



UNITED STATES CAPITOL POLICE
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
SEMIANNUAL REPORT
TO CONGRESS

April 1, 2013 — September 30, 2013



United States Capitol Police



History

Created by Congress in 1828 following the assault on a son of John Quincy Adams in the Capitol Rotunda, the original duty of the United States Capitol Police (USCP) was to provide security for the United States Capitol Building. Its mission has expanded to provide the Congressional community and its visitors with a variety of police services. These services are provided through a variety of specialty support units, network of foot and vehicular patrols, fixed posts, full-time Containment and Emergency Response Team, K-9 Unit, Patrol/Mobile Response Division, and full-time Hazardous Devices and Hazardous Materials Sections. The agency had 2078 sworn and civilian employees as of September 7, 2013.

Mission

Today's USCP officer has the primary responsibility of protecting life and property; preventing, detecting, and investigating criminal acts; and enforcing traffic regulations throughout a large complex of congressional buildings, parks, and thoroughfares. With the signing of Public Law 112-74, USCP was given jurisdiction over the Capitol Reflecting Pool and Union Square—adding to its concurrent jurisdiction with other police agencies, including the United States Park Police and Metropolitan (D.C.) Police, of an area approximately 200 blocks around the Capitol complex. USCP is also charged with the protection of Members of Congress, officers of Congress, and their families throughout the entire United States, its territories and possessions, and the District of Columbia.

Office of Inspector General



History

With Public Law 109-55 (August 2, 2005), Congress directed that the Capitol Police Board appoint an Inspector General (IG) for the Department. The IG was to be appointed without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of integrity and demonstrated ability in accounting, auditing, financial analysis, law, management analysis, public administration, or investigations.

On July 12, 2006, the Chairman of the Capitol Police Board swore in the first IG for the Department at the Headquarters for the United States Capitol Police—the Eney, Chestnut, Gibson Memorial Building in Washington, D.C. On August 11, 2013, Fay F. Ropella began her tenure as the second IG for the Department.

Mission

The IG is responsible for conducting and supervising audits and investigations relating to the programs and operations of the Department. The Office of Inspector General (OIG) examines, evaluates and, where necessary, critiques the programs and operations, recommending ways to carry out departmental responsibilities in the most effective, efficient, and economical manner possible. OIG also audits, investigates, and oversees matters related to the Department's programs and operations, consistent with applicable laws, regulations, and policies.



Message from the Inspector General

I am pleased to present this Semiannual Report to Congress as Inspector General of the United States Capitol Police (USCP or Department). This report describes the work of USCP Office of Inspector General (OIG) for the period from April 1, through September 30, 2013. As an initial matter, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the USCP Board, the Chief of Police, and Congress for their confidence and support while I was acting Inspector General (IG). On August 11, 2013, I began my tenure as the USCP IG.

The audits and investigations described in this report illustrate the commitment of the USCP OIG to promoting the efficiency and effectiveness of USCP, as well as the impact OIG has had on USCP programs and operations.

During this period, Audits issued three reports: *Performance Audit of USCP Canine (K-9) Program* (Report Number 2013-OIG-04); *Performance Audit of Library of Congress Division Special Events Unit Reimbursement Process* (Report Number 2013-OIG-06); and *Evaluation of USCP Dignitary Protection Division* (Report Number 2013-OIG-07). At the end of the reporting period, Audits had two ongoing projects: audit of USCP financial statements for the period ended September 30, 2013, and a performance audit of USCP controls over ammunition.

Investigations continued to receive and evaluate Hotline complaints and conduct outreach with USCP personnel including recruit officer classes. OIG received 23 complaints, initiated 5 investigations, and closed 6 cases. Most importantly, based on previous work by Investigations with the Department of Justice, USCP recovered \$1.3 million in an interim distribution settlement of funds related to the Zylon ballistic vests.

During this reporting period, the Department continued to make significant progress in closing open recommendations older than 6 months. As of September 30, 2013, USCP had fully implemented six recommendations older than 6 months, which OIG closed.

I want to express my appreciation for the dedication and achievements of OIG staff during our transition period. Additionally, I commend USCP, the Board, and members of the oversight community for their professionalism and devotion to the USCP mission. We thank the officers whose service and sacrifice inspire our goal to achieve excellence through unity.

In closing, we look forward to the continued support of Congress, the Board, the Chief of Police, and the Department as we strive to use our oversight functions to promote accountability, integrity, and efficiency; improve USCP programs and operations; and ensure the most efficient use of taxpayer dollars.

Fay F. Ropella, CPA, CFE
Inspector General

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	2
Legislation Monitored	3
Agent of Positive Change	4
Proactive Efforts	5
Audits	6
Investigations	10
Appendix 1 – Reports Issued	13
Appendix 2 – Resolution of Report Recommendations	14
Appendix 3 – Peer Review Reporting	18
Table 1 – Reports Issued with Questioned Costs	19
Table 2 – Reports with Recommendations That Funds Be Put to Better Use	20
Table 3 – Investigations Statistics	21
IG Act Reporting Requirements	22
Working Relationship Principles for Agencies and Offices of Inspectors General	23

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Semiannual Report is issued pursuant to the provisions of Section 5 of the Inspector General (IG) Act of 1978, as amended, and summarizes the activities of the United States Capitol Police (USCP or Department) Office of Inspector General (OIG) for the period April 1, 2013, through September 30, 2013. During this reporting period, OIG continued to direct its available resources toward those areas of greatest risk for the Department. We completed work intended to promote the economy, efficiency, effectiveness, and integrity of the Department's programs and operations. The work of each of the OIG components is summarized below.

