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The Office of the Inspector General (OIG) audits, evaluations, inspections, special review reports, investigations press releases, and ongoing work are available at oig.justice.gov.
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Automatic Email Updates

The OIG offers a free email subscription service that provides automatic notifications by email when new reports or other information is posted to the OIG website.

To receive email notifications of additions to the OIG website, go to the OIG website at oig.justice.gov, click on “Sign up for email updates,” and then click the link labeled “Start, Change, or Cancel Your Subscription.” You will be asked to provide the email address where you want the notifications to be sent. You may elect to receive notifications for all reports and documents when they are added to the OIG website or you can elect to receive notifications for only certain types of OIG reports and documents. At any time, you can change your email address, modify your password, add or delete subscriptions, or remove your email address from this service.
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MESSAGE FROM THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

It is my pleasure to submit this Semiannual Report on the operations of the Department of Justice (DOJ) Office of the Inspector General (OIG), which covers the period from April 1, 2021, to September 30, 2021. Despite continuing to work in a maximum telework posture due to the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, the OIG maintained the quantity and quality of oversight work expected of us during this period. In fact, the OIG continued to be incredibly productive and completed more reports this semiannual period than during the last semiannual reporting period. This exceptional effort is a testament to the commitment of OIG staff to our important mission.

During this semiannual reporting period, the OIG continued its COVID-19 oversight work, which it began in March 2020 at the outset of the pandemic. In addition to the interactive dashboards outlining data related to COVID-19 within the Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP), the OIG also released results of a follow-up survey of BOP staff perceptions of the BOP's management of the pandemic and a limited scope review of the Executive Office for Immigration Review's response to the pandemic. The OIG has also worked to ensure robust oversight of $850 million in pandemic-related U.S. Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act grant funding disbursed by DOJ to fund state, local, and tribal efforts to combat COVID-19, including a review of the Office of Justice Program's administration of CARES Act funding.

Within the past 6 months, the OIG has completed and released numerous important reports, not related to COVID-19, pertaining to DOJ and its law enforcement components. For example, the OIG released audits of DOJ's policy on body worn cameras, the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI) Woods Procedures for applications filed with the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, the Drug Enforcement Administration's Headquarters-based oversight of supported foreign law enforcement units, and the U.S. Marshals Service's (USMS) judicial security activities. Additionally, the OIG completed and issued reports related to an investigation and review of the FBI's handling of allegations of sexual abuse by former USA Gymnastics physician Lawrence Gerard Nassar and a review of the FBI's adjudication process for misconduct investigations. The OIG also issued management advisory memoranda identifying urgent security concerns involving staff entering BOP facilities, security concerns at BOP camp locations, and concerns relating to DOJ human resource policies.

The OIG also completed and issued numerous audit reports relating to DOJ's contracts and grants, including USMS sole-source contracts, the Tax and Environmental and Natural Resources Divisions' contracts for expert witnesses, and grants related to crime victims, victims of violence against women, and the juvenile justice system. Additionally, the OIG released an alert notifying DOJ's grant-making components of issues related to their transition to the JustGrants grants award management system.
Further, the OIG’s Investigations Division closed 143 criminal or administrative misconduct cases, and its work resulted in 68 convictions or pleas and 66 terminations, administrative disciplinary actions, and resignations. The quality of the investigations described in this report demonstrates the importance of effective, fair, and independent investigative oversight conducted by our Office. As always, the OIG remains committed to its mission to detect and deter waste, fraud, abuse, and misconduct related to DOJ programs, and to promote economy and efficiency in those programs—as is exemplified in our work over the past 6 months. As usual, the Semiannual Report reflects the exceptional work of OIG personnel.

Michael E. Horowitz
Inspector General
October 29, 2021
HIGHLIGHTS

Statistical Highlights
The following summaries highlight some of the OIG's audits, evaluations, inspections, special reviews, and investigations, which are discussed further in this report. As the highlights illustrate, the OIG continues to conduct wide-ranging oversight of Department of Justice (DOJ or Department) programs and operations.

OIG-wide

52 Total Number of OIG Reports Issued

385 Total Number of Recommendations in OIG Reports (including dollar-related recommendations)

Audit Division

41 Reports Issued

$5,697,917 Questioned Costs

$9,116 Funds Recommended to Be Put to Better Use

302 Recommendations for Management Improvements
12 Single Audit Act Transmittal Reports Issued

$181,914 Questioned Costs

13 Recommendations for Management Improvements

Evaluation and Inspections Division

5 Reports Issued

25 Recommendations for Management Improvements

Investigations Division

6,345 Allegations Received by the Investigations Division

137 Investigations Opened

143 Investigations Closed
Audits, Evaluations, Inspections, and Special Reviews Highlights

Examples of OIG audits, evaluations, inspections, and special reviews completed during this semiannual reporting period are:

- **Limited-Scope Review of the Executive Office for Immigration Review’s Response to the Coronavirus Disease 2019 Pandemic.** The OIG examined the Executive Office for Immigration Review’s (EOIR) response to the pandemic and its efforts to mitigate risk. EOIR suspended certain hearings, but it continued to hear detained cases and uphold deadlines for many immigration cases. This, combined with EOIR's historical reliance on paper filings, as well as a lack of equipment, limited its ability to adopt remote options for filing and court appearances promptly or universally. EOIR increased telework, promoted social distancing, and provided personal protective equipment to staff. However, EOIR did not apply these changes evenly and initial communication related to the pandemic was sometimes unclear, inconsistent, and untimely.

- **Audit of DOJ Policy on Body Worn Cameras.** The OIG found that DOJ and its law enforcement components were generally unprepared to implement body worn camera (BWC) programs. On June 7, 2021, the Deputy Attorney General issued a memorandum directing the Components to develop BWC policies and submit those policies for review.
within 30 days. The primary areas of concern were: (1) policies for BWC use, (2) operational costs of a BWC program, and (3) contracting options for the purchase of BWC equipment and video management systems. The OIG made three recommendations to DOJ, and DOJ agreed with all of them.

The OIG released a video message to accompany this report.

- **Audit of the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s Execution of Its Woods Procedures for Applications Filed with the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court Relating to U.S. Persons.** The OIG found widespread non-compliance with the execution of and compliance with the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s (FBI) factual accuracy review procedures (“Woods Procedures”) for Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) applications. The OIG also identified the need for the FBI and National Security Division (NSD) to ensure rigorous supervisory review and robust oversight to assist FISA-related accuracy efforts. The OIG report made 10 recommendations to the FBI and NSD, and the FBI and NSD agreed with all of them.

The OIG released a video message to accompany this report.

- **Review of the FBI’s Adjudication Process for Misconduct Investigations.** The OIG released a report examining how efficiently and effectively the FBI’s Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR) manages misconduct adjudications and the extent to which those adjudications follow FBI policy. The OIG found that FBI policy does not adequately describe all disciplinary options FBI OPR regularly uses, FBI OPR does not document substantiation decisions for all cases in which employees separate under inquiry, FBI OPR has not fully transitioned to electronic recordkeeping, and FBI employees could benefit from additional training about the misconduct adjudication process. The OIG made eight recommendations to improve the transparency and effectiveness of FBI OPR's adjudication process, and the FBI agreed with all of them.

The OIG released a video message to accompany this report.

- **Notification of Urgent Security Concerns Involving Staff Entering Federal Bureau of Prisons Facilities.** The OIG released a Management Advisory Memorandum (MAM) to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP) advising of urgent security concerns identified in connection with staff entering BOP facilities without being searched. The OIG identified these concerns in connection with an OIG investigation involving the introduction of contraband at a BOP facility. A review of the facility’s video monitoring system revealed that staff were able to enter the facility during the night shift and walk around the metal detector without being screened. After discussing the matter with BOP personnel at the facility, the OIG is concerned that this presents systemic concerns. In this memorandum, the OIG made three recommendations to address the concerns identified, and the BOP agreed with all of them.

- **Notification of Security Concerns at the BOP Camp Locations.** The OIG released a MAM to the Director of the BOP advising of concerns identified in connection with inmate accountability and security at the BOP Federal Prison Camp (FPC) and Satellite Prison Camp (SPC) locations. The OIG identified these concerns in connection with multiple investigations
involving prison escapes, and recommended that steps should be taken by the BOP to address security concerns at FPCs and SPCs BOP-wide. In this memorandum, the OIG made three recommendations to address the concerns identified, and the BOP agreed with all of them.

- **Audit of the U.S. Marshals Service Judicial Security Activities.** The OIG found that the U.S. Marshals Service (USMS) does not have the resources or proactive threat detection capabilities that the USMS has determined it needs to meet its protective services obligations for USMS-protected persons, including judges. The specific findings in the report include: (1) resource limitations have hampered planned improvements, (2) inadequate threat detection capabilities, (3) outdated home security equipment, and (4) personal safety and security awareness briefings need improvement. The report made eight recommendations to improve the USMS’s judicial security activities, and the USMS agreed with all of them.

  The OIG released a [video message](#) to accompany this report.

- **Audit of the Drug Enforcement Administration’s Headquarters-Based Oversight of its Supported Foreign Law Enforcement Units.** The OIG found that the Drug Enforcement Administration’s (DEA) Headquarters-based oversight of DEA-supported foreign law enforcement units was insufficient for the high-risk environment in which these units operate. The OIG noted deficiencies related to: (1) critical incidents, (2) entities not included in the DEA’s formal foreign law enforcement programs, (3) host nation agreements, (4) judicial wire intercept programs, and (5) financial management and performance tracking. The OIG made 10 recommendations to the DEA, and the DEA agreed with all of them.

  The OIG released a [video message](#) to accompany this report.

**Investigative Highlights**

As shown in the statistics at the beginning of this section and in the charts below, the OIG investigates many allegations of misconduct involving DOJ employees or contractors and grantees who receive DOJ funds.
The following are examples of such investigations:

- **Investigation and Review of the FBI’s Handling of Allegations of Sexual Abuse by Former USA Gymnastics Physician Lawrence Gerard Nassar.** On July 13, 2021, the OIG completed its report of investigation for an investigation initiated based on allegations that FBI employees in the FBI’s Indianapolis Field Office mishandled allegations of sexual abuse of athletes by former USA Gymnastics Physician Lawrence Gerard Nassar. The OIG found that senior officials in the FBI Indianapolis Field Office failed to respond to the Nassar allegations with the utmost seriousness and urgency that they deserved and required, made numerous fundamental errors when they did respond to them, and violated multiple FBI polices. The investigation was presented for prosecution on May 1, 2019, and declined on September 16, 2020. The OIG has completed its investigation and has provided this report to the FBI for appropriate action.*8

- **Findings of Misconduct by a then-Special Agent in Charge and two then-FBI Assistant Special Agents in Charge for Their Roles in an Unauthorized $2 Million Purchase of Intellectual Property Related to a Classified Undercover Operation and Related Misconduct.** On June 25, 2021, the OIG completed its report of investigation for an
investigation initiated upon receipt of information from the FBI alleging that in 2014 senior
FBI officials from a field division spent $2 million in government funds without authorization
and engaged in other acts of misconduct related to that expenditure. The investigation
was presented for prosecution on February 13, 2015, and declined on March 2, 2016. The
OIG has completed its investigation and has provided a classified report to the FBI for
appropriate action.*

• **Former DEA Diversion Investigator Convicted of Enticing a Minor to Have Sex and
Child Pornography Charges.** On June 22, 2021, a former DEA Diversion Investigator
assigned to the DEA’s New York Field Division was found guilty of attempted production
of child pornography, attempted receipt of child pornography, and attempted enticement
of a minor. According to the evidence introduced at trial, from in or about October 2019
through in or about January 2020, the Diversion Investigator communicated with an
undercover officer (“UC-1”) who was posing as a 14-year-old boy. During the course
of hundreds of graphic text communications and multiple real-time conversations, he
repeatedly sent sexually explicit images and videos to UC-1 in an attempt to persuade
UC-1 to transmit sexually explicit images, photos, and live visual depictions of UC-1 to the
Diversion Investigator. The investigation was conducted by the OIG and the New York City
Police Department.

• **Findings of Misconduct by a BOP Warden for Failing to Address a Lack of Heat in
Housing Units, Failing to Maintain a Functioning Camera System Throughout the
Facility, and Lack of Candor.** On July 28, 2021, the OIG completed its report of investigation
for an investigation initiated upon receipt of information from the BOP’s Office of Internal
Affairs (OIA) alleging that a BOP Warden subjected inmates to inhumane conditions by
forcing them to live in housing units with inadequate heat for an extended period of time.
The investigation was presented for prosecution on September 12, 2019, and declined on
February 12, 2020. The OIG has completed its investigation and has provided this report to
the BOP for appropriate action.*

• **Findings of Misconduct by a then-United States Marshal for Misuse of Government-
Issued Computer Devices and False Statements.** On April 9, 2021, the OIG completed
its report of investigation for an investigation initiated upon receipt of information from
the USMS OPR alleging that a government-issued laptop computer assigned to a United
States Marshal, who had attempted to access Internet sites containing pornography.
The investigation was presented for prosecution on December 4, 2018, and declined on
August 28, 2020. The OIG has completed its investigation and has provided its report to the
USMS for its information.*

• **Findings of Misconduct by an Assistant United States Attorney for Illegal Possession
and Attempted Smuggling of a Controlled Substance (Xanax) Without a Prescription,
False Statements, Attempted Obstruction, Failure to Report Foreign Travel, and
Misuse of Official Time.** On April 15, 2021, the OIG completed its report of investigation for
an investigation initiated upon receipt of information from the Executive Office for United
States Attorneys (EOUSA) alleging that in March 2018, at a port of entry on the United States-
Mexico border, an Assistant United States Attorney (AUSA) was arrested by state highway
patrol for misdemeanor Driving Under the Influence (DUI), misdemeanor DUI with blood
alcohol content above .08 percent, and misdemeanor possession of a controlled substance.
The investigation was presented for prosecution on May 2, 2018, and declined on October 7, 2019. The OIG has completed its investigation and has provided its report to EOUSA and DOJ's OPR.*

- **Findings of Misconduct by a then-Senior DOJ Official for Failing to Appear for a Compelled OIG Interview.** During the course of an ongoing administrative misconduct investigation, the OIG informed a then-senior DOJ official, who was a non-career member of the Senior Executive Service, that the senior DOJ official was a subject in the investigation and that the OIG sought to interview the senior DOJ official in connection with the investigation. After several unsuccessful attempts to schedule a voluntary interview with the senior DOJ official, the OIG instructed the senior DOJ official to appear for a compelled interview. The senior DOJ official failed to appear for the compelled interview and resigned from Department employment shortly thereafter. The OIG does not have the authority to compel or subpoena testimony from former Department employees, including those who retire or resign during the course of an OIG investigation. The OIG has provided its report to the applicable DOJ leadership office and the DOJ OPR for any action they deem appropriate.*
The OIG is a statutorily created independent entity whose mission is to detect and deter waste, fraud, abuse, and misconduct involving DOJ programs and personnel and promote economy and efficiency in DOJ operations. The OIG investigates alleged violations of criminal and civil laws, regulations, and ethical standards arising from the conduct of DOJ employees in their numerous and diverse activities. The OIG also audits and inspects DOJ programs and assists management in promoting integrity, economy, efficiency, and effectiveness. The OIG has jurisdiction to review the programs and personnel of the FBI, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF), BOP, DEA, U.S. Attorneys’ Offices (USAO), USMS, and all other organizations within DOJ, as well as DOJ’s contractors and grant recipients.

