



Office of Inspector General

Semiannual
Report to
the Congress

October 1, 1982 to
March 31, 1983

May 1, 1983



General
Services
Administration

Office of
Inspector
General

Washington, DC 20405

APR 28 1983

Honorable Gerald P. Carmen
Administrator
General Services Administration
Washington, DC 20405

Dear Mr. Carmen:

The enclosed semiannual Report to the Congress for the six-month period ended March 31, 1983 is submitted pursuant to Public Law 95-452, the Inspector General Act of 1978. In accordance with Section 5(b) of this Act, you are required to submit this report to the Congress within 30 days, together with any comments you deem appropriate.

The accomplishments detailed within this report reflect highly creditable performance by the staff of the Office of Inspector General. Despite the constraints imposed by budget cutbacks and personnel reductions, our audit staff recommended savings of almost \$65 million. Collectively, our audit and investigative efforts resulted in sustained savings, as demonstrated by management commitment, court order/agreement, or actual recovery of money or property, totaling more than \$79.4 million. This translates to \$8.60 of sustained savings for every dollar expended by the OIG.

Comparison of the sustained audit savings with the savings originally recommended yields a rate of return of about 74 percent. This rate indicates to me that the systems for audit resolution and followup that we developed together are having the desired effect. I believe that we can anticipate even better results in the future as the systems become more firmly established.

During this period the Office of Inspector General made a number of other contributions which were equally significant, but less amenable to quantification. Implementation of our management report recommendations has resulted in unquantifiable Agency savings in terms of increased program effectiveness and operational efficiency. In addition, we broadened our efforts to minimize fraud, waste and mismanagement through an aggressive prevention and awareness program.

Page 2

Our accomplishments this period have been made possible by a high level of cooperation and support on the part of GSA management. I am confident that your continued support will allow us to make even greater contributions in future reporting periods.

Sincerely,



JOSEPH A. SICKON
Inspector General

Enclosure

Introduction and Overview

INTRODUCTION

This report, which is submitted pursuant to Section 5 of Public Law 95-452, chronicles the activities of the Office of Inspector General (OIG) during the period October 1, 1982 to March 31, 1983. It is the ninth such report since the appointment of GSA's first Inspector General in 1979.

OVERVIEW

As this report details, the OIG compiled a very solid record of accomplishments during the six-month reporting period. We believe these accomplishments are especially meaningful when viewed within the larger context of challenges this organization has addressed since Fiscal Year 1981.

Reductions in appropriations during recent fiscal years have resulted in concomitant reductions in authorized and actual staff levels. Also, since Fiscal Year 1981 we have undertaken a number of internal management improvement projects which have placed exceptional short-term strain on available resources. These projects have included: a major internal reorganization; consolidation and collocation of audit and investigations field offices; development and implementation of a comprehensive automated management information system; and, perhaps most significantly, the introduction of a strategic methodology for addressing all of the OIG's statutory obligations.

In the face of these challenges, the performance of the OIG staff, in terms of dedication, professionalism and productivity, has been impressive. Our performance indicators have shown steady improvement since 1981, culminating in the excellent record achieved during this six-month reporting period. Recommended audit savings per auditor, for example, have climbed from \$421,000 in Fiscal Year 1981 to \$509,000 at the midpoint of Fiscal Year 1983. Similarly, criminal case referrals per investigator have climbed from 0.81 cases in 1982, the first year such data were compiled, to 2.49 cases. We are proud of these achievements and look forward to a continuing record of high productivity within the OIG.

HIGHLIGHTS OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS DURING THIS REPORTING PERIOD

As indicated above, our audit and investigative functions achieved very substantial results during these six months. At the same time, we made significant contributions by focusing OIG and Agency attention on the need to prevent fraud, waste and abuse from occurring in the first place.

We also made progress in our effort to assure that internal OIG operations are efficient and economical. Summaries of specific accomplishments by topical areas follow.

1. Audit Accomplishments

We issued 381 audit reports during this period recommending savings of almost \$65 million. This figure translates to recommended savings of almost \$20 for every dollar spent in direct audit time. Of the reports, 112 addressed internal management operations, 225 involved GSA's contracting function, and 44 were the result of inspections. Based upon recommendations in these reports, as well as from recommendations made in prior periods, Agency management has committed itself to avoid over \$73 million in costs, and to take steps to recover over \$4 million. These sustained costs translate into annualized savings of \$12 dollars for every \$1 invested. Additionally, these audits have resulted in unquantifiable savings to the Agency in terms of increased program effectiveness and operational efficiency. The following examples will serve to illustrate the nature of audit findings during this period.

- In reviewing GSA's project to rehabilitate the Nashville Union Train Station into Government office space, we found that the large project costs did not justify the small benefits to be derived from the renovation. Advised of these findings, management is now finalizing plans to dispose of the station. This action will avoid the expenditure of an estimated \$12.5 million.
- An audit of the actions taken by GSA to prevent missed lease options on rented space revealed that uncorrected data in the automated system could have resulted in additional Government costs of \$3.5 million. The data have now been corrected and actions to prevent the recurrence of such situations are being implemented.
- A review of the outleasing of space in the Old Post Office Building in Washington, DC, identified numerous deficiencies. Based upon management actions in response to our concerns, we estimate that \$7.7 million will be saved over the life of the outlease.
- A postaward audit of a multiple award schedule contract disclosed violations of the defective pricing provisions of the contract. Accordingly, we recommended that \$324,000 be recovered from the contractor. The majority of our findings were sustained by the contracting officer in negotiations, and a check for \$300,000 was sent to the Government on February 16, 1983.

During this reporting period we worked in concert with the Agency in establishing new and significantly more stringent policies and procedures relative to audit followup. We are looking forward to even greater benefits from audits as a result of these new policies and procedures.

2. Investigative Accomplishments

Our investigations staff continued to aggressively pursue criminal, civil and administrative actions against those persons or firms who have defrauded or attempted to defraud the Government. At the close of the previous period, we reported 563 pending investigative cases, a substantial number of which (269) involved white collar crime. Of the 378 cases opened during this period, 135 involved white collar crime. Our investigative activity resulted in a sharp rise in the number of criminal referrals made to the Department of Justice or other authorities for prosecutive action: 119 cases were referred during this period, as opposed to 38 referrals during the previous period. OIG investigative activity also resulted in:

- 43 case referrals accepted for criminal prosecution.
- 28 indictments/informations and 14 convictions on criminal referrals.
- 158 case referrals for administrative action and 22 case referrals for contractor suspension/debarment.
- 17 reprimands, 19 employee suspensions, 3 demotions, and 19 terminations.
- 3 contractor suspensions and 11 contractor debarments.
- 814 Hotline calls and letters, 16 GAO referrals, and 8 other agency referrals.
- 11 case referrals to other Federal and State agencies for further investigation or other action.
- \$154,036 in investigative recoveries.
- \$1.8 million in civil settlements and judgments.
- 17 civil case referrals to either the Civil Division of the Department of Justice or the appropriate U.S. Attorney.
- 14 Inspector General subpoenas and successful litigation of a subpoena enforcement action.

3. Prevention Activities

The Inspector General Act of 1978 directs the OIG to assume a leadership role in the formulation of policies designed to promote economy, efficiency and effectiveness in Agency operations and to execute programs directed at both the detection and prevention of fraud and abuse. Within the current reporting period, this Office has increased its prevention role

through a broad program keyed to four elements:

- Defining areas vulnerable to fraud and waste through establishment of an inventory of auditable entities, analyses of recurring audit and investigative findings, and implementation of an operational survey program;
- Anticipating problems with proposed systems and transactions, and addressing them through OIG preaward advisory reviews and OIG participation in automated data processing (ADP) design projects;
- Educating GSA employees, through Integrity Awareness Briefings, to the potential for waste, fraud and abuse and their personal responsibility for reporting such matters to the OIG; and
- Communicating the mission and activities of the OIG, through careful followup on Hotline complaints, Hotline publicity, and participation in projects of the President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency.

4. Internal OIG Management Improvements

During the past six months, a number of actions aimed at increasing the efficiency and economy of OIG operations continued to progress according to established milestones. Among these were the further development of our integrated audit planning system and the expanding role of our computerized information system for tracking the accomplishment of audits as well as investigative cases. The first series of internal critiques of audit reports has been finished as a part of our effort to assure high quality in these reports, and procedures are under development for reviews of OIG field offices to commence during the next period.

STAFFING AND BUDGET ISSUES

Although we are proud of our accomplishments during this reporting period, it must be recognized that the level of resources currently authorized for the OIG will not permit adequate, long-term audit and investigative coverage of GSA's programs. A detailed discussion of our concerns appears in Section I (page 2) of this report.

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW	i
REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	vi
SECTION I - ORGANIZATION, STAFFING AND BUDGET	1
SECTION II - AUDIT ACCOMPLISHMENTS	3
A. Summary of Accomplishments	3
B. Significant Problems, Abuses, Deficiencies and Recommendations for Corrective Action During the Current Reporting Period	8
C. Audit Resolution and Followup	19
D. Unreasonable Refusal of Information or Assistance	28
SECTION III - INVESTIGATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS	29
A. Summary of Accomplishments	29
B. Unreasonable Refusal of Information or Assistance	37
SECTION IV - REVIEW OF LEGISLATION AND REGULATIONS	38
A. General	38
B. Significant Comments	38
SECTION V - OTHER ACTIVITIES	40
A. Prevention Activities	40
B. Projects Sponsored by the President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency	44
C. OIG Internal Management Initiatives	45
APPENDIX I - AUDIT REPORT REGISTER	47
APPENDIX II - INSPECTION REPORT REGISTER	80
APPENDIX III - DELINQUENT DEBTS	84

Reporting Requirements

The table below cross-references the reporting requirements prescribed by the Inspector General Act of 1978 to the specific report pages on which they are addressed. Additionally, the information requested by the Congress in Senate Report No. 96-829 (dated June 23, 1980) relative to the 1980 Supplemental Appropriations and Rescission Bill is also cross-referenced to the appropriate page of the report.

<u>SOURCE</u>	<u>PAGE NUMBER</u>
<u>Inspector General Act</u>	
1. Section 4(a)(2) - Review of Legislation and Regulations	38-39
2. Section 5(a)(1) - Significant Problems, Abuses, and Deficiencies	8-18 31-34
3. Section 5(a)(2) - Recommendations With Respect to Significant Problems, Abuses and Deficiencies	8-18
4. Section 5(a)(3) - Prior Recommendations Not Yet Implemented	23-28
5. Section 5(a)(4) - Matters Referred to Prosecutive Authorities	31
6. Section 5(a)(5) and 6(b)(2) - Summary of Instances Where Information Was Refused	28 37
7. Section 5(a)(6) - List of Audit Reports	47-83
<u>Senate Report No. 96-829</u>	
1. Resolution of Audits	19-20
2. Delinquent Debts	84-85

Section I - Organization, Staffing and Budget

The GSA Office of Inspector General (OIG) was established pursuant to Public Law 95-452, the Inspector General Act of 1978. As currently configured, the Office is divided into five major organizational elements which function cooperatively to perform the missions legislated by the Congress.

ORGANIZATION

The five functional elements of the Office are:

- Office of Audits, which provides comprehensive internal (management) and external (contract) audit coverage as well as professional/technical reviews of Agency contracts and operations (inspections).
- Office of Investigations, which manages a nationwide program designed to detect and investigate illegal and/or improper activities involving Agency programs, personnel and operations.
- Office of Policy, Plans and Evaluation, which provides centralized planning and assessment services, including internal evaluations of OIG operations.
- Office of Counsel to the Inspector General, which provides independent legal counsel and technical assistance.
- Office of Executive Director, which provides centralized administrative and management support services, including data systems support to other elements of the OIG.

OFFICE LOCATIONS

The Office of Inspector General is headquartered in Washington, DC at GSA's Central Office building. We maintain field audit and investigations offices in each of GSA's 11 regions. These are located in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Atlanta, Chicago, Kansas City, Ft. Worth, Denver, San Francisco, Auburn and Washington, DC. In addition, we maintain investigations offices in Los Angeles, Cleveland, and St. Louis. We are currently in the process of establishing an audit and investigations office in San Juan, Puerto Rico.

STAFFING/BUDGET

The approved Fiscal Year 1983 budget for GSA's Office of Inspector General is \$18.5 million. While this budget provides for an approved staffing level of 466 full-time equivalent (FTE) positions, full-year funding allows for only 436 FTEs. As of March 31, 1983, actual on-board staffing

was 406. We are actively recruiting in order to bring our on-board strength to the level for which we are fully funded.

Over the past year, reductions in appropriations and staffing have had an enormous impact on this Office's ability to function at a level which we view to be acceptable. A discussion of our concerns follows.

STAFFING/BUDGET ISSUES

We first alerted the Congress to our concern over the effects of reduced appropriations in our report for the period ending September 30, 1982. Authorized staffing has been reduced from 569 FTE positions in Fiscal Year 1980 to a current level of only 466. Moreover, approved funding for Fiscal Year 1983 is sufficient to cover only 436 FTE positions.

Our inventory of auditable GSA entities conservatively identifies a need for 275 staff years of effort to provide adequate coverage of internal agency operations. Current authorized levels allow us to allocate only 188 staff years to this activity. Similarly, insufficient staffing in our external (contract) audit program has resulted in the loss of significant opportunities for substantial cost avoidance and recoveries. For example, we currently have resources to audit 125 of the 5,500 contracts within the Multiple Award Schedule Program each year, and these audits yield approximately \$17.5 million annually in cost avoidance/cost recovery. We have estimated that 280 such contracts could be audited, with similar opportunities for savings, with the addition of only 31 auditors to this program. There are other areas within the contract audit program which could potentially provide similar long-term benefits to the taxpayer. However, definition of our resource needs in those areas awaits completion of the OIG's inventory of GSA contracts and solicitations, which will define the universe of contracts and procurement actions requiring audit.

The effect of reduced staffing on our investigations program has been equally serious. Neither the workload nor responsibilities of the program have diminished. Indeed, increased emphasis on complex civil recovery cases imposes greater and previously unforeseen resource requirements on this program. However, staff allocated to this program has been reduced from 130 FTEs to 121 FTEs. Moreover, funding is available to support only 105 positions at this time. At the 130 level, we were capable of referring 60 percent of our caseload for prosecutive consideration or administrative action within 90 days of case initiation. At our present level of funding, only 36 percent can be referred within 90 days.

We believe that prompt action is needed to rectify these staffing and funding shortfalls. To this end, we have already approached the Administrator of GSA and the Office of Management and Budget.

Section II - Audit Accomplishments

A. SUMMARY OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS

During the six-month period ended March 31, 1983, the Office of Inspector General issued 381 audit reports, including 13 audits performed by other agencies. This figure is consistent with the number of reports issued during the previous six-month period. A listing of individual reports can be found in Appendices I and II to this report.

Collectively, these reports recommend savings of almost \$65 million, which is comprised of over \$57.2 million in recommended cost avoidance and over \$7.7 million in recommended cost recoveries. These figures translate to recommended savings of almost \$20 for every dollar spent in direct audit time. In addition, our audit recommendations resulted in unquantifiable savings to the Agency in terms of increased program effectiveness and operational efficiency.

Based on recommendations in these reports, as well as from recommendations made in prior periods, management has committed itself to avoid over \$73 million in costs, and to take steps to recover over \$4 million. These sustained costs translate into annualized savings of \$12 for every \$1 invested.

These figures compare favorably with the results achieved during the last period. While management committed itself to avoid \$42 million last period, commitments during the current period exceeded \$72 million. Sustained recovery recommendations are approximately equal to those of the last period.

Table 1 presents a summary of recommended savings by type of review.

<u>Type of Review</u>	<u>No. of Reports</u>	<u>Recommended Savings</u>
Contract Audits	225	\$27,479,203
Internal Audits	112	34,894,491
Inspections	44	2,604,243
TOTALS	381	\$64,977,937

1. Contract Audit Accomplishments

We issued 225 contract audit reports during the period resulting in recommended cost recoveries and cost avoidance of almost \$27.5 million. Thirteen of these audits, involving recommended cost avoidance of \$180,296, were performed by other agencies. Another two audits, involving recommended cost avoidance of

\$146,414, were performed by our staff but involved non-GSA contracts. Table 2, which presents a breakdown of these costs by type of audit, shows that audits of contractor claims resulted in the largest payback in terms of dollars reviewed. In fact, we questioned over 73 percent of the dollars reviewed.

TABLE 2. SUMMARY OF CONTRACT AUDITS

<u>AUDITS BY GSA-IG</u>	<u>Reports Issued</u>	<u>Total Dollars Reviewed</u>	<u>Recommended Cost Avoidance</u>	<u>Recommended Cost Recovery</u>
Architect-Engineer Proposals	16	\$ 8,258,775	\$ 1,029,659	\$ -
Claims	27	8,078,864	5,899,089	-
Initial Pricings	47	32,941,934	3,635,389	-
Change Orders	3	736,576	115,985	-
Lease Escalations	27	20,274,168	7,104,940	-
Multiple Award-Preaward	28	75,030,977	3,714,651	-
Multiple Award-Postaward	36	93,665,934	-	5,327,945
Others	<u>28</u>	<u>7,179,630</u>	<u>337,060</u>	<u>134,189</u>
Subtotal - GSA-IG	<u>212</u>	<u>\$246,166,858</u>	<u>\$21,836,773</u>	<u>\$5,462,134</u>
<u>AUDITS BY OTHER AGENCIES</u>				
Initial Pricings	9	\$ 13,094,130	\$ 180,296	\$ -
Others	<u>4</u>	<u>4,118,118</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
Subtotal - Audits by Others	<u>13</u>	<u>\$ 17,212,248</u>	<u>\$ 180,296</u>	<u>\$ -0-</u>
TOTAL AUDITS	<u>225</u>	<u>\$263,379,106</u>	<u>\$22,017,069</u>	<u>\$5,462,134</u>
TOTAL COSTS RECOMMENDED (Avoidance and Recovery)			<u>\$27,479,203</u>	

In terms of contract audits settled this period, the amount of total costs sustained represents more than twice the amount achieved last period. Table 3, which provides settlement amounts on those audits performed by GSA and GSA audits performed by other agencies, shows that over 65 percent of our recommendations for cost avoidance and 28 percent of our recommendations for cost recovery were sustained in negotiations. While we are encouraged that overall almost two-thirds of our recommendations are being sustained, we are working to improve this rate. Recent policy changes calling for increased coordination between contracting officer and auditor as well as the Agency's new audit resolution policy should serve to increase settlement amounts.