OIG Audits completed three projects during this reporting period:

Performance Audit of USCP Canine (K-9) Program (Report Number OIG-2013-04); *Performance Audit of Library of Congress Division Special Events Unit Reimbursement Process* (Report Number OIG-2013-06); and *Evaluation of USCP Dignitary Protection Division* (Report Number OIG 2013-07). At the end of the reporting period, Audits had two on-going projects: audit of USCP financial statements for the period ended September 30, 2013, and a performance audit of USCP controls over ammunition.

OIG Investigations received and evaluated 23 complaints during this reporting period, of which 20 were Hotline complaints and 3 were from other sources. In addition, OIG initiated 5 investigations and closed 6 cases. Investigative projects closed during this reporting period are identified in Appendix 1.

During this reporting period, OIG continued work with stakeholders to maintain and foster an open and effective relationship. As an example of our continued work with stakeholders, OIG continued its active engagement with the Chief of Police (Chief), Capitol Police Board (Board), and Congress through meetings, briefings, and dialogue with members and staff of the Department's authorizing and appropriation committees and subcommittees on a range of issues relating to the work of the OIG and USCP. OIG continued its outreach activities providing briefings to new employees and recruit officer classes preparing for departure to the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Glynco, Georgia.

OIG also continues to be a contributing participant in the activities of the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE), which was statutorily established to enhance efforts to promote integrity and efficiency and to detect and prevent fraud, waste, and abuse in Federal programs.

Furthermore, the IG continued participating in legislative branch OIG activities such as regular meetings with other Inspectors General.

LEGISLATION MONITORED

Legislation Monitored

OIG reviewed and monitored the following legislation:

H.R. 313 – *The Government Spending Accountability Act of 2013*

H.R. 1858 – *The Congress Leads by Example Act of 2013*

S. 549 – *The Public Online Information Act of 2013*

S. 639 – *The Geolocational Privacy and Surveillance Act*

S. 808 – *A bill to establish an Office of Inspector General of the Senate*

S. 994 – *The Digital Accountability and Transparency Act of 2013*



AGENT OF POSITIVE CHANGE

Recovered Funds

Assisted by OIG, the Department of Justice litigated a series of cases involving defective ballistic vests. Sold between 1998 through 2005, the vests degraded more quickly than expected. The Department was a major purchaser of the vests and as a result of the suit, received an interim distribution of \$1.3 million based on an allocation between Federal payers of the vests.

Resolution of Open Recommendations

Since its inception in July 2006, OIG has made numerous recommendations for improving financial management and enhancing internal controls. During this reporting period, the Department continued its significant progress in ensuring that recommendations are implemented. As a result of those efforts, OIG closed seven open recommendations (six recommendations that were older than 6 months and one recommendation less than 6 months). Specifically, OIG closed one recommendation from *Agreed-upon Procedures Time and Attendance [REDACTED] System* (Report Number OIG-2012-04), one recommendation from *Performance Audit of USCP Canine Program* (Report Number OIG-2013-04), one recommendation from the *Controls over Travel Vouchers* (Report Number OIG-2009-02), and four recommendations from the *Performance Audit Building Access Card Process* (Report Number OIG-2012-03). The Department continues work in fully implementing other recommendations, and OIG is hopeful that it can close additional recommendations soon.

K-9 Task Force Established

Based on a May 2013 OIG recommendation, the Department established a K-9 Task Force. In a subsequent review of the OIG recommendations, the Department examined cost savings and ultimately notified active and retired canine technicians that benefits and privileges for retired canines would cease immediately. That action will result in annual recurring cost savings to the Department.

PROACTIVE EFFORTS

OIG Strategic Planning

OIG continues to conduct strategic planning designed to improve its efficiency, enhance its productivity, and better align its strategic plan and organizational goals with the Department. Our exercise consisted of strategy sessions for enhancing methods of gathering key events and material as well as methods for presenting OIG's Semiannual Report to Congress, and building a sound collaborative foundation that would enable us to produce high-quality and timely products for stakeholders.

OIG revised its strategic plan and performance goals as well as its annual plan. OIG expects to issue its strategic and annual plan in October 2013.

Outreach Activities

As part of our continuing efforts for promoting accountability through better awareness of OIG's role, mission, and services, OIG made presentations to Department managers and employees, legislative branch officials, and committee staff members.

OIG also continues its proactive initiative to strengthen accountability by providing fraud prevention and awareness training to Department personnel.



The Assistant Inspector General for Investigations conducts outreach with recruit officers.

