



Office of the Inspector General

U.S. Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board

Annual Plan

Fiscal Year 2017

FOREWORD

The *Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014*, provided that notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Inspector General (IG) of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is authorized in 2014 and subsequent years to exercise the same authorities with respect to the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB), as determined by the NRC Inspector General (IG), as the IG exercises under the *Inspector General Act of 1978* (5 U.S.C. App.) with respect to the NRC. I am pleased to present the Office of the Inspector General's (OIG) *FY 2017 Annual Plan* for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB). The *Annual Plan* provides the audit and investigative strategies and associated summaries of the specific work planned for the coming year. It sets forth OIG's formal strategy for identifying priority issues and managing its workload and resources for Fiscal Year (FY) 2017.

Congress created DNFSB in September 1988 as an independent Executive Branch agency to identify the nature and consequences of potential threats to public health and safety at the Department of Energy's (DOE) defense nuclear facilities, elevate those issues to the highest levels of authority, and inform the public. DNFSB strives to protect public health and safety by ensuring implementation of safety standards at DOE defense nuclear facilities, conducting in-depth reviews of new DOE defense facilities during design and construction to ensure the early integration of safety into design; and providing oversight to prevent an accidental detonation of a nuclear weapon during the evaluation, maintenance, or dismantlement process.

OIG sought input both from Congress and DNFSB in the development of this *Annual Plan*.

We have programmed all available resources to address the matters identified in this plan. This approach maximizes the use of our resources. However, to respond to a changing environment, it is sometimes necessary to modify this plan as circumstances, priorities, and or resources warrant.

Hubert T. Bell
Inspector General

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MISSION AND AUTHORITY.....	1
PLANNING STRATEGY.....	2
AUDIT AND INVESTIGATION UNIVERSE.....	2
AUDIT STRATEGY.....	3
INVESTIGATION STRATEGY.....	3
PERFORMANCE MEASURES.....	5
OPERATIONAL PROCESSES.....	6
AUDITS.....	6
INVESTIGATIONS.....	8
HOTLINE.....	9

APPENDICES

A AUDITS PLANNED FOR FY 2017

Audit of DNFSB's Fiscal Year 2016 Financial Statements.....	A-1
Audit of DNFSB's Telework Program.....	A-2
Audit of DNFSB's Human Resources Process for Filling Vacancies.....	A-3
Audit of DNFSB's Site Representative Program.....	A-4
Audit of DNFSB's Compliance with Standards Established by the Digital Accountability and Transparency Act (DATA) of 2014.....	A-5
Audit of DNFSB's Implementation of Its Governing Legislation.....	A-6
Audit of DNFSB's Fiscal Year 2017 Financial Statements.....	A-7
Independent Evaluation of DNFSB's Implementation of the Federal Information Security Modernization Act for FY 2017.....	A-8
Evaluation of Potential Compromise of Systems (Social Engineering).....	A-9

Assessment of DNFSB’s Most Serious Management and Performance Challenges..... A-10

Audit of DNFSB’s Employee Concerns Program A-11

B INVESTIGATIONS – PRIORITIES, OBJECTIVES, AND INITIATIVES FOR FY 2017

C ISSUE AREAS AND DESIGNATED ISSUE AREA MONITORS

D ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

MISSION AND AUTHORITY

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission's (NRC) Office of the Inspector General (OIG) was established on April 15, 1989, pursuant to *Inspector General Act* Amendments contained in Public Law 100-504. In addition, the *Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014*, provided that notwithstanding any other provision of law, the NRC Inspector General (IG) is authorized in 2014 and subsequent years to exercise the same authorities with respect to the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB), as determined by the NRC IG, as the IG exercises under the *Inspector General Act of 1978* (5 U.S. C. App.) with respect to NRC.

OIG's mission is to (1) conduct and supervise independent audits and investigations of agency programs and operations; (2) promote economy, effectiveness, and efficiency within the agency; (3) prevent and detect fraud, waste, and abuse in agency programs and operations; (4) develop recommendations regarding existing and proposed regulations relating to agency programs and operations; and (5) keep the agency head and Congress fully and currently informed about problems and deficiencies relating to agency programs. The Act also requires the Inspector General (IG) to prepare a semiannual report to the DNFSB Chairman and Congress summarizing the activities of the OIG.

