

Office of Inspector General Project Quality Scorecards – Fourth Quarter Fiscal Year 2007

Report Number	Staff Days	Project Cost (000s)	Elapsed Days from Kickoff to OCPL	Planning	Field Work	Evidence	Supervision	Draft Report Preparation and Timeliness	Significance	Report Communication	Total Assignment Score
2007-B-00002	503	397	166	3	4	4	4.8	13	3	Not Scored *	31.8*
2007-4-00068	247	206	184	3	3.5	4	4.5	13	2.7	8.8	39.5
2007-P-00028	430	338	297	3	4	4	4.1	7	2	7.0	31.1
2007-P-00029	513	246	273	2	4	4	3.8	7	1	7.3	29.1
2007-2-00030	Not Tracked	Not Tracked	160	3	4	4	3.8	7	1	8.6	31.4
2007-P-00030	762	637	430	3	3.5	3.0	4.7	8	3	8.4	33.6
2007-P-00031	997	783	491	3	3.5	4	4.2	3	3	8.2	28.9
2007-P-00032	234	185	161	3	3	4	4.8	13	-	8.4	36.2
2007-P-00033	836	684	177	3	4	4	3.6	12.5	2	6.2	35.3
2007-P-00034	468	375	699	-	2	3	2.1	-4	-	6.3	9.4
2007-P-00035	110	135	97	3	4	4	3.7	13	2	8.4	38.1
2007-P-00036	240	189	246	3	4	4	4.8	8	2	8.4	34.2
2007-P-00037	238	198	73	3	4	4	4.4	12	1	8.3	36.7
2007-P-00038	62	55	124	2	4	4	3.0	13	1	8.2	35.2
2007-2-00039	11	9	30	3	4	4	4.0	13	1	8.8	37.8
2007-P-00039	720	545	428	3	3.75	4	4.4	4	3	7.8	29.95
2007-4-00078	289	241	254	3	2.9	4	3.8	7	3	8.6	32.3
2007-2-00040	Not Tracked	Not Tracked	162	3	3	4	3.1	7	4	8.6	32.7
2007-P-00040	390	306	253	3	4	4	4.8	7	1.5	6.8	31.1

* "Report Communication" not scored because report consisted of briefing slides.

Titles of the Reviews

- 2007-B-00002 - Assessment of EPA's Projected Pollutant Reductions Resulting from Enforcement Actions and Settlements
- 2007-4-00068 - Ozone Transport Commission Incurred Costs Under EPA Assistance Agreements XA98379901, OT83098301, XA97318101, and OT83264901
- 2007-P-00028 - ENERGY STAR Program Can Strengthen Controls Protecting Integrity of the Label
- 2007-P-00029 - Superfund's Board of Directors Needs to Evaluate Actions to Improve the Superfund Program
- 2007-2-00030 - Excess Federal Funds Drawn on EPA Grant No. XP98838901, Awarded to the City of Huron, South Dakota
- 2007-P-00030 - Improved Management Practices Needed to Increase Use of Exchange Network
- 2007-P-00031 - Development Growth Outpacing Progress in Watershed Efforts to Restore the Chesapeake Bay
- 2007-P-00032 - Federal Facilities in Chesapeake Bay Watershed Generally Comply With Major Clean Water Act Permits
- 2007-P-00033 - Using the Program Assessment Rating Tools as a Management Control Process
- 2007-P-00034 - Complete Assessment Needed to Ensure Rural Texas Community Has Safe Drinking Water

- continued -

2007-P-00035 - EPA Needs to Strengthen its Privacy Program Management Controls
 2007-P-00036 - Total Maximum Daily Load Program Needs Better Data and Measures to Demonstrate Environmental Results
 2007-P-00037 - Progress Made in Improving Use of Federal Supply Schedule Orders, But more Action Needed
 2007-P-00038 - Decision Needed on Regulating the Cooling Lagoons at the North Anna Power Station
 2007-2-00039 - Ineligible Federal Funds Drawn on EPA Grant No. XP98284701
 2007-P-00039 - Limited Investigation Led To Missed Contamination at Ringwood Superfund Site
 2007-4-00078 - Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe Outlays Reported Under Five EPA Assistance Agreements
 2007-2-00040 - Cost and Lobbying Disclosure Issues Under EPA Grant Numbers X98981901 and XP97914901 Awarded to City of Fallon, Nevada
 2007-P-00040 - Strategic Agricultural Initiative Needs Revisions to Demonstrate Results

The project quality scorecard reflects the OIG's process for measuring quality of audit, evaluation, and other reviews. The process to measure quality is part of the OIG's overall quality control system that serves as a basis for ensuring our results will consistently meet customers' needs and withstand challenges. Generally, all OIG audits, program evaluations, and other reviews are conducted in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. The OIG's Project Management Handbook is the OIG's policy document for conducting all reviews in accordance with these and other professional standards.

The scoring process encompasses an evaluation of activities from preliminary research to the point that an OIG team submits a draft report to the OIG's Office of Congressional and Public Liaison (OCPL) for edit. The process includes a measurement for report communication that encompasses the readability, completeness, conciseness, and presentation of draft reports. Staff days are measured based on a goal of providing the report to OCPL within 200 days; teams receive +5 points if a report comes in under 200 days; a point is deducted for every 50 days beyond 200 days.

Scores on the attached scoresheets are not necessarily representative of the quality of the final report, since revisions to the draft may be made. Teams may improve the report based in part on the scorecards results and the Agency's comments to the draft report.

The maximum number of points that can be earned in each specific phase are:

Planning	3 points
Field Work	4 points
Evidence	4 points
Supervision	5 points
Draft Report Preparation and Timeliness	8 points
Significance	10 points
Report Communication	9 points