



**U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL**



**Management and Performance Challenges for
Fiscal Year 2026**

December 18, 2025

26-O-01



VISION STATEMENT

We are agents of positive change striving for continuous improvements in our agency's management and program operations, as well as within the Office of Inspector General.

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

We will:

Work with the Commission and the Congress to improve program management.

Maximize the positive impact and ensure the independence and objectivity of our audits, investigations, and other reviews.

Use our investigations and other reviews to increase government integrity and recommend improved systems to prevent fraud, waste, and abuse.

Be innovative, question existing procedures, and suggest improvements.

Build relationships with program managers based on a shared commitment to improving program operations and effectiveness.

Strive to continually improve the quality and usefulness of our products.

Work together to address government-wide issues.



December 18, 2025

TO: Peter A. Feldman, Acting Chairman

FROM: Christopher W. Dentel, Inspector General

SUBJECT: Management and Performance Challenges for Fiscal Year 2026

In accordance with the Reports Consolidation Act of 2000, I am providing you information on what I consider to be the most serious management and performance challenges facing the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) in fiscal year (FY) 2026. Congress left the determination and threshold of what constitutes a most serious management and performance challenge to the discretion of the Inspector General. These challenges are defined as mission critical areas or programs that have the potential to be a significant weakness or vulnerability that would greatly impact agency operations or strategic goals if not addressed by management.

As detailed in the following pages, the CPSC has made great improvements in terms of tone at the top and accountability, two areas that have been highlighted as weaknesses in past years' management challenges. Current senior leadership, unlike a number of their predecessors, has taken action to address issues related to employees who have failed to meet the high legal and ethical standards expected of federal employees. However, a number of the challenges inherited by senior management will take time to address. In FY 2026, the most serious management and performance challenges facing the CPSC remain similar to those it faced in FY 2025:

1. Enterprise Risk Management
2. Resource Management
3. Information Technology Security

Complicating senior leadership's efforts to address the above challenges are issues related to the agency's culture. They will need to overcome agency management's historic reluctance to embrace change and hold staff accountable for results in order to achieve the objectives they have set regarding optimizing the use of limited resources, integrating Artificial Intelligence and other IT solutions into agency operations, developing better measures of program effectiveness, and ensuring adherence to policies, rules, regulations, and laws.

Please feel free to contact me if you or your staff have any questions or concerns.

INTRODUCTION

The fiscal year (FY) 2026 management and performance challenges directly relate to the current administration's priorities of improving government efficiency, restoring government accountability, and eliminating waste. They also relate to the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission's (CPSC) statutory mission of "Protecting the public from hazardous consumer products" and address the CPSC's *Strategic Goal 1: Sustain the operational backbone of the Commission to ensure resilience and continuity*.

Senior agency management have set a number of ambitious goals for themselves and appear to be bringing fresh ideas to deal with longstanding issues. For example, the CPSC plans to create an Analytic Center of Excellence and leverage advanced data analytics to improve its ability to identify unsafe products and target illegal shipments. However, this forward lean must be balanced against the challenges that agency leadership has inherited. These include the need to address shortcomings in the way the agency has dealt with human capital and financial management that have gone uncorrected for years and will not be susceptible to quick fixes. However, I am happy to report that, as noted below, the agency is now showing a greater willingness to address these issues and progress has been reported by the agency in a number of areas.

The FY 2026 management and performance challenges are:

1. Enterprise Risk Management
2. Resource Management
3. Information Technology Security

Neither the listed challenges nor the issues underlying these challenges are new. Examples of the impacts of these persistent challenges and their ongoing nature include the two most recent Financial Statement Audits (FSAs), which resulted in findings related to pervasive weaknesses in the agency's system of internal control over its finances. In addition, the CPSC failed to properly complete its statutorily required annual report on the administration of the Consumer Product Safety Act (CPSA) to the President and Congress for fiscal years 2020, 2021, and 2022 and its Real Property Capital Plan in 2022. These reports are all valuable tools which, when prepared timely and accurately, can assist agency staff in planning and risk assessment tasks.

Challenges do not necessarily equate to problems; rather, they should be considered areas most deserving of ongoing focus by CPSC management and staff. The challenges we identify speak to both the foundation of agency operations - internal controls - as well as the ability of the CPSC to manage risk and respond to changes in the external operating environment and within the agency.