TABLE 3. SUMMARY OF TOTAL COSTS SUSTAINED ON CONTRACT AUDITS SETTLED DURING THE PERIOD

REPORT ISSUE DATE	AVOIDANCE		RECOVERY	
	Recommended Costs	Costs Sustained	Recommended Costs	Costs Sustained
FY 79 GSA	\$ 223,913	\$ 99,516	\$ 794,555	\$ -
FY 80 GSA	446,922	358,037	840,426	396,020
Other	312,403	243,048	-	-
FY 81 GSA	22,463,291	16,221,128	3,284,628	204,031
Other	159,374	109,061	-	-
FY 82 GSA	30,356,243	18,210,665	2,773,233	1,290,851
Other	439,476	191,022	-	-
FY 83 GSA	<u>4,533,769</u>	<u>2,872,730</u>	<u>416,334</u>	<u>383,061</u>
Total-GSA	<u>\$58,024,138</u>	<u>\$37,762,076</u>	<u>\$8,109,176</u>	<u>\$2,273,963</u>
Total-Other	<u>\$ 911,253</u>	<u>\$ 543,131</u>	<u>\$ -</u>	<u>\$ -</u>
TOTAL	<u><u>\$58,935,391</u></u>	<u><u>\$38,305,207</u></u>	<u><u>\$8,109,176</u></u>	<u><u>\$2,273,963</u></u>
TOTAL COSTS SUSTAINED (Avoidance and Recovery)		<u><u>\$40,579,170</u></u>		

2. Internal Audit Accomplishments

During the current reporting period, the Inspector General issued 112 internal audit reports involving recommended cost avoidance of over \$34 million. We also recommended cost recoveries of over \$721,000. Table 4 summarizes these audits by GSA organizational element and shows the amount of cost savings recommended.

The data reflect that almost 91 percent of our recommendations for cost avoidance were made within the Public Buildings Service. Three of these audits, which are highlighted as significant audits in Section IIB of this report, account for almost \$24 million of our recommendations for cost avoidance.

TABLE 4. SUMMARY OF INTERNAL AUDIT REPORTS

<u>Program Area</u>	<u>No. of Reports Issued</u>	<u>Percentage of Total Audits</u>	<u>Recommended Cost Avoidance</u>	<u>Recommended Cost Recovery</u>
Plans, Programs and Financial Management	11	10	\$ 2,014,970	\$712,100
Information Resources Management	8	7	300,635	-
Federal Property Resources Service	3	3	1,040	-
Federal Supply and Services	15	13	722,000	-
National Archives and Records Service	1	1	-	-
Public Buildings Service	73	65	31,134,700	9,046
Organization and Personnel	1	1	-	-
TOTALS	112	100	\$ 34,173,345	\$721,146

Internal audits resolved during the reporting period resulted in sustained cost avoidance of over \$34.2 million and sustained cost recovery of \$712,100.

3. Inspection Accomplishments

During the reporting period, the Inspector General issued 43 inspection reports covering 181 GSA contracts with a value of over \$90 million. Total recommended cost avoidance resulting from these inspections amounted to almost \$1.1 million; total recommended cost recoveries amounted to \$1.5 million. Table 5 shows the reports issued and results by program area. In addition, we assisted the Inspector General, Department of Commerce, in an audit of the Patent Review Process. The report prepared by our staff recommended cost avoidance of \$439,000 and cost recovery of \$35,000.

In addition to these inspections, the staff participated in numerous multidisciplinary reviews in conjunction with other audit divisions and/or various investigative units. The results of such reviews are included in the data for the other OIG elements.

TABLE 5. SUMMARY OF INSPECTION RESULTS

<u>Program Area</u>	<u>No. of Reports Issued</u>	<u>Total Dollar Value of Contracts</u>	<u>Recommended Cost Avoidance</u>	<u>Recommended Cost Recoveries</u>
Public Buildings Service				
Leasing	3	\$ 617,060	\$ -	\$ 35,523
New Construction	4	33,626,449	809,333	434,574
Repairs and Alterations	23	16,221,594	-	44,203
Buildings Operations	2	499,415	-	-
Energy	1	-	106,000	-
Federal Supply and Services	9	23,246,315	164,383	1,010,227
Information Resources Management	<u>1</u>	<u>16,000,000</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
TOTAL	43*	\$90,210,833	\$1,079,716	\$1,524,527

*Includes two reports which were issued late in the last reporting period and were not included in those figures. Neither involved recommendations for cost avoidance or cost recovery.

Inspection reports resolved during the period resulted in a management commitment to avoid the expenditure of \$809,333 and to seek the recovery of \$1,040,543.

B. SIGNIFICANT PROBLEMS, ABUSES, DEFICIENCIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CORRECTIVE ACTION

The results highlighted in the paragraphs which follow are presented by GSA program area. Where possible, management's response to the report and the status of the recommendations are provided. For those reports issued late in the reporting period, this information was not available at the time of publication.

1. Space Management

Controls Over Costs for Repairs, Alterations, and Improvements to Leased Space

Each year, GSA's Public Buildings Service (PBS) expends substantial sums of money for repairs, alterations and improvements to leased space. In the past, expenditures for such lease alterations have been as great as \$36 million annually. In order to determine the adequacy of controls in this area, we analyzed prior OIG and General Accounting Office (GAO) reports to consolidate the conditions and findings which might indicate systemic problems affecting the program.

We found that policies and procedures were inadequate to effectively control the cost of repairs, alterations, and improvements. The primary reason resided in the treatment of alterations as being exempt from the Federal Procurement Regulations and the Public Buildings Act prospectus requirement. Under these circumstances, we felt that there was little assurance that the Government was obtaining the most reasonable prices available.

Accordingly, we recommended on January 26, 1983 that the Commissioner of PBS: (1) clearly indicate in all policies and handbooks that lease alterations are subject to the Federal Procurement Regulations whenever the cost of alteration is not included in rental payments, and (2) ensure that audits are requested for all lease alteration and lease construction contract modification proposals in excess of \$100,000.

The Commissioner concurred in our recommendations.

Norfolk, Virginia Buildings Manager Needs to Improve Internal Controls

The buildings management program represents one of the areas in which fraud was detected in the late 1970's. As part of our ongoing effort to prevent and detect fraud, waste and abuse, we review this program on a regular basis. On January 27, 1983, we issued a report detailing the results of our review of the procedures and internal controls followed by the buildings manager in the Norfolk, Virginia area.

The problems surfaced by this audit, although specifically related to the Norfolk review, are typical of the findings disclosed by the 11 other buildings management reviews conducted over the last six months.

Overall, we found that the buildings manager needed to improve controls over the procurement and documentation of small purchases; the accountability for operating and expendable equipment; the verification and reconciliation of monthly office costs; and the use of automated management reports. Therefore, we recommended that field office employees be instructed in techniques for procuring and documenting small order purchases; office costs be verified by both employees and the buildings manager; and a complete inventory of all operating and expendable equipment be conducted. Furthermore, we recommended that field office efficiency be increased through educating employees on the need for and use of automated reports.

The Regional Administrator agreed with our recommendations. As of the date of this report, the Commissioner, PBS, had not responded to the audit report.

Controls Over Lease Renewal Dates

In our last Report to the Congress, we identified several incidents where missed lease renewal options could result in additional Government costs. This audit was initiated to determine whether corrective actions subsequently taken by PBS were adequate to prevent the recurrence of missed renewal options.

Our review disclosed that although PBS required all GSA regions to reconcile the information contained in the Public Buildings Service/Information System (PBS/IS) with the individual lease files, the adequacy of such reviews in two regions was questionable. In these regions, the PBS/IS was found to contain erroneous lease renewal date information even after the reconciliation was performed. In one of these regions we estimated that GSA could have incurred additional rental costs of about \$3.5 million due to uncorrected data. Furthermore, we found that each region had different procedures for managing lease renewal dates and, in spite of past problems, PBS had not developed and implemented nationwide procedures.

Accordingly, on March 28, 1983, we recommended that the Commissioner of PBS develop standard procedures for use nationwide to manage and control lease data, and that periodic regional reviews be performed to ensure that such procedures are fully implemented.

The Commissioner agreed with the findings and recommendations contained in the draft report. We are awaiting his response to the final audit report.

Implementation of the Public Buildings Cooperative Use Act

We evaluated the management and operation of the program established by GSA to implement the Public Buildings Cooperative Use Act of 1976. This Act requires GSA to outlease surplus Government space whenever possible and to acquire, through lease or purchase, historic buildings to fulfill Government space needs whenever feasible and prudent. As of June 30, 1981, GSA had acquired 14 historic buildings, leased parts of 45 historic buildings, and entered into 97 outleases.

Our review disclosed a number of problems associated with the implementation of the Act. The most significant finding was that legislative and economic restraints prevent GSA from effectively implementing its provisions. A second major problem area, relating to outleasing for commercial mall development, is discussed in detail in our report on the Old Post Office Building which follows.

Our report confirmed past reviews performed by both the GAO and various GSA study groups which identified significant legislative and economic restraints, especially in regards to the acquisition of historic buildings. In some instances, such acquisitions were not economically feasible considering the limitations imposed by the Economy Act of 1932. In other cases, historic buildings did not meet Federal fire safety, energy conservation and handicapped facility requirements. Finally, the planning for historic buildings often could not be accomplished without assurance of funding availability, i.e., plans for obtaining space are usually made three years before funds are available.

In responding to the draft report, the Commissioner of PBS stated that while management recognizes the impact of existing constraints on the acquisition of historic buildings, he did not believe that relaxing standards or cancelling GSA's participation in the program was necessary. He also indicated that the policy and procedures needed to correct the problems identified in this report would be included in the new out-leasing handbook scheduled to be released in early 1983.

We recommended on March 25, 1983 that PBS review GSA's experience in the acquisition and renovation of historic buildings, as well as past studies made by GSA and GAO, to identify changes necessary to ensure a workable and meaningful historic buildings program. After examining all the possible solutions, including cancellation, GSA should propose legislation that would clarify the intent of the historic buildings program and enhance GSA's ability to carry it out.

Outleasing of Space in the Old Post Office Building

This audit report summarizes some of the major events which occurred in the outleasing of the Old Post Office Building in

Washington, DC, and provides an analysis of the actions taken by management in response to some of our concerns. The outleasing action involved approximately 56,500 square feet of net usable space for development into a commercial mall.

The review was initiated in response to a November 1981 request from the Assistant Regional Administrator, Office of Public Buildings and Real Property, to provide advisory assistance to the lease negotiation team prior to the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The MOU described the business terms of a lease to be signed at a later date.

Our review identified 23 significant legal and business issues in the MOU and we therefore recommended that it not be signed until these issues could be resolved. However, management ignored our recommendation and a similar one from Regional Counsel and executed the MOU on February 4, 1982. Our concerns centered around the fact that the MOU: (1) lacked adequate terms and conditions to protect the Government; (2) contained other provisions contrary to public policy or statute; and (3) gave the developer a contractual basis to claim significant damages in the event a formal lease was not executed. The matter was brought to the attention of the Associate Administrator for Operations and the Regional Administrator, National Capital Region, who initiated appropriate corrective actions on most items. Subsequently, we closely monitored implementation of the corrective actions and continued to work with the negotiation team.

Ultimately, management negotiated major changes which significantly improved the terms and conditions of the formal lease. This lease, which was signed on October 4, 1982, corrected all but two of our major concerns. These were: (1) the lack of an independent evaluation of the proposed outleasing agreement by a qualified expert in this specialized area, and (2) the lack of a termination provision.

No recommendations were made in our March 30, 1983 report since the lease had already been executed and management had implemented certain corrective actions. These actions could result in cost avoidances of \$7.7 million over the life of the outlease. Recommendations to prevent the recurrence of these problems with future outleases are contained in our report on implementation of the Public Buildings Cooperative Use Act of 1976, which was discussed previously.

2. Construction Management

Termination of the Nashville Union Train Station Rehabilitation Project

As discussed previously, the Public Buildings Cooperative Use Act of 1976 (Cooperative Use Act) authorizes GSA's Administrator to acquire and utilize space in suitable buildings of historic,

architectural, or cultural significance and encourages the location of commercial, cultural, educational and recreational facilities within public buildings. These provisions have provided the impetus for GSA to become actively involved in the renovation of many historic structures, including the conversion of the Nashville Union Train Station into Federal office space.

We initiated a review of this project to determine whether: (1) additional Government-owned space was required in the Nashville area; (2) renovation of the station represented the best means of acquiring additional office space; and (3) the project could be completed within established funding limitations. We found that the conversion was economically unsound and could not be completed within the approved funding. Furthermore, we determined that there was no immediate need for additional office space in the Nashville area. Accordingly, on November 30, 1982 we recommended that the Commissioner, PBS, in cooperation with the Administrator, should (1) advise the Congress that GSA cannot complete all of the work contained in the \$7.2 million prospectus, and (2) propose project termination due to the large costs involved and the small benefits to be derived.

The Commissioner, PBS, concurred in the audit recommendations and final plans to dispose of the train station are being formulated. We estimate that through this action the Government will avoid the expenditure of \$12.5 million.

Audit of Damages for Increased Construction Costs

We audited a contractor's \$1.2 million claim for increased costs allegedly resulting from Government-caused delays while the firm was performing piping and plumbing work at the Social Security Administration's Metro-West Building in Baltimore, Maryland. In our audit report dated October 26, 1982, we questioned \$1.1 million in costs arising from: overstated extended home office overhead costs; unsupported and unallowable extended job site costs; overstated labor escalation; unsupported labor inefficiency costs; and unallowable profit.

Approximately \$850,000 of the recommended questioned costs were sustained in negotiations with the contractor.

Inspection of the Lease/Construction of a Laboratory Facility

An inspection of the work performed in the construction of a laboratory facility for the Environmental Protection Agency revealed that inadequate contract administration and a lack of technical input in the conceptual, design, and construction

phases of the project has resulted and/or will result in Government overpayments and losses of over \$1.5 million. We found that instead of assigning technically qualified individuals to perform site inspections, negotiate change orders, and administer the contract, GSA allowed a leasing specialist to perform these functions. As a result, over \$85,000 in work required by the lease/construction agreement was not performed; over \$113,000 was lost on change orders due to excessively priced items or inadequate credits; over \$45,000 was paid on change orders for work already required by the lease/construction agreement; credits worth more than \$104,000 were not obtained on deleted work; over \$525,000 will be lost over the life of the lease due to excessive energy consumption arising from faulty construction; and unnecessary maintenance costs of over \$790,000 will be incurred over the life of the lease due to the substitution of a less efficient mechanical system and the negotiation of a maintenance service package which duplicates the original lease agreement.

Management's response to the draft report indicated concurrence in the findings and implementation of the major recommendations with the exception of the development of the internal procedures that would require such projects to be administered by the Design and Construction Division. Management's response stated that implementation of this recommendation would be delayed pending the issuance of new Central Office guidelines in this area.

Our final report, dated March 31, 1983, recommended that the Regional Administrator direct the contracting officer to: (1) require the lessor to correct and/or complete all defects and omissions, or have GSA perform this work and backcharge the lessor; (2) in conjunction with legal counsel, determine the basis for recovery of identified losses and initiate recovery action; (3) conduct a study of the mechanical system to identify the specific causes of the excessive energy usage; and (4) develop internal procedures that would require all special purpose lease/construction projects and major lease alterations to be administered by the Regional Design and Construction Division.

Construction of the San Jose Federal Building

At the request of the Associate Administrator for Operations, we reviewed deficiencies in the construction of the U.S. Courthouse and Federal Building in San Jose, California. Specifically, we inspected problems associated with the contractor's failure to provide shoring to support composite floor beams at certain locations and evaluated the adequacy of the remedial actions being pursued by regional officials. We also evaluated the contractor's system and procedures for shoring subsequent to the identification of this omission.

We found that the contractor's failure to provide shoring first came to light as a result of a site visit by the structural engineers for the design architect. The inspection services contractor who originally inspected the work failed to recognize this contract requirement and enforce it. This failure resulted from a lack of familiarity with the contract and a full understanding of its terms.

Our review of subsequent corrective actions pursued by the region found that they were adequate and appropriate. However, our review of the contractor's shoring system and procedures (first used after the omission was disclosed) found them to be inadequate for a number of reasons. Accordingly, on March 3, 1983, we recommended that: (1) the entire structure be surveyed to determine whether overstressing is evident; (2) the contracting officer review the overall performance of the inspection services contractor; (3) regional counsel be apprised of the shoring problems so that the Government's position is documented; and (4) both regional counsel and the contracting officer take action to ensure that delays do not adversely affect occupancy of this facility.

Management was in general agreement with the findings and recommendations contained in the draft report. They did, however, disagree as to the extent of the survey which needs to be performed. We are awaiting their response to the final report.

3. Procurement of Supplies and Services

Plastic Bag Procurement

The Office of Federal Supply and Services procures approximately \$14 million worth of plastic bags each year. Our review of these procurement actions revealed a number of weaknesses, the most significant of which was GSA's failure to invoke the economic price adjustment (EPA) clause. This clause provides for adjustments in contract prices when specific changes occur in the Producers Price Index. During our review, we found that the Producers Price Index had declined during the term of the contracts, yet GSA had not initiated the downward price adjustments to which it was entitled. As a result, in our report dated March 22, 1983, we recommended that these overpayments be recovered from the contractors.

In responding to our recommendations, management agreed that \$528,000 could be recovered and they are in the process of doing so now. Management has also revised the EPA clause to preclude a recurrence of this situation.

Alleged Waste in Proposed Carpet Replacement

In response to a Hotline complaint, we reviewed the planned \$1 million replacement of carpeting at the Social Security Administration (SSA) Service Center in Richmond, California. The complaint alleged that the proposed replacement of carpeting was a waste of taxpayers' money because the existing carpeting was still in good condition.

We found that the carpeting scheduled for replacement did not exhibit any significant wear, with the exception of certain isolated areas in exterior corridors. Consequently, we recommended on March 16, 1983 that the Assistant Regional Administrator for Public Buildings and Real Property: (1) limit carpet replacement at the Richmond SSA Center to those areas where replacement is needed; (2) defer total carpet replacement until general wear is evident; and (3) schedule periodic shampooing of the carpet to prolong its life.

Management agreed with our recommendations and cancelled the procurement. In their response to the final report, management also indicated that they will review similar projects on an annual basis to verify their validity.

\$300,000 Refund Obtained Due to Defective Pricing

We performed a postaward audit of a multiple award schedule supplier of radio equipment, antennas, and tone/voice paging systems. The audit, which covered the period of September 1976 to November 1979, found that the GSA had negotiated a discount rate of 17 percent while the firm's best customers received an average discount of almost 25 percent. We concluded that GSA received incomplete and inaccurate pricing data and, had all the pertinent facts been disclosed, the Government would have negotiated a discount rate at least equal to that given to the firm's best customers. Accordingly, on October 27, 1982, we recommended a \$324,000 refund in accordance with the defective pricing provisions of the contract.

The contractor agreed with the majority of our recommendations. A check for \$300,000 was sent to the Government on February 16, 1983.

4. Financial Management

Improper Recording of Obligations

A multiregional review of obligations recorded for GSA appropriations found overstatements of about \$2.1 million at the close of Fiscal Year 1981. These overstatements represented accruals of lease escalation costs after final

payments had been made, obligated amounts that lacked adequate supporting documentation, and obligations made against completed projects. They occurred due to the absence of an adequate year-end review of open items, the low priority assigned to monitoring obligations, and a failure to deobligate items identified as invalid.

