommendations not agreed to by management	—	193,618,329
TOTAL	39	\$531,183,064
For which no management decision had been made as of 3/31/99		
Less than 6 months old	25	\$ 61,480,786
More than 6 months old	3	345,655
TOTAL	28	\$ 61,826,441

Statistical Summary of OIG Accomplishments

**Table 3. Management Decisions on OIG Audits
with Questioned Costs**

	No. of Reports	Questioned Costs
For which no management decision had been made as of 10/1/98		
Less than 6 months old	11	\$ 7,335,241
More than 6 months old	0	0
Reports issued this period	<u>8</u>	<u>4,917,375</u>
TOTAL	19	\$12,252,616
For which a management decision was made during the reporting period		
Disallowed costs	—	\$11,871,024
Costs not disallowed	<u>—</u>	<u>0</u>
TOTAL	18	\$11,871,024*
For which no management decision had been made as of 3/31/99		
Less than 6 months old	1	\$ 688,313
More than 6 months old	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
TOTAL	1	\$ 688,313

**Includes \$306,721 that management decided to seek that exceeded recommended amounts.*

Statistical Summary of OIG Accomplishments

Investigative Workload

The OIG opened 53 investigative cases and closed 76 cases during this period. In addition, the OIG received and evaluated 78 complaints and allegations from sources other than the Hotline that involved GSA employees and programs. Based upon our analyses of these complaints and allegations, OIG investigations were not warranted.

Referrals

The OIG makes criminal referrals to the Department of Justice or other authorities for prosecutive consideration and civil referrals to the Civil Division of the Department of Justice or U.S. Attorneys for litigative consideration. The OIG also makes administrative referrals to GSA officials on certain cases disclosing wrongdoing on the part of GSA employees, contractors, or private individuals doing business with the Government.

Table 4. Summary of OIG Referrals

Type of Referral	Cases	Subjects
Criminal	23	43
Civil	8	13
Administrative	59	83
TOTAL	90	139

In addition, the OIG made 9 referrals to other Federal activities for further investigation or other action and 33 referrals to GSA officials for informational purposes only.

Actions on OIG Referrals

Based on these and prior referrals, 13 cases (27 subjects) were accepted for criminal prosecution and 4 cases (8 subjects) were accepted for civil litigation. Criminal cases originating from OIG referrals resulted in 6 indictments/informations and 6 successful prosecutions. OIG civil referrals resulted in 4 cases being accepted for civil action and 4 case settlements. Based on OIG administrative referrals, management debarred 3 contractors, and took 8 personnel actions against employees.

Statistical Summary of OIG Accomplishments

Monetary Results

Table 5 presents the amounts of fines, penalties, settlements, judgments, and restitutions payable to the U.S. Government as a result of criminal and civil actions arising from OIG referrals.

In addition, the OIG had administrative recoveries of \$2,210,901 during the course of its investigations, predominantly in investigative savings.

Table 5. Criminal and Civil Recoveries

	<u>Criminal</u>	<u>Civil</u>
Fines and Penalties	\$ 17,700	\$ —
Settlements and Judgments	—	5,238,328
Restitutions	1,814,948	—
TOTAL	\$1,832,648	\$5,238,328

APPENDICES

Appendix I - Significant Audits from Prior Reports

Under the Agency audit management decision process, the GSA Office of the Chief Financial Officer, Office of the Controller, is responsible for tracking the implementation of audit recommendations after a management decision has been reached. That office furnished the following status information.

Nineteen audits highlighted in prior Reports to the Congress have not yet been fully implemented; all are being implemented in accordance with currently established milestones.

Security Enhancements in Federal Buildings

Period First Reported: April 1, 1998 to September 30, 1998

The review evaluated GSA's program for upgrading security in Federal buildings. The report contained six recommendations; four have been implemented.

The remaining recommendations involve establishing an inventory over x-ray units and portable equipment, and tracking and reporting cost data for future countermeasures. They are both scheduled for completion by January 15, 2000.

Property Management Procurement Activities

Period First Reported: April 1, 1998 to September 30, 1998

The review identified opportunities for strengthening controls over procurement-related issues. The report contained eight recommendations; seven have been implemented.

The remaining recommendation involves the collection of recommended savings. It will remain open until collection is verified. It is scheduled for completion by July 15, 1999.

Travel Management Program Funding Fee

Period First Reported: April 1, 1998 to September 30, 1998

The review assessed GSA's Travel Management program funding fee. The report contained seven recommendations; three have been implemented.

The remaining recommendations include combining two forms into one; exploring contracting with a third party; establishing one industrial funding fee for all customers; and developing a database. They are scheduled for completion between June 15, 1999 and November 15, 1999.

Electronic Commerce Shopping

Period First Reported: April 1, 1998 to September 30, 1998

The review assessed GSA's efforts to place four million items on the GSA Advantage system. The report contained five recommendations; four have been implemented.

The remaining recommendation involves developing a plan to achieve the project's objectives. It is scheduled for completion by September 15, 1999.

Information Systems Security

Period First Reported: April 1, 1998 to September 30, 1998

The review assessed the security measures of six major Internet and Intranet GSA applications. The report contained four recommendations; one has been implemented.

The remaining recommendations include establishing an information technology (IT) security program; specifying roles and responsibilities for systems to ensure security; and basing IT security decisions on risk assessments. They are scheduled for completion between June 15, 1999 and September 15, 1999.

Agency Conferences Management

Period First Reported: April 1, 1998 to September 30, 1998

The review focused on the controls over Agency conference site selections and expenditures. The report contained four recommendations; two have been implemented.

One recommendation involves documentation relative to the conference, attendees, alternative sites, costs, and appropriate approval. It is scheduled for completion by

Appendix I - Significant Audits from Prior Reports

April 15, 1999. The second recommendation involves the determination and reporting of Purpose Statute violations. It is scheduled for completion by May 15, 1999.

