

Office of Inspector General Project Quality Scorecards – Second 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
2007-1-00037	129	107	319	3	1	4	1	5	1	5.1	20.1
2007-1-00044	220	135	280	3	2	4	1	6	1	7.2	24.2
2007-4-00045	93	221	139	3	3	4	4.2	12	10	6.4	42.2
2007-4-00052	150	330	352	2	4	4	4.5	4	3	7	28.5
2007-P-00007	639	466	189	3	3	3	4.5	12	2	4.7	32.2
2007-P-00008	Contracted Out										
2007-P-00009	173	361	205	2	4	3	4.5	7	3	7.8	31.3
2007-P-00010	106	83	117	3	4	4	5	12	2	8	38
2007-P-00011	356	287	177	2	4	4	2	12	2	7.3	33.3
2007-P-00012	488	402	308	1	3	4	3	7	3	8.6	29.6
2007-P-00013	378	229	217	3	4	4	3.5	7	2	6.1	29.6
2007-P-00015	934	108	256	3	3	4	4.5	7	3	8	32.5
2007-P-00016	321	255	190	3	2	4	2	12	3	8.6	34.6
2007-P-00017	478	356	184	2	4	4	4.1	11	2	7.4	34.5
2007-P-00018	Confidential Business Information										
2007-4-00034	45	38	226	1	3	4	4.1	6	3	8.7	29.8

Titles of the Reviews

- 2007-1-00037 - State of New Hampshire Clean Water State Revolving Fund Program Financial Statements for the Year Ended 6/30/05
- 2007-1-00044 - State of New Hampshire Drinking Water State Revolving Fund Program Financial Statements for the Year Ended 6/30/05
- 2007-4-00045 - America's Clean Water Foundation Incurred Costs for EPA Assistance Agreements X82835301 and X82672301
- 2007-4-00052 - Ecology and Environment CFY 2001 Incurred Cost
- 2007-P-00007 - EPA Could Improve Processes for Managing Contractor Systems and Reporting Incidents
- 2007-P-00008 - Contracted out
- 2007-P-00009 - EPA Relying on Existing Clean Air Act Regulations to Reduce Atmospheric Deposition to the Chesapeake Bay and its Watershed
- 2007-P-00010 - The U.S. Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board Should Track Adherence to Closed Recommendations
- 2007-P-00011 - Interagency Agreements to Use Other Agencies' Contracts Need Additional Oversight
- 2007-P-00012 - EPA's Allowing States to Use Bonds to Meet Revolving Fund Match Requirements Reduces Funds Available for Water Projects
- 2007-P-00013 - Performance Track Could Improve Program Management to Ensure Value
- 2007-P-00015 - New Contract for Hurricane Katrina Command Post Reduced Costs but less Restrictive Requirements Would Have Increased Competition
- 2007-P-00016 - Environmental Justice Concerns and Communications Problems Complicated Cleaning up Ringwood Mines and Landfill Site
- 2007-P-00017 - EPA Needs to Strengthen Financial Database Security Oversight and Monitor Compliance
- 2007-P-00018 - Confidential Business Information
- 2007-P-00034 - Agreed Upon Procedures Applied to Hurricane Katrina and Rita Task Order 13, 14, 15 and 16 Under BOA DACW56-02-6-1001

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