



Results from the **2018 Annual** Agency Ethics Program Questionnaire

A **SNAPSHOT** of the Executive Branch Ethics Program

United States
Office of Government Ethics

7/11/2019 (Revised 8/5/19, per Addendum)

CY18

Contents

Section 1 – Introduction	2
Legal Requirement	2
Topics Covered	2
Changes to the Questionnaire	2
Methodology	3
Response Rate	3
Data Limitations	3
Section 2 – Key Highlights	4
Ethics Officials & Resourcing.....	4
Financial Disclosure	4
Implementation of New Financial Disclosure Requirements.....	5
Training.....	6
Implementation of New Training Requirements.....	6
Advice & Counsel.....	7
Ethics Pledge.....	7
Enforcement	8
Section 3 – Compilation of Agency Responses.....	9
Program Resources and Administration.....	9
Education and Training	13
Advice, Counseling, and Remedies.....	17
Financial Disclosure Program Management and Electronic Filing Systems	20
Public Financial Disclosure.....	23
Confidential Financial Disclosure	25
Enforcement of Standards of Conduct and Criminal and Civil Statutes	26
Ethics Pledge Assessment.....	28
Special Government Employees (SGEs)	32
Appendix	35

Section 1 – Introduction

Every year, each agency within the executive branch completes the Annual Agency Ethics Program Questionnaire (“questionnaire” or “survey”). Each questionnaire response provides a snapshot of that agency’s ethics program. In the aggregate, the responses also provide a picture of the executive branch ethics program as a whole. This report compiles and summarizes the agency responses for calendar year 2018.

Legal Requirement

Pursuant to the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, as amended, executive branch agencies are required to submit an annual report to OGE. OGE collects the required report through the questionnaire.

Topics Covered

The questionnaire collects information about the following aspects of an agency ethics programs:

- Organizational Structure
- Ethics Program Resources and Administration
- Ethics Education and Training
- Advice, Counseling, and Remedies
- Financial Disclosure Program Management and Electronic Filing Systems
- Public and Confidential Financial Disclosure
- Enforcement
- Ethics Pledge (contained in Executive Order 13770)
- Special Government Employees

Changes to the Questionnaire

As a result of a comprehensive review of the purpose and utility of the annual questionnaire, OGE decided to separate it into two data calls: an annual compliance focused questionnaire and a targeted survey focused on program practices conducted every three years.

The annual questionnaire now focuses on ethics program compliance rates of each of the main program areas designed to prevent, detect, and resolve conflicts of interest.¹ This data enables OGE to hold agencies accountable for administering compliant programs and to promptly intervene if necessary.

OGE plans to do a separate data call, approximately every three years, to assess agency practices. That survey will request information on how the agency carries out its main program areas. The separate data call will elicit more detailed responses through an

¹ As a result of these changes, the number of questions in the annual questionnaire was reduced from 97 to 58.

open-ended question format. OGE will share the information across the executive branch and will use the results to tailor support to the agencies.

These separate data calls fulfill OGE's dual role as both an oversight agency and one that provides leadership and support to the executive branch agencies.

Methodology

The survey covered activity that occurred in calendar year 2018. In September 2018, OGE provided an advance copy of the questionnaire to every Designated Agency Ethics Official.

Normally, OGE opens the survey the first week of January of each year, and agency responses are due on or before February 1.² However, because of the partial lapse of appropriations from December 22, 2018, until January 25, 2019, OGE opened the survey in late January 2019 and extended the deadline to March 15, 2019.

Each agency's response reflects the aggregated numbers for the entire agency; accordingly, OGE allowed only one response per agency.

OGE used a proprietary application to collect each agency response. OGE followed up with individual agencies based on a select set of criteria, such as large changes from the previous year's response, internal inconsistencies of responses, or narrative responses that were unclear or incomplete.

Response Rate

100% (137 agencies)

Data Limitations

When reviewing this report, it is important to keep in mind the following data limitations:

- While OGE reviews certain agency responses for anomalies and follows up as necessary, OGE does not independently verify the information submitted by each agency.
- Agency ethics officials may interpret the questions differently, which may result in data variation.
- This report does not include classified information. Therefore, the aggregate number for certain questions³ may be higher than reported.
- In some cases, lack of coordination between the ethics office and other offices within the agency responsible for aspects of the ethics program, such as the Inspectors General office, results in incomplete responses.⁴

² See 5 C.F.R. § 2638.207.

³ Questions 2, 15-17, 20, 35-38, 41-42, 54-58

⁴ OGE intends to take steps to address this issue in advance of next year's annual questionnaire.

Section 2 – Key Highlights

This section highlights key data points from the aggregate agency responses contained in Section 3. The data reflects agency responses for calendar year 2018.

Ethics Officials & Resourcing

The Designated Agency Ethics Official (DAEO) is the employee with primary responsibility for directing the daily activities of an agency's ethics program and coordinating with OGE. The questionnaire responses show that **most DAEOs (87%) were career employees**. Sixty-two percent (62%) of DAEOs had spent less than 5 years in their current position, and **69% had 5 years or more ethics experience**, overall. (See Q3)

Across the 137 agencies, **5,139 federal employees provided more than one hour of support to the ethics program** per week. This could be substantive support of the training, advice, or financial disclosure functions, or it could be support of administrative, human resources, or information technology functions. Significantly, **more than half (68%) of all employees who supported the ethics program worked outside the DC metro area**. Also, **most of these employees performed ethics duties as one of many responsibilities**; only 10% worked on ethics more than 30 hours a week. (See Q5)

Of the 137 reporting agencies, **42% reported needing more resources**. Agencies most frequently indicated needing additional support in the area of human capital, followed by technology. (See Q8)

Financial Disclosure

The financial disclosure system prevents conflicts of interest through a systematic review of the financial interests of both current and prospective employees.

The 2018 questionnaire results demonstrate a high rate of compliance with the filing requirements:

- **99% compliance rate for filing public financial disclosures:** 26,045 reports filed out of 26,205 required (See Q36 and Q56)
- **99% compliance rate for filing confidential financial disclosures:** 380,863 reports filed out of 382,901 required (See Q41 and Q56)

In addition to new entrant, annual, and termination reports, public filers must also report transactions of certain securities as they occur so that ethics officials can evaluate potential conflicts of interest in close to real time. In 2018, public filers submitted **14,898 periodic transaction reports**. (See Q37)

The primary purpose of financial disclosure is to identify and remedy potential conflicts of interest. The questionnaire asks agencies to report the number of individual filers who took remedial actions as a result of information on a financial disclosure. It also asks them to report the number and type of remedial actions taken. Not all agencies track this

information. For example, 72% track the number of recusals, divestitures, resignations, and reassignments, and 7% of agencies track at least one of those remedies. Of the 108 agencies that tracked this information, **540 filers took 1,791 remedial actions as a result of information on a financial disclosure report.** Of the 1,791 reported remedial actions, **48% were recusals, 36% were divestitures, 16% were resignations from outside positions,** and less than 1% were reassignments. (See Q26 and Q27)

Agencies continue to use technology to support their financial disclosure programs. As required by regulation, **all 137 agencies used *Integrity*, OGE's executive branch-wide electronic filing system,** for at least some of their public disclosure reports. In addition, 61 agencies reported using other electronic filing systems for other public reports and/or confidential reports. **Of the 380,859 confidential reports filed in 2018, 67% were filed electronically.** (See Q35, Q35, and Q41)

The law requires that the financial interests of certain high-level officials are publicly available. This public availability promotes confidence in the integrity of the federal government by demonstrating that these officials are not compromised by personal or other outside interests. In 2018, agencies reported a total of **2,932 requests for public financial disclosure reports.** (See Q40)

Implementation of New Financial Disclosure Requirements

In 2017, OGE implemented new requirements designed to strengthen the coordination between agencies' human resources (HR) and ethics officials.⁵ Specifically, HR officials must notify ethics officials within specified time frames regarding the status of employees as financial disclosure filers. Prompt notification is necessary for timely disclosure and screening for potential conflicts of interest.

Most agencies met the new time frames, though compliance regarding notification of new confidential filers was not as high as for new public filers (See Q29 and Q30):

- **91% of the agencies reported that in all or most cases the HR office(s) notified the DAEO of appointments to public financial disclosure positions** within the 15-day deadline
- **83% of the agencies reported that in all or most cases the human resources office(s) notified the DAEO of appointments to confidential financial disclosure positions** within the 15-day deadline⁶

⁵ See 81 Fed. Reg. 76271 (Nov. 2, 2016). 5 C.F.R. § 2638.105.

⁶ Confidential financial disclosure filers do not file a termination report.

Training

Agencies must provide initial ethics training to all new employees. Agencies must also provide annual ethics training to certain employees. The training educates employees on how to identify ethics issues and how to obtain assistance in resolving those issues.