OIG Hotline

As part of its duties and responsibilities, OIG maintains a toll-free Hotline that provides employees and private citizens an opportunity to relay information regarding fraud, waste, and abuse.

AUDITS

Performance Audit USCP Canine Program (OIG-2013-04)

The USCP Canine (K-9) Explosive Detection and Conventional and Person-Borne Improvised Explosive Detection (PBIED) teams contribute to the Department's strategic goal of preventing, detecting, and deterring criminal and terrorist activity from reaching their intended target with improvised explosive devices. As a result of an anonymous allegation, OIG conducted a performance audit of the USCP K-9 Program. The objectives of the performance audit were to determine if the K-9 Unit (1) established adequate internal controls and processes for ensuring integrity of the K-9 Program and (2) complied with applicable laws, regulations, and guidance pertaining to management and operation of the K-9 Program. Our scope included controls, processes, and operations during fiscal years (FYs) 2010, 2011, and 2012.

The K-9 Unit did not establish adequate internal controls and processes that would adequately ensure integrity of the K-9 Program. Although it followed a specified set of practices and processes, K-9 did not document the majority of those practices and processes. For example, K-9 did not have a written manual or internal control guide related to safeguarding inventory, equipment, and supplies. Most importantly, the written standard operating procedures (SOPs) for K-9 were vague and not specific about controls, training, best practice requirements, and how program effectiveness should be measured. And although K-9 officials stated that they strive to comply with the Scientific Working Group on Dog and Orthogonal Detector Guidelines (SWGDOG) as best practices, they did not always follow them. SWGDOG SC-2, *General Guidelines*, requires recordkeeping and document management. The guidelines also require that handler/department/organization document training, certification, proficiency assessments, and discipline-related data. Yet, K-9 did not maintain training or recertification plans. The OIG analysis of canine team training data from October 2009 through October 2012 showed that canine teams were repeatedly not in compliance with the monthly 16 hours best practice training requirement, which ensures that canine teams remain proficient in explosives and odor-on-person detection. K-9 also did not always comply with SOPs, or maintain documentation supporting that it complied with SOPs.

K-9 is an important program and has numerous opportunities for using its limited resources in a more efficient and effective manner. The Department agreed to implement all of the audit's 10 recommendations. In fact, the Department has already fully implemented one recommendation, which OIG recently closed.

AUDITS

Performance Audit Library of Congress Division Special Events Unit Reimbursement Process (OIG-2013-06)

The authority in section 1905, chapter 29, title 2 of the United States Code, *Deposit and use of reimbursements for law enforcement assistance*, permits USCP to accept reimbursements for law enforcement assistance from any Federal, State, or local government agency and credit those funds to a general expense appropriation. The USCP Library of Congress (LOC) Division provides law enforcement support to non-congressionally sponsored special events held at LOC facilities. LOC reimburses USCP for overtime costs that officers incur while providing law enforcement support to the non-congressional special events. At the request of the Chief Financial Officer (CFO), OIG conducted a performance audit of the reimbursement process for the Special Events Unit in the Department's LOC Division. The objectives of our audit were to determine whether: (1) controls were operating effectively and efficiently with respect to the special events reimbursement process, and (2) the Department complied with applicable laws, regulations, and guidance pertaining to management and operation of LOC Division special events reimbursable activities. Our scope included controls, processes, and operations in place from October 1, 2011, through December 31, 2012.

USCP did not maintain an internal control manual or written internal control procedures related to the LOC Division special events reimbursable process. In addition, the Division did not have SOPs specific to the special events reimbursable process or for collection of accounts receivable. While the Department had some practices that it followed related to the special events reimbursable process, the practices were not clearly documented or readily available for review. The LOC Division did, however, develop a flow chart of the special events process, which included Office of Financial Management (OFM) procedures. OFM provided summaries of existing procedures, and the Office of the Chief provided a draft SOP for the reimbursement process dated June 22, 2009. As of July 2013, the Department had not finalized the draft SOP. Last updated in 2006, USCP and LOC had not renewed the interagency agreement (IA) related to special events reimbursable activities. In addition, as of July 2013, the Department had not updated its 2009 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with LOC. The MOU is vague with regard to the LOC Division special events reimbursable activities and does not include elements that were part of a previous agreement dated May 10, 2006, which contained a detailed statement of work for special events. The Department generally complied with established practices. For that audit, the Department agreed to implement all recommendations.

AUDITS

Evaluation of USCP Dignitary Protection Division (OIG-2013-07)

Based on an investigation, OIG conducted a performance audit of the USCP Dignitary Protection Division (DPD) program. The objectives of the audit were to determine if DPD (1) established adequate internal controls and processes that would ensure the integrity of the program, and (2) complied with applicable laws, regulations, and guidance pertaining to the management operation of DPD. Our scope included DPD controls, processes, and operations from October 1, 2011, through December 31, 2012.

Overall, the Department issued guidance that would ensure DPD could accomplish its mission. However, we identified areas that needed improving, such as strengthening DPD internal controls and establishing adequate criteria to measure compliance and performance. Our evaluation of the procedures revealed that although SOPs describe the types of reports required, DPD did not establish criteria for consistent preparation and submission of reports.

