


UNITED STATES CAPITOL POLICE
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

**SEMIANNUAL REPORT
TO THE CONGRESS**

October 1, 2010 — March 31, 2011



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 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 the use of a variety of specialty support units, a network of foot and vehicular patrols, fixed posts, a full time CERT (Containment and Emergency Response Team), K-9, a Patrol/Mobile Response Division and full time Hazardous Devices and Hazardous Materials Sections. The agency has 2,134 sworn and civilian employees as of March 31, 2011.

Mission

Today's United States Capitol Police officer has the primary responsibility for protecting life and property; preventing, detecting, and investigating criminal acts; and enforcing traffic regulations throughout a large complex of congressional buildings, parks, and thoroughfares. The USCP has exclusive jurisdiction within the United States Capitol Grounds and has concurrent jurisdiction with other police agencies, including the United States Park Police and the DC Police, in an area of approximately 200 blocks around the complex. Additionally, they are 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 the Capitol Police Board to appoint an Inspector General (IG) for the Department 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 Eney, Chestnut, Gibson Memorial Building, United States Capitol Police Headquarters in Washington, D.C.

Mission

The Inspector General 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 these 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



**Inspector General
Carl W. Hoecker**

I am pleased to present the United States Capitol Police (USCP) Office of Inspector General (OIG) semiannual report for the period October 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011.

The audits, investigations, and other activities outlined within this report demonstrate OIG's ongoing commitment to ensure efficiency and integrity within USCP programs and operations.

In August 2010, after the Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a legal decision related to expired/cancelled funds, OIG auditors resumed work on the fiscal year 2009 financial statement audit. Concurrently, we began the audit of the FY 2010 financial statements.

I am pleased to report that the Department has focused on improving its budget formulation processes and controls for FY 2012. These efforts resulted in OIG closing all recommendations associated with the audit of the Department's budget formulations processes.

During this period, and as part of the three-year cycle of independent peer reviews, the USCP OIG audit function underwent a System Review, receiving a rating of pass from the Inspector General, National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH).

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank our committees of jurisdiction, the Capitol Police Board, and the Department for the interest and support they have shown our office. We look forward to working closely with the Chief and his leadership team, the Board, and Congress to increase efficiency and effectiveness in USCP programs and operations.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Carl W. Hoecker". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

**Carl W. Hoecker
Inspector General**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....	1
Legislation Monitored.....	2
Agent of Positive Change.....	3
Proactive Efforts.....	4
Audits.....	5
Investigations.....	7
Appendix 1 – Reports Issued	8
Appendix 2 – Resolution of Report Recommendations	9
Appendix 3 – Peer Review.....	14
Table 1 – Reports Issued with Questioned Costs	15
Table 2 – Reports with Recommendations That Funds be put to Better Use.....	16
Table 3 – Investigations Statistics.....	17
IG Act Reporting Requirements.....	18
Working Relationship Principles for Agencies and Offices of Inspector General	19
Contacting the Office of Inspector General.....	inside back cover

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Semiannual Report is issued pursuant to the provisions of Section 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, and summarizes the activities of the United States Capitol Police's (USCP or Department) Office of Inspector General (OIG) for the period October 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011. During this reporting period, OIG continued to direct its available resources toward those areas of greatest risk with the Department. We completed work 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 supported the Department's effort to improve accountability and financial management by continuing our audit of the Department's Fiscal Year (FY) 2009 and 2010 financial statements. We expect to issue the audit report by the end of May 2011. Additionally, the NEH OIG conducted a peer review of USCP OIG's audit organization and issued a *System Review Report* on January 27, 2011. Federal audit organizations can receive a rating of pass, pass with deficiencies, or fail. USCP OIG received a peer review rating of pass.

OIG Investigations received and evaluated 78 complaints during this reporting period, of which 75 were hotline complaints and three were from other sources. In addition, we initiated eight investigations and closed five.

The Department provided evidence which enabled OIG to close all recommendations associated with the audit of its budget formulation process.