The OIG consists of the Immediate Office of the Inspector General and the following divisions and office:

- **Audit Division** is responsible for independent audits of DOJ programs, computer systems, and financial statements. The Audit Division has regional offices in the Atlanta, Chicago, Denver, Philadelphia, San Francisco, and Washington, D.C., areas. Its Financial Statement Audit Office and Computer Security and Information Technology Audit Office are located in Washington, D.C., along with Audit Headquarters. Audit Headquarters consists of the immediate office of the Assistant Inspector General for Audit, Office of Operations, Office of Policy and Planning, and Office of Data Analytics.

- **Investigations Division** is responsible for investigating allegations of bribery, fraud, abuse, civil rights violations, and violations of other criminal laws and administrative procedures governing DOJ employees, contractors, and grantees. The Investigations Division has field offices in Chicago, Dallas, Denver, Los Angeles, Miami, New York, and Washington, D.C. The Investigations Division has smaller, area offices in Atlanta, Boston, Detroit, El Paso, Houston, New Jersey, San Francisco, and Tucson. The Fraud Detection Office and the Cyber Investigations Office are co-located with the Washington Field Office. The Cyber Investigations Office also includes personnel in the Dallas and Los Angeles Field Offices. Investigations Headquarters in Washington, D.C., consists of the immediate office of the Assistant Inspector General for Investigations and the following branches: Operations I, Operations II, Investigative Support, Administrative Support, and the Hotline Operations Branch.

The map on the following page shows the locations for the Audit and Investigations Divisions.
• **Evaluation and Inspections Division** conducts program and management reviews that involve on-site inspection, statistical analysis, interviews, and other techniques to review DOJ programs and activities and makes recommendations for improvement.

• **Oversight and Review Division** blends the skills of Attorneys, Investigators, Program Analysts, and Paralegals to conduct special reviews and investigations of sensitive allegations involving DOJ employees and operations.

• **Management and Planning Division** provides the Inspector General with advice on administrative and fiscal policy and assists OIG components by providing services in the areas of planning, budget, finance, quality assurance, human resources, training, procurement, facilities, asset management, telecommunications, security, and general mission support.

• **Information Technology Division** executes the OIG’s IT strategic vision and goals by directing technology and business process integration, network administration, implementation of computer hardware and software, cybersecurity, applications development, programming services, policy formulation, and other mission-support activities.
• **Office of General Counsel** provides legal advice to OIG management and staff. It also drafts memoranda on issues of law; prepares administrative subpoenas; represents the OIG in personnel, contractual, and legal matters; and responds to Freedom of Information Act requests.

The OIG has a nationwide workforce of more than 500 Special Agents, Auditors, Inspectors, Attorneys, and support staff. For Fiscal Year (FY) 2021, the OIG direct appropriation is $110.565 million, and the OIG anticipates earning an additional $17.4 million in reimbursements.

As required by Section 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (IG Act), as amended, this Semiannual Report to Congress is reviewing the accomplishments of the OIG for the 6-month period of April 1, 2021, through September 30, 2021.

Additional information about the OIG and full-text versions of many of its reports are available at [oig.justice.gov](http://oig.justice.gov).
Beginning in early-March 2020, the OIG promptly shifted a significant portion of its oversight efforts toward assessing the DOJ's readiness to respond to the emerging Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic. Through its initial assessment, and the subsequent passage of the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act on March 27, 2020, the OIG determined that the most immediate challenges to DOJ operations involved preventing the spread of the virus among federal inmates and detainees; safely operating immigration courts; and ensuring robust oversight of $850 million in pandemic-related grant funding being disbursed to state, local, and tribal organizations. Since that time, these efforts have been expanded to include areas such as the impact of COVID-19 on DOJ law enforcement and other day to day operations. In June 2020, the OIG reported on new COVID-19 management challenges for the Department, as discussed here. More recently, the OIG released a collection of interactive dashboards with data on COVID-19 case trends, testing trends, and deaths due to COVID-19 in BOP-managed correctional facilities, as shown here.

The OIG's completed pandemic-related work for this reporting period is listed below, along with the OIG's ongoing work. More information about the OIG’s Pandemic Oversight activities is available here.

**Reports Issued**

**Limited-Scope Review of EOIR’s Response to the Coronavirus Disease 2019 Pandemic**

The OIG examined EOIR's response to the pandemic and its efforts to mitigate risk. EOIR suspended certain hearings, but it continued to hear detained cases and upheld deadlines for many immigration cases. This, combined with EOIR's historical reliance on paper filings, as well as a lack of equipment, limited its ability to adopt remote options for filing and court appearances promptly or universally. EOIR increased telework, promoted social distancing, and provided personal protective equipment to staff. However, EOIR did not apply these changes evenly and initial communication related to the pandemic was sometimes unclear, inconsistent, and untimely.

**Staff Perceptions of the BOP's Management of the COVID-19 Pandemic**

The OIG launched an interactive dashboard with results of a follow-up anonymous survey (conducted in February 2021) on BOP institution staff perceptions of the BOP's management of the pandemic and how the pandemic affected them at work. While most survey respondents rated their institution's response to the pandemic as “effective” or “somewhat effective,” respondents also reported that the pandemic has had negative effects on staff. The OIG found that opportunities for improvement remain. The Evaluation and Inspections Division conducted the survey, and the Office of Data Analytics created the data visualization.
Review of the Office of Justice Programs’ Administration of CARES Act Funding

The OIG found that the Office of Justice Programs (OJP) acted quickly to distribute Coronavirus Emergency Supplemental Funding (CESF) funding and that most recipient spending reviewed appeared allowable under the terms and conditions of the awards. However, the OIG noted that as of March 31, 2021, nearly a year after the first award was made, CESF recipients reported spending or obligating just 40 percent of the total amount awarded. The OIG found that some OJP staff reported that they did not receive training on the CESF program or were dissatisfied with the training they received. Some award managers reported that CESF performance reports do not contain the information necessary to effectively oversee CESF awards.

Investigations

In January 2021, the Pandemic Response Accountability Committee (PRAC) stood up a Fraud Task Force to serve as a resource for the Inspector General community by surging investigative resources into those areas where the need is the greatest, currently pandemic loan fraud. Agents from OIGs across the government are detailed to work on task force cases. These agents have partnered with prosecutors at the Department’s Fraud Section, Criminal Division, and at USAOs across the country.

The Investigations Division has nine agents who are assigned to the PRAC Fraud Task Force on a part-time basis. The PRAC has extended their authority to investigate pandemic-related fraud to the DOJ OIG through a memorandum of understanding. The agents are assigned Paycheck Protection Program cases while continuing to work their existing DOJ OIG caseload. This initiative allows the DOJ OIG to make a broader contribution to the Inspector General community by assisting with investigations that might otherwise remain unstaffed.

The idea behind the PRAC Fraud Task Force is to harness the expertise of the oversight community and attack this problem with every available tool. The Task Force works closely with other initiatives to combat pandemic fraud such as the Department’s COVID-19 Fraud Enforcement Task Force.
Ongoing Work

The OIG’s ongoing work is available here.

- Audit of DOJ’s Coordination Efforts Addressing Pandemic-Related Fraud
- Capstone Review of Findings from Remote Inspections of Facilities Housing BOP Inmates during the COVID-19 Pandemic
- Effects of Pandemic on Workforce and Operations: Litigation Component Surveys
- Audit of the Office on Violence Against Women’s (OVW) Grant Administration due to the COVID-19 Pandemic
- Review Examining BOP’s Use of Home Confinement as a Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic
- Survey of BOP Inmates on their Experience in BOP Facilities during the COVID-19 Pandemic
MULTICOMPONENT

While many of the OIG’s activities are specific to a particular component of DOJ, other work covers more than one component and, in some instances, extends to DOJ contractors and grant recipients. The following describes OIG audits, evaluations, inspections, special reviews, and investigations that involve more than one DOJ component.

Reports Issued

Audit of DOJ Policy on Body Worn Cameras
The OIG found that DOJ and its law enforcement components were generally unprepared to implement Body Worn Camera (BWC) programs. On June 7, 2021, the Deputy Attorney General issued a memorandum directing the Components to develop BWC policies and submit those policies for review within 30 days. The primary areas of concern were: (1) policies for BWC use, (2) operational costs of a BWC program, and (3) contracting options for the purchase of BWC equipment and video management systems. The OIG made three recommendations to DOJ, and DOJ agreed with all of them.

The OIG released a video message to accompany this report.

Audit of the FBI’s Execution of the Woods Procedures for Applications Filed with the FISC Relating to U.S. Persons
The OIG found numerous instances where the FBI did not comply with its Woods Procedures, which are designed to ensure FISA applications are “scrupulously accurate” and require agents to document support for all factual assertions contained in them. The OIG’s findings in this report confirm the widespread non-compliance that the OIG first reported in its March 2020 MAM to the FBI and provide more specificity on the instances of non-compliance related to the OIG’s review of 29 FISA applications approved by the FISC between FYs 2015 and 2019. The OIG found that the non-compliance occurred primarily because the FBI and NSD generally did not place sufficient emphasis and attention on the need for rigorous supervisory review and robust oversight. The specific findings in the report include: (1) non-compliance with Woods Procedures, (2) weaknesses in FBI supervisory review of Woods Files and use of FBI and NSD oversight findings, and (3) a need for further reinforcement by the FBI and NSD in messaging the importance of Woods Procedures compliance. The OIG report made 10 recommendations to the FBI and NSD, and they both agreed with all of the recommendations.

The OIG released a video message to accompany this report.

The OIG reviewed the expansion of the Institutional Hearing and Removal Program (IHRP). The BOP and EOIR worked with U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) and U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services to expand the number of IHRP facilities, enhance video teleconference capabilities, and implement uniform intake policies. Preliminary data indicates that IHRP participants may be spending less time in ICE detention when a final order of removal is issued while the IHRP participant is still in BOP custody, resulting in a cost savings for the government. The OIG made one recommendation to the BOP and EOIR to develop performance metrics and assess the IHRP expansion and program, and the Department agreed with it.

Audit of DOJ Contracts Awarded to Adaptive Digital Systems, Inc., for Covert Audio and Video Equipment

The OIG determined that generally the FBI and the DEA adequately documented each acquisition plan and conducted market research in compliance with the federal acquisition regulation (FAR). However, the OIG identified areas of improvement for future acquisitions. For example, the OIG found the FBI did not complete various FAR requirements related to time-and-materials purchases. Additionally, the OIG determined that Adaptive Digital Systems, Inc., charged each agency different prices for the same equipment. The OIG found that Adaptive Digital Systems, Inc., applied discounts on items purchased in bulk differently between the agencies, further exacerbating price differences for like items. The specific finding areas were: (1) acquisition and procurement; (2) billings and payments; (3) contract oversight, monitoring, and administration;
(4) contractor performance; and (5) physical security of equipment. The report made 13 recommendations to the DOJ components, and the FBI, DEA, and ATF agreed with all of them.

**Examination of DOJ's FY 2020 Compliance under the Payment Integrity Information Act of 2019**

The OIG released an examination report of DOJ's FY 2020 compliance under the Payment Integrity Information Act of 2019. The OIG's examination assessed the Department's compliance with the reporting requirements of the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) Circular A-123, Management's Responsibility for Internal Control, Appendix C, Requirements for Payment Integrity Improvement. The OIG concluded that the Department complied, in all material respects, with the aforementioned requirements for the FY ended September 30, 2020.

**Federal Information Security Modernization Act Audits**

The Federal Information Security Modernization Act (FISMA) requires the Inspector General for each agency to perform an annual independent evaluation of the agency's information security programs and practices. The evaluation includes testing the effectiveness of information security policies, procedures, and practices of a representative subset of agency systems.

This reporting period, the OIG finalized the reports on the FY 2020 FISMA compliance of the security programs and systems for the remaining one of six DOJ components reviewed: Justice Management Division's (JMD) DOJ Identity Services System. In the FY 2020 audits for all six components, including ATF's information security program and Confidential Informant Master Registry and Reporting System; Civil Rights Division's (CRT) information security program and CRT Justice Consolidated Office Network System; FBI's information security program, Uniform Crime Reporting System, and Graph Analysis Mapping Application System; NSD's information security program and Foreign Agents Registration Act System; and USMS's information security program and Business Process Management Platform System which were previously reported, the OIG identified weaknesses in all eight of the domains and within one of the eight control areas tested. The OIG issued 42 recommendations in these reports to improve the information security programs reviewed, and the respective DOJ components agreed with all of them.

The OIG is currently reviewing FY 2021 FISMA compliance at six DOJ components: the FBI, JMD, Antitrust Division, DEA, EOUSA, and Federal Prison Industries. In addition, the OIG is reviewing FY 2021 compliance at the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia, which is an independent, federal executive branch agency.

**Single Audit Act Reports**

The Single Audit Act of 1984, as amended, promotes sound financial management of federal financial assistance provided to state, local, and tribal governments, colleges, universities, and nonprofit organizations. Under 2 C.F.R. 200, Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards, such entities that expend $750,000 or more in federal funds in 1 year must have a “single audit” performed annually covering all federal funds expended that year. These audits are conducted by non-federal auditors, such as independent public accounting firms and state auditors. The OIG performs quality reviews of these audit reports when they pertain to DOJ funds and to determine whether they contain audit findings related to DOJ funds. The OIG’s oversight of non-federal audit activity informs federal
managers about the soundness of the management of federal programs and identifies any significant areas of internal control weakness, noncompliance, and questioned costs for resolution or follow-up. As a result of the OIG’s review of the single audits during this semiannual period, the OIG transmitted to OJP 12 single audit reports covering expenditures totaling nearly $238,356,000 in 126 grants and other agreements. To address these deficiencies, the auditors recommended 13 management improvements and identified questioned costs totaling more than $181,000. The OIG also monitors these audits through the resolution and closure process.

**Civil Rights and Civil Liberties**
Section 1001 of the Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act (USA PATRIOT Act) directs the OIG to receive and review complaints of civil rights and civil liberty violations by DOJ employees, to publicize how people can contact the OIG to file a complaint, and to send a semiannual report to Congress discussing the OIG’s implementation of these responsibilities. In August 2021, the OIG released its most recent report, which summarized the OIG’s Section 1001 activities from January 1 through June 30, 2021. The report described the number of complaints the OIG received under this section, the status of investigations conducted by the OIG and DOJ components in response to those complaints, and an estimate of the OIG’s expenses for conducting these activities.