Overall, the results from the questionnaire demonstrate a high rate of compliance with the training requirements (See Q16, Q20, and Q55):

- **92% of new employees received the required initial ethics training** within the 3-month deadline
- **95% of public and confidential financial disclosure filers received required annual ethics training** (excluding Special Government Employees)
- **99.7% of Special Government Employees** serving on a board, commission, or committee **received initial ethics training** before or at the first meeting

In addition, almost three-fourths of agencies (72%) provided annual ethics training to employees not required by regulation to receive training. More than half (59%) provided additional, specialized training to special categories of employees, such as procurement personnel and supervisors. (See Q21-Q23)

Implementation of New Training Requirements

In 2017, OGE implemented new requirements designed to strengthen the ethics education and training program.⁷

Specifically, Senate-confirmed Presidential appointees must complete an initial ethics briefing within 15-days of appointment. **Ninety-nine percent (99%) of new Senate-confirmed Presidential appointees received the briefing by the deadline.** (See Q15)

In addition, agencies must notify prospective employees of the ethical obligations associated with the position in their written offer of employment. In agencies with 1,000 or more employees, the offices delegated the responsibility for issuing these notices must confirm to the DAEO that there are procedures in place to meet this requirement. **Seventy-six percent (76%) of the agencies reported that all of the relevant offices provided this confirmation to the DAEO.** (See Q14)

Finally, each new employee of an agency must complete an *interactive* initial ethics training covering certain topics within three months of appointment. In agencies with 1,000 or more employees, the office delegated the responsibility for providing this initial ethics training must certify to the DAEO that there is a process in place for meeting the requirements. **Eighty-eight percent (88%) of the agencies reported that all of the offices delegated the responsibility for providing initial ethics training provided the required certification to the DAEO.** (See Q18)

⁷ See 81 Fed. Reg. 76271 (Nov. 2, 2016). 5 C.F.R. § 2638.

Advice & Counsel

Agency ethics officials advise prospective, current, and former employees regarding the ethics laws and rules. This counseling helps ensure that employees receive relevant and timely guidance when faced with ethics issues. **Employees most frequently sought guidance on: (1) gift acceptance, (2) outside employment/activities, and (3) financial disclosure reporting.** (See Q24)

Employees must recuse from government matters that affect the financial interest of someone with whom they are seeking employment. While all employees are encouraged to seek advice from ethics officials on how to navigate these situations, the law requires certain high-level employees to notify their ethics official in writing when they begin negotiating for employment with a non-government entity. This notification helps ensure that officials in the highest positions receive timely advice. In 2018, these **senior officials filed 1,545 notifications regarding negotiations for employment.** (See Q25)

Ethics Pledge

Executive Order 13770 requires certain individuals appointed to an executive branch agency on or after January 20, 2017, to sign an Ethics Pledge (“Pledge”).⁸ By signing the Pledge, these appointees commit to additional recusal obligations, post-employment restrictions, and a ban on accepting gifts from lobbyists or lobbying organizations.

Agencies reported **1,313 appointees in 2018.** Of those, **1,287 signed the Pledge,** which includes 12 appointees from three agencies who should have signed the Ethics Pledge in 2018 but signed in 2019. The **remaining 26 were not required to sign,** for the following reasons (see Q48-49):

- 21 were appointed without a break in service after serving in another position for which the Pledge had already been signed
- 5 were appointed to an exempt, non-policymaking position

Appointees who were registered lobbyists during the two years prior to their appointment are required to recuse from certain activities related to their prior lobbying activities. Of the full-time non-career appointees in 2018, agencies reported that **3% were registered lobbyists during the two years prior** to their appointment. (See Q50)

The Executive Order provides a mechanism for the President or his designee to waive any of the restrictions contained in the Pledge. **The White House granted 15 waivers to 14 individuals across 6 agencies.** The White House most frequently waived paragraph 6 of the Pledge, which requires appointees to recuse for two years from certain matters related to former employers or clients. (See Q51)

⁸ The following advisories, located on OGE’s website, provide detailed guidance regarding the appointees subject to the Ethics Pledge: LA-17-03, DO-09-003, DO-09-005, DO-09-010, and DO-09-020.

With regard to **violations of the Pledge**, one (1) agency reported a violation of the Pledge, another (1) agency reported two potential violations, and one (1) agency is reviewing a possible violation. (See Q52-53)

Enforcement

While OGE takes actions to ensure agency compliance with ethics program requirements, each agency is responsible for investigating and taking action against an employee who violates an ethics rule or law. Agencies may take corrective or disciplinary action under applicable Government-wide regulations or agency procedures. If misconduct is potentially criminal, the agency must refer the matter to the Department of Justice.

Twenty-three (23) agencies reported a total of 56 referrals to the Department of Justice concerning potential violations of the criminal conflict of interest statutes. Ten (10) agencies reported taking a total of **18 disciplinary actions based on violations of the criminal conflict of interest statutes**.⁹ All of these disciplinary actions were based on violation of 18 U.S.C. § 208, a criminal statute that prohibits taking official action that can affect a personal interest. (See Q43-45)

Forty (40) agencies reported taking disciplinary actions based on violations of the Standards of Conduct.¹⁰ Within those agencies, **1,077 discrete actions** were taken (multiple actions could be taken for one individual). The most common basis for disciplinary actions involved **misuse of position**.

⁹ While the questionnaire does not provide an option for agencies to indicate they do not know or do not track this information, agency comments indicate this is sometimes the case.

¹⁰ While the questionnaire does not provide an option for agencies to indicate they do not know or do not track this information, agency comments indicate this is the case for some agencies.

Section 3 – Compilation of Agency Responses

The information in this section represents a summary of the responses provided by the 136 reporting agencies. For each response, the **bold, red** number indicates the total number of agencies who provided that response. Percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number, except when the rounding would have resulted in a 100%.

PART 4. PROGRAM RESOURCES AND ADMINISTRATION

1. Agency: **137 (100% response rate)**
2. Number of full-time agency employees as of December 31, 2018: **3,745,872**
3. Information about the Designated Agency Ethics Official (DAEO):

a. Vacant (as of December 31, 2018)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (<i>skip to #4a</i>) 8 (6%) <input type="checkbox"/> No 129 (94%)
b. Time in current DAEO position	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than 1 year 19 (15%) <input type="checkbox"/> 1-4 years 60 (47%) <input type="checkbox"/> 5-9 years 25 (19%) <input type="checkbox"/> 10 or more years 25 (19%)
c. Total years performing ethics duties	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than 1 year 8 (6%) <input type="checkbox"/> 1-4 years 32 (25%) <input type="checkbox"/> 5-9 years 29 (22%) <input type="checkbox"/> 10 or more years 60 (47%)
d. Percent of time spent on ethics	<input type="checkbox"/> 0-25% 100 (78%) <input type="checkbox"/> 26-50% 13 (10%) <input type="checkbox"/> 51-75% 4 (3%) <input type="checkbox"/> 76-100% 12 (9%)
e. Is the DAEO a career employee or a political appointee?	<input type="checkbox"/> career employee 112 (87%) <input type="checkbox"/> political appointee 17 (13%)
f. Number of reporting levels between the DAEO and the agency head.	One level: 106 (82%) ¹¹ Two levels: 18 (14%) Three levels: 5 (4%)

¹¹ For one (1) agency, the agency head retained the duties of the DAEO, which means there would be no reporting levels between the DAEO and agency head. However, zero was not a valid option in the survey instrument.

4. Information about the Alternate Designated Agency Ethics Official (ADAEO)

a. Vacant (as of December 31, 2018)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (<i>skip to #5</i>) 11 (8%) <input type="checkbox"/> No 126 (92%)
b. Time in current ADAEO position	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than 1 year 26 (21%) <input type="checkbox"/> 1-4 years 51 (40%) <input type="checkbox"/> 5-9 years 26 (21%) <input type="checkbox"/> 10 or more years 23 (18%)
c. Total years performing ethics duties	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than 1 year 8 (6%) <input type="checkbox"/> 1-4 years 25 (20%) <input type="checkbox"/> 5-9 years 39 (31%) <input type="checkbox"/> 10 or more years 54 (43%)
d. Percent of time spent on ethics	<input type="checkbox"/> 0-25% 63 (50%) <input type="checkbox"/> 26-50% 23 (18%) <input type="checkbox"/> 51-75% 10 (8%) <input type="checkbox"/> 76-100% 30 (24%)
e. Is the ADAEO a career employee or a political appointee?	<input type="checkbox"/> career employee 121 (96%) <input type="checkbox"/> political appointee 5 (4%)

5. Number of employees, including the DAEO and ADAEO, who performed ethics program duties in 2018 (e.g., financial disclosure, education and training, advice and counseling, program administration).

Duty Station	Number of employees by hours worked each week					TOTAL
	Less than 1 hour per week (up to .025 FTE*)	1-10 hours per week (up to .25 FTE*)	11-20 hours per week (up to .5 FTE*)	21-30 hours per week (up to .75 FTE*)	31-40 hours per week (up to 1 FTE*)	
a. D.C. Metro area	656	785	239	110	575	2,365 (32%)
b. Outside the D.C. Metro area	1,501	2,455	633	166	176	4,931 (68%)
TOTAL	2,157 (30%)	3,240 (44%)	872 (12%)	276 (4%)	751 (10%)	7,296¹²

*FTE = Full Time Equivalent

¹² When accounting for the typical numbers of hours worked per week by each individual, the number of full-time equivalent employees who support the ethics program was 2,258.

6. In what areas did contractors support the ethics program? Select all that apply.
- Not applicable (no contractors supported the ethics program) **88**¹³
 - IT services (e.g., developing or supporting electronic filing systems, applications, websites, and/or databases, etc.) **38**
 - Administrative support (e.g., tracking filing or training requirements, sending reminders, data entry, etc.) **17**
 - Substantive ethics support (e.g., providing training, initial review of financial disclosures, drafting advice for further review, etc.) **8**
 - Other (please describe) **5** ([see Q6 Table](#))
7. Did another federal agency or federal entity provide ethics services or support to your agency? Do not include contractors, OGE support, or OMB support of MAX.gov.
- Yes (please provide the name of the federal agency or entity and describe the services or support provided) **29** (21%) ([see Q7 Table](#))
 - No **108** (79%)
8. Does your agency's ethics program need additional resources? Check all that apply.
- No additional resources needed **80**¹⁴
 - Budgetary **27**
 - Human Capital **46**
 - Technology **36**
 - Other (specify) **6** ([see Q8 Table](#))
9. Did the agency head meet with the ethics staff to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the ethics program in 2018?
- Yes **97** (73%)
 - No **36** (27%)
 - Not applicable (specify why) **4**¹⁵ ([see Q9 Table](#))
10. Did your agency (e.g., ethics office, Inspector General, General Counsel, etc.) conduct a self-assessment to evaluate any aspect of the ethics program in 2018?
- Yes **82** (60%)
 - No (*skip to #13*) **55** (40%)

¹³ OGE did not include percentages for questions that allowed agencies to select more than one response.

