U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Inspector General
Office of Audit Services

Audit Report

Business Management Information
System

November 2002

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
Washington, DC 20585

November 4, 2002

MEMORANDUM FOR THE SECRETARY

FROM: Gregory H. Friedman (Signed)
                                       Inspector General

SUBJECT: INFORMATION: Audit Report on "Business Management
                                       Information System"

BACKGROUND

The Department of Energy began development of an integrated, agency-wide business
information system in 1998. As originally conceived, the Business Management Information
System (BMIS) was to integrate a new core financial management system with other business
related systems, such as procurement and human resources, and eliminate a number of legacy
program-level business related systems.

Development of the core accounting system component of BMIS began in September 2000.
This component, known as Phoenix, was intended to replace the Department's primary
accounting, financial reporting, and funds distribution systems, and was to be interfaced with
financial and business systems of operating contractors, national laboratories, and power
marketing administrations. Life cycle implementation and production costs for the Phoenix
portion of BMIS were projected to be about $82 million. We initiated this audit to determine
whether the development of BMIS satisfied Federal and Department systems development
requirements and goals and was aligned with the Corporate Systems Information Architecture.

RESULTS OF AUDIT

At the time of our review, BMIS was unable to satisfy key Federal requirements and was not
aligned with the Department's corporate information technology architecture. Specifically, we
observed that program elements were developing separate systems that were not capable of full
integration with other business systems and that did not take full advantage of existing Phoenix
components. Also, BMIS did not incorporate all corporate-level development efforts and, as
noted in systems planning documentation, did not:

- Link performance and financial data, an element needed to satisfy Federal financial
  system requirements; and,
- Replace certain inefficient program and site-level financial management
  and managerial cost information systems.

During the course of audit field work, the Director, Office of Management, Budget and Evaluation/Chief Financial Officer (CFO) came to the conclusion that BMIS, as originally scoped, would not fully satisfy current and future business system integration requirements nor was it being developed in a manner consistent with the systems design criteria in the President's Management Agenda. Accordingly, the CFO, in conjunction with the Chief Information Officer: initiated an evaluation of the enterprise architecture and BMIS; directed a "slow down" of work on the Phoenix project so that the evaluation initiative could be completed; and, appointed an executive to lead the overall integration effort. Subsequently, the Department, under the joint lead of the CFO and CIO, initiated an entirely new system design proposal. These actions are a radical departure from the initial BMIS/Phoenix effort and they include improved development activities. In our judgment, depending upon the execution of the current effort, the Department's activities have the potential of strengthening management and oversight authority, and significantly helping the Department's efforts to complete a development plan aligned with an inclusive enterprise architecture.

MANAGEMENT REACTION

Overall, management concurred with our recommendations and expressed its confidence that its recent initiatives, when complete, should satisfy our audit recommendations.

Attachment

cc: Chief of Staff
     Under Secretary for Energy, Science and Environment
     Administrator, National Nuclear Security Administration
     Director, Office of Management, Budget and Evaluation/Chief Financial Officer
     Chief Information Officer

BUSINESS MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

System Planning and Development Needs Improvement

System Development Requirements

Federal laws and directives require that agencies maximize the value of information technology (IT) investments and that development projects be closely monitored and aligned with an agency-wide IT architecture. Agencies are specifically required to adopt a comprehensive approach to acquiring and managing IT, with the Chief Information Officer (CIO) monitoring all IT programs for performance and advising management on whether to continue, modify, or terminate projects. Financial decision-making for IT investments is to be linked to the agency's strategic plans and its IT architecture. Moreover, agencies should integrate relevant business-related functions when designing and implementing new financial management systems. As new financial systems are implemented, stand-alone, duplicative, or potentially redundant ancillary or subsidiary systems are to be eliminated.

Development Issues

At the time of our audit, the Business Management Information System (BMIS) development effort did not satisfy several of these key requirements and was not aligned with the Department's Corporate Systems Information Architecture. We found, for example, that:

- The Department had not developed formal plans to replace existing inefficient program and site-level budget formulation systems. Various organizations maintain a number of such systems that are paper intensive and not fully integrated with the core accounting system. Based on information provided by program management officials, we learned that the Phoenix development effort would not have eliminated the need for these systems. In fact, we learned that program officials planned to continue maintaining 13 of 14 program-specific systems.

