



*Association of Inspectors GeneralSM
Historic Carpenters' Hall
320 Chestnut Street
Philadelphia, PA 19106*

PRINCIPLES AND STANDARDS FOR OFFICES OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

- Statement of Principles
- Quality Standards for Offices
- Quality Standards for Investigations
- Quality Standards for Inspections, Evaluations, and Reviews
- Quality Standards for Audits

May 2004

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction	1
Statement of Principles For Offices of Inspector General	3
Basis of Legal Authority for an Office of the Inspector General	3
Quality Standards.....	6
Quality Standards For Offices of Inspector General	7
Introduction	7
Independence.....	8
Planning	10
Organizing.....	12
Staff Qualifications.....	13
Direction and Control.....	15
Coordination	17
Reporting.....	18
Confidentiality	20
Quality Assurance	22
Quality Standards for Investigations	25
Introduction	25
General Standards.....	26
A. Staff Qualifications.....	26
B. Independence	26
C. Due Professional Care	26
Qualitative Standards.....	28
A. Quality Control	28
B. Planning	28
C. Data Collection and Analysis	29
D. Evidence.....	30
E. Timeliness	30
F. Reporting.....	30
G. Confidentiality	31
H. Follow-Up	31
Quality Standards For Inspections, Evaluations, And Reviews.....	33
Introduction	33
General Standards.....	34
A. Staff Qualifications.....	34
B. Independence	34
C. Due Professional Care	34
Qualitative Standards.....	37
A. Quality Control	37
B. Planning	37
C. Data Collection and Analysis	38
D. Evidence.....	39
E. Timeliness	40
F. Fraud and Other Illegal Acts.....	40
G. Reporting	41
H. Confidentiality.....	41
Quality Standards for Audits	43
Appendix.....	

This page intentionally left blank

INTRODUCTION

The ASSOCIATION OF INSPECTORS GENERALSM was organized on October 26, 1996. As stated in the Association's Articles of Organization, Constitution and Bylaws, the purpose of the Association is to:

foster and promote public accountability and integrity in the general areas of the prevention, examination, investigation, audit, detection, elimination and prosecution of fraud, waste and abuse through policy research and analysis; standardization of practices, policies, and ethics, encouragement of professional development by providing and sponsoring educational programs, and the establishment of professional qualifications, certification, and licensing.

On October 27, 1999, the Board of Directors of the Association voted to create a committee to establish generally accepted inspector general principles and standards. The committee prepared these principles and standards following an open procedure that allowed for due process. The committee drafted the principles and standards, basing the standards on quality standards for federal inspectors general issued by the President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency. The drafts were developed for use by the broad range of inspector general offices throughout the nation. Each of the drafts was then distributed to the federal, state, and local inspector general community for review and comment. The committee considered all comments in detail, revised the drafts as appropriate, and presented the drafts to the Board of Directors.* On May 16, 2001, the Board of Directors of the Association found that the draft documents represent generally accepted principles, quality standards, and best practices generally applicable to federal, state, and local offices of inspectors general. On that date the Board formally approved the following five documents:

- Statement of Principles for Offices of Inspector General
- Quality Standards for Offices of Inspector General
- Quality Standards for Investigations by Offices of Inspector General
- Quality Standards for Inspections, Evaluations and Reviews by Offices of Inspector General
- Quality Standards for Audits by Offices of Inspector General

The Association recommends that offices of inspector general adopt these documents for their use with the following or similar language:

The generally accepted principles and quality standards, formally approved by the ASSOCIATION OF INSPECTORS GENERALSM on 16 May 2001, are hereby adopted by this office insofar as they do not conflict with statute, regulation, executive order, or other policy of this office.

Information about the committee and the process that it followed is in the appendix.

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES FOR OFFICES OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Accountability is key to maintaining public trust in our democracy. Inspectors general at all levels of government are entrusted with fostering and promoting accountability and integrity in government. While the scope of this oversight varies among Offices of Inspectors General (OIGs), the level of public trust, and hence public expectation, embodied in these offices remains exceptionally high. The public expects OIGs to hold government officials accountable for efficient, cost-effective government operations and to prevent, detect, identify, expose and eliminate fraud, waste, corruption, illegal acts and abuse. This public expectation is best served by inspectors general when they follow the basic principles of integrity, objectivity, independence, confidentiality, professionalism, competence, courage, trust, honesty, fairness, forthrightness, public accountability and respect for others and themselves. Inspectors general are granted substantial powers to perform their duties. In exercising these powers, inspectors general regard their offices as a public trust, and their prime duty as serving the public interest.

By the nature of their work, OIGs are held to the same or higher expectations than other government officials in using prudence with public resources. Because OIGs often identify and describe wasteful use of public resources by organizations under scrutiny, they have a concomitant duty to conduct their own work in an efficient and effective manner. OIG work should adhere to professional standards and include quality controls to assure that all products are of the highest possible quality. This requires an internal quality assurance program and suggests periodic external quality reviews for each OIG.

An OIG is judged by the results of its efforts and the timeliness, accuracy, objectivity, fairness, and usefulness of these results. These are the cornerstones of OIG accountability. Qualitative and quantitative performance measures should be developed measured internally, and reported to the public.

BASIS OF LEGAL AUTHORITY FOR AN OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

An OIG should be formally created as a legal entity. The Association recommends that the OIG be established by statute or, if necessary, by executive order. The statute should establish the OIG's mandate, authority, and powers; provide for confidentiality of records and proceedings; identify qualifications for the inspector general and staff; protect the office's independence; and provide protection to whistleblowers.

A. Mandate: The statute should state the OIGs mission and identify the operations, programs, departments, or agencies subject to the OIG's jurisdiction.

Commentary: The Association recommends that the legal authority establish a mission that encompasses prevention and detection of fraud, waste, and abuse; efficient and effective use of public resources; and promotion of public integrity.

B. Authority: The statute should authorize the OIG to conduct specific functions, such as:

- to audit, inspect, evaluate, and investigate the activities, records and individuals affiliated with contracts and procurements undertaken by the governmental entity and any other official act or function of the governmental entity.
- to conduct criminal, civil and administrative investigations.
- to engage in prevention activities, including but not limited to: review of legislation; review of rules, regulations, policies, procedures, and transactions; training and education.
- to refer matters for further civil, criminal, and administrative action to appropriate administrative and prosecutorial agencies.
- to conduct joint investigations and projects with other oversight or law enforcement agencies.
- to issue public reports.
- to establish policies and procedures to guide functions and processes conducted by the OIG.
- to attend any meetings held by agencies.
- to recoup the cost of investigations from nongovernmental entities involved in willful misconduct.

C. Powers: The statute should grant the OIG specific powers and identify any limits on those powers, such as:

- the power of subpoena for persons and documents, requirements for service of the subpoena, confidentiality of subpoenaed documents and testimony, and subpoena enforcement provisions.
- law enforcement authority (police powers).

- access to all records maintained by or available to any governmental entity relating in any way relate to the OIG's duties and responsibilities.
- access to the head of any public entity, when necessary for any purpose pertaining to the OIG's responsibilities.
- access to testimony or documents from any individual, firm, or nongovernmental entity relating to the duties and responsibilities of the OIG.
- require public employees to report to the OIG information regarding fraud, waste, corruption, illegal acts, and abuse.