**Reports with Outstanding Unimplemented Recommendations**
Periodically, the OIG publishes a list of recommendations from the OIG’s audits, evaluations, reviews, and other reports that the OIG had not closed as of a specified date, because it had not determined that DOJ had fully implemented them. The information omits recommendations that DOJ determined to be classified or sensitive, and therefore unsuitable for public release. This list includes the titles of reports with recommendations not closed and the status and descriptions of the not closed recommendations. Hyperlinks to each report are also included in this list.

The most recent report of recommendations not closed by the OIG as of September 30, 2021, is available on the OIG’s website. The recommendations in this report are associated with over $76 million in questioned costs and approximately $3 million in funds that the OIG recommends could be used more efficiently if repurposed by the agency.

**Investigations**
The following information about OIG investigations of allegations against senior governmental employees in several components in which the OIG determined the allegations were unsubstantiated is provided pursuant to the IG Act § 5(a)(22)(B). The OIG closed these investigations without public disclosure during the reporting period:

- The OIG closed seven investigations of alleged misconduct by senior government employees that were ultimately unsubstantiated. These investigations included allegations of conflict of interest, contract fraud, false statements, inappropriate relationships, job performance failure, release of information, and waste, abuse, or mismanagement of a government program.
Management Advisory Memorandum

- **Notification of Concerns Regarding Lack of Department Policy Requiring Express Authorization for Department Attorneys to Participate in the Criminal or Civil Investigation or Prosecution of Former Clients.** The OIG released a MAM to the Deputy Attorney General of DOJ advising of concerns identified during recent OIG investigations involving DOJ attorneys and former clients. In this memorandum, the OIG made two recommendations to address the concerns identified, and the Office of the Deputy Attorney General agreed with them.

Issue Alert

- **JustGrants Transition Impacting DOJ Awardees' Ability to Access Funds and Manage Award Activities.** This issue alert ensured awareness of the issues associated with DOJ's transition to JustGrants. It was shared with all three grant-making agencies: (1) Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, (2) OJP, and (3) OVW. No formal recommendations were made.

Ongoing Work

The OIG's ongoing work is available [here](#).

- Review of Racial Equity in DOJ's Law Enforcement Components
- Review Examining the Role and Activity of DOJ and its Components in Preparing for and Responding to the Events at the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021
- Audit of DOJ's Cyber Supply Chain Risk Management Efforts
- Review of DOJ's Use of Subpoenas and Other Legal Authorities to Obtain Communication Records of Members of Congress and Affiliated Persons, and the News Media
- Review of the Department's Violent Crime Initiatives
- Audit of DOJ's FY 2021 Compliance with the Digital Accountability and Transparency Act
- Review Examining DOJ's and its Law Enforcement Components' Roles and Responsibilities in Responding to Protest Activity and Civil Unrest in Washington, D.C., and Portland, Oregon
- Audits of DOJ and Selected Components Annual Financial Statements FY 2021
- Audit of DOJ's Strategy to Address the Domestic Violent Extremist Threat
Reports Issued

**Review of the FBI's Adjudication Process for Misconduct Investigations**

The OIG released a report examining how efficiently and effectively FBI OPR manages misconduct adjudications and the extent to which those adjudications follow FBI policy. The OIG found that FBI policy does not adequately describe all disciplinary options FBI OPR regularly uses, FBI OPR does not document substantiation decisions for all cases in which employees separate under inquiry, FBI OPR has not fully transitioned to electronic recordkeeping, and FBI employees could benefit from additional training about the misconduct adjudication process. The OIG made eight recommendations to improve the transparency and effectiveness of FBI OPR's adjudication process, and the FBI agreed with all of them.

The OIG released a [video message](#) to accompany this report.

**Audit of Selected Aspects of the FBI's National Instant Criminal Background Check System**

The OIG found that the FBI's National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS) does not automatically verify out-of-state purchasers' eligibility for firearms purchases under the age requirement of their state of residence. The OIG's report contains one recommendation to the FBI to strengthen controls over the sale of firearms to out-of-state purchasers by updating the NICS background check to verify age requirements of an out-of-state firearm purchaser in both the purchaser's state of residence and the state of sale to ensure basic age eligibility. The FBI agreed with the recommendation.

The OIG released a [video message](#) to accompany this report.

**Audit of the FBI’s Efforts to Notify Victims of Child Sexual Abuse Material**

The OIG found that the FBI maintained an inefficient and incomplete tracking system that kept some victims from being properly notified and the FBI did not accurately portray its victim notification process on its website. The FBI received clarification about the “actively traded” threshold and developed a mitigation plan to change its procedures for conducting victim notification. It appears that the mitigation plan will improve the victim notification process, but it does not clearly state that victims will be notified of their rights every time their images are involved in a federal investigation as required by law. The OIG made six recommendations to the FBI, and the FBI agreed with all of them.
Investigations

During this reporting period, the OIG received 755 complaints involving the FBI. The most common allegations made against FBI employees were Official Misconduct; Waste, Mismanagement; and Off-Duty Violations. Most of the complaints received during this period were considered management issues and were provided to FBI management for its review and appropriate action.

The OIG opened 11 investigations and referred 21 allegations to the FBI’s Inspection Division (INSD) for action or investigation with a requirement that the INSD report the results of its action or investigation to the OIG. At the close of the reporting period, the OIG had 94 open criminal or administrative investigations of alleged misconduct related to FBI employees. The criminal investigations involved allegations of Official Misconduct, Off-Duty Violations, and Fraud.

The following are examples of investigations involving the FBI that the OIG conducted during this reporting period:

- **Findings of Misconduct by a then-FBI Unit Chief for Failure to Satisfy Financial Obligations and Honor Just Debts, Misuse of Position by Requesting and Obtaining a Loan from a Subordinate, and Lack of Candor in FBI and Federal Financial Disclosure Forms.** On July 16, 2021, the OIG completed its report of investigation for an investigation initiated after receiving information from the FBI alleging that a then-FBI Unit Chief committed misconduct by failing to honor a just debt involving a $25,000 loan, failing to report this debt and other financial delinquencies to the FBI, and pressuring a subordinate into making a $12,000 loan and then refusing to repay the loan. The investigation was presented for prosecution on August 31, 2020, and declined on September 19, 2020. The OIG has completed its investigation and has provided its report to the FBI.*

- **Findings of Misconduct by an FBI Assistant Director for Failure to Timely Report a Romantic Relationship with a Subordinate and Related Misconduct.** On July 9, 2021, the OIG completed its report of investigation for an investigation initiated after receiving information from the FBI alleging that an Assistant Director was engaged in an inappropriate...
relationship with a subordinate. The OIG has completed its investigation and has provided its report to the FBI and DOJ's OPR for appropriate action.*

- **Former FBI Management and Program Analyst and FBI Subcontractor Sentenced for Bribery of a Public Official.** On April 6, 2021, a former FBI Management and Program Analyst (MAPA) previously assigned to FBI Headquarters in Washington, D.C., was sentenced to 39 months of imprisonment and ordered to pay $15,353 in restitution for one count of bribery of a public official and one count of making and subscribing a false federal income tax return. On May 5, 2021, an FBI sub-contractor was sentenced to 18 months of imprisonment, 3 years of supervised release, and ordered to pay a $100,000 fine for one count of bribery of a public official. According to the factual statement in support of the guilty plea, between 2016 and 2018, the sub-contractor provided the MAPA $120,000 and other items of value in exchange for the MAPA making decisions that benefited the sub-contractor's company. The investigation was conducted by the OIG and the Internal Revenue Service.

- **Investigation and Review of the FBI's Handling of Allegations of Sexual Abuse by Former USA Gymnastics Physician Lawrence Gerard Nassar.** On July 13, 2021, the OIG completed its report of investigation for an investigation initiated based on allegations that FBI employees in the FBI's Indianapolis Field Office mishandled allegations of sexual abuse of athletes by former USA Gymnastics Physician Lawrence Gerard Nassar. The OIG found that senior officials in the FBI Indianapolis Field Office failed to respond to the Nassar allegations with the utmost seriousness and urgency that they deserved and required, made numerous fundamental errors when they did respond to them, and violated multiple FBI polices. The investigation was presented for prosecution on May 1, 2019, and declined on September 16, 2020. The OIG has completed its investigation and has provided this report to the FBI for appropriate action.*

- **Findings of Misconduct by a then-Special Agent in Charge and two then FBI Assistant Special Agents in Charge for Their Roles in an Unauthorized $2 Million Purchase of Intellectual Property Related to a Classified Undercover Operation and Related Misconduct.** On June 25, 2021, the OIG completed its report of investigation for an investigation initiated upon receipt of information from the FBI alleging that in 2014 senior FBI officials from a field division spent $2 million in government funds without authorization and engaged in other acts of misconduct related to that expenditure. The investigation was presented for prosecution on February 13, 2015, and declined on March 2, 2016. The OIG has completed its investigation and has provided a classified report to the FBI for appropriate action.*

- **Findings of Misconduct by Former FBI Special Agent in Charge for Making Two False Statements.** On May 28, 2021, the OIG completed its report of investigation for an investigation initiated upon receipt of information from the FBI INSD alleging that a former FBI Special Agent in Charge obtained an FBI HR-218 card by making false statements to an FBI employee. The investigation was presented for prosecution on January 15, 2021, and declined that same day. The OIG has completed its investigation and has provided its report to the FBI for its information.*
• **Findings of Misconduct by a then-Senior FBI Official for Having Numerous Unauthorized Contacts with the Media, and for Accepting Unauthorized Gifts from Members of the Media.** On July 6, 2021, the OIG completed its report of investigation for an investigation initiated upon receipt of records from the FBI Insider Threat Unit, alleging that a then-Senior FBI official had numerous contacts with members of the media between January and November 2016 in violation of FBI policy. The investigation was presented for prosecution on February 6, 2018, and declined June 19, 2019. The OIG has completed its investigation and has provided this report to the FBI for its information.*

**Management Advisory Memorandum**

• **Notification of Concerns Regarding Use of Photographs of FBI Employees for Online Undercover Operations.** The OIG released a MAM to the Director of the FBI advising of concerns regarding the use of photographs of FBI employees who are not certified undercover employees or certified online cover employees in online undercover operations. In this memorandum, the OIG made two recommendations to the FBI to address the concerns identified, and the FBI agreed with both of them.

**Ongoing Work**

The OIG’s ongoing work is available [here](#).

---

Audit of the FBI’s Office of General Counsel’s Roles and Responsibilities

Review of Gender Equity in the FBI’s Training and Selection Processes for New Special Agents and Intelligence Analysts at the FBI Academy

Review of the DOJ’s and FBI’s Planning for a Future FBI Headquarters Facility

Audit of the FBI’s National Security Undercover Operations

Audit of the FBI’s Purchase Order Awarded to Idemia National Security Solutions, LLC

Audit of the FBI’s Contract Awarded to Clark Construction Group, LLC for the Innovation Center
Report Issued

Audit of the BOP’s Management and Oversight of its Chaplaincy Services Program

The OIG identified significant deficiencies and opportunities for improvement in BOP’s delivery of religious services to inmates. The specific findings in the report include: (1) chaplaincy shortages and lack of faith diversity, (2) inmate-led religious services increase opportunities for high-risk inmates to exert influence, (3) inadequate control of Chapel Libraries and monitoring of Chapel Spaces, and (4) improvements in oversight of volunteer faith providers needed. The OIG report made five recommendations to the BOP, and the BOP agreed with all of them.

The OIG released a video message to accompany this report.

Investigations

During this reporting period, the OIG received 4,732 complaints involving the BOP. The most common allegations made against BOP employees included Official Misconduct and Force, Abuse, Rights Violations. The majority of complaints dealt with non-criminal issues that the OIG referred to the BOP’s OIA for its review.

The OIG opened 68 investigations and referred 7 allegations to the BOP’s OIA for action or investigation with a requirement that BOP OIA report the results of its action or investigation to the OIG. At the close of the reporting period, the OIG had 278 open cases of alleged misconduct against BOP employees. The criminal investigations covered a wide range of allegations, including Official Misconduct; Force, Abuse, Rights Violations; and Fraud.

![BOP Cases Opened by Offense Category](chart.png)

Source: Investigations Data Management System
The following are examples of investigations involving the BOP that the OIG conducted during this reporting period:

- **Former BOP Correctional Officer Sentenced for Bribery of a Public Official.** On May 13, 2021, a former BOP Correctional Officer (CO) previously assigned to the Federal Correctional Institution Schuylkill in Pennsylvania was sentenced to 24 months of imprisonment and 1 year of supervised release, as well ordered to forfeit $89,700, for one count of bribery. The CO pleaded guilty to a one-count Information, which stated that from in or about 2011 through in or about 2016, the CO received more than $89,700 in return for smuggling tobacco and related items into the facility and providing that contraband to inmates.

- **BOP Inmate Sentenced for Aiding and Abetting Attempt to Obtain Contraband in Prison.** On May 13, 2021, a BOP inmate previously housed at the Federal Correctional Institution Texarkana in Texas was sentenced to 70 months of imprisonment and 3 years of supervised release for one count of aiding and abetting attempt to obtain contraband in prison. According to the factual statement in support of the guilty plea, in or about October and November 2018, the inmate facilitated communication to bring Buprenorphine, a controlled substance, into the facility with the intent it be distributed to other inmates. The investigation was conducted by the OIG and the U.S. Postal Inspections Service.

- **Former BOP CO Sentenced for Bribery.** On June 29, 2021, a former BOP CO previously assigned to the Federal Correctional Complex in Yazoo City, Mississippi, was sentenced to 18 months of imprisonment, 2 years of supervised release, and ordered to pay a $1,500 fine and money judgment of $7,000 for one count of bribery. The CO pleaded guilty to count one of the Indictment, which stated that from on or about July 6, 2018, through in or about December 2018, she agreed to accept money in exchange for providing prohibited objects to an inmate.

- **Findings of Misconduct by a BOP Warden for Failing to Address a Lack of Heat in Housing Units, Failing to Maintain a Functioning Camera System Throughout the Facility, and Lack of Candor.** On July 28, 2021, the OIG completed its report of investigation for an investigation initiated upon receipt of information from the BOP's OIA alleging that a BOP Warden subjected inmates to inhumane conditions by forcing them to live in housing units with inadequate heat for an extended period of time. The investigation was presented for prosecution on September 12, 2019, and declined on February 12, 2020. The OIG has completed its investigation and has provided this report to the BOP for appropriate action.*

### Management Advisory Memoranda

- **Notification of Concerns Identified in Connection with the BOP's Procurement of Air Ambulance Services.** The OIG released a MAM to the Director of the BOP advising of concerns regarding the BOP's procurement of ambulance services. Specifically, the fact that current BOP Comprehensive Medical Services contracts do not specifically address air ambulance services, or otherwise address how they should be reimbursed, and therefore do not require that air ambulance services be reimbursed using Medicare benchmark rates. This has led to inconsistent claims and payments for air ambulance services across BOP institutions, and that the BOP in many cases has reimbursed air ambulance claims at
excessive rates as compared to Medicare reimbursement rates. In this memorandum, the OIG made two recommendations to address the concerns identified, and the BOP agreed with both of them.