Below is a brief discussion of each management and performance challenge along with examples of management's efforts to address each, as well as references to the Office of Inspector General's (OIG) completed work, and information on planned work related to the CPSC's management and performance challenges.



I. ENTERPRISE RISK MANAGEMENT

Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) is an integrated approach to understanding, analyzing and managing risk across an agency in order to help the agency achieve its objectives. It includes and integrates internal controls as a fundamental part of its framework. While ERM is broader than just internal control, an effective internal control system is considered an essential component for managing and mitigating risks to achieve an organization's objectives.

This is an area where the agency has made substantial progress in the past two years. However, resources constraints due to budgetary pressure and the FY 2025 hiring freeze have undercut the agency's ability to fully incorporate ERM into its operations. Specifically, as noted below, the loss of the agency's only internal control auditor, and the inability to fill this position, as well as the decision to no longer contract for internal control support, have impacted the agency's efforts in this area.

Risk is the effect of uncertainty on agency operations. Traditionally, organizations managed risks by placing responsibilities on unit leaders to manage the risks within their areas of responsibility. For example, the chief information officer was responsible for managing risks related to the organization's information technology operations, the chief financial officer (CFO) was responsible for managing risks related to finance and budget, the general counsel for legal risks, and so on. This traditional approach to risk management is often referred to as silo risk management whereby each silo leader is responsible for managing risks within their silo.

This traditional approach to risk management has limitations, which could result in significant risks going undetected or not being fully understood by management. Some risks "fall between the silos." Also, some risks affect multiple silos in different ways. So, while a silo leader might recognize a potential risk, he or she may not realize the significance of that risk to other aspects of the agency. For example, the director of facilities may adjust leases in a way designed to promote operational efficiencies at the agency without communicating said change to the CFO because he does not realize the potential financial reporting consequences of these changes.

Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Memorandum A-123, *Management's Responsibility for Internal Control*, (A-123) is the federal government's standard for federal agencies that defines management's responsibilities for internal control and ERM. The 2016 update to A-123 emphasized the importance of having an appropriate risk management process for every federal agency. The guidance includes a requirement that agencies annually assess risks that may impact their strategic plan and take those risks into account in their planning efforts.

A-123 also mandates that agencies comply with Government Accountability Office, Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government (Green Book), and the internal control requirements of the Federal Managers Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA).

The Green Book defines controls and explains how its components and principles are integral to an agency's internal control system. The Green Book also provides managers criteria for designing, implementing, and operating an effective internal control system.

We note that the CPSC has experience using a risk-based methodology for certain of its operations, for example, its research and inspection operations. However, it is only relatively recently that the Office of Financial Management, Planning, and Evaluation began developing a risk assessment process for the agency as a whole. The agency reported that by the end of FY 2024, risk assessments had been performed by all assessable units¹ and internal controls have been identified to deal with the risks found by that process.²

Once risks and opportunities are identified through the risk assessment process, they should be addressed through internal controls. Internal control systems are the tools used by management to help an entity achieve its objectives. Internal controls can range from providing written delegations of authority, that outline who has authority and responsibility over sensitive tasks; to monitoring and analyzing employee use of computers, to detect and prevent misuse as well as to track employee's use of official time; and to include the creation of written policies and procedures, to guide entity operations.

The objective of ERM is to develop a holistic portfolio-view of the most significant risks to the agency's most important objectives. ERM seeks to create a top-down, enterprise view of all the significant risks that might impact the strategic objectives of the agency. In other words, ERM attempts to take into account all types of risks that might have an impact – both positive and negative – on the accomplishment of the agency's mission.

An effective ERM process should be an important strategic tool for agency leaders. Insights about risks emerging from the ERM process should be an important input to the agency's strategic plan. As management and the commission become more knowledgeable about potential risks, they can use that intelligence to design strategies to nimbly navigate future risks as they emerge. Proactively thinking about risks should provide greater efficiencies by reducing the likelihood that unforeseen risks will emerge which might derail important strategic initiatives for the agency. Proactive thinking about risks should also increase the odds that the agency is better prepared to minimize the impact of a risk event should it occur.