The audit also revealed that none of the Division's SOPs state either the format of reports or when reports are due. Agents in DPD may or may not have submitted reports in a timely manner or in electronic format. Agents also may or may not utilize the latest report versions or formats. That condition occurred because DPD did not provide computers to each DPD agent. The lack of consistent access to a Department-issued device can lead to data security issues and inefficiencies. According to multiple interviews of DPD officials, the methods that agents may have used for transmitting files—such as hotel computers—may not have been secure. Use of flash drives was also a common practice. Opportunities for more efficiency do, however, exist. Examples of efficacy improvements include areas such as Web-based applications for time and attendance and entering travel expense data. It would also be useful for agents to use standardized reports as well as have the capability of saving reports directly to a secure server. Cost savings could also be achieved by conducting additional DPD Basic Agent Training or using civilians instead of sworn officers to perform administrative tasks.

The Department agreed to implement all recommendations.

ON-GOING AUDITS

Audit of USCP Fiscal Year 2013 Financial Statements



In accordance with our *FY 2013 Annual Plan*, we began an audit of the Department's 2013 principal financial statements in August 2013. The primary objective of the audit was to express an opinion on whether the Department's financial statements are presented fairly, in all material respects, and in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. Auditors will evaluate and report on compliance with laws and regulations related to the financial statements. Auditors will also opine on the effectiveness of the Department's internal controls over financial reporting. The review is based on the *Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and being conducted in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants and *Government Auditing Standards*, also issued by the Comptroller General of the United States.

OIG expects to issue a report about December 16, 2013.

Performance Audit of USCP Controls over Ammunition



At the request of the Chief, OIG began a performance audit of the Department's controls over ammunition. The objectives of the audit were to determine whether USCP: (1) had effective internal controls over ammunition that would ensure accountability of those sensitive items; (2) complied with applicable policies and procedures, laws, and regulations; and (3) inventory records reconcile to actual ammunition on hand and financial accounting records. Our scope included internal controls, policies, and procedures during FY 2012 and FY 2013 as well as the inventory of ammunition on hand for the period ending September 30, 2013.

We have begun planning for the audit and conducted an entrance conference on September 20, 2013. OIG expects to issue a report in January 2014.

INVESTIGATIONS

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

INVESTIGATIONS

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

INVESTIGATIONS

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

APPENDIX 1

REPORTS ISSUED

OIG-2013-04	Performance Audit United States Capitol Police Canine (K-9) Program
--------------------	--

OIG-2013-06	Performance Audit of USCP Library of Congress Division Special Events Unit Reimbursement Process
--------------------	---

OIG-2013-07	Evaluation of United States Capitol Police Dignitary Protection Division
--------------------	---

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

APPENDIX 2

RESOLUTION OF REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

Timely resolution of outstanding recommendations continues to be a priority for both OIG and the Department. As of September 30, 2013, OIG has made a total of 226 recommendations to the Department. Of those 226 recommendations, the Department closed 173, with 53 still open and requiring additional corrective actions before closing. The following table lists recommendations older than 6 months.

Appendix 2 – Resolution of Report Recommendations			
Report Number	Report Title	Recommendation Number	Recommendation
2009-01 2011-01 2012-02 2013-01	FY 2008 FS FYs 2010/2009 FS FY 2011 FS FY 2012 FS	Repeat Finding 1.2 1.1 1.1 1.1	Payroll Processing – We recommended that USCP consistently implement T&A [time and attendance] certification policies and procedures and that timekeepers review all certification reports to ensure that employees and supervisors sign and date reports. (1) USCP management needs to enforce the revised policies and procedures in Special Directive [REDACTED]; (2) because the condition has been in existence for many years, we also recommended that the supervisor/timekeeper procedures for monitoring of T&A include identifying habitual failures in submitting certification reports so that corrective actions can be targeted to those employees, and (3) we recommended that USCP evaluate the feasibility of using [REDACTED], a T&A system, to automate the T&A certification process.
2009-01 2011-01 2012-02 2013-01	FY 2008 FS FYs 2010/2009 FS FY 2011 FS FY 2012 FS	Repeat Finding 1.3 1.2 1.2 1.2	Payroll Processing – We recommended that USCP consistently implement T&A certification policies and procedures and that timekeepers review all certification reports to ensure that employees and supervisors sign and date reports. (1) USCP management needs to enforce the revised policies and procedures in Special Directive [REDACTED]; (2) because the condition has been in existence for many years, we also recommended that the supervisor/timekeeper procedures for monitoring of T&A include identifying habitual failures in submitting certification reports so that corrective actions can be targeted to those employees, and (3) we recommended that USCP evaluate the feasibility of using [REDACTED], a T&A system, to automate the T&A certification process.
2009-01 2011-01 2012-02 2013-01	FY 2008 FS FYs 2010/2009 FS FY 2011 FS FY 2012 FS	Repeat Finding 1.6 1.4 1.3 1.3	Payroll Processing – As in the prior year's recommendation, USCP should perform monthly reconciliation between the National Finance Center (NFC) and [REDACTED] to ensure leave balance information is correctly reported in both systems. We also recommended that the Office of Human Resources (OHR) implement corrective actions in a timely manner.
2009-01 2011-01 2012-02 2013-01	FY 2008 FS FYs 2010/2009 FS FY 2011 FS FY 2012 FS	Repeat Finding 1.9 1.6 1.4 1.4	Payroll Processing – We recommended that USCP ensure that its employees comply with USCP Special Directive No. [REDACTED] addressing responsibility to record daily worked hours using [REDACTED] time clocks. We also recommended that USCP enhance its procedures for monitoring employees who show a pattern of not clocking in or out and verify if hours entered in [REDACTED] are actual hours the employees worked.
2011-01 2012-02 2013-01	FY 2010/2009 FS FY 2011 FS FY 2012 FS	Repeat Finding 10 1.5 1.5	Payroll Processing – As in the prior year's recommendation, we recommended that USCP monitor timekeeper distribution and collection of certification reports to complete T&A review procedures at the end of each pay period. We also recommended that USCP emphasize deadlines or include a deadline for T&A staff to complete the T&A confirmation of certification report.