D. Confidentiality: The statute should authorize the OIG to maintain appropriate confidentiality of records and, to the extent practicable, of the identities of individuals who provide information to the OIG, unless it is necessary to make such records or identities public in the performance of his/her duties. The statute should impose penalties for breach of confidentiality.

E. Inspector general and staff qualifications: The statute should provide requirements for the position of inspector general and staff. The inspector general should be selected without regard to political affiliation on the basis of integrity, capability for strong leadership, and demonstrated ability in accounting, auditing, financial analysis, law, management analysis, public administration, investigation, or criminal justice administration or other appropriate fields. The inspector general should hold at appointment, or be required to obtain within a time certain after appointment, certification as a Certified Inspector General.

Commentary: The Association established the Certified Inspector General (CIG) program in 1999 after identifying six areas of core competency. Qualified participants (inspectors general and experienced senior staff) can earn the CIG designation by attending the Inspectors General Institute. Highly qualified instructors present segments on the following six areas of core competency:

- *Context of the inspector general function*
- *Ethics*
- *Public management issues*
- *Legal issues*
- *Audits, inspections, and reviews*
- *Investigating fraud, waste, and abuse*

Certified Inspectors General are required to adhere to the continuing professional education standard contained herein in order to retain their certification.

The staff of the OIG should collectively possess the variety of knowledge, skills, and experience needed to accomplish the OIG mission. The OIG should ensure that staff receive appropriate training and that OIG staff attain and maintain appropriate professional licensure and certification.

F. Independence: The statute should contain provisions to help establish and maintain the independence of the inspector general and the OIG. The statute should address:

- *Appointment and removal* - Procedures should be established for the appointment of the inspector general and for the removal of the inspector general only for cause.
- *Term* – The inspector general should be appointed for a fixed term.
- *Organizational placement* – The OIG should be placed in the governmental structure to maximize independence from operations, programs, policies, and procedures over which the OIG has authority.
- *Funding* – The OIG should be funded through a mechanism that will provide adequate funding to perform its mission without subjecting it to internal or external impairments on its independence.

G. Whistleblower protection – The statute should provide protections to complainants who, as a result of their complaints to the OIG, might be subject to retaliation by their employers.

QUALITY STANDARDS

OIGs should strive to deliver outstanding products that are timely, objective, accurate, balanced, and presented in such a way that appropriate officials will be able to act on the information conveyed. Conclusions and recommendations should be well thought out and adequately supported by objective evidence. In order to ensure that these characteristics of competence are routinely integrated into OIG work, the Board of Directors of the Association formally approved the following quality standards:

- Quality Standards for Offices of Inspector General
- Quality Standards for Investigations by Offices of Inspector General
- Quality Standards for Inspections, Evaluations and Reviews by Offices of Inspector General
- Quality Standards for Audits by Offices of Inspector General

QUALITY STANDARDS FOR OFFICES OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

This document contains quality standards for the management, operation, and conduct of Offices of Inspector General (OIGs). They have been formulated and approved by the ASSOCIATION OF INSPECTORS GENERALSM. The standards are advisory and are not intended to impose requirements. They are for OIG use to guide the conduct of official duties in a professional manner.

Scope

OIGs are established with generally similar missions, but often under differing authorities and mandates. These differences, as well as other factors, may affect the practices of various offices and, consequently, the applicability of standards to these offices.

Background

In accomplishing their missions, OIGs use a variety of approaches. For example, audits, investigations, and inspections are used as a basis for evaluating agency programs and operations, for identifying and presenting for prosecution criminal and civil wrongdoing, and addressing administrative misconduct. Reviews of allegations received through hotlines and other means help to identify high-risk areas and determine where internal controls should be strengthened. Some OIGs use a variety of techniques and titles, such as fraud control programs, inspections, operational surveys, and other special activities to focus attention on agency needs to improve operations. Reviews of legislation and regulations serve to strengthen controls and ensure that the public interest is protected without imposing unnecessary burdens. Reports to public officials, agency heads, agency management, legislative bodies, and prosecutorial authorities keep appropriate officials apprised of the results of OIG activities.

Basic Premise

Public office carries with it a responsibility to apply public resources economically, efficiently, and effectively with the integrity necessary to maintain the public trust. Because OIGs have a unique mission in government related to public office responsibility, the Association has formally approved the following general quality standards.

INDEPENDENCE

A. General Standard

The inspector general and OIG staff involved in performing or supervising any assignment should be free from personal or external impairments to independence and should constantly maintain an independent attitude and appearance.

B. Background

The inspector general is responsible for establishing and maintaining independence so that OIG opinions, conclusions, judgments, and recommendations will be impartial and viewed by others as impartial. The inspector general and OIG staff should consider not only whether they are independent and whether their own attitudes and beliefs permit them to be independent, but also whether there is anything about their situation which might lead others to question their independence. All situations deserve consideration since it is important that the OIG be as independent as possible and impartial in fact and in appearance.

The inspector general and OIG staff need to consider both personal and external impairments. If either of these affect the OIG's ability to perform its work impartially, the inspector general should decline to perform the work and report the circumstances to the appropriate official. If the inspector general cannot decline to perform the work, the impairment should be disclosed in any resulting report, along with any potential impact the impairment might have on the outcome of the report's conclusions.

C. Personal Impairments

There are circumstances in which the Inspector General and OIG staff cannot be impartial because their personal situations may create actual or perceived conflicts of interest. In such situations, the OIG staff who are affected by these circumstances should disqualify themselves from an OIG review and allow the work to continue without them. Personal impairments may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Official, professional, personal, or financial relationships that might appear to lead the OIG to limit the extent of the work, to limit disclosure, or to alter the outcome of the work.
- Preconceived ideas toward activities, individuals, groups, organizations, objectives, or particular programs that could bias the outcome of the work.

- Previous involvement, especially recent involvement, in a decision-making or management capacity that could affect the work.
- Biases that may affect the objectivity of the OIG staff member in the performance work.
- Conduct of a review by an individual who had previously performed work subject to review.

D. External Impairments

Factors external to the OIG can restrict the efforts or interfere with the OIGs ability to form independent and objective opinions and conclusions. For example, under the following conditions work could be adversely affected and the OIG would not have complete freedom to make an independent and objective judgment:

1. Interference or undue influence in the selection, appointment, and employment of OIG staff.
2. Restrictions on funds or other resources dedicated to the OIG, such as timely, independent legal counsel, that could prevent the OIG from performing essential work.
3. Interference or undue influence in the OIGs selection of what is to be examined, determination of scope and timing of work or approach to be used, the appropriate content of any resulting report, or resolution of audit findings.
4. Influences that jeopardize continued employment of the inspector general or individual OIG staff for reasons other than competency or the need for OIG services.
5. Interference with OIG access to documents or individuals necessary to perform OIG work.
6. Improper political pressures that affect the selection of areas for review, the performance of those reviews, and the objective reporting of conclusions without fear of censure.

PLANNING

A. General Standard

The OIG should maintain a planning system for assessing the nature, scope, trends, vulnerabilities, special problems, and inherent risks of agency programs and operations and for use in establishing the goals, objectives, and tasks to be accomplished by the OIG within a specific time period.