There are multiple frameworks developed by well-regarded independent oversight entities, such as the Treadway Commission, which develops guidelines for organizations to evaluate internal controls, risk management, and fraud deterrence designed to facilitate the implementation of an effective ERM program. Most recommend organizations do the following:

- align ERM to mission objectives
- identify risks
- assess risks

¹ Certain offices in the CPSC are not included in the agency's definition of assessable units.

² The Audit of the CPSC's Implementation of the FMFIA for 2018 and 2019 found that misalignment existed between how the CPSC identified programmatic or operational activities, how it measured the performance of these activities, and how it reported these activities. Our audit recommended that the CPSC focus on programs that help achieve the agency's mission, e.g. FastTrack, rather than offices, e.g. the Office of Compliance, which are organizational units.



- respond to risks
- monitor risks
- communicate and report on risks as conditions change

The agency now reports that its ERM program is operational rather than pilot. It has implemented a Senior Risk Management Counsel that provides governance to its ERM program by identifying and mitigating risks to the agency's ability to meet its strategic goals. However, its efforts in the area of internal control were hampered in FY 2025 by the lack of an internal control auditor and the loss of the contractor support previously used to perform risk assessments. On a foundational level, the CPSC is only now incorporating ERM into its operations and we have not had the opportunity to audit the effectiveness of the agency's efforts in this area.

Historically, the CPSC has lacked an effective system of internal control. Within the federal government, an agency's internal control system is the tool used by management to both ensure compliance with laws and regulations and to help the organization achieve its objectives, navigate change and manage risk. A strong internal control system provides stakeholders with reasonable assurance that the agency's operations are effective and efficient, use reliable information for decision-making, and are compliant with applicable laws and regulations.

The CPSC's past weaknesses in applying the principles of ERM and the resulting negative impact on the CPSC's ability to implement internal controls have been repeatedly noted in past Federal Information Security Modernization Act (FISMA) reviews, including the Evaluation of the CPSC's FISMA Implementation for FY 2025, Financial Statement Audit for FY 2023, Evaluation of the CPSC's Compliance with the Payment Integrity Information Act for Fiscal Year 2024 (PIIA), the Audit of the CPSC's Grants Program, and the Report of Investigation Regarding the 2019 Clearinghouse Data Breach.

The agency acknowledged that resource constraints have prevented them from testing the effectiveness of the internal controls in question, but it is apparent that agency management has placed both emphasis on and resources behind this effort that had been lacking in the past. The development of formal internal controls covering the majority of the agency would represent a truly foundational step in implementing effective internal controls at the CPSC. Agency management has indicated that they are planning on improving their risk assessment and statement of assurance processes in FY 2026 as well as providing managers additional training in these areas.

Another area where improvement has been made but much work remains to be done involves the agency's system of directives. A fundamental weakness in the CPSC's internal control system historically has been the failure to develop and maintain an up-to-date set of written policies and procedures. This problem was first reported over four years ago in our Audit of the CPSC's Directives System. In an effort to address this issue, the Chairman directed the Office of General Counsel to take the lead in ensuring that the agency reviews and revises its directives system. Although not yet audited, it appears that this is another area where substantial improvements have been made in the past few years. The Office of General Counsel has developed a process to track, review, and revise agency directives. However, although the development of such a process is a key development and a vital first step in addressing the ongoing issues with outdated written policies and procedures, the agency continues to have



challenges in this area. Additionally, the agency's recent progress in this area has been negatively impacted this year by resource constraints and the hiring freeze. For example, some key human capital and financial management directives are over two decades old and clearly out of date. Other areas of agency operations suffer from having no written policies or procedure governing their operations.

The lack of written policies and procedures has contributed to the agency not meeting basic statutory and regulatory requirements. The agency's recent failure to comply with PIIA reporting requirements in FY 2024, complete mandatory reports to Congress regarding agency operations, as required by the CPSC, and not being aware of the requirement to complete a capital planning report required by OMB, appear to be linked to weaknesses in internal control rather than deliberate acts. In the case of the CPSC reporting requirements, there were no internal controls in place to ensure that these reports were completed. In the case of the capital planning reporting requirements, there was no process in place to ensure the agency tracked the creation of external requirements. On a positive note, for the first time in two decades, the names of the individuals selected to serve on the FY 2025 Senior Executive Service Performance Review Board were published in the Federal Register as required by federal regulation. Prior to this, the last time the CPSC met this requirement was FY 2006.