In furtherance of the execution of this mission and of particular importance to OIG's annual plan development, the IG summarized what he considers to be the most serious management and performance challenges facing DNFSB and assessed DNFSB's progress in addressing those challenges. In its latest annual assessment (October 2016), the IG identified the following as the most serious management and performance challenges facing DNFSB:¹

1. Management of a healthy and sustainable organizational culture and climate.
2. Management of security over internal infrastructure (personnel, physical, and cyber security) and nuclear security.
3. Management of administrative functions.
4. Management of technical programs.

Through its Issue Area Monitor (IAM) program, OIG staff monitor DNFSB performance on these management and performance challenges. These challenges help inform decisions concerning which audits and evaluations to conduct each fiscal year.

¹The challenges are not ranked in any order of importance.

PLANNING STRATEGY

The FY 2017 Annual Plan is based, in part, on knowledge gained through OIG audit and investigative activities. These activities pertain to DNFSB and its operations, work conducted under the IAM program, and management and performance challenges facing DNFSB as of October 2016 as identified by OIG.

AUDIT AND INVESTIGATION UNIVERSE

DNFSB, an independent executive branch agency established by Congress in September 1988, is charged with providing technical safety oversight of the Department of Energy's (DOE) defense nuclear facilities and activities in order to provide adequate protection of the health and safety of the public and workers. Its mission is to provide independent analysis, advice, and recommendations to the Secretary of Energy to inform the Secretary, as operator and regulator of DOE's defense nuclear facilities, in providing adequate protection of public health and safety at these facilities.

DNFSB's board is composed of five Presidentially appointed, Senate confirmed members who are required by law to be "respected experts" in the field of nuclear safety with a demonstrated competence and knowledge relevant to its independent investigative and oversight functions. Most of DNFSB's approximate 120 full-time equivalents work at the agency's Washington, DC, headquarters. DNFSB's FY 2017 budget is approximately \$31 million.

DNFSB's enabling statute assigns specific functions to the agency for accomplishing its safety oversight mission, including to

- Review and evaluate the content and implementation of standards relating to the design, construction, operation, and decommissioning of DOE defense nuclear facilities at each facility, and recommend to the Secretary of Energy specific measures needed to ensure that public health and safety are adequately protected.
- Investigate any event or practice at a DOE defense nuclear facility DNFSB determines has adversely affected, or may adversely affect, public health and safety.
- Review the design of new DOE defense nuclear facilities before construction begins and recommend modifications of the design deemed necessary to ensure public health and safety.
- Make recommendations to the Secretary of Energy pertaining to operation, standards, and research needs pertaining to DOE defense

nuclear facilities that DNFSB deems necessary to ensure public health and safety. In making its recommendations, DNFSB shall consider, and specifically assess, risk and the technical and economic feasibility of implementing the recommended measures.

OIG's audit and investigation oversight responsibilities are derived from DNFSB's array of programs, functions, and support activities established to accomplish its mission.

AUDIT STRATEGY

Effective audit planning requires current knowledge about DNFSB's mission and the programs and activities used to carry out that mission. Accordingly, OIG continually monitors specific issue areas to strengthen its internal coordination and overall planning process. Under the office's IAM program, staff designated as IAMs are assigned responsibility for keeping abreast of major DNFSB programs and activities. The broad IAM areas address information management, nuclear safety, and corporate management. Appendix C contains a list of the IAMs and the issue areas for which they are responsible.

The audit planning process yields audit assignments that identify opportunities for increased efficiency, economy, and effectiveness in DNFSB programs and operations; detect and prevent fraud, waste, and mismanagement; improve program and security activities at headquarters and site locations; and respond to emerging circumstances and priorities. The priority for conducting audits is based on (1) mandatory legislative requirements; (2) critical agency risk areas; (3) emphasis by the President, Congress, Board Chairman, or other Board Members; (4) a program's susceptibility to fraud, manipulation, or other irregularities; (5) dollar magnitude or resources involved in the proposed audit area; (6) newness, changed conditions, or sensitivity of an organization, program, function, or activities; (7) prior audit experience, including the adequacy of internal controls; and (8) availability of audit resources.

INVESTIGATION STRATEGY

OIG investigation strategies and initiatives add value to DNFSB programs and operations by identifying and investigating allegations of fraud, waste, and abuse leading to criminal, civil, and administrative penalties and recoveries. By focusing on results, OIG has designed specific performance targets focusing on effectiveness. Because DNFSB's mission is to protect public health and safety, the main investigative concentration involves alleged DNFSB misconduct or inappropriate actions that could adversely impact health and safety-related matters. These investigations typically include allegations of

- Misconduct by high-ranking DNFSB officials and other DNFSB officials, such as managers and inspectors, whose positions directly impact public health and safety.
- Failure by DNFSB's management to ensure that health and safety matters are appropriately addressed.
- Conflict of interest by DNFSB employees with DNFSB contractors.
- Indications of management or supervisory retaliation or reprisal.