- BMIS would not eliminate the need to maintain various managerial cost distribution systems nor provide access to transaction data at the contractor level. The Department had no formal plans to integrate managerial cost reporting into BMIS. Development of such information is essential to satisfying certain Federal requirements regarding the matching of costs. The Department currently uses an extensive manual process to compile this information.

- While the Department recognized that the replacement for its out-of-date procurement system should be integrated with its business information system, it had neither planned for nor decided on the extent to which BMIS would achieve this goal. Procurement system modernization planning efforts were allowed to proceed on a separate track and had not been fully coordinated with the ongoing Phoenix development.

• The Department had not resolved how it would link financial management data with performance information. Specifically, no formal plans had been developed to ensure financial data to be contained in Phoenix would ultimately be tied to performance information in other BMIS modules.

With regard to linking performance and financial data, the Department recognized that such linkage was necessary and is working to ensure that Phoenix can accommodate the linkage at some future point. Although a decision as to how integration will be achieved had not been made at the time of our audit, we learned that the Department had implemented an interim, stand-alone performance monitoring system.

During our audit, the Department also identified concerns about the extent to which BMIS would satisfy key requirements and be aligned with the information architecture. Accordingly, the Director, Office of Management, Budget, and Evaluation/Chief Financial Officer (CFO) initiated a series of actions to change the direction of the development effort. These actions are discussed more fully on page 3 of this report.

Strategic Approach

Past BMIS development issues arose, in part, because the Department had not developed a strategic approach for the project to guide development efforts and prevent functional duplication. Specifically, an overall management structure had not been clearly delineated to champion development efforts and to ensure participation and support by program offices and sites. In addition, the Department had not prepared detailed performance measures to guide completion of the project. As described below, we believe these additional components are necessary to ensure a fully successful development project.

Integration/Development Planning

A detailed strategic plan for BMIS that addressed integration and implementation of key business system components such as procurement was needed. Such a plan is a prerequisite for implementing the Corporate Systems Information Architecture and should assist in preventing functional duplication and redundancy in Department-wide information systems. Management also had not developed an overall master plan to guide development efforts and tie various business related information systems into an overall corporate business management information system.

Additionally, the Department had not prepared lifecycle-based plans for security and contingency for BMIS. In particular, we noted that while the Phoenix project had enabled certain vendor supplied security features, it had not developed an overall cyber security plan. Also, a contingency plan had not been developed for mitigating potential implementation problems such as failure of the core accounting system. As noted in prior audits of the Western Area Power Administration's financial statements, the lack of well-developed contingency plans could have potentially disastrous effects and could jeopardize the Department's ability to prepare auditable financial statements.

Performance Goals

We also noted that detailed performance measures to guide the overall BMIS development effort had not been formulated. For example, the Department's Annual Performance Plans lacked quantifiable or realistic performance measures for monitoring BMIS implementation status or ensuring development of a system that could better serve enterprise-wide business management information needs. Plans contained measures that applied only to Phoenix and called for system implementation without specific goals to tie program and activity level effort into an integrated development effort.

Changes in Project Direction

During our audit, the CFO informed the Office of Inspector General that he had reached similar conclusions about the BMIS effort and undertaken a number of actions intended to address these issues. For example, the CFO informed us that he had initiated an evaluation of the enterprise architecture and BMIS, and had directed a slow down of work on the Phoenix project pending the results of that evaluation. In the meantime, the Department began planning efforts to replace potentially duplicative systems. We also learned from officials within the Office of the CFO that the Office of Procurement completed a memorandum of agreement with the Phoenix project with the goal of better integrating development efforts and in recognition of the need to align with the current efforts.

In September 2002, the CFO formally announced that he had revised the Department's approach to BMIS development. He also announced that as part of this initiative, a single senior executive had been appointed to serve as the focal point for all development efforts.

Additionally, a process was established for ensuring that the new business system architecture would be responsive to user needs, thereby reducing the need for redundant legacy systems. In fact, the CFO noted that resources would not be committed to legacy systems that did not support the overall plan. The executive that now heads development also told us that he had recently completed a detailed plan, with milestones and objectives, to facilitate management of the overall effort. At the time our report was finalized, the CFO had not yet reviewed the plan.

The Department's recent actions are encouraging. In our judgment, the CFO's initiative is an excellent step toward correcting the problems that have thus far hindered the BMIS development effort. We note, however, that a successful development effort will require substantial long-term commitment by senior management in all of the Department's major program offices.