Appendix 2 – Resolution of Report Recommendations			
Report Number	Report Title	Recommendation Number	Recommendation
2011-01 2012-02 2013-01	FY 2010/2009 FS FY 2011 FS FY 2012 FS	Repeat Finding 12 1.6 1.6	Payroll Processing – We recommended that USCP document the audits or tests performed and the supervisory review of the test results to include the name of the sample tested (if less than 100 percent) in test workpapers. We also recommended that USCP develop a test worksheet that will include the test attributes (criteria), result, and corrective actions, if applicable.
2013-01	FY 2012 FS	1.7	Payroll Processing – We recommended that OHR: (1) Ensure record of the leave reconciliation, including the reason for any variances and corrective action to resolve variances, is readily available for examination. (2) Revise the Record of Leave Data form to allow for recordation of compensatory leave balances and associated rate of pay.
2009-01 2011-01 2012-02 2013-01	FY 2008 FS FYs 2010/2009 FS FY 2011 FS FY 2012 FS	Repeat Finding 2.2H 22 2.1 2.1	Financial Management – We recommended that USCP develop a formal monthly reporting process from the program offices overseeing construction-in-progress to the Office of Financial Management (OFM) and provide signed confirmation that the financial reports from the partner agencies have been reviewed and accepted.
2011-01 2012-02 2013-01	FY 2010/2009 FS FY 2011 FS FY 2012 FS	Repeat Finding 38 3.1	Financial Management – We recommended that USCP develop and implement a methodology that would ensure that user activity is routinely reviewed through logs generated by the [REDACTED] application.
2011-01 2012-02 2013-01	FY 2010/2009 FS FY 2011 FS FY 2012 FS	Repeat Finding 40 3.3 3.3	Financial Management – We recommended that USCP implement account management controls within [REDACTED] to remove access of terminated individuals in a timely manner. We also recommended that USCP update the mechanism to request and approve access to [REDACTED] to provide requestors with the ability to select specific access roles that agree to roles assigned within [REDACTED].
2012-02 2013-01	FY 2011 FS FY 2012 FS	4.1 4.1	Financial Management - We recommend OFM review the nature of the accrued liabilities to determine proper classification as to an asset or an expense. Also, we recommend that OFM perform periodic comparison of actual to estimated accrued liability to ensure its accrual methodology procedures results in a reasonable estimate of goods and services received but not paid.
2013-01	FY 2012 FS	2.2	Financial Management, Construction-in-progress Accounting and Reporting – We recommended that USCP establish policies and procedures requiring that program offices certify to OFM monthly assets deployed and placed in service during the period.
2008-06	Review of Specialty Assignment and Proficiency Pay Programs	2	Specialty Pay – We recommended that USCP take action to collect remaining questioned costs totaling \$13,000.
2008-06	Review of Specialty Assignment and Proficiency Pay Programs	5	Specialty Pay – We recommended that USCP finalize its draft firearms and field officer training directives and enforce the consistent use of a standard USCP form, Form [REDACTED].
2008-06	Review of Specialty Assignment and Proficiency Pay Programs	8	Specialty Pay – We recommended that USCP take action to clarify its Maximum Annual Payable Rate in light of Public Law 108-7. In addition, we recommended that the Chief request that the Office of the General Counsel provide a legal opinion regarding: (1) USCP authority to defer payments to the next calendar year when an employee may exceed the annual salary limitation; and (2) appropriate options for collecting amounts from employees who received amounts in excess of the annual salary limitation.
2008-08	Review of Compliance with USCP Hiring Standards and with Directive [REDACTED]	1	Triple III – We recommended that USCP, in coordination with the Board, update its hiring standards and establish a comprehensive hiring directive outlining the Department's vision and goals to create a talented and committed workforce, to support an effective organizational culture, and enhance the overall performance of the USCP workforce.

