



Office of Audits
Office of Inspector General
U.S. General Services Administration

GSA's Office of Administrative Services Awarded an Invalid \$13.7 Million Task Order

Report Number A240066/H/3/F25003
July 10, 2025

Executive Summary

GSA's Office of Administrative Services Awarded an Invalid \$13.7 Million Task Order

Report Number A240066/H/3/F25003

July 10, 2025

Why We Performed This Audit

The GSA Office of Inspector General received a hotline complaint that alleged unduly restricted competition in the award of Task Order Number 47HAA024F0028 (information technology [IT] research licenses and consulting services task order). Based on that allegation, we initiated an audit. Our audit objective was to determine if GSA's Office of Administrative Services (OAS), Office of Internal Acquisition (OIA) awarded this task order in accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR), the GSA Acquisition Manual (GSAM), blanket purchase agreement (BPA) requirements, and other applicable internal policies.

What We Found

OIA awarded an invalid task order for IT research licenses and consulting services that did not comply with the FAR, the GSAM, BPA requirements, and other applicable internal policies. Specifically, OIA made an improper sole-source award by issuing an invalid task order against a U.S. Department of Defense BPA that GSA was not authorized to use. In addition, GSA supported the sole-source award using a flawed limited-source justification that was not approved prior to the award and was not posted publicly. Further, the technical evaluation and price analysis for the awarded task order were flawed. Finally, reviews of the task order were either deficient or were not performed.

What We Recommend

We recommend that the GSA Chief Administrative Services Officer:

1. Ensure that justifications for other than full and open competition are completed prior to award and publicly posted.
2. Enforce accountability with OAS personnel who did not comply with the FAR, the GSAM, and OIA internal policies in the award of the audited task order.
3. Revise OIA's *Internal Quality Assurance Review* policy to reduce delays, and employ a risk-based sampling methodology when selecting contracts for review.
4. Establish an OAS policy to supplement GSA Order ADM 5000.4B, *Office of General Counsel Legal Review*, to reduce the monetary threshold for legal review commensurate with the monetary values of OIA contracts.

In his response to our report, the GSA Chief Administrative Services Officer agreed with our recommendations. OAS's response can be found in its entirety in ***Appendix B***.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Results	3
<i>Finding 1 – OIA made an improper sole-source award by issuing an invalid task order against a DOD BPA that GSA was not authorized to use.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Finding 2 – GSA supported the sole-source award using a flawed limited-source justification that was not approved prior to the award and was not posted publicly.</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Finding 3 – The technical evaluation and price analysis for the awarded task order were flawed.</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Finding 4 – Reviews of the task order were either deficient or not performed.</i>	<i>7</i>
Conclusion.....	11
Recommendations	11
GSA Comments.....	11
Appendix A – Objective, Scope, and Methodology.....	12
Appendix B – GSA Comments.....	14
Appendix C – Report Distribution	15

Introduction

We performed an audit of GSA's award of Task Order Number 47HAA024F0028.

Purpose

The GSA Office of Inspector General received a hotline complaint that alleged unduly restricted competition in the award of Task Order Number 47HAA024F0028 (information technology [IT] research licenses and consulting services task order). Based on that allegation, we initiated an audit.

Objective

Our audit objective was to determine if GSA's Office of Administrative Services (OAS), Office of Internal Acquisition (OIA) awarded this task order in accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR), the GSA Acquisition Manual (GSAM), blanket purchase agreement (BPA) requirements, and other applicable internal policies.

See **Appendix A** – Objective, Scope, and Methodology for additional details.

Background

Established in April 2014, OIA provides acquisition support to GSA's services and staff offices.¹ OIA reports to GSA's Chief Administrative Services Officer (CASO); its mission is to provide collaborative, innovative, and strategic acquisition solutions that enable GSA services and staff offices to successfully achieve their missions.