B. Background

The inspector general is responsible for ensuring that the resources available to the OIG are used as efficiently and effectively as possible. Execution of this responsibility requires a planning process designed to maximize the impact of the OIG in detecting and preventing fraud, waste, and abuse and in encouraging economy, efficiency, and effectiveness, with the commitment of resources needed to accomplish each OIG task.

C. Elements of the Planning Process

The OIG should carefully consider the universe subject to the OIG's jurisdiction. Analysis of this universe will identify the nature of programs and operations, their scope and dollar magnitude, their staffing and budgetary trends, their perceived vulnerabilities, and their inherent risks.

The OIG should develop a strategy for screening those programs and operations identified as potential subjects for review. The strategy should be designed to OIG resources effectively. Total OIG capabilities, programs, and resources, should be considered in developing this strategy, which may encompass activities such as audits, investigations, inspections, operational surveys, vulnerability assessments, internal control reviews, and fraud control studies. The OIG should also consider the plans of other organizations. Strategic planning, in this context, need not be limited to a specific time period and should be a flexible process that allows for appropriate changes.

Based on the above analysis, the OIG should set priorities and create action plans. Because resources are rarely sufficient to meet requirements, the OIG must choose among competing priorities. In making these choices, OIG considerations may include:

1. Vulnerabilities to fraud and other crimes, waste, abuse, and mismanagement.
2. Needs and priorities of the agency, legislative bodies, and other appropriate officials.

3. Benefits likely to result from OIG review, such as better internal controls; improved economy, efficiency, and effectiveness; detection and prevention of fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement; and cost recovery.
4. Probable cost-effectiveness of each selection, (OIG resources that would be expended compared to anticipated benefits).
5. Impacts of alternative OIG review approaches: for example, identifying major systemic problems as opposed to concentrating on individual manifestations of these systemic problems.

D. Prevention

OIG planning should incorporate a strategy to identify the causes of fraud, waste, and abuse, and a commitment to help overcome these problems. OIG prevention efforts may include:

1. A routine procedure for OIG staff to identify and report prevention opportunities identified in their work, and for OIG managers to refer these to appropriate officials.
2. Special awareness and training initiatives designed to orient public or private program personnel to systemic weaknesses in their programs and operations;
3. Reviews and comments on initial designs of new programs and operations;
4. Analyses of audit, investigation, and other OIG reports to identify trends and patterns;
5. Education and training programs to build the capacity of public officials and other to operate efficiently, effectively, and ethically; and
6. An effective means for tracking recommendations.

ORGANIZING

A. General Standard

The inspector general is responsible for organizing the OIG to assure efficient and effective deployment of the OIG's resources.

B. Background

The fact that each OIG is different and approaches its mission within widely differing contexts precludes prescription of a consistent organizational structure for OIGs. An inspector general may wish to emphasize such areas as fraud control, investigations, vulnerability assessments, internal controls, inspections, operational surveys, or computer security. The following section provides several basic organizational principles that the inspector general may apply.

C. Organizational Principles

1. Duties and responsibilities should be clearly assigned within the OIG structure. There need not be a separate organizational unit for each duty and responsibility. The inspector general should appoint staff needed to perform the OIG mission effectively.
2. The OIG organizational structure should foster coordinated, balanced, and integrated accomplishment of the OIG mission, goals, and objectives.
3. Recruiting, staffing, and training should support the OIG mission and organizational structure.
4. Quality assurance and internal evaluation functions should be kept as independent as possible of the OIG operational units. Where limited size or resources preclude such organizational independence, quality assurance and evaluation assessments should be conducted by personnel not assigned to the OIG units reviewed.

STAFF QUALIFICATIONS

A. General Standard

OIG staff should collectively possess the variety of knowledge, skills, and experience needed to accomplish the OIG mission.

B. Background

Today, in a period of rapid technological change and unprecedented management demands, special levels of staff competence are needed throughout government. Because of the unique nature of their mission, OIGs require staff capable of efficiently and effectively dealing with a multitude of different programs and activities, many of them representing extremely complex and sophisticated areas of expertise. OIG objectives cannot be achieved without OIG staff who are professionally and technically qualified to accomplish this.

C. Basic Qualifications

The qualifications noted below relate to the collective knowledge, skills and experience of an OIG, not necessarily to any one staff member. It is the inspector general's responsibility to decide which skills can be obtained through support service contractors or outside consultants, more effective use of staff members who already possess the requisite skills, staff development and training, or new recruitment.

These qualifications include the following:

1. Knowledge of OIG statutory requirements and applicable directives, rules, and regulations.
2. Working familiarity with the organizations, programs, activities, and functions within the OIG's area of responsibility.
3. Skills needed to evaluate the efficiency, economy, and effectiveness of program performance within the OIG's area of responsibility.
4. Knowledge of government policies, requirements, and guidelines related to a particular task.
5. State-of-the-art technical skills as needed such as computer auditing, detection of computer fraud, review of information technology design requirements, statistical sampling and analysis, factor analysis, trend analysis, systems and management analysis, undercover techniques, and covert surveillance.

6. Appropriate licensure and certification in the professional activities conducted by the OIG (for example, Certified Inspector General, Certified Fraud Examiner, Certified Public Accountant, etc.).
7. Managerial skills for supervisors and team leaders.
8. Knowledge of entities, groups, and individuals that interact with government agencies and programs subject to the OIG's jurisdiction.

D. Skills Assessment and Staff Development

To ensure that the OIG staff possesses needed skills, the inspector general should assess the skills of OIG staff, determine the extent to which these skills match OIG staff requirements, and the methods by which any deficiencies can be corrected. In staff development, the inspector general should identify opportunities for staff development to meet the OIG's skill needs.

E. Continuing Professional Education/Development

OIG staff performing investigations, inspections, evaluations, reviews, or audits need to maintain their professional competence through continuing education (CPE). Therefore, each staff person who performs investigations, inspections, evaluations, reviews, or audits should complete, every 2 years, at least 40 hours of CPE that directly enhance the person's professional proficiency. Dependent upon the focus of the office, at least 12 of the 40 hours of CPE should be in subjects directly related to the person's primary responsibility (investigation, inspection, evaluation, review, or audit), the government environment, or the specific or unique environment in which the entity subject to examination operates.

DIRECTION AND CONTROL

A. General Standard

The inspector general should direct and control OIG operations to ensure that (1) all activities are adequately supervised, (2) performance is consistent with professional standards, and (3) periodic internal assessments are made of OIG activities and accomplishments.

B. Supervision

OIG supervisors at all levels should ensure that OIG staff receive effective direction, guidance, and oversight, and training. Proper supervision is required throughout project assignments. This includes making sure that personnel explicitly understand, without ambiguity, the nature, scope, content and timing of the work assigned to them, and what product is expected. It also includes sufficient interim checks to determine whether jobs are on schedule and are being executed in accordance with plans, so that necessary mid-course corrections can be made without disrupting the assignments. Supervision should be exercised at each level of the organization and for each level of task responsibility. The actual amount of supervision provided will vary, based on resources available, complexity, and sensitivity of the work, and experience of staff assigned to the assignment.

C. Quality Control

The OIG should establish procedures to ensure adequate quality control over its work. Quality control is an inherent responsibility of the OIG supervisors. Quality control and quality assurance are not synonymous. Quality assurance (discussed in a separate standard) is a formal and distinct effort intended to ensure that the entire OIGs are adhering to professional standards and the dictates of sound management. Quality control is the process by which supervisors ensure that the work of their immediate staff meets professional standards.