OIG will also implement initiatives designed to monitor specific high-risk areas within DNFSB's corporate management that are most vulnerable to fraud, waste, and abuse. A significant focus will be on emerging information technology and national security issues that could negatively impact the security and integrity of DNFSB data and operations. OIG is committed to improving the security of the constantly changing electronic business environment by investigating unauthorized intrusions and computer-related fraud, and by conducting computer forensic examinations. Other proactive initiatives will focus on determining instances of procurement fraud, theft of property, insider radicalization threats, and Government travel and purchase card abuse.

As part of these proactive initiatives, OIG will meet with DNFSB's internal and external stakeholders to identify systemic issues or vulnerabilities. This approach will allow the identification of potential vulnerabilities and an opportunity to improve agency performance, as warranted.

OIG personnel will routinely interact with public interest groups, individual citizens, industry workers, and DNFSB staff to identify possible lapses in DNFSB's regulatory oversight that could impact public health and safety. OIG will also conduct proactive initiatives and reviews into areas of current or future regulatory safety or security interest to identify emerging issues or address ongoing concerns regarding the quality of DNFSB's regulatory oversight.

Appendix B provides investigation priorities, objectives and initiatives for FY 2017. Specific investigations are not included in the plan because investigations are primarily responsive to reported violations of law and misconduct by DNFSB employees and contractors, as well as allegations of irregularities or abuse in DNFSB's programs and operations.

PERFORMANCE MEASURES

For FY 2017, we will use a number of key performance measures and targets for gauging the relevancy and impact of our audit and investigative work. The performance measures are:

1. Percentage of OIG audits undertaken and issued within a year.
2. Percentage of final Board actions taken within 2 years on audit recommendations.
3. Percentage of Board actions taken in response to investigative reports.
4. Percentage of active cases completed in less than 18 months.

OPERATIONAL PROCESSES

The following sections detail the approach used to carry out the audit and investigative responsibilities previously discussed.

AUDITS

OIG's audit process comprises the steps taken to conduct audits and involves specific actions, ranging from annual audit planning to audit follow up activities. The underlying goal of the audit process is to maintain an open channel of communication between the auditors and DNFSB officials to ensure that audit findings are accurate and fairly presented in the audit report.

OIG performs the following types of audits:

Performance – Performance audits focus on DNFSB administrative and program operations and evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency with which managerial responsibilities are carried out, including whether the programs achieve intended results.

Financial – These audits, which include the financial statement audit required by the *Accountability of Tax Dollars Act of 2002* and OMB Bulletin 15-02 (Audit Requirements for Federal Financial Statements), attest to the reasonableness of DNFSB's financial statements and evaluate financial programs.

Contract – Contract audits evaluate the costs of goods and services procured by DNFSB from commercial enterprises.

The key elements in the audit process are as follows:

Audit Planning – Each year, suggestions are solicited from Congress, DNFSB, management, external parties, and OIG staff. An annual audit plan (i.e., this document) is developed and distributed to interested parties. It contains a listing of planned audits to be initiated during the fiscal year depending on availability of resources and the general objectives of the audits. The annual audit plan is a “living” document that may be revised as circumstances warrant, with a subsequent redistribution of staff resources.

Audit Notification – Formal notification is provided to the office responsible for a specific program, activity, or function, informing them of OIG's intent to begin an audit of that program, activity, or function.

Entrance Conference – A meeting is held to advise DNFSB officials of the objective(s), and scope of the audit, and the general audit methodology to be followed.

Survey – Exploratory work is conducted before the more detailed audit work commences to gather data for refining audit objectives, as appropriate; documenting internal control systems; becoming familiar with the activities, programs, and processes to be audited; and identifying areas of concern to management. At the conclusion of the survey phase, the audit team will recommend to the Assistant Inspector General for Audits (AIGA) a “Go” or “No Go” decision regarding the verification phase. If the audit team recommends a “No Go,” and it is approved by the AIGA, the audit is dropped.

Audit Fieldwork – A comprehensive review is performed of selected areas of a program, activity, or function using an audit program developed specifically to address the audit objectives.

End of Fieldwork Briefing With Agency – At the conclusion of audit fieldwork, the audit team discusses the tentative report findings and recommendations with the auditee.