In four reports issued between October and December 1982, we recommended that: (1) the status of open obligations be determined through distribution of open item listings to all GSA activities; (2) accrual accounts be liquidated when final payment is made for lease escalation costs and no further accruals are made; (3) lease escalation costs chargeable to other years be identified and required adjustments be made; (4) invalid or unsupported open items be deobligated on a timely basis prior to year-end closing; and (5) more emphasis be placed on year-end closing procedures.

Management generally agreed with the recommendations and initiated appropriate action.

Controls Over Travel Tickets

We initiated a review of the controls used by GSA to identify unused and partially used travel tickets purchased with Government Transportation Requests (GTRs). We found that such tickets were not being promptly identified and that refunds relative to these tickets were not being processed in a timely manner. These problems resulted from a reliance upon administrative controls without corresponding accounting controls.

On March 30, 1983, we recommended that GSA establish accounting controls to complement the administrative controls already in use. We suggested a potential scenario which would place the responsibility for the cost of the unused ticket with the traveler until the travel voucher is submitted to GSA's Office of Finance. Furthermore, recognizing that GSA formulates the Government guidelines for the use and control of tickets purchased with GTRs, we also recommended that GSA take action to amend the Federal Property Management Regulations to require agencies to maintain adequate accounting controls, including individual accountability for unused and partially used airline tickets. We believe such action is necessary in light of GSA's recent efforts to recover almost \$12 million in ticket refunds due the Government but never claimed by individual agencies.

In response to the draft report, management took exception to our recommendations. We reaffirmed them both in our final report.

5. Other Significant Audits

FSS-28 System Development Project

We have found audits of systems development projects to be a valuable prevention tool. This period we initiated a review of the Self-Service Store Automation Project (FSS-28) which identified serious internal control weaknesses in its design and operation. We found that the FSS-28 could not generate reports required by its users and that modification of the system to produce such reports might not be possible due to hardware compatibility problems and inefficient software. Consequently, the system could not provide line item accountability - the primary purpose for procuring it originally. Our review also disclosed that funding this procurement through the General Supply Fund revolving fund rather than direct appropriation was inappropriate.

We recommended on December 13, 1982 that management not proceed with system implementation until several alternative solutions to the identified deficiencies were explored. We also recommended that the General Supply Fund not be used to fund this procurement unless GSA's Office of General Counsel rendered a formal opinion authorizing it as a legal source of funding.

Management has initiated action to implement all of our recommendations. Negotiations were begun with the contractor to correct all of the system deficiencies at no additional cost to GSA. This action will result in a \$500,000 cost avoidance over the next five years.

Application of the ICB System Concept

Since 1973, PBS has mandated open-space planning and Integrated Ceiling and Background (ICB) systems for all new Federal office buildings and major alteration projects. ICB systems are designed to provide acoustical privacy in these open-space offices. We initiated a review of the implementation of the ICB concept to determine whether the systems were operating as intended and to assess the extent to which ICB system goals have been met.

We found that mandatory application of this concept in building construction has created customer dissatisfaction and wasted millions of dollars by requiring the purchase and installation of materials/equipment without achieving the objective of speech privacy. In almost every building inspected, speech privacy was lacking because one or more system elements were missing, inoperative, or being used improperly. In others, additional costs were incurred because offices designed to meet open-space requirements had been compartmentalized at

the request of tenant agencies. In many instances, the performance of heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems of the buildings were seriously impaired due to the installation of ceiling high partitions in the open-space area. Moreover, we found that GSA officials have not aggressively pursued solutions to these problems.

On March 24, 1983, we recommended that: (1) new building concepts be thoroughly evaluated and tested prior to implementation; (2) background masking systems be installed only at the expense of agencies requesting such systems; (3) GSA provide office acoustics training for building managers, their staffs, and selected tenant agency space managers responsible for maintaining masking systems; and (4) guidelines be developed to minimize the future partitioning of open-space offices (such projects would require approval from the highest levels of PBS).

Management generally concurred in the findings and recommendations contained in our draft report. We are awaiting their response to the final audit report.

Floyd Bennett Field Communications System

At the request of the Regional Administrator, we initiated a review of the Floyd Bennett Field telecommunications system project. The purpose of the review was to determine whether GSA had taken measures to ensure that the contractor had installed a fully operational system in accordance with the contract specifications, and to evaluate management actions in response to customer agency complaints.

We found that inadequate and substandard installation of the system had resulted in serious problems which will mean that this \$400,000 system will have to be replaced. While some fault for this waste of resources rests with the contractor, our review disclosed that poor planning by GSA and ineffective contract administration contributed to the problems.

Recognizing these problems, and aware that GSA will soon be entering an era in which it will be responsible for many multimillion dollar telecommunications projects, we recommended on March 23, 1983 that the Regional Administrator ensure that all future telecommunications projects be thoroughly inspected by qualified individuals prior to acceptance. Further, we recommended that steps be taken to recover some \$37,000 in overpayments to the contractor identified by this audit.

The Regional Administrator agreed with the recommendations in our draft report. We are awaiting management's response to the final audit report.

C. AUDIT RESOLUTION AND FOLLOWUP

1. Overview

During the period, GSA's management has been generally responsive to the recommendations contained in our audit reports. In most cases, implementation is proceeding according to the milestones agreed upon by the Office of Inspector General and management.

On December 22, 1982, the Administrator signed GSA Order ADM 2030.2A which sets forth the policies, definitions, responsibilities and procedures for the GSA audit resolution and follow-up system. This Order tasks the Inspector General and GSA management officials with the responsibility for promptly resolving any differences over audit recommendations and findings so that final resolution decisions can be made within six months after an audit report is issued.

Tables 6 and 7 provide resolution information for contract and internal audits. Comparable data are not yet available for inspections reports, which became subject to systematic followup requirements only with the promulgation of the aforementioned GSA Order.

TABLE 6. AUDIT RESOLUTION AND SETTLEMENT - CONTRACT AUDITS WITH RECOVERY RECOMMENDATIONS

	<u>No. of Reports</u>	<u>Recommended Recovery</u>	
<u>Resolution</u>			
Reports to be Resolved as of 9/30/82			
-Less than 6 months old	22	\$10,063,230	
-More than 6 months old	2	32,373	
Reports Issued this Period	<u>30</u>	<u>5,462,134</u>	
TOTAL TO BE RESOLVED	<u>54</u>	<u>\$15,557,737</u>	
Reports Resolved			
- Issued Prior Periods	24	\$10,095,603	
- Issued Current Period	<u>10</u>	<u>2,334,857</u>	
TOTAL RESOLVED	<u>34</u>	<u>\$12,430,460</u>	
Unresolved as of 3/31/83*	<u>20</u>	<u>\$ 3,127,277</u>	
<u>Settlement</u>			<u>Sustained Recovery</u>
Final Settlements			
- Issued Prior Periods	6	\$ 179,493	\$ 75,110
- Issued Current Period	<u>6</u>	<u>416,334</u>	<u>383,061</u>
TOTAL SETTLED	<u>12</u>	<u>\$ 595,827</u>	<u>\$458,171</u>

*All reports are less than six months old.

TABLE 7. AUDIT RESOLUTION AND COSTS SUSTAINED - INTERNAL AUDITS

<u>Resolution</u>	<u>No. of Reports</u>	<u>Reports With Recommended Savings</u>	<u>Recommended Savings</u>
Unresolved as of 10/1/82	26	4	\$ 1,808,802
Audits Issued Current Period	<u>112</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>34,894,491</u>
TOTAL TO BE RESOLVED	<u>138</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>\$ 36,703,293</u>
Resolved During Period			
- Audits Prior Period	22	3	\$ 1,464,871
- Audits Current Period	<u>69</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>33,575,271</u>
TOTAL RESOLVED	<u>91</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>\$ 35,040,142</u>
Unresolved as of 3/31/83	<u>47</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>\$ 1,663,151</u>
			<u>Costs Sustained</u>
<u>Costs Sustained</u>			
- Audits Prior Period	22	3	\$ 1,452,208
- Audits Current Period	<u>69</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>33,487,348</u>
TOTAL COSTS SUSTAINED	<u>91</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>\$ 34,939,556</u>

Of the 47 reports which were unresolved at the close of the period, only 4 reports were six months old or older. One of these reports involved recommended savings of \$343,931.

2. Implementation Reviews

GSA Order ADM 2030.2A places primary responsibility for followup on the implementation of resolved audit recommendations with the Office of Audit Resolution, Office of Oversight. However, the Office of Inspector General reviews implementation actions on a test basis. These reviews are called implementation reviews to distinguish them from other followup actions.

During the period, the OIG conducted 18 implementation reviews. In 13 reviews, or 72 percent, management had successfully implemented our recommendations. Last period, management had implemented our recommendations in 82 percent of the reviews conducted.

Because of the emphasis placed on followup, we believe that the instances where our recommendations were not implemented are highly significant. For this reason, they are highlighted in the paragraphs which follow.

Regional Management of the Public Buildings Service/Information System Needs Improvements

A review of the actions taken to implement the recommendations contained in this March 24, 1982 report disclosed that four of our recommendations had not been fully implemented. Accordingly, on March 23, 1983 we reaffirmed our four recommendations.

The results of this review are particularly significant because Agency tracking officials within the Office of Audit Resolution, Office of Oversight, had considered the corrective action complete on two of the recommendations we reaffirmed. In light of our review, these officials have agreed to reverify the status of all four recommendations.

This audit, which was highlighted in a prior Report to the Congress, is also discussed in the following section addressing significant recommendations on which corrective action has not been completed.

Contracting Procedures and Administrative Controls Over Alterations in Leased Space Need to Be Improved

A review of the actions taken to implement the recommendations contained in this October 22, 1980 report disclosed that three recommendations had not been implemented. On February 8, 1983, we reaffirmed our recommendations to: (1) increase the quality of reviews of lease files prior to approval of transactions; (2) require contracting officers to negotiate reductions in rental payments during extended periods of vacancy; and (3) determine the actions to be taken relative to artwork installed in one leased location.

At the time of publication of this report, management had not yet responded to our implementation review.

Improvements Needed in Administration of GSA Controlled Space

Our April 22, 1981 audit of GSA's administration of space in the Washington, DC area found that significant improvements needed to be made. A subsequent review of the actions taken to implement our recommendations disclosed that two recommendations had not been fully implemented. On November 8, 1982, we reaffirmed our recommendations to update and maintain building drawings and to require periodic reconciliation of space records with building drawings.

On December 9, 1982, the Regional Administrator responded that the region had encountered problems in implementing the recommendations. He provided an action plan for the outstanding recommendations. The Commissioner, PBS, has not yet responded to the report.

Processing of Federal Buildings Fund Payments

This audit, issued on June 30, 1981, found that controls over payments made from the Federal Buildings Fund were inadequate. Accordingly, we made 16 recommendations for corrective action. On November 12, 1982, our implementation review found that six recommendations had not been implemented. These recommendations related to inadequate documentation authorizing utility service, failure to take prompt payment discounts, and late payments to vendors.

On December 21, 1982, the Regional Administrator responded to our report and agreed to implement all of the recommendations.

Administration of Construction Contracts Could Be Improved

Our audit report dated June 23, 1981 made eight recommendations directed at improving the administration of construction contracts. Our review of implementation actions found that our recommendation to institute procedures to assure an independent review of the accuracy and reliability of Government estimates had not been fully implemented.

Although draft procedures had been developed, they were still under review and no specific target date had been established for issuance of final procedures. Therefore, on October 13, 1982 we reaffirmed our original recommendation and further recommended that corrective action be taken in a timely fashion. These recommendations will remain open until the procedures have been formalized.

3. Significant Recommendations Made in Previous Reports on Which Corrective Action Has Not Been Completed

Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-50 requires agency heads to designate a top management official to oversee audit followup, including resolution and implementation action. Within GSA, the Deputy Administrator is the Agency Followup Official and, as such, is personally responsible for making final decisions to resolve differences between management and the Office of Inspector General in a timely manner; ensuring that corrective actions are taken on resolved audit recommendations; and ensuring that systems of followup, resolution and corrective action are documented and in place. The Office of Audit Resolution, Office of Oversight, acts as staff to the Agency Followup Official on audit resolution and implementation matters.

Most of the information for this section was provided by the Office of Audit Resolution. This information has been separated into two major subdivisions to draw a distinction between the reasons for lack of implementation. The first section details those situations in which corrective action has not been completed because there is some impediment to either the resolution or implementation process. The second contains recommendations which are being implemented according to established milestones but are not yet fully implemented due to time considerations.

a. Significant Audit Recommendations Which Have Not Been Satisfactorily Implemented

Systems Development and Control

Period First Reported: April 1, 1981 - September 30, 1981

This review found that GSA's Office of Finance had expended approximately \$265,000 to develop the Stockpile Billing and Receivables System and then decided to terminate it. Because we believed the termination was not justified or adequately documented, we recommended that: (1) the decision to terminate be formally reevaluated and the reasons for not implementing the system be thoroughly documented and supported by data which would be available for review by the Office of Audits, and (2) the reevaluation specifically address the reason(s) the system was allowed to proceed to completion before termination and, to the extent possible, assign responsibility for this waste of GSA resources in an effort to minimize the potential for its recurrence.

As we advised the Congress in our last report, the Assistant Administrator for Plans, Programs, and Financial Management disagreed with our recommendations. We referred the matter to the Agency Followup Official on July 23, 1982 for resolution. The matter was referred, in turn, to the Office of

Audit Resolution for review. Their recommendations were to be presented to the Agency Followup Official by November 1982.

The Inspector General requested status information from the Agency Followup Official on January 4, 1983. No response has been received to date.

Problems Relating to GSA's ADP Systems

Period First Reported: October 1, 1980 - March 31, 1981

This audit found that GSA had not developed contingency/recovery plans for its major sensitive computer systems. We made 10 recommendations for corrective action; two have not been implemented. They relate to the development of a contingency/recovery plan for the B-7700 and FSS-19 systems, and the performance of risk analyses on the same systems.

Because the Assistant Administrator for Plans, Programs and Financial Management originally took exception to these recommendations, the matter was brought to the Administrator's attention on November 18, 1981. Resolution occurred on December 21, 1981.

As of March 31, 1983, neither of these recommendations had been implemented.

Evaluation of a Change Order Proposal

Period First Reported: April 1, 1982 - September 30, 1982

Our audit report, issued on August 16, 1982, concluded that a \$300,000 credit change order submitted on GSA's VOTRAKON project in Saudi Arabia was understated by \$640,000. In our last Report to the Congress, we advised that resolution of this matter was being deferred until January 1983.

As of March 31, 1983, this audit remains unresolved. The contracting officer questions whether this matter should be processed under the changes clause or treated as a termination for convenience.

Regional Management of the Public Buildings Service/Information System Needs Improvement

Period First Reported: October 1, 1981 - March 31, 1982

An internal audit of the Public Buildings Service/Information System found the system's usefulness and reliability had been reduced. We made 10 recommendations for corrective action.

In our last Report to the Congress, we reported that the Office of Audit Resolution was carrying four recommendations as unimplemented. Two involved personnel matters and two concerned unnecessary system reports. In their status report as of March 31, 1983, they advised that corrective action had been completed on the two recommendations dealing with personnel matters, leaving two recommendations addressing the elimination of unnecessary system reports still unimplemented.

An implementation review performed by the Office of Audits and issued on March 23, 1983 found that four recommendations remained unimplemented. One involved personnel matters (a recommendation closed by the Office of Audit Resolution) and three involved systems reports (one of these recommendations had been previously closed by the Office of Audit Resolution, while the remaining two are the above items referenced as open).

The Office of Audit Resolution has agreed to reverify the status of all four recommendations reaffirmed in our implementation review.

Procurement of Computer Hardware and Software to Support GSA Operations

Period First Reported: April 1, 1982 - September 30, 1982

This audit disclosed that the procurement of 26 minicomputers to support the Federal Supply Service would cost GSA in excess of \$5.9 million more than the equipment configuration already in place. Management agreed with our recommendations and terminated the procurement.

As of March 31, 1983, one recommendation remained open due to the transfer of functional responsibility brought about by a reorganization. Management is currently in the process of finalizing their action plan.

b. Significant Audit Recommendations Being Implemented According to Established Milestones

Audit of a Missed Lease Option

Period First Reported: April 1, 1982 - September 30, 1982

Our review of a missed lease option in San Francisco, California, verified that the Government had failed to exercise its right to retain the leased space at a base rental rate of \$9.20 per square foot. We projected that additional Government costs could equal \$24 million to \$33 million over the next 10 years. Accordingly, we made

eight recommendations for corrective action; seven of these recommendations have been implemented.

The remaining recommendation, directed at the Commissioner of PBS, involved the development of a manual system to track multi-unit leases. It called for two separate actions. The first action was completed on January 7, 1983. The remaining action was to have been completed by February 1983; this milestone has been extended to April 29, 1983.

Poor Inspection of Repair and Alteration Contract Work

Period First Reported: April 1, 1982 - September 30, 1982

Our review of repair and alteration work on a warehouse disclosed numerous contract deficiencies, defects and omissions which went unnoticed by GSA inspectors. Accordingly, we made nine recommendations for corrective action; corrective action has been completed on eight of our recommendations.

The remaining recommendation, which required the contractor to perform the specified work or obtain a credit, remains open relative to one contract item - the pilasters which were never installed. The region has determined that the pilasters are a necessary structural requirement and has rejected an attempt by the contractor to provide a credit for these items. Accomplishment of the work has been complicated and delayed by the fact that the construction company was sold to a new owner. The region is working to resolve this matter with the contractor.

Contracting Procedures for Commercial Appraisal Services Do Not Assure Adequate Competition

Period First Reported: April 1, 1982 - September 30, 1982

Our audit of the contracting procedures utilized to award commercial appraisal service contracts found that current practices do not assure adequate competition. We made three recommendations to correct the deficiencies disclosed; two have been implemented.

The third recommendation, involving the revision of the appraisal handbook, is being implemented by both the Public Buildings Service (PBS) and the Federal Property Resources Service (FPRS), since each has its own appraisal handbook. The PBS handbook has been revised in draft form and was transmitted to all regions on March 30, 1983 with an instructional letter requiring its use even though it is still in draft form. The FPRS revision is proceeding according to schedule.

Deteriorated Roof Adversely Affecting Stockpiled Asbestos

Period First Reported: April 1, 1982 - September 30, 1982

Our review of the National Defense Stockpile storage program disclosed that water leaking through the roof of the Baton Rouge Depot, Baton Rouge, Louisiana had caused deterioration of the burlap and plastic bags covering stored asbestos. We recommended that immediate action be taken to resolve this problem.

In response to our recommendation, a task force developed a plan to either sell or bury the asbestos by May 1983. This date has been extended to December 1, 1983.