Use of Resources

Systems development on the scale contemplated by the Department is technically complex and resource-intensive. The Phoenix component alone is projected to have a lifecycle cost of $82 million, and total BMIS costs would presumably be considerably more. Moreover, the project's ultimate success will be judged in large measure by how well the new system integrates the Department's major business information needs and how well it enables decision-makers to link financial information with performance data. A fully-developed strategic approach and project-specific performance measures − along with the enhancements already initiated by the CFO − should help the Department ensure that its new business architecture is obtained as cost-effectively as possible and that it achieves its expected outcomes.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Director of Management, Budget and Evaluation/Chief Financial Officer, in conjunction with the Chief Information Officer, should:

1. Finalize and implement a master plan, strategy, and/or program enterprise architecture relating to corporate level business information system development efforts that includes an evaluation of capabilities to meet requirements and other functionality such as procurement, budget and performance measurement; and,

2. Establish specific, quantifiable, and realistic performance measures or goals to be applied immediately, and ultimately included in the Department's Annual Performance Plan to guide the BMIS development effort.

MANAGEMENT REACTION   Management concurred with our recommendations and made a number of technical comments that have been reflected in the report. The text of management's comments is included as Appendix 3.

Appendix 1

OBJECTIVE

To determine whether the development of BMIS was aligned with the Corporate Systems Information Architecture and will satisfy Federal and Department systems development requirements and goals.

SCOPE

The audit was performed at Departmental Headquarters between October 2001 and August 2002. In accordance with our objective, we evaluated whether the Department's development of BMIS will satisfy IT architecture, Federal and Department requirements, and Department goals.

METHODOLOGY

To accomplish our objectives, we:

- Reviewed Federal Regulations such as the Clinger-Cohen Act, Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA), OMB Circulars, Departmental Orders, Notices, and guidance pertaining to IT security, acquisition, development, and operation.

- Reviewed relevant reports issued by the Office of Inspector General and the General Accounting Office.

- Reviewed Department budget requests, performance agreements and plans for compliance with GPRA.

- Reviewed the Department of Energy − Information Architecture Project − DOE Corporate Systems Information Architecture and related appendices.

- Reviewed the task order, the statement of work, invoices, development plans, and procedures and practices relating to BMIS development.

- Held discussions with officials and staff in ME, CIO, and various program and operational offices.

The audit was conducted in accordance with generally accepted Government auditing standards for performance audits and included tests of internal controls and compliance with laws and regulations to the extent necessary to satisfy the audit objective. Accordingly, we assessed internal controls regarding the development and acquisition of

information systems. Because our review was limited, it would not necessarily have disclosed all internal control deficiencies that may have existed at the time of our audit. We did not rely on computer-processed data to accomplish our audit objective.

We held an exit conference with cognizant Department Headquarters officials on October 11, 2002.

Appendix 2

PRIOR OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORTS

- *The U.S. Department of Energy's Procurement and Assistance Data System,* (DOE/IG-0436, January 1999). The Department's Procurement and Assistance Data System (PADS) did not meet user needs or comply with generally accepted system practices. It was not easy to use and did not provide needed information to managers. An attempt to redesign PADS had failed earlier due to inept contractors, lack of user involvement in the planning process, and was not part of an overall architecture systems development approach.

- *Commercial Off-the-Shelf Software Acquisition Framework*, (DOE/IG-0463, March 2000). The Department had not developed and implemented software standards or effectively used enterprise-wide contracts, key components of a COTS acquisition framework. Departmental offices (Federal and contractor) acquired application and operating system software that varied in type and price, and duplicated procurement efforts by awarding and managing multiple contracts for the same product. Many offices purchased software over and above normal operational requirements to ensure that data could be exchanged between locations.

- *Facilities Information Management System*, (DOE/IG-0468, April 2000). The purpose of the Facilities Information Management System (FIMS) was to provide Departmental management with access to up-to-date, reliable real property information and to assist in real property decision making. FIMS was inaccurate and incomplete. Real property existed at some sites that had not been entered in FIMS, while in other instances recorded property could not be located. In addition, some supplemental data needed to help manage and report on the Department's real property had not been entered in the system. This occurred because many field sites maintained their own site-specific real property systems and did not use FIMS to manage property. Further, the Headquarters organization with oversight responsibility for FIMS did not have the authority to require field sites to maintain and use the FIMS database.