Discussion Draft Report – A discussion draft copy of the report is provided to DNFSB management to allow them the opportunity to prepare for the exit conference.

Exit Conference – A meeting is held with the appropriate DNFSB officials to discuss the discussion draft report. This meeting provides DNFSB management the opportunity to confirm information, ask questions, and provide any necessary clarifying data.

Final Draft Report – If requested by DNFSB management during the exit conference, a final draft copy of the report that includes comments or revisions from the exit conference is provided to DNFSB to obtain formal written comments.

Final Audit Report – The final report includes, as necessary, any revisions to the facts, conclusions, and recommendations of the draft report discussed in the exit conference or generated in written comments supplied by DNFSB managers. Written comments are included as an appendix to the report. Some audits are sensitive and/or classified. In these cases, final audit reports are not made available to the public.

Response to Report Recommendations – Offices responsible for the specific program or process audited provide a written response on each recommendation (usually within 30 days) contained in the final report. DNFSB management responses include a decision for each recommendation indicating agreement or disagreement with the recommended action. For agreement, DNFSB management provides corrective actions taken or planned and actual or target dates for completion. For disagreement, DNFSB management provides their reasons for disagreement and any alternative proposals for corrective action.

Impasse Resolution – If the response by the action office to a recommendation is unsatisfactory, OIG may determine that intervention at a higher level is required.

Audit Follow up and Closure – This process ensures that recommendations made to management are implemented.

INVESTIGATIONS

OIG's investigative process normally begins with the receipt of an allegation of fraud, mismanagement, or misconduct. Because a decision to initiate an investigation must be made within a few days of each referral, OIG does not schedule specific investigations in its annual investigative plan.

Investigations are opened in accordance with OIG priorities in consideration of prosecutorial guidelines established by the local U.S. attorneys for the Department of Justice (DOJ). OIG investigations are governed by the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency Quality Standards for Investigations, the OIG Special Agent Handbook, and various guidance provided periodically by DOJ.

Only four individuals in the OIG can authorize the opening of an investigative case: the Inspector General (IG), the Deputy IG, the Assistant IG for Investigations, and the Senior Assistant for Investigative Operations. Every allegation received by OIG is given a unique identification number and entered into a database. Some allegations result in investigations, while others are retained as the basis for audits, referred to DNFSB management, or, if appropriate, referred to another law enforcement agency.

When an investigation is opened, it is assigned to a special agent who prepares a plan of investigation. This planning process includes a review of the criminal and civil statutes, program regulations, and agency policies that

may be involved. The special agent then conducts the investigation, and uses a variety of investigative techniques to ensure completion.

In cases where the special agent determines that a crime may have been committed, he or she will discuss the investigation with a Federal and/or local prosecutor to determine if prosecution will be pursued. In cases where a prosecuting attorney decides to proceed with a criminal or civil prosecution, the special agent assists the attorney in any preparation for court proceedings that may be required.

For investigations that do not result in prosecution but are handled administratively by the agency, the special agent prepares a Report of Investigation summarizing the facts disclosed during the investigation. The report is distributed to agency officials who have a need to know the results of the investigation. For investigative reports provided to agency officials, OIG requires a response within 120 days regarding action taken as a result of the investigative finding(s). OIG monitors corrective or disciplinary actions that are taken.

OIG collects data summarizing the criminal and administrative action taken as a result of its investigations and includes this data in its semiannual reports to Congress.

HOTLINE

The OIG Hotline Program provides DNFSB employees, contract employees, and the public with a confidential means of reporting to the OIG instances of fraud, waste, and abuse relating to Board programs and operations.

Please Contact:

E-mail:	Online Form
Telephone:	1-800-233-3497
TDD	1-800-270-2787
Address:	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Office of the Inspector General Hotline Program Mail Stop O5-E13 11555 Rockville Pike Rockville, MD 20852

AUDITS PLANNED FOR FY 2017

Audit of DNFSB's Fiscal Year 2016 Financial Statements

DESCRIPTION AND JUSTIFICATION:

Under the *Chief Financial Officers Act*, as updated by the *Accountability of Tax Dollars Act of 2002* and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Bulletin 15-02, *Audit Requirements for Federal Financial Statements*, OIG is required to audit DNFSB's financial statements. The report on the audit of DNFSB's financial statements is due on November 15, 2016.

OBJECTIVES:

The audit objectives are to:

- Express opinions on DNFSB's financial statements and internal controls.
- Review compliance with applicable laws and regulations.
- Review the controls in DNFSB's computer systems that are significant to the financial statements.
- Assess the agency's compliance with OMB Circular A-123, Revised, Management's Responsibility for Enterprise Risk Management and Internal Control.