- **Notification of Security Concerns at the BOP’s Camp Locations.** The OIG released a MAM to the Director of the BOP advising of concerns identified in connection with inmate accountability and security at the BOP FPC and SPC locations. The OIG identified these concerns in connection with multiple investigations involving prison escapes, and recommended that steps should be taken by the BOP to address security concerns at FPCs and SPCs BOP-wide. In this memorandum, the OIG made three recommendations to address the concerns identified, and the BOP agreed with all of them.

- **Notification of Urgent Security Concerns Involving Staff Entering BOP Facilities.** The OIG released a MAM to the Director of BOP advising of urgent security concerns identified in connection with staff entering BOP facilities without being searched. The OIG identified these concerns in connection with an OIG investigation involving the introduction of contraband at a BOP facility. A review of the facility’s video monitoring system revealed that staff were able to enter the facility during the night shift and walk around the metal detector without being screened. After discussing the matter with BOP personnel at the facility, the OIG is concerned that this presents systemic concerns. In this memorandum, the OIG made three recommendations to address the concerns identified, and the BOP agreed with all of them.

## Ongoing Work

The OIG’s ongoing work is available [here](#).

- Review of BOP Inmate Deaths in Custody
- Audit of the BOP’s Contracts Awarded to the University of Massachusetts Medical School
- Audit of the BOP’s Management of its National Gang Unit
- Audit of the BOP’s Efforts to Construct and Maintain Institutions
- Review of the BOP’s Efforts to Address Inmate Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault Against BOP Staff
- Review of the BOP’s Policy Development Process
- Audit of the BOP’s Contracts Awarded to Naphcare, Inc., for Medical Services Provided to Community Corrections Management Inmates
Reports Issued

**Audit of the USMS’s Judicial Security Activities**

The OIG found that the USMS does not have the resources or proactive threat detection capabilities that the USMS has determined it needs to meet its protective services obligations for USMS-protected persons, including judges. The specific findings in the report include: (1) resource limitations have hampered planned improvements, (2) inadequate threat detection capabilities, (3) outdated home security equipment, and (4) personal safety and security awareness briefings need improvement. The report made eight recommendations to improve the USMS’s judicial security activities, and the USMS agreed with all of them.

The OIG released a [video message](oig.justice.gov) to accompany this report.

**Audit of the USMS’s Awarding and Administration of Sole-Source Contracts**

The OIG found that the USMS was unable to produce documentation of the justifications for 14 of the 38 sole-source contract awards selected for testing. During the audit, the USMS’s Office of Procurement developed an internal audit plan in compliance with USMS policy, but the plan did not cover the intergovernmental agreements (IGA) the agency uses to obtain detention services from state, local, and tribal governments. Like sole-source contracts, IGAs are not subject to full and open competition and expose the USMS to many of the same risks. However, the OIG determined that the USMS’s IGAs receive significantly less oversight and review. In a prior investigative procedural reform recommendation, the OIG recommended that the USMS ensure that its contractors informed their workers of their whistleblower rights and remedies. The OIG determined that while USMS corrective actions improved communication to contractors, subcontractors, and grantees about whistleblower rights and remedies, further steps are needed to ensure implementation of any new or updated DOJ policies regarding whistleblower protection. The OIG made three recommendations to the USMS, and the USMS agreed with all of them.

**Review of the USMS’s Tactical Training Officer Program**

The USMS established the Tactical Training Officer Program to address officer safety risks, but the OIG identified several gaps that prevent the program from being as effective as it could be in mitigating risks to officer safety. Because the tactics most likely to mitigate risks to officer safety evolve, updating the training related to officer safety with lessons learned and addressing gaps in the curriculum would help ensure that the USMS’s officer safety-related training is and remains relevant. The USMS agreed with all seven of the OIG’s recommendations to increase the effectiveness of the USMS Tactical Training Officer Program.
Investigation

During this reporting period, the OIG received 208 complaints involving the USMS. The most common allegations made against USMS employees were Official Misconduct and Force, Abuse, Rights Violations. The majority of the complaints were considered management issues and were provided to the USMS’s OIA for its review and appropriate action.

The OIG opened seven investigations and referred seven allegations to the USMS’s OIA for its review with a requirement that OIA report the results of its action or investigation to the OIG. At the close of the reporting period, the OIG had 47 open cases of alleged misconduct against USMS employees. The most common allegations were Official Misconduct.

![USMS Cases Opened by Offense Category](chart)

The following is an example of an investigation involving the USMS that the OIG conducted during this reporting period:

- **Findings of Misconduct by a then-United States Marshal for Misuse of Government-Issued Computer Devices and False Statements.** On April 9, 2021, the OIG completed its report of investigation for an investigation initiated upon receipt of information from the USMS OPR alleging that a government-issued laptop computer assigned to a United States Marshal, who had attempted to access Internet sites containing pornography. The investigation was presented for prosecution on December 4, 2018, and declined on August 28, 2020. The OIG has completed its investigation and has provided its report to the USMS for its information.*

Ongoing Work

The OIG’s ongoing work is available [here](#).

Review of the USMS’s Pharmaceutical Drug Costs for Detainees

Audit of the USMS’s Management of Seized Cryptocurrency
Reports Issued

Audit of the DEA’s Laboratory Information Management System Support Contracts

The OIG found that not all DEA laboratory workflows were Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS)-integrated and that updates and customizations to the baseline LIMS software largely focused on only one of three laboratory end user groups. The OIG also noted deficiencies in: (1) pre-award planning timeliness, (2) contract administration, (3) inaccurate billing and payments, (4) insufficient performance monitoring, (5) untimely and distorted performance evaluation and reporting, and (6) noncompliance with whistleblower protections. The OIG report made eight recommendations to the DEA, and the DEA agreed with all of them, while Abbott Informatics Corporation, to whom DEA awarded the contract, elected not to provide a written response to the report.

Audit of the DEA’s Headquarters-Based Oversight of its Supported Foreign Law Enforcement Units

The OIG found that the DEA’s Headquarters-based management and oversight were insufficient for the high-risk environment in which these units operate. In addition, the DEA lacks a comprehensive strategy for DEA-supported foreign law enforcement programs, which impedes its ability to make well-informed decisions, effectively manage its foreign partnerships, and demonstrate the collective success of these programs. The OIG noted deficiencies related to: (1) the process for reporting and responding to critical incidents, (2) oversight of entities not included in the DEA’s formal foreign law enforcement programs, (3) the process for monitoring host nation agreements, (4) the development and maintenance of records associated with judicial wire intercept programs, (5) the financial management structure, and (6) the system for tracking program requirements and performance. The OIG made 10 recommendations to the DEA, and the DEA agreed with all of them and initiated corrective measures.

The OIG released a video message to accompany this report.

Investigations

During this reporting period, the OIG received 211 complaints involving the DEA. The most common allegations made against DEA employees were Official Misconduct and Waste, Mismanagement. The majority of the complaints were considered management issues and were provided to the DEA for its review and appropriate action.

The OIG opened 8 cases and referred 14 allegations to the DEA’s OPR for action or investigation with a requirement that OPR report the results of its action or investigation to the OIG. At the close of the reporting period, the OIG had 48 open cases of alleged misconduct against DEA employees. The most common allegations were Official Misconduct.
The following are examples of investigations involving the DEA that the OIG conducted during this reporting period:

- **Former DEA Special Agent Sentenced for Conspiracy, Conversion of Property, Falsification of Government Records, Obstructing Justice, and Perjury.** On August 12, 2021, a former DEA Special Agent assigned to the New Orleans Office was sentenced to 160 months of incarceration and 3 years of supervised release for one count of conspiracy, one count of conversion of property, two counts of falsification of government records, three counts of obstructing justice, and two counts of perjury. According to the evidence presented at trial, from in or about February 2009 through in or about January 2016, the Special Agent and another defendant, who were part of an interagency drug task force, stole money and items seized during law enforcement operations, as well as destroyed evidence seized during law enforcement operations. In addition, according to the evidence introduced at trial the Special Agent perjured himself and directed others to commit perjury to obtain a conviction against a criminal defendant. The investigation was conducted by the OIG, the FBI, and DEA OPR.

- **Former DEA Diversion Investigator Convicted of Enticing a Minor to Have Sex and Child Pornography Charges.** On June 22, 2021, a former DEA Diversion Investigator assigned to the DEA’s New York Field Division was found guilty of attempted production of child pornography, attempted receipt of child pornography, and attempted enticement of a minor. According to the evidence introduced at trial, from in or about October 2019 through in or about January 2020, the Diversion Investigator communicated with an undercover officer (“UC-1”) who was posing as a 14-year-old boy. During the course of hundreds of graphic text communications and multiple real-time conversations, he repeatedly sent sexually explicit images and videos to UC-1 in an attempt to persuade UC-1 to transmit sexually explicit images, photos, and live visual depictions of UC-1 to the Diversion Investigator. The investigation was conducted by the OIG and the New York City Police Department.
Ongoing Work

The OIG’s ongoing work is available here.

Audit of the DEA's Authorized Central Storage Program
Investigation

During this reporting period, the OIG received 186 complaints involving ATF personnel. The most common allegations made against ATF employees were Official Misconduct and Waste, Mismanagement. The majority of the complaints were considered management issues and were provided to ATF for its review and appropriate action.

The OIG opened 4 investigations and referred 12 allegations to OPR for action or investigation with a requirement that OPR report the results of its action or investigation to the OIG. At the close of the reporting period, the OIG had 14 open criminal or administrative investigations of alleged misconduct related to ATF employees. The investigations included Official Misconduct, Off-Duty Violations, and Fraud.

ATF Cases Opened by Offense Category
April 1, 2021–September 30, 2021

- Off-Duty Violations: 1
- Fraud: 1
- Ethics Violations: 2

Source: Investigations Data Management System

The following is an example of an investigation involving the DEA that the OIG conducted during this reporting period:

- **Former ATF Special Agent Sentenced for Possession of Heroin.** On May 21, 2021, a former ATF Special Agent, previously assigned to ATF's Savannah Area Office in Georgia, was sentenced to 12 months of probation and ordered to pay a $2,500 fine for one count of possession of heroin. According to the factual statement in support of the guilty plea, on or about January 2, 2020, the Special Agent knew that heroin, a Schedule I controlled substance, was in his residence. The investigation was conducted by the OIG and the FBI.
Ongoing Work

The OIG’s ongoing work is available here.

Audit of ATF’s Oversight of 3-D Firearm Printing Technology

Review of ATF Headquarters Officials’ Use of Government-Owned Vehicles for Home to Work Transportation

Audit of ATF’s Criminal Investigation Referrals and Revocation of Licenses for Federal Firearms Licensees
Reports Issued

Audits of Grants to State and Local Entities

During this reporting period, the OIG audited seven external OJP grant recipients, including recipients receiving funds from multiple DOJ components, as described by the following examples.

- **Audit of OJP’s Grants Awarded to the Georgia Department of Juvenile Justice, Decatur, Georgia.** The OIG released an audit report on two grants totaling over $1,600,00 in funding through the Second Chance Act. The OJP awarded these grants for the purpose of improving reentry outcomes for incarcerated youth across the state of Georgia. The OIG identified concerns with the Georgia Department of Juvenile Justice (GDJJ) grant financial management practices, hiring of grant-funded personnel, expenditures, contract oversight, drawdowns, and financial reporting. The OIG identified $433,727 in unsupported matching costs, contractor payments, travel costs, and drawdowns. The OIG also identified $604,051 in unallowable costs for positions and contractor payments. The OIG made 21 recommendations to the OJP, and the OJP agreed with all of them. The GDJJ agreed with 20 recommendations and partially agreed with one.

- **Audit of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Grant Awarded to the National Children’s Advocacy Center, Huntsville, Alabama.** The OIG released a report on a DOJ grant for $2.4 million awarded to the National Children’s Advocacy Center (NCAC). The OJP awarded this grant to support the development and implementation of a model training and technical assistance program to improve the judicial system’s handling of child abuse and neglect cases. The OIG concluded that the NCAC used its funding to provide training and technical assistance for child abuse professionals. However, the OIG found that the NCAC did not accurately and completely report its indirect costs. The NCAC also inaccurately reported program income earned from grant-related activities. The OIG made seven recommendations to the OJP, and the OJP and the NCAC agreed with all of them.

- **Audit of OJP’s and the OVW’s Cooperative Agreements Awarded to White Bison, Inc., Colorado Springs, Colorado.** The OIG released an audit report examining approximately $870,000 awarded to White Bison, Inc. OJP awarded one cooperative agreement under the OJP FY 2016 Self-Help Group for American Indian and Alaska Native Survivors of Homicide Facilitator’s Guide Project. The OVW awarded the other cooperative agreement under the OVW FY 2018 Training and Technical Assistance Initiative. The OIG identified concerns regarding White Bison’s compliance with program performance and accomplishments, performance reports, the use of funds, federal financial reports, and policies and procedures. The OIG also identified a total questioned cost of $48,819. The OIG made six recommendations to OJP and three recommendations to the OVW.
• **Audit of OJP’s Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Grants Awarded to Youth Collaboratory, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.** The OIG released a report on awards totaling $7.5 million to the Youth Collaboratory, Inc., (Youth Collaboratory). OJP awarded the grants to strengthen and expand Youth Collaboratory’s network of subrecipient agencies providing mentoring services to young people around the country. The OIG determined that, generally speaking, expenditures charged to the grant were allowable, supported, and properly allocated in compliance with award requirements. However, the OIG identified areas for improvement related to subrecipient monitoring procedures and allocating personnel costs to these grants. The OIG made four recommendations to OJP, and OJP agreed with all of them while Youth Collaboratory agreed with one but disagreed with three recommendations.

• **Audit of the Bureau of Justice Assistance 2020 Republican Presidential Candidate Nominating Convention Grant Awarded to Charlotte, North Carolina.** The OIG released a report on a grant to secure the 2020 Republican National Convention. The goal of the $16.8 million grant award was to provide a safe and secure environment for an originally estimated 75,000 convention delegates, elected officials, dignitaries, and media members. The OIG concluded that Charlotte accomplished the goal of the grant although due to the COVID-19 pandemic and health measures intended to protect the public, only about 800 delegates and visitors attended the convention. The OIG also found that Charlotte was unable to show that four employees who were paid $5,838 from grant funds worked on convention-related activities. The report made three recommendations to OJP, and OJP and Charlotte agreed with all of them.