An Approach to Improving GSA's Leasing Program

Period First Reported: October 1, 1981 - March 31, 1982

This compendium report disclosed that GSA must take a more aggressive role in establishing and enforcing policy for leasing. Toward this end, we made 14 recommendations; nine of the 14 have been implemented.

PBS has advised the Office of Audit Resolution that two of the remaining recommendations have been implemented; they are awaiting written documentation to confirm this fact. Regarding the three other recommendations, implementation is proceeding according to the revised milestone dates.

Prompt Action Needed to Preserve America's Recorded Heritage

Period First Reported: October 1, 1981 - March 31, 1982

Our audit of the National Archives and Records Service found that intrinsically valuable historical documents were not being adequately preserved and protected. To correct the identified deficiencies, we made eight recommendations for corrective action; corrective action has been completed on four recommendations.

The remaining recommendations are being completed according to established milestones. All recommendations should be implemented by October 1983.

Reimbursable Work Authorizations

Period First Reported: October 1, 1981 - March 31, 1982

We found that GSA was performing work for tenant agencies under reimbursable agreements without Congressional review

and approval. We recommended that GSA develop procedures which would require tenant agencies to cite appropriations when requesting reimbursable services to demonstrate Congressional approval.

Phase one of the corrective action was completed on July 2, 1982. Completion of the second step, revision of GSA Form 2957-RWA, should have been completed by January 31, 1983. It is being delayed until September 1983 due to management's need to solidify policy in this area.

Inadequate and Improper Financial Management of the Construction Services Fund

Period First Reported: October 1, 1981 - March 31, 1982

Our review of the Construction Services Fund disclosed serious improprieties relative to its financial management. The audit report contained nine recommendations; corrective action has been completed on eight of these recommendations.

The remaining open recommendation required that action be taken to determine the true fund needs of the Fund and, upon determination, action be taken to obtain the necessary funds. This action should be completed by April 1983.

Contract for New Federal Office Building Improperly Administered

Period First Reported: October 1, 1981 - March 31, 1982

Our review of the construction of the new Federal office building and courthouse in Hato Rey, Puerto Rico found that over \$580,000 in unnecessary costs were incurred and additional funds were wasted due to improper administration of the construction contract. We made four recommendations, including one to initiate action to recover overpayments to the contractor.

Corrective action has been taken and/or completed on all recommendations. Regarding the recovery of the overpayment, a claim was forwarded to the General Accounting Office on April 3, 1982. To date, no monies have been collected. The Office of Audit Resolution is carrying this recommendation as an open item until the overpayment is recovered.

D. UNREASONABLE REFUSAL OF INFORMATION OR ASSISTANCE

During the period, the Office of Audits did not experience any refusals of information or assistance by Agency management.

Section III - Investigative Accomplishments

A. SUMMARY OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS

This reporting period was marked by significant accomplishments relative to criminal, civil and investigative actions. In spite of staffing constraints, we were able to maintain a level of activity consistent with that of the past period and continued to manage the workload of the previous period in a timely manner.

At the close of the prior period, we reported 563 investigative cases as pending. A substantial number of these cases (269) involved white collar crimes such as fraud, bribery, embezzlement or false claims. During the period, we aggressively pursued such cases and were able to close 89 of them. Overall, we were able to close 226 of the 563 cases pending at the close of the last period. In addition to this investigative activity, we opened 378 new cases during the period. A substantial number of these new cases (135) also involved white collar crimes against the Government. A total of 84 investigative cases opened this period were also closed this period.

Our activities resulted in a sharp rise in the number of criminal referrals made to the Department of Justice or other authorities for prosecutive consideration. Whereas we referred 38 cases during the last period, this period 119 cases were referred. We believe that this increase reflects the emphasis placed on early consultation with the U.S. Attorneys Office regarding the criminal potential evident in the investigative cases we are working. Further, this rise also evidences referrals to local authorities on those cases which have been declined by the Department of Justice.

Our activities also resulted in a large increase in the number of administrative referrals (158 cases this period as opposed to 86 cases last period). This rise is a function of two related factors: the increased visibility of this Office as a result of education and communication initiatives we have undertaken and, because of this visibility, a sharp increase in the number of referrals from management and employees relative to improper, although not illegal, conduct on the part of GSA employees.

Finally, the recoveries achieved through litigation and investigation are noteworthy. This period, criminal and civil litigation resulted in total recoveries of \$1,909,186, as opposed to the \$201,820 recovered last period. Similarly, investigations resulted in recoveries of \$154,036 in contrast to the \$2,242 we reported last period. While such amounts are a function of the cases themselves, we believe they are highly significant in and of themselves.

1. Investigative Workload

The investigative workload remained relatively constant as compared to the last period. We opened 378 new cases and closed a total of 310 cases. Detailed information on investigative activity is presented in Table 1 by case category.

In addition to these cases, we received and evaluated 161 complaints/allegations from sources other than the Hotline which involved GSA employees and programs. Based upon an analysis of these allegations, formal investigations were not warranted.

TABLE 1. INVESTIGATIVE WORKLOAD ACTIVITY

<u>Case Category</u>	<u>Cases Open*</u> <u>10/1/82</u>	<u>Cases</u> <u>Opened</u>	<u>Cases</u> <u>Closed</u>	<u>Cases</u> <u>Remaining</u> <u>Open</u> <u>3/31/83</u>
White Collar Crimes (Fraud, Bribery, Embezzlement, and False Claims)	269	135	113	291
Other Crimes in GSA-Controlled Space	114	101	59	156
Contractor Suspension/ Debarment	44	17	18	43
Employee Misconduct	83	52	62	73
Other	53	73	58	68
TOTAL	<u>563</u>	<u>378</u>	<u>310</u>	<u>631</u>

*Figures relating to cases open at the close of our last reporting period have been adjusted.

2. Referrals

The Office of Inspector General makes three distinct types of referrals to officials outside of the Agency: criminal, civil and investigative. During the period, we referred 119 criminal cases involving 163 subjects to the Department of Justice or other authorities for prosecutive consideration. The status of these referrals is as follows:

	<u>Cases</u>	<u>Subjects</u>
Pending Prosecutive Decision		
as of October 1, 1982	57	110
Referrals	119	163
Declinations	77	112
Accepted for Prosecution	43	67
Pending Prosecutive Decision		
as of March 31, 1983	56	94

We also referred 17 cases involving 25 subjects to either the Civil Division of the Department of Justice or the appropriate U.S. Attorney for civil action. These referrals could result in potential recoveries of almost \$1.2 million. The status of our civil referrals is as follows:

	<u>Cases</u>	<u>Subjects</u>
Pending Litigation Decision		
as of October 1, 1982*	21	42
Referrals	17	25
Declinations	8	16
Accepted for Litigation	4	9
Pending Litigation Decision as		
of March 31, 1983	26	42

*Referrals reported as pending at the close of the last period have been adjusted.

For the 26 cases representing 42 subjects pending at the close of the period, total potential recoveries exceed \$11.2 million.

In addition to these criminal and civil referrals, our Office made 11 investigative referrals to other Federal or State agencies for further investigation or other appropriate action.

3. Significant Criminal and Civil Cases

Many of the referrals made during the period, as well as those from prior periods, have resulted in cases that are particularly noteworthy. Selected cases are synopsized in the paragraphs which follow.

Civil Fraud Settlement of \$816,896 Entered

On December 2, 1982, an agreement was reached between the Government and a firm and its officers relative to a civil fraud case. In a prior criminal action, the defendants were found guilty of defrauding the U.S. Air Force under a GSA equipment repair contract. At that time, the firm was fined \$45,000, its officers were placed on probation, and all three subjects were debarred by GSA. In the civil settlement, judgments totaling \$816,896 were entered against the subjects.

Summary Judgment of \$598,000 Awarded

Investigation of a firm which held GSA contracts in five regions for repairing and recapping military tires resulted in a successful civil action against the firm this period. Litigation stemmed from a February 1981 criminal case wherein the firm's president and production foreman pled guilty to charges of supplying inferior materials to contract users. At that time, substantial fines were imposed, the subjects were placed on probation, and the firm and the defendants were debarred by GSA. In the February 24, 1983 civil decision, the U.S. District Court entered a summary judgment against the firm and its president in the amount of \$598,000 plus interest and costs.

Agreement Reached Regarding False Certifications and Billings

An investigation of a firm which held two term construction contracts with GSA disclosed violations of the Davis-Bacon Act. We found that contractor employees working on Federal job sites were underpaid by \$29,000 and at least 25 false certified payrolls were filed with GSA. Further, the investigation disclosed that the contractor also defrauded GSA of approximately \$140,000 in work required under the terms of the two contracts.

Criminal action was declined in favor of civil prosecution under the False Claims Act. In October 1982, after only four days of trial, the contractor and the Government reached a settlement agreement wherein GSA would retain the \$141,000 already withheld from the contractor, the firm would pay GSA an additional \$12,500, and the contractor would not do business with GSA until after June 1984.

Settlement Reached With Security Firm

In November 1982, the Government reached an agreement with a security firm and its president and contract manager. The corporation, which held a number of security guard contracts

with GSA, was found to have disguised its failure to satisfy certain of its contractual provisions relating to the training of its personnel through false certifications.

The settlement requires the corporation to pay \$5,000 immediately and to pay an additional \$30,000, plus interest, in monthly installments over the next five years. As part of the settlement, GSA agreed to remove the name of the corporation, its president and contract manager from the debarred bidders list and to restore their eligibility for Government contracts.

Withholding Action Upheld

In November 1982, the Government reached an agreement with a custodial services firm and its two principal owners and operators. The settlement concerned a civil suit filed by the contractor and a counterclaim filed by the Government.

The contractor instituted a civil suit in the U.S. Court of Claims to recover approximately \$41,000 which GSA had withheld from the firm due to deficient and allegedly fraudulent performance on Government contracts. This withholding action was instituted when our investigation established that the contractor was not providing the contractually required staffhours and was falsifying its records to disguise this fact.

In response to this suit, the Government brought a counterclaim against the firm based upon the Civil False Claims Act and various common law theories. Under the terms of the settlement, the Government retained all of the monies withheld and the firm agreed not to challenge any debarment action instituted by GSA against the firm.

GSA Accounts Receivable Collections Embezzled

A GSA Supervisory Operating Accountant resigned from his position while under investigation for embezzling accounts receivable funds. Our investigation established that he had embezzled checks and cash totaling over \$37,000 during an 18 month period. On February 1, 1983, this former employee pled guilty to a one count information charging him with violating 18 USC 641 (Embezzlement). On March 10, 1983, the subject was sentenced to three years imprisonment.

Assistant Buildings Manager Solicited Bribes

A GSA Assistant Buildings Manager resigned from his position after we began an investigation of allegations of bribery and extortion. The investigation established that the subject and a co-conspirator extorted approximately \$25,000 from contractors doing business with GSA. On November 10, 1982, the subject

admitted to directly receiving \$4,000 by pleading guilty to five counts of 18 USC 201 (Bribery). He was sentenced to a \$20,000 fine, one year in prison (suspended), and one year of probation.

Former Employee Convicted of Bribery and Conspiracy

A two-year investigation disclosed that a construction contractor had paid a former GSA engineer approximately \$13,000 to approve and process over 70 false and fraudulent change orders valued at more than \$200,000. On November 15, 1982, the former employee was sentenced to one year imprisonment (nine months suspended), a \$10,000 fine, and three years probation. The contractor has been sentenced to a fine of \$5,000, two years probation and 200 hours of community service work.

4. Criminal Prosecutions and Civil Settlements

Cases accepted for criminal prosecution during this and prior periods resulted in 28 indictments/informations and 14 convictions. Detailed information on subjects in the criminal justice system is presented in Table 2. The case against one subject, an employee of a firm, was dismissed.

TABLE 2. SUBJECTS IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM					
	<u>Indictments/ Informations</u>	<u>Convictions Pleas/Trials</u>		<u>Sentences Imposed/Pending</u>	
GSA Employees	7	4	1	6	1
Firms	4	3	0	3	1
Officers, Employees, Principals and Agents of Firms	10	4	0	7	0
Other Individuals	6	2	0	4	0
Other Government Employees	1	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	<u>28</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>2</u>

Civilly, settlements were reached in 10 cases involving 14 subjects and judgments were entered in 5 cases involving 7 subjects.

5. Litigation: Recoveries, Penalties and Settlements

Table 3 presents the amounts determined to be owed the Government as a result of both criminal and civil actions. The totals do not necessarily reflect actual monetary recoveries.

	<u>Criminal</u>	<u>Civil</u>	<u>Total</u>
Fines and Penalties	\$ 47,700	\$ -	\$ 47,700
Settlements and Judgments	7,836	1,807,497	1,815,333
Restitutions	46,153	-	46,153
TOTAL	\$101,689	\$1,807,497	\$1,909,186

6. Investigation Recoveries

In addition to the recoveries achieved through audits and litigation, investigations conducted by the Office of Inspector General may directly result in the recovery of monies or property of the Government. This period, \$154,036 was recovered through our investigations.

7. Administrative Referrals and Actions Involving GSA Employees and Programs

During the period, 158 cases involving 190 subjects were referred to GSA officials for administrative action. These referrals normally involved nonprosecutable wrongdoing on the part of GSA employees, contractors, or private individuals doing business with GSA. In addition, we referred 65 cases concerning 74 subjects to Agency officials for informational purposes.

The status of administrative referrals during the period is as follows:

	<u>Cases</u>	<u>Subjects</u>
Pending as of October 1, 1982 . . .	55	60
Referrals	158	190
Action Completed	134	157
Pending as of March 31, 1983 . . .	79	93

Of the 158 cases (190 subjects) referred for administrative action, 106 cases (110 subjects) involved GSA employees. As a result of those referrals involving just GSA employees, management took the following personnel actions:

Reprimands	17
Suspensions	19
Demotions	3
Terminations	19

8. Contractor Suspensions and Debarments

The Office of Inspector General has continued its efforts to make the suspension/debarment process a more effective and more readily used means of protecting the interests of the Government in connection with GSA's multibillion dollar procurement activities.

We referred to Agency officials 2 cases involving 5 subjects for suspension and 20 cases recommending 56 subjects for debarment. During the period, 3 suspensions were imposed and 11 debarments were effected. Recommendations on 14 suspensions and 22 debarments were disapproved.

The status of these referrals is as follows:

	<u>Cases</u>	<u>Subjects</u>
<u>SUSPENSIONS</u>		
Pending as of October 1, 1982	5	25
Referrals	2	5
Actions Completed	3	17
Pending as of March 31, 1983	4	13
<u>DEBARMENTS</u>		
Pending as of October 1, 1982	10	28
Referrals	20	56
Actions Completed	9	33
Pending as of March 31, 1983	21	51

9. Inspector General Subpoenas

The Office of Inspector General views the use of subpoenas to be an effective tool for obtaining information when other reasonable measures fail. During the period, 14 instances met this criterion and subpoenas were issued.

In addition, the Office litigated a subpoena enforcement action this period when an educational institution refused to comply with a subpoena duces tecum calling for the production of certain student records. On January 18, 1983, the U.S. District

Court, Washington, D.C., granted judicial enforcement, rejecting the school's claim that the subpoena was not lawfully issued and that production of such records would violate the Buckley Amendment. No appeal was taken and the records were provided.

B. UNREASONABLE REFUSAL OF INFORMATION OR ASSISTANCE

The Offices of Counsel and Investigations encountered no instances where information or assistance was unreasonably refused by Agency management.

Section IV - Review of Legislation and Regulations

A. GENERAL

The Office of Inspector General is mindful of the importance of its legislated responsibility to review proposed legislation and regulations. Such reviews constitute an important vehicle for highlighting any areas which might have a negative impact on the ability of this Office to perform its legislated mission or for recommending changes which could strengthen our ability to eliminate fraud, waste or mismanagement. In addition, these reviews serve to provide another perspective from which the originators can view the potential impact of new legislation or regulations.

As of March 31, 1983, this Office had reviewed 128 legislative matters and 33 regulatory initiatives.

B. SIGNIFICANT COMMENTS

The paragraphs below detail the comments made by the Office on the more significant legislative and regulatory matters reviewed.

-- Opposed H.R. 33, a bill to transfer management of the National Defense Stockpile to the Secretary of Defense. We support the present law which vests management responsibility with the President who in turn delegates it to several federal agencies on a functional basis. Our position was based in part upon the fact that the stockpile program is designed to serve civil and industrial needs as well as military mobilization requirements.

-- Supported enactment of DOD Draft Bill 23 to amend the Service Contract Act of 1965. We believed the bill would simplify administration of the Act and perhaps resolve some problems of interpretation.

-- Supported enactment of State Department Draft Bill 19, Foreign Service Act Amendments of 1983, which would extend the provisions of the Hatch Act to the Inspector General of the Foreign Service and the Department of State and the Director General of the Foreign Service. We expressed the view that since all other Inspectors General were already subject to the Hatch Act and the Director General, although appointed, is required to be a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, this provision would enhance their independence.

-- Strongly supported H.R. 1092, the Federal Computer Systems Protection Act of 1983, which imposes criminal penalties for misuse of certain computers. We felt that such legislation was justified in light of the rising incidence of computer fraud nationwide.

-- Opposed enactment of S. 2695, the Federal Procurement Improvement Act of 1982, expressing the view that the proposed "advocates for competition" would merely duplicate the duties of contracting officers under existing law.

-- Recommended a Presidential veto of Enrolled Bill 1371 to amend Section 12 of the Contract Disputes Act of 1978. This bill would require the Government to pay interest on contractor claims from the date on which they are received by the contracting officer, regardless of the date of certification. In making our recommendation, we pointed out that claims are often certified long after they are received by the contracting officer.

-- Supported and provided comments on the revision of GSA regulations and Federal Procurement Regulations to effect those changes to Agency and Governmentwide contractor debarment and suspension procedures brought about by Office of Federal Procurement Policy Letter 82-1. In particular, we strongly supported the assignment of the fact-finding role to the GSA Board of Contract Appeals, since such action will more closely align GSA's procedures with those of other agencies and will facilitate the suspension and debarment process within GSA.

Section V - Other Activities

A. PREVENTION ACTIVITIES

The Inspector General Act of 1978 directs the OIG to assume a leadership role in the formulation of policies designed to promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in Agency operations, and to execute programs directed at both the detection and prevention of fraud and abuse. In the past, the majority of this Office's activities centered upon detection and improvements to Agency programs. While prevention initiatives certainly were not ignored, the events of the late 1970's did not allow for their emphasis. Undoubtedly, the disclosures of fraud during that period mandated that the bulk of our resources be directed at swift and immediate detection and elimination.

More recently, and especially within the current reporting period, this Office has stepped up activities relative to prevention. Mindful that fraud and waste will only be minimized when the conditions conducive to their existence are removed, we have undertaken a broad-sweeping program keyed to what we believe are the fundamental elements of prevention: definition, anticipation, education and communication.

Definition

The first fundamental element leading to prevention, definition, collectively refers to all those efforts aimed at identifying areas vulnerable to fraud and waste and, to the extent possible, assessing the degree of vulnerability. Within GSA's OIG, "vulnerability assessment" has taken many forms, each of which is directed at a specific purpose.