The CPSC has made progress in resolving some ERM and internal control findings and recommendations from this office. The OIG acknowledges management's:

- Creation of a Senior Management Counsel to address ERM at the agency level and provide governance and risk mitigation.
- Development of an agency risk register.
- Ongoing efforts at reviewing and revising its directive system.
- Ongoing efforts to revise the management assurance and internal controls program governance, including its internal communication and its processes for consolidating its entity-level checklist responses for the statement of assurance.
- Reported success in meeting its goal to have all assessable units develop formal internal control programs in accordance with Green Book and A-123.

Recently completed OIG work in this area includes: Audit of the Consumer Product Safety Commission's Fiscal Year 2024 Financial Statements, Management Alert 23-O-04, Human Capital Program Assessment, Evaluation of the CPSC's Compliance with Tax Withholding Requirements, and Evaluation of the CPSC's Federal Information Security Modernization Act (FISMA) Implementation for FY 2024 and FY 2025, and Audit of the CPSC's Internal Controls Over Space Utilization. Ongoing OIG work in this area includes the Audit of the Consumer Product Safety Commission's Fiscal Year 2025 Financial Statements and the Pre-Dissemination Review Audit. Upcoming OIG work in this area includes scheduled evaluations of the CPSC's Budget Process and Senior Executive Service (SES) Performance Management System.

Until recently, a recurring challenge at the CPSC, and one which has compounded the difficulty in adequately addressing the CPSC's other internal control deficits, has been the "tone at the top" of the agency. I am happy to report that current senior leadership is in the process of reversing this trend.



Agency management has acted decisively to deal not only with a number of recent integrity type offenses but also moved to review the agency's responses to prior incidents.

The OIG will continue to address ERM as part of its statutory audits and as a component in other planned engagements. An evaluation of the CPSC's ERM program as a whole has been included in the OIG's annual audit plan for a number of years; however, in the past the program was clearly not sufficiently mature to be auditable. This may no longer be the case.

II. RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

This challenge relates to management's stewardship of its resources including human capital, agency funds, and agency assets. This challenge has been exacerbated for years by uncertainty over agency funding levels and deficiencies in the agency's internal budgeting and performance management processes. For example, there are issues related to the calculations used to determine personnel costs and verify operating costs and performance measures. This makes it difficult to ensure program effectiveness, establish appropriate staff levels, and make determinations regarding the optimal mix of "in house" and contracted work. This complicates the duties of both oversight officials (commission, congress, etc.) and agency management.

The CPSC must reform its financial reporting and budgetary processes so that these become useful management tools instead of simply paperwork exercises. Such a reform would provide senior management with timely and accurate information and allow decision makers to better understand how financial resources are allocated across agency programs.

Current agency management has taken decisive action to refocus the agency on achieving its mission of protecting the public from hazardous consumer products and reshaping the agency to more efficiently accomplish this mission. The agency needs to continually assess whether it currently has the right personnel to support the mission and is providing the right training, tools, structure, and incentives to achieve operational success. Management must continually assess the agency's needs regarding knowledge, skills, and abilities so that the agency can be effective now and prepare for the challenges of the future. These challenges are complicated by the ERM issues discussed previously and budgetary and hiring constraints within which the agency must operate.

Management's efforts in this area have been affected by its Human Capital Program which, as noted in our assessment of same, has historically not aligned with federal regulations and lacked overall accountability. Additionally, the CPSC has not made full use of flexibilities available to it to aid in the recruitment and retention of information technology (IT) and other professionals; nor was it adequately performing succession planning. Many of the findings and recommendations found in the Human Capital Program Assessment were over two decades old and were first identified in Office of Personnel Management evaluations in 1998 and 2008. However, these recommendations were not resolved, including a finding that the CPSC had not established a system of accountability to ensure that its human capital program is managed effectively and efficiently. As noted, when the report was issued, these shortcomings, if not corrected, could prevent the CPSC from achieving its mission. I am happy to



report that the CPSC has addressed some of these concerns, senior agency management officials have become directly involved, and three longstanding recommendations were closed in FY 2025.