During this reporting period, OIG continued work with our stakeholders to maintain and foster an open and effective relationship. For example, OIG continued its active engagement with the Chief, 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. Additionally, OIG remains a contributing participant in the activities of the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE), which was statutorily established to enhance governmentwide efforts to promote integrity and efficiency and to detect and prevent fraud, waste, and abuse in Federal programs. The USCP IG continued to serve as the vice-chairman of the Investigations Committee of CIGIE. OIG also continues to monitor applicable legislation.



LEGISLATION MONITORED

Legislation Monitored

OIG continues to review and monitor legislation as follows:

H.R. 553

Latest Major Action: Became Public Law No: 111-258. Section 6 (a) (1) requires that no later than September 30, 2016, the IG of each department or agency of the United States with an officer or employee who is authorized to make original classifications, in consultation with the Information Security Oversight Office, shall carry out no less than two evaluations of that department or agency or a component of the department or agency —

(A) to assess whether applicable classification policies, procedures, rules, and regulations have been adopted, followed, and effectively administered within such department, agency, or component; and

(B) to identify policies, procedures, rules, regulations, or management practices that may be contributing to persistent misclassification of material within such department, agency or component of the department or agency.

H.R. 209 – *The Reducing Information Controls Designation Act*

H.R. 3082 – *The Continuing Appropriations and Surface Transportation Extensions Act of 2011*

H.R. 5815 – *The Inspector General Authority Improvement Act*

S.241 – *The Non-Federal Employee Whistleblower Protection Act of 2011*

S.1490 – *The Personal Privacy and Security Act of 2009*

S. 942 – *The Government Charge Card Abuse Prevention Act of 2009*





AGENT OF POSITIVE CHANGE

USCP Employee Personally Identifiable Information (PII)

In September 2010, OIG received an anonymous complaint alleging that the Department was not protecting employees' PII on the Department's shared drive.

While the Department, as a legislative branch agency, is not required to comply with the Federal Privacy Act (the Act) of 1974 and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) guidance, the Department uses these principles as best practices in the development of its policies and procedures. Federal privacy best practices including the Act, Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002 (FISMA), and OMB guidance require each agency to identify and safeguard PII in both paper and electronic form.

On the day the complaint was received, OIG met with the Acting Chief Administrative Officer and Director of the Office of Information Systems (OIS) to discuss the matter. OIG recommended that OIS take immediate action to protect this data. The Department took immediate corrective action and redesigned its network data storage methodology on the shared drive.





PROACTIVE EFFORTS

Legislative Branch Financial System Cross-Servicing Agreement Common Auditor

USCP OIG continues to work with the Inspectors General of the Legislative Branch participating in a financial system cross-servicing agreement with the Library of Congress. The goal is to select a common auditor to conduct the financial statement audit for each agency. A charter and combined Statement of Work have been developed. Also, the group formulated criteria to evaluate potential contractors. The solicitation has been issued and the responding proposals will be evaluated during the next reporting period.

Major Management Challenges

OIG has identified protection/security, information security, financial management, human capital, and resolution of audit recommendations as major management challenges for the Department for FY 2011. OIG has met with the newly appointed Chief Administrative Officer and Director of Financial Management in an effort to jointly focus on improving performance in the challenges.

OUTREACH ACTIVITIES



As part of our continuing efforts to promote accountability through better awareness of OIG's role, mission, and services, OIG made presentations to Department managers and employees, Legislative branch officials, and committee staffers.



AUDITS

Peer Review Conducted of USCP OIG's Audit Organization

Government Auditing Standards (GAS) requires audit organizations that perform audits or attestation engagements in accordance with GAS to have an appropriate quality control system and to undergo external peer reviews at least once every three years. The CIGIE Audit Committee administers the external peer review program under GAS for Federal Offices of Inspector General. The peer review program is designed to provide reasonable assurance that the OIG carries out its work in accordance with established policies and procedures and complies with legal and regulatory requirements applicable to the OIG.

The NEH OIG conducted a peer review of USCP OIG's audit organization and issued a *System Review Report* on January 27, 2011. There were no comments or recommendations included in the System Review Report. The NEH OIG report stated:

"In our opinion, the system of quality control for the audit organization of the USCP OIG in effect for the year ended September 30, 2010, has been suitably designed and complied with to provide USCP OIG with reasonable assurance of performing and reporting in conformity with applicable professional standards in all material respects. Federal audit organizations can receive a rating of pass, pass with deficiencies, or fail. USCP OIG received a peer review rating of pass."