SCHEDULE:

Initiated in the 3rd quarter of FY 2016.

MANAGEMENT CHALLENGE 3:

Management of administrative functions.

Audit of DNFSB's Telework Program

DESCRIPTION AND JUSTIFICATION:

The *Telework Enhancement Act of 2010* (the Telework Act), was enacted into law with the goal of ensuring that Federal agencies more effectively integrate telework into their management plans and agency cultures. The Telework Act defines telework as a work-flexibility arrangement under which an employee performs the duties and responsibilities of his or her position from an approved worksite other than the location from which the employee would otherwise work. The Telework Act establishes requirements for agencies when implementing their telework policies. The head of each executive agency needs to establish and implement a policy under which employees shall be authorized to telework. Also, employees must enter into written agreements with their agencies before participating in telework. Moreover, the head of each executive agency must ensure that employees eligible to telework and managers of teleworking employees receive training on telework before the employee enters into a written telework agreement.

Currently, DNFSB has approximately 85 of 105 staff members participating in its telework program. Approximately six staff members are teleworking full-time.

OBJECTIVE:

The audit objectives are to determine (1) if DNFSB's telework program complies with applicable laws and regulations, and (2) the adequacy of internal controls over the program.

SCHEDULE:

Initiated in the 4th quarter of FY 2016.

MANAGEMENT CHALLENGE 1:

Management of a healthy and sustainable organizational culture and climate.

Audit of DNFSB's Human Resources Process for Filling Vacancies

DESCRIPTION AND JUSTIFICATION:

The Office of Personnel Management (OPM) requires agencies to establish and maintain a system of accountability for merit system principles. Agencies are further required to use guidance, measures, and metrics and to identify the measures used in agency accountability policies. OPM established the Human Capital Assessment and Accountability Framework (HCAAF) system as standards, including appropriate metrics for evaluators to use when assessing human capital management by Federal agencies. HCAAF's system components are (1) Strategic Alignment System, (2) Leadership/ Knowledge Management System, (3) Results-Oriented Performance Culture System, (4) Talent Management System, and (5) Accountability System. Human resources evaluators use agency processes and activities outlined in standards for the HCAAF System to ensure, over time, the agency manages people efficiently and effectively in accordance with merit system principles, veterans' preference and related public policies.

The 2015 DNFSB Culture and Climate Survey conducted by OIG suggests that DNFSB's process for hiring and retaining staff needs improvement. Specifically, there is a perception among DNFSB staff that the agency is not attracting and retaining the right talent. Moreover, survey results reflect that 38 percent of DNFSB employees plan to leave in the next year.

OBJECTIVE:

The audit objective is to determine if DNFSB has identified mission-critical occupations and competencies and developed strategies to hire and retain staff in accordance with Federal standards.

SCHEDULE:

Initiate in the 1st quarter of FY 2017.

MANAGEMENT CHALLENGE 3:

Management of administrative functions.

Audit of DNFSB's Site Representative Program

DESCRIPTION AND JUSTIFICATION:

DNFSB's mission is to provide independent analysis, advice, and recommendations to the Secretary of Energy, as operator and regulator of DOE's defense nuclear facilities, for the adequate protection of public health and safety. The enabling legislation of DNFSB authorizes its Board to assign staff to be stationed at any DOE defense nuclear facility to carry out the mission and functions of the agency. DNFSB's Board used this authority to establish and implement the Site Representative Program, which serves an essential function for the agency's safety oversight of DOE's defense nuclear facilities.

DNFSB site representatives relocate to a DOE site with defense nuclear facilities and perform direct oversight of the safety of operations. DNFSB currently has site representatives stationed at five DOE defense nuclear facilities. Site representatives advise the agency on the overall safety conditions at defense nuclear facilities. Site representatives also act as DNFSB's liaison with local DOE and contractor management, state and local agencies, elected officials and their staff, stakeholder organizations, the media, and the public.

DNFSB site representatives serve a critical role as the Board relies on site representatives to perform direct oversight of nuclear safety at their assigned DOE sites. Site representatives are expected to evaluate the physical conditions of the facilities, identify and communicate safety issues to the Board and its headquarters staff, and participate in the planning and execution of safety reviews.

OBJECTIVE:

The audit objective is to determine whether the Site Representative Program provides for the necessary onsite oversight of DOE defense nuclear facilities to adequately protect public health and safety.