¹⁴ OGE did not include percentages for questions that allowed agencies to select more than one response.

¹⁵ The percentages in this question exclude agencies that answered "not applicable."

11. To whom were the results reported? Select all that apply.

- Agency Head **36**¹⁶
- DAEO **65**
- Inspector General **9**
- Other (specify) **27** ([see Q11 Table](#))

12. What kind of changes resulted from the assessment? ¹⁷

- Programmatic changes (please describe) **59**¹⁸ ([see Q12 Table](#))
- Policy changes (please describe) **20** ([see Q12 Table](#))
- No changes resulted (specify why not) **12** ([see Q12 Table](#))
- Not applicable (specify why) **3** ([see Q12 Table](#))

13. Of the following required written procedures, which did you have in place? Check all that apply:

- Collection of confidential financial disclosure reports
(5 C.F.R. 2638.104(c)(8)(i)) **132**¹⁹
- Collection of public financial disclosure reports
(5 C.F.R. 2638.104(c)(8)(i)) **136**
- Follow up with delinquent confidential financial disclosure filers
(DA-09-03-92) **124**
- Follow up with delinquent public financial disclosure filers
(DA-09-03-92) **125**
- Public availability of public financial disclosure reports
(5 C.F.R. 2638.104(c)(8)(i)) **119**
- Review/evaluation of confidential financial disclosure reports
(5 C.F.R. 2638.104(c)(8)(i)) **127**
- Review/evaluation of public financial disclosure reports
(5 C.F.R. 2638.104(c)(8)(i)) **130**
- Issuance of notice of ethical obligations in written offers of employment
(5 C.F.R. 2638.303) **111**
- Provision of initial ethics training (5 C.F.R. 2638.304) **126**
- Issuance of ethics notice to new supervisors
(5 C.F.R. 2638.306) **100**
- None **1**

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FOR PART 4. Please indicate the question number to which the comment corresponds. (*not required*)

[See Part 4 Table](#)

¹⁶ OGE did not include percentages for questions that allowed agencies to select more than one response.

¹⁷ Agencies were allowed to select more than one response.

¹⁸ OGE did not include percentages for questions that allowed agencies to select more than one response.

¹⁹ OGE did not include percentages for questions that allowed agencies to select more than one response.

PART 5. EDUCATION AND TRAINING

14. Did all of the office(s) responsible for issuing ethics notices to prospective employees, pursuant to 5 C.F.R. 2638.303, provide the DAEO with the certification required pursuant to 5 C.F.R. 2638.310?
- All of the offices provided the certification to the DAEO **48 (76%)**
 - Some of the offices provided the certification to the DAEO (explain why not all offices) **7 (11%)**
 - None of the offices provided the certification to the DAEO (explain why not all offices) **8 (13%)**
 - Not applicable because my agency has less than 1,000 employees **68²⁰**
 - Not applicable because the DAEO's office is responsible for issuing ethics notices to prospective employees **6²¹**
15. How many new agency leaders, as defined in 5 C.F.R. 2638.305(a), were required to receive ethics briefings by December 31, 2018? **286**
- a. How many of those leaders received their briefing within 15 days of their appointment? **283 (99%)**
 - b. How many of those leaders received their briefing beyond the 15-day requirement? **3 (1%)**
 - c. How many of those leaders have yet to receive their briefing as of today? **0**

If applicable, please explain why some of the leaders received their briefing beyond the 15-day requirement or have yet to receive their briefing. [See Q15 Table](#)

²⁰ The percentages in this question exclude agencies that answered "not applicable."

²¹ The percentages in this question exclude agencies that answered "not applicable."

16. How many employees, **including SGEs**, were required to receive Initial Ethics Training (IET) by December 31, 2018 (5 C.F.R. 2638.304)? Include employees who were excluded, under 5 C.F.R. 2638.304(a), from the requirement to receive the interactive portion of the IET. **350,926**
- a. How many of those employees received IET within the 3-month requirement? **324,320 (92%)**
 - b. How many of those employees received IET beyond the 3-month requirement? **8,425 (2%)**
 - c. How many of those employees have not received IET as of today? **18,181 (5%)²²**

If applicable, please explain why some employees received IET beyond the 3-month requirement or have yet to receive IET. [See Q16 Table](#)

Example: If an employee started at the agency on December 15, 2018, and the employee completed IET prior to the end of the calendar year, include the employee in your required and received numbers. If, on January 1, the employee has not completed IET, do not count that employee in your required numbers. Instead, include the employee in your 2019 Questionnaire response in 2020.

17. How many non-supervisory positions at or below the GS-8 grade level, or the equivalent, were excluded from the requirement to receive the *interactive* portion of their initial ethics training during 2018, pursuant to 5 C.F.R. 2638.304(a) (i.e., they received only *written* materials)? **248**
18. Did all of the office(s) delegated the responsibility for providing initial ethics training (IET) provide the required certification to the DAEO, pursuant to 5 C.F.R. 2638.310?
- All of the offices provided the certification to the DAEO **30 (88%)**
 - Some of the offices provided the certification to the DAEO (specify why) **3 (9%)**
 - None of the offices provided the certification to the DAEO (specify why) **1 (3%)**
 - Not applicable because my agency has less than 1,000 employees **62²³**
 - Not applicable because all IET was provided by an office under the DAEO's supervision **41²⁴**

²² The Department of Defense and the Department of Agriculture had the largest proportion (11,672) of the 18,181 employees who had not yet received IET. See each agency's questionnaire response for the explanation provided by the agency.

²³ The percentages in this question exclude agencies that answered "not applicable."

²⁴ The percentages in this question exclude agencies that answered "not applicable."

19. Did the head of the agency complete either initial ethics training and/or annual ethics training in 2018?

- Yes **126 (95%)**
- No (specify why) **6 (5%)** ([see Q19 Table](#))
- Not Applicable (specify why) **5²⁵** ([see Q19 Table](#))

20. Required Annual Ethics Training

Type of covered employees (Include SGE filers)	# Required	# Received (of those required)
a. Executive Schedule Level I or Level II public filers (OGE Form 278e)	65	64 (98%)
b. All other public filers (OGE Form 278e)	21,631	19,983 (92%)
c. Confidential filers (OGE Form 450, 450A, and OGE-approved alternative confidential financial disclosure forms)	353,566	335,292 (95%)
d. Other employees required by 5 C.F.R. 2638.307(a) (employees appointed by the President; employees of the Executive Office of the President; Contracting Officers; or, other employees designated by the head of the agency.)	35,690	35,452 (99%)
TOTAL	410,952	390,791 (95%)

If applicable, please explain discrepancies between the number of employees who were required to receive training and the number of employees who received training: [See Q20 Table](#)

21. Did you provide **annual** ethics training to other employees *not otherwise required by regulation to receive training* (i.e., any other employees not covered by the chart above)?

- Yes (please specify who) **99 (72%)** ([see Q21 Table](#))
- No **38 (28%)**

²⁵ The percentages in this question exclude agencies that answered “not applicable.”

22. Did you provide additional, specialized ethics training during 2018 (i.e., beyond any required initial ethics training or annual ethics training)?

- Yes **81 (59%)**
- No (*skip to next Part*) **56 (41%)**

23. Which groups did you target for additional, specialized ethics training? Check all that apply.

- All agency personnel (including individuals not required by regulation to receive annual training) **26²⁶**
- HR personnel **12**
- IT personnel **8**
- Procurement personnel **25**
- Supervisors **28**
- Other (specify all) **45 (see Q23 Table)**

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FOR PART 5. Please indicate the question number to which the comment corresponds. (not required)

[See Part 5 Table](#)

²⁶ OGE did not include percentages for questions that allowed agencies to select more than one response.

PART 6. ADVICE, COUNSELING, AND REMEDIES

24. From the list below, select the three topics that your employees most **frequently** sought guidance on in 2018. Please rate them in order, such that the first topic was the topic on which employees sought guidance the most frequently.