IMPAC Credit Card Program

Period First Reported: October 1, 1997 to March 31, 1998

The evaluation focused on the controls over the use of the International Merchant Purchase Authorization Cards (IMPAC) for small purchases. The report contained four recommendations; one has been implemented.

The recommendations include improving management controls; developing a review program of card practices and transactions; and providing training. They are scheduled for completion between April 15, 1999 and May 15, 1999.

Megacenter Dispatch Services

Period First Reported: October 1, 1997 to March 31, 1998

The review focused on GSA's plans to consolidate security control centers into four megacenters. The report contained four recommendations; none has been implemented.

The recommendations include developing alternate access procedures; developing contingency plans to continue the dispatch function during natural disasters; upgrading alarm systems; and implementing a preventive alarm maintenance program. They are scheduled for completion by June 15, 2000.

Accuracy of Rent Billing Data

Period First Reported: October 1, 1997 to March 31, 1998

The review identified opportunities for improving the accuracy of GSA's rent billing data. The report contained three recommendations; two have been implemented.

The remaining recommendation involves reassessing accountability for building and tenant data accuracy. It is scheduled for completion by June 15, 1999.

Contract Workload Management

Period First Reported: October 1, 1997 to March 31, 1998

The review identified opportunities for improving workload management. The report contained one recommendation; it has not yet been implemented.

The recommendation involves the need to automate key activities of the contracting process. It is scheduled for completion by December 15, 1999.

Procurement Personnel Qualifications

Period First Reported: October 1, 1997 to March 31, 1998

The review focused on the training and experience requirements for procurement personnel. The report contained four recommendations; three have been implemented.

The remaining recommendation involves training requirements for contracting officers. It is scheduled for completion by April 15, 1999.

Year 2000 Computer Systems

Period First Reported: October 1, 1997 to March 31, 1998

The review assessed GSA's progress for planned systems conversions. The report contained three recommendations; two have been implemented.

The remaining recommendation involves taking steps to manage, coordinate, and accelerate year 2000 computer analysis and conversion. It is scheduled for completion by October 15, 1999.

Federal Protective Service Investigation Office

Period First Reported: April 1, 1997 to September 30, 1997

The evaluation focused on a review of the Federal Protective Service's criminal investigation activities. The report contained five recommendations; two have been implemented.

Appendix I - Significant Audits from Prior Reports

The remaining recommendations include establishing measurable performance standards; improving program accountability; and considering adoption of benchmarked best practices on a national basis. They are scheduled for completion between June 15, 1999 and August 15, 1999.

Administration of Real Estate Taxes

Period First Reported: April 1, 1997 to September 30, 1997

The review examined the real estate tax administration of GSA's leases. The report contained two recommendations; one has been implemented.

The recommendation involves modifying contract procedures to ensure the Government receives its share of reductions in real estate taxes. While all pertinent actions have been taken, it remains open until all recovery actions are completed. It is scheduled for completion by July 15, 1999.

Inventory Cost Management

Period First Reported: April 1, 1997 to September 30, 1997

A review of the program management systems noted that improvements were needed in computing the economic order quantity (EOQ). The report contained three recommendations; two have been implemented.

The remaining recommendation involves improving the accuracy and reliability of EOQ to reduce inventory levels and operating costs. It is scheduled for completion by May 15, 1999.

Telecommuting Centers

Period First Reported: October 1, 1996 to March 31, 1997

The review focused on GSA's role in the Federal Government's telecommuting initiatives, and the recovery of costs and the methods being used to recover costs. The report contained two recommendations; one has been implemented.

The remaining recommendation involves developing billing rates for Federal telecommuting center customer

agencies to recover costs, and developing a mechanism for billings. It is scheduled for completion by April 15, 1999.

Debarment Program

Period First Reported: October 1, 1996 to March 31, 1997

The review identified opportunities for improving the debarment program. The report contained two recommendations; they have not yet been implemented.

One recommendation involves modifying the new contractor information system and is scheduled for completion by August 15, 1999. The other recommendation involves providing debarment program training to contracting officers. It is scheduled for completion by May 15, 1999.

Stock Program Management Information System

Period First Reported: October 1, 1995 to March 31, 1996

The review identified opportunities for improving the accuracy and reliability of information provided to program managers. The report contained four recommendations; three have been implemented.

The remaining recommendation involves improving the accuracy and reliability of computerized lead-time projections and is scheduled for completion by May 15, 1999.

Aircraft Management

Period First Reported: October 1, 1995 to March 31, 1996

The review identified opportunities for improving GSA's program to assist civilian agencies with the management and cost-effectiveness of their aircraft operations. The report contained five recommendations; four have been implemented.

The remaining recommendation concerns the identification of aircraft data necessary for making informed decisions and is scheduled for completion by May 15, 1999.

Appendix II - Audit Report Register

Date of Report	Audit Number	Title	Financial Recommendations	
			Funds to Be Put To Better Use	Questioned (Unsupported) Costs

(Note: Because some audits pertain to contracting award or actions which have not yet been completed, the financial recommendations to these reports are not listed in this Appendix.)