Within OIA, there are three offices led by division directors who report to the OIA Director: (1) Acquisition Policy and Workforce Division, (2) Acquisition Operations Division, and (3) Acquisition Services Division. The Acquisition Operations Division and Acquisition Services Division contracting officers award contracts for GSA customers.

Contracting officers have the authority to award, administer, or terminate contracts and are ultimately responsible for safeguarding the government's interest. The Federal Acquisition Regulations System establishes uniform acquisition policies and procedures for use by contracting officers within executive agencies, including GSA, when awarding contracts. The Federal Acquisition Regulations System is composed of the FAR and agency regulations that implement or supplement the FAR.²

¹ GSA Order ADM D 5450.168, *Changes in GSA Delegation of Authority* (April 24, 2014). This order has since been replaced; however, this is the version that established OIA.

² The FAR implements various legislative requirements, including 41 U.S.C. 253, *Competition in Contracting Act*, which requires "full and open competition through the use of competitive procedures" in federal procurement.

The GSAM consolidates GSA acquisition regulations and guidance that all GSA personnel, including OIA, are expected to follow. FAR 1.102, *Statement of guiding principles for the Federal Acquisition System*, states that the Federal Acquisition Regulations System's policy is "to promote competition in the acquisition process."

Competition proponents contend that when the government promotes competition in its acquisitions, it can acquire higher-quality goods and services at lower prices. FAR 1.602-1, *Authority*, requires contracting officers to ensure that "all requirements of law, executive orders, regulations, and applicable procedures, including clearances and approvals, have been met."

In April 2023, OIA received the initial requirements documents for an IT research licenses and consulting services task order to assist with GSA's management of government IT services. The task order was intended to combine two existing task orders and support multiple internal GSA customers, including GSA IT, the Office of Government-wide Policy, the Office of Human Resources Management, and the Federal Acquisition Service's Office of Information Technology Category (ITC). OIA assigned a contracting officer, and ITC provided a program manager and a contracting officer's representative (COR).

On January 18, 2024, OIA issued a solicitation for the combined task order for IT research licenses and consulting services to a single contractor. The contractor submitted its proposal, valued at \$13.7 million, on January 25, 2024. On February 1, 2024, OIA awarded a sole-source task order (Task Order Number 47HAA024F0028), valued at \$13.7 million, against a U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) BPA that had been established under a GSA schedule contract.³

³ DOD Enterprise Software Initiative Agreement Number N66001-19-A-0049.

Results

OIA awarded an invalid task order for IT research licenses and consulting services that did not comply with the FAR, the GSAM, BPA requirements, and other applicable internal policies. Specifically:

- OIA made an improper sole-source award by issuing an invalid task order against a DOD BPA that GSA was not authorized to use.
- GSA supported the sole-source award using a flawed limited-source justification that was not approved prior to the award and was not posted publicly.
- The technical evaluation and price analysis for the awarded task order were flawed.
- Reviews of the task order were either deficient or were not performed.

Finding 1 – OIA made an improper sole-source award by issuing an invalid task order against a DOD BPA that GSA was not authorized to use.

From the start of this procurement, GSA had a preferred contractor and intended to make an award to that contractor through a sole-source procurement. The contracting officer, while concerned about making a sole-source award, eventually placed a sole-source task order to the preferred contractor against a DOD BPA. However, the task order was invalid because GSA was not authorized to use the DOD BPA.

Emails to the contracting officer from the ITC COR and the ITC program manager indicate that they identified a preferred contractor early in the acquisition planning process. In April 2023, ITC submitted the initial requirements documents to OIA, and a contracting officer was assigned. In the requirements documents, ITC submitted a draft limited-source justification that cited market research results from a request for information.

The contracting officer requested that the ITC COR provide the market research results from the request for information. However, the ITC program manager replied that a request for information had not been issued for the requirement. The contracting officer responded that the information in the submitted justification was “non-factual.”