<p>Gift acceptance Most frequent topic: 50 agencies Second most frequent topic: 20 agencies Third most frequent topic: 22 agencies This topic was selected a total of <u>92</u> times</p>
<p>Outside employment/activities Most frequent topic: 26 agencies Second most frequent topic: 31 agencies Third most frequent topic: 34 agencies This topic was selected a total of <u>91</u> times</p>
<p>Financial disclosure reporting Most frequent topic: 25 agencies Second most frequent topic: 28 agencies Third most frequent topic: 26 agencies This topic was selected a total of <u>79</u> times</p>
<p>Travel, subsistence, and related expenses from non-federal sources Most frequent topic: 11 agencies Second most frequent topic: 19 agencies Third most frequent topic: 10 agencies This topic was selected a total of <u>40</u> times</p>
<p>Post-employment restrictions Most frequent topic: 6 agencies Second most frequent topic: 9 agencies Third most frequent topic: 24 agencies This topic was selected a total of <u>39</u> times</p>
<p>Conflicting financial interests Most frequent topic: 14 agencies Second most frequent topic: 11 agencies Third most frequent topic: 10 agencies This topic was selected a total of <u>35</u> times</p>
<p>Impartiality in performance of official duties Most frequent topic: 4 agencies Second most frequent topic: 9 agencies Third most frequent topic: 5 agencies This topic was selected a total of <u>18</u> times</p>
<p>Misuse of position, government resources, and information Most frequent topic: 0 agencies Second most frequent topic: 8 agencies Third most frequent topic: 3 agencies</p>

This topic was selected a total of 11 times
Other (specify) See Q24 Table
Most frequent topic: 1 agency
Second most frequent topic: 2 agencies
Third most frequent topic: 3 agencies
This topic was selected a total of 6 times

25. Number of notification statements of negotiation or recusal under section 17(a) of the STOCK Act submitted to the ethics office in 2018: **1,545**
26. Number of public financial disclosure filers who, in 2018, took specific remedial actions (e.g., divestiture, resignation from outside position, written disqualification, 18 U.S.C. section 208 waiver, reassignment, etc.) because of information on a new entrant, annual, periodic transaction, or termination report: **540**
- Don't know/don't track **29 (21%)**
27. Number of individual remedial actions taken in 2018 because of information on a new entrant, annual, periodic transaction, or termination public financial disclosure report:

a. Recusals 853 Don't know/don't track 34 (25%)
b. Divestitures 644 Don't know/don't track 29 (21%)
c. Resignations from outside positions 291 Don't know/don't track 32 (23%)
d. Reassignments 2 Don't know/don't track 36 (26%)
e. Other not listed (specify) 1 Don't know/don't track 48 (35%)

If Other, specify [See Q27 Table](#)

28. Number of 18 U.S.C. 208 waivers granted in 2018:

	Number Granted in 2018	Number Sent to OGE
a. 208(b)(1) waivers	117	57 ²⁷
b. 208(b)(3) waivers	261	272 ²⁸

If applicable, please explain discrepancies between the number of waivers granted and the number provided to OGE. [See Q28 Table](#)

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FOR PART 6. Please indicate the question number to which the comment corresponds. *(not required)*

[See Part 6 Table](#)

²⁷ OGE subsequently received all waivers required to be submitted.

²⁸ The Department of Health and Human Services provides waivers to OGE in batches, so the waivers provided to OGE in calendar year 2018 include some granted at the end of calendar year 2017.

PART 7. FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AND ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEMS

29. How often, within the 15-day deadline, did the human resources office(s) notify the DAEO of appointments to public and confidential financial disclosure filing positions (5 C.F.R. 2638.105(a)(1))?

	In all Cases	In Most Cases	In Some Cases	Never	Not Applicable (specify why, below)
a. Public Filers	57 (56%)	35 (35%)	5 (5%)	4 (4%)	36 ²⁹
b. Confidential Filers	50 (49%)	36 (35%)	10 (10%)	7 (7%)	34 ³⁰

If not applicable, specify why. [See Q29a Table \(public filers\) and Q29b Table \(confidential filers\)](#)

30. How often, within the 15-day deadline, did the human resources office(s) notify the DAEO of terminations from public financial disclosure filing positions (5 C.F.R. 2638.105(a)(2))?

	In all Cases	In Most Cases	In Some Cases	Never	Not Applicable (specify why, below)
Public Filers	55 (56%)	35 (36%)	4 (4%)	4 (4%)	39 ³¹

If not applicable, specify why. [See Q30 Table](#)

31. Did your agency use an electronic financial disclosure filing system (e-filing system) in calendar year 2018? Note: This includes *Integrity*.

- Yes **137 (100%)**
- No (*skip to next Part*) **0**

²⁹ The percentages in this question exclude agencies that answered “not applicable.”

³⁰ The percentages in this question exclude agencies that answered “not applicable.”

³¹ The percentages in this question exclude agencies that answered “not applicable.”

32. Which system did your agency use?

- Integrity* ONLY (skip to next Part) **76 (55%)**
- Integrity* AND Other (specify) **61 (45%)** ([see Q32 Table](#))
- Other ONLY (specify) **0**

33. Indicate for which forms your agency used the “Other” e-filing system. Check all that apply.

- Public Financial Disclosure (OGE Form 278e) **31**³²
- Periodic Transactions (OGE Form 278-T) **17**
- Confidential Financial Disclosure (OGE Form 450, 450A, or OGE-approved alternative form) **60**

34. Indicate your FY 2018 actual costs for using the e-filing system. Note: Because OGE does not charge fees to use *Integrity*, there are no reportable costs associated with the use of *Integrity*.

	Public (do not include <i>Integrity</i>)	Confidential	Total
a. Amount paid to a non-federal vendor in FY 2018	\$699,506 (based on 53 agencies that track, 8 agencies did not track)	\$4,052,103 (based on 53 agencies that track, 8 agencies did not track)	\$4,751,609
b. Amount paid to a federal agency in FY 2018	\$292,898 (based on 57 agencies that track, 4 agencies did not track)	\$1,692,424 (based on 56 agencies that track, 5 agencies did not track)	\$1,985,322
c. Amount for all internal costs associated with operating an e-filing system (e.g., FTE, overhead, etc.) in FY 2018	\$209,656 (based on 50 agencies that track, 11 agencies did not track)	\$1,794,880 (based on 47 agencies that track, 14 agencies did not track)	\$2,004,536
Total FY 2018 actual costs	\$1,202,060	\$7,539,407	\$8,741,467

³² OGE did not include percentages for questions that allowed agencies to select more than one response.

35. Indicate the number of filers who filed electronically in fiscal year 2018.

	Public (excluding filers in <i>Integrity</i>)	Confidential
Number of financial disclosure filers, not reports, who filed electronically in FY 2018	10,570	255,359

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FOR PART 7. Please indicate the question number to which the comment corresponds. *(not required)*

[See Part 7 Table](#)

PART 8. PUBLIC FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

36. Report the number of public financial disclosure reports (OGE Form 278e) required to be filed by December 31, 2018, **excluding SGEs**, and the number of reports actually filed (i.e., received in hand) by December 31, 2018.

OGE Form 278e Reports		PAS ²	Non-Career SES ³	Career SES ³	Schedule C	Other ⁴	TOTAL
a. Nominee/ New Entrant	Required	313	341	1,125	575	1,792	4,146
	Filed	313	337	1,094	572	1,764	4,080 (98%)
b. Annual	Required	391	578	9,081	727	8,487	19,264
	Filed	391	571	9,068	725	8,477	19,232 (99.8%)
c. Termination	Required	71	164	928	171	929	2,263
	Filed	70	162	903	162	910	2,207 (98%)
d. Combination ¹	Required	9	25	228	16	143	421
	Filed	8	23	228	16	141	416 (99%)
Total	Required	784	1,108	11,362	1,489	11,351	26,094
	Filed	782 (99.7%)	1,093 (99%)	11,293 (99%)	1,475 (99%)	11,292 (99%)	25,935 (99%)

¹ Includes reports filed to satisfy both annual and termination requirements, as well as new entrant and termination requirements.

² Presidential appointees confirmed by the Senate.

³ Senior Executive Service, Senior Foreign Service, Senior Cryptologic Service, Defense Intelligence Senior Executive Service, etc.

⁴ Includes members of the Uniformed Services, Administrative Law Judges, Senior Level employees (SES Equivalent), administratively determined positions, officials in the Executive Office of the President who do not otherwise meet the criteria of another section, etc.

Example for new entrant and termination reports: If an employee started/left the agency on December 15, 2018, and the employee filed a new entrant/termination report prior to the end of the calendar year, include the report in your required and filed numbers. If, on January 1, the employee has not filed a new entrant/termination report, do not count that

report in your required numbers. Instead, include the employee in your 2019 Questionnaire response in 2020.

If applicable, please explain discrepancies between the number of reports required to be filed and the actual number of reports filed. [See Q36 Table](#)

37. Number of periodic transaction reports filed, *excluding those filed by SGEs*: **14,898**

Note: Count the total number of periodic transaction reports filed. *Example 1*: If two employees each file 5 periodic transaction reports during the calendar year, report “10” in the table above. *Example 2*: If an employee files one report each month, each report is counted separately. Report “12” in the table.

38. Extension and late fees for new entrant, annual, termination, and combination public financial disclosure reports and periodic transaction reports, *excluding those for reports filed by SGEs*.

	Granted Filing Extension	Granted Waiver of Late Filing Fee	Paid Late Filing Fee
a. Number of OGE Form 278e Reports	4,319	240	73
b. Number of OGE Form 278-T Reports	328	409	94

39. Number of public financial disclosure filers reported in calendar year 2018 to the Attorney General for failure to file: **6**
40. How many requests for public financial disclosure reports did you receive in 2018? Count each OGE Form 201 as one request, even if it contains a request for documents for multiple individuals. **2,932**

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FOR PART 8. Please indicate the question number to which the comment corresponds. *(not required)*

[See Part 8 Table](#)

PART 9. CONFIDENTIAL FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

41. Report the number of confidential financial disclosure reports required to be filed by December 31, 2018, *excluding SGEs*, and the number of reports actually filed by December 31, 2018.

	Required	Filed	
		450	276,509
		450A	49,779
		OGE-approved alternative form	27,012
Total	354,714		353,300 (99.6%)

Example for new entrant reports: If an employee started at the agency on December 15, 2018, and filed a new entrant report prior to the end of the calendar year, include the report in your required and filed numbers. If, on January 1, the employee has not filed a new entrant report, do not count that report in your required numbers. Instead, include the employee in your 2019 Questionnaire’s new entrant numbers in 2020.