PBS Management Consulting Reviews

11/04/98	A80645	Management Consulting Review: Review of Asbestos Problem at the Peter Rodino, Jr. FOB, Newark, New Jersey		
----------	--------	---	--	--

PBS Internal Audits

10/08/98	A83048	Limited Review of Funding Related to Major Construction Projects in the National Capital Region		
11/18/98	A82453	Audit of Procurements in the Helena, Montana, Field Office		
12/01/98	A80321	Audit of the Availability of Federal Building Design Plans		
12/31/98	A82141	Review of the Dallas and Houston Customer Service Centers		
01/05/99	A83312	Audit of Unbilled Space in Building A at the GSA Stores Depot, Franconia, Virginia		\$1,000,000
02/08/99	A82704	Audit of the Reliability of Regional General and Administrative Expense in PBS Building Income Statements		
02/22/99	A82476	Management Control Review of Pricing Negotiated Leasing Procurements, Public Buildings Service, Pacific Rim Region		
03/18/99	A80647	Follow-up Audit of the Federal Protective Service's Program for Upgrading Security at Federal Facilities		
03/18/99	A83304	Audit of Vacant Space		
03/22/99	A83042	Audit of Change Orders, Portals II		

Appendix II - Audit Report Register

Date of Report	Audit Number	Title	Financial Recommendations	
			Funds to Be Put To Better Use	Questioned (Unsupported) Costs
03/23/99	A81543	Audit of the Public Buildings Service Property Management Center in Des Moines, Iowa		
03/24/99	A83305	Audit of PBS Initiatives to Improve Space Alterations		
03/24/99	A995025	Audit of Security Measures for New and Renovated Federal Facilities		
03/26/99	A995156	Postaward Lease Audit: 1001 Bishop Street, Honolulu, HI, Pacific Rim Region		
03/30/99	A82708	Review of Reporting Controls Over Direct Building Costs, Greater Southwest Region		

PBS Contract Audits

10/08/98	A81826	Preaward Audit of Time Extension Proposal: Subcontractors to J.E. Dunn Construction Company, Contract Number GS06P94GYC0076		
10/09/98	A81825	Preaward Audit of Time Extension Proposal: J.E. Dunn Construction Company, Contract Number GS06P94GYC0076		
10/13/98	A80636	Preaward Audit of a Claim: Structural Preservation Systems, Inc., Contract Number GS-02P-96-DTC-0033		
10/20/98	A80649	Preaward Audit of Architect and Engineering Services Contract: Gwathmey Siegel & Assoc. Architects, LLC, Solicitation Number GS-02P-98-DTC-0059(N)		
10/22/98	A80935	Preaward Audit of Architect and Engineering Services Contract: Ove Arup & Partners, Contract Number GS-02P-98-DTC-0059(N)		
10/22/98	A83027	Audit of Claim for Increased Cost: Clark Concrete Contractors, Inc., Contract Number GS-11P94-MKC0078		
10/30/98	A81527	Audit of Claim for Increased Costs: BPT Courthouse Associates, L.P., Contract Number GS-05P-93-GBC-0004		

Appendix II - Audit Report Register

Date of Report	Audit Number	Title	Financial Recommendations	
			Funds to Be Put To Better Use	Questioned (Unsupported) Costs
11/13/98	A82471	Preaward Audit of a Claim for Increased Costs: Hensel Phelps Construction Company, Contract Number GS-08P-96-JFC-0006		
11/16/98	A80646	Preaward Audit of a Claim: Beacon/Pro Con Joint Venture, Contract Number GS-02P-94-CUC-0070(N)		
11/17/98	A80644	Limited Postaward Audit of Direct Labor Rates: Hines GS Properties, Inc., Lease Number GS-02B-22885		
12/15/98	A82472	Preaward Audit of a Claim for Increased Costs: Trautman & Shreve, Inc., Subcontractor to Hensel Phelps Construction Company, Contract Number GS-08P-96-JFC-0006		
12/16/98	A995006	Preaward Audit of a Claim: Chereco Co., Inc., Subcontractor to TGMI/Contractors, Inc., Contract Number GS-03P-96-DXC-0021		
12/22/98	A995005	Preaward Audit of a Claim: TGMI/Contractors, Inc., Contract Number GS-03P-96-DXC-0021		
01/05/99	A995101	Preaward Audit of Claim for Increased Costs: Program and Construction Management Group, Contract Number GS-11P-94MKC-0019		
01/08/99	A80648	Preaward Audit of Architect and Engineering Services Contract: Lehrer McGovern Bovis, Inc., Solicitation Number GS-02P-98-DTC-0073(N)		
01/14/99	A995132	Preaward Audit of Architect and Engineering Services Contract: Leadshill-Herkenhoff, Inc., Solicitation Number GS-07P-98-JUC-0022		
01/21/99	A995123	Limited Review of Claimed Incurred Costs: Linpro New York Realty, Inc., 290 Broadway Retail Space		
01/28/99	A995126	Preaward Audit of Cost or Pricing Data: CTA Architects Engineers, Solicitation Number GS-08P-98-JCC-0037		

Appendix II - Audit Report Register

Date of Report	Audit Number	Title	Financial Recommendations	
			Funds to Be Put To Better Use	Questioned (Unsupported) Costs
01/29/99	A995106	Postaward Audit of Overhead Rate: Turner Construction Company, Contract Number GS-05P-94GBC-0051	\$36,008	
02/04/99	A995097	Preaward Audit of Architect and Engineering Services Contract: Diversified Engineering, Inc., Solicitation Number GS-11P98EGD0004		
02/05/99	A995113	Preaward Audit of Supplemental Architect and Engineering Services Contract: Van Deusen & Associates, Solicitation Number GS-02P-98-PLD-0029(N)		
02/10/99	A995158	Preaward Audit of Architect and Engineering Services Contract: H + G Architects, Solicitation Number GS-02P-98-PLD-0015(N)		
02/11/99	A83055	Preaward Audit of Architect and Engineering Services Contract: Benbassat & Sporidis Company, Solicitation Number GS-11P98EGD0004		
02/16/99	A995154	Preaward Audit of Supplemental Architect and Engineering Contract: Technicon Engineering, Inc., Solicitation Number GS-04P-98-RBD-0049		
02/17/99	A995100	Preaward Audit of a Claim: Chereco Co., Inc., Subcontractor to TGMI/Contractors Inc., Contract Number GS-03P-96-DXC-0021		
02/19/99	A995166	Audit of Termination Claim: W.J. McGuire Company, Contract Number GS05P97GAC0207		
02/24/99	A995168	Audit of Architect and Engineering Services Contract: Schmidt Associates, Inc., Contract No. GS-05P-96-GBC-0013		
02/26/99	A995117	Preaward Audit of Claim for Increased Costs: William V. Walsh Construction Company, Inc., Contract Number GS-11P96MKC0027		
02/26/99	A995153	Preaward Audit of Cost or Pricing Data: Berkebile, Nelson, Immenschuh, McDowell Architects, Solicitation Number GS06P98GYD0018		