Subsequently, the contracting officer expressed concerns with the sole-source award throughout the acquisition process:

- **May 2023** – The contracting officer wrote that she was “not sure” of her confidence in the documents clearing the Competition Advocate and Contract Review Board (CRB).
- **July 2023** – The contracting officer requested a meeting with the ITC COR and ITC program manager, as well as the OIA Director, who “is not convinced that this can remain a sole source and should be competed.”

- **October 2023** – The contracting officer wrote the following to an OAS Senior Acquisition Advisor: “We may have to keep this at full and open competition unless we can pull a rabbit out of a hat and come up with a miracle.”

The contracting officer was looking for a “miracle” that would facilitate a sole-source award to ITC’s preferred contractor. In late December 2023, the contracting officer found the “miracle” in a DOD BPA that had been established under a GSA schedule contract.⁴ The contracting officer placed the sole-source task order against the DOD BPA on February 1, 2024.

However, GSA was not an authorized user of the DOD BPA because it met none of the required categories. The DOD BPA, and its supplemental ordering guide, establishes three categories of authorized users:

1. DOD departments and agencies;⁵
2. GSA or other agencies ordering on behalf of DOD; and
3. All federal agencies, if the Office of Management and Budget has designated the agreement Best in Class.⁶

Since the contracting officer did not have the authority to use the DOD BPA, the task order is invalid. In an August 8, 2024, alert memorandum, we notified the CASO of this issue and told him to take immediate action to cease further work under the task order.⁷

In response, OIA notified the contractor that GSA would not exercise the option period after the expiration of the base period on January 31, 2025. However, despite acknowledging that it was not authorized to use the DOD BPA, GSA continued the work it began under the invalid task order. GSA spent more than \$2.6 million under the invalid task order, including almost \$1.5 million after our alert memorandum was issued.

Finding 2 – GSA supported the sole-source award using a flawed limited-source justification that was not approved prior to the award and was not posted publicly.

To meet the requirements of the DOD BPA ordering guide and FAR 8.405-6, *Limiting sources*, GSA developed a limited-source justification to support the sole-source award to the preferred contractor. The contracting officer, ITC COR, and ITC program manager developed the limited-

⁴ DOD Enterprise Software Initiative Agreement Number N66001-19-A-0049.

⁵ As defined in 48 C.F.R. 202.101, *Purpose*.

⁶ Best in Class designations identify government-wide contracts that meet key criteria defined by the Office of Management and Budget and are recommended or required for use by memorandums or other policy.

⁷ *GSA’s Office of Administrative Services’ Award of a \$13.7 Million Task Order is Invalid* (A240066-2, August 8, 2024).

source justification based on highly specialized requirements. It was signed by the CASO on March 12, 2024, approximately 6 weeks after the task order was awarded.

However, we found that the limited-source justification was inadequate to deviate from competing the award. The limited-source justification was flawed because it included unnecessary and immaterial requirements to justify the sole-source award to the preferred contractor. Moreover, the issues with the sole-source justification were compounded because, contrary to FAR requirements, it was not approved prior to award and was not posted publicly.

Justification Rationale

The justification rationale to limit sources was based on two highly specialized requirements: (1) a proprietary product and (2) telecommunications benchmarking services. However, on July 10, 2023, the ITC program manager notified the contracting officer by email that ITC removed the proprietary product from the requirements. We confirmed that the statement of work did not reference or require this product. Despite the proprietary product not being required, it was included in the justification to limit competition.

The remaining telecommunications benchmarking services are highly specialized; however, they were immaterial to the overall contract scope, representing approximately 4 percent of the total cost. In a July 2023 email, the ITC program manager mentioned that splitting the requirements using the highly specialized services as a basis of the sole-source award had “a better chance of getting it through the CRB and Competition advocate [*sic*].”

In the end, the justification included an unnecessary proprietary product and immaterial highly specialized services. It appears these items were included with the sole intent to justify award of the task order to the preferred contractor without competition.