Appendix 2 – Resolution of Report Recommendations			
Report Number	Report Title	Recommendation Number	Recommendation
2009-06	Audit of USCP Off-site Deployments	1	Off-site Deployments – We recommended that USCP in coordination with the Board and Committees of jurisdiction, establish a policy clearly defining terms such as deployment, “direct nexus” to the mission, and the three exceptions under 2 U.S.C. § 1978 and establish a complete listing of off-campus activities that do not require formal notification.
2009-06	Audit of USCP Off-site Deployments	2	Off-site Deployments – We recommended that USCP immediately document its decision-making process as it relates to off-campus activities.
2009-06	Audit of USCP Off-site Deployments	3	Off-site Deployments – We recommended that USCP implement procedures to capture and document estimated and actual costs in all off-campus activities.
2009-06	Audit of USCP Off-site Deployments	4	Off-site Deployments – We recommended that USCP develop written measures and standards for off-campus activities.
2012-01	Audit of USCP Enterprise Architecture	1	Enterprise Architecture – We recommended that the USCP Office of Information Systems (OIS) immediately update its strategic plan to define objectives and goals that align with the short- and long-term goals and objectives of the Department. The plan also should incorporate goals on optimizing enterprise-wide information systems performance and accountability.
2012-01	Audit of USCP Enterprise Architecture	2	Enterprise Architecture – We recommended that OIS immediately update its strategic plan to define objectives and goals that align with the short- and long-term goals and objectives of USCP.
2012-01	Audit of USCP Enterprise Architecture	3	Enterprise Architecture – We recommended that USCP management evaluate the distinct organizations with significant information technology investments and operations. As part of this evaluation, all individuals within the organization, either within OIS or other bureaus and offices that have any information technology support responsibilities, should be identified. Once identified, an analysis should be performed to determine how those individuals can be aligned within OIS. If re-alignment is not feasible, information technology responsibilities of the individuals should be transitioned to appropriate individuals within OIS.
2012-01	Audit of USCP Enterprise Architecture	4	Enterprise Architecture – We recommended that USCP immediately complete a full inventory of systems in use by the Department to identify its “as is” configuration. Once developed and validated, OIS should develop the Department’s “to be” configuration and its transition plan to achieve this configuration.
2012-01	Audit of USCP Enterprise Architecture	5	Enterprise Architecture – We recommended that USCP Enterprise Architecture Review Board’s decisions and recommendations be incorporated into the decision-making process that aligns its information technology investments with the budgeting and procurement processes (Force Development Process).
2012-4	AUP Time and Attendance ██████ System	1	Time and Attendance – We recommended that USCP immediately enforce its time and attendance policies and procedures to ensure consistency throughout the Department. In addition, the Department should include in performance standards, milestones, and evaluations criteria that will hold supervisors and employees accountable for a lack of compliance as it relates to time and attendance. The Department may also want to consider other disciplinary actions for noncompliance with time and attendance policies and procedures.
2012-4	AUP Time and Attendance ██████ System	2	Time and Attendance – We recommended that USCP consider centralizing monitoring of hardship cases through the OHR for better monitoring, communication, and oversight.
2012-4	AUP Time and Attendance ██████ System	3	Time and Attendance – We recommended that USCP consider evaluating the utility of all time and attendance related reports; revising/adding data elements of those reports, such as summary and individual totals; and standardizing report distribution to appropriate management and timekeeper.

Appendix 2 – Resolution of Report Recommendations			
Report Number	Report Title	Recommendation Number	Recommendation
2012-4	AUP Time and Attendance [REDACTED] System	4	Time and Attendance – We recommended that USCP consider discontinuing time and attendance reports offering little value to supervisors and timekeepers and create and adequately distribute meaningful reports. A report requested by numerous timekeepers was one that identified the dates and times during which a [REDACTED] clock unit was not operational.
2012-4	AUP Time and Attendance [REDACTED] System	6	Time and Attendance – We recommended that USCP continue its efforts to automate fully its labor management system, [REDACTED]. In addition, we recommended that USCP consider integrating the Scheduler, Shift Trading functionalities, Leave Approval Interface, Virtual Time Clock, Electronic Timesheet Certifications, and others that would make its labor management system more efficient and effective. Such integration of functions would allow the Department to understand fully costs associated with performing a duty, such as staffing a door or entrance/exit point.
2012-4	AUP Time and Attendance [REDACTED] System	7	Time and Attendance – We recommended that USCP develop a policy that specifically addresses swiping requirements for monitoring as well as a policy that prescribes consequences for failing to comply with swiping. In addition, the Department should evaluate the need for exempt employees to swipe in lieu of alternate means of recording time and attendance within necessary internal controls.
2012-4	AUP Time and Attendance [REDACTED] System	9	Time and Attendance – We recommended that USCP evaluate the feasibility of pooling timekeeper resources to level imbalanced workloads after the Department has established time and attendance procedures that are consistently utilized as outlined in Recommendation 1. Additionally, USCP should revise Position Descriptions and incorporate timekeeper duties to reflect the amount of time spent on time and attendance activities.
2013-03	Building Access Card Process	1	Building Access Card Process – We recommended that USCP develop and implement policies and procedures for the Badge and Fingerprint Office to ensure that all forms are current, complete, and accurate. We specifically recommended that USCP should: • Add a checklist section to the bottom of Form [REDACTED] to document the procedures performed in reviewing the submitted form for completeness and accuracy. • Update the USCP Directive [REDACTED] to require that agencies use the current Form [REDACTED] to document criminal history records check requests.
2013-03	Building Access Card Process	3	Building Access Card Process – We recommended that USCP update Badge and Fingerprint Office SOPs and Directives to require that IDs be copied/scanned. Additionally, USCP should consider using a color scanner/copier in place of the current black and white scanner/copier for improved readability.
2013-03	Building Access Card Process	6	Building Access Card Process – We recommended that USCP develop and implement policies and procedures that would facilitate use of E-Verify by OHR for USCP new hires.