Appendix II - Audit Report Register

Date of Report	Audit Number	Title	Financial Recommendations	
			Funds to Be Put To Better Use	Questioned (Unsupported) Costs
03/02/99	A995139	Preaward Audit of a Claim: Stromberg Metal Works, Inc., Subcontractor to W.M. Schlosser Company, Inc., Contract Number GS-03P-92-DXC-0021		
03/05/99	A83053	Preaward Audit of Claim for Increased Costs: American Combustion Industries, Inc., a Subcontractor to Walsh Construction Co., Inc., Contract Number GS-11P96MKC0027		
03/09/99	A995165	Audit of Termination Settlement Proposal: HPH Mechanical, Inc., Contract Number GS-08P-97-VEC-0061		
03/11/99	A995177	Preaward Audit of Supplemental Architect and Engineering Contract: Prad Group, Inc., Solicitation Number GS-04P-98-RBD-0049		
03/19/99	A995124	Audit of Claim for Increased Costs: Dawson Building Contractors, Inc., Contract Number GS-04P-95-EXC-0046		
03/24/99	A995128	Preaward Audit of Cost or Pricing Data: Sachs Electric Company, Subcontractor to Morse Diesel International, Inc., Contract Number GS06P95-GZC0501		
03/30/99	A995150	Preaward Audit of Supplemental Architect and Engineering Services Contract: Ammann & Whitney Consulting Engineers, P.C., Solicitation Number GS-02P-98-PLD-0015(N)		

FSS Internal Audits

10/30/98	A81832	Review of Federal Supply Service Customer's Complaint of Excessive Selling Price		
11/30/98	A83056	Audit of Professional Travel Corporation, Travel Management Center		
03/03/99	A82474	Management Control Review of Proceeds From Sales of Surplus Personal Property, The Heartland Region		

Appendix II - Audit Report Register

Date of Report	Audit Number	Title	Financial Recommendations	
			Funds to Be Put To Better Use	Questioned (Unsupported) Costs
03/03/99	A82474	Management Control Review of Proceeds From Sales of Surplus Personal Property, Pacific Rim Region		
03/12/99	A82474	Management Control Review of Proceeds From Sales of Surplus Personal Property		
03/23/99	A995145	Review of Eastern Fleet Management Center, Hyattsville, Maryland		
03/24/99	A81544	Advisory Review of the Interagency Fleet Management System Reporting of Customers' Usage of Alternative Fuels		
03/26/99	A82474	Management Control Review of Proceeds From Sales of Surplus Personal Property, Northeast & Caribbean Region		
03/26/99	A82474	Management Control Review of Proceeds From Sales of Surplus Personal Property, Mid-Atlantic Region		
03/30/99	A82705	Advisory Review of Interagency Fleet Management System (IFMS) Performance Measures		
<i>FSS Contract Audits</i>				
10/02/98	A81226	Preaward Audit of Multiple Award Schedule Contract: Slickbar Products Corporation, Solicitation Number 7FXG-U5-98-1901-B		
10/05/98	A82150	Preaward Review of Multiple Award Schedule Contract: Zodiac of North America, Inc., Solicitation Number 7FXG-U5-1901-B		
10/07/98	A80937	Limited Audit of Industrial Funding Fee Under Contract Number GS-26F-1018B: Danka Office Imaging Company		\$49,731
10/07/98	A82151	Price Adjustments on Multiple Award Schedule Contract: Motorola, Incorporated, Contract Number GS-35F-1125-D for the Interim Period October 1, 1998 Through September 30, 1999		

Appendix II - Audit Report Register

Date of Report	Audit Number	Title	Financial Recommendations	
			Funds to Be Put To Better Use	Questioned (Unsupported) Costs
10/08/98	A80928	Preaward Audit of Multiple Award Schedule Contract for the Extension Period April 1, 1999 Through March 31, 2002: Science Applications International Corporation, Contract Number GS-35F-4461G		
10/20/98	A80639	Postaward Audit of Multiple Award Schedule Contract: Photon Technology International, Inc., Contract Number GS-24F-1140B		\$13,384
10/27/98	A51542	Postaward Audit of Multiple Award Schedule Contract: Liebert Corporation, Contract Number GS00F06964		\$1,163,140
10/27/98	A51568	Postaward Audit of Multiple Award Schedule Contract: Liebert Corporation, Contract Number GS-07F-3779A		\$229,935
11/03/98	A80932	Preaward Review of Multiple Award Schedule Contract for the Extension Period April 1, 1999 Through March 31, 2002: Micron Electronics, Inc., Contract Number GS-35F-4317D		
11/09/98	A995027	Preaward Review of Multiple Award Schedule Contract: Carolina Shoe Company, Solicitation Number 7FXG-E4-97-8409-B		
12/03/98	A82146	Preaward Review of Multiple Award Schedule Contract: Dell Marketing, L.P., Contract Number GS-35F-4076D		
12/09/98	A82139	Preaward Audit of Multiple Award Schedule Contract: ASAP Software Express, Inc., Contract Number GS-35F-4027D		
12/17/98	A995107	Preaward Audit of Sex Crimes Study Contract: National Academy of Public Administration, Solicitation Number AT/TC 20271		
01/05/99	A995035	Preaward Audit of Multiple Award Schedule Contract: Toshiba America Information Systems, Inc., Computer Systems Division, Solicitation Number FCIS-JB-980001B		