Approval and Posting

The justification was not approved prior to award, as required by FAR 8.405-6. OAS’s Competition Advocate brought this issue to the attention of OIA’s assigned attorney in GSA’s Office of General Counsel. The GSA attorney responded that FAR Part 8, *Required Sources of Supplies and Services*, does “not explicitly” state that the justification must be approved before award.

However, both the FAR and OIA policy indicate the justification should be reviewed and approved prior to award. FAR 8.405-6 indicates that a justification should be completed prior to award by stating “an ordering activity must justify its action when restricting consideration.” It also references a “proposed order” when identifying the circumstances that could justify limiting sources. Further, OIA’s own policy, Operational Notice (ON) 15-001 Supplement 003, *Acquisition Document Reviews and Approvals*, identifies a justification as a pre-solicitation document, which means it should be prepared prior to award.

In addition, there is no evidence that the contracting officer publicly published a notice of award and the justification within 14 days of the order, as required by FAR 8.405-6. Consequently, this sole-source contract was not publicly published, and the notice of the sole-source award was withheld from the public.

In summary, emails from the ITC COR and ITC program manager indicate that they had identified a preferred contractor early in the acquisition planning process. The contracting officer awarded a sole-source task order to the preferred contractor using a DOD BPA; however, the task order was invalid because GSA was not authorized to use the BPA. The contracting officer also used a flawed limited-source justification for unnecessary and immaterial highly specialized requirements to justify limiting competition on the task order.

In future acquisitions, OIA should ensure that required limited-source justifications are properly reviewed and signed prior to award and publicly posted. This will help ensure that the justification rationale is sufficient to deviate from promoting competition in government contracts. Additionally, publicly posting the contract action supports the government's goals of increasing competition and broadening future participation.

Finding 3 – The technical evaluation and price analysis for the awarded task order were flawed.

The ITC COR and the contracting officer completed a flawed technical evaluation and price analysis for the awarded task order.

Technical Evaluation

A technical evaluation assesses how well a contractor's technical approach demonstrates a thorough understanding of the government's requirements. However, the technical evaluation on this award was not performed in accordance with the OIA Technical Evaluation Plan template or the technical evaluation plan for this task order.

The OIA Technical Evaluation Plan template requires a three-member technical evaluation panel. Despite this, the technical evaluation plan for this task order only required a two-member technical evaluation panel and listed the ITC COR and ITC program manager as panelists. However, only the ITC COR, identified as the technical evaluation lead, completed an evaluation, and he did not document the evaluation using the OIA Technical Evaluation Plan template. As a result, the technical evaluation for the task order was deficient.

Price Analysis

In the Award Decision Memorandum, the contracting officer concluded that the proposal presented a fair and reasonable price in accordance with FAR 15.404-1, *Proposal analysis techniques*. The contracting officer specifically listed the three techniques used to arrive at that conclusion: (1) comparison to historical prices paid, (2) comparison to published price lists, and

(3) comparison to the independent government cost estimate (IGCE). However, none of these techniques are supported by source information maintained in the contract file to demonstrate that the proposed price is fair and reasonable.

Comparison to historical prices paid. The Award Decision Memorandum includes a comparison of the proposed pricing to the two previous task orders, awarded to two different contractors, for similar services. The contracting officer's documented calculation, which we verified for accuracy, shows that the proposed pricing would cost \$1.2 million more than the pricing of the two previous task orders combined.

Comparison to published price lists. The contracting officer documented in the Award Decision Memorandum that the proposed pricing was aligned with the pricing of the DOD BPA; however, this is not correct. In fact, the contractor's proposal disclosed that the pricing for research memberships was based on the DOD BPA, while the pricing for consulting services used the GSA schedule price, which was higher than the DOD BPA pricing. So, for consulting services, the contractor proposed the higher price available. Additionally, the contracting officer stated in the Award Decision Memorandum that the proposal is 4 percent less than GSA schedule pricing; however, there is no analysis to support this claim. It appears that the contracting officer repeated a statement from the contractor's proposal, which stated pricing was on average 4 percent less than GSA schedule pricing.