D. Assessing OIG Accomplishments

The OIG should periodically assess its results and accomplishments. Goals and objectives, no matter how carefully developed, are of little value unless progress toward meeting them is evaluated. The OIG should have a strategic plan that details its vision, mission, goals, objectives, strategies, and performance measures against which it expects to be held accountable. The OIG should also have a planning process to show expected performance and a management information system showing past performance and results. Realistic assessment of performance information is essential to identify

shortfalls in performance, to improve future operations, to determine whether goals are reasonable and attainable, and to affix accountability for results.

The OIG should also evaluate, in terms of cost/benefit and other appropriate factors, the feasibility of different approaches to detecting fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement, and encouraging economy and efficiency. The OIG should be innovative in searching for and implementing new approaches to discharging its mission. Knowledge gained from these reviews may be used in various ways, such as, to improve the OIG's planning processes, to initiate more cost-effective approaches, to indicate the need to reorganize or improve OIG operations, or to identify the need for additional OIG resources and the concomitant benefits to be provided by the OIG.

COORDINATION

A. General Standard

The OIG should coordinate its activities internally and with other components of government to assure effective and efficient use of available resources.

B. Background

The inspector general is responsible for ensuring coordination of work planned and in process so that effective and efficient use made of limited resources and to avoid fragmentation or duplication of effort.

C. Elements of Coordination

1. In planning work to be performed, the OIG should coordinate with appropriate officials. The OIG should also take into consideration requests from legislative bodies, requests from other agencies and organizations, and complaints from employees and private citizens.
2. In fulfilling the responsibilities of the OIG, the OIG should also take appropriate steps to minimize unnecessarily duplicative work. In this regard, the OIG should coordinate its own work internally and with other groups performing independent evaluations of operations and programs.
3. Upon beginning a review and wherever else appropriate, the OIG should seek information concerning prior reviews of that activity or function. Data from such reviews should be utilized to the extent possible to reduce additional work by the OIG.
4. OIG staff should be alert to situations or problems that might affect other governmental organizations. When such situations arise, the OIG should coordinate with other affected organizations, as appropriate. Joint or coordinated reviews, audits, inspections, or investigations may be performed to fulfill the requirements of all parties involved.

REPORTING

A. General Standard

The OIG should keep appropriate officials and the public properly informed of the OIG's activities, findings, recommendations, and accomplishments as consistent with the OIG's mission, legal authority, organizational placement, and confidentiality requirements.

B. Background

Although OIGs typically share similar missions, there are differences among them. They vary in their legal authority, organizational placement, and confidentiality provisions vary considerably. Consequently, each OIG must determine the nature, frequency, and extent of its reporting.

C. Reports to Appropriate Officials

The OIG should inform appropriate officials through oral or written reports of important OIG undertakings, their outcomes, and any problems encountered that warrant the officials' attention. The OIG should alert them as early as possible to instances of criminal behavior or other egregious misconduct and waste that become known to the OIG, to the extent consistent with requirements imposed by confidentiality rules, the prosecutive system, and effective investigation, audit, inspection, or other review by the OIG.

D. Distribution of Final Reports

If authorized or required, final reports on the results of OIG activities should be distributed or otherwise made available to appropriate legislative bodies, interested parties, and the public to the extent consistent with the law, including requirements imposed by confidentiality rules and the prosecutive system.

E. Periodic Reports

If authorized or required, the OIG should issue periodic reports summarizing the OIG's activities, findings, recommendations, and accomplishments since the prior reporting period. The report should contain, to the extent consistent with the OIG's mission, legal authority, and confidentiality requirements:

- a description of significant problems within the OIG's jurisdiction and OIG recommendations for corrective action, including any recommendations for statutory changes;
- identification of each significant recommendation described in previous periodic OIG reports on which corrective action has not been completed;

- a summary of matters referred to prosecutive authorities and the prosecutions, convictions, recoveries and other results from such referrals;
- a summary of civil and administrative referrals and the results from such referrals;
- a list of each audit, inspection, or other report completed during the reporting period; and
- a statement of recommended amendments to the statute, regulations or procedures governing the OIG that would improve the effectiveness or the operation of the OIG.

Such periodic summary reports should be submitted to appropriate executive officials and, if authorized or required, to the appropriate legislative body and the public.

E. Reporting in Emergency Circumstances

If the OIG receives a credible allegation or other evidence of a significant and immediate danger to the health or safety of people or property, the OIG should inform appropriate individuals as soon as possible, consistent with confidentiality requirements.

F. Reporting Criminal Matters

If reasonable grounds exist to believe that there has been a violation of federal, state, or local criminal law and the matter is not subject to the jurisdiction of the OIG, the OIG should expeditiously report the allegation to the appropriate law enforcement authority.

G. Elements of Effective Reporting

All reports, whether written or oral, should 1) be appropriate to the purpose, concise, complete, objective, timely, relevant, free of jargon, and accurate; 2) comply with appropriate professional standards adopted by the OIG (including those for audits, investigations, and inspections, evaluations and reviews); and 3) conform to the OIG's established policies and procedures.

CONFIDENTIALITY

A. General Standard

The OIG should establish and follow procedures for safeguarding the identity of confidential sources and for protecting privileged and confidential information. Specifically, each OIG should ensure that:

- confidential sources who make complaints or provide information to the OIG will not have their identities disclosed without their consent unless the OIG determines that such disclosure is required by law or necessary to further the purposes of an audit, investigation, inspection, evaluation, review, or other inquiry; and
- privileged or confidential information gathered by the OIG will be protected from disclosure unless the OIG determines that such disclosure is required by law or necessary to further the purposes of an audit, investigation, inspection, evaluation, review, or other inquiry.

B. Background

OIGs are in the fact-gathering business. Many facts are gathered from employees or other individuals who might be subject to retribution or harassment if they were known to be cooperating with the OIG. Also, much of the information gathered concerns personal or proprietary matters. For these reasons, it is essential that the OIG comply with all legal mandates in order to safeguard the identities of confidential sources and protect sensitive information compiled during the course of audits, investigations, inspections, evaluations, reviews, or other inquiries. A variety of federal, state, and local government legislation govern this area of activity.

C. General Elements of the Confidentiality Standard

1. The OIG may receive and investigate complaints or information from employees concerning a possible activity constituting a violation of law, rules, or regulations, or mismanagement, waste of funds, abuse of authority or a substantial and specific danger to the public health or safety. The OIG should not, after receipt of such complaint or information, disclose the identity of the employee without the consent of the employee unless the Inspector General determines such disclosure is necessary or is required by statute.
2. OIG records containing the identities of confidential sources or other privileged and confidential information will be appropriately safeguarded.

3. Procedures for releasing OIG records to the public will be established, including the designation of those OIG staff authorized to make disclosure determinations.
4. In making determinations about the release of confidential information, applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations must be considered.

QUALITY ASSURANCE

A. General Standard

The OIG should establish and maintain a quality assurance program to ensure that work performed adheres to established OIG policies and procedures, meets established standards of performance, and is carried out economically, efficiently, and effectively.

B. Background

Because OIGs evaluate how well programs and operations are functioning, they have a special responsibility to ensure that their own operations are as effective as possible. Each OIG should implement a quality assurance program that provides reasonable assurance that the OIG is operating effectively and, specifically, that work performed by the OIG:

- is in accordance with OIG policies, procedures, and plans;
- is guided by the standards in this document and by the standards referenced herein; and,
- is carried out economically, efficiently and effectively.