If applicable, please explain discrepancies between the number of reports required to be filed and the actual number of reports filed. [See Q41 Table](#)

42. Number of OGE 450, 450A, or OGE-approved alternative forms granted filing extensions in 2018: **5,392**

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS PART 9. Please indicate the question number to which the comment corresponds. *(not required)*

[See Part 9 Table](#)

PART 10. ENFORCEMENT OF STANDARDS OF CONDUCT AND CRIMINAL AND CIVIL STATUTES

43. Number of disciplinary actions taken based wholly or in part upon violations of the Standards of Conduct provisions (5 C.F.R. part 2635) or your agency's supplemental Standards (if applicable) in 2018. For purposes of this question, disciplinary actions include removals, demotions, suspensions, and written reprimands or their equivalents: **1,077**

Of those, how many were disciplinary actions were taken wholly or in part upon violations of:

- Subpart A (General Provisions) **348**
- Subpart B (Gifts from Outside Sources) **23**
- Subpart C (Gifts Between Employees) **4**
- Subpart D (Conflicting Financial Interests) **19**
- Subpart E (Impartiality in Performing Official Duties) **24**
- Subpart F (Seeking Other Employment) **12**
- Subpart G (Misuse of Position) **623**
- Subpart H (Outside Activities) **85**

44. Number of disciplinary actions taken based wholly or in part upon violations of the criminal conflict of interest statutes, 18 U.S.C. sections 203, 205, 208, and 209, in 2018. For purposes of this question, disciplinary actions include removals, demotions, suspensions, and written reprimands or their equivalents: **18**

Of those, how many were disciplinary actions taken based wholly or in part upon violations of:

- 18 U.S.C. section 203 (Compensation in Matters Affecting the Government) **0**
- 18 U.S.C. section 205 (Claims Against and Matters Affecting the Government) **0**
- 18 U.S.C. section 208 (Acts Affecting a Personal Financial Interest) **18**
- 18 U.S.C. section 209 (Supplementation of Salary) **0**

45. Number of referrals made to the Department of Justice of potential violations of the conflict of interest statutes (18 U.S.C. sections 203, 205, 207, 208, 209), failure to file or filing false public financial disclosures (5 U.S.C. app. section 104 or 18 U.S.C. section 1001), a civil matter involving outside earned income under 5 U.S.C. app. section 501, or outside activities under 5 U.S.C. app. section 502 in 2018: **56**

DOJ Referrals

- a. How many of those referrals were accepted for prosecution **3**
- b. How many of those referrals were declined for prosecution **41**
- c. How many of those referrals were pending DOJ's decision as of December 31, 2018 **12**

Disciplinary Action

- a. How many of those referrals resulted in disciplinary or corrective action **9**
- b. How many of those referrals resulted in a determination not to take disciplinary or corrective action **9**
- c. How many of those referrals are pending a determination as to whether disciplinary or corrective action will be taken **17**

46. Did your agency submit all referral(s) and disposition(s) of the referral(s) to OGE via OGE Form 202 (as required by 5 C.F.R. 2638.206(a))?

- Yes **26**
- No (specify why) **8** ([see Q46 Table](#))³³
- Not Applicable (specify why) **103** ([see Q46 Table](#))

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FOR PART 10. Please indicate the question number to which the comment corresponds. *(not required)*

[See Part 10 Table](#)

³³ Six (6) of the seven (7) agencies indicated they had no referrals to report. One (1) agency indicated that the required referral was delayed due to a typographical error that affected the Office of Inspector General's internal tracking process for filing OGE 202 forms. One (1) agency did not realize the requirement applied to referrals made by their Office of Inspector General. However, OGE confirmed that the requirement does apply. The agency subsequently committed to submitting all covered referrals via Form 202.

PART 11. ETHICS PLEDGE ASSESSMENT

47. Were any full-time non-career appointees (e.g., Presidentially Appointed Senate Confirmed (PAS), Presidentially Appointed (PA), non-career Senior Executive Service (SES), Schedule C, etc.) appointed to or by your agency from January 1 through December 31, 2018?

- Yes **64 (47%)**
- No (*skip to #51*) **73 (53%)**

Note: For guidance on what constitutes a full-time non-career appointee for purposes of the Ethics Pledge, see LA-17-03 available at www.oge.gov.

48. For each category of appointee, provide the number of full-time non-career appointees appointed between January 1 and December 31, 2018, and indicate the number who did and did not sign the Ethics Pledge. Note: Please include all appointees who did not sign, regardless of whether or not they were required to sign. Additional explanatory information is requested in the next question.

Number of Full-Time Non-Career Appointees	Type of Full-Time Non-Career Appointees by Category					
	PAS	PA	Non-career SES	Schedule C	Other	Total
a. Appointed 01/01/2018 – 12/31/2018	221	182	229	615	67	1,314
i. Signed the Ethics Pledge	219	179	225	598	67	1,288³⁴
ii. Did not sign the Ethics Pledge	2	3	4	17	0	26

If applicable, please explain discrepancies between the number appointed and the number who signed or did not sign the Pledge. [See Q48 Table](#)

If all appointees signed, skip to question 50

³⁴ This total includes 13 appointees from four (4) agencies who signed the Ethics Pledge late. It also includes two (2) appointees from one (1) agency who may have signed the Pledge in 2018 but for whom no copy was found in the agency files; the agency subsequently collected a signed Pledge from both.

49. For each appointee who did not sign the Ethics Pledge, find the appropriate rationale(s) and indicate the total number of appointees who fit into that category.

Rationale for Not Signing the Ethics Pledge	Number and Type of Full-Time Non-Career Appointees Who Did Not Sign the Ethics Pledge					
	PAS	PA	Non-career SES	Schedule C	Other	Total
a. Occupy an exempt non-policymaking position (Schedule C or other comparable authority)	0	1	0	4	0	5
b. Appointed without break in service after serving in another position for which the Ethics Pledge was already signed	2	2	4	13	0	21
c. Other (please explain)	0	0	0	0	0	0

If other, please explain. **No agency selected "other"**

50. How many appointees appointed between January 1 and December 31, 2018 and subject to the Ethics Pledge were registered lobbyists during the two years prior to their appointment? **36 (3%)**

51. Section 3 of Executive Order 13770 provides a waiver mechanism for the restrictions contained in the Ethics Pledge. Indicate below how many waivers were granted to appointees in your agency in 2018, the names of those individuals granted waivers in 2018, and which of the Pledge paragraphs were implicated.

	Number of Ethics Pledge Waivers Granted By Pledge Paragraph	Name(s) of Individual(s) Granted Ethics Pledge Waivers
a. Paragraph 1	0	
b. Paragraph 2	0	
c. Paragraph 3	0	
d. Paragraph 4	0	
e. Paragraph 5	1	Invitees to the 2018 AIPAC Policy Conference
f. Paragraph 6	13	Jennifer Dickey; John Eisenberg; Kenneth Juster, Marry Kissel; Jesse Panuccio, Brian Benczkowski, Jeffrey Wall (received 2 waivers); Noel Francisco; Lisa Gordon-Hagerty; Charles Verdon; Anne White; Randall Shriver
g. Paragraph 7	1	Ken Barbic
h. Paragraph 8	0	
i. Paragraph 9	0	
j. Other (please explain)	0	

If other, please explain. [See Q51 Table](#)

52. Were there any violations of the Ethics Pledge during 2018?

- Yes **2 (1%)**
- No (*skip to next Part*) **135 (99%)**

53. Please provide information on enforcement actions taken as a result of violations of the Pledge. [See Q53 Table](#)

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FOR PART 11. Please indicate the question number to which the comment corresponds. *(not required)*

[See Part 11 Table](#)

PART 12. SPECIAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES (SGEs)

54. How many Special Government Employees (SGEs) did your agency have, in total, during calendar year 2018? **46,994** (*if zero, skip to Additional Comments for Part 12*)
55. How many SGEs serving on a board, commission, or committee were required to receive Initial Ethics Training (IET) by December 31, 2018 (5 C.F.R. 2638.304(b)(2))? **20,616**
- a. How many of those SGEs received IET before or at the beginning of the first meeting? **20,562 (99.7%)**
 - b. How many of those SGEs received IET after the first meeting? **39 (.2%)**
 - c. How many of those SGEs have not received IET as of today? **15 (.1%)**

If applicable, please explain why some SGEs received IET after the first meeting or have yet to receive IET. [See Q55 Table](#)

56. Report the number of SGE public and confidential financial disclosure reports required to be filed by December 31, 2018 and the number of reports actually filed by December 31, 2018.

Tye of SGE	Confidential Reports (OGE Form 450 or OGE- Approved Alternative Form)		Public Reports (OGE Form 278e)	
	Required	Filed	Required	Filed
a. Advisory Committee Members (FACA)	24,852	24,290 (98%)	22	22 (100%)
b. Advisory Committee Members (non-FACA)	285	280 (98%)	0	0
c. Experts/ Consultants	2,120	2,112 (99.6%)	66	66 (100%)
d. Board Members	301	286 (95%)	9	9 (100%)
e. Commissioners	166	136 (82%)	11	10 (91%)
f. Other	463	459 (99%)	3	3 (100%)
TOTAL	28,187	27,563 (98%)	111	110 (99%)

Example for new entrant and termination reports: If an employee started with the agency on December 15, 2018, and filed a new entrant report prior to the end of the calendar year, include the report in your required and filed numbers. If, on January 1, the employee has not filed a new entrant report, do not count that report in your required numbers. Instead, include the employee in your 2019 Questionnaire response numbers in 2020.