The next peer review of USCP OIG's audit organization is scheduled for September 2013.



ON-GOING AUDITS

Audit of USCP's FYs 2009 and 2010 Financial Statements

OIG began the Department's 2009 principal financial statements in July 2009. The primary objective of the audits is to express an opinion on whether the financial statements are presented fairly, in all material respects, in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. In addition, we will examine the effectiveness of the USCP's internal control over financial reporting based on the *Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and will be conducted in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) and *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Further, OIG will evaluate and report on compliance with laws and regulations related to the financial statements.

In November 2009, in coordination with the United States Capitol Police Board, OIG placed this audit on hold to seek a legal decision from GAO related to expired/cancelled funds. On June 4, 2010, GAO issued its decision that amounts advanced in FY 2007 by the Department from its FY 2003 appropriation were available to cover obligations incurred by the Department of Transportation's Volpe Center until September 30, 2008. At that point, the Department's FY 2003 appropriation (both obligated and unobligated balances) was canceled by operation of law. The funds were not available to cover Volpe's November 2008 obligation for its interagency agreement with the Naval Air Systems Command. To the extent the Department is unable to transfer FY 2009 or no-year funds to Volpe to cover the obligation, it will have violated the Antideficiency Act by obligating in excess of available appropriations. The Department sought ratification of its use of the FY 2003 appropriation. On December 22, 2010, the use of the FY 2003 appropriation, without fiscal year limitation, was ratified (Public Law 111-322, Section 165).

Upon receipt of the GAO decision, OIG rescinded the stop work order on June 10, 2010 and, accordingly, work resumed on the 2009 audit. In September 2010, OIG began its audit of the USCP's 2010 principal financial statements. In coordination with the Department, OIG made a decision to combine the 2009 and 2010 financial statement audits and issue comparative statements for the periods ending September 30, 2009 and September 30, 2010.

OIG expects to issue the final reports by the end of May 2011.



INVESTIGATIONS

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



APPENDIX 1 – REPORTS ISSUED

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



APPENDIX 2 – RESOLUTION OF REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

Timely resolution of outstanding recommendations continues to be a priority of both our office and the Department. As of March 31, 2011, OIG has made 137 recommendations to the Department. The Department has closed 89 recommendations and 48 recommendations remain open, which require additional corrective action(s) for completion. Listed below are recommendations over six months old.

<i>Appendix 2 – Resolution of Report Recommendations</i>			
<i>Report Number</i>	<i>Report Title</i>	<i>Recommendation Number</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>
2009-01	FY 2008 FS	1.2	Payroll Processing - We recommend that the CAO develop and implement policies and procedures requiring all employees to positively attest to the accuracy of pay period information transmitted to NFC.
2009-01	FY 2008 FS	1.3	Payroll Processing - We recommend that the CAO enforce existing policies and procedures to require supervisors to approve the accuracy of pay period information before it is transmitted to NFC.
2009-01	FY 2008 FS	1.4	Payroll Processing -We recommend that the CAO continue monitoring implementation of policies and procedures to permit USCP to efficiently and effectively track and certify all hours incurred by all employees.
2009-01	FY 2008 FS	1.6	Payroll Processing - We recommend that the CAO develop policies and procedures that specifically outlines when reconciliations are to be completed to whom the reconciliations are to be provided for supervisory review.
2009-01	FY 2008 FS	1.8	Payroll Processing - We recommend that the CAO develop detailed procedures to guide employees and supervisors responsible for the maintenance of separated employee documentation. Testing found two forms [REDACTED] [REDACTED] was missing from 38 employee files tested. Two of these 38 were also missing the final [REDACTED] and one was missing the SF-50.
2009-01	FY 2008 FS	1.9	Payroll Processing - We recommend that the CAO develop detailed procedures to guide employees and supervisors responsible with procedures to document and/or obtain collaborating evidence to support employee assertions.
2009-01	FY 2008 FS	1.10	Payroll Processing - We recommend that the CAO develop procedures to guide supervisors responsible for reviewing and approving certification reports in identifying circumstances in which civilian personnel would be entitled to night differential pay. As an alternative, [REDACTED] could be programmed to incorporate the rule.
2009-01	FY 2008 FS	1.12	Payroll Processing - We recommend that the CAO implement a procedure to add a system date to the certification reports to document the date when timekeepers print the reports.
2009-01	FY 2008 FS	2.1	Financial Management - We recommend that the CAO continue to develop policies and procedures covering all matters impacting USCP's financial performance, take steps to ensure that they are implemented consistently through the Department, and provide training for all employees.