• **Audit of OJP’s Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Cooperative Agreement Awarded to the Montana Division of Criminal Investigation, Helena, Montana.** The OIG released a report on a cooperative agreement totaling $897,540. OJP awarded the cooperative agreement under the Internet Crimes Against Children (ICAC) Task Force Program to help state and local law enforcement agencies develop an effective response to technology-facilitated child sexual exploitation and Internet crimes against children. The OIG found that the Montana Division of Criminal Investigation (MTDCI) under-reported the performance measures in the progress reports. Additionally, the OIG had concerns with the lack of formal guidance issued by OJP to the MTDCI regarding the external ICAC task force members not being categorized as subrecipients and the monitoring requirements. The OIG made two recommendations to OJP, and OJP and the MTDCI agreed with both of them.

• **Audit of OJP’s and the OVW’s Grants Awarded to Gaston County, North Carolina.** The OIG released an audit report on three OJP grants and one OVW grant. The purpose of the OJP and OVW grants were to provide aid and services to victims of sexual assault or domestic violence and to support a broad range of criminal justice related activities. During the period of October 1, 2017, through September 11, 2020, Gaston County was awarded $1,894,635 in funds from the four grants. The OIG concluded that Gaston County achieved most of the grants’ goals and objectives and generally adhered to grant requirements. The report made no recommendations.
Investigations

During this reporting period, the OIG received 30 complaints involving OJP. The most common allegation made against OJP employees, contractors, or grantees was Fraud.

During this reporting period, the OIG opened two investigations. At the close of the reporting period, the OIG had 30 open criminal or administrative investigations of alleged misconduct related to OJP employees, contractors, or grantees. The most common allegation was Fraud.

The following are examples of investigations involving the OJP that the OIG conducted during this reporting period:

• **Former Board Chairwoman of Nonprofit Organization That Received DOJ Grant Funds Convicted for Theft of Public Funds, Wire Fraud, and Fraudulent Travel Claims.** On April 2, 2021, the former Board Chairwoman of a nonprofit organization receiving DOJ grant funds was found guilty of theft from a program receiving federal funding, wire fraud, and false claims after a 5-day jury trial. According to the evidence presented at trial, between 2017 and 2018, the Chairwoman, along with others, misappropriated federal grant funds to make cash payments to others, buy purses and earrings as door prizes, meet in Las Vegas—a trip that cost $31,744—and receive double payments for meals. According to the evidence introduced at trial, during a 4-month period, she was responsible in the misappropriation of more than 10 percent of grant funds designed to help address violence on Indian reservations in Montana.

• **Former Executive Director and Former Treasurer of Nonprofit Organization That Received DOJ Grant Funds Sentenced for Theft of Public Funds.** On June 29, 2021 and June 17, 2021, the former Executive Director and former Treasurer of a nonprofit organization receiving DOJ grant funds were sentenced for one count of theft of public funds. The former Executive Director received 36 months of probation and ordered to pay $35,127 in restitution, and the former Treasurer received 24 months of probation and ordered to pay $2,973 in restitution. According to the factual statement in support of the guilty plea, between 2017 and 2018 they knowingly converted money exceeding $1,000 for their own use.

• **Non-DOJ Individual Sentenced for Theft of Government Funds.** On April 19, 2021, a now disbarred non-DOJ attorney was sentenced to 51 months of imprisonment and 3 years of supervised released, ordered to forfeit $922,559.84, and ordered to pay restitution in the amount of $867,870.76 for one count of theft government funds. According to the evidence presented at trial, from in or about 2012 through in or about 2019, the attorney represented a retired New York City Police Department officer in connection with the retired officer’s claim for compensation from the 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund (VCF). In or about October 2016, the VCF deposited over $1 million dollars in the attorney's bank account on the retired officer's behalf. The attorney sent only approximately 10 percent to the retired officer and stole over $900,000 of those funds.
Ongoing Work

The OIG’s ongoing work is available [here](#).

---

Audit of the Bureau of Justice Assistance Comprehensive Opioid, Stimulant, and Substance Abuse Program

Audit of the Bureau of Justice Assistance National Sexual Assault Kit Initiative Grant Program

Audit of the OJP Contract Awarded to ICF Incorporated, L.L.C. for the Office for Victims of Crime (OVC) Training and Technical Assistance Center

Audit of OJP’s Contract Awarded for the JustGrants System
The Crime Victims Fund (CVF) was established by the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (VOCA) and serves as a major funding source for victim services throughout the country. The fund includes deposits from criminal fines, forfeited bail bonds, penalty fees, and special assessments collected by USAOs, U.S. Courts, and BOP. OJP’s OVC administers the CVF by sending states and territories funding directly through the VOCA victim assistance and compensation formula grants and awarding discretionary grants to state and local public and private entities to support national-scope projects, training, and technical assistance that enhances the professional expertise of victim service providers. Since FY 2015, Congress substantially increased the amount of funding available from the CVF for these DOJ programs. From FY 2015 through 2021, DOJ awarded more than $15 billion in funding for CVF programs.

The OIG’s audits of victims of crime programs have resulted in hundreds of recommendations to improve recipients’ administration of CVF-funded grants, enhance program performance, improve monitoring of thousands of subrecipients, and help ensure accountability for billions of CVF dollars. During this semiannual reporting period, the Audit Division issued six audits of state CVF VOCA grant recipients and at the end of the period had seven ongoing audits of state CVF VOCA grant programs. The OIG’s state CVF VOCA grant audits issued this period are described below.

**Reports Issued**

**Audits of CVF Grants to State Entities**

During this reporting period, the OIG released six audits of state CVF-funded grant programs, as described below.

- **Audit of OJP’s Victim Compensation and Emergency Assistance Grants Awarded to the State of Nevada Department of Health and Human Services, Carson City, Nevada.** The OIG released a report on six DOJ grants totaling over $25 million awarded to the Nevada Department of Health and Human Services (NDHHS). OJP awarded these grants to provide financial support through the payment of compensation benefits to crime victims throughout Nevada, which included an antiterrorism and emergency assistance program (AEAP) grant in response to the mass shooting at the Route 91 Harvest Festival concert in 2017. The OIG identified that NDHHS: (1) did not clearly communicate program guidelines to victims of rape or sexual assault; (2) inadequately separated duties in key program functions; (3) reported inaccurate performance data to the OVC; (4) did not ensure compliance with select special conditions of the grants; (5) did not properly track VOCA victim compensation and AEAP grant expenses; (6) incurred unallowable and unsupported costs; and (7) did not sufficiently monitor AEAP subrecipients to ensure compliance with grant requirements. The OIG also identified over $360 thousand in total questioned costs for unsupported and unallowable payments to victims and AEAP subrecipients, duplicate
victim compensation payments, and unsupported administrative costs. The OIG made
27 recommendations to OJP, and OJP and NDHHS agreed with all of them.

- **Audit of OJP's Victim Assistance Grants Awarded to the Kentucky Justice and Public Safety Cabinet, Frankfort, Kentucky.** The OIG released a report on three grants totaling over $100 million awarded to the Kentucky Justice and Public Safety Cabinet (JPSC). OJP awarded these grants to enhance crime victim services throughout Kentucky. The OIG identified several concerns regarding subgrants, including: (1) delays in subgrant notifications to subrecipients, (2) inadequate subrecipient notification when reallocating unused funds and insufficient communications with subrecipients about requirements, and (3) untimely subgrant monitoring and inadequate subgrant financial monitoring. Further, the Kentucky JPSC did not implement adequate controls over grant financial activities resulting in over $800,000 in unsupported and/or unallowable costs. Additionally, the OIG identified that the Kentucky JPSC did not have adequate procedures for drawing down federal funds, which resulted in over $700,000 in excess funds drawn down. The OIG made 19 recommendations to OJP, and OJP agreed with all of them. The Kentucky JPSC agreed with 15 recommendations, partially or did not fully agree with three recommendations, and disagreed with one recommendation.

- **Audit of OJP's Victim Compensation Grants Awarded to the State of Alaska, Violent Crimes Compensation Board, Anchorage, Alaska.** The OIG released a report on four DOJ grants totaling $2.335 million awarded to the State of Alaska Violent Crimes Compensation Board (VCCB). The OIG concluded that the VCCB used and managed VOCA funding to enhance its victim compensation program by providing financial support to crime victims. However, the OIG found that the VCCB submitted inaccurate Crime Victim Compensation State Certification Forms, which may have resulted in incorrect VOCA victim compensation award amounts for FYs 2017 through 2020. The OIG also identified areas for improvement related to record retention, policy and procedures, and performance reporting, and identified questioned costs of over $248,000 related to unsupported and unallowable victim compensation payments. The OIG made nine recommendations to OJP, and OJP and the VCCB agreed with all of them.

- **Audit of OJP's Victim Compensation Grants Awarded to the Texas Office of the Attorney General, Austin, Texas.** The OIG released a report on three DOJ grants totaling over $77.9 million awarded to the Texas Office of Attorney General (Texas OAG). OJP awarded these grants to provide financial support through the payment of compensation benefits to crime victims throughout Texas. The OIG found that errors in the state certification forms resulted in the Texas OAG receiving $1,140,000 less in funding than what it could have been awarded in FYs 2017 through 2020. The OIG also found that from 1,413 transactions reviewed there were 12 instances of unsupported and unallowable overpayments totaling $10,237 and 1 instance of an underpayment to a claimant. The OIG made two recommendations to OJP, and OJP and the Texas OAG agreed with both of them.

- **Audit of OJP's Victim Compensation Grants Awarded to the New Hampshire Department of Justice, Concord, New Hampshire.** The OIG released an audit report on two grants totaling $334,000 awarded to the New Hampshire Department of Justice (NHDOJ). OJP awarded these grants to provide financial support through various forms of compensation benefits paid to crime victims and service providers throughout New
Hampshire. The OIG found that NHDOJ established an adequate program to administer compensation benefits to victims and survivors of criminal violence. However, the OIG identified opportunities where NHDOJ could enhance its internal controls for processing compensation benefits and reporting of performance accomplishments. The OIG made two recommendations to OJP, and OJP and NHDOJ agreed with both of them.

- **Audit of OJP’s Victim Compensation Grants Awarded to the Tennessee Department of Treasury, Nashville, Tennessee.** The OIG released an audit report examining the Tennessee Department of Treasury’s (TDT) administration of three grants totaling over $14,000,000 in victim compensation funding. OJP awarded these grants for the purpose of providing financial support through various forms of compensation benefits paid to and on behalf of crime victims throughout Tennessee. The OIG identified one instance where the TDT’s annual certification form was not supported by underlying expenditure data, resulting in $3,000 in questioned costs. Prior to the OIG’s audit, the TDT had made a process change that corrected the cause of the certification error. The OIG made one recommendation to OJP, and both OJP and the TDT agreed with the recommendation.
Investigation

The following is an example of an investigation that the OIG conducted during this reporting period:

- **Findings of Misconduct by a then-Senior DOJ Official for Failing to Appear for a Compelled OIG Interview.** During the course of an ongoing administrative misconduct investigation, the OIG informed a then-senior DOJ official, who was a non-career member of the Senior Executive Service, that the senior DOJ official was a subject in the investigation and that the OIG sought to interview the senior DOJ official in connection with the investigation. After several unsuccessful attempts to schedule a voluntary interview with the senior DOJ official, the OIG instructed the senior DOJ official to appear for a compelled interview. The senior DOJ official failed to appear for the compelled interview and resigned from Department employment shortly thereafter. The OIG does not have the authority to compel or subpoena testimony from former Department employees, including those who retire or resign during the course of an OIG investigation. The OIG has provided its report to the applicable DOJ leadership office and the DOJ OPR for any action they deem appropriate.*

Community Relations Service Investigation

The following is an example of an investigation that the OIG conducted during this reporting period:

- **Findings of Misconduct by Community Relations Service Senior Official for Violation of DOJ Information Technology Security Rules of Behavior for General Users.** On July 2, 2021, the OIG completed its report of investigation for an investigation initiated upon receipt of information alleging that a Community Relations Service Senior Official violated DOJ Information Technology Security Rules of Behavior. The investigation was presented for prosecution on September 8, 2016, and declined on February 27, 2017. The OIG has provided its report to Community Relations Service for appropriate action.*
Criminal Division
Reports Issued

Audit of the Criminal Division’s Process for Incoming Mutual Legal Assistance Requests

The OIG released a report examining the DOJ Criminal Division's process for incoming mutual legal assistance (MLA) requests. The Criminal Division's Office of International Affairs is responsible for responding to incoming MLA requests from foreign authorities to assist foreign criminal investigations. The specific findings in the report include: (1) lack of permanent funding impacted the success of the reform initiative strategy, (2) support from U.S. Attorney Offices may not be sufficient to handle expected increases in future workloads, (3) the Office of International Affairs is challenged by high attrition, (4) the Office of International Affairs continues to rely on an antiquated case management system, and (5) training and outreach resources for foreign authorities could be improved. The OIG made one recommendation to EOUSA and six recommendations to the Criminal Division, and EOUSA and the Criminal Division agreed with all of them.

Audit of the Money Laundering and Asset Recovery Section’s Administration of the Equitable Sharing Program

The OIG released a report examining the Money Laundering and Asset Recovery Section’s (MLARS) Administration of the Equitable Sharing Program. The DOJ Equitable Sharing Program allows state or local law enforcement agencies that directly participate in an investigation or prosecution resulting in a federal forfeiture to claim a portion of federally forfeited cash, property, and proceeds. The OIG found that MLARS needs to improve its administration of equitable sharing activities in several key areas to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of its efforts. Specifically, the OIG found issues with: (1) equitable sharing agreement and certification forms, (2) compliance reviews, (3) remedying misspent funds, and (4) training of program participants. The report made 11 recommendations to help improve MLARS' administration and oversight of the Equitable Sharing Program, and MLARS agreed with all of them.

Audits of Equitable Sharing Program Activities

During this reporting period, the OIG released two audits of Equitable Sharing Program participants, as described below.