If applicable, please explain discrepancies between the number of reports required to be filed and the actual number of reports filed. [See Q56 Table](#)

57. Number of SGEs excluded from all or a portion of the confidential filing requirements per 5 C.F.R. 2634.904(b): **19,005**

58. Extensions and late filing fees for SGE financial disclosure reports:

	Granted filing extension	Granted waiver of late filing fee	Paid late filing fee
a. Number of OGE Form 278e Reports	38	0	0
b. Number of OGE Form 450 or OGE-Approved Alternative Forms	218		

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FOR PART 12. Please indicate the question number to which the comment corresponds. *(not required)*

[See Part 12 Table](#)

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE COMMENTS:

[See Additional Comments Table](#)

Appendix

Q6 Table. In what areas did contractors support the ethics program? Specify Other.

Contract attorneys assist in answering ethics questions from the Office of General Counsel's helpdesk on their assigned duty day. The contractor will address each such question in consultation with the ADAEO or DAEO.
Contractors indirectly support the ethics program by, for example, assisting Human Capital with automating notifications for persons entering and leaving filing positions and assisting the Ethics Program with creating, editing and publishing training documents.
Contractor staff provided assistance to the Departmental Ethics Office on FOIA requests for ethics program records.
Human resources support
Ethics program hired a retired TVA attorney who served as a deputy ethics official to assist with the review of the agency's policy for financial disclosure reporting

Q7 Table. Did another federal agency or federal entity provide ethics services or support to your agency? (Do not include contractors, OGE support, or OMB support of MAX.gov.) If yes above, please provide the name of the federal agency or entity and describe the services or support provided.

Washington Headquarters Services ... provided ethics briefing
Army. The ASBCA's GS employees are hired via the Army's personnel system. Therefore, Army provides prospective employees with the required notices.
The Bureau worked closely with Ethics Officials at the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) while OMB's Director was detailed to serve as the Bureau's Acting Director, while continuing to serve as OMB Director. Given that he served in both roles concurrently, we coordinated with OMB when reviewing invitations, speaking events, gift questions and issuing other ethics guidance.
White House Counsel's Office
Department of Justice Office of Inspector General (DOJ OIG) provides supplemental legal services to the agency, including ethics services. The ADAEO is an employee of DOJ OIG. Also, employee in agency's field office attended annual ethics training at a different Executive Branch agency.
The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) is a component of the Executive Office of the President (EOP). Two other offices within the EOP provided general ethics support and provided some additional ethics training to CEQ employees in 2018.
DoD SOCO provided advice and training.
DRA has an MOU with the Department of Commerce to provide substantive ethics support with ethics advice, financial disclosure, and training as needed and billed on an hourly basis.
Office of the Secretary of Defense Standards of Conduct Office
Department of the Army's Financial Disclosure System
OSC - Hatch Act Unit - opinions/guidance.

The Department of the Army provides their online secure Financial Disclosure Management System (FDM) for our use.
Army Financial Data Management System. Used for confidential financial disclosure reporting
Farm Credit Administration provides ethics services to the Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation on a contract basis.
Annual ethics training was provided by the Dept. of Education. Hatch Act training was provided by the Office of Special Counsel
Department of Commerce: general ethics guidance and program support / financial disclosure filing supervision
Department of State
DOI - provide all personnel services for the James Madison Foundation.
Department of the Army - We use the Army provided FDM system for all of our 450 filers' financial disclosures.
Mr. Paul Zimmerman, General Counsel at the Inter-American Foundation led the annual ethics training for the NEA's Confidential and Public Disclosure filers in 2018. The NEA provides live annual ethics training to its Confidential and Public Disclosure filers each year and sometimes we will request that other ethics experts lead the training (with NEA ethics officials present to answer Agency-specific inquiries). We've found this approach beneficial to our filers as it reinforces to our filers the importance of ethics practice across the federal government and introduces them to various ethics officials at other agencies.
Other EOP components.
We conferred with ethics and other officials at State and the NLRB on requests for ethics advice.
Bureau of the Fiscal Service-Treasury provides ethics notices to new hires in offer letters.
The DOD provides information technology and communications support to the Executive Office of the President.
USDA assisted in developing an online ethics training course.
CIA - Ethics Compliance tracking System
White House Office - certifies all Public Financial Disclosures of APs, DAPs, and SAPs.
We use ARMY's Financial Disclosure Management System for our 450 and 278 reports. Our ethics officials review the reports however, not ARMY.
HUD's ethics office administers USICH's ethics program.

Q8 Table. Does your agency's ethics program need additional resources? If Not applicable above, specify why.

space
Interest in OGE expansion of Integrity or equivalent system to permit one source electronic filing for OGE 450s.
We are looking to implement an electronic filing system for confidential filers. We are also looking to focus on developing and retaining our ethics personnel.
Given the heavy turnover in leadership personnel in 2018, assessment of program resource needs is still in progress at this time.

One ethics officer believes the FDM system needs updating. FDM is working on this and has updated some parts of the system. We are generally satisfied with the FDM system.
An electronic filing system for the confidential financial disclosure program is needed and software to create and track the ethics training program is needed.

Q9 Table. Did the agency head meet with the ethics staff to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the ethics program in 2018? If Not applicable above, specify why.

The DAEO is the agency head.
The head of the Agency had not been confirmed in 2018.
The agency head acted as the DAEO for part of the year last year.
USTDA's nominee for agency head was awaiting Senate confirmation during the reporting period.

Q11 Table. To whom were the results reported? Specify Other.

All affected employees.
N/A
Office of Government Ethics
Deputy Ethics Officials.
Head of the regional ethics personnel (who have responsibility for working with our FACA SGEs) - for us, this is the Chief of the Regional Programs Unit
DAEO discussed recommendations for ethics program with General Counsel.
The results of the assessment were also discussed with CEQ's Chief of Staff.
Agency Human Resources director, head of inspected unit
OGE completed its Agency Program Review for the Department of the Navy.
Local Counsel and Management.
Ethics program review reports go to the following individuals at the reviewed component: the component head, Designated Ethics Counselor, and Ethics Coordinator. Our procedures also allow the DAEO to send the reports to the HHS Secretary as needed.
Chief Financial Officer, Senior Ethics and Legal Officials
Chief Counsels and General Counsels in components
Bureau/Office Head
DAEO and Deputy General Counsel for FHWA
At one bureau, Director, Administrative and Internal Law Division at another bureau, Counsel to the IG at a third bureau, suggested revisions to its ethics policy were reported to that bureau's Deputy General Counsel for one bureau, assessment requested by Chief Counsel to determine if there were any issues and to address any identified issues timely.
COO and Chief of Staff
The results were also reported to the Senior Management Team.
OGE (Audit)
The ADAEO.
Executive Director
ADAEO
Other is Chief Operating Officer and Component Heads

DoD OIG OGC does not have a DAEO. Self-assessments and meetings were led by the ADAEO.
General Counsel
OGE

Q12 Table. What kind of changes resulted from the assessment?

No Changes Resulted (specify why not)

The assessment findings resulted in no need for programmatic or policy changes.
No specific changes made. As a general practice, we informally assess our program Consistency of advice and counsel, administration of confidential financial disclosure program, Compliance with applicable ethics laws and regulations.
No changes were instituted because USARC's ethics program is adequate.
The assessment did not indicate that any changes were necessary.
Our internal control review resulted in a satisfactory review of the program. No changes were deemed necessary.
Internal controls review resulted in a satisfactory rating. No changes necessary.
The Ethics Office received no recommendations in OIG's audit of FHFA's Controls Over Post-Employment Restrictions and Financial Disclosure for Offboarded Employees. The Ethics Office also received positive feedback in the Office of Quality Assurance's Records and Information Management File Plan Review.
Our assessment was in the form of a Client Satisfaction Survey. The Office of General Counsel conducted an Internal Partner Satisfaction Survey to determine if clients are satisfied with the quality and timeliness of services provided. The responses to the survey showed that our clients are very satisfied with our services thus resulting in no changes to our program.
No deficiencies identified
There were no recommendations provided.
We are still discussing switching web based platforms for ethics inquiry/ethics opinion tracking.
Agreed to continue the program of an Ethics update during agency-wide staff meeting.

Not applicable (specify why)

Although there were no changes that resulted from the assessment, the Agency did however update its training questions as well as its ethics skits.
In consultation with OGE's records manager, the ADAEO is still in the process of finalizing a proposed records plan and a schedule for identifying, filing, retaining and disposing of ethics program records according to the records schedule.
Nothing was reported to the DAEO re needed changes.

Policy changes (please describe)

Minor technical changes related to Integrity were made, and the description of covered employees was changed.
Added additional language for applicant/new hire ethics notificatons and requirements.

12. The DAEO has undertaken an initiative to develop a Business Code of Conduct which will represent a reflection of EXIM's core values. In the event the office receives additional resources, it will implement other recommendations resulting from the self-assessment.
#12 The Ethics Office worked with the Director of Human Resources to further improve its ethics training policies and notification procedures with regard to new employees, reassignments, and employees promoted to supervisory positions. In addition, as a result of an IMLS Risk-Assessment Plan provided to OGE, IMLS is committed to timely notifying supervisors/agency director (as appropriate) whenever IMLS filers fail to meet financial disclosure filing deadlines.
Adopted supplemental regulations and policy re: prior approval for outside activities.
In October 2018, the Board regained a quorum. The DAEO/General Counsel briefed the new Chairman and Board Members on the state of the ethics program and proposed updates given the long sub-quorum period. The updates are continuing, with OGE desk officer assistance as needed.
Standard operating procedures created to ensure compliance through chain of command.
We will conduct additional analysis of data that we already compile and a new cross functional ethics committee has been created to review and address employee misconduct in addition to conduct that violates the ethics regulations.