SCHEDULE:

Initiate in the 1st quarter of FY 2017.

MANAGEMENT CHALLENGE 4:

Management of technical programs.

Audit of DNFSB's Compliance with Standards Established by the Digital Accountability and Transparency Act (DATA) of 2014

DESCRIPTION AND JUSTIFICATION:

The *Digital Accountability and Transparency Act (DATA)* of 2014 was enacted May 9, 2014, and requires that Federal agencies report financial and payment data in accordance with data standards established by the Department of Treasury and OMB. The data reported will be displayed on a Web site available to taxpayers and policy makers. In addition, the Act requires that OIG review statistical samples of the data submitted by the agency under the Act and report to Congress on the completeness, timeliness, quality and accuracy of the data sampled and the use of the data standards by the agency.

The Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE) identified a timing anomaly with the oversight requirements contained in the Act and recommended that IGs delay reports required by the Act. In the interim, CIGIE encouraged IGs to undertake DATA "Readiness Reviews" well in advance of the first November 2017 report. This Readiness Review strategy is being pursued by DNFSB OIG. It is the plan of OIG to provide Congress with the first required report in November 2017.

OBJECTIVE:

The audit objectives are to (1) review the data submitted by the agency under the DATA to determine the completeness, timeliness, quality and accuracy of the data sampled, and (2) assess the use of the data standards by the agency.

SCHEDULE:

Initiate in the 2nd quarter of FY 2017.

MANAGEMENT CHALLENGE 3:

Management of administrative functions.

Audit of the DNFSB's Implementation of Its Governing Legislation

DESCRIPTION AND JUSTIFICATION:

DNFSB was created by Congress in 1988 as an independent organization within the executive branch chartered with the responsibility of providing recommendations and advice to the President and the Secretary of Energy regarding public health and safety issues at DOE defense nuclear facilities. The Board reviews and evaluates the content and implementation of health and safety standards, as well as other requirements, relating to the design, construction, operation, and decommissioning of DOE's defense nuclear facilities.

DNFSB is led by five presidentially-appointed Board members serving staggered 5 year terms. The Board is supported by about 105 technical and administrative staff personnel and an annual budget of approximately \$31 million.

The Board has a variety of authorities and powers for interacting with DOE. These include: (1) conducting public hearings, (2) issuing subpoenas for the attendance of witnesses and production of evidence, (3) formally requesting information or establishing reporting requirements, (4) stationing onsite resident inspectors, and (5) conducting special studies. The Board and its staff annually conduct about 200 site visits of an average duration of 2-3 days. The Board communicates with DOE through trip reports, requests for information, other written correspondence, and meetings. The Board transmits a total of about 100 pieces of correspondence annually to senior DOE management at headquarters and field offices.

OBJECTIVE:

The audit objective is to determine whether the Board is operating in accordance with implementing legislation.

SCHEDULE:

Initiate in the 2nd quarter of FY 2017.

MANAGEMENT CHALLENGE 1:

Management of a healthy and sustainable organizational culture and climate.

Audit of DNFSB's Fiscal Year 2017 Financial Statements

DESCRIPTION AND JUSTIFICATION:

Under the *Chief Financial Officers Act*, as updated by the *Accountability of Tax Dollars Act of 2002* and OMB Bulletin 15-02, *Audit Requirements for Federal Financial Statements*, OIG is required to audit DNFSB's financial statements. The report on the audit of DNFSB's financial statements is due on November 15, 2017.

OBJECTIVES:

The audit objectives are to:

- Express opinions on DNFSB's financial statements and internal controls.
- Review compliance with applicable laws and regulations.
- Review the controls in DNFSB's computer systems that are significant to the financial statements.
- Assess the agency's compliance with OMB Circular A-123, Revised, *Management's Responsibility for Enterprise Risk Management and Internal Control*.

SCHEDULE:

Initiate in the 3rd quarter of FY 2017.

MANAGEMENT CHALLENGE 3:

Management of administrative functions.

Independent Evaluation of DNFSB's Implementation of the Federal Information Security Modernization Act for Fiscal Year 2017

DESCRIPTION AND JUSTIFICATION:

The *Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014* (FISMA) requires an independent evaluation of DNFSB's information security program and practices. The annual assessments provide agencies with the information needed to determine the effectiveness of overall security programs and to develop strategies and best practices for improving information security.

FISMA provides the framework for securing the Federal Government's information technology including both unclassified and national security systems. All agencies must implement the requirements of FISMA and report annually to OMB and Congress on the effectiveness of their security programs.