United States Capitol Police Office of Inspector General

Appendix 2 – Resolution of Report Recommendations			
Report Number	Report Title	Recommendation Number	Recommendation
2009-01	FY 2008 FS	2.2	Financial Management - We recommend that the CAO develop procedures to prevent significant erroneous entries as well as procedures to detect significant errors in a timelier manner and to develop a more rigorous quality assurance process.
2009-01	FY 2008 FS	2.3	Financial Management – We recommend that the CAO develop and implement policies and procedures to facilitate the flow of information from the General Counsel to OFM.
2009-01	FY 2008 FS	2.6	Financial Management - We recommend that the CAO develop procedures to ensure that [REDACTED] transactions classified as FA are in fact new additions and not corrections of previously existing assets. Additionally, FD transactions should be actual disposals and not corrections.
2009-01	FY 2008 FS	2.7	Financial Management - We recommend that the CAO insure that OFM and PAMD need to continue to work vigorously together to insure that their past efforts are not wasted.
2009-01	FY 2008 FS	3.1	Information Systems – We recommend that USCP officially appoint a CPO and develop policies and procedures to ensure all personally identifiable information is identified and safeguarded.
2009-01	FY 2008 FS	3.2	Information Systems - We recommend that management ensure that a standard security benchmark for all systems is developed and implemented. Organizations such as the National Institute for Standards and Technology and the Center for Internet Security provide guidance on security benchmarks for Federal government systems.
2009-01	FY 2008 FS	3.3	Information Systems - We recommend that management ensure that all system users (including contractors) receive security awareness training on an annual basis, and that management develops procedures to ensure all users agree to abide by the Rules of Behavior for using USCP systems.
2009-01	FY 2008 FS	3.4	Information Systems - We recommend that management develop new procedures to ensure that all users of major financial applications review and acknowledge system specific Rules of Behavior prior to gaining system access.
2009-01	FY 2008 FS	3.5	Information Systems - We recommend that management conduct risk assessments in accordance with guidelines and recommendations for protecting Federal information systems. This risk assessment process and the documented results should be integrated into a comprehensive process for Certifying and Accrediting major systems.
2009-01	FY 2008 FS	3.6	Information Systems - We recommend that management create system security plans in accordance with guidelines and recommendations for protecting Federal information systems. System security plans should document all controls protecting the system and the final document should be approved by management before it is integrated into a comprehensive process for Certifying and Accrediting major systems.
2009-01	FY 2008 FS	3.7	Information Systems - We recommend that management ensures that there is an independent assessment of security controls conducted as part of a comprehensive C&A process.
2009-01	FY 2008 FS	3.8	Information Systems - We recommend that management develops a process to track and manage all know own system weaknesses. This process should include a centralized method of documenting and managing known issues, their associated corrective action plans, and the status of change implementations.
2009-01	FY 2008 FS	3.9	Information Systems - We recommend that management obtain and review a SAS No. 70 report or equivalent for the [REDACTED] system as part of their continuous monitoring process.