- *Corporate and Stand-Alone Information Systems Development*, (DOE/IG-0485, September 2000). Duplicative and/or redundant computer systems exist or are under development at virtually all organization levels within the Department. Despite efforts to implement several corporate-level applications, many organizations continued to invest in custom or site-specific development efforts that duplicated corporate functionality. Programs, sites, and contractors had also developed a number of administrative and programmatic information systems that duplicate the functionality of systems in use by other Departmental elements.

- *Report on the Department of Energy's Consolidated Financial Statements* (DOE/IG-FS-01-01, February 2001). The Department's financial statements for Fiscal Year 2000 received an unqualified audit opinion. However, reportable conditions were found in the system of internal controls over financial reporting that could adversely affect the Department's ability to record, process, summarize and report financial data. The conditions related to performance measurement reporting, financial management at the Western Area Power Administration (Western), and unclassified information system security. For instance, some goals were not meaningful or relevant, or stated in objective or quantifiable terms and cost effectiveness data relating to performance was not presented, except for the total net costs of each business line. Also, weaknesses and vulnerabilities were noted in security planning and the means to re-establish computer functions in the event a disaster occurs. Furthermore, Western's system did not generate timely, useful reports that contained complete and accurate financial information and thus was unable to accurately track and report on budget execution and meet external reporting requirements, including the preparation of financial statements. During implementation, Western did not run new and old financial systems in parallel and did not adequately plan, test and document the new system. Weaknesses continue to exist at Western in such areas as the lack of formalized plans or procedures for disaster recovery.

- *The U.S. Department of Energy's Corporate Human Resource Information System*, (DOE/IG–0494, February 2001). Despite a number of operational improvements, the Department's Corporate Human Resource Information System (CHRIS) had not satisfied all Federal and Departmental requirements and had not met certain Departmental goals and objectives. For example, system development activities, such as the evaluation of selected commercial-off-the-shelf products and tracking of development and implementation costs were inadequate or had not been completed. Departmental goals to re-engineer certain human resource processes and eliminate redundant systems had also not been satisfied. CHRIS development and implementation efforts have been adversely affected because the Department did not adhere to project planning requirements and best practices for system development projects.

- *Performance Measures at the Department of Energy*, (DOE/IG-0504, May 2001). The Department has made progress in implementing the Government Performance Results Act of 1993. It has issued a comprehensive performance and accountability report for three consecutive years with the established goals designed to define the level of performance to be achieved by each program. However, the report points out problems with the usefulness and completeness of the performance measures and the validity and accuracy of some of the results reported. Specifically, several measures were not objective or quantifiable; critical measures relating to some of the Department's major challenge areas were not present; and performance results reported for the selected measures were not always accurate and valid.

- *The Department of Energy's Implementation of the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996*, (DOE/
  IG‒0507, June 2001). While the Department had taken action to address certain
  information technology (IT) related management problems, it had not been completely
  successful in implementing the requirements of the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996. The
  Department had not satisfied major requirements of the Act to develop and implement an
  integrated, enterprise-wide IT architecture, closely monitor policy implementation efforts,
  and acquire IT-related assets in an effective and efficient manner. Factors, such as a
  decentralized approach to IT management, the organization placement of the Chief
  Information Officer, and the lack of an IT baseline, may have contributed to these problems
  and impacted the Department's ability to satisfy Clinger-Cohen requirements.

- *Integrated Planning, Accountability, and Budgeting System-Information System*, (DOE/
  IG‒0509, June 2001). The Department's Integrated Planning, Accountability, and
  Budgeting System-Information System (IPABS-IS) was not integrated into the
  Department's Corporate Systems Information Architecture and did not fully satisfy
  Department goals and meets users' information needs. Despite prior attempts at developing
  and operating a corporate-level information system solution, the Department did not
  integrate this system's development into its IT architecture project. As a consequence, there
  were project management and security weaknesses in the development and operation of
  IPABS-IS that impacted its ability to satisfy Department goals and meet user information
  needs.