Appendix II - Audit Report Register

Date of Report	Audit Number	Title	Financial Recommendations	
			Funds to Be Put To Better Use	Questioned (Unsupported) Costs
01/06/99	A50944	Postaward Audit of Multiple Award Schedule Contract: E.I. DuPont De Nemours and Company, Inc., Contract Number GS-00F-4505A for the Interim Period February 1, 1991 Through April 30, 1995		\$179,593
01/11/99	A995031	Interim Period Postaward Audit of Multiple Award Schedule Contracts: Harter Corporation, Contract Numbers GS-29F-0155C and GS-28F-0002B		
02/18/99	A71517	Postaward Audit of Multiple Award Schedule Contract: Case Corporation, Contract Number GS-00F-5402A		\$1,593,279
03/10/99	A995136	Preaward Audit of Multiple Award Schedule Contract: Booz Allen & Hamilton, Inc., Solicitation Number FCIS-JB-980001B		
03/11/99	A70916	Postaward Audit of Multiple Award Schedule Contract: Intermetro Industries Corporation, Contract Number GS-07F-6655A for the Period March 12, 1993 Through September 30, 1996		\$688,313
03/11/99	A995133	Preaward Audit of Multiple Award Schedule Contract for the Extension Period April 1, 1999 Through September 30, 2002: IBM Corporation, Contract Number GS-35F-4984H		
03/12/99	A995161	Preaward Audit of Cost or Pricing Data Proposal: Eagle Research Group, Inc., Solicitation Number TFTP-98-SC-874		
03/30/99	A995120	Preaward Audit of Multiple Award Schedule Contract for the Extension Period April 1, 1999 Through March 31, 2002: Government Technology Services, Inc., Contract Number GS-35F-4120D		

Other Internal Audits

12/08/98	A82710	Report on Limited Audit of the Fiscal Year 1998 Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act Assurance Statements		
----------	--------	--	--	--

Appendix II - Audit Report Register

Date of Report	Audit Number	Title	Financial Recommendations	
			Funds to Be Put To Better Use	Questioned (Unsupported) Costs
12/16/98	A83610	Audit of Progress Made in Converting GSA's Office of the Chief Financial Officer Computer Systems to Operate in the Year 2000		
02/10/99	A995028	General Services Administration Office of Inspector General's Report on Payroll Withholdings, Contributions and Employee Headcount Data		
02/25/99	A81216	Survey of GSA Staff Office Payments		
02/25/99	A82709	Report on Internal Controls Over Performance Measures		
<i>Non-GSA Contract Audits</i>				
11/12/98	A995009	Audit of the Administrative Procedures of the National Capital Planning Commission		
12/15/98	A82475	Preaward Audit of a Claim: Shell Oil Company		

Appendix III - Audit Reports over 12 Months Old with Final Action Pending

Pursuant to Section 810, Prompt Resolution of Audit Recommendations, of the National Defense Authorization Act, (Public Law 104-106), this appendix identifies those audit reports where final actions remain open 12 months

after the report issuance date. The GSA Office the Chief Financial Officer, Office of the Controller, furnished the following information.

Audits with Management Decisions Made after February 10, 1996 for Which No Final Action Has Been Completed

Date of Report	Audit Number	Title
<i>Contract Audits</i>		
03/01/96	A60327	Report on Audit of Subcontractor's Claim for Increased Costs: Kendland Company Inc., Contract Number GS01P93BZC0003
03/18/96	A60318	Report on Audit of Claim for Increased Costs: Maron Construction Co., Inc., Contract Number GS01P93BZC0003
05/29/96	A10542	Postaward Audit of Multiple Award Schedule Contract: Sunshine Chemical Specialties, Inc., Contract Number GS-00F-87668
08/15/96	A51827	Postaward Audit of Multiple Award Schedule Contract: Sybase, Inc., Contract Number GS00K92AGS5576 for the Period September 9, 1992 Through September 30, 1993
08/21/96	A61544	Preaward Audit of a Claim: D. L. Woods Construction, Inc., Contract Number GS05P91GBC0057
09/20/96	A61534	Preaward Audit of a Claim: Marino Construction Company, Contract Number GS05P90GBC0101
10/17/96	A53617	Postaward Audit of Multiple Award Schedule Contract: Cantwell-Cleary Co., Inc., Contract Number GS-02F-6071A for the Interim Period March 31, 1992 Through October 31, 1994
11/01/96	A21882	Postaward Audit of Multiple Award Schedule Contract: Hamilton Sorter Company, Inc., Contract Number GS-00F-07065 for the Period November 14, 1988 Through September 30, 1991
11/01/96	A31851	Postaward Audit of Multiple Award Schedule Contract: Hamilton Sorter Company, Inc., Contract Number GS-00F-02598 for the Period August 26, 1988 Through March 31, 1991
11/01/96	A31865	Postaward Audit of Multiple Award Schedule Contract: Hamilton Sorter Company, Inc., Contract Number GS-00F-02046 for the Period December 4, 1987 Through September 30, 1990
12/17/96	A70606	Postaward Audit of Travel Costs: Centel Federal Systems Corporation, Contract Number GS-00K-89AHD0007