United States Capitol Police Office of Inspector General

Appendix 2 – Resolution of Report Recommendations			
Report Number	Report Title	Recommendation Number	Recommendation
2009-01	<i>FY 2008 FS</i>	3.11	Information Systems - We recommend that management establish and implement policies and procedures that ensure inactive network accounts are periodically reviewed and addressed in a timely manner.
2009-01	<i>FY 2008 FS</i>	3.12	Information Systems - We recommend that management ensure that key infrastructure components of the general support system are continuously monitored for security violations and malicious activities, and reported to management in a timely manner.
2009-01	<i>FY 2008 FS</i>	3.13	Information Systems - We recommend that management revise and update the OFM COOP in accordance with best practices for Federal organizations, as well as ensure that all key areas of the COOP are adequately tested and documented. We further recommend that the recovery timeframes are appropriately established as part of COOP revision process.
2009-01	<i>FY 2008 FS</i>	3.15	Information Systems - We recommend that the CAO implement policies and procedures to require that a test plan and objectives be developed prior to testing contingency plans. The test plan should include a clear scope, scenario, and logistics as well as indicate the personnel who will be involved. Additionally, we recommend that a formal report be documented upon completion of the test. The report usually includes successful and non-successful steps as well as lessons learned. Furthermore, we recommend that the contingency plan be updated to reflect the discovered deficiencies.
2009-01	<i>FY 2008 FS</i>	3.16	Information Systems - We recommend that the CAO perform account reviews of all ██████ users and ensure that all users have appropriate access and assigned roles.
2009-01	<i>FY 2008 FS</i>	3.17	Information Systems - We recommend that the CAO perform account reviews and ensure that all active accounts are assigned to an active ██████ user or are otherwise disabled.
2008-06	<i>Review of Specialty Assignment and Proficiency Pay Programs</i>	1	Specialty Pay - We recommend that the United States Capitol Police develop and implement a sound, effective method of accounting for each specialty assignment and proficiency pay program in the National Finance Center and the ██████ accounting systems. During the interim, the Office of Human Resources should establish written procedures for processing and reconciling its cuff records with actual disbursements.
2008-06	<i>Review of Specialty Assignment and Proficiency Pay Programs</i>	2	Specialty Pay - We recommend that the United States Capitol Police take action(s) to collect questioned costs totaling \$196,420 and provide supporting documentation for \$30,600.
2008-06	<i>Review of Specialty Assignment and Proficiency Pay Programs</i>	3	Specialty Pay - We recommend that the United States Capitol Police consider whether all the specialty assignment and proficiency pay programs are needed and, if so, determine the most efficient and effective method of implementation and allocate the necessary resources to effectively administrate the program(s).
2008-06	<i>Review of Specialty Assignment and Proficiency Pay Programs</i>	4	Specialty Pay - We recommend that the United States Capitol Police, in the interim, clarify Specialty Assignment and Proficiency Pay Program Administrative Directives regarding a. Exclusion(s) or payment(s) from multiple programs when using the same defining criteria such physical fitness, firearms proficiency, risk to self, and maintenance of certification or proficiencies, thereby avoiding costs of \$279,219 and putting funds to better use. b. the aggregate of 50 percent of the previous six-month period for pay purposes for hazardous duty and plainclothes. c. the 45-calendar day requirement for specialty assignment pay.



United States Capitol Police Office of Inspector General

Appendix 2 – Resolution of Report Recommendations			
Report Number	Report Title	Recommendation Number	Recommendation
2008-06	<i>Review of Specialty Assignment and Proficiency Pay Programs</i>	5	Specialty Pay – We recommend that the United States Capitol Police finalize its draft firearms and field officer training directives and enforce the consistent use of a standard [REDACTED] Form.
2008-06	<i>Review of Specialty Assignment and Proficiency Pay Programs</i>	6	Specialty Pay - We recommend that the United States Capitol Police strengthen tracking and reconciliation procedures to ensure employees do not improperly receive payments within the same fiscal year or when ineligible for such pay.
2008-06	<i>Review of Specialty Assignment and Proficiency Pay Programs</i>	8	Specialty Pay - We recommend that the United States Capitol Police take action(s) to clarify its Maximum Annual Payable Rate in light of Public Law 108-7. In addition, we recommend that the Chief of Police request 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.
2008-06	<i>Review of Specialty Assignment and Proficiency Pay Programs</i>	9	Specialty Pay - We recommend that the United States Capitol Police consider whether these specialty assignment and proficiency pay programs are needed to compete with other police forces and, if so, then the Department should link its goals and measures of these programs with retention and recruitment of Department personnel.
2008-08	<i>Review of Compliance with USCP Hiring Standards and with Directive [REDACTED]</i>	1	Triple III - We recommend that the United States Capitol Police, in coordination with the Capitol Police 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 Department.
2009-02	<i>Controls Over Travel Vouchers</i>	2	Travel Vouchers - We recommend that the United States Capitol Police provide travel cardholders training or, at a minimum, require all cardholders to take the U.S. General Services Administration on-line training course for cardholders and document such training. Additionally, the Office of Financial Management should review the questionable vouchers and determine if questioned costs should be collected from cardholders.
2009-02	<i>Controls Over Travel Vouchers</i>	3	Travel Vouchers - We recommend that the United States Capitol Police strengthen its controls surrounding voucher payment process. Specifically, require cardholders to mark duplicate travel vouchers clearly as "COPY" when resubmitting to the Office of Financial Management. Additionally, the Office of Financial Management should develop and implement a mandatory specialized training course for the approving, authorizing, and certifying officials reiterating their roles and responsibilities. Refresher courses should be provided on a periodic basis. Until a training course is developed and implemented, require applicable officials to review the FTR and Department policies and procedures related to reviewing travel vouchers and approving travel expenditures.
2009-05	<i>Audit of USCP Purchase Card Program</i>	1	Purchase Card - We recommend that the United States Capitol Police update and communicate policies and procedures to address the identified internal control deficiencies noted for the Purchase Card Program culminating in a comprehensive purchase card management plan.
2009-05	<i>Audit of USCP Purchase Card Program</i>	2	Purchase Card - We recommend that the United States Capitol Police update the PCard guidance.