- *The Department's Unclassified Cyber Security Program*, (DOE/IG-0519, August 2001).
  The Government Information Security Reform Act (GISRA) codifies existing policies and
  regulations and reiterates security responsibilities outlined in the Computer Security Act of
  1987 and the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996. While the Department had made improvements
  in its unclassified cyber security program, the program did not adequately protect data and
  information systems as required by GISRA. Specifically, problems existed with security
  program planning and management, risk management, contingency planning, computer
  incident reporting, and training management. Configuration management or access control
  problems also existed at many of the 24 sites evaluated.

- *Inspection of Cyber Security Standards for Sensitive Personal Information*, (DOE/IG-0531,
  November 2001). The Department did not always meet the requirements prohibiting
  unauthorized disclosure of Privacy Act/Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) personal
  information addressed in the Privacy Act of 1974, the Freedom of Information Act, and the
  Computer Security Act of 1987. The Department did not have Department-wide baseline
  criteria for protecting Privacy Act/FOIA personal information; did not group Privacy Act/
  FOIA personal information with other unclassified sensitive information for protection; and
  allows individual sites and program offices to develop differing security measures for
  protection of Privacy Act/FOIA personal information.

- *Telecommunications Infrastructure* (DOE/IG-0537, December 2001). The Department had not effectively consolidated or optimized significant segments of its telecommunications infrastructure. Duplicative data transmission infrastructures existed across the complex, and the Department had not optimized the acquisition of Internet and video services. A number of sites utilized open market sources to acquire Internet service that could have been provided from existing capacity.

- *Management Challenges at the Department of Energy* (DOE/IG-0583, December 2001). The Department continues to experience difficulties in managing some of its major projects. For the most part, the Department's prime contractors manage these projects. Cost overruns, schedule delays, and undesirable scope reductions have been recurring problems. The Department has not satisfied major requirements of the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 to develop and implement an integrated, enterprise-wide IT architecture, closely monitor policy implementation efforts, and acquire IT related assets in an effective and efficient manner. The Department has made some progress toward the use of performance information for program management. However, additional work needs to be done to ensure that the Department has the metrics in place, and uses them to manage its programs and activities effectively.

Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20585

SEP 09 2002

MEMORANDUM FOR ASSISTANT INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR AUDIT SERVICES
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

FROM: BRUCE M. CARNES, DIRECTOR
               OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT, BUDGET
               AND EVALUATION/CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

SUBJECT: Draft Report on Business Management Information System

In response to the Draft Report entitled, "Business Management Information System," dated
August 12, 2002, the following comments are provided:

<u>General Comment</u>

Actions that I initiated in conjunction with the Chief Information Officer prior to any knowledge of
this report are not adequately reflected in the transmittal memorandum to the Secretary or in the
draft report. Specifically, we recognized that the Business Management Information System (BMIS)
vision as currently scoped did not satisfy key requirements and goals for integrating our business
systems, nor did it address the President's Management Agenda in a timely manner. We also
recognized the importance of ensuring BMIS compliance with the Department's Enterprise
Architecture. Accordingly, in May 2002, we initiated a task with Mitre Corporation to conduct an
intensive assessment of the Enterprise Architecture and BMIS. This effort was also discussed with
and supported by the Office of Management and Budget. The detailed Mitre tasks are documented
in a formal statement of work. As a result of this initiative, on June 4, 2002, a "slow down" order
was issued to the contractor working on the Phoenix project. It is my position that the actions we
are taking address the majority of the issues identified in the draft report and, consequently, the
report should be modified to sufficiently acknowledge them.

<u>Transmittal Memorandum to the Secretary</u>

- The background paragraph suggests that the BMIS initiative began in 1995. The BMIS initiative
  did not begin until 1998. In 1995, a group of financial managers developed a report entitled,
  "Financial Management Excellence" that recommended a new accounting system and better
  integration of business management systems. However, this was prior to BMIS and the
  recommendations were put on hold to address a Secretarial initiative to consolidate the
  Department's accounting centers.

- Paragraph 1 of the memorandum states that BMIS "was to provide a core financial management
  system, eliminate a number of legacy program-level business related systems, and include

2

business related systems such as procurement and human resources." The BMIS vision is the integration of financial management, procurement, human resources, and other corporate business systems. The statement included in the report reflects the Phoenix financial management vision, not the BMIS vision. Your report should clearly state that Phoenix is the financial management system component of BMIS and that BMIS is the overall integration of all corporate business management systems.