Comparison to the IGCE. The price analysis also relied heavily on the IGCE, which was valued at \$17.7 million. OIA has a standard template to document IGCEs. The OIA standard template requires an analysis summary, the preparer's signature, and the date the proposal was signed.

However, there is no support for the \$17.7 million IGCE cited in the Award Decision Memorandum. The IGCE did not follow the OIA standard template and lacked critical details of the pricing source used, who prepared it, and when it was prepared. As a result, the IGCE cited in the price analysis is unsupported and should not have been used to determine a fair and reasonable price.

In summary, the technical evaluation and price analysis for this task order were flawed. However, that did not prevent the award of the task order to the predetermined preferred contractor. This may have been identified by reviews; however, they were either deficient or not performed. OAS should ensure accountability for personnel who do not comply with the FAR, the GSAM, and OIA internal policies.

Finding 4 – Reviews of the task order were either deficient or not performed.

To ensure that contract actions and documentation comply with the FAR and the GSAM, OIA contract actions and documentation go through multiple reviews prior to award. These reviews include the review and approval of contract documentation by one level above the contracting officer (typically an OIA division director), the OIA Director, and the CRB. OIA procurements can

also be subject to legal review. However, the reviews of this task order were either deficient or were not performed.

These reviews are discussed below:

- OIA ON 15-001 Supplement 003 requires the review and approval of certain acquisition documents to ensure they reflect sound judgment and demonstrate compliance with relevant regulations, policies, and internal procedures. As discussed in *Finding 2*, the limited-source justification was not reviewed and approved prior to award. In addition, the acquisition plan and the Small Business Set-Aside Strategy form were not fully reviewed.⁸

OIA ON 15-001 Supplement 003 requires nearly all OIA contract documentation to be reviewed by one level above the contracting officer. OIA's review log shows that the OAS Senior Acquisition Advisor served as the one-level-above reviewer for this task order. However, the one-level-above preaward review was completed 5 days after the task order was awarded. This delay rendered the preaward review ineffective at ensuring that the task order complied with regulations, policies, and internal procedures.

- OIA ON 20-002 Supplement 002, *Establishment of the Contract Review Board (CRB) for the Office of Administrative Services*, requires CRB review of OIA contract actions through three sessions: (1) pre-solicitation, (2) preaward, and (3) ad-hoc.⁹ CRBs assess the overall strategy, quality, and compliance of designated contract actions. Waivers can be requested if a contract action cannot comply with the requirement due to matters outside the control of the acquisition team.

In this case, the contracting officer did not request the pre-solicitation CRB until 4 days after solicitation issuance. Further, the contracting officer did not address the CRB comments until after awarding the task order. The contracting officer also did not request a preaward CRB and did not obtain a waiver.

When we asked the contracting officer why she did not request a waiver, she told us that she discussed a waiver with her division director, but it "did not go anywhere." The contracting officer also told us that the (now retired) Deputy CASO provided verbal instruction to issue the solicitation without a CRB because of the urgency to award the task order and avoid a lapse in service. However, we analyzed the timing and determined that there was sufficient time for this task order to meet all internal review requirements by the targeted award date of February 1, 2024.

⁸ GSA Form 2689, *Small Business Analysis Record*, is required because the task order was more than \$6 million and not set aside for small business.

⁹ This guidance has since been replaced; however, we used the OIA ON in effect at the time of the award.

- OIA ON 15-003 Supplement 002, *Internal Quality Assurance Review*, requires all OIA contract actions to be input into the Electronic Acquisition System Integration system and undergo routine preaward and quarterly quality assurance reviews. The purpose of quality assurance reviews is to ensure the accuracy and sufficiency of contract files to clearly demonstrate compliance with applicable regulations, policies, and procedures. However, the Electronic Acquisition System Integration system did not contain all required contract file documentation until we requested it in April 2024.