One form of definition relates to the straightforward itemization of what areas appear to be vulnerable to fraud and waste. This period we completed an inventory of auditable entities which systematically defines the internal audit workload, the corresponding level of audit coverage required and, through a series of weighting factors, evaluates the organization/program's vulnerability to fraud and waste and its need for ongoing audit review. This information will form the basis of our annual audit planning process and, because of the weighting factors, will enable us to select work based solely on the area's perceived vulnerability to fraud, waste and mismanagement. We believe that the focusing of resources in areas viewed as vulnerable constitutes one major prevention technique.

Another type of definition performed by this Office involves analysis of audit results. Such analyses, which sometimes take the form of reviewing all audits within a given program, similar audits over a chronological period, or collectively analyzing the regional results of a specific audit, have helped us to identify systemic agency problems and provided

insight into appropriate remedial action. It has been our experience that these collective analyses often lend more insight into the underlying causes than individual reviews which frequently capture only the symptoms or isolate a specific problem at a particular point in time.

We believe that such analyses constitute an important prevention vehicle because of the perspective and knowledge they provide. Consequently, we have continued to emphasize across-the-board reviews culminating in consolidated or compendium reports. One such effort, a review of controls over repairs, alterations and improvements to leased space, is highlighted as a significant audit for this period in Section IIB of this report.

A final aspect of definition resides in our establishment of a specialized unit whose major responsibilities include operational surveys designed to prevent the occurrence of fraud and waste. This unit, when fully functioning, will comprise the focal point for many of our prevention activities.

Prior to the close of the reporting period, this unit began developing a program for the conduct of operational surveys. As currently envisioned, these surveys will be performed by multidisciplinary teams of five people who will work onsite for three to six weeks. The surveys will result in reports to management and, where appropriate, referrals to audits and/or investigations. Currently, this unit is defining potential areas for review.

Anticipation

Anticipation operates on the premise that instances of fraud and waste can be minimized when there are front-end assurances that, at least at the onset, the program or activity was operating within applicable laws, regulations, policies, or procedures. Toward this end, we have continued to emphasize our preaward reviews of leases and audits of major systems development projects.

The OIG began performing advisory reviews of leases in early 1982. Such reviews are performed to ensure that contractual actions relative to all leases involving annual rentals in excess of \$200,000 conform with regulatory requirements. Moreover, these reviews are designed to identify deficiencies in the leasing process, disclose any irregularities affecting lease award, and determine that all required documentation was prepared. While these reviews are purely advisory in nature and do not constitute a concurrence in or approval to make an award, we believe they constitute a valuable prevention measure.

The following schedule shows the program results for this period:

Lease proposals submitted for review	58
Lease proposals reviewed	32
Reviews with no or minor deficiencies	26
Reviews with major deficiencies	6

Examples of major deficiencies include:

- a prospectus for the total one year lease extension was not submitted for Congressional approval.
- a market survey was not performed.
- the proposed lease agreement did not identify the partners involved in the lease as required by PBS regulations.
- inconsistencies existed in the Solicitation for Offer, lease agreement, and Price Negotiation Memorandum (PNM), i.e., the lease showed a term of 9 years and 11 months while the PNM showed 10 years.
- the liquidated damages clause was erroneously lined out of a lease agreement.
- the rental rate for the proposed supplemental agreement was far greater than the rate for the base lease yet no justification was provided.
- exact space requirements for the tenant agency were not known.

Similarly, we have been reviewing major ADP systems development projects for the past four years. The objectives of such audits are to ensure that adequate controls are built into these systems while they are being developed, and to prevent waste and misuse of valuable ADP resources. In the past year alone, GSA avoided approximately \$6.4 million in unnecessary and/or unjustified ADP procurements because of these audits. Our efforts in this area are continuing. Presently, we are involved in several reviews of ADP operations where there is similar potential for avoiding unnecessary costs.

This period, we also developed a model control system for space acquisition and utilization in coordination with GSA management and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). The model, which was issued by OMB on November 22, 1982, contains guidelines designed to prevent unnecessary expenditures by helping agencies to establish, improve, and evaluate their space acquisition and utilization programs. Over the next six to eight months, several agencies will be testing the model's usefulness as a management tool.

Education

Education relates directly to heightening the awareness of GSA employees to the manifestations of fraud and waste and their personal responsibility to report any suspected instances to the OIG. Likewise, education refers to teaching employees the standards which govern their own professional activities.

We have sought to achieve these objectives through an ongoing education program. In 1981, we developed an Integrity Awareness Briefing for presentation to Agency employees. Since its inception, over 2,000 employees have received this training. This period, we expanded our audience to include members of the OIG staff as well. Our intent was to increase our own staff's sensitivity to indicators of fraud and, more importantly, not to presume that their work experience automatically translated to personal knowledge of how to respond to fraud.

During this period, 1,011 managers, supervisors and employees in nine GSA regions as well as Central Office attended these briefings.

Communication

Communication refers to our initiatives to make people more aware of GSA's OIG in particular and other IG offices in general. Toward this end, we have nearly finalized a brochure on our Hotline for distribution throughout the Agency. We believe that in addition to acting as a detection device, the Hotline, in its own way, exercises a prevention role. The more people become aware of such devices and the emphasis placed upon their use, the more potential wrongdoers may be inclined to think twice about their actions for fear of being reported. Taking this a step further, we are taking action to have all OIG Hotline numbers printed on the back cover of all the individual telephone directories of Federal agencies.

Between October 1, 1982 and March 31, 1983, we received 814 Hotline calls and letters, 16 referrals from the General Accounting Office (GAO), and 8 referrals from other agencies. These complaints were evaluated and, where warranted, appropriately referred to GSA program officials, other Federal agencies or were retained by this Office for audit, inspection or investigative action. Complaints were referred as follows:

Audits/Inspections/Investigations . . .	57
GSA Program Officials	68
Other Agencies	10

The remaining 703 complaints required no further action and were closed.

Beyond this aspect of communication, there is the need to share successful prevention techniques which may have applications in other agencies or programs. In this regard, we continuously advise other agencies of techniques/programs which we have found to be beneficial and which might have application in their own agency. Currently, we are actively participating in a President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency (PCIE) subcommittee designed to develop and promote the media for such communication Governmentwide.

Conclusion

We believe that this combination of definition, anticipation, education and communication comprises a well-rounded and well-directed approach to prevention. While the effects of a prevention program can generally not be measured with precision, we believe our program is successful. We are pleased to see the growing emphasis placed on prevention by the President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency and view many of these initiatives as complementary to our own.

B. PROJECTS SPONSORED BY THE PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL ON INTEGRITY AND EFFICIENCY

The OIG continued to work on the interagency projects sponsored by the President's Council on Integrity and Efficiency (PCIE). This Council, which was established by an Executive Order in March 1981, provides leadership for Governmentwide activities designed to reduce waste and abuse in Federal programs and operations. Table 1 delineates the specific projects in which we are participating and the extent of our involvement.

During the period, we concluded our efforts relative to the Governmentwide audit of construction contract change orders. The purpose of this review, which was planned and coordinated under the direction of the Department of Transportation, was to evaluate the adequacy and effectiveness of internal controls over change orders in protecting the Government against fraud, waste and abuse. The Department of Defense, Veterans Administration, and the Environmental Protection Agency also took part in this project.

Within GSA, the review was performed in five regions (New York, Atlanta, Kansas City, Auburn, and the National Capital Region). Almost 230 change orders were reviewed and ninety percent were found to be deficient in one or more of the following areas: documentation, pricing actions, negotiations, financial practices or management information systems.

The detailed results were consolidated in a draft report which was submitted to GSA management on October 29, 1982. Subsequently, the report and management's response were forwarded to the Department of Transportation for inclusion in the overall project report.

We continued to take the lead role on the Council project addressing procurement suspensions and debarments. This effort, which complements initiatives to strengthen Government use of debarment and other mechanisms, is designed to facilitate the implementation of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Letter 82-1. This letter, which sets forth the policies and procedures governing suspensions and debarments of contractors throughout the Executive Branch, also provides for consolidated listings of suspended, debarred and ineligible contractors.

We also co-chaired an interagency task force project aimed at reviewing the desirability and feasibility of a single Governmentwide suspension and debarment system. The system would encompass all individuals and entities doing business with the Government whether it be as a contractor, as a participant in Federal programs, or as a recipient of assistance or benefits. Under such a system, suspension/debarment actions imposed by one agency would extend to all agencies.

Relative to this project, a major study involving 19 Executive Branch departments and agencies was completed in November 1982. The project report, entitled "Report of the Interagency Project Team on Suspension and Debarment -- A Comprehensive Governmentwide System Is Needed," is currently being circulated for comment among senior Federal officials.

TABLE 1. PARTICIPATION IN PCIE PROJECTS

<u>Project Name</u>	<u>Participation</u>
Construction Contract Change Orders	Full
Procurement Suspensions and Debarments	Full
Uniform Suspension and Debarment Standards	Full
Governmentwide 8(a) Eligibility	Limited
OMB Circular A-102	Limited

During the period, we were also actively involved in three other PCIE Committees: the Prevention Committee, initiated in January 1983; the Training Committee, Subcommittee on Auditor Training; and the Incentives and Administrative Remedies Committee.

C. OIG INTERNAL MANAGEMENT INITIATIVES

During the past six months, a number of initiatives undertaken in prior periods continued to progress according to established milestones. These actions reflect the overall emphasis and attention being given to improving the efficiency of OIG operations.

-- Integrated Planning System. The audit planning system developed and instituted at the end of the last reporting period is functioning smoothly. Our management information system is now being utilized for maintenance of the annual plan, for

initiation of audit assignments, and for tracking audits in progress. Operational control of the plan is now vested in the Office of Audits while the Office of Policy, Plans and Evaluation oversees plan accomplishment. Currently, we are developing, as an adjunct to the system, an annual planning conference. Aimed at increasing regional input in the process as well as at strengthening communication between regional and headquarters audit managers, the conference will be used to define, integrate and prioritize areas of audit emphasis for Fiscal Year 1984.

-- Inspector General Information System (IGIS). The value and usefulness of this system becomes more apparent as time passes and we learn to more fully utilize its potential. An integral part of the audit planning and tracking system, it is now being used for control of the investigative caseload as well. All of our regional offices and headquarters are now on line, allowing for data input, retrieval and interactive communication. Policies, procedures and operating manuals are being developed concurrently, and during the upcoming reporting period virtually all management reports on the status of audits and investigations will be produced through IGIS.

-- Evaluations of Component Offices. Guidelines for the critique of audit reports were developed and put into practice by the Office of Policy, Plans and Evaluation during this period. An initial group of reports were evaluated and the evaluations were distributed to and discussed with cognizant audit officials. The purpose of these critiques is to promote a definitive level of quality in OIG audit reports and to ensure their compliance with OIG policies and General Accounting Office standards. Procedures are likewise being developed for reviews of OIG field offices and, once completed, onsite evaluations will commence. It is anticipated that the first of these evaluations will take place in the next reporting period and they will be conducted on an ongoing basis thereafter.

Appendices

REPORT REGISTER
CONTRACT AUDITS

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date of Report</u>
1A-20888-02-02	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal for A/E Services, Jansen & Rogan, Engineers P.A., Contract No. GS-02B-23180(NEG)	10/04/82
2C-20276-00-05	Letter Report - Price Reduction and Defective Pricing, Joerns Furniture, Contract No. GS-00S-00069	10/05/82
2Q-20885-04-04	Preaward Audit of 8(a) Pricing Proposal, R&E Electronics, Inc., Solicitation No. CDPW-W-81-J-A0009-W4	10/07/82
2C-10660-00-09	Price Reduction and Defective Pricing, Beckman Instruments, Inc., Contract Nos. GS-00S-04560, 86591, and 27010	10/08/82
2M-20862-01-01	Cafeteria Operations, Canteen Corp., Waltham, Massachusetts	10/08/82
1L-20919-09-09	Letter Report - Lease Escalation Proposal, Murdock Development Co., 2022 Camino del Rio North, San Diego, California, Lease No. GS-09B-75762	10/08/82
A30005/4/F/821012	Letter Report - Lease Escalation Review, Duvall Building, St. Petersburg, Florida, Contract No. GS-04B-20669	10/12/82
1L-20658-05-05	Lease Escalation Proposal, Chicago Exchange Building Associates, Lease No. GS-05BR-12447	10/13/82
ID-20779-11-11	Claim for Increased Costs, Albers Construction Co., Contract No. GS-06B-81150	10/13/82
1D-20804-11-02	Claim for Delay Costs, Edison Price Lighting, Inc., Second-Tier Sub-contractor Under USS-OCF-W&M, Joint Venture Under Price Contract No. GS-00B-02839	10/13/82
2Q-20944-00-26-D	Evaluation of Price Proposal, Racal Communications, Inc.	10/13/82

REPORT REGISTER
CONTRACT AUDITS

Number	Title	Date of Report
2J-20945-04-04	Preaward Price Proposal for Cleaning Services, A&B Maintenance, Inc., Contract No. GS-04B-82757	10/15/82
1A-20973-11-11	Letter Report - Preaward Evaluation of A/E Pricing Proposal, The E/A Design Group, Chartered, Contract No. GS-11B-19064	10/15/82
1A-20044-05-05	Preaward Evaluation of Price Proposal, Holabird & Root, Proposal No. GS-05BC-90463	10/18/82
2F-20705-00-01	Claim for Increased Costs, Coleman Furniture Corp.	10/18/82
2M-20865-02-02	Shoe Repair Shop Concession, Johnson's Shoe Service, Concessionaire Under Small Business Administration Concession Agreement No. GS-02B-17452 (NEG)	10/18/82
1D-20871-11-11	Claim for Increased Costs, Hoel-Steffen Construction Co., Contract No. GS-06B-81101	10/18/82
1L-20782-09-09	Letter Report - Lease Escalation Proposal, Tishman West Management, 525 Market Street, San Francisco, California, Lease No. GS-09B-73066	10/19/82
1A-20854-02-02	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal for A/E Services, Quinlivan, Pierik & Kraus/Robson & Woese, Inc., A Joint Venture, Contract No. GS-02B-23155(NEG)	10/19/82
1A-20942-11-11	Preaward Evaluation of A/E Pricing Proposal, Contract Amendment No. 6, Metcalf/KCF Joint Venture, Contract No. GS-03B-99021	10/20/82
2B-20963-00-03	Contractor's Pricing Proposal, Grim Corp., Solicitation No. GSC-CDPCE-00019-N-6-29-82	10/22/82
2F-20714-07-07	Claim for Equitable Adjustment, Apex Rent-A-Car, Inc., Contract No. GS-07S-04979	10/25/82

REPORT REGISTER
CONTRACT AUDITS

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date of Report</u>
2C-20930-10-06	Letter Report - Price Reduction and Defective Pricing, Nissen Corp., Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Contract No. GS-02S-30532	10/25/82
2B-20939-00-02	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, Metropolitan Microforms, Ltd., Solicitation No. FCGE-B9-75224-N	10/25/82
2J-20944-10-10	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, Coast Janitorial Service, Inc., Contract No. GS-10B-50871-01	10/25/82
2J-20959-07-07	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, Williamson & Son Janitorial Service, Inc., Contract No. GS-07B-21279	10/25/82
1D-20455-03-11	Claim for Increased Costs, T.A. Gorman, Inc., Contract No. GS-03B-78059	10/26/82
2B-20960-07-02	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, Randall Manufacturing Co., Inc., Solicitation No. 7CF-52093 B5/7FC	10/26/82
2C-10067-00-03	Postaward Audit, RCA Corp., Mobile Communications Systems, Meadow Lands, Pennsylvania, Contract No. GS-00S-44630	10/27/82
2C-20109-08-08(a)	Price Reduction, Mobile Office Manufacturing and Leasing Corp., Contract No. GS-08S-33535 and Renewal No. 1	10/27/82
2C-20118-00-10	Price Reduction and Defective Pricing, IVAC Corp., Contract No. GS-00S-86663	10/27/82
2N-20928-06-06	Claim for Unmetered Steam Usage, Kansas City Power and Light Co., Kansas City, Missouri, Contract No. GS-06B-13900	10/27/82
A30004/1/F/821028	Letter Report - Delay Claim, Gilbane/Parametric, J.V., Providence, Rhode Island	10/28/82

REPORT REGISTER
CONTRACT AUDITS

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date of Report</u>
2W-20896-01-01	Time and Material Contract, Gibson Motor and Machine Service, Inc.	10/29/82
A30045/2/F/821101	Letter Report - Lease Escalation, Coldwell Banker, 237 South Street, Morristown, New Jersey, Lease No. GS-02B-18594	11/01/82
1A-20957-10-02	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal for A/E Services, Dubin & Bloome Associates, P.C., Project No. NOR26500	11/01/82
1D-20777-11-11	Claim for Increased Costs, T.A. Gorman, Inc., Contract No. GS-00B-02839	11/02/82
2K-20358-11-06	Letter Report - Cost Plus Award Fee Contracts, Springfield Building Maintenance, Inc., Contract Nos. 03C8095301-2 and 03C9046401-3	11/05/82
A30044/2/F/821108	Letter Report - Lease Escalation Proposal, Whitestone Associates, 130-30 31st Avenue, College Point, New York, Lease No. GS-02B-17982	11/08/82
2C-20096-07-05	Price Reduction, General Instrument Corp., Lamp Division, Contract No. GS-00S-85258	11/08/82
2R-20859-00-03	Preaward Evaluation of Proposal Submitted for Multiple Award Schedule Contract, General Electric Co., Mobile Communications Business Div. Solicitation No. GSC-CDPCD-00019-N-6-29-82	11/08/82
1A-20933-09-09	Preaward Evaluation of A/E Pricing Proposal, Bay Architects Associates, Contract No. GS-09B-C-20604-SF	11/08/82
A30001/8/F/821110	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, Honeywell Inc., Test Instruments Division, Solicitation No. FGS-L-36394-N-9-16-81, Amendment No. FCGS-L-3639-N	11/10/82