Draft Report

- Page 1, Budget and Cost Systems – While we acknowledge the fact that a formal plan has not been developed for replacing budget formulation systems, it is inappropriate to raise this as a concern at this stage of the project. Budget Formulation is identified in the Phoenix contract with IBM Global Services as Phase II, and formal plans will be developed when this phase is fully initiated. Regarding the statement about starting a budget formulation initiative, a small Budget Formulation team was established to begin analyzing the business requirements and recommend potential system solutions. The team presented preliminary recommendations to me that did not include the elimination of program budget formulation systems, and I instructed them to develop a corporate solution that would eliminate the need for redundant systems.

- In the same paragraph, the statement regarding the retention of the Approved Funding Program (Funds Distribution System) is misleading. The current Oracle functionality for this business process will not satisfy the Department's requirements, and a portion of the current system will be retained until Oracle improves its software. The Funds Distribution System is being partially retained and integrated with the Oracle application instead of customizing the Oracle code or developing an in-house software solution. The Funds Distribution System will be eliminated when Oracle software improvements are completed and distributed. This was clearly addressed in the updated Business Case, dated January 4, 2002.

- In the second paragraph, the memorandum implies a need for functional cost data at the transaction level. Contractors currently provide functional cost data to Headquarters on an annual basis. Implementing functional cost at the transaction level or on a more frequent basis was discussed during the requirements phase with the program offices, and no one expressed a need for this information. Since there is no expressed need for functional cost data on either a more frequent basis or at the transaction level, diverting significant funding and manpower to produce this information is unwarranted.

- Page 2, Coordination of Systems Development Efforts – The statement that procurement system modernization efforts were allowed to proceed on a separate track and not fully coordinated with Phoenix is misleading. Procurement requirements were never part of the Phoenix statement of work, and it was absolutely necessary for the Office of Procurement and Assistance Management to develop its detailed requirements and business case. The procurement business case has been completed, but not yet approved. Therefore, no management decisions have been made as to the

2

3

future direction of the procurement modernization efforts. It is also important to note that the Phoenix contract has an option for procurement integration services, and the Procurement Modernization and Phoenix project managers have had discussions with the Contracting Officer regarding this option to ensure integration between the two systems.

- Page 5, Recommendations – While overall I concur with the recommendations, the report reflects criticism of a position that I am not taking. I had the same concerns and have taken action to address the project shortcomings. The Mitre effort discussed previously addresses your second recommendation. In addition, I have appointed a senior executive in my organization to lead the overall Business Management Systems integration effort. This initiative will include representation from all Headquarters and field organizations and will ensure that the entire suite of corporate business management systems is fully integrated, supports the overall DOE enterprise architecture, and is fully responsive to customer needs. I am confident that this initiative addresses the remaining recommendations contained in the report.

The Chief Information Officer has also reviewed the draft report and concurs with the comments provided in this memorandum.

Please feel free to contact Jim Campbell or myself if you have any questions or would like to discuss our comments. We can be reached on 6-4171.

3

CUSTOMER RESPONSE FORM

The Office of Inspector General has a continuing interest in improving the usefulness of its products. We wish to make our reports as responsive as possible to our customers' requirements, and, therefore, ask that you consider sharing your thoughts with us. On the back of this form, you may suggest improvements to enhance the effectiveness of future reports. Please include answers to the following questions if they are applicable to you:

1. What additional background information about the selection, scheduling, scope, or procedures of the audit would have been helpful to the reader in understanding this report?

2. What additional information related to findings and recommendations could have been included in this report to assist management in implementing corrective actions?

3. What format, stylistic, or organizational changes might have made this report's overall message more clear to the reader?

4. What additional actions could the Office of Inspector General have taken on the issues discussed in this report which would have been helpful?

Please include your name and telephone number so that we may contact you should we have any questions about your comments.

Name _____   Date _____

Telephone _____   Organization _____

When you have completed this form, you may telefax it to the Office of Inspector General at (202) 586-0948, or you may mail it to:

Office of Inspector General (IG-1)
Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20585

ATTN: Customer Relations

If you wish to discuss this report or your comments with a staff member of the Office of Inspector General, please contact Wilma Slaughter at (202) 586-1924.

The Office of Inspector General wants to make the distribution of its reports as customer friendly and cost effective as possible. Therefore, this report will be available electronically through the Internet at the following address:

U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Inspector General, Home Page
http://www.ig.doe.gov

Your comments would be appreciated and can be provided on the
Customer Response Form attached to the report.