OBJECTIVE:

The audit objective is to conduct an independent evaluation of DNFSB's implementation of FISMA for FY 2017.

SCHEDULE:

Initiate in the 3rd quarter of FY 2017.

MANAGEMENT CHALLENGE 2:

Management of security over internal infrastructures (personnel, physical, and cyber security) and nuclear security.

Evaluation of Potential Compromise of Systems (Social Engineering)

DESCRIPTION AND JUSTIFICATION:

Effective security is multi-faceted and must include integrated protections provided by the various components of a defense-in-depth strategy. Recent examples, such as the OPM breach, where Federal agency and private corporate data becomes publicly available highlights the necessity to provide and ensure protections over an organization's security posture. Unless agency technical, management, and operation security controls work in concert, there is potential for an attacker to exploit a weakness in a faulty security construct. Accordingly, an organization's security posture is only as strong as its weakest link, which most often is the result of human error.

Social engineering seeks to exploit weaknesses in a facility's security posture in order to gain access to the facility and its information systems and data. Therefore, it is important for a government agency to identify its most critical personnel and operational weaknesses so that it may improve the mechanisms on which its security posture is dependent.

OBJECTIVE:

The audit objective is to assess the effectiveness and adequacy of the agency's measures used to protect the security and integrity of sensitive information technology systems and data.

SCHEDULE:

Initiate in the 3rd quarter of FY 2017.

MANAGEMENT CHALLENGE 2:

Management of security over internal infrastructures (personnel, physical, and cyber security) and nuclear security.

Assessment of DNFSB's Most Serious Management and Performance Challenges**DESCRIPTION AND JUSTIFICATION:**

In January 2000, Congress enacted the *Reports Consolidation Act of 2000*, which requires Federal agencies to provide an annual report that would consolidate financial and performance management information in a more meaningful and useful format for Congress, the President, and the public. Included in the Act is a requirement that, on an annual basis, IGs summarize the most serious management and performance challenges facing their agencies. Additionally, the Act requires that IGs assess their respective agency's efforts to address the challenges.

OBJECTIVES:

The audit objectives are to:

- Identify the most serious management and performance challenges facing DNFSB.
- Assess DNFSB's efforts to address the management and performance challenges.

SCHEDULE:

Initiate in the 3rd quarter of FY 2017.

MANAGEMENT CHALLENGES 1 THROUGH 4:

Addresses all of the management challenges.

Audit of DNFSB's Employee Concerns Program

DESCRIPTION AND JUSTIFICATION:

DNFSB's vision is to efficiently and effectively accomplish the safety oversight needed to provide timely advice to the Secretary of Energy in assuring public health and safety at DOE's defense nuclear facilities, exhibiting the highest standards of public service. One of the ways that DNFSB plans to fulfill this is through leadership and operational processes within an organizational culture that strives for the highest standards of integrity, efficiency, effectiveness, transparency, fiscal responsibility, and management proficiency. DNFSB employees are the foundation of this plan.

As such, addressing employee concerns is critical. Employee concerns can manifest in a number of ways and having policies and programs, such as an open door policy and differing views program, will help improve the alignment of human capital with the Board's mission, goals, and objectives. An effective employee concerns program will champion an open, collaborative working environment that encourages all employees to promptly voice differing views without fear of retaliation and offers advice and guidance to employees on the various ways to raise and pursue mission-related differing views.

OBJECTIVE:

The audit objective is to determine if DNFSB has an employee concerns program in place that helps it efficiently and effectively accomplish its safety mission.

SCHEDULE:

Initiate in the 4th quarter of FY 2017.

MANAGEMENT CHALLENGE 1:

Management of a healthy and sustainable organizational culture and climate.

**INVESTIGATIONS –
PRIORITIES, OBJECTIVES,
AND INITIATIVES FOR FY 2017**

INTRODUCTION

The Assistant Inspector General for Investigations (AIGI) has responsibility for developing and implementing an investigative program that furthers OIG's objectives. The AIGI's primary responsibilities include investigating possible violations of criminal statutes relating to DNFSB's programs and activities, investigating allegations of misconduct by DNFSB employees, interfacing with DOJ on OIG-related criminal matters, and coordinating investigations and OIG initiatives with other Federal, State, and local investigative agencies and other AIGIs.

Investigations covering a broad range of allegations concerning criminal wrongdoing or administrative misconduct affecting various DNFSB programs and operations. Investigations may be initiated as a result of allegations or referrals from private citizens; DNFSB employees; Congress; other Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies; OIG audits; the OIG Hotline; and proactive efforts directed at areas bearing a high potential for fraud, waste, and abuse.