REPORT REGISTER
CONTRACT AUDITS

Number	Title	Date of Report
1D-20974-11-11	Claim for Increased Costs, E. C. Ernst, Inc., Contract No. GS-03B-01998	11/12/82
1A-20902-10-10	Zimmer, Gunsul, Frasca, Partnership, Architects, Portland, Oregon, Federal Building East, Project NOR26500	11/15/82
2J-20909-03-03	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, Liberty Security Services, Inc., Solicitation No. GS-03B-82-R-0029	11/16/82
A30064/5/F/821118	Letter Report - Accounting System and Controls Over Progress Payments, Peter Pirsch & Sons, Contract No. GS-00T-40273	11/17/82
2R-20976-00-03	Preaward Evaluation of Proposal Submitted for Multiple Award Schedule Contract, Tactec Systems, Inc., Solicitation No. GSC-CDPCE-00019-N-6-29-82	11/17/82
A30006/8/F/821119	Settlement Proposal for Contract Termination, D. L. McLaughlin Co., Inc., Contract No. GS-08B-81138	11/19/82
1T-20971-11-11	Termination Settlement Proposal, G. W. Mechanical Contractors, Inc., Contract No. GS-11B-98450	11/19/82
1R-20785-06-06	Region 6 Has Generally Estimated Costs for Janitorial Services in Accordance with the PBS A-76 Cost Model	11/22/82
1L-20916-02-02	Lease Escalation Proposal, Se Fish Associates, FDA Building, Buffalo, New York, Lease No. GS-02B-8978	11/22/82
A30002/5/F/821123	Preaward Evaluation of Price Proposal, Gould, Inc. Instrument Division, Solicitation No. FGS-L-36394-N-9-16-81 (9/1/82), Renewal of Contract No. GS-00S-45192	11/23/82

REPORT REGISTER
CONTRACT AUDITS

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date of Report</u>
2C-20109-08-08(b)	Price Reduction, Mobile Office Manufacturing & Leasing Corp., Contract No. GS-08S-35221	11/23/82
2A-20948-11-11	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, Public Law Education Institute, Contract (Renewal) No. GS-01S-08018	11/23/82
A30035/6/F/821124	Evaluation of Change Order Proposal (P-3), Ed Davis Construction Co., Inc., Lee's Summit, Missouri, Contract No. GS-06B-21050	11/24/82
A30046/W/F/821124	Claim for Increased Costs, McKramish-Chesapeake, Inc., Contract No. GS-00B-02839	11/24/82
2C-20643-00-01	Price Reduction and Defective Pricing, Farrington Business Systems, Inc., Contract No. GS-00S-23573	11/26/82
2C-20755-00-01	Price Reduction, AF-Davidson (Division of White Consolidated Industries), Contract No. GS-00S-23010	11/26/82
1L-20899-02-02	Lease Escalation Proposal, 60 E. Amherst Co., 60 E. Amherst Street, Buffalo, New York, Lease No. GS-02B-18640	11/26/82
A30039/10/F/821129	Letter Report - Preaward Evaluation of Price Proposal, Monaco Enterprises, Inc.	11/29/82
2C-20881-07-10	Letter Report - Price Reduction and Defective Pricing, Monaco Enterprises, Inc.	11/29/82
1D-20907-11-03	Evaluation of Claim for Increased A/E Costs, SSA Computer Center Building, Woodlawn Associated Planners and Architects, Contract No. GS-00B-02540	11/29/82
1L-20914-08-08	Lease Escalation, Equity Management, Inc., Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse, Helena, Montana, Lease No. GS-08B-09785	11/29/82

REPORT REGISTER
CONTRACT AUDITS

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date of Report</u>
2G-20898-07-09	Postaward Vehicle Rental Contract, Travel-Car-Rent-A-Car, Contract No. GS-07S-05025	11/29/82
2A-20952-07-06	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, Hill's Pet Products, Inc., Solicitation No. 7CR-W-52241/B5/7YC	11/30/82
1D-20308-11-11	Claim for Increased Cost, McKamish-Chesapeake, Inc., Contract No. GS-03B-78059	12/01/82
1R-20968-04-04	Letter Report - A-76 Cost Estimate Was Prepared In Accordance With Revised PBS Cost Model	12/01/82
1D-20282-11-11	Claim for Increased Costs, Honeywell, Inc., Contract No. GS-03B-78059	12/02/82
A30008/W/F/821206	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, Larry's Service Company, Inc., Contract No. GS-11C-20345	12/06/82
A30112/9/F/821206	Letter Report - Escalation Proposal, Robert A. McNeil Corporation, 4220 Maryland Parkway, Las Vegas, Nevada, Lease No. GS-09B-76592	12/06/82
A30079/4/F/821206	Letter Report - Superb Maintenance Services, Inc., Proposal to Provide Janitorial Services in Savannah, Georgia	12/06/82
A30048/9/F/821208	Letter Report - Lease Escalation Proposal, One Embarcadero Center, San Francisco, California, Lease No. GS-09B-6390	12/08/82
A30098/4/F/821208	Preaward Audit of Pricing Proposal, Telco Research Corp., Nashville, Tennessee	12/08/82
A30014/2/F/821209	Letter Report - Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, JVC Company of America, Solicitation No. GSC-DCPCE-00018-N	12/09/82
A30087/2/F/821209	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, Phillips Electronic Instruments, Inc., Solicitation No. FGS-G-36393-N	12/09/82

REPORT REGISTER
CONTRACT AUDITS

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date of Report</u>
1B-20791-11-11	Preaward Evaluation of A/E Pricing Proposal, Energy Systems Engineering, Inc., Contract No. GS-11B-19063	12/09/82
1C209081103/3/F/821209	Preaward Evaluation of Change Order Proposal, Structural Preservation Systems, Inc., Contract No. GS-03B-88611, Change Order No. 5	12/09/82
A30127/9/F/821210	Letter Report - Eligibility as a Manufacturer Under Walsh-Healey, Roan Corporation	12/10/82
A30011/7/F/821215	Price Reduction Audit of Harris Corp., Computer Systems Division, Contract No. GS-00C01928	12/15/82
A30133/X/F/821215	Contract Audit Closing Statement, IBM Corporation	12/15/82
A30134/X/F/821215	Evaluation of Price Proposal, Watkins-Johnson Company	12/15/82
1D-20843-11-11	Claim for Increased Costs, Honeywell, Inc., Contract No. GS-03B-02839	12/16/82
A30017/W/F/821217	Lease Escalation Proposal, Southwest Joint Venture, Lease No. GS-03B-60172	12/17/82
A30018/W/F/821217	Lease Escalation Proposal, Westwood Joint Venture No. 4, Lease No. GS-03B-60031	12/17/82
A30102/6/F/821217	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, Bucher and Willis, Salina, Kansas	12/17/82
A300072/F/821220	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, Nikon, Inc., Solicitation No. GSA-3YC-82-N-020	12/20/82
A30056/1/F/821220	Preaward Evaluation of Construction Consultant Services, Gilbane/Jackson (Joint Venture), Contract No. PA3PC004	12/20/82
A30075/1/F/821222	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, VG Instruments, Inc., RFP-FGS-G-36393-N9-23-82	12/22/82

REPORT REGISTER
CONTRACT AUDITS

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date of Report</u>
A30078/1/F/821222	Letter Report - Preaward Evaluation of Canberra Industries, Inc., Solicitation No. FGS-G-36393-N-9-23-82	12/22/82
A30117/W/F/821223	Letter Report - Value Engineering Change Proposal, National Restoration Corp., Contract No. GS-03C-16097	12/23/82
1D207761111/W/F/821227	Claim for Increased Costs, Owens-Corning Fiberglas, Subcontractor to USS-OCF-W&M, Joint Venture, Contract No. GS-00B-02839	12/27/82
2C208030002/2/F/821229	Letter Report - Price Reduction and Defective Pricing Review, Mettler Instrument Corp., Contract No. GS-00S-27290	12/29/82
2C206560105/5/F/821229	Letter Report - Defective Pricing and Price Reductions, National Safety Council, Contract No. GS-01S-07805	12/29/82
A30063/5/F/821230	Preaward Evaluation of Price Proposal, Packard Instrument Co., Inc., Solicitation No. FGS-G-36393-N-9-23-82	12/30/82
2C207560001/1/F/821230	Postaward Audit, Simplex Time Recorder Co., Gardner, Massachusetts	12/30/82
1L209150808/8/F/821230	Lease Escalation Proposal, Denver West Office Building No. 2 Venture, Golden, Colorado, Lease No. GS-08B-09787	12/30/82
A30022/W/F/830104	Preaward Evaluation of Lease Alteration Pricing Proposal, Spruell Development Corp., Lease No. GS-03B-6390	01/04/83
A30051/6/F/830104	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, Wulfsberg Electronics, Inc., Overland Park, Kansas	01/04/83
A30072/2/F/830105	Letter Report - Price Reduction and Defective Pricing, C.R. Bard, Inc., Bard Urological Division, Contract No. GS-00S-27194	01/05/83

REPORT REGISTER
CONTRACT AUDITS

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date of Report</u>
1L209670909/9/F/830103	Lease Escalation Claim, Spear Street Investment Co., Lease No. GS-09B-73348	01/07/83
A30103/6/F/830110	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, Campbell and Wieland, Inc., St. Louis, Missouri	01/10/83
1K209691111/W/F/830110	Preaward Evaluation of Lease Alteration Pricing Proposal, Donohoe Construction Co., Lease No. GS-11B-00052	01/10/83
2C-20678-00-09	Letter Report - Price Reduction and Defective Pricing, Antekna, Inc., Contract No. GS-00S-86336	01/11/83
1L209311111/W/F/830111	Lease Escalation Proposal, 2025 M Associates (Joint Venture) Lease No. GS-03B-90012	01/11/83
A30037/9/F/830107	Letter Report - Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, CEC Division, Bell and Howell Co., Pasadena, California, Solicitation No. FGSL-36394-N-9-16-81	01/11/83
A30132/5/F/830111	Preaward Evaluation of Price Proposal, Kenton Peters and Associates, Contract No. GS-05BC-90411, Modification No. 10	01/11/83
A30094/7/F/830112	Preaward Evaluation of A/E Pricing Proposal, The Stuck/Mott Group, A Joint Venture, Solicitation No. GS-07B-31235	01/12/83
A30119/8/F/830112	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, CPT Corporation, Solicitation No. GSC-CDPS-C-21-N-5-12-83	01/12/83
1K209701111/W/F/830112	Preaward Evaluation of Lease Alteration Pricing Proposal, District Building Services, Inc., Lease No. GS-11B-10025	01/12/83

REPORT REGISTER
CONTRACT AUDITS

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date of Report</u>
A30042/2/F/830113	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, W. D. Cambell Co./ The Gunlocke Co., Solicitation No. FNP-A1-1151-N	01/13/83
2C202751006/6/F/830113	Price Reduction and Defective Pricing Proposal, Universal Gym Equipment, Inc., Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Contract No. GS-02S-30531	01/13/83
A30070/6/F/830114	Price Reduction and Defective Pricing Proposal, Universal Gym Equipment, Inc., Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Contract No. GS-02S-30349	01/14/83
A30148/1/F/830114	Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, M&H Building Services, Inc.	01/14/83
A30204/X/F/830114	Evaluation of Price Proposal and Change Order Proposal, CACI, Inc.-Federal, Contract No. GS-00S-22058	01/14/83
2C208080001/1/F/830114	Postaward Audit, Sorensen Co., Manchester, New Hampshire, Contract No. GS-00S-27406	01/14/83
A30105/6/F/830117	Letter Report - Region 6's Preparation of A-76 Mechanical Maintenance Cost Estimates	01/17/83
A30082/9/F/830118	Letter Report - Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, Beckman Instruments, Inc., Fullerton, California, Solicitation No. FGS-G-36393-N-9-23-82	01/18/83
20209510909/9/F/830118	Postaward Audit of Cost and Pricing Data, Inter-Con Security Systems, Inc., Contract No. GS-09B-02194	01/18/83
A30171/8/F/830119	Lease Escalation Proposal, Denver West Office Building No. 3 Venture, Golden, Colorado, Lease No. GS-08B-10737	01/19/83

REPORT REGISTER
CONTRACT AUDITS

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date of Report</u>
A30176/6/F/830119	Evaluation of Termination Settlement Proposal, Don Bartch Roofing Co., Inc., St. Louis, Missouri, Contract No. GS-06B-23690	01/19/83
A30007/7/F/830121	Review of Contract Billings, Merigoni Business Machines, Contract No. GS-07D-00299	01/21/83
A30232/5/F/830124	Letter Report - Financial Review Don H. Barden, Lease No. GS-05B-12503	01/24/83
A30084/5/F/830125	Evaluation of Value Engineering Change Proposal, The Mosler Safe Co., Contract No. GS-03B-78341	01/25/83
A30097/4/F/830125	Report on Final (Third Year) Audit of Cost Plus Award Fee Contract, Kentucky Building Maintenance, Inc., John C. Kluckzynski Federal Building and U.S. Postal Building, Chicago, Illinois, Contract No. GS-05B-41892(NEG)	01/25/83
A30196/6/F/830125	Letter Report - Financial Review of Leisure Travel and Tours, Inc., Independence, Missouri, Contract No. GS-00T-01682	01/25/83
1D209721111/W/F/830125	Claim for Increased Costs, John C. Grimberg Co., Inc., Contract No. GS-03B-88311	01/25/83
A30219/5/F/830127	Letter Report - Preaward Evaluation of Multiple Award Pricing Proposal, General Instrument Corp., Lamp Division, Solicitation No. 7CF-52213/L5/7FC, Contract No. GS-07S-08992	01/27/83
A30123/4/F/830128	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal for A/E Services, Robert and Company, U.S. Court of Appeals, Atlanta, Georgia, Contract No. GS-04B-82410	01/28/83

REPORT REGISTER
CONTRACT AUDITS

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date of Report</u>
A30124/3/F/830128	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposals, Cooper Medical Devices Corp., Solicitation No. FGA-W-X2500-N-9-17-82	01/28/83
A30164/W/F/830128	Preaward Evaluation of Lease Alteration Pricing Proposal, Starr Management Corp., Lease No. GS-03B-70036	01/28/83
A30168/4/F/830128	Claim for Damages, Termination of Contract for Convenience of Government, C.S.R.A. Security and Investigative Services, Inc., Contract No. GS-04B-82534	01/28/83
1R209031010/10/F/830128	Buildings Management Division Has Generally Estimated Costs for Janitorial Services in Accordance with the Revised PBS A-76 Cost Model, Region 10	01/28/83
A30146/2/F/830131	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, Security Guard Service, Masgon Patrol Service, Inc., Subcontractor Under U.S. Small Business Administration RFP 2PPB-DW-24,114 (NEG)	01/31/83
2S004020001/1/F/830131	Price Reduction and Defective Pricing, Data General Corp., Contract No. GS-00C-01265	01/31/83
2C207400003/3/F/830201	Postaward Audit, Laboratory Procedures, Inc., King of Prussia, Pennsylvania, Contract No. GS-04S-23840	02/01/83
A30242/4/F/830201	Letter Report - A&B Maintenance, Inc.'s Proposal to Provide Janitorial Services at Several Locations in the Fort Lauderdale, Florida, Area, Contract No. GS-04B-82872	02/01/83
A30095/2/F/830202	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, Dumont Oscilloscope Laboratories, Inc., Solicitation No. FCGS-X-36395-N	02/02/83

REPORT REGISTER
CONTRACT AUDITS

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date of Report</u>
A30129/7/F/830202	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, Abbott Laboratories, Abbott Diagnostics Division, Solicitation No. FGS-P-36396-N-1-12-82	02/02/83
A30221/8/F/830202	Accounting System Review, Superior Fire Apparatus Co., Contract No. GS-00T-40260	02/02/83
1D207611107/7/F/830202	Claim for Increased Costs, USS-OCF-W&M, Joint Venture and Subcontractor, Owens Corning Fiberglas, Contract No. GS-00B-02839	02/02/83
A30195/6/F/830203	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, Sylvester James and Sons Maintenance Service, Inc., Kansas City, Kansas, Contract No. GS-06B-27659-01	02/03/83
A30113/9/F/830207	Preaward Evaluation of A/E Pricing Proposal, Albert C. Martin and Associates, Solicitation No. RCA 72125	02/07/83
A30157/W/F/830207	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, Multivac, Inc., Contract No. GS-11C-30012	02/07/83
A30210/6/F/830207	Letter Report - Price Reduction and Defective Pricing Review, Raye Limited, Inc., St. Louis, Missouri, Contract No. GS-01S-07893	02/07/83
A30179/2/F/830209	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, The Bates Manufacturing Co., Solicitation No. 2YC-NAF-N-A1467-S	02/09/83
A30143/2/F/830209	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal for A/E Services, Tippetts-Abbett-McCarthy-Stratton (TAMS), PADC Contract No. PA3PC001	02/09/83
A30151/5/F/830209	Preaward Evaluation of Price Proposal, Clarke Division, McGraw-Edison Co., Solicitation No. 9YCO-OLQ-M-A0671/82	02/09/83

REPORT REGISTER
CONTRACT AUDITS

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date of Report</u>
1C208050202/2/F/830209	Claim for Construction Changes, PJR Construction Corp., Contract No. GS-02B-74005, Requests for Proposal Nos. 103, 138, 142, 143, and 163	02/09/83
A30122/4/F/830210	Claim for Damages, Termination of Contract for Convenience of Government, Government Contract Service, Inc., Contract No. GS-03B-98801	02/10/83
A30241/1/F/830211	Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, Crystal Industrial Maintenance Co., Inc.	02/11/83
A30116/W/F/830214	Lease Escalation Proposal, Arlington Alliance Ltd., Lease No. GS-03B-5735	02/14/83
A30218/3/F/830214	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, A to Z Maintenance Co., Solicitation No. 2PPB-D5 24,049 (NEG)	02/14/83
1D204890404/4/F/830214	Pretrial Accounting Submission, Submitted by Fischback & Moore, Inc., Subcontractor to Frank Briscoe Co., Inc., Contract No. GS-04B-16375	02/14/83
1D204900404/4/F/830214	Pretrial Accounting Submission, Submitted by McKenney's, Inc., Subcontractor to Frank Briscoe Co., Inc., Contract No. GS-04B 16375	02/14/83
1D204910408/8/F/830214	Delay Claim for Increased Costs, F&M Systems Co., Subcontractor to Frank Briscoe Co., Inc., Under Prime Contract No. GS-04-16375	02/14/83
1D204940405/5/F/830214	Amended Claim for Increased Costs, Watson-Mahaney, Inc., Subcontractor to Frank Briscoe Co., Contract No. GS-04B-16375	02/14/83
1R208900909/9/F/830214	Region 9's Implementation of the PBS A-76 Cost Model	02/14/83

REPORT REGISTER
CONTRACT AUDITS

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date of Report</u>
A30091/W/F/830215	Lease Escalation Proposal, Arlington Alliance, Ltd., James K. Polk Building, Lease No. GS-03B-5707	02/15/83
A30130/7/F/830215	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, Curtin Matheson Scientific, Inc., Solicitation No. FGS-P-36396-N-1-12-82	02/15/83
A30120/5/F/830216	Preaward Evaluation of Price Proposal, AM International, Inc., Bruning Division, Solicitation No. FGE-B2-75202-N-8-19-82 (Renewal #1)	02/16/83
2C20277005/5/F/830216	Price Reductions, Joerns Furniture Co., Inc., Contract No. GS-00S-86881	02/16/83
A30089/W/F/830217	Lease Escalation Proposal, Arlington Alliance, Ltd., Zachary Taylor Building, Lease No. GS-03B-5735	02/17/83
A30136/8/F/830217	Preaward Audit of Multiple Award Contract to Monsanto Co., Solicitation No. 8YCG-B3-C-14164	02/17/83
A30139/W/F/830217	Lease Alteration Proposal, Fisher and Strachan, Inc., Lease No. GS-03B-5783	02/17/83
A30235/3/F/830217	Postaward Audit, Bergen Expo Systems, Inc., Clifton, New Jersey, Contract No. GS-03S-81025	02/17/83
A30003/7/F/830218	Price Reduction Review, Edmont-Wilson, Division of Becton, Dickinson and Co., Contract No. GS-01S-07341	02/18/83
A30206/1/F/830222	Preaward Evaluation of Offer Submitted by Instrumentation Laboratory, Inc., Solicitation No. FCGS-G-36393-N	02/22/83
2C110250007b/7/F/830222	Price Reduction/Defective Pricing, Abbott Laboratories, Diagnostics Division, Contract No. GS-00S-86972	02/22/83