• Audit of the Chicago Police Department’s Equitable Sharing Program Activities, Chicago, Illinois. The OIG released a report examining the Chicago, Illinois, Police Department's (Chicago PD) management and oversight of its equitable sharing funds. The OIG found that the Chicago PD did not ensure proper oversight of its program and had not established policies and procedures to manage its equitable sharing-related activities. The OIG also determined that the Chicago PD did not have an adequate property management system in place to identify and track equipment purchased with equitable sharing funds, and the Equitable Sharing Agreement and Certification report filed during the OIG's audit review period could not be reconciled to the Chicago PD's accounting records. The OIG identified $49,273 in construction costs that warrant further review by the Criminal Division. The OIG made eight recommendations to the Criminal Division, and the Criminal Division agreed with all of them.
• **Audit of the Kansas Highway Patrol’s Equitable Sharing Program Activities, Topeka, Kansas.** The OIG released an audit report examining Kansas Highway Patrol’s (KHP) equitable sharing program activities in FYs 2019 and 2020. During that period, KHP received $4,569,660 and spent $3,121,344 in equitable sharing funds. The OIG identified unallowable expenses and concerns related to suspension and debarment verification, which the OIG brought to KHP’s attention while conducting the audit and for which KHP took immediate corrective action. In addition, the OIG identified an additional $2,712 of personnel expenses related to regular pay that were not included in our testing. The report made one recommendation to the Criminal Division, and the Criminal Division agreed with the recommendation.

**Environment and Natural Resources Division**

**Ongoing Work**

The OIG’s ongoing work is available [here](#).

Audit of the Superfund Activities in the Environment and Natural Resources Division for FYs 2019 and 2020

**Executive Office for Immigration Review**

**Ongoing Work**

The OIG’s ongoing work is available [here](#).

Inspection and Review of EOIR Immigration Hearings Conducted Via Video Teleconference

Audit of EOIR’s Electronic Case Management System Contracts

**Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys**

**Investigations**

The following are examples of investigations that the OIG conducted during this reporting period:

• **Former USAO Paralegal Specialist Sentenced for False Statements.** On July 27, 2021, a former USAO Paralegal Specialist was sentenced to 5 years of probation for one count of false statements. According to the factual statement in support of the guilty plea, the Paralegal Specialist worked at the USAO in the Western District of Texas, where AUSAs were leading an investigation into a drug trafficking organization. The Paralegal Specialist learned that her brother-in-law was under federal investigation for drug trafficking and notified her sister of this information. During an interview with FBI and DEA agents, she was asked...
whether she had revealed to her sister that her brother-in-law was under investigation and she knowingly misrepresented that she had not. She later confessed to disclosing this information to her sister. The investigation was conducted by the OIG, DEA, and FBI.

- **Findings of Misconduct by an AUSA for Illegal Possession and Attempted Smuggling of a Controlled Substance (Xanax) Without a Prescription, False Statements, Attempted Obstruction, Failure to Report Foreign Travel, and Misuse of Official Time.** On April 15, 2021, the OIG completed its report of investigation for an investigation initiated upon receipt of information from EOUSA alleging that in March 2018, at a port of entry on the United States-Mexico border, an AUSA was arrested by state highway patrol for misdemeanor DUI, misdemeanor DUI with blood alcohol content above .08 percent, and misdemeanor possession of a controlled substance. The investigation was presented for prosecution on May 2, 2018, and declined on October 7, 2019. The OIG has completed its investigation and has provided its report to EOUSA and DOJ’s OPR.*

- **Findings of Misconduct by then AUSA for Misuse of Position and Misuse of Government Computer.** On April 1, 2021, the OIG completed its report of investigation for an investigation initiated upon receipt of information from the Department of Homeland Security Homeland Security Investigations (HSI), alleging that a then AUSA may have misused the AUSA's government position. At the time of HSI's referral to OIG, the AUSA had already retired. The investigation was presented for prosecution on August 22, 2016, and declined on March 15, 2019. The OIG has completed its investigation and has provided its report to EOUSA for its information and to the Department's OPR for appropriate action.*

**Ongoing Work**

The OIG’s ongoing work is available [here](#).

---

Audit of EOUSA’s Contracts Awarded to the Cherokee Nation 3S, LLC for Legal and Other Support Services

**Justice Management Division**

**Management Advisory Memorandum**

- **Notification of Concerns Identified in DOJ’s Human Resources Policies.** The OIG released a MAM JMD identifying concerns related to DOJ’s human resources (HR) policies. The OIG found that DOJ lacked formalized Department wide guidance for implementing and managing vital approaches for effective and progressive human capital administration. Moreover, DOJ has not fulfilled its internal requirement to review and update its HR policies every 5 years. The OIG also has concerns that DOJ lacks a centralized location for its HR guidance and various policies. The OIG made four recommendations to JMD to address the HR policy concerns that the OIG identified. JMD agreed with all four recommendations and informed the OIG that it is taking steps to achieve the recommended results of the OIG’s MAM.
Ongoing Work

The OIG's ongoing work is available here.

Audit of JMD's Administration of Shared Information Technology Costs through the Working Capital Fund

Office of Community Oriented Policing Services

Ongoing Work

The OIG's ongoing work is available here.

Audit of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services Anti-Heroin Task Force Program

Office on Violence Against Women

Reports Issued

The OVW administers financial and technical assistance to communities across the country for the development of programs, policies, and practices aimed at ending domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. The OVW recipients include state and local governments, universities, non-profit agencies, and for-profit agencies. During this reporting period, the OIG conducted five audits of OVW grant recipients, as described by the following examples.

- **Audit of the OVW's Tribal Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Coalitions Program Grants Awarded to the Montana Native Women's Coalition, Billings, Montana.** The OIG released an audit report examining three grants totaling $931,599 awarded by the OVW, Tribal Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Coalitions Program to the Montana Native Women's Coalition (MNWC). The OIG found that the MNWC did not maintain adequate documentation to demonstrate that grant goals and objectives were achieved and to support performance measures. The OIG found that the MNWC did not adhere to all of the award requirements tested and did not maintain an adequate accounting system or financial records. Finally, the OIG identified $333,318 in net unallowable, unsupported costs. The OIG made 31 recommendations to the OVW, and the OVW agreed with all of them and MNWC did not state whether they agreed with any of the 31 recommendations.

- **Audit of the OVW's Grants Awarded to Inspire Action for Social Change, Montana City, Montana.** The OIG released a report on three cooperative agreements totaling over $1.9 million awarded to Inspire Action for Social Change (Inspire Action). The OIG found that Inspire Action did not adhere to all of the award requirements the OIG tested but accomplished or was making progress to accomplish the grant objectives. The OIG also identified concerns with Inspire Action's progress reports, grant financial management practices, expenditures, and subrecipient oversight. The OIG identified
$14,029 in unallowable expenditures and $58,409 in unsupported costs. The OIG made 18 recommendations to the OVW, and the OVW agreed with all of them and Inspire Action did not state whether they agreed with any of the 18 recommendations.

• **Audit of the OVW’s Grants Awarded to The Haven, Inc., Houma, Louisiana.** The OIG released a report examining The Haven’s administration of two grants totaling over $1 million in funding through the Transitional Housing Program and Legal Assistance Program. The OVW awarded these grants to provide 6 to 24 months of transitional housing and legal assistance for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. The OIG identified concerns with The Haven’s practices for submitting required performance and federal financial reports to the OVW. The OIG also noted several deficiencies related to internal controls, including recording of grant expenditures, and policies and procedures for grant management practices. The Haven had not submitted a grant adjustment modification requesting approval for a project change for the Legal Assistance Program grant. The OIG made 14 recommendations to the OVW, and both the OVW and The Haven agreed with all of them.

• **Audit of the OVW’s Technical Assistance Awards to the National Center for State Courts, Williamsburg, Virginia.** The OIG released a report examining four grants totaling over $1.1 million awarded to the National Center for State Courts (NCSC). The OVW awarded these grants to provide direct technical assistance to other OVW grantees. The OIG found that NCSC did not comply with essential award conditions pertaining to the monitoring of program activities. The NCSC did not justify and document subrecipient and consultant rates and monitor subrecipient payroll expenses. The NCSC also could not fully support some travel expenses and Federal Financial Reports. The audit identified $35,790 in questioned costs and $1,109 in funds to be put to better use. The OIG made 12 recommendations to the OVW. The OVW agreed with 11 of 12 recommendations, and the NCSC agreed with 10 recommendations and disagreed with 2 recommendations.

• **Audit of the OVW’s Grants Awarded to the Oklahoma Coalition Against Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.** The OIG released a report of approximately $1.4 million awarded to the Oklahoma Coalition Against Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault (OCADVSA). The OVW awarded the grants under the State Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Coalitions program to support the enhancement of coalitions by funding specific projects, such as training and technical assistance. The OIG identified $874,932 in net unallowable and unsupported expenditures. The OIG also found that progress and financial reports were inaccurate or not supported. Finally, the OIG found that OCADVSA’s policies and procedures did not have specific language regarding accountable property and asset management, contract award and management, payroll, and performance measurement and outcome assessment. The OIG made 11 recommendations to the OVW, and the OVW agreed with all of them and OCADVSA did not state whether they agreed with any of the 11 recommendations.
Tax Division
Report Issued
Audit of Certain Tax Division Contracts Awarded for Expert Witness Services

The OIG released a report examining the Tax Division’s contracting for expert witness services—focusing on a judgmental sample of three contracts totaling $3.7 million. The Tax Division uses expert witnesses to assist in executing its mission of enforcing the nation’s tax laws through criminal and civil litigation, and these services are funded through DOJ’s Fees and Expenses of Witnesses Appropriation. The OIG identified numerous areas of non-compliance with the FAR during the contract award, administration, and oversight processes. In addition, the OIG identified $24,296 in questioned costs. The OIG made 15 recommendations to the Tax Division, and the Tax Division agreed with all of them.
TOP MANAGEMENT AND PERFORMANCE CHALLENGES

The OIG has published a report on the top management and performance challenges facing DOJ annually since 1998. The report is based on the OIG’s oversight work, research, and judgment. By statute, this report is required to be included in DOJ’s annual Agency Financial Report.

This year’s report identifies nine challenges that the OIG believes represent the most pressing concerns for DOJ. While the challenges are not rank-ordered, the OIG believes that strengthening public trust in DOJ, managing the prison system during the COVID-19 pandemic, enhancing national security—including the rising danger of homegrown violent extremism, guarding against cyber-related intrusions, and enhancing trust between police and communities are urgent challenges that will continue to garner significant public attention, and that will require meaningful and swift action from the Department.

Top Management and Performance Challenges for the Department of Justice–2021

- Strengthening Public Trust in the U.S. Department of Justice
- The Department’s Contingency Planning Post-Pandemic
- Maintaining a Safe, Secure, and Humane Prison System
- Countering Domestic and International Terrorism and Safeguarding National Security
- Protecting the Nation and Department against Cyber-Related Threats and Emerging Technologies
- Strengthening Community Engagement, Law Enforcement Coordination, and the Response to Violent Crime
- Managing the Opioids/Fentanyl Crisis
- Managing Human Capital
- Ensuring Financial Accountability of Department Contracts, Grants, and Pandemic-Related Funds

Detailed information about DOJ’s management and performance challenges is available online [here].
Congressional Testimony
During this reporting period, the Inspector General testified on two occasions:

- “Dereliction of Duty: Examining the Inspector General's Report on the FBI's Handling of the Larry Nassar Investigation” before the U.S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary on September 15, 2021; and


Legislation and Regulations
The IG Act directs the OIG to review proposed legislation and regulations relating to the programs and operations of DOJ. Although DOJ's Office of Legislative Affairs reviews all proposed or enacted legislation that could affect DOJ's activities, the OIG independently reviews proposed legislation that could affect its operations and legislation that relate to waste, fraud, or abuse in DOJ's programs and operations. For example, during this period, the OIG reviewed legislation, including the Inspector General Independence and Empowerment Act, IG Testimonial Subpoena Authority Act, and Whistleblower Protection Improvement Act.
WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION COORDINATOR PROGRAM

Whistleblowers perform a critical role when they bring forward evidence of wrongdoing and they should never suffer reprisal for doing so. The OIG Whistleblower Protection Coordinator Program works to ensure that whistleblowers are fully informed of their rights and protections from reprisal.

In July 2021, DOJ Inspector General Michael Horowitz participated as an honorary speaker at the annual National Whistleblower Day event, and was joined by Senator Charles Grassley, Senator Ron Wyden, Representative Jackie Speier, Secretary of Labor Marty Walsh, and many others in support of the event’s primary goal: celebrating the accomplishments of whistleblowers and their efforts to fight corruption, waste, and other crimes.

At this year’s event, Inspector General Horowitz discussed his role as Chair of the PRAC, to highlight the PRAC’s work fighting waste, fraud, and abuse in pandemic spending. With trillions of dollars going to millions of recipients, Inspector General Horowitz noted that whistleblowers are a critical part of the effort to ensure that these funds go to their intended recipients, promote economic recovery, and improve public health providers, and are not wasted or misspent by individuals or corporations or others looking to take advantage of the unprecedented increase in federal spending. For more information on the PRAC’s work, visit their website.

April 1, 2021–September 30, 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee complaints received⁹</th>
<th>199</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee complaints opened for investigation by the OIG</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee complaints that were referred by the OIG to the components for investigation</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee complaint cases closed by the OIG¹⁰</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Audit Overview