We reviewed OIA ON 15-003 Supplement 002 to determine why insufficient contract file documentation went undetected for 2 months from the date of award until our request. The policy requires internal quality assurance reviews to be performed “during the first month of a calendar year quarter...on a sample of the contract actions completed within the preceding calendar year quarter.” We discussed this policy with the division director of OIA’s Office of Acquisition Policy, who explained that based on OIA’s methodology, this task order would be eligible for review in April 2025, approximately 14 months after award.

Further, contracts are randomly selected for quality assurance reviews, not by risk factors like monetary value or contract type. Due to the time delay and random selection, the contracts that present the most risk to OIA may not receive a quality assurance review. As a result, OIA contracting actions may not be accurately or sufficiently documented to demonstrate compliance with regulations.¹⁰

- GSA Order ADM 5000.4B, *Office of General Counsel Legal Review*, establishes monetary thresholds for Office of General Counsel review of Agency contract actions. A legal review provides a safeguard to ensure that contract actions comply with the FAR and the GSAM. As required by this order, certain GSA offices reduced the monetary thresholds and specified additional actions that require legal review. This order does not require OAS to establish its own monetary thresholds.

The acquisition plan for this task order was not subject to legal review because it did not meet the \$20 million threshold established in the GSA order. Since OAS is not required to establish its own monetary threshold for legal review, OIA contract actions may not receive adequate legal oversight based on the monetary values of its contract actions. If OAS had reduced its monetary threshold for legal review, it is possible that such a review could have prevented the award of this invalid task order.

Overall, the reviews to ensure that this task order complied with the FAR and GSAM were either deficient or were not performed. OAS should ensure accountability for personnel who do not comply with OIA internal policies. In addition, OAS should revise its internal contract review

¹⁰ The GSA Procurement Management Review Division had a similar finding in its FY 2024 Contracting Activity Report for OAS. This report noted that contract file documentation policies are in place but are missing required processes to monitor for complete and accurate files.

policies to reduce delays and use a risk-based sampling methodology. Lastly, OAS should establish an OAS policy to supplement GSA Order ADM 5000.4B to reduce the monetary threshold for legal review commensurate with the monetary values of OIA contracts.

Conclusion

OIA awarded an invalid task order for IT research licenses and consulting services that did not comply with the FAR, the GSAM, BPA requirements, and other applicable internal policies. Specifically, OIA made an improper sole-source award by issuing an invalid task order against a DOD BPA that GSA was not authorized to use. In addition, GSA supported the sole-source award using a flawed limited-source justification that was not approved prior to the award and was not posted publicly. Further, the technical evaluation and price analysis for the awarded task order were flawed. Finally, reviews of the task order were either deficient or were not performed.

Recommendations

We recommend that the GSA Chief Administrative Services Officer:

1. Ensure that justifications for other than full and open competition are completed prior to award and publicly posted.
2. Enforce accountability with OAS personnel who did not comply with the FAR, the GSAM, and OIA internal policies in the award of the audited task order.
3. Revise OIA's *Internal Quality Assurance Review* policy to reduce delays, and employ a risk-based sampling methodology when selecting contracts for review.
4. Establish an OAS policy to supplement GSA Order ADM 5000.4B to reduce the monetary threshold for legal review commensurate with the monetary values of OIA contracts.

GSA Comments

In his response to our report, the GSA Chief Administrative Services Officer agreed with our recommendations. OAS's response can be found in its entirety in **Appendix B**.

Appendix A – Objective, Scope, and Methodology

Objective

The GSA Office of Inspector General received a hotline complaint that alleged unduly restricted competition in the award of Task Order Number 47HAA024F0028 (IT research licenses and consulting services task order). Based on that allegation, we initiated an audit. Our audit objective was to determine if OIA awarded this task order in accordance with the FAR, the GSAM, BPA requirements, and other applicable internal policies.

Scope and Methodology

The scope of our audit was limited to OIA's sole-source award of Task Order Number 47HAA024F0028, dated February 1, 2024, including market research and acquisition planning, evaluation, and award activities.