APPENDIX 3

Peer Review Reporting

Implementing Section 989C of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act Inspector General Peer Review Activity April 1, 2013 – September 30, 2013

Last Peer Review Conducted of the USCP OIG Audit Organization

As part of the 3-year cycle of independent peer reviews, the last peer review report² covering the USCP OIG Audit organization was issued January 27, 2011, by the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) OIG. USCP OIG received a peer review rating of pass for the fiscal year ended September 30, 2010. Furthermore, NEH OIG had no comments or recommendations in its *System Review Report* of USCP OIG.

The next peer review of the OIG Audit organization for the period ended September 30, 2013, is scheduled for November 2013.

Last Peer Review Conducted by the USCP OIG Audit Organization

USCP OIG was not involved in any peer review work during this reporting period. USCP OIG issued its last *Reviewing Inspector General Report* on March 12, 2010, to the Federal Maritime Commission OIG.

USCP OIG is scheduled to conduct the peer review of Appalachian Regional Commission for the period ended September 30, 2013. OIG will begin work in November 2013.

² The CIGIE Audit Committee administers the external peer review program under generally accepted government auditing standards (GAGAS) for Federal Offices of Inspectors General. GAGAS requires that audit organizations perform audits or attestation engagements in accordance with GAGAS to have an appropriate system of quality control and to undergo external peer reviews at least once every 3 years. GAGAS prescribes: (1) the elements of scope of the peer review, including performing a risk assessment to help determine the number and types of engagements to select; (2) the requirements for reporting on the results of the peer review; (3) the qualifications of review staff; and (4) the distribution of peer review reports. GAGAS also prescribes requirements for granting extensions of deadlines for submitting peer review reports.

Table 1

Reports Issued with Questioned Costs³
April 1, 2013, through September 30, 2013

Category	(Dollars in Thousands)		
	No. of Reports	Questioned Costs	Unsupported Costs
For which no management decision has been made by the commencement of the reporting period	3	\$2,314	\$1,305
Which were issued during the reporting period	0	\$0	\$0
Subtotal	3	\$2,314	\$1,305
For which a management decision was made during the reporting period			
• dollar value of disallowed costs	0	\$0	\$0
• dollar value of cost not disallowed	0	\$0	\$0
For which no management decision has been made by the end of the reporting period	3	\$2,314	\$1,305
Reports for which no management decision was made within 6 months of issuance	3	\$2,314	\$1,305

³ A “questioned cost” denotes that one or more of the following three situations exist: (1) an alleged violation of a provision of a law, regulation, contract, grant, cooperative agreement, other agreement, or document governing the expenditure of funds; (2) a finding that, at the time of the audit, such cost is not supported by adequate documentation; or (3) a finding that the expenditure of funds for the intended purpose is unnecessary or unreasonable.

Table 2

Reports Issued with Recommendations that Funds Be Put to Better Use⁴
April 1, 2013, through September 30, 2013

Category	Number of Reports	Dollar Value (in thousands)
For which no management decision has been made by the commencement of the reporting period	0	\$0
Which were issued during the reporting period	1	\$42
Subtotal	1	\$42
For which management decision was made during the reporting period	0	\$0
• dollar value of recommendations that were agreed to by management ○ based on proposed management action ○ based on proposed legislative action	0	\$0
• dollar value of recommendations that were not agreed to by management	0	\$0
For which no management decision has been made by the end of the reporting period	1	\$42
Reports for which no management decision was made within 6 months of issuance	0	\$0

⁴ A recommendation that funds be put to better use is a recommendation by OIG that funds could be used more efficiently if Department management took actions to implement and complete the recommendations, including: reductions in outlays, deobligation of funds from programs or operations; withdrawal of interest subsidy costs on loans or loan guarantees, insurance, or bonds; costs not incurred by implementing recommended improvements related to the operations of the Department, a contractor, or a grantee, avoidance of unnecessary expenditures noted in preaward reviews of contract or grant agreements; or any other savings which are specifically identified.

Table 3

Investigations Statistics **April 1, 2013, through September 30, 2013**

Recoveries	\$1.3 M*
Fines and Restitutions	\$0
Investigative Cases Opened	5
Investigative Cases Closed	6
Internal Control Reviews	0
Arrests	0
Indictments	0
Convictions	0
Personnel Actions	0
Total Complaints Received	23
Hotline Complaints Received	20
Complaints from Other Sources	0
Complaints Referred (to Department or other agencies)	6
Inspector General Subpoenas	0

*Numbers in millions.

