

Office of Inspector General Project Quality Scorecards – First 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-P-00002	253	205	22	3	4	4	3.7	9	3	5.5	32.5
2007-2-00003	371.4	307	177	3	2	4	4.3	12	3	8.5	36.8
2007-4-00027	524	229	228	3	2	4	3.4	6	3	7.5	28.9
2007-1-00019 *	3,421	2,561	213	3	2	4	3.9	5	3	7.9	28.8
2007-P-00004	546	420	285	2	3	3	1	6	3	7.2	25.2
2007-4-00019	103	75	467*	3	4	4	1.8	7	3	8.4	31.2
2007-P-00001	1,301	962	544	1	4	4	4.3	1	3	6.1	23.4
2007-4-00026 **	283	220	307	3	2	4	2.9	3	3	7.5	25.4
2007-P-00006	690	530	589	2	2	4	3	-1	2	5.9	17.9
2007-1-00001	259	216	492	3	3	4	2.7	2	3	6.8	24.5
2007-P-00003	403	293	237	2	2	3	3.5	3	1	5.9	20.4
2007-P-00005 *	641	501	549*	1	3	3	1	1	2	6.5	17.5

* 2007-4-00019 suspended for 243 days and 2007-P-00005 suspended for 96 days

** 2007-4-00026 is a financial grant audit where outlines are not provided to the Agency/auditee prior to the issuance of the draft report-no exit held prior to draft

Note 1: If team proceeded directly to field work all points awarded for preliminary research

Note 2: The percent of working papers reviewed within 30 days is based upon the date prepared and had to be reviewed by the Project Manager or the Product Line Director

Titles of the Reviews

2007-P-00002 - EPA Needs to Plan and Complete a Toxicity Assessment for the Libby Asbestos Cleanup

2007-2-00003 - Information Concerning Superfund Cooperative Agreements with NY and NJ

2007-4-00027 - Examination of Financial Management Practices of the National Rural Water Association, Duncan OK

2007-1-00019 - Audit of EPA's Fiscal 2006 and 2005 Consolidated Financials

2007-P-00004 - Saving the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Requires Better Coordination of Environmental and Agricultural Resources

2007-4-00019 - Ecology and Environment Cost Impact Proposal-Subcontract Administration for Cost Accounting Standard 402 Noncompliance -Subcontract Administrator Labor Charging Practices

2007-P-00001 - Oversight of the Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program Needs Improvement

2007-4-00026 - International City/County Management Association Reported Outlays under Seven Selected Cooperative Agreements

2007-P-00006 - EPA has Improved Five Year Review Process for Superfund Remedies But Further Steps Needed

2007-1-00001 - Fiscal Year 2005-2004 Financial Statements for the Pesticide Reregistration and Expedited Processing Fund

2007-P-00003 - Partnership Programs May Expand EPA's Influence

2007-P-00005 - EPA's Management of Interim Status Permitting Needs Improvement to Ensure Continued Progress

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