REPORT REGISTER
CONTRACT AUDITS

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date of Report</u>
1D204920402/2/F/830222	Claim for Delay Costs, Haggerty Millwork Corp., Subcontractor to Frank Briscoe Co., Inc., Under Prime Contract No. GS-04B-16375	02/22/83
1D204930402/2/F/830222	Claim for Delay Costs, J.I. Hass Co., Inc., Subcontractor to Frank Briscoe Co., Inc., Under Prime Contract No. GS-04B-16375	02/22/83
1D204860403/3/F/830223	Amended Claim and Pretrial Accounting Submission, ACandS, Inc., Subcontractor to Frank Briscoe Co., Inc., Contract No. GS-04B-16375	02/23/83
A30263/5/F/830223	Letter Report - Preaward Evaluation of Multiple Award Pricing Proposal, Victor Technologies, Inc., Victor United Division, Solicitation No. YGE-Y1-75235-N-1-6-83	02/23/83
A30313/X/F/830224	Preaward Evaluation of Price Proposal, Electronics System Division, Bunker Ramo-Eltra Corp., Solicitation No. GSC-CDPSC-00021	02/24/83
2C203560005/5/F/830224	Postaward Audit of Multiple Award Contract, Spacesaver Corp., Contract No. GS-00S-20180	02/24/83
A30126/1/F/830225	Letter Report - Price Reduction and Defective Pricing Audit, Pitney Bowes Corp., Contract No. GS-00S-23514	02/25/83
A30227/W/F/830225	Letter Report - Preaward Evaluation of Custodial Service Pricing Proposal, Diplomatic Painting & Building Services Co., Inc., Contract No. GS-11C-30035	02/25/83
A30244/W/F/830225	Lease Alteration Proposal, Northwestern Development Co., Lease No. GS-03B-06521	02/25/83
1L209650808/8/F/830225	Lease Escalation Proposal, The Crystal Co., Sunlight Manor Federal Office Center, Glenwood Springs, Colorado, Lease No. GS-08B-09916	02/25/83

REPORT REGISTER
CONTRACT AUDITS

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date of Report</u>
2C208660011/W/F/830228	Letter Report - Price Reduction and Defective Pricing Audit, Hazleton Laboratories America, Inc., Contract No. GS-04S-2391	02/28/83
A30047/W/F/830228	Lease Claim, Woodbridge Construction Co., Cyclone Service Corp., Lease No. GS-03B-70043	02/28/83
A30128/7/F/830228	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, Owens-Illinois, Inc., Kimble Division, Solicitation No. FGS-P-36404-N-8-9-82	02/28/83
A30247/6/F/830228	Letter Report - Price Reduction and Defective Pricing Review, Excel Industries, Inc., Hesston, Kansas, Contract No. GS-07S-07691	02/28/83
A30023/W/F/830303	Contract Modification, Advanced Energy Control Systems, Inc., Contract No. GS-11C-10462	03/03/83
A30264/4/F/830304	Letter Report - Preaward Review of Colbar, Inc.'s Proposal to Provide Janitorial Services, Raleigh, North Carolina, Contract No. GS-04B-82829	03/07/83
A30153/W/F/830307	Preaward Evaluation of Lease Alteration Proposal, The Charles E. Smith Companies, Lease No. GS-03B-06503	03/07/83
A30298/2/F/830307	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal for Security Guard Services, Masgon Patrol Services, Inc., Subcontractor Under U.S. Small Business Administration, Solicitation No. RFP-2PPB-PF-24, 136(NEG)	03/07/83
A30307/8/F/830307	Defective Pricing, Monsanto Co., Wildfire Control Division, Ontario, California, Requirements Contract No. GS-08S-35840	03/07/83
A30182/3/F/830308	Preaward Evaluation of Proposal Submitted for Multiple Award Schedule Contract, Geometric Data, Solicitation No. FCGS-P-36396-N-1-12-82	03/08/83

REPORT REGISTER
CONTRACT AUDITS

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date of Report</u>
A30338/X/F/830308	Preaward Evaluation of Price Proposal Submitted by Trak Systems, Division of Trak Microwave Corp., Solicitation No. GSC-KESA-X-00022-N-12-21-82	03/08/83
A30059/4/F/830309	Price Reduction and Defective Pricing, Pullman-Holt Products, Inc., Tampa, Florida, Contract No. GS-09S-41199	03/09/83
A30114/9/F/830903	Preaward Evaluation of A/E Pricing Proposal, Shapiro, Okino, Hom and Associates, Contract No. GS-09B-C-8175-SF	03/09/83
A30156/W/F/830309	Preaward Evaluation of Lease Escalation Proposal, Hoffman Co., Inc., Hoffman Building II, Lease No. GS-03B-5960	03/09/83
A30226/W/F/830310	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, Datatronix, Inc., RFP No. KET-VC-83-04	03/10/83
2C105020403/3/F/830310	Postaward Audit of C&D Batteries Division, Plymouth Meeting, Pennsylvania, Contract No. GS-04S-22135	03/10/83
2S209000007/7/F/830310	Postaward Review of Texas Instruments, Inc., Contract No. GS-00C-01671	03/10/83
A30217/3/F/830311	Preaward Evaluation of Proposal Submitted for Multiple Award Schedule Contract, E.I. Dupont DeNemours & Co., Inc., Solicitation No. FCGS-P-36396-N-1-12-82	03/11/83
A30142/2/F/830314	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, Ortho Diagnostic Systems, Inc., Solicitation No. FGS-P-36396-N	03/14/83
A30231/5/F/830314	Lease Escalation Proposal, The Cleveland Rockford Co., Lease No. GS-05B-12439	03/14/83

REPORT REGISTER
CONTRACT AUDITS

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date of Report</u>
A30274/W/F/830315	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, Cassidy Cleaning, Inc., Contract No. GS-11C-30026	03/15/83
A30134/S/F/830316	Evaluation of Price Proposal, C3, Inc., Solicitation No. GSC-KESA-B-00023-N	03/16/83
A30249/1/F/830316	Letter Report - Preaward Evaluation of Pitney Bowes, Corp., Solicitation No. YGE-Y1-75235-N-1-6-83	03/16/83
A30364/X/F/830316	Contract Audit Closing Statement, Computer Sciences Corp., Systems Division, Contract No. GS-00C-50000	03/16/83
2C208500001/1/F/830318	Postaward Audit of Jeol, U.S.A., Inc., Contract Nos. GS-00S-85185 and GS-00S-27167	03/18/83
A30147/W/F/830318	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, Jones & Artis/Smoot, A Joint Venture, Contract No. GS-11B-08605 (Neg)	03/18/83
A30350/4/F/830318	Letter Report - Lease Escalation Review, Navelex Building, North Charleston, South Carolina, Contact No. GS-04B-15479	03/18/83
A30140/W/F/830321	Preaward Evaluation of Lease Escalation Proposal, W. H. Tysons Page Corp., Page Building, Lease No. GS-03B-6640	03/21/83
A30201/5/F/830321	Lease Escalation Proposal, American National Bank of Chicago, Trustee Under Trust No. 32501 and Trust No. 40589, Lease No. GS-05BR-12005	03/21/83
A30318/5/F/830321	Letter Report - Preaward Evaluation of Price Proposal, A. B. Dick Co., Solicitation No. YGE-MB-75239-N	03/21/83
A30125/4/F/830322	Price Reduction and Defective Pricing, Medart, Inc., Greenwood, Mississippi, Contract No. GS-00S-38211	03/22/83

REPORT REGISTER
CONTRACT AUDITS

Number	Title	Date of Report
A30306/8/F/830322	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, Synergetics International, Inc., Boulder, Colorado, Solicitation No. GSC-CDPCE-00021-N-12-28-82	03/22/83
A30322/4/F/830322	Letter Report - Preaward Audit of 8(a) Price Proposal, E. R. Smith Construction Co., Inc., Federal Building and Courthouse, Clarksdale, Mississippi	03/22/83
A30229/5/F/830322	Letter Report - Preaward Evaluation of Initial Space Alteration Proposal, LaSalle National Bank, Trustee Under Trust No. 101866, Lease No. GS-05B-13596	03/22/83
A30169/9/F/830324	Letter Report - Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, Hewlett Packard Co., Palo Alto, California, Solicitation No. FGS-P-36396-N-1-12-82	03/24/83
A30299/2/F/830325	Letter Report - Accounting Systems Review of Ward'79 Limited, Elmira Heights, New York, Contract No. GS-00S-64020	03/25/83
A30162/9/F/830328	Price Reduction and Defective Pricing, Computer Sciences Corp., Contract Nos. GS-00C-51043 and GS-00C-51077	03/28/83
A30209/9/F/830328	Preaward Evaluation of Price Proposal, Inter-Con Security Systems, Inc., Alhambra, California, RFP No. OPR-9PPB-83-0212	03/28/83
A30276/W/F/830328	Preaward Evaluation of Lease Alteration Pricing Proposal, JBG Properties, Inc., Lease No. GS-03B-06512	03/28/83
A30404/X/F/830329	Preaward Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, Hoover Systems Acoustical Screens In Color, Inc., Solicitation No. FNP-F5-1272-N-11-19-82	03/29/83

REPORT REGISTER
CONTRACT AUDITS

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date of Report</u>
A30104/6/F/830329	Letter Report - Review of Office of Budget's Revised General and Administrative Rate Guidelines for A-76 Cost Estimates	03/29/83
A30391/X/F/830329	Evaluation of Pricing Proposal, Sutron Corp., Solicitation No. GSC-CDPCE-00021-N-12-28-82	03/29/83
A30406/X/F/830330	Evaluation of Cost Proposal for Modification of Maintenance Service Contract, Western Union Telegraph Co., Government Systems Division, McLean, Virginia, Contract No. GS-00C-50405	03/30/83
A30208/7/F/830331	Vehicle Rental Agreements, Thrifty-Rent-A-Car, Little Rock, Arkansas, Contract No. GS-07S-07956	03/31/83
A30257/2/F/830331	Letter Report - Price Reduction and Defective Pricing, Empire Sporting Goods Manufacturing Co., Inc., Contract No. GS-01S-07799	03/31/83

REPORT REGISTER
INTERNAL AUDITS

Number	Title	Date of Report
3C-00624-09-09-F(1)	Short Form Followup - Controls Over the Transfer and Donation of Personal Property Can Be Improved	10/01/82
5D-00672-02-02-F(1)	Followup - Controls Over Payments for Contract Labor at the Raritan Depot Need To Be Improved	10/04/82
4B-20409-05-05	Letter Report - Regional Management of the Public Buildings Service Information System, Region 5	10/05/82
4D-20152-08-08	Accident and Fire Prevention Branch, Office of Public Buildings and Real Property, Region 8	10/06/82
4E-00692-11-11-F(1)	Followup - Administration of Construction Contracts Could Be Improved	10/13/82
6G-10934-05-05	Selected 8(a) Contracts, Region 5	10/13/82
5P-00673-09-09-F(1)	Short Form Followup - Operations of the Office of External Affairs, Region 9	10/15/82
4M-20396-05-05	Letter Report - Administration of ADP Service Contracts, Region 5	10/18/82
4G-20828-07-07(g)	Letter Report - Proposed Award of Lease, 275 West Campbell Road, Richardson, Texas	10/18/82
4D-20571-01-01	Letter Report - Building Management Operations at the JFK Federal Building, Boston, Massachusetts	10/19/82
3V-00229-09-09-F(1)	Short Form Followup - Transportation Costs Can Be Reduced by Thousands of Dollars, Region 9	10/20/82
4G-20800-04-04(f)	Letter Report - Option Renewal Dates for Leases in Region 4	10/20/82
A30025b/9/F/821082	Letter Report - Proposed Award of Lease Extension, 2500 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, California	10/20/82

REPORT REGISTER
INTERNAL AUDITS

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date of Report</u>
A30025c/9/F/821022	Letter Report - Proposed Award of Lease Extension, 4727 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, California	10/22/82
5D-20160-07-07	Unliquidated Obligations and Yearend Spending, FY 1981	10/26/82
4D-20573-02-02	Buildings Management Field Office, Trenton, New Jersey, Region 2	10/26/82
3N-203 5-09-09	Small Purchases Program, Office of Personal Property, Region 9	10/27/82
4E-12055-01-01	Letter Report - Review of the Planning and Decision Process Relative to the Initial Stages of the Proposed Boston Federal Building	10/28/82
4D-20412-07-07	Internal Controls Need To Be Strengthened at the Dallas Field Office, Region 7	10/28/82
5D-20226-07-07-F(1)	Short Form Followup - Regional Regional Imprest Funds	10/29/82
4F-20523-11-11	Controls Over Firearms and Badges Need To Be Improved	10/29/82
4G-20966-09-09	Letter Report - Test of Lease Data, Region 9	10/29/82
4M-20746-11-11	Letter Report - Implementation of the Recommendations of the Washington Telecommunications Interagency Committee Report	11/01/82
4G-00504-00-11-F(1)	Followup - Significant Improvements Need To Be Made in Administering GSA Controlled Space, Central Office and the National Capital Region	11/08/82
30-20133-09-09	Inventory Management, Region 9	11/08/82
5D-00668-11-11-F(1)	Followup - Improved Controls Needed Over the Processing of Federal Buildings Fund Payments	11/12/82
4D-20572-02-02	Buildings Management Field Office, Whitestone, New York, Region 2	11/16/82

REPORT REGISTER
INTERNAL AUDITS

Number	Title	Date of Report
A30081a/W/F/821117	Letter Report - Proposed Award of Succeeding Lease, Thomas Circle South, 1121 Vermont Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C., Lease No. GS-11B-20083	11/17/82
A30061b/8/F/821119	Letter Report - Proposed Award of Lease, Kerr-McGee Lab Building, 5960 N. McIntyre Street, Golden, Colorado	11/19/82
A30061a/8/F/821119	Letter Report - Proposed Award of Lease, Western Management Building, 1772 South 300 West, Salt Lake City, Utah	11/24/82
9B-12048-51-02	Construction Contract Change Orders, Region 2	11/26/82
5D-20155-02-02	Review of FY 1981 Yearend Obligations Recorded in the Federal Buildings Fund and Other Appropriated Funds in Region 2	11/26/82
4M-10755-09-09	Administration of Automatic Data Processing (ADP) Service Contracts, Region 9	11/29/82
5D-20162-09-09	Unliquidated Obligations, FY 1981, Region 9	11/30/82
4E-20175-04-04	GSA Should Terminate the Nashville Union Train Station Project	11/30/82
5T-20510-01-01	Federal Archives and Records Center, Waltham, Massachusetts, Region 1	11/30/82
4M-20748-00-22	Letter Report - Proposed Sole-Source Award to MITRE	12/01/82
4G-20813-04-04	Region 4 Should Reevaluate Architect/Engineer Retrofit Proposals	12/01/82
A30049e/7/F/821203	Letter Report - Proposed Award of Lease, 1661 Canal Street, New Orleans, Louisiana	12/03/82

REPORT REGISTER
INTERNAL AUDITS

Number	Title	Date of Report
A30106/4/F/821206	Lease for the Social Security Administration's Office of Hearings and Appeals, Nashville, Tennessee	12/06/82
4B-20410-09-09	PBS/IS Lease Assignment Data, Region 9	12/08/82
A30081B/W/F/821209	Letter Report - Proposed Award of Succeeding Lease, 633 Indiana Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C., Lease No. GS-11B-20069	12/09/82
5D-20164-11-11	Yearend Closing - Additional Improvements Needed	12/09/82
A30052/R/F/821210	Solicitations for Leased Space to House the Southern Division of Navy's Facilities Engineering Command	12/10/82
3U208920101/1/F/821211	Letter Report - Boston Inter-agency Motor Pool, Region 1	12/11/82
A30111/Z/F/821213	Letter Report - FSS-28 Systems Development Project	12/13/82
A30029/4/F/821214	Letter Report - Pending Lease Award, Lease No. GS-04B-22422 MEPS Facility, Jacksonville, Florida	12/14/82
4I107821111/W/F/821215	Improvements Need To Be Made in the Procuring and Maintaining of Security Equipment	12/15/82
A30081D/W/F/821215	Letter Report - Proposed Award of Succeeding Lease, 1745 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Virginia, Lease No. GS-11B-30003	12/15/82
4G-10418-06-06-F(2)	Letter Report - Second Implementation Review - Conscientious Lease Administration Could Have Resulted in Substantial Cost Savings to the Government	12/16/82

REPORT REGISTER
INTERNAL AUDITS

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date of Report</u>
3N-10207-06-06-F(2)	Letter Report - Second Implementation Review - Formal Advertised Procurement Process Would Be Improved With Increased Emphasis on Internal Controls and Greater Adherence to Procurement Procedures	12/16/82
4G-00688-06-06-F(2)	Letter Report - First Implementation Review - Timely Lease Actions Would Improve the Effectiveness of the Region 6 Leasing Program	12/16/82
A30081C/W/F/821221	Letter Report - Proposed Award of Succeeding Lease, 2121 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Virginia, Lease No. GS-11B-30000	12/21/82
A30166/1/F/821222	Letter Report - Proposed Award of Lease Extension, 100 Summer Street, Boston, Massachusetts, Lease No. GS-01B-(PRA)-03083(NEG)	12/22/82
A30167/4/F/821223	Letter Report - Pending Lease Award, 1100 Spring Street, Atlanta, Georgia, Lease No. GS-04B-22428	12/23/82
3C206080404/4/F/821223	Management of Excess Personal Property, Region 4	12/23/82
4E-12041-11-11	Management of the Social Security Administration, Administrative Headquarters Expansion Project	12/23/82
A30149/1/F/821228	Letter Report - Proposed Award of Lease Nos. GS-01B-(PEL)-03380 (NEG) and GS-01B-(PRA)-03029(NEG) for West Warwick, Rhode Island	12/28/82
5D206140909/9/F/821228	Administrative Equipment Fund, Regions 9 and 10	12/28/82
4E-20559-04-04	Letter Report - Regional Design and Construction Value Engineering Program	12/29/82
A30077/10/F/821229	Letter Report - Proposed Award of Lease No. GS-10B-05023, Lloyd 500 Building, Portland, Oregon	12/29/82