Appendix III - Audit Reports over 12 Months Old with Final Action Pending

Date of Report	Audit Number	Title
01/10/97	A52159	Postaward Audit of Multiple Award Schedule Contract: Austin Computer Systems, Inc., Contract Number GS-00K-91-AGS-5201
01/24/97	A72431	Audit of Real Estate Tax Adjustments: Pacific Corporate Towers, LLC, Lease Number GS-09B-85185, Calendar Years 1987 Through 1995
02/06/97	A70622	Preaward Audit of Change Order Proposal: Turner Construction Company, Contract Number GS-02P-95-DTC-0014
03/17/97	A72433	Audit of Real Estate Tax Adjustments: L.A. World Trade Center Partnership and Royal Investment System Partnerships, Lease Number GS-09B-85563, Calendar Years 1989 Through 1996
03/21/97	A70632	Preaward Audit of Change Order Proposal: Expert Electric, Inc., Contract Number GS-02P-94-CUC-0033(N)
03/24/97	A72434	Audit of Real Estate Tax Adjustments: WRC Properties, Inc., Lease Number GS-09B-88163, Calendar Years 1990 Through 1996
03/24/97	A72435	Audit of Real Estate Tax Adjustments: WRC Properties, Inc., Lease Number GS-09B-91634, Calendar Years 1993 Through 1996
03/25/97	A70306	Preaward Audit of Architect and Engineering Services Contract: R.G. Vanderweil Engineers, Inc., Solicitation Number GS-01P-95-BZC-0047
04/03/97	A72450	Preaward Audit of a Claim for Increased Costs: Azteca Construction, Inc., Subcontractor to Morse Diesel International, Inc., Contract Number GS-09P-95-KTC-0032
04/04/97	A72437	Audit of Real Estate Tax Adjustments: WRC Properties, Inc., Lease Number GS-09B-91267, Calendar Years 1993 Through 1995
04/04/97	A72436	Audit of Real Estate Tax Adjustments: WRC Properties, Inc., Lease Number GS-09B-90017, Calendar Years 1991 Through 1995
04/18/97	A70628	Postaward Audit of Multiple Award Schedule Contract: Clayton Associates, Inc., Contract Number GS-07F-8188B, for the Interim Period June 1, 1994 Through January 31, 1997
04/24/97	A71212	Preaward Audit of Cost and Pricing Proposal: The Logistics Company, Inc., Task Order Request GSC-TFGE-97-2002
06/06/97	A73619	Preaward Audit of Cost or Pricing Data: Symbiont, Inc., RFP Number GSC-TFGD-97-1010
06/06/97	A72466	Limited Scope Preaward Audit of Proposed Overhead and Direct Labor Rates: Brayton & Hughes Design Studio, Solicitation Number GS-09P-95-KTC-0029

Appendix III - Audit Reports over 12 Months Old with Final Action Pending

Date of Report	Audit Number	Title
06/11/97	A61827	Postaward Audit of Multiple Award Schedule Contract: Alexander Manufacturing Company, Contract Number GS-07F-3956A for the Period February 1, 1992 Through October 31, 1995
06/16/97	A70927	Preaward Audit of Cost or Pricing Data: JIL Information Systems, Inc., Proposal No. GSC-TFGD-97-1012
06/17/97	A72464	Limited Scope Preaward Audit of Proposed Overhead and Direct Labor Rates: Moore Ruble Yudell, Solicitation Number GS-09P-95-KTC-0029
06/17/97	A72470	Limited Scope Preaward Audit of Proposed Overhead and Direct Labor Rates: Frederick Brown Associates, Solicitation Number GS-09P-95-KTC-0029
06/24/97	A70928	Preaward Audit of Cost or Pricing Data: Criticom, Inc., Solicitation No. GSC-TFGD-97-1014
06/25/97	A72445	Preaward Audit of a Claim for Increased Costs: Morse Diesel International, Inc., Contract Number GS-09P-95-KTC-0032
06/26/97	A72471	Limited Scope Preaward Audit of Proposed Overhead and Direct Labor Rates: Tsuchiyama & Kaino, Inc., Solicitation Number GS-09P-95-KTC-0029
06/26/97	A72465	Preaward Audit of a Claim for Increased Costs: Lawson Mechanical Contractors, Subcontractor to Morse Diesel International, Inc., Contract Number GS-09P-95-KTC-0032
06/27/97	A71811	Audit of Claim for Increased Costs, Miscellaneous Subcontractors to: Morse Diesel International, Inc., Contract Number GS06P94GYC0037
07/11/97	A71533	Preaward Audit of Claim for Increased Costs: M.A. Mortenson Company, Contract Number GS-05P-93-GBC-0022
07/11/97	A71803	Audit of Claim for Increased Costs: Nicholson Construction Company, Contract Number GS06P94GYC0037
07/22/97	A71804	Audit of Claim for Increased Costs: Rodio/ICOS St. Louis Joint Venture, Subcontractor to Morse Diesel International, Inc., Contract Number GS06P94GYC0037
07/28/97	A70307	Limited Scope Postaward Audit of Multiple Award Schedule Contract: Edward Ochman Systems, Contract Number GS-00F-5350A
07/29/97	A61849	Postaward Audit of Multiple Award Schedule Contract: Hytorc, Division of Unex Corporation, Contract Number GS-06F-77977 for the Period November 1, 1989 Through October 31, 1994
07/30/97	A70644	Preaward Audit of Cost or Pricing Data: Cole Consulting Corp., Subcontractor to Lehrer McGovern Bovis, Inc., Contract Number GS-02P-92-CUC-0028(N)