Quality assurance differs from quality control. Quality control is the responsibility of line managers to ensure that their units and personnel perform work that meets the above standards. Quality assurance, on the other hand, is an evaluative effort conducted by sources external to the units/personnel being reviewed to ensure that the overall work of the OIG meets these standards. Thus, an audit supervisor ensuring that audit reports are properly referenced to working papers is an example of quality control. An independent reviewer evaluating the accuracy of the referencing process is an example of quality assurance, as is a team of external reviewers examining the extent to which the overall office investigative process is following professional standards.

Commentary: The Association recommends that OIGs periodically invite external reviewers to review the OIG's adherence to professional standards adopted by the OIG.

C. Elements of a Quality Assurance Program

1. A quality assurance program should be structured and implemented to assure an objective appraisal. The quality assurance assessments should be conducted by individuals who are not directly involved in the activity or unit being reviewed and

who do not report to the immediate supervisor of that activity or unit.

2. The same professional care should be taken with quality assurance evaluations as with other OIG efforts, including quality of advance preparation, documentation of findings, supportable recommendations, and solicitation of comment from the supervisor of the activity or unit reviewed.
3. Where necessary to facilitate the quality assurance evaluations, an OIG should maintain a management information system that shows the status, progress, and results of OIG effort. Analysis of the data generated by this system should focus attention on particular deficiencies warranting review during quality assurance evaluations. Such analysis, for example, may identify inaccurate analysis, ill-defined scope of work, unclear written work, failure to follow applicable standards, apparent inconsistencies between offices, chronic delays in completing assignments, repeated requests that work be redone, abuse of leave, or failure to adopt new techniques. With such information, the quality assurance program should be able to determine the underlying causes of problems in OIG operations and develop realistic recommendations for correcting the deficiencies.
4. The Inspector General should strive for timely implementation of necessary improvements of office processes.

QUALITY STANDARDS FOR INVESTIGATIONS
BY
OFFICES OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

This document contains quality standards for investigations conducted by Offices of Inspector General (OIGs). They have been formulated and approved by the ASSOCIATION OF INSPECTORS GENERALSM. The standards are advisory and are not intended to impose requirements. They are for OIG use to guide the conduct of official duties in a professional manner.

Scope

OIGs are established with generally similar missions, but often under differing authorities and mandates. These differences, as well as other factors, may affect the practices of various offices and, consequently, the applicability of standards to these offices.

Background

In accomplishing their missions, OIGs use a variety of approaches, including investigative and forensic audit techniques to gather and assess evidence related to alleged wrongdoing; potential violations of laws, rules and regulations, policies, and procedures; or other abuses that impact negatively on the ability of the organization to effectively and efficiently carry out its duties. Normally, investigations focus on obtaining sufficient factual evidence for use in determining whether criminal, civil, or administrative actions should be initiated against the specific parties for their actions or lack of actions. In the course of such investigations, the OIGs might identify high-risk areas and determine where internal controls should be strengthened. These findings are brought to the attention of appropriate officials for corrective action.

Note: Standards are presented in bold, italicized typeface and must be followed if adopted by an OIG. The balance of information in the standards section is suggested best practice, guidance, and clarification for conduct of the function.

GENERAL STANDARDS

A. Staff Qualifications

The first general standard for OIG investigative organizations is:

Individuals assigned to conduct the investigative activities should collectively possess the knowledge, skills, and experience required for the investigative work.

Guidelines

The General Standard of Staff Qualifications contained in the Quality Standards for Offices of Inspector General shall apply to investigations performed by OIG staff.

B. Independence

The second general standard for OIG investigative organizations is:

The Inspector General and OIG staff involved in performing or supervising any investigative assignment must be free from personal or external impairments to independence and should constantly maintain an independent attitude and appearance.

Guidelines

The General Standard of independence contained in the Quality Standards for Offices of Inspector General should apply to investigations performed by OIG staff.

C. Due Professional Care

The third general standard for OIG investigative organizations is:

Due professional care should be used in conducting investigations and in preparing accompanying reports.

Guidelines

Exercising due professional care means using good judgment in choosing investigation subjects and methodology as well as creating accurate and complete investigation documentation and investigative reports. Due professional care presumes a working knowledge consistent with investigation objectives.

Quality Standards for Investigations

Due professional care requires:

- Standards - OIGs and their investigators should follow the Associations professional standards and comply with applicable standards of conduct.
- Thoroughness - Investigations should be conducted in a diligent and complete manner, and reasonable steps should be taken to ensure that sufficient relevant evidence is collected; pertinent issues are sufficiently resolved; and appropriate criminal, civil, contractual, or administrative remedies are considered.
- Legal Requirements - Investigations should be initiated, conducted, and reported in accordance with (a) all applicable laws, rules, and regulations; (b) guidelines from applicable prosecutorial authorities; and (c) internal agency policies and procedures. Investigations will be conducted with due respect for rights and privacy of those involved.
- Appropriate Techniques - Methods and techniques used in each investigation should be appropriate for the circumstances and objectives.
- Objectivity - Evidence should be gathered and reported in a fair, unbiased manner in an effort to determine the validity of alleged improprieties or evaluate the likelihood of violations of statutes, rules, or regulations.
- Ethics - At all times the actions of the OIG investigators should conform with the high standards expected of OIG staff.
- Timeliness - Investigations must be conducted in a timely manner while recognizing the individual complexities of each investigation.
- Accurate and Complete Documentation - Investigative findings, conclusions, and outcomes (such as indictments, convictions, and recoveries) should be supported by adequate documentation, including investigator notes, court orders of judgment and commitment, suspension or debarment notices, settlement agreements, and other documents) in the case file.
- Coordination - Appropriate OIG staff should coordinate investigations with appropriate officials. In cases where civil or administrative actions are necessary, appropriate OIG staff should coordinate actions with prosecutors and other appropriate officials.

QUALITATIVE STANDARDS

A. Quality Control

The first qualitative standard for OIG investigative organizations is:

To ensure quality and expedite the progress of investigations, proper supervision will be exercised from the start of such work to its completion.

Guidelines

The Directing and Controlling Standard and the Quality Assurance Standard set forth in the Quality Standards for Offices of Inspector General should also be followed as applicable.

Supervision adds expert judgment to the work done by less experienced staff and provides necessary training for them. Supervisors should satisfy themselves that investigators clearly understand their assigned tasks before starting the work. Team members should work cooperatively with each other and their supervisors to understand not only what work they are to do and how they are to proceed, but why the work is to be done and what it is expected to accomplish.

Supervisory reviews should determine that:

1. Evidence adequately supports any referrals for possible criminal, civil, or administrative action; findings; conclusions; and recommendations.
2. Investigation objectives are met.
3. Investigative plans are followed, unless deviation is justified and authorized.

Each OIG should develop appropriate procedures for determining and documenting that supervision has been adequate. Each OIG should also develop appropriate internal controls to ensure that investigations conform to these Quality Standards.

B. Planning

The second qualitative standard for OIG investigative organizations is:

Investigative work is to be adequately planned.

Guidelines

The Planning Standard and the Coordinating Standard set forth in the Quality Standards for Offices of Inspector General should also be followed as applicable.