United States Capitol Police Office of Inspector General

Appendix 2 – Resolution of Report Recommendations			
Report Number	Report Title	Recommendation Number	Recommendation
2009-05	<i>Audit of USCP Purchase Card Program</i>	3	Purchase Card - We recommend that the United States Capitol Police require the Purchase Card Program Coordinator to conduct monthly monitoring of purchase cardholder statements and purchase log reconciliations to measure compliance.
2009-05	<i>Audit of USCP Purchase Card Program</i>	4	Purchase Card - We recommend that the United States Capitol Police review reported questionable transactions and make a determination as to their appropriateness and valid Government need.
2009-06	<i>Audit of USCP Off-site Deployments</i>	1	Off-site Deployments - We recommend that the United States Capitol Police, in coordination with the Capitol Police 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	<i>Audit of USCP Off-site Deployments</i>	2	Off-site Deployments - We recommend that the United States Capitol Police immediately document its decision-making process as it relates to off campus activities.
2009-06	<i>Audit of USCP Off-site Deployments</i>	3	Off-site Deployments - We recommend that the United States Capitol Police immediately implement procedures to capture and document estimated and actual costs in all off campus activities.
2009-06	<i>Audit of USCP Off-site Deployments</i>	4	Off-site Deployments - We recommend that the United States Capitol Police develop written measures and standards for off campus activities.
2010-02	<i>Review of Hazardous Materials Response Team Procurement Process</i>	3	Procurement - We recommend the United States Capitol Police safeguard government contract records by establishing physical control over vulnerable assets. Access to records should be limited to authorized individuals, and accountability for their custody and use should be assigned and maintained.



APPENDIX 3 – Peer Review Reporting

Implementing Section 989C of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act Inspector General Peer Review Activity October 1, 2010 – March 31, 2011

Last Peer Review Conducted of USCP OIG Audit Organization

As part of the three-year cycle of independent peer reviews, the last peer review report¹ covering USCP OIG Audit Organization was issued January 27, 2011, by the Office of Inspector General, National Endowment for the Humanities. The System Review Report had no comments or recommendations. USCP OIG received a peer review rating of pass.

Last Peer Review Conducted by 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 Office of Inspector General.