During this reporting period, the OIG's Audit Division issued 41 audit reports and other releases, which contained more than $5.6 million in questioned costs, and made 302 recommendations for management improvement. Specifically, the Audit Division issued 15 internal audit reports of DOJ programs; 3 contract audit reports; 20 external audit reports of grants and other agreements funded at over $277.5 million; and 3 other releases. The Audit Division also issued 12 Single Audit Act audits of programs funded at more than $238.3 million.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reports</th>
<th>Number of Reports</th>
<th>Total Questioned Costs (including unsupported costs)</th>
<th>Unsupported Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No management decision made by beginning of period</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issued during period</td>
<td>16(^{14})</td>
<td>$5,879,831</td>
<td>$5,140,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needing management decision during period</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$5,879,831</td>
<td>$5,140,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management decisions made during period:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–Amount of disallowed costs(^{15})</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$5,879,831</td>
<td>$5,140,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–Amount of costs not disallowed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No management decision at end of period</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Funds Recommended to Be Put to Better Use\(^{16}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reports</th>
<th>Number of Reports</th>
<th>Unsupported Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No management decision made by beginning of period(^{17})</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issued during period</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$9,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needing management decision during period</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$9,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management decisions made during period:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Amount of disallowed costs(^{18})</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$9,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Amount of costs not disallowed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No management decision at end of period</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Significant Recommendations for Which Corrective Actions Have Not Been Completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reports</th>
<th>Report Title</th>
<th>Rec. No.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-129</td>
<td>Audit of the FBI’s Execution of Its Woods Procedures for Applications Filed with the FISC Relating to U.S. Persons</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The OIG recommended that the FBI develop and implement policy that describes the expectations for supervisory review of Woods Files. Specifically, this policy should clearly convey the requirement for reviewers to confirm support for all statements of fact in each application and provide for better evidence of the supervisory review process that goes beyond simply signing the Woods Form. As part of this policy modification, the FBI should also consider options for incorporating an element of independent verification of the Woods File during the FISA application process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-095</td>
<td>Audit of Selected Aspects of the FBI’s NICS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The OIG recommended that the FBI strengthen controls over the sale of firearms to out-of-state purchasers by updating the NICS background check to verify age requirements of an out-of-state firearm purchaser's state of residence and state of sale to ensure basic age eligibility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>OIG Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-028 (January 2021)</td>
<td>DOJ's Planning and Implementation of Its Zero Tolerance Policy and Its Coordination with the Departments of Homeland Security and Health and Human Services</td>
<td>The OIG recommended that the Department, prior to issuing a significant policy affecting multiple DOJ components, other Executive Branch agencies, or the courts, coordinate directly with affected stakeholders to ensure effective implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-027 (February 2020)</td>
<td>Review of the BOP's Pharmaceutical Drug Costs and Procurement</td>
<td>The OIG recommended that the Department, in consultation with the appropriate Department components and other federal stakeholders: formally assess the risks and benefits of seeking to obtain Big 4 pricing for pharmaceutical purchases, as well as the authority to cap reimbursement for outside medical care at the Medicare rate, for the Department and all of its components, and, if warranted by the assessments, develop a plan to obtain such pricing and/or authority, including timeframes and assignments of responsibility for pursuing the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-05 (October 2019)</td>
<td>Review of the DEA's Regulatory and Enforcement Efforts to Control the Diversion of Opioids</td>
<td>The OIG recommended that DEA develop a national prescription opioid enforcement strategy that encompasses the work of all DEA field divisions tasked with combating the diversion of controlled substances, and establish performance metrics to measure the strategy's progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-03 (August 2019)</td>
<td>A Joint Review of Law Enforcement Cooperation on the Southwest Border between the FBI and HSI</td>
<td>The OIG recommended that the FBI and HSI jointly develop a memorandum of understanding or similar written agreement governing FBI and HSI operations on overlapping criminal investigative areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-01 (December 2018)</td>
<td>Review of DOJ's Implementation of the Death in Custody Reporting Act of 2013</td>
<td>The OIG recommended that OJP conduct a study on data collected under the Death in Custody Reporting Act of 2013 as described in the statute and submit a report on the study to Congress as soon as practicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-05</td>
<td>Review of the BOP’s Use of Restrictive Housing for Inmates with Mental Illness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-05</td>
<td>Review of the BOP’s Contraband Interdiction Efforts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-3</td>
<td>Review of the DEA’s Use of Cold Consent Encounters at Mass Transportation Facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Special Reviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-04</td>
<td>A Review of Various Actions by the FBI and DOJ in Advance of the 2016 Election</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td>The OIG recommended that the Department consider developing practice guidance that would assist investigators and prosecutors in identifying the general risks with and alternatives to permitting a witness to attend a voluntary interview of another witness, in particular when the witness is serving as counsel for the other witness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-04</td>
<td>A Review of Various Actions by the FBI and DOJ in Advance of the 2016 Election</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The OIG recommended that the Department consider making explicit that, except in situations where the law requires or permits disclosure, an investigating agency cannot publicly announce its recommended charging decision prior to consulting with the Attorney General, Deputy Attorney General, U.S. Attorney, or his or her designee, and cannot proceed without the approval of one of these officials.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The OIG recommended that the Department consider adopting a policy addressing the appropriateness of Department employees discussing the conduct of uncharged individuals in public statements.

The OIG recommended that the Department consider providing guidance to agents and prosecutors concerning the taking of overt investigative steps, indictments, public announcements, or other actions that could impact an election.

# Audit Follow-up

**OMB Circular A-50**

OMB Circular A-50, Audit Follow-up, requires audit reports to be resolved within 6 months of the audit report issuance date. The Audit Division monitors the status of open audit reports to track the audit resolution and closure process. As of September 30, 2021, the Audit Division was monitoring the resolution process of 146 open reports and closed 64 reports this reporting period.

# Evaluation and Inspections Workload and Accomplishments

The following chart summarizes the workload and accomplishments of the Evaluation and Inspections Division during the 6-month reporting period ending September 30, 2021.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workload and Accomplishments</th>
<th>Number of Reviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviews active at beginning of period</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews cancelled</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews initiated</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final reports issued</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews active at end of reporting period</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Investigations Statistics**

The following chart summarizes the workload and accomplishments of the Investigations Division during the 6-month period ending September 30, 2021.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Allegations</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotline (telephone, mail, and email)</td>
<td>2,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sources</td>
<td>3,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Allegations Received</td>
<td>6,345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Investigative Caseload**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Allegations</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigations Opened this Period</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigations Closed and Reports of Investigation Issued this Period</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigations in Progress as of 9/30/21</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prosecutive Actions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Allegations</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Indictments/Informations</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrests</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convictions/Pleas</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecutions Referred to the Department of Justice</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecutions referred to State and Local Prosecutors</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Administrative Actions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Allegations</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terminations</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resignations</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary Action</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Monetary Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Allegations</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fines/Restitutions/Recoveries/Assessments/Forfeitures</td>
<td>$4,216,318.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Fines/Restitutions/Recoveries/Penalties/Damages/Forfeitures</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-judicial Restitutions/Recoveries/Forfeitures/Revocations/Seizures</td>
<td>$694,593.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Investigations Division Briefing Programs**

OIG investigators conducted 58 Integrity Awareness Briefings for DOJ employees and other stakeholders throughout the country. These briefings are designed to educate employees and other stakeholders about the misuse of a public official’s position for personal gain and to deter employees and other stakeholders from committing such offenses. The briefings reached 1,579 employees.
**OIG Hotline**

During FY 2021, the OIG received the majority of its Hotline complaints through its electronic complaint form located [here](#).

In addition, DOJ employees and citizens are able to file complaints by telephone, fax, and postal mail. The online access, fax, and postal mail all provide the ability to file a complaint in writing to the OIG.

From all Hotline sources during the second half of FY 2021, 2,515 new complaints related to DOJ operations or other federal agencies were entered into the OIG's complaint tracking system. Of the new complaints, 2,179 were forwarded to various DOJ components for their review and appropriate action; 116 were filed for information; 98 were forwarded to other federal agencies; and 9 were opened by the OIG for investigation.

![Complaint Sources](#)

Source: Investigations Data Management System

Approximately, 7,142 additional Hotline email and phone contacts were processed and deemed non-jurisdictional and outside the purview of the federal government and therefore were not entered into the OIG's complaint tracking system.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronyms and Abbreviations</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATF</td>
<td>Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSA</td>
<td>Assistant United States Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOP</td>
<td>Federal Bureau of Prisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BWC</td>
<td>Body Worn Cameras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARES</td>
<td>Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIGIE</td>
<td>Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Correctional Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVID-19</td>
<td>Coronavirus Disease 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT</td>
<td>Civil Rights Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVF</td>
<td>Crime Victims Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEA</td>
<td>Drug Enforcement Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOJ or Department</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOIR</td>
<td>Executive Office for Immigration Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOUSA</td>
<td>Executive Office for United States Attorneys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI</td>
<td>Federal Bureau of Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISA</td>
<td>Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISMA</td>
<td>Federal Information Security Management Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>Fiscal Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG Act</td>
<td>Inspector General Act of 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSD</td>
<td>Inspection Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JMD</td>
<td>Justice Management Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAM</td>
<td>Management Advisory Memorandum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICS</td>
<td>National Instant Criminal Background Check System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIA</td>
<td>Office of Internal Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIG</td>
<td>Office of the Inspector General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJP</td>
<td>Office of Justice Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMB</td>
<td>Office of Management and Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPR</td>
<td>Office of Professional Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVC</td>
<td>Office for Victims of Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patriot Act</strong></td>
<td>Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>USAO</strong></td>
<td>U.S. Attorney's Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>USMS</strong></td>
<td>U.S. Marshals Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VOCA</strong></td>
<td>Victims of Crime Act of 1984</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 | Glossary of Terms

The following are definitions of specific terms as they are used in this report.

**Cooperative Agreement:** Term used to describe when the awarding agency expects to be substantially involved with the award’s activities; often used interchangeably with “grant.”

**Disallowed Cost:** The IG Act defines “disallowed cost” as a questioned cost that management, in a management decision, has sustained or agreed should not be charged to the government.

**Diversion:** When controlled substance transactions fall outside the congressionally mandated closed system of distribution, the activity constitutes diversion.

**Equitable Sharing Cost:** This program allows state or local law enforcement agencies that directly participate in an investigation or prosecution resulting in a federal forfeiture to claim a portion of federally forfeited cash, property, and proceeds.

**External Audit Report:** The results of audits and related reviews of expenditures made under DOJ contracts, grants, and other agreements. External audits are conducted in accordance with the Comptroller General's Government Auditing Standards and related professional auditing standards.

**Funds Recommended to Be Put to Better Use:** Recommendation by the OIG that funds could be used more efficiently if management of an entity took actions to start and complete the recommendation, including: (1) reductions in outlays; (2) deobligation of funds from programs or operations; (3) withdrawal of interest subsidy costs on loans or loan guarantees, insurance, or bonds; (4) costs not incurred by implementing recommended improvements related to the operations of the entity, a contractor, or grantee; (5) avoidance of unnecessary expenditures noted in pre-award reviews of contract or grant agreements; or (6) any other savings that specifically are identified.

**Internal Audit Report:** The results of audits and related reviews of DOJ organizations, programs, functions, computer security and information technology, and financial statements. Internal audits are conducted in accordance with the Comptroller General's Government Auditing Standards and related professional auditing standards.

**Management Decision:** The IG Act defines “management decision” as the evaluation by the management of an establishment of the findings and recommendations included in an audit report and the issuance of a final decision by management concerning its response to such findings and recommendations, including actions concluded to be necessary.

**Mutual Legal Assistance:** An agreement between two or more countries for the purpose of gathering and exchanging information in an effort to enforce public or criminal laws.

**Questioned Cost:** A cost that is questioned by the OIG because of: (1) an alleged violation of a provision of a law, regulation, contract, grant, cooperative agreement, or 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.
**Single Audit Act Audits:** Single Audit Act audits are performed by public accountants or a federal, state or local government audit organization in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. They are intended to determine whether the financial statements and schedule of expenditures of federal awards are presented fairly, to test internal controls over major programs, to determine whether the grant recipient is in compliance with requirements that may have a direct and material effect on each of its major programs, and to follow up on prior audit findings. These audits are required to be performed for organizations that expend $750,000 or more in federal awards in accordance with the Single Audit Act of 1984, as amended, and 2 CFR part 200, subpart F, Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance).

**Supervised Release:** Court-monitored supervision upon release from incarceration.

**Unsupported Cost:** A cost that is questioned by the OIG because the OIG found that, at the time of the audit, the cost was not supported by adequate documentation.
3 | Audit Division Reports

Internal Audit Reports

**Multicomponent**
Audit of the DOJ Policy on BWCs
Audit of the FBI’s Execution of Its Woods Procedures for Applications Filed with the FISC Relating to U.S. Persons
Examination of the U.S. DOJ's FY 2020 Compliance with the Payment Integrity Information Act of 2019

**Drug Enforcement Administration**
Audit of the DEA's Headquarters-Based Oversight of its Supported Foreign Law Enforcement Units

**Federal Bureau of Prisons**
Audit of the BOP's Management and Oversight of its Chaplaincy Services Program

**Federal Bureau of Investigation**
Audit of Selected Aspects of the FBI's NICS
Audit of the FBI's Efforts to Notify Victims of Child Sexual Abuse Material

**United States Marshals Service**
Audit of the USMS's Judicial Security Activities
Audit of the USMS's Awarding and Administration of Sole-Source Contracts

**Other Department Components and Agencies**
Audit of the Money Laundering and Asset Recovery Section's Administration of the Equitable Sharing Program
Audit of the Criminal Division's Process for Incoming MLA Requests
Audit of a Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency System Pursuant to the FISMA of 2014, FY 2020
Audit of the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency's Information Security Program Pursuant to the FISMA of 2014, FY 2020
Audit of JMD's DOJ Identity Services System Pursuant to the FISMA of 2014, FY 2020
Audit of JMD's Information Security Program Pursuant to the FISMA of 2014, FY 2020

Contract Audit Reports

**Multicomponent**
Audit of DOJ's Contracts Awarded to Adaptive Digital Systems, Inc. for Covert Audio and Video Equipment

**Drug Enforcement Administration**
Audit of the DEA's Laboratory Information Management System Support Contracts
**Tax Division**  
Audit of Certain Tax Division Contracts Awarded for Expert Witness Services

**External Audit Reports**

**Alabama**  
Audit of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Grant Awarded to the National Children’s Advocacy Center, Huntsville, Alabama

**Alaska**  
Audit of OJP’s Victim Compensation Grants Awarded to the State of Alaska, Violent Crimes Compensation Board, Anchorage, Alaska

**Colorado**  
Audit of OJP’s and the OVW's Cooperative Agreements Awarded to White Bison, Inc., Colorado Springs, Colorado

**Georgia**  
Audit of OJP’s Grants Awarded to the Georgia Department of Juvenile Justice, Decatur, Georgia

**Illinois**  
Audit of the Chicago Police Department's Equitable Sharing Program Activities, Chicago, Illinois

**Kansas**  
Audit of the Kansas Highway Patrol’s Equitable Sharing Program Activities, Topeka, Kansas

**Kentucky**  
Audit of OJP’s Victim Assistance Grants Awarded to the Kentucky Justice and Public Safety Cabinet, Frankfort, Kentucky

**Louisiana**  
Audit of the OVW's Grants Awarded to The Haven, Inc., Houma, Louisiana

**Montana**  
Audit of OJP’s Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Cooperative Agreement Awarded to the Montana Division of Criminal Investigation, Helena, Montana  
Audit of the OVW's Grants Awarded to Inspire Action for Social Change, Montana City, Montana  
Audit of the OVW's Tribal Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Coalitions Program Grants Awarded to the Montana Native Women’s Coalition, Billings, Montana

**New Hampshire**  
Audit of OJP’s Victim Compensation Grants Awarded to the New Hampshire Department of Justice, Concord, New Hampshire

**Nevada**  
Audit of OJP’s Victim Compensation and Emergency Assistance Grants Awarded to the State of Nevada Department of Health and Human Services, Carson City, Nevada
North Carolina
Audit of OJP's and the OVW's Grants Awarded to Gaston County, North Carolina
Audit of the Bureau of Justice Assistance 2020 Republican Presidential Candidate Nominating Convention Grant Awarded to Charlotte, North Carolina

Oklahoma
Audit of the OVW's Grants Awarded to the Oklahoma Coalition Against Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Pennsylvania
Audit of OJP's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Grants Awarded to Youth Collaboratory, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Tennessee
Audit of OJP's Victim Compensation Grants Awarded to the Tennessee Department of Treasury, Nashville, Tennessee

Texas
Audit of OJP's Victim Compensation Grants Awarded to the Texas Office of the Attorney General, Austin, Texas