To accomplish our objective, we:

- Interviewed OAS personnel, including the CASO, contracting officer, a senior acquisition advisor, and two division directors;
- Interviewed representatives from the internal GSA customer offices of GSA IT; GSA Office of Human Resources Management; and ITC, including the COR, to understand the required services;
- Reviewed the FAR, GSAM, BPA guidelines, and OAS internal policies related to the award of a GSA schedule BPA task order;
- Obtained contract file documentation and other information supporting the task order award;
- Assessed the design, implementation, and effectiveness of internal controls to determine if they contributed to deficiencies in this task order award;
- Obtained GSA's Procurement Management Review report for OAS to determine applicability to the audit objective;
- Tested market research and acquisition planning documentation, including the IGCE, acquisition plan, and limited-source justification, against applicable regulations and policies to determine compliance;
- Analyzed the price analysis and technical evaluation to determine the reasonableness and supportability of the conclusions; and
- Reviewed the accuracy of the task order's data within the Federal Procurement Data System-Next Generation.

Internal Controls

We assessed internal controls significant within the context of our audit objective against GAO-14-704G, *Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government*. The methodology above describes the scope of our assessment, and the report findings include any internal control deficiencies we identified. Our assessment is not intended to provide assurance on GSA's internal control structure as a whole. GSA management is responsible for establishing and maintaining internal controls.

Compliance Statement

We conducted the audit between June and December 2024 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objective. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objective.

Appendix B – GSA Comments

Docusign Envelope ID: E9E86A29-09DD-4E6E-ABE3-8808E338AFEC



Office of Administrative Services

June 17, 2025

MEMORANDUM FOR THOMAS TRIPPLE
REGIONAL INSPECTOR GENERAL
FOR AUDITING (RIGA)
MID-ATLANTIC REGION AUDIT OFFICE (JA-3)

FROM: BOB STAFFORD *Bob Stafford*
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES (H)

SUBJECT: *Response to the Office of Inspector General (OIG) Draft Report, GSA's Office of Administrative Services Awarded an Invalid \$13.7 Million Task Order (Report Number A240066)*

We appreciate the opportunity to review and comment on the referenced draft report GSA's *Office of Administrative Services Awarded an Invalid \$13.7 Million Task Order (A240066)*, dated May 30, 2025. We agree with and appreciate OIG's recommendations and will implement them to strengthen the program. Upon issuance of the final audit report, we will establish a Corrective Action Plan outlining the specific actions and estimated completion dates in support of the implementation.

If you have any questions, please contact Matthew Watt, OAS Chief of Staff.

U.S. General Services Administration
Street Address of the FROM official
City, State Zip
www.gsa.gov

Appendix C – Report Distribution

Acting GSA Administrator (A)

GSA Deputy Administrator (AD)

Chief Administrative Services Officer (H)

Chief of Staff (H)

Director, Office of Internal Acquisition (H1A)

Chief Financial Officer (B)

Acting Deputy Chief Financial Officer (B)

Office of Audit Management and Accountability (BA)

Assistant Inspector General for Auditing (JA)

Deputy Assistant Inspector General for Acquisition Audits (JA)

Deputy Assistant Inspector General for Real Property Audits (JA)

Director (JAO)



CONTACT US

For more information about the GSA OIG, please visit us online at www.gsaig.gov.

**Office of Inspector General
U.S. General Services Administration**

1800 F Street, NW

Washington, DC 20405

Email: oig_publicaffairs@gsaig.gov

Phone: (202) 501-0450 (General)

(202) 273-7320 (Press Inquiries)

GSA OIG Hotline

To report allegations of fraud, waste, abuse, mismanagement, or misrepresentations affiliated with GSA, please submit information to our hotline, www.gsaig.gov/hotline, or call (800) 424-5210.

Follow us:



[gsa-oig](#)



[gsa_oig](#)



[@gsa-oig](#)



[gsa-oig](#)