Appendix III - Audit Reports over 12 Months Old with Final Action Pending

Date of Report	Audit Number	Title
07/30/97	A71819	Postaward Audit of Commercial Acquisition of Multiple Products Contract: Hytorc of Virginia, Inc., Contract Number GS-06F-78361 for the Period November 1, 1994 Through December 18, 1996
07/31/97	A71820	Audit of Claim for Increased Costs: Morse Diesel International, Inc., Contract Number GS06P94GYC0037
07/31/97	A72467	Limited Scope Preaward Audit of Proposed Overhead and Direct Labor Rates: Peterson Construction Company, Inc., Contract Number GS-08P-96-JFC-0004
08/5/97	A73617	Refund From The Committee For Purchase From People Who Are Blind Or Severely Disabled, Agreement Number GS-02F-61511
08/14/97	A73022	Preaward Audit of Change Order Proposal: Turner Construction Company, Subcontractor to BPT Metroview Assocs., L.P., Contract Number GS-11P91AQC0060
08/22/97	A70646	Preaward Audit of a Delay Claim: Beacon/Pro Con Joint Venture, Contract Number GS-02P-94-CUC-0070(N)
08/28/97	A72463	Limited Scope Preaward Audit of Proposed Overhead and Direct Labor Rates: Gruen Associates, Solicitation Number GS-09P-95-KTC-0029
08/29/97	A70645	Preaward Audit of Cost or Pricing Data: Lehrer McGovern Bovis, Inc., Contract Number GS-02P-92-CUC-0028(N)
09/22/97	A70649	Preaward Audit of a Delay Claim: Consolidated Electric, Inc., Subcontractor to Beacon/Pro Con Joint Venture, Contract Number GS-02P-94-CUC-0070(N)
09/24/97	A71526	Price Adjustments on Multiple Award Schedule Contract: Domore Corporation, Contract Number GS-00F-5232A for the Interim Period December 1, 1997 Through January 31, 2001
10/02/97	A72478	Audit of Claim for Increased Costs: Gonzales Construction Company, Inc., Contract Number GS-08P-95-JAC-0001
10/03/97	A73031	Preaward Audit of Change Order Proposal: Turner Construction Company, Subcontractor to BPT Metroview Assocs., L.P., Contract Number GS-11P91AQC0060
10/23/97	A70655	Preaward Audit of a Delay Claim: Denron Plumbing and HVAC, Inc., Subcontractor to Beacon/Pro Con Joint Venture, Contract Number GS-02P-94-CUC-0070(N)
10/23/97	A72486	Audit of Claim for Increased Costs: Mountain Gravel & Construction Co., Subcontractor to Gonzales Construction Company, Inc., Contract Number GS-08P-95-JAC-0001
10/24/97	A70660	Preaward Audit of a Change Order Proposal: Beacon/Pro Con Joint Venture, Contract Number GS-02P-94-CUC-0070(N)

Appendix III - Audit Reports over 12 Months Old with Final Action Pending

Date of Report	Audit Number	Title
11/12/97	A70656	Preaward Audit of a Delay Claim: J.C. Higgins Corp., Subcontractor to Beacon/Pro Con Joint Venture, Contract Number GS-02P-94-CUC-0070(N)
11/26/97	A22536	Postaward Audit of Multiple Award Schedule Contract: Ingres Corporation, Contract Number GS00K89AGS5589
11/26/97	A32476	Limited Audit of Government Billings: Ingres Corporation, Contract Number GS00K89AGS5589
12/10/97	A81512	Preaward Audit of a Claim for Increased Costs: Don-Lee, Inc., Subcontractor to D.L. Woods Construction Inc., Contract Number GS05P91GBC0057
12/16/97	A72493	Preaward Audit of a Termination for Convenience Settlement Proposal: Crown Tank Cleaning Services, dba Airo Services, Contract Number GS-10P-96-LTC-0050
12/22/97	A73606	Audit of Claim for Increased Cost: W.M. Schlosser Company, Inc., Contract Number GS-03P-93-DXC-0044
12/24/97	A80602	Preaward Audit of a Delay Claim: Dan Lepore and Sons, Inc., Subcontractor to Beacon/Pro Con Joint Venture, Contract Number GS-02P-94-CUC-0070(N)
01/12/98	A80604	Preaward Audit of a Delay Claim: Able Finishing, Inc., Subcontractor to Beacon/Pro Con Joint Venture, Contract Number GS-02P-94-CUC-0070(N)
01/12/98	A80608	Preaward Audit of a Delay Claim: Beacon/Pro Con Joint Venture, Contract Number GS-02P-94-CUC-0070(N)
02/05/98	A80609	Preaward Audit of a Delay Claim: The Woodworks Architectural Millwork, Inc., Subcontractor to Beacon/Pro Con Joint Venture, Contract Number GS-02P-94-CUC-0070(N)
02/09/98	A81522	Preaward Audit of a Claim for Increased Costs: Kirkhoff Mechanical, Inc., Second Tier Subcontractor to D.L. Woods Construction Inc., Contractor Number GS05P91GBC0057
02/11/98	A80607	Preaward Audit of a Claim: Beacon/Pro Con Joint Venture, Contract Number GS-02P-94-CUC-0070(N)
02/23/98	A82418	Preaward Audit of a Claim for Increased Costs: Walters & Wolf, Subcontractor to Hoffman Construction Company of Oregon, Contract Number GS-10P-94-LTC-0041
02/27/98	A83014	Audit of Claim for Increased Costs: Turner Construction Company, Contract Number GS-11P91AQC0060
02/27/98	A52155	Postaward Audit of Multiple Award Schedule Contract: Network General Corporation, Contract Number GS00K92AGS6109
03/05/98	A80612	Preaward Audit of a Claim: Beckman Construction Company, Contract Number GS-03P-92-CDC-0335

Appendix III - Audit Reports over 12 Months Old with Final Action Pending

Date of Report	Audit Number	Title
03/17/98	A83016	Preaward Audit of Change Order Proposal: Turner Construction Company, Subcontractor to BPT Metroview Assocs., L.P., Contract Number GS-11P91AQC0060
03/19/98	A81515	Audit of Claim for Increased Costs: Herman B. Taylor Construction Company, Contract Number GS-07P-92-HUC-0017