Recent examples of the high cost of failing to retain competence or adequately plan for succession occurred during the FY 2023 and FY 2024 audits of the CPSC's financial statements. Despite being warned repeatedly by this office of the existence of a "key person" risk, created by the agency's over reliance on one individual to both manage financial operations and prepare the financial statements for the agency, the agency did not develop a succession plan to deal with the risk of this individual leaving the agency. When this individual did leave the agency, there was no one able to adequately perform their duties. This resulted in disruptions to the financial operations of the agency and to its ability to successfully complete its publication of its audited FY 2023 financial statements in a timely manner. It also played a role in the agency receiving a qualified audit opinion in FY 2023 and being found to have material weaknesses in its financial reporting in FY 2023 and FY 2024. Agency management has addressed these competency issues over the past two years by supplementing its internal staff with contractors. The FY 2025 Financial Statement Audit is ongoing as of the time this document is being written but it seems likely that agency management will again in FY 2026 be forced to make hard decisions involving what work should be done in-house and what work should be outsourced to contractors.

The agency enters FY 2026 after experiencing unprecedented turnover in FY 2025. Overall headcount decreased by 80 (from 525 to 445). Support operations (HR, Finance, etc.) staffing levels fell over 20 percent. In contrast, field and scientific/laboratory staff decreased by approximately eight percent in the same period. Additionally, a number of existing critical vacancies (chief financial officer, budget officer, internal control auditor, human resource director, etc.) could not be filled. The agency reports that steps have been taken to improve the transfer of information from departing employees. This assertion has not yet been assessed by this office. This creates both a challenge in conducting current operations and an opportunity to reshape the agency.

The CPSC needs to implement policies and procedures to secure and safeguard vulnerable assets as well as accurately track property as part of its financial operations. Vulnerable assets include physical property and data the agency collects and uses to analyze potential harm to consumers. The CPSC should have adequate policies and procedures in place to safeguard data from unauthorized release and both track the value of physical assets and protect them from misappropriation. Issues related to property management were noted in the FY 2023 and FY 2024 Financial Statement Audits, where they played a role in the agency receiving a qualified opinion in FY 2023, and having to request and receive permission from OMB to utilize a single year (rather than the traditional two year comparative) presentation in FYs 2023 and 2024.

As part of resource management, the agency should implement best practices and recommendations, such as those described in government-wide directives from the General Services Administration, OMB, and Office of Personnel Management, as well as the Government Accountability Office and OIG reports, to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the CPSC's operations. These reports include recommendations with which management has previously concurred. Corrective action taken by management on resolved findings and recommendations is essential to improving the effectiveness and



efficiency of government operations. Historically, insufficient resources were allocated to implementing OIG recommendations with which the agency had already concurred. This led to the continuation of problems that had already been identified and that management had already agreed to address.

The agency appears to be placing much greater emphasis on this area of late with senior management officials becoming directly involved in the audit follow-up process. This has clearly led to a greater effort on the part of management officials to implement recommendations. For example, the agency took steps to address recommendations relating to human capital and internal control issues which, despite having been concurred with, had gone years without being directly addressed. Similarly, the agency closed the final open recommendation related to the 2019 Data Breach Investigation this year.

Despite the positive developments noted above, there remains room for improvement. For example, the agency has not developed a comprehensive corrective action plan to address its IT security weaknesses, see “Information Technology Security” below for greater detail. In order to properly incentivize management officials, the agency should explicitly take into account the successes and failures of its SES members and other staff responsible for addressing OIG recommendations in their performance appraisal and performance-based award systems. This would create both a financial incentive and a record of individual senior managers’ efforts to implement OIG recommendations. We note the CPSC has in the past included an SES performance metric regarding actions taken to address findings made by the OIG. However, the metric does not appear to measure the success or validity of those actions, only whether the attempts were timely.

Implementing existing recommendations designed to improve human capital, financial management, and the protection of assets will allow the CPSC to be more efficient and avoid future costs. Effective resource management will allow the CPSC to be agile while responding to change and support overall agency success.

Recently completed OIG work in this area includes: Audit of the CPSC’s Internal Controls Over Space Utilization, Audit of the Consumer Product Safety Commission’s Fiscal Year 2024 Financial Statements, Human Capital Program Assessment, Evaluation of the CPSC’s FISMA Implementation for FY 2024, and Audit of the CPSC’s FISMA Implementation for FY 2025. Ongoing OIG work in this area includes the Audit of the Consumer Product Safety Commission’s Fiscal Year 2025 Financial Statements and the Fleet Vehicle Planning, Management, and Analysis Audit. Upcoming OIG work in this area includes scheduled evaluations of the CPSC’s Budget Process and SES Performance Management System and the Audit of the CPSC’s FISMA Implementation for FY 2026.

III. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SECURITY

Senior leadership is making a concerted effort to upgrade CPSC’s use of technology. They are working to replace outdated data collection systems with Artificial Intelligence powered data mining efforts. This initiative will provide CPSC staff access to electronic health and injury records, commercial trade data, and retailer information. By integrating this data, CPSC staff will have real-time insights into emerging hazards enabling them to act more quickly. These efforts have the potential to make CPSC a



much more effective organization supporting the mission of keeping American families from unreasonable risks of injury associated with consumer products.

In IT, there is competition for the resources required to maintain current systems and the resources required to develop new tools and systems. Additionally, there is competition for resources necessary to meet mission initiatives and resources required to address the ever-evolving IT security environment. As this office has expressed before, and the agency also noted, the CPSC will not be able to meet current and future demands with its current IT resources. The agency will need to reassess the risks and benefits of allocating resources to new systems versus securing and maintaining legacy systems. This challenge is not unique to the CPSC. Current agency leadership appears to be more willing to develop new systems and ways of doing things than many of their predecessors. For example, as previously discussed, the agency has announced that it will be creating an Analytic Center of Excellence to harness advanced data analytics, consistent with President Trump's Executive Order 14179.

During the FY 2025 FISMA evaluation, the CPSC's compliance with the annual FISMA reporting metrics set forth by the Department of Homeland Security and the OMB was assessed. It was found that improvements have occurred in some areas. The CPSC was able to close 23 recommendations. Specifically, since the FY 2024 FISMA evaluation, the CPSC had:

- defined and documented the taxonomy of the CPSC's information system components
- implemented solutions to perform scenario analysis and modeled potential responses, including modeling the potential impact of a threat exploiting a vulnerability and the resulting impact to organizational systems and data
- implemented registration and inventorying procedures for the CPSC's information systems
- developed, documented, and implemented a process for determining and defining system boundaries
- implemented the CPSC's policies and procedures for provisioning, managing, and reviewing privileged accounts
- developed and implemented policies and procedures in support of Binding Operational Directive 22-01, Reducing the Significant Risk of Known Exploited Vulnerabilities
- performed an assessment of the knowledge, skills, and abilities of the CPSC personnel with significant security responsibilities
- developed a security awareness and training strategy/plan
- defined and implemented event logging requirements

However, despite these improvements, it was determined that the CPSC still had not implemented an effective information security program in accordance with FISMA requirements. The CPSC has not implemented an effective program because the CPSC has still not taken a formal approach to information security risk management and has not prioritized addressing FISMA requirements and OIG recommendations. The National Institute of Standards and Technology provides guidance to federal agencies on establishing effective information security programs. This guidance postulates that establishing effective governance and a formalized approach to information security risk management is the critical first step to achieving an effective information security program. To date, the CPSC has not taken this critical first step.

The IT challenges currently facing the CPSC include: evolving threats, increasingly sophisticated attacks including state-sponsored attacks, and new compliance requirements. These challenges are further complicated by the rapid changes in the agency's IT environment as CPSC management overhauls its data collection and analysis tools.

Recently completed OIG work in this area includes: Audit of the Consumer Product Safety Commission's Fiscal Year 2024 Financial Statements, Evaluation of the CPSC's FISMA Implementation for FY 2025, Evaluation of the CPSC's Management of Cloud Computing, Shared Services, & Third-Party Systems; and Evaluation of the CPSC's NIST Cybersecurity Framework Implementation. Ongoing OIG work in this area includes the Audit of the CPSC's Adoption of Zero Trust Architecture and Audit of the Consumer Product Safety Commission's Fiscal Year 2025 Financial Statements. Upcoming OIG work in this area includes the scheduled Audit of the CPSC's FISMA Implementation for FY 2026.





For more information on this report please contact us at CPSC-OIG@cpsc.gov

To report fraud, waste, or abuse, mismanagement, or wrongdoing at the CPSC go to
OIG.CPSC.GOV or call (301) 504-7906

Office of Inspector General, CPSC, 4330 East-West Hwy., Suite 702, Bethesda, MD 20814