¹ The Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE) Audit Committee administers the external peer review program under Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards (GAGAS) for Federal Offices of Inspector General. GAGAS requires audit organizations that 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 three 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 Costs² October 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011

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	4	\$2,701	\$1,341
Which were issued during the reporting period	0	\$0	\$0
Subtotals	4	\$2,701	\$1,341
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	4	\$2,701	\$1,341
Reports for which no management decision was made within 6 months of issuance	4	\$2,701	\$1,341

² 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 Use³ October 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011

Category	Number of Reports	Dollar Value (in thousands)
For which no management decision has been made by the commencement of the reporting period	1	\$282
Which were issued during the reporting period	0	\$0
Subtotals	1	\$282
For which management decision was made during the reporting period	0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• dollar value of recommendations that were agreed to by management<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ based on proposed management action○ based on proposed legislative action	0	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	\$282
Reports for which no management decision was made with 6 months of issuance	1	\$282

³ A recommendation that funds be put to better use is a recommendation by the 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 October 1, 2010 through March 31, 2011

Recoveries	\$0
Fines and Restitutions	\$0
Investigative Cases Opened	8
Investigative Cases Closed	5
Internal Control Reviews Initiated	0
Arrests	0
Indictments	0
Convictions	0
Personnel Actions	0
Total Complaints Received	78
Hotline Complaints Received	75
Complaints from Other Sources	3
Complaints Referred (to Department or other agencies)	17
Inspector General Subpoenas	0



IG Act REPORTING REQUIREMENTS PAGE

Section 4(a)(2) Review of Legislation.....2

Section 5(a)(1) Significant Problems, Abuses, and Deficiencies.....5-7

**Section 5(a)(2) Recommendations with Respect to
Significant Problems, Abuses, and Deficiencies.....5-7**

**Section 5(a)(3) Recommendations Included in Previous
Reports on Which Corrective Action Has
Not Been Completed.....9-13**

Section 5(a)(4) Matters Referred to Prosecuting Authorities.....None

**Section 5(a)(5) Summary of Instances Where Information
Was Refused.....None**

Section 5 (a)(6) Reports Issued During the Reporting Period.....8

Section 5(a)(7) Summary of Significant Reports.....5-7

Section 5(a)(8) Questioned and Unsupported Costs (Table 1).....15

**Section 5(a)(9) Recommendations that Funds be put
to Better Use (Table 2).....16**

**Section 5(a)(10) Summary of Reports Issued before
the start of the Reporting Period for which
no Management Decision has been made.....N/A**

Section 5(a)(11) Significant Revised Management Decisions.....N/A

**Section 5(a)(12) Management Decisions with which the
Inspector General is in Disagreement.....None**

Section 5(a)(13) Specifically excluded by Public Law 109-55.....N/A

Section 5(a)(14-16) Peer Review Reporting Requirements.....14



Working Relationship Principles for Agencies and Offices of Inspector General

The *Inspector General Act* establishes for most agencies an OIG and sets out its mission, responsibilities, and authority. The unique nature of the Inspector General 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 the two consider to be a productive relationship and then consciously manage toward that goal in an atmosphere of mutual respect.

By providing objective information to promote government management, decision making, and accountability, the OIG contributes to the agency's success. The 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. The OIG provides the agency, Board, and Congress with objective assessments of opportunities to be more successful. The OIG, although not under the direct supervision of the Chief, must keep the Board and the Congress fully and currently informed of significant OIG activities. Given the complexity of management and policy issues, the 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 the OIG and the agency to become unproductive. The following working relationship principles provide some guidance for agencies and OIGs. **To work together most effectively, the OIG and the agency should strive to:**

Foster open communications at all levels.

The agency will promptly respond to the OIG requests for information to facilitate OIG activities and acknowledge challenges that the OIG can help address. Surprises are to be avoided. With very limited exceptions, primarily related to investigations, the 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 the OIG. The agency should recognize the OIG's independent role in carrying out its mission within the agency, while recognizing the responsibility of the OIG to report both to Congress and to the agency head. The OIG should work to carry out its functions with a minimum of disruption to the primary work of the agency. The agency should allow the OIG timely access to agency records and other materials.

Be thorough, objective, and fair. The 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. The 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 the OIG's statutory independence of operation. In addition, agencies need to recognize that the OIG also will need to carry out work that is congressionally requested, mandated by law, or self-initiated.

Be knowledgeable. The 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 help ensure that the OIG is kept up to date on current matters and events.

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

NOTES

NOTES

CONTACTING THE OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

The success of OIG's 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 1-866-906-2446. A confidential or anonymous message can be left 24 hours a day/7days 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, D.C. 20510*

OIG staff members open mail addressed to the above address.

You can also contact us by email at: OIG@cap-police.senate.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 the OIG at (202) 593-4201.