This investigative plan was developed to focus OIG investigative priorities and use available resources most effectively. It provides strategies and planned investigative work for FY 2017. The most serious management and performance challenges facing DNFSB, as identified by the IG, were also considered in the development of this plan.

PRIORITIES

The OIG estimates it will initiate approximately five investigations in FY 2017. Reactive investigations into allegations of criminal and other wrongdoing will claim priority on OIG's use of available resources. Because DNFSB's mission is to protect public health and safety, Investigations' main concentration of effort and resources will involve investigations of alleged DNFSB employee misconduct that could adversely impact public health and safety related matters.

OBJECTIVES

To facilitate the most effective and efficient use of limited resources, Investigations has established specific objectives aimed at preventing and detecting fraud, waste, and abuse as well as optimizing DNFSB's effectiveness and efficiency. Investigations will focus its investigative efforts in areas, which include possible violations of criminal statutes relating to DNFSB's programs and operations and allegations of misconduct by DNFSB employees.

INITIATIVES

- Investigate allegations that DNFSB employees violated governmentwide ethics regulations.
- Interact with public interest groups, individual allegeders, and industry workers to identify indications of lapses in DNFSB's regulatory oversight that could create safety and security problems.
- Maintain close working relationships with members of the intelligence community to identify and ameliorate vulnerabilities and threats to DNFSB employees and resources.
- Proactively review and become knowledgeable in areas of DNFSB staff emphasis to identify emerging issues that may require future OIG involvement.
- Take an aggressive stand to protect DNFSB's infrastructure against both internal and external computer intrusions by working in close coordination with DNFSB. This will include developing and disseminating information to assist in protecting DNFSB computer systems and aggressively pursuing suspected computer intrusion incidents.
- Attempt to detect possible wrongdoing perpetrated against DNFSB's procurement and contracting program. This will include periodic meetings between OIG and DNFSB management officials and a fraud awareness presentation by OIG special agents to DNFSB contract specialists, project managers, project officers, and other identified employees.
- Coordinate with DNFSB management officials in instances involving abuse of individual travel cards issued to agency employees as well as purchase cards issued for the procurement of supplies and equipment.
- Conduct fraud awareness and information presentations for DNFSB employees and external stakeholders regarding the role of the OIG.
- Investigate allegations of misconduct by DNFSB employees and contractors, as appropriate.

OIG Hotline

- Promptly process complaints received via the OIG Hotline. Initiate investigations when warranted and properly dispose of allegations that do not warrant OIG investigation.

Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) & Privacy Act

- Promptly process all requests for OIG information received under FOIA. Coordinate as appropriate with General Counsel to the IG and the FOIA and Privacy Section.

Liaison Program

- Maintain close working relationships with other law enforcement agencies, public interest groups, and the Congress. This will be accomplished through periodic meetings with pertinent congressional staff, public interest groups, and appropriate law enforcement organizations.
- Maintain a viable regional liaison program to foster a closer working relationship with DNFSB site offices.

ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES

Investigations undertakes both proactive initiatives and reactive investigations. Approximately 85 percent of available investigative resources will be used for reactive investigations. The balance will be allocated to proactive investigative efforts such as reviews of DNFSB contract files, examinations of DNFSB information technology systems to identify weaknesses or misuse by agency employees, reviews of delinquent Government travel and purchase card accounts, and other initiatives.

**ISSUE AREAS AND DESIGNATED
ISSUE AREA MONITORS**

ISSUE AREAS AND DESIGNATED ISSUE AREA MONITORS

Information Management

Kristen Lipuma
Beth Serepca

Nuclear Safety

Michael Blair
George Gusack
Sherri Miotla
John Thorp

Corporate Management

Jimmy Wong

**ABBREVIATIONS
AND ACRONYMS**

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AIGA	Assistant Inspector General for Audits
AIGI	Assistant Inspector General for Investigations
CIGIE	Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency
DATA	Digital Accountability and Transparency Act
DOE	U.S. Department of Energy
DOJ	U.S. Department of Justice
DNFSB	Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board
FISMA	Federal Information Security Modernization Act
FOIA	Freedom of Information Act
FY	Fiscal Year
HCAAF	Human Capital Assessment and Accountability Framework
IAM	Issue Area Monitor
IG	Inspector General
NRC	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
OIG	Office of the Inspector General
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
OPM	Office of Personnel Management