Programmatic changes (please describe)

We refined our record-keeping practices and policies, revised the content of initial ethics training, and began preparing monthly status updates tracking the status of financial disclosure reports, ethics training, and post-employment counseling.
We revised the Bureau's educational materials and the ethics annual communications plan (e.g., emails to all-hands, information distributed to management officials, information on our intranet site) to incorporate additional topics and specific ethics questions based on the survey responses. We also offered specialized training to offices based on their survey responses.
The CSB completed a ethics inspection during calendar year 2017. In the process of that inspection and follow up, the CSB addressed a number of matters including policy and program changes. During 2018, the bulk of the assessment was done in conjunction with the completion of the CY 2017 questionnaire and was intended to make sure the program remained on track. We did make minor changes to recordkeeping and the confidential report process. CSB drafted a written procedure to address The CSB has a draft written procedure to cover the requirements of 2638.303, 2638.304, and 2638.306, but it was not finalized by 12/31/18.
Modifications to the ethics training materials to reflect the latest OGE guidance and directives.
A self-assessment of the DFAS ethics training program resulted in a proposal to provide ethics training to all agency employees on an annual basis as well as a new live in-person training aimed at enhancing the ethics knowledge of executive staff so they can better identify and advise on potential ethics issues. Both programs should be fully implemented in 2019.

<p>The Chief, Ethics/ADAE0 strived to ensure OGC's Ethics Program had a stronger presence among supervisors and the entire Agency She has also succeeded in gaining our Agency Senior leaders support by providing more in person training, publishing articles on our internal website and our Agency's TV/DISA Dateline websites. Also, the workforce is now more engaged with comfort and trust with approaching the office with questions or concerns due to adding the Ethics PM to serve as the liaison between the employees and counselors.</p>
<p>An additional ethics attorney was hired. Additional attorneys were assigned to assist with reviewing OGE 450s and 278s. Requested and received funds for Reserve support.</p>
<p>Ensured all new initial entrants employees are required to take on-line interactive ethics training. The J1/HR places each employee into this requirement through DLA's Learning Management System.</p>
<p>As a result of the assessment, the agency made certain procedural changes to the ethics program. This changes principally involved greater use of technology in the ethics program. For example, employee ethics files are now stored electronically to enable more efficient retrieval and review.</p>
<p>Additional staff was assigned to support the ethics training program.</p>
<p>funding for new hires</p>
<p>Improved implementation of human resources duties prescribed in 5 CFR 2638, improved ethics counselor knowledge.</p>
<p>Additional documentation of advice. Continuity planning in the event ethics staff were to leave the agency.</p>
<p>Several programmatic changes were implemented to strengthen the program, including changes or updates required to ensure compliance with new OGE regulations (e.g., financial disclosure), implementation of best practices, and addition of resources.</p>
<p>Re-instituted monthly meetings with senior management, human resources leadership, and administrative officers. Process for improvement of review and certification of reports.</p>
<p>DOI Leadership approved a restructuring of the Departmental Ethics Office, and committed to significantly increase staffing, training, and budget support across the DOI Ethics Program.</p>
<p>improvements to training and provision of ethics advice/counseling (FHWA) improvements to overall ethics program management (OST)</p>
<p>After realignment of the Office of General Counsel (OGC), the Principal Deputy General Counsel, top career attorney in OGC, now serves as the DAEO, and the Chief Counsel, SES manager of the Ethics Specialty Team, serves as the ADAEO. This heightens the visibility of VA's ethics program.</p>
<p>We undertook a strategic plan exercise and committed to improve our programmatic oversight. For example, we issued clear direction to ethics officials about how to conduct their confidential financial disclosure collection, review and certification process. As OGE noted in its 2017 program review of EPA, our ethics program was under-resourced. In 2018, EPA Ethics faced intense scrutiny that we leveraged into increased resources. By the end of CY 2018, we were able to double the size of the EPA Ethics team.</p>
<p>We updated our written policies and procedures pertaining to both our Public and Confidential Financial Disclosure Program and revised our processes to ensure SGE's</p>

holding over on advisory committees receive annual training required by Section 2638.307.
Efforts to increase visibility of Ethics department by increasing Ethics training provided by the ADAEO in face to face meetings with employees in field
Coordination between the Human Resources Office and the Ethics Office improved. A new letter was developed for inbound new employees who will need to prepare confidential financial disclosure reports. The tracking system for new employee training was improved and implemented.
The agency has implemented processes to ensure the proper documentation of all ethics briefings and trainings.
Designated one additional ethics counselor.
Changes to orientation briefing, upload all a support documentation into Integrity system. Would like to have OGE 450s in an electronic system. Researching best path forward.
Administrative Officers no longer add or delete filers in EPTS. The HR electronic system automatically syncs with EPTS adding and deleting/sending termination reports directly to filers. Assessment also led to improvement in completing initial ethics training at two centers (See Q. 16).
For years, the NEH ethics office has sent monthly emails on various ethics topics to all agency staff. In 2018, the ethics office evaluated ways it could improve these emails and, as a result, revised the list of topics covered and reformatted the emails to make them seem more relevant and reader-friendly, and to be consistent with electronic communications best practices.
Additional resources to meet deadlines for financial disclosure reviews
Changes from the DAEO's assessment include written procedures for PAS recusals, coordination between offices, and more employees outside of the Ethics Office screening for potential conflicts.
1) Approved recommendation fro Ethics training for all Agency employees. 2) Implementing an online Financial Disclosure reporting tool, similar to Integrity.
We are still evaluating the implications of the self-assessment. We made programmatic updates to how advice is rendered, tracking of advice, and how we deliver that advice. We have also worked to develop our training program, including the ongoing development of targeted training.
additional training will be needed for the DAEO postion. Legal assistance will be require as previous DAEO did not have legal experience. Discussed with desk officer the use of external consultation, which in the future Denali Regional Commission.
As a result of the self-assessment, the NRC strengthened our procedures for notifying employees of applicable ethics rules, ethics-training requirements, and financial-disclosure requirements. We also made changes to provide improved access to ethics counselors and to ethics training materials.
Ethics session included at all Board business meetings. Board members and staff not present are required to complete training remotely, working with the DAEO, and confirm that all training is completed.
Improvements were made in organization and in training.
Continuous process improvement.

We included additional ethics reference documentation in our in-briefing packets. We offered additional ways to obtain ethics training. We invited ethics officials from other Federal agencies to provide training to our staff to offer variety in teaching methods, but consistent topical content.
Utilized newly created Senior Employee Management Office (SEMO) by having training and other ethics related articles and announcements published in the quarterly newsletter. SEMO provides OGC a monthly list of those senior employees who are retiring or resigning.
During a ADAEO bi-weekly meeting and self-assessment of our foreign gifts procedures, we realized we were maintaining a number of unprocessed foreign gifts. We inventoried the gifts, processed them through the Foreign Gifts Office located at the Pentagon for appropriate disposition.
Created a system to better track aspects of our ethics program
Updates to improve tracking of financial disclosure forms
Changes in training.
Changes to confidential financial disclosure program.
The agency increased training to all employees. It also created procedures between the ethics officials and HR.
Increased Ethics Training. Developing new financial conflicts of interest screening tools.
IG- DAEO and IG developed process for review of 450 reports of IG filers DAEO - developed new filing system for all filers - established individual files for each filer going back to 2012 for better records management controls.
Updated templates and procedures to ensure the office was providing the most accurate and relevant legal advice.

Programmatic and policy changes (please describe)

Changed substance and tracking of FACA SGE annual training and submission of conflicts forms.
In 2018, CEQ updated its financial disclosure practices, reevaluated which agency personnel should be required to file financial disclosures, and documented the results of the assessment.
Based on current trends in ethics issue identified, updated ethics training for various groups within the agency. Update financial disclosure SOPs to reflect use of Integrity for 278 filers.
Created new intake forms to gather complex factual information regarding PGE and Outside employment. Revisited Contract Audit Manual 2-S103.1 processes for requesting conflict of interest and audit independence assessments and re-emphasized employee and supervisor input.
The agency instituted additional oversight of the Public Financial Disclosure Program and updated the Financial Disclosure Program Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs).
Various DDAEOs reported a variety of changes, most of which related to improvements in tracking mechanisms, implementation of updated SOPs, improved use of technology, incorporation of senior leader messaging, and improved training methodologies. In addition, SOCO has updated its website to make it more user friendly and continues to