Virginia
Audit of the OVW's Technical Assistance Awards to the National Center for State Courts, Williamsburg, Virginia

Single Audit Act Reports of Department Activities
City of Cleveland, Ohio FY 2020
City of Detroit, Michigan FY 2020
City of Simi Valley, California FY 2020
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania FY 2020
End Domestic Abuse Wisconsin: The Wisconsin Coalition Against Domestic Violence, Inc., Madison, Wisconsin FY 2020
Floyd County Fiscal Court, Prestonsburg, Kentucky FY 2016
Helping Establish Assistance Resource Team, Sacramento, California FY 2020
The International Institute of Buffalo, Buffalo, New York FY 2020
Minnesota Coalition Against Sexual Assault, Saint Paul, Minnesota FY 2020
National Council of Young Men's Christian Association of the USA, Chicago, Illinois FY 2020
State of New Hampshire FY 2020
State of North Carolina FY 2020
Other Audit Releases
MAM: Notification of Concerns Identified in DOJ's HR Policies
OIG Issue Alert: JustGrants Transition Impacting DOJ Awardees' Ability to Access Funds and Manage Award Activities
Review of OJP’s Administration of CARES Act Funding
# Quantifiable Potential Monetary Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audit Report</th>
<th>Questioned Costs</th>
<th>Unsupported Costs</th>
<th>Funds Recommended to Be Put to Better Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audit Reports Performed by the DOJ OIG</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of Certain Tax Division Contracts Awarded for Expert Witness Services</td>
<td>$24,296</td>
<td>$9,350</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of DOJ's Contracts Awarded to Adaptive Digital Systems, Inc. for Covert Audio and Video Equipment</td>
<td>$1,488,948</td>
<td>$1,475,388</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Grant Awarded to the National Children's Advocacy Center, Huntsville, Alabama</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of OJP's Victim Compensation Grants Awarded to the State of Alaska, Violent Crimes Compensation Board, Anchorage, Alaska</td>
<td>$248,828</td>
<td>$242,288</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of OJP's and the OVW's Cooperative Agreements Awarded to White Bison, Inc., Colorado Springs, Colorado</td>
<td>$48,819</td>
<td>$24,669</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of OJP's Grants Awarded to the Georgia Department of Juvenile Justice, Decatur, Georgia</td>
<td>$604,051</td>
<td>$433,727</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of the Chicago Police Department's Equitable Sharing Program Activities, Chicago, Illinois</td>
<td>$49,273</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of OJP's Victim Assistance Grants Awarded to the Kentucky Justice and Public Safety Cabinet, Frankfort, Kentucky</td>
<td>$1,560,785</td>
<td>$1,481,363</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of the OVW's Grants Awarded to Inspire Action for Social Change, Montana City, Montana</td>
<td>$66,510</td>
<td>$58,409</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of the OVW's Tribal Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Coalitions Program Grants Awarded to the Montana Native Women's Coalition, Billings, Montana</td>
<td>$333,318</td>
<td>$186,785</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount 1</td>
<td>Amount 2</td>
<td>Amount 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of OJP's Victim Compensation and Emergency Assistance Grants Awarded</td>
<td>$353,529</td>
<td>$319,550</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the State of Nevada Department of Health and Human Services, Carson City, Nevada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of the Bureau of Justice Assistance 2020 Republican Presidential Candidate Nominating Convention Grant Awarded to Charlotte, North Carolina</td>
<td>$5,838</td>
<td>$5,838</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of the OVW's Grants Awarded to the Oklahoma Coalition Against Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma</td>
<td>$874,932</td>
<td>$874,932</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of OJP's Victim Compensation Grants Awarded to the Tennessee Department of Treasury, Nashville, Tennessee</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit of the OVW's Technical Assistance Awards to the National Center for State Courts, Williamsburg, Virginia</td>
<td>$35,790</td>
<td>$26,056</td>
<td>$1,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal (Audits Performed by the DOJ OIG)</strong></td>
<td>$5,697,917</td>
<td>$5,138,355</td>
<td>$9,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audits Performed by State/Local Auditors and Independent Public Accounting Firms Under the Single Audit Act</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth of Pennsylvania FY 2020</td>
<td>$179,816</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of North Carolina FY 2020</td>
<td>$2,098</td>
<td>$2,098</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal (Audits Performed by State/Local Auditors and Independent Public Accounting Firms Under the Single Audit Act)</strong></td>
<td>$181,914</td>
<td>$2,098</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$5,879,831</td>
<td>$5,140,453</td>
<td>$9,116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 Evaluations, Inspections, Special Reviews, and Other Releases

Evaluation and Inspections Division

Limited-Scope Review of EOIR’s Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic

Review of the USMS’s Tactical Training Officer Program

Key Insights: COVID-19 in Correctional and Detention Facilities


Staff Perceptions of the BOP’s Management of the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Follow-Up Survey of BOP Staff

Review of the FBI’s Adjudication Process for Misconduct Investigations

Investigations Division

MAM: Notification of Concerns Regarding Lack of Department Policy Requiring Express Authorization for Department Attorneys to Participate in the Criminal or Civil Investigation or Prosecution of Former Clients

MAM: Notification of Urgent Security Concerns Involving Staff Entering BOP Facilities

MAM: Notification of Concerns regarding Use of Photographs of FBI Employees for Online Undercover Operations

MAM: Notification of Security Concerns at the BOP’s Camp Locations

MAM: Notification of Concerns Identified in Connection with the BOP’s Procurement of Air Ambulance Services

Oversight & Review Division

Nothing to report this period.
6 Peer Reviews

Peer Reviews Conducted by another OIG

Audit Division
The most recent peer review of the Audit Division was performed by the Department of Labor (DOL) OIG. In its report issued March 27, 2019, the DOJ OIG received a peer review rating of pass for its system of quality control in effect for the year ended September 30, 2018. The DOL OIG did not make any recommendations.

Evaluation and Inspections Division
A peer review of the Evaluation and Inspections Division was performed by a team of staff from the U.S. Postal Service OIG. In the report issued on September 9, 2021, the team determined that the Evaluation and Inspections Division generally met seven of CIGIE's Quality Standards for Inspection and Evaluation (2012) and generally complied with its own internal policies and procedures.

Investigations Division
The Investigations Division underwent a peer review performed by the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration (TIGTA) in March 2021, during the previous semiannual reporting period. However, due to the coronavirus pandemic, there was a delay in the report's release, and it was received in July 2021, during the Fall 2021 semiannual reporting period. TIGTA OIG found that the DOJ OIG is compliant with the quality standards established by the CIGIE and the Attorney General Guidelines for Inspectors General with Statutory Law Enforcement Authority. There are no outstanding recommendations.

Peer Reviews Conducted by the OIG

Audit Division
The Audit Division did not conduct any peer reviews during this reporting period.

Evaluation and Inspections Division
The Evaluation and Inspections Division did not conduct any peer reviews during this reporting period.

Investigations Division
The Investigations Division did not conduct any peer reviews during this reporting period.
## Reporting Requirements

The IG Act specifies reporting requirements for semiannual reports. The requirements are listed below and indexed to the applicable pages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IG Act References</th>
<th>Reporting Requirements</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 4(a)(2)</td>
<td>Review of Legislation and Regulations</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(1)</td>
<td>Description of Significant Problems, Abuses, and Deficiencies</td>
<td>12-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(2)</td>
<td>Description of Significant Recommendations for Corrective Actions</td>
<td>12-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(3)</td>
<td>Identification of Significant Recommendations for Which Corrective Actions Have Not Been Completed</td>
<td>53-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(4)</td>
<td>Summary of Matters Referred to Prosecutive Authorities</td>
<td>6, 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(5)</td>
<td>Summary of Reports of Refusal to Provide Information or Assistance</td>
<td>Nothing to Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(6)</td>
<td>Listing of Audit, Inspection, and Evaluation Reports</td>
<td>63-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(7)</td>
<td>Summary of Significant Reports</td>
<td>12-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(8)</td>
<td>Statistical Tables of Total Numbers of Audit, Inspection, and Evaluation Reports and Total Value of Questioned Costs</td>
<td>51&lt;sup&gt;27&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(9)</td>
<td>Statistical Tables of Total Numbers of Audit, Inspection, and Evaluation Reports and Total Value of Funds Recommended to Be Put to Better Use</td>
<td>52&lt;sup&gt;28&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(10)</td>
<td>Prior OIG Reports Unresolved, Uncommented Upon, or Containing Unimplemented Recommendations</td>
<td>18&lt;sup&gt;29&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(11)</td>
<td>Description and Explanation of the Reasons for Any Significant Revised Management Decision</td>
<td>Nothing to Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(12)</td>
<td>Information About Any Significant Management Decisions with Which the Inspector General Disagreed</td>
<td>Nothing to Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(13)</td>
<td>Information Described in FFMIA Section 804(b)</td>
<td>Nothing to Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(14)</td>
<td>Peer Reviews Conducted by Another OIG</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(15)</td>
<td>Outstanding Recommendations from Peer Reviews of the OIG</td>
<td>Nothing to Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(16)</td>
<td>Outstanding Recommendations from Peer Reviews Conducted by the OIG</td>
<td>Nothing to Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(17)</td>
<td>Statistical Table Pertaining to OIG Investigations</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(18)</td>
<td>Description of Metrics for OIG Investigative Table</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(19)</td>
<td>Reports Involving Substantiated Allegations Against Senior Government Employees</td>
<td>Investigative Narratives Marked with an Asterisk (*) on pages 21-23, 25, 28, 41, 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(20)</td>
<td>Instance of Whistleblower Retaliation</td>
<td>Nothing to Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(21)</td>
<td>Attempts to Interfere with OIG Independence</td>
<td>Nothing to Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5(a)(22)</td>
<td>Inspections, Evaluations, Audits, and Investigations of Senior Government Employees Undisclosed to the Public</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENDNOTES

1. This figure includes OIG audits, reports, evaluations, inspections, special reviews, surveys, issue alerts, and management advisory memoranda issued during the reporting period. This figure does not include Single Audit Act reports, which are identified below, or Reports of Investigation. For this period, the figure also includes one report issued by the Pandemic Response Accountability Committee to which the OIG’s Evaluation and Inspections Division contributed.

2. This figure includes all recommendations, including those for management improvements and dollar-related recommendations, which are recommendations for components to remedy questioned costs and funds to be put to better use.

3. This figure includes audit reports and other releases as shown in Appendix 3.

4. See glossary for definition of “Questioned Costs.”

5. This figure includes reports and a survey.

6. These figures represent allegations entered into the OIG’s complaint tracking system. They do not include the approximate 7,142 additional Hotline, email, and phone contacts that were processed and deemed non-jurisdictional and outside the purview of the federal government.

7. Includes civil, criminal and non-judicial fines, restitutions, recoveries, assessments, penalties, and forfeitures.

8. An asterisk (**) indicates that the investigative summary is responsive to IG Act § 5(a)(19).

9. Employee complaint is defined as an allegation received from whistleblowers, defined broadly as complaints received from employees and applicants with the Department, or its contractors, subcontractors, or grantees, either received directly from the complainant by the OIG Hotline, the field offices, or others in the OIG, or from a Department component if the complaint otherwise qualifies and is opened as an investigation.

10. This number reflects cases closed during the reporting period regardless of when they were opened.

11. See glossary for definition of “Questioned Costs.”

12. See glossary for definition of “Unsupported Costs.”

13. Includes reports previously issued for which no management decision has been made. See glossary for definition of “Management Decision.”

14. Of the audit reports issued during this period with questioned costs, two were Single Audit Act reports.

15. Includes instances in which management has taken action to resolve the issue and/or the matter is being closed because remedial action was taken. See glossary for definition of “Disallowed Costs.”
16  See glossary for definition of “Funds Recommended to Be Put to Better Use.”
17  Reports previously issued for which no management decision has been made.
18  Includes instances in which management has taken action to resolve the issue and/or the matter is being closed because remedial action was taken.
19  In addition to its own five products, the Evaluation and Inspections Division contributed to the joint Key Insights: COVID-19 in Correctional and Detention Facilities Report, which was issued by the Pandemic Response Accountability Committee in May 2021.
20  These figures represent allegations entered into the OIG’s complaint tracking system. They do not include the approximate 7,142 additional Hotline, email, and phone contacts that were processed and deemed non-jurisdictional and/or outside the purview of the federal government.
21  At the conclusion of an investigation, one or more type of report is prepared. The prepared report may be an abbreviated report of investigation or a full report of investigation. In addition, an investigative summary for public posting on the OIG public website may be prepared for investigations involving senior government employees. The number of reports issued represents one report for each investigation.
22  The number of indictments reported include both sealed and not sealed.
23  This number includes all criminal and civil referrals to DOJ for a prosecutorial decision whether they were ultimately accepted or declined with the caveat that if an investigation was referred to more than one DOJ office for a prosecutorial decision, the referral to DOJ was only counted once. The number reported as referred represents referrals for both individuals and or other legal entities.
24  The number reported as referred represents referrals for both individuals and or other legal entities.
25  These audits are reviewed by the OIG to assess the quality and the adequacy of the entity’s management of federal funds. The OIG issues these audits to the responsible component and performs follow-up on the audit reports’ findings and recommendations.
26  In addition to its own five products, the Evaluation and Inspections Division contributed to the joint Key Insights: COVID-19 in Correctional and Detention Facilities Report, which was issued by the Pandemic Response Accountability Committee in May 2021.
27  The OIG did not release any inspection or evaluation reports this period that identified questioned costs.
28  The OIG did not release any inspection or evaluation reports this period that identified funds recommended to be put to better use.
29  This information is provided pursuant to IG Act § 5(a)(10)(C). The OIG does not have any information to report pursuant to IG Act § 5(a)(10)(A)-(B) for this reporting period.
30  This information is provided pursuant to IG Act § 5(a)(22)(B). The OIG does not have any information to report pursuant to IG Act § 5(a)(22)(A).
REPORT WASTE, FRAUD, ABUSE, OR MISCONDUCT

To report allegations of waste, fraud, abuse, or misconduct regarding Department of Justice programs, employees, contractors, or grants, please go to the DOJ OIG website at oig.justice.gov or call the OIG’s Hotline at (800) 869-4499.

The OIG website has complaint forms that allow you to report the following to the OIG:

- General allegations of fraud, waste, and abuse in Department programs or by Department employees;
- Contract fraud, including mandatory disclosures required by contractors when they have credible evidence of violations of the civil False Claims Act or certain violations of criminal law;
- Grant fraud, including fraud, waste, or abuse related to the Department’s award of Recovery Act funds; and
- Violations of civil rights or civil liberties by Department employees.

To give information by mail or facsimile, please send to:

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of the Inspector General
Investigations Division
ATTN: OIG Hotline
950 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C., 20530
Fax: (202) 616-9881

For further information on how to report a complaint to the OIG, please call (800) 869-4499.