The standard for planning investigations is intended to clarify investigative issues to be addressed in advance of initiating the investigation and includes preparing a written investigative plan. Effective planning provides the basis to clearly identify the investigative issues to be addressed prior to initiating the investigation and includes preparing a written investigative plan spelling out the objectives of the investigation and specific investigative steps to be performed. In this process sufficient effort should be undertaken to assure that investigative objectives will be met within anticipated time constraints of the assignment. In addition, adequate coordination can prevent unnecessary duplication of effort.

C. Data Collection and Analysis

The third qualitative standard for OIG investigative organizations is:

Information and data gathered during an investigation should be carefully documented and organized relative to case objectives.

Guidelines

Appropriate investigative techniques should be chosen and employed to ensure that the data gathered are sufficiently reliable for making judgments regarding the matters being investigated.

Sources of investigative information should be documented in sufficient detail to provide a basis for assessing its reliability. Such documentation should address pertinent questions related to the objectives of the investigation and provide information needed to determine the facts relative to potential violations of laws, rules, regulations, policies and procedures.

Data gathered and analyzed as part of the investigation should be accurately interpreted, logically presented, and maintained in the investigative case file. The basis and support for the results of investigations should be carefully organized and described in the investigative case file.

D. Evidence

The fourth qualitative standard for OIG investigative organizations is:

Sufficient, competent, and relevant evidence is to be obtained to afford a reasonable basis for the investigative findings and conclusions.

Guidelines

- Evidence is *sufficient* if there is enough of it to support the report's findings.
- Evidence used to support findings is *relevant* if it has logical, sensible relationships to those findings.
- Evidence is *competent* to the extent that it is consistent with fact (valid).

E. Timeliness

The fifth qualitative standard for OIG investigative organizations is:

Investigations should be conducted in a timely manner.

Guidelines

Timeliness increases the value of investigations. The nature of investigations also requires that schedules be flexible in order to respond to changing priorities or unforeseen circumstances, such as the need to expand the scope of an investigation or respond to an emergent need caused by other events.

F. Reporting

The sixth qualitative standard for OIG investigative organizations is:

Where appropriate, investigative activity should result in a timely referral for criminal prosecution or written report. All reports shall present factual data accurately, fairly, and objectively, and present the results of investigation in a persuasive manner.

Guidelines

Investigative report language should be clear and concise, recognizing that some assignments deal with highly technical or sensitive material and should be written in terms that are intelligible to informed professionals.

Quality Standards for Investigations

Systemic weaknesses or management problems disclosed in an investigation should be reported to appropriate officials. Normally such disclosures will be made as part of a separate written report including recommendations as to specific corrective actions.

G. Confidentiality

The seventh qualitative standard for OIG investigative organizations is:

The OIG should establish and follow procedures for safeguarding the identity of confidential sources and for protecting privileged and confidential information.

Guidelines

The Confidentiality Standard contained in the Quality Standards for Offices of Inspector General shall apply to investigations performed by OIGs.

H. Follow-Up

The eighth qualitative standard for OIG investigative organizations is:

Appropriate follow-up to administrative or systemic issues identified by investigators should be performed to assure that any recommendations made to appropriate officials are adequately considered and properly addressed.

Guidelines

Ultimate investigative success depends on whether necessary corrective actions are taken. Therefore, each OIG should take steps as necessary to determine whether appropriate officials take timely, complete, and reasonable actions to correct problems identified in investigative reports.

Quality Standards for Investigations

Quality Standards for Investigations

QUALITY STANDARDS FOR INSPECTIONS, EVALUATIONS, AND REVIEWS BY OFFICES OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

This document contains quality standards for inspections, evaluations, and reviews conducted by Offices of Inspector General (OIGs). They have been formulated and adopted by the ASSOCIATION OF INSPECTORS GENERALSM. The standards are advisory and are not intended to impose requirements. They are for OIG use to guide the conduct of official duties in a professional manner.

Scope

OIGs are established with generally similar missions, but often under differing authorities and mandates. These differences, as well as other factors, may affect the practices of various offices and, consequently, the applicability of standards to these offices.

Background

In accomplishing their missions, OIGs use a variety of approaches. For example, audits, investigations, inspections, evaluations, and reviews are used as a basis for evaluating agency programs and operations and for identifying and presenting for prosecution criminal wrongdoing. Reviews of allegations, ongoing or completed investigations, and other means help to identify high-risk areas and determine where internal controls should be strengthened. Reviews of legislation and regulations serve to strengthen controls and ensure that the public interest is protected without imposing unnecessary burdens. Reports to appropriate officials and legislative bodies keep them apprised of the results of OIG activities.

OIGs may have responsibilities that go beyond audits and investigations. This additional work includes inspecting, evaluating, reviewing, studying, and/or analyzing government operations and programs for the purposes of providing information for decision-making, and of making recommendations to improve programs, policies, or procedures. The objectives of these processes include providing a source of factual and analytical information, monitoring compliance, measuring performance, and assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of operations.

Note: Standards are presented in bold, italicized typeface and must be followed if adopted by an OIG. The balance of information in the standards section is suggested best practice, guidance, and clarification for conduct of the function.

GENERAL STANDARDS

A. Staff Qualifications

The first general standard for OIG inspections, evaluations, and reviews is:

Individuals assigned to conduct inspection, evaluation, and review activities should collectively possess the knowledge, skills, and experience required for the work.

Guidelines

The General Standard of Staff Qualifications contained in the Quality Standards for Offices of Inspector General shall apply to inspections, evaluations, and reviews performed by OIG staff.

B. Independence

The second general standard for OIG inspections, evaluations, and reviews is:

The Inspector General and OIG staff involved in performing or supervising any assignment should be free from personal or external impairments to independence and should constantly maintain an independent attitude and appearance.

Guidelines

The General Standard of Independence contained in the Quality Standards for Offices of Inspector General should apply to inspections, evaluations, and reviews performed by OIG staff.

C. Due Professional Care

The third standard for OIG inspections, evaluations, and reviews by an OIG is:

Due professional care should be used in conducting inspections, evaluations, and reviews and in preparing accompanying reports.

Guidelines

Exercising due professional care means using good judgment in choosing inspection, evaluation, and review subjects and methodology; creating accurate and easily read working papers; and preparing reports Due

Quality Standards For Inspections, Evaluations, and Reviews

professional care presumes a working knowledge consistent with the objectives pertinent to the operations to be examined. Due professional care includes obtaining, to the extent possible, a mutual understanding of the inspection, evaluation or review scope, objectives, findings, and conclusions with the entity being reviewed.

Due professional care requires:

- **Standards** - OIGs and their staff should follow the Association's professional standards and comply with applicable standards of conduct. If issues of possible illegal behavior arise, OIG staff should promptly present such information to their supervisors for review and possible referral to the appropriate investigative office. In conducting an inspection, evaluation, or review, staff should employ the methods of inquiry most appropriate for the object of study. They may rely on the work of others to the extent feasible once they satisfy themselves of the quality of the work by appropriate tests or by other acceptable means.
- **Thoroughness** - Inspections, evaluations, and reviews should be conducted in a diligent and complete manner, and reasonable steps should be taken to ensure pertinent issues are sufficiently resolved and to ensure that all appropriate criminal, civil, contractual, or administrative remedies are considered.
- **Legal Requirements** - Inspections, evaluations, and reviews should be initiated, conducted, and reported in accordance with all applicable laws, rules, and regulations.
- **Appropriate Techniques** - Methods and techniques used in each inspection, evaluation, and review should be appropriate for the circumstances and objectives.
- **Objectivity** - Evidence should be gathered and reported in a fair, unbiased, and independent manner to convince the report user of the validity of the conclusions and recommendations made during the inspection, evaluation, or review.
- **Ethics** - At all times the actions of OIG staff should conform with the high standards of conduct expected from OIG staff.
- **Timeliness** - Work should be conducted and reported with due diligence and in a timely manner while recognizing the individual complexities of each case or project situation.