IG Act REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Section	Requirement	Page
Section 4(a)(2)	Review of Legislation	3
Section 5(a)(2)	Significant Problems, Abuses, and Deficiencies	6-12
Section 5(a)(3)	Recommendations with Respect to Significant Problems, Abuses, and Deficiencies	6-12
Section 5(a)(4)	Recommendations Included in Previous Reports on Which Corrective Action Has Not Been Completed	14-17
Section 5(a)(5)	Matters Referred to Prosecuting Authorities	None
Section 5 (a)(6)	Summary of Instances Where Information Was Refused	None
Section 5(a)(7)	Reports Issued During the Reporting Period	13
Section 5(a)(8)	Summary of Significant Reports	6-12
Section 5(a)(9)	Questioned and Unsupported Costs (Table 1)	19
Section 5(a)(10)	Recommendations that Funds be put to Better Use (Table 2)	20
Section 5(a)(11)	Summary of Reports Issued before the start of the Reporting Period for which no Management Decision has been made	19
Section 5(a)(12)	Significant Revised Management Decisions	N/A
Section 5(a)(13)	Management Decisions with which the Inspector General is in Disagreement	None
Section 5(a)(14-16)	Specifically excluded by Public Law 109-55	N/A
Section 989C of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act	Peer Review Reporting Requirements	18

Working Relationship Principles for Agencies and Offices of Inspectors General

The *Inspector General Act* establishes for most agencies an OIG and sets out its mission, responsibilities, and authority. The unique nature of the IG function can present a number of challenges for establishing and maintaining effective working relationships. To work most effectively together, the agency and its OIG need to clearly define what each considers a productive relationship and then consciously manage toward that goal in an atmosphere of mutual respect.

By providing objective information for promoting Government management, decision-making, and accountability, OIG contributes to the agency's success. OIG is an agent of positive change, focusing on eliminating waste, fraud, and abuse, and on identifying problems and recommendations for corrective actions by agency leadership. OIG provides the agency, Board, and Congress with objective assessments of opportunities to be more successful. OIG, although not under the direct supervision of the Chief, must keep the Board and Congress fully and currently informed of significant OIG activities. Given the complexity of management and policy issues, OIG and the agency may sometimes disagree on the extent of a problem and the need for and scope of corrective action. However, such disagreements should not cause the relationship between OIG and the agency to become unproductive. The following working relationship principles provide some guidance for agencies and OIGs. **To work together most effectively, OIG and the agency should strive to:**

Foster open communications at all levels.

The agency will promptly respond to OIG requests for information to facilitate OIG activities and acknowledge challenges that OIG can help address. Surprises are to be avoided. With very limited exceptions, primarily related to investigations, OIG should keep the agency advised of its work and its findings on a timely basis, and strive to provide information helpful to the agency at the earliest possible stage.

Interact with professionalism and mutual respect.

Each party should always act in good faith and presume the same from the other. Both parties share, as a common goal, the successful accomplishment of the agency's mission.

Recognize and respect the mission and priorities of the agency and OIG. The agency should recognize OIG's independent role in carrying out its mission within the agency, while recognizing the responsibility of OIG to report both to Congress and to the agency head. OIG should work to carry out its functions with a minimum of disruption to the primary work of the agency. The agency should allow OIG timely access to agency records and other materials.

Be thorough, objective, and fair. OIG must perform its work thoroughly, objectively, and with consideration to the agency's point of view. When responding, the agency will objectively consider differing opinions and means of improving operations. Both sides will recognize successes in addressing management challenges.

Be engaged. OIG and agency management will work cooperatively in identifying the most important areas for OIG work, as well as the best means of addressing the results of that work, while maintaining OIG's statutory independence of operation. In addition, agencies need to recognize that OIG also will need to carry out work that is congressionally requested, mandated by law, or self-initiated.

Be knowledgeable. OIG will continually strive to keep abreast of agency programs and operations, and agency management will be kept informed of OIG activities and concerns being raised in the course of OIG work. Agencies will keep OIG up to date on current matters and events.

Provide feedback. The agency and OIG should implement mechanisms, both formal and informal, that will ensure prompt and regular feedback.

CONTACTING THE OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Success of the OIG mission to prevent fraud, waste, abuse, or mismanagement depends on the cooperation of employees and the public. There are several ways to report questionable activity.

Call us at 202-593-4201 or toll-free at 866-906-2446. A confidential or anonymous message can be left 24 hours a day/7 days a week.



Toll-Free
1-866-906-2446

Write or visit us – we are located at:



*United States Capitol Police
Attn: Office of Inspector General, Investigations
119 D Street, NE
Washington, DC 20510*

You can also contact us by email at: OIG@USCP.GOV

**When making a report, convey as much information as possible such as:
Who? What? Where? When? Why? Complaints may be made anonymously or
you may request confidentiality.**

Additional Information and Copies:

To obtain additional copies of this report, call OIG at 202-593-4201.