REPORT REGISTER
INTERNAL AUDITS

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date of Report</u>
A30034/1/F/821230	Letter Report - Buildings Management Operations at the Providence, Rhode Island Field Office	12/30/82
4M204000707/7/F/821230	Letter Report - Region 7 Telecommunication Functions	12/30/82
3V-20711-06-06	Regional Reviews Are Needed to Ensure Carrier Compliance with Negotiated Freight Rates	12/30/82
3C207680707/7/F/821230	Letter Report - Excess Personal Property, Region 7	12/30/82
A30173/2/F/830110	Letter Report - Proposed Award of Lease Extension, 114 Old Country Road, Mineola, New York, Lease No. GS-02B-10313	01/10/83
6H-20958-03-21	Review of Allegation of Improper Disclosure of Information - A-76 Review of Custodial Services and Elevator Operations, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania	01/12/83
4F204110505/5/F/83113	Federal Protective Service Division Operations, Region 5	01/13/83
3J203880202/2/F/830114	Review of the Contracting Officer Warrant Program, Region 2	01/14/83
3K-20134-09-09	Using Plant Facilities Reports Effectively, Office of Personal Property, Region 9	01/17/83
A30177/2/F/830118	Letter Report - Proposed Award of Lease, 101 East Post Road, White Plains, New York, Rahmani Construction Corp., Lessor, Lease No. GS-02B-22135	01/18/83
A30086/6/U/830118	Letter Report - Implementation Review on Improved Reports and Procedures are Needed for Effective Inventory Management	01/18/83
A30178/9/F/830118	Letter Report - Proposed Award of Lease Extension, 11099 La Cienga Boulevard, Los Angeles, California	01/18/83

REPORT REGISTER
INTERNAL AUDITS

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date of Report</u>
A30185/9/F/830118	Letter Report - Proposed Lease Award, 9100 E. Flair Drive, El Monte, California	01/18/83
3B-00623-11-11-F(1)	Short Form Implementation Review - Watch Contractors Required to Purchase Government Manufactured Bearings That They Cannot Use	01/21/83
A30225/9/F/830121	Letter Report - Proposed Lease Extension, 201 N. Central Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona	01/21/83
A30031/6/F/830121	Region 6 May Have Restricted Competition When Obtaining Space for the Armed Forces Recruiting/ Examination Station in Kansas City, Missouri	01/21/83
5D205190101/1/F/830121	Financial Processing Deficiencies Exit Within the Federal Building Fund, Region 1	01/21/83
A30223/10/F/830124	Letter Report - Special Review of PBS/IS Leased Renewal Data	01/24/83
4G-10587-00-24	Controls Over Costs of Repairs, Alterations, and Improvements in Leased Space	01/26/83
4D209370101/1/F/830126	Letter Report - Building Management Operations at the Manchester, New Hampshire, Field Office	01/26/83
4D208530303/3/F/830127	The Norfolk, Virginia, Buildings Manager Needs to Improve Internal Controls and to Better Follow Prescribed Procedures	01/27/83
3J110831111/W/F/830128	Significant Improvements Are Needed in the Contracting Officer Warrant Program	01/28/83
4D209110202/2/F/830131	Buildings Management Field Office, Greater Manhattan, New York, Region 2	01/31/83

REPORT REGISTER
INTERNAL AUDITS

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date of Report</u>
A30251/R/U/830201	Second Implementation Review - Audit of Administration of VOTRAKON, Saudi Arabian Construction Project	02/01/83
A30261/4/F/830203	Letter Report - Pending Lease Award, Pershing Point Plaza, Atlanta, Georgia, Lease No. GS-04B-23123	02/03/83
A30081E/W/F/830207	Letter Report - Proposed Supplemental Lease Agreement No. 1, Federal Center Plaza, 400 C Street, S.W., Washington. D.C., Lease No. GS-11B-20054	02/07/83
7792240909/9/U/830208	Implementation Review - Contracting Procedures and Administrative Controls Over Alterations in Leased Space Need To Be Improved, Region 9	02/08/83
3N206010505/5/F/830209	Advertised Procurements, Office of Personal Property, Region 5	02/09/83
A30081F/W/F/830210	Letter Report - Proposed Award of Lease, 806/814 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C., Lease No. GS-11B-30005	02/10/83
A30287/4/F/830214	Letter Report - Pending Award of Supplemental Agreement No. 4 to Lease No. GS-04B-15910, CWC Building, Atlanta, Georgia	02/14/83
4M206121010/10/F/830214	The Economy and Efficiency of the Current Systems and Programming Service Contract Has Not Been Established, Region 10	02/14/83
30209250202/2/F/830214	Letter Report - Inventory Procedures and Inventory Observation at Belle Mead Supply Depot, Region 2	02/14/83
A30243/10/F/830215	Letter Report - Proposed Award of Lease, Cascade Exchange Building, Portland, Oregon, Lease No. GS-10B-03931	02/15/83

REPORT REGISTER
INTERNAL AUDITS

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date of Report</u>
5D207711010/10/F/830215	Timekeeping Controls and Supervisory Review Practices Need Improvement for More Accurate, Complete, and Reliable Payroll Records, Region 10	02/15/83
4M203980202/2/F/830217	Proliferation of Word Processing Equipment. Region 2	02/17/83
4D205740202/2/F/830218	Buildings Management Field Office, Belle Mead, New Jersey, Region 2	02/18/83
A30255/2/F/830224	Letter Report - Delay in Moving HUD Offices in Newark, New Jersey	02/24/83
A30295/9/F/820224	Letter Report - Proposed Lease Award, 211 Main Street, San Francisco, California	02/24/83
4D209060505/5/F/830224	Buildings Manager Field Office Review, Springfield, Illinois, Region 5	02/24/83
A30272/4/F/830225	Letter Report - Overpayment of Water Bills on Lease Nos. GS-04B-15456 and GS-04B-20016	02/25/83
4D209120707/7/F/830228	Regional Controls Over New Orleans Field Office Procurements are Adequate and Effective	02/28/83
A30192/Z/F/830302	Letter Report - Interim Report on the Personnel Information Resources System (PIRS)	03/02/83
A30252/7/F/830303	Letter Report - Proposed Purchase of Building, 555 Griffin Square, Dallas, Texas	03/03/83
A30332/7/F/830304	Letter Report - Proposed Award of Lease, 1415 North Loop West, Houston, Texas	03/03/83
A30331/7/F/830307	Letter Report - Proposed Award of Lease, 10910 N. Central Expressway, Dallas, Texas	03/07/83
A30320/10/F/830308	Letter Report - Preaward Lease Review, Sea-Tac Office Center, Seattle, Washington	03/08/83

REPORT REGISTER
INTERNAL AUDITS

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date of Report</u>
A30010/7/F/830311	Review of Real Property Appraisal Staff Operations	03/11/83
A30289/4/F/830311	Letter Report - Determine Total Contract Cost and Unpaid Amount Due on A/E Contract No. GS-04B-13278(NEG) with Finch, Alexander, Barnes, Rothschild and Paschal, Inc. (FABRAP)	03/11/83
A30314/1/F/830314	Letter Report - Proposed Award of Lease, 120 Boylston Street, Boston, Massachusetts, Lease No. GS-01B-03384	03/14/83
3U206111010/10/F/830317	Seattle Motor Pool's Adherence to Prescribed Procedures Will Lead to Improved Controls Over Vehicle Repairs, Petroleum and Parts	03/17/83
5D209211111/W/F/830317	Administration of Fuel Billings in the National Capital Region	03/17/83
A30202/2/F/830317	Letter Report - Proposed Award of Lease, 250 Fulton Avenue, Hempstead, New York, Lease No. GS-02B-22137	03/17/83
3B107560202/2/F/830318	GSA's Stockpile of Precious Metals and Diamonds	03/18/83
3C203741111/W/F/830318	Internal Controls Within the Surplus Sales Section Need Significant Improvement	03/18/83
A30358/9/F/830322	Letter Report - Preaward Audit of a Succeeding Lease, 1275 Market Street, San Francisco, California	03/22/83
A30211/5/I/830322	Interim Letter Report - Operations of Chicago Federal Archives and Records Center (FARC)	03/22/83
4G107840505/5/F/830323	Letter Report - Lease Award and Administration, Region 5	03/23/83
A30099/2/F/830323	The Floyd Bennett Field Telecommunications System Project	03/23/83

REPORT REGISTER
INTERNAL AUDITS

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date of Report</u>
A30349/W/U/830323	Implementation Review - Regional Management of the Public Buildings Service/Information System Needs Improvement	03/23/83
6A107980021/O/F/830324	GSA's Implementation of the Integrated Ceiling and Background System Concept	03/24/83
4G1090211111/W/F/830325	Opportunities Exist to Improve the Administration of the Public Buildings Cooperative Use Act of 1976	03/25/83
30206050202/2/F/830325	Export Operations at the Belle Mead Depot, Region 2	03/25/83
4D1023111111/W/U/830328	Short Form Implementation Review - Building Management Operations at the Justice Field Office Could Be Improved	03/28/83
4G209690024/R/F/830328	Review of Controls Over Lease Renewal Dates	03/28/83
4G2072611111/W/F/830330	Outleasing of Space in the Old Post Office Building, Washington, D.C.	03/30/83
A30265/F/F/830330	Controls Over Unused Transportation Tickets Purchased With Government Transportation Requests	03/30/83
5D201660606/6/F/830331	Operating Efficiency and Management Controls at the National Payroll Center Can Be Improved	03/31/83
A30310/6/F/830331	Letter Report - The Physical Inventory Count of the Kansas City Self-Service Store Was Performed in Accordance with Prescribed Procedures	03/31/83
9B2021551111/W/F/830331	The Administering, Managing, and Reporting Practices of Construction Contract Change Orders Need Improvements in the National Capital Region	03/31/83

REPORT REGISTER
INSPECTION REPORTS

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date of Report</u>
S-PBS-C-17-82	Letter Report - Construction of a New Courthouse Annex to the Existing Courthouse in Miami, Florida, Contract No. GS-04B-81005	10/07/82
W-PBS-C-01-82	Inspection of Project RCA 20256- Sealing of Exterior Concrete Panel Joints, Federal Office Building and Post Office, 777 Sonoma Avenue, Santa Rosa, California	10/08/82
NC-FSS-06-82	Letter Report - Contracts for Paper Bags Awarded to Great Plains Bag Corporation	10/19/82
W-FSS-11-82	Inspection of Need for Price Analysis on Competitive Bids	10/28/82
W-PBS-C-19-82	Letter Report- Building Expansion of the National Archives and Records Storage Center, San Bruno, California, Project No. ICA 20245	10/29/82
NC-PBS-L-13-82	Five Lafayette Fisher Properties in Chicago, Illinois	10/29/82
NC-PBS-L-07-82	Veterans Administration Clinic, Evansville, Indiana, Contract No. GS-05B-12173	11/02/82
NC-PBS-C-01-82	Review of Contract Administration and Work-in-Place, Interior Remodeling and Roof Repair, U.S. Post Office and Courthouse, Levenworth, Kansas	11/08/82
S-PBS-C-16-82	Letter Report - U.S. Border Station, Laredo, Texas (Followup of Report No. S-PBS-C-02-82, dated 3/1/82)	11/10/82
NC-FSS-03-82	Contracts for Plastic Bags Awarded to Skytop Plastics, Inc.	12/03/82
S-PBS-C-23-82	Security System Installation, Richard B. Russell Federal Building, Atlanta, Georgia	12/06/82
NC-FSS-05-82	Contracts for Paper Bags Awarded to Duro Paper Bag Manufacturing Company	12/16/82

REPORT REGISTER
INSPECTION REPORTS

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date of Report</u>
PBS-C-11-82	Letter Report - Alterations to Office Space, FOB-10A, 800 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C., Contract No. GS-11B-18338	12/23/82
NC-PBS-P-27-82	Letter Report - Six Lease Alterations Sites	12/29/82
A30073/4/F/821229	Letter Report - Space Alteration, USPO/CT, Huntsville, Alabama, Contract No. GS-04B-82019	12/29/82
A30016/9/F/830117	Review of Tool Kit Contracts for Compliance with the Buy American Act	01/17/83
NC-FSS-11-82	Letter Report - Procurement of Grocery Bags	01/18/83
A30172/W/F/830125	Letter Report - Contract to Repair Parapet Walls, J. Edgar Hoover Building, Washington, D.C., Contract No. GS-03B-88358	01/25/83
PBS-P-12-82	Alterations to the Second and Third Floors, Oceanographic Building, Suitland, Maryland, Contract No. GS-11B-08247	01/27/83
NC-PBS-B-28-82	Technical Evaluation of the Pre-examination Process of Patent Applications, Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, D.C.	01/28/83
NC-PBS-B-01-82	U. S. Courts Space Alterations, U. S. Courthouse, Des Moines, Iowa	01/31/83
W-PBS-C-12-82	Construction of 5th Floor Courtroom, U. S. Courthouse, Los Angeles, California	01/31/83
SPBSE0483/4/F/830210	Energy Conservation Program at IRS Service Center, Chamblee, Georgia	02/10/83
A30180/9/F/830211	Letter Report - West Los Angeles Field Office	02/11/83
A30150/T/F/830216	Letter Report - Bison Instruments, Inc.	02/16/83

REPORT REGISTER
INSPECTION REPORTS

<u>Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date of Report</u>
SPBSC1882/4/F/830218	Alterations to the Richard B. Russell Federal Building, Atlanta, Georgia, Contract No. GS-04B-82005	02/18/83
SFSS1482/4/F/830222	Administration of Contract No. GS-00C-70111, Computer Data Systems, Inc., at the Interagency Data Systems Facility, Huntsville, Alabama	02/22/83
W-PBS-C-16-81	Project RCA 20295, Miscellaneous Alterations, Improvements and Handicapped Provisions at the U.S. Court of Appeals and Post Office, 7th and Mission Streets, San Francisco, California	02/24/83
NC-PBS-B-05-82	Inspection of New 1st Floor Facility for U. S. Marshall's Federal Building, U. S. Courthouse, Detroit, Michigan	02/28/83
A30080	Miscellaneous Improvements, Federal Center, St. Louis, Missouri	02/28/83
A30019/T/F/830303	Inspection of Composite Floor Beam Problems and Related Structural Items, U. S. Courthouse and Federal Building, San Jose, California	03/03/83
NCPBSB0682/5/F/830304	Space Alterations, Federal Building, U.S. Courthouse, Cedar Rapids, Iowa	03/04/83
PBSB0682/W/F/830307	Letter Report - Renovation of Federal Building, 320 1st Street, N.W, Washington, D.C., Contract No. GS-03B-78080	03/07/83
A30207/5/F/830315	Letter Report - Contract Administration and Work-in-Place Space Alterations, Federal Building, U.S. Courthouse, Davenport, Iowa, Contract No. GS-06B-13440	03/15/83
A30258/5/F/830315	Letter Report - Contract Administration and Work-in-Place Service Center Replacement System Project, Federal Building, Kansas City, Missouri	03/15/83

REPORT REGISTER
INSPECTION REPORTS

Number	Title	Date of Report
NCPBSL0382/5/F/830316	Letter Report - Veterans Administration Clinic and Social Security Administration Office, Canton, Ohio, Contract No. GS-05B-12503	03/16/83
A30107/9/F/830316	Alleged Waste in Proposed Carpet Replacement at the Social Security Administration, Western Program Service Center, 1221 Nevin Avenue, Richmond, California	03/16/83
A30071/9/F/830318	Letter Report - East Bay Field Office, 1515 Clay Street, Oakland, California	03/18/83
NCFSS0182/T/F/830322	Inspection of Solicitations for Plastic Bags	03/22/83
PBSC0882/W/F/830323	Letter Report - Renovation of Naval Intelligence Command (NIPSSA) Computer Room, Oceanographic Building, Suitland, Maryland, Contract No. GS-11B-08248	03/23/83
PBSB1782/W/F/830331	Lease/Construction of the EPA Laboratory, Annapolis, Maryland, Lease No. GS-03B-70043	03/31/83

DELINQUENT DEBTS

GSA's Credit and Finance Branch, Office of Finance, provided the information presented in this section.

GSA's Non-Federal Debt Collection Activity

During this period, GSA embarked on a number of efforts to improve its management reporting, the most ambitious of which is the automation of non-federal receivables. At this juncture, the information required for the major reporting requirements is compiled manually. GSA is in the process of converting all funds to the National Electronic Accounting and Reporting (NEAR) System. Included in this systems effort is the development of a new accounts receivable module, which is being designed to accommodate both internal and external receivable reporting requirement data elements. This long range effort (1987) includes the development of a fully interactive system which would greatly facilitate the retrieval of accounts receivable/debt collection data. Numerous meetings have been held regarding both federal and non-federal reporting requirements during the October to March period.

Another effort that came to fruition was GSA's initiative to eliminate further delinquencies created by its tax return reproduction program. GSA had recommended to the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) that there be a prepaid flat fee, rather than a billed base and per-page fee. While reviewing this recommendation, the IRS decided to take over the entire program in October 1983 with the exception of the reproduction aspects. The IRS will enter into a reimbursable agreement with GSA for these reproduction services.

GSA also initiated procedures to accommodate the provisions of the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) Circular A-50 dated September 29, 1982, entitled "Audit Follow-up." On December 22, 1982, GSA issued GSA Order ADM 2030.2A, "Audit Resolution and Followup System," which defined staff responsibilities for audit resolution and follow-up procedures.

Non-Federal Receivables

Because GSA is currently operating under a manual system, data on non-Federal receivables for the period of October 1, 1982 to March 31, 1983 was not available at the time of this report's publication. Consequently, six-month data for the period July 1, 1982 through December 31, 1982 is provided.

	As of <u>June 30, 1982</u>	As of <u>December 31, 1982</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Total Amounts			
Due GSA	\$ 69,128,915	\$ 64,009,674	\$5,119,241
Amount Delinquent	\$ 10,709,819	\$ 9,082,377	\$1,627,442
Total Amount Written Off as Uncollectible Between July 1, 1982 and December 31, 1982			\$2,106,352

As the data indicates, during the six-month period dating from July 1 through December 31, 1982, GSA reduced its non-federal delinquency from \$10.7 million to \$9.1 million. Of this \$9.1 million, \$1.3 million, or 14 percent, has been referred to the Department of Justice. An additional \$2.8 million, or 31 percent, is in formal dispute within the Agency, i.e., before the GSA Board of Contract Appeals. Another \$2.6 million, or 29 percent, is comprised of principal and interest on real estate credit sales.

GSA is responsible for collecting approximately \$5 billion a year in federal and non-federal receivables. Its non-federal receivables comprise less than 10 percent of this activity. As of December 31, 1982, \$64 million was outstanding, which includes the \$9.1 million dollars considered delinquent, and 45 percent of which is either in formal dispute or has been referred to the Department of Justice.

In keeping with its ongoing practice of concentrating on areas with the highest delinquencies, excess cost claims were reduced by almost \$900 thousand dollars during July through December.