Quality Standards For Inspections, Evaluations, and Reviews

- Accurate and Complete Documentation - Report findings, conclusions, and recommendations should be supported by adequate documentation.
- Coordination - Appropriate OIG staff should coordinate the results of the inspections, evaluations, and reviews with appropriate officials.

QUALITATIVE STANDARDS

A. Quality Control

The first qualitative standard for OIG inspections, evaluations, and reviews is:

To ensure quality and expedite the progress of an inspection, evaluation, or review, proper supervision will be exercised from the start of such work to completion of the final report.

Guidelines

The Directing and Controlling Standard and the Quality Assurance Standard set forth in Quality Standards for Offices of Inspector General should also be followed as applicable.

Supervision adds expert judgment to the work done by less experienced staff and provides necessary training for them. Supervisors should satisfy themselves that the members of the inspection, evaluation, or review team clearly understand their assigned tasks before starting the work. Team members should be informed why the work is to be done and what it is expected to accomplish.

Supervisory reviews should determine that:

1. Evidence adequately supports findings, conclusions, and recommendations.
2. Inspection, evaluation, or review objectives are met.
3. Work plans are followed, unless deviation is justified and authorized.

Each OIG should develop appropriate procedures for determining and documenting that supervision has been adequate. Each OIG should also develop appropriate internal controls to ensure that inspections, evaluations, and reviews conform to these Quality Standards.

B. Planning

The second qualitative standard for OIG inspections, evaluations, and reviews is:

Inspection, evaluation, and review work is to be adequately planned.

Guidelines

The Planning Standard and the Coordinating Standard set forth in Quality Standards for Offices of Inspector General should also be followed as applicable.

The standard for planning inspections, evaluations, and reviews is intended to ensure that the area for work is researched in order to clarify issues and adequately designed to address these issues in a written individual work plan. Research, design, and coordination should be thorough enough, within the time constraints of the assignment, to assure that work plan objectives are met and to ensure that appropriate care is given to coordinating inspection, evaluation, or review work to avoid duplication of effort. In pursuing this standard, the following guidelines should be considered:

1. Research - Inspection, evaluation, and review research includes a review, consistent with the work objectives, of existing data; applicable laws, policies and regulations; other analytic work; discussions with program and other appropriate officials; and literature research. The results of the research will be documented in the working papers and will be used to develop an individual work plan for the specific type of work to be undertaken.
2. Work Plan - A written work plan should be developed that clearly defines the purpose and scope of the inspection, evaluation or review; the areas and/or potential issues to be addressed; the methodologies to be used; and the manner in which the work will be conducted. The plan will be documented in the working papers and used as the basis for organization of documentation.
3. Coordination - Work plan development includes coordinating the planned activities with other inspection, audit, and investigative entities as well as appropriate organizations that could be affected by the activities. Such coordination is necessary to determine the existence of potential ongoing work being conducted by other agencies and to determine the effect of their activities upon the work being planned. Coordination efforts will be documented in the working papers.

C. Data Collection and Analysis

The third qualitative standard for OIG inspections, evaluations, and reviews is:

Information and data obtained about the organization, program, activity, or function being examined should be consistent with the

Quality Standards For Inspections, Evaluations, and Reviews

inspection, evaluation, or review objectives, carefully documented and organized, and lead to a reasonable basis for conclusions.

Guidelines

Sources of information should be described in the supporting documentation in sufficient detail so that the adequacy of the information, as a basis for conclusions, can be assessed.

Information should be of such scope, and selected and analyzed in such ways, as to address pertinent questions about the objectives of the inspection, evaluation, or review and be responsive to the informational needs and interest of specified audiences.

The information-gathering instruments and procedures should be chosen or developed and then supplemented to ensure that the information is sufficiently reliable and valid for use in meeting the inspection, evaluation, or review objectives. Staff will use professional judgment in determining whether the information is sufficiently reliable and valid.

Qualitative and quantitative information gathered and analyzed in an inspection, evaluation, or review should be appropriately and logically presented in working papers to ensure accurate interpretations.

Data collection and analysis procedures should be appropriately controlled and supervised to protect the resulting findings and reports from distortion by the personal feelings and biases of any party to the inspection, evaluation, or review. The basis and support for findings should be carefully organized and described in supporting documentation.

D. Evidence

The fourth qualitative standard for OIG inspections, evaluations, and reviews is:

Sufficient, competent, and relevant evidence is to be obtained to afford a reasonable basis for inspection, evaluation, and review findings and conclusions.

Guidelines

- Evidence is *sufficient* if there is enough of it to support the report's findings.
- Evidence used to support findings is *relevant* if it has logical, sensible relationships to those findings.
- Evidence is *competent* to the extent that it is consistent with fact (valid).

E. Timeliness The fifth qualitative standard for OIG inspections, evaluations, and reviews is:

Inspections, evaluations, and reviews should be conducted in a timely manner.

Guidelines

Timeliness increases the value of inspections, evaluations, and reviews. The nature of inspections, evaluations, and reviews also requires that schedules be flexible enough to respond to changing priorities or unforeseen circumstances, such as the need to expand the scope of an inspection, evaluation, or review, or to respond to an emergent need caused by other events.

F. Fraud and Other Illegal Acts The sixth qualitative standard for OIG inspections, evaluations, and reviews is:

OIG staff engaged in inspections, evaluations, and reviews have a responsibility to be alert for indications of illegal activity in the course of conducting their work. If during or in connection with an inspection, evaluation, or review, staff become aware of illegal acts, or indications of such acts, they should promptly present such information to their supervisors for review and possible referral to the appropriate investigative office.

Guidelines

Staff should be alert to circumstances that come to light during inspections, evaluations, or reviews indicating fraud and other illegal acts. While the identification of illegal activities is not usually an objective of an inspection, evaluation, or review, it is necessary to have a clear understanding of the necessary action if such circumstances are discovered.

Quality Standards For Inspections, Evaluations, and Reviews

G. Reporting The seventh qualitative standard for OIG inspections, evaluations, and reviews is:

Inspections, evaluations, or reviews should result in a timely written report to appropriate officials. All reports should present factual data accurately, fairly, and objectively, and present findings, conclusions and recommendations in a persuasive manner.

Guidelines

Written reports from OIG inspections, evaluations, and reviews should describe the work's objectives, scope, and methodology, and state that the work was done in accordance with the Quality Standards for Inspections, Evaluations, and Reviews by Offices of Inspector General. Report language should be clear and concise, recognizing that some assignments deal with highly technical material and should be written in terms intelligible to informed professionals. The OIG should solicit pertinent views and comments of appropriate officials on the content of the report.