Appendix III - Audit Reports over 12 Months Old with Final Action Pending

Date of Report	Audit Number		Projected Final Action Date
Internal Audits			
03/25/96	A53321	FSS' Stock Program Management Information Systems Need to be Improved to Provide More Accurate and Reliable Information	05/15/99
03/27/96	A43005	Audit of GSA's Aircraft Management Program	05/15/99
03/27/96	A62424	Audit of Criminal History Background Checks for Child Care Center Employees	04/15/99
03/29/96	A42720	Audit of Accounting and Billing Controls Over the Public Buildings Service, National Capital Region's Reimbursable Work Authorizations	05/15/99
08/27/96	A62448	Audit of Background Checks on Contractor Personnel	06/15/99
12/02/96	A63019	Audit of the PAPCAP Price Adjustments	06/15/99
01/28/97	A63023	Audit of the National Capital Region's Emergency Support Function	05/15/99
02/04/97	A61537	Audit of Postaward Lease Administration: U.S. Bankruptcy Court, Columbus, Ohio, Lease Number GS-05B-15610	08/15/99
03/11/97	A60936	Audit of the General Services Administration's Regional Telecommuting Center Initiatives	04/15/99
03/26/97	A61247	Review of the Public Buildings Service Debarment Program	08/15/99
06/10/97	A62709	Arthur Andersen LLP, Fiscal Year 1996 Management Letter Comments and Suggestions for Consideration	10/15/99
07/11/97	A60645	Audit of the Federal Protective Service's Criminal Investigation Program	08/15/99
09/25/97	A73302	Inventories Can Be Reduced by Using More Accurate and Reliable Data on Economic Order Quantities and Safety Stock	05/15/99
09/26/97	A70627	Audit of Real Estate Tax and Janitorial Service Contract Payments	03/15/99
01/22/98	A72126	Audit of the Contracting Officer Warrant Program, Region 7	04/15/99
01/23/98	A70302	Management Control Review, Public Buildings Service, Property Management IMPAC Credit Card Program	05/15/99
01/30/98	A72443	Audit of the Megacenter Program, Federal Protective Service, Public Buildings Service	05/15/99
02/11/98	A73311	Audit of the Accuracy of PBS Rent Billings in GSA Owned and Leased Buildings	06/15/99

Appendix III - Audit Reports over 12 Months Old with Final Action Pending

Date of Report	Audit Number	Title	Projected Final Action Date
03/30/98	A83007	Follow-up Review of the Contract Workload Management	12/15/99
03/31/98	A73902	GSA Needs to Prioritize and Accelerate Year 2000 Computer Conversion Efforts	10/15/99

Appendix IV - Delinquent Debts

The GSA Office of the Chief Financial Officer provided the following information.

GSA Efforts to Improve Debt Collection

During the period October 1, 1998 through March 31, 1999, GSA efforts to improve debt collection and reduce the amount of debt written off as uncollectible focused on upgrading the collection function and enhancing debt management. These activities included the following:

- The GSA Finance Centers continue to refer delinquent non-Federal claims to the U.S. Department of the Treasury (Treasury) for cross-servicing collection activities. FY 1999 collections on non-Federal claims, to date, exceed \$10 million. Administrative offsets have resulted in an additional collection of \$85,000. GSA also collects non-Federal claims using Pre-Authorized Debits (PAD's). From September 30, 1998 to March 31, 1999, six PAD's were used to collect \$4,515.
- GSA continues to improve its new Accounts Receivable Claims System (ARCS). The use of this system will improve tracking, follow-up, referral, and reporting of claim functions. ARCS also allows multiple users to simultaneously access claims data.

The ARCS system was enhanced to handle a new type of claim related to the collection of past due industrial funding fees owed by contractors.

- In February 1999, an Inspector General audit of the Heartland Finance Center's non-Federal claims collection process disclosed the center was in compliance with all requirements of the Debt Collection Improvement Act. The auditors found the center to be a leader in electronically transmitting claims to Treasury's Financial Management Service.
- Persistent claims coordination efforts between regional contracting officers, Finance Center personnel, and Treasury claims offset personnel continue to strengthen our collection efforts. Our Federal debt collections are taking less time, therefore, allowing us to dedicate more resources to non-Federal collection to improve both Federal and non-Federal collections.
- We have increased the number and dollar amount of billings under the Memorandum of Understanding between the Federal Telecommunications Service and the Defense Finance and Accounting Service. We also have increased the collection of outstanding accounts receivable from the Department of Defense through the manual On-line Payment and Collection system.

Non-Federal Accounts Receivable

	As of October 1, 1998	As of March 31, 1999	Difference
Total Amounts Due GSA	\$23,757,957	\$28,048,802	\$4,290,845
Amount Delinquent	\$12,375,303	\$18,388,523	\$6,013,220
Total Amount Written Off as Uncollectible Between 10/1/98 and 3/31/99	\$305,760		

Appendix V - Reporting Requirements

The table below cross-references the reporting requirements prescribed by the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, to the specific pages where they are addressed. The information requested by the Congress in Senate

Report No. 96-829 relative to the 1980 Supplemental Appropriations and Rescission Bill and the National Defense Authorization Act is also cross-referenced to the appropriate page of the report.

Requirement	Page
Inspector General Act	
Section 4(a)(2) - Review of Legislation and Regulations28
Section 5(a)(1) - Significant Problems, Abuses, and Deficiencies2,19
Section 5(a)(2) - Recommendations With Respect to Significant Problems, Abuses, and Deficiencies2,19
Section 5(a)(3) - Prior Recommendations Not Yet Implemented37
Section 5(a)(4) - Matters Referred to Prosecutive Authorities33
Sections 5(a)(5) and 6(b)(2) - Summary of Instances Where Information Was Refused	None
Section 5(a)(6) - List of Audit Reports40
Section 5(a)(7) - Summary of Each Particularly Significant Report2,19
Section 5(a)(8) - Statistical Tables on Management Decisions on Questioned Costs32
Section 5(a)(9) - Statistical Tables on Management Decisions on Recommendations That Funds Be Put to Better Use31
Section 5(a)(10) - Summary of Each Audit Report Over 6 Months Old for Which No Management Decision Has Been Made	None
Section 5(a)(11) - Description and Explanation for Any Significant Revised Management Decision	None
Section 5(a)(12) - Information on Any Significant Management Decisions With Which the Inspector General Disagrees	None
Senate Report No. 96-829	
Resolution of Audits30
Delinquent Debts57
National Defense Authorization Act49

**Make
like
it's
your
money!**

It is.

To report suspected waste,
fraud, abuse, or mismanagement
in GSA, call your

Inspector General's Hotline

Toll-free 1-800-424-5210
Washington, DC metropolitan area
(202) 501-1780

or write: GSA, IG, Hotline Officer
Washington, DC 20405



U.S. General Services Administration
Office of the Inspector General