Written reports resulting from OIG inspections, evaluations, and reviews should be distributed in a timely manner to appropriate officials responsible for taking action in response to report findings and recommendations. Further distribution will be subject to the internal policies of each OIG and fully comply with all privacy and freedom of information restrictions.

H. Confidentiality

The seventh qualitative standard for OIG inspections, evaluations, and reviews is:

The OIG should establish and follow procedures for safeguarding the identity of confidential sources and for protecting privileged and confidential information.

Guidelines

The Confidentiality Standard contained in the Quality Standards for Offices of Inspector General shall apply to inspections, evaluations, and reviews performed by OIGs.

I. Follow-Up

The eighth qualitative standard for OIG inspections, evaluations, and reviews is:

Appropriate follow-up should be performed to ensure that any recommendations are adequately considered and properly addressed.

Guidelines

Ultimate inspection, evaluation, or review success depends on whether necessary corrective actions are taken. Therefore, each OIG should take steps as necessary to determine whether appropriate officials take timely, complete, and reasonable actions to correct problems identified in reports.

**Quality Standards for Audits
By
Offices of Inspector General**

Audits performed by Offices of Inspectors General (OIGs) should be done in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards. The ASSOCIATION OF INSPECTORS GENERALSM recommends that OIGs perform audits pursuant to one of the following:

- *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, or
- *Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing* issued by the Institute of Internal Auditors.

Each OIG should adopt and follow the audit standards appropriate to the OIG's mission and authority.

**APPENDIX
COMMITTEE TO ESTABLISH
GENERALLY ACCEPTED INSPECTOR GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND
GENERALLY ACCEPTED GOVERNMENT INSPECTOR GENERAL STANDARDS**

In December 1999, under authorization from the ASSOCIATION OF INSPECTORS GENERALSM Board of Directors, President Robert A. Cerasoli appointed the following 15 members to a committee to develop generally accepted inspector general principles and standards.

Roland M. Malan, Chair Former Inspector General NY Metropolitan Transportation Authority	
F. Daniel Ahern, Jr. First Assistant Inspector General for Management Massachusetts Office of the Inspector General	Leonard C. Odom Inspector General Chicago Housing Authority
Paul Balukas Inspector General New York State Welfare Office	Steven A. Pasichow Inspector General New York City Housing Authority
Thomas P. Charles Inspector General State of Ohio	Benjamin J. Redmond Inspector General City of Philadelphia
Robert DeSousa Inspector General Commonwealth of Pennsylvania	James B. Thomas, Jr., Director of Auditing Office of the Chief Inspector General State of Florida
Martin J. Dickman Inspector General U.S. Railroad Retirement Board	Roger Viadero Inspector General U.S. Department of Agriculture
Gaston L. Gianni, Jr. Inspector General Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	Alexander Vroustouris Inspector General City of Chicago
Barbara J. Hansberry General Counsel <u>Massachusetts Office of the Inspector General</u>	David C. Williams Inspector General Tax Administration U.S. Office of the Treasury

All meetings of the Committee were held in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The Committee assembled for the first time on March 3, 2000. The Committee concluded that there was no existing set of general principles regarding inspector general offices

Appendix

and identified a list of topics to be covered in statement of general principles. The Committee identified existing sets of standards for federal inspector general offices and for the separate functions of audits, inspections, and investigations. Specifically, these standards were:

- *Quality Standards for Federal Offices of Inspector General* issued by the President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency, January 1986.
- *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, 1994 Revision
- *Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing* issued by the Institute of Internal Auditors.
- *Quality Standards for Investigations* issued by the President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency and the Executive Council on Integrity and Efficiency, September 1997.
- *Quality Standards for Inspections* issued by the President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency, March 1993.

The Committee agreed: 1) to recommend that inspectors general use the *Government Auditing Standards* promulgated by the US General Accounting Office for audits; and 2) to use the federal PCIE standards as a basis for developing quality standards that could be applied to inspector general offices at all levels of government. The Committee organized teams to develop drafts of specific topics for discussion at future meetings.

In its second meeting, held on June 12, 2000, the Committee focused on the draft *Principles for Offices of Inspector General*. Additional work at that meeting was spent on draft *Quality Standards for Offices of Inspector General*. Substantial progress was made in discussing and revising both draft documents and subcommittees were created to develop discussion drafts of investigation and inspection standards for the membership. The Committee also decided to add to the audit standards that, in addition to the *Government Auditing Standards*, Offices may use the *Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing* issued by the Institute of Internal Auditors depending on which audit standards were appropriate to the Office's mission and authority.

The Committee met on August 21, 2000, and marked up drafts of the *Principles for Offices of Inspector General*, the *Quality Standards for Offices of Inspector General*, the *Quality Standards for Investigations* and the *Quality Standards for Inspections*. On September 22, 2000, the Committee continued its work on these documents and

Appendix

completed final exposure drafts of the *Principles for Offices of Inspector General* and the *Quality Standards for Offices of Inspector General*.

On October 18, 2000, the Committee Chair presented and explained the two draft documents to the Association's Board of Directors. The Board voted to authorize the Committee to circulate the draft documents among the Association's membership and the inspector general community for review and comment. Copies of the exposure drafts were distributed to all federal, state, and local offices of inspector general for comment and were posted with an invitation for comment on the Association's website, www.inspectorsgeneral.org. Reviewers were invited to submit written comments to the Committee by March 30, 2001.*

The Committee met again on December 11, 2000 and completed final exposure drafts of *Quality Standards for Offices by Offices of Inspector General* and *Quality Standards for Inspections, Evaluations, and Reviews by Offices of Inspector General*.

On December 13, 2000, the Executive Committee of the Association voted to authorize the Committee to circulate these two additional draft documents among the Association's membership and the inspector general community for review and comment. Again, copies of the exposure drafts were distributed to all federal, state, and local offices of inspector general and were posted with an invitation for comment on the Association's website. Reviewers were invited to submit written comments to the Committee by March 30, 2001.

The Committee received formal comments on proposed standards from federal, state, and local Offices of Inspector General. The following table reports the number of comments received on each exposure draft document by governmental level.

Exposure Draft Document	Comments Received			
	Federal	State	Local	Total
Statement of Principles	12	3	1	16
Quality Standards for:				
Offices	8	2	2	12
Investigations	3	3	1	7
Inspections, Evaluations, & Reviews	5	3	1	9
Total	28	11	5	44

* The initial due date for comments on the draft *Statement of Principles for Offices of Inspector General* and the draft *Quality Standards for Offices Of Inspector General* was March 16, 2001. This deadline was subsequently extended to March 30, 2001 to coincide with the due date for comments on the other draft documents.

Appendix

On April 23 and 24, 2001, the Committee convened to consider in detail the comments it had received. The Committee made appropriate changes to the exposure drafts in response to the comments and produced final drafts of the documents for submission to the Association's Board of Directors. On May 16, 2001, the Board of Directors found that the draft documents represent generally accepted principles, quality standards, and best practices generally applicable to federal, state, and local offices of inspectors general. The Board voted to recommend that offices of inspector general adopt these documents for their use with the following or similar language:

The generally accepted principles and quality standards, formally approved by the ASSOCIATION OF INSPECTORS GENERALSM on 16 May 2001, are hereby adopted by this office insofar as they do not conflict with statute, regulation, executive order, or other policy of this office.