<p>update the content to provide more tools for ethics counselors in the field. SOCO is also currently working on a Joint Ethics Regulation re-write that will update policies to reflect recent regulatory changes and current best practices.</p>
<p>Programmatic changes: Agency components continue to work on automating ethics programs for easy information storage, retrieval, and utilization. Examples include: greater use of HHS ethics inter and intranet websites, connecting different databases such as HR employee records and ethics records tracking systems, and implementation of HHS Reimagine initiative throughout ethics program components. Additional program improvements may be recommended on a case-by-case basis. Policy Changes HHS continues to update agency ethics policy based on regulatory updates and changes.</p>
<p>Various components will implement some or all of the following: Programmatic: funding increase for additional staff, enhanced training development and program tracking/documentation, improved procedures, increased use of templates for Form 450 review and IET assignment, consideration of increased personnel needs. Policy: enhanced Form 278 review/certification, enhanced recusal obligations and implementation, enhanced advice and Form 201 tracking.</p>
<p>Timeliness of reviewing and certifying financial disclosure reports. Continued compliance with applicable ethics laws and regulation, including revised OGE Regulations which initiated re-drafting of Department Policy.</p>
<p>At HQ, most significantly, redistribution of administrative ethics work, redistribution of assignments among attorneys, and modified approach to invitational travel at one bureau, new training for confidential filers another bureau began implementing procedures to better track late fee waivers and to review and update guidance, as needed, on an annual basis.</p>
<p>OGE Form 450 filers - reduced the number of filers by requiring employees designated as contract technical stewards who are responsible for contracts valued at \$10M or more to file instead of requiring all contract technical stewards to file. Outside employment approval process - identified process to remove bottlenecks and utilize an IT tool to develop an electronic approval form. Working with IT in FY19 to implement the electronic platform.</p>
<p>OGE conducted an Ethics Program Inspection. As a result of this inspection, the Commission in general evaluated all aspects of the ethics program. OGE provided some guidance on what needed to change. In adherence to the guidance provided by OGE, the Commission has changed a number of things. The Commission now has an official notice of ethical obligations for new potential employees and one for new supervisors. The Commission has implemented a process to track ethics training, which requires Commission Members to sign an Ethics Training Acknowledgement Form.</p>
<p>Changed substance and tracking of FACA SGE annual training and submission of conflicts forms.</p>
<p>In 2018, CEQ updated its financial disclosure practices, reevaluated which agency personnel should be required to file financial disclosures, and documented the results of the assessment.</p>
<p>Based on current trends in ethics issue identified, updated ethics training for various groups within the agency. Update financial disclosure SOPs to reflect use of Integrity for 278 filers.</p>

Created new intake forms to gather complex factual information regarding PGE and Outside employment. Revisited Contract Audit Manual 2-S103.1 processes for requesting conflict of interest and audit independence assessments and re-emphasized employee and supervisor input.
The agency instituted additional oversight of the Public Financial Disclosure Program and updated the Financial Disclosure Program Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs).
Various DDAEOs reported a variety of changes, most of which related to improvements in tracking mechanisms, implementation of updated SOPs, improved use of technology, incorporation of senior leader messaging, and improved training methodologies. In addition, SOCO has updated its website to make it more user friendly and continues to update the content to provide more tools for ethics counselors in the field. SOCO is also currently working on a Joint Ethics Regulation re-write that will update policies to reflect recent regulatory changes and current best practices.
Programmatic changes: Agency components continue to work on automating ethics programs for easy information storage, retrieval, and utilization. Examples include: greater use of HHS ethics inter and intranet websites, connecting different databases such as HR employee records and ethics records tracking systems, and implementation of HHS Reimagine initiative throughout ethics program components. Additional program improvements may be recommended on a case-by-case basis. Policy Changes HHS continues to update agency ethics policy based on regulatory updates and changes.
Various components will implement some or all of the following: Programmatic: funding increase for additional staff, enhanced training development and program tracking/documentation, improved procedures, increased use of templates for Form 450 review and IET assignment, consideration of increased personnel needs. Policy: enhanced Form 278 review/certification, enhanced recusal obligations and implementation, enhanced advice and Form 201 tracking.
Timeliness of reviewing and certifying financial disclosure reports. Continued compliance with applicable ethics laws and regulation, including revised OGE Regulations which initiated re-drafting of Department Policy.
At HQ, most significantly, redistribution of administrative ethics work, redistribution of assignments among attorneys, and modified approach to invitational travel at one bureau, new training for confidential filers another bureau began implementing procedures to better track late fee waivers and to review and update guidance, as needed, on an annual basis.
OGE Form 450 filers - reduced the number of filers by requiring employees designated as contract technical stewards who are responsible for contracts valued at \$10M or more to file instead of requiring all contract technical stewards to file. Outside employment approval process - identified process to remove bottlenecks and utilize an IT tool to develop an electronic approval form. Working with IT in FY19 to implement the electronic platform.
OGE conducted an Ethics Program Inspection. As a result of this inspection, the Commission in general evaluated all aspects of the ethics program. OGE provided some guidance on what needed to change. In adherence to the guidance provided by OGE, the Commission has changed a number of things. The Commission now has an official notice of ethical obligations for new potential employees and one for new supervisors. The

Commission has implemented a process to track ethics training, which requires Commission Members to sign an Ethics Training Acknowledgement Form.

Part 4 Table. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FOR PART 4. Please indicate the question number to which the comment corresponds.

Questions 4 and 5: The ADAEO position was vacant as of 1/1/2019 due to retirement however, the ADAEO performed his duties for half of the reporting period.
#2 The answer is classified #3f The DAEO is a PAS official who provided direct support to the Agency head.
Question 3: DAEO left the employ of CSB during 2018. The Agency Head appointed a new DAEO after 12/31/2018. Question 7: CSB outsources certain HR functions to Dept.of Interior which sends out offer letters to prospective employees. However, this is not an ethics support contract. Question 13: The CSB has a draft written procedure to cover the requirements of 2638.303, 2638.304, and 2638.306. It intends to finalize within a few weeks.
In calendar year 2018, one Deputy Ethics Counselor departed CFTC Ethics and was not replaced however, in the later part of the calendar year, the program gained an Alternate DAEO.
3(f): Number of reporting levels reduction to "1" was formalized in CY 2019.
Question 13 - In practice, CEQ follows all of the procedures.
DTRA does not have written procedures in places regarding the "issuance of ethical obligations in written offers of employment" or "the issuance of ethics notices to new supervisors" because the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) is responsible for issuing these notices on behalf of DTRA.
The agency head has retained the duties of the DAEO. The Chief of Staff engages in ethics for the DRA. While not a federal employee, he helps facilitate contacts between the federal employee, Department of Commerce, and OGE for provision of ethics advice, training, and review of financial disclosure reports.
Q8 - The majority of those DDAEOs indicating additional resources were needed specified the need for more personnel. Q10&11 - Some DDAEO organizations conducted their own self assessments, the results of which were reported to their agency heads and/or to their Staff Judge Advocate/GC. SOCO conducts rotational Program Assist Visits, the results of which are also provided to the SJA/GC for the agency/command, as well as to the DAEO and Secretary. Q13 - The categories for which DDAEO organizations have written policies and procedures varies. At the DAEO level, SOCO has policies for all and is in the process of making them available for DDAEOs to use as templates in crafting their own SOPs to fit their unique structure and needs.
Question 9: These matters were discussed with the Acting General Counsel.
Q.13. Written procedures are in place for most of the identified items, although some components still lack written procedures for issuance of ethics notices. We continue to work towards ensuring compliance throughout the Department.
#9 The Inspector General met with IG ethics staff to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the ethics program in 2018.
5. DOJ has 31 attorneys serving as Deputy Designated Agency Ethics Officials (DDAEOs) in its Bureaus, Divisions and components. In addition, the Departmental Ethics Office

<p>(DEO) in the Justice Management Division (JMD) oversees the Department-wide ethics program and provides direct advice to DOJ's senior leadership, to JMD, and to certain components. DEO's programmatic functions include issuance of Department-wide guidance, providing ethics information, advice and counsel to DDAEOs, preparation of ethics training materials, delivery of ethics training, ethics program reporting, overall management of financial disclosure, and retention of ethics documents.</p>
<p>#5: Please note that the employees identified in this chart include a significant number of part-time Assistant Ethics Counselors (AECs) who work only limited hours on ethics matters as a collateral duty and are not full-time ethics specialists. A number of Bureau and Office ethics programs discontinued utilizing part-time AECs to provide services to their respective ethics program in 2018. #10: Please note that only a limited number of Bureau and Office ethics programs completed self-assessments in 2018.</p>
<p>Q2: Total includes 11,935 seasonal employees. Q6: No for most bureaus, but some including HQ have contractors providing IT support.</p>
<p>4. The position became vacant as of February 1, 2019. The agency is currently recruiting to fill the position.</p>
<p>Question 2 - FDIC continues to downsize from the 2008 financial crisis with the expiration of "term" appointments. Question 6 - Our response on last year's questionnaire should have been yes regarding contractor support of the FDIC e-filing system.</p>
<p>#12 - The Ethics Office also incorporated voting with clickers into AET to assess employee knowledge of ethics rules. Data was later downloaded to use in creating future training sessions.</p>
<p>N/A</p>
<p>3F - The agency head is the DAEO.</p>
<p>Q. 5 - The DC metro area includes Goddard Space Flight Center and NASA OIG located in the Washington, DC area. Q. 6 - Ethics Program Tracking System (EPTS) is supported by contractor personnel.</p>
<p>For question 13--Coordinating with Human Capital to ensure that all information required by 5 CFR 2638.306 is provided timely to new supervisors.</p>
<p>Q13 - All of the written procedures related to the ethics program can be found in the Commission's Ethics Education Plan and Financial Disclosure Policy.</p>
<p>4d. ADEO is a part-time employee working 24 hours/wk - 48 hours/pay period. She devotes all of her time to ethics.</p>
<p>Question 2 - this information is classified</p>
<p>Comment on Question 5: Consistent with OGE's guidance on this year's questionnaire, the NRC's response includes administrative and information-technology personnel who provide program support on a limited or as-needed basis. These employees were not captured in the NRC's response to last year's questionnaire.</p>
<p>Q9 - As a small agency, we are in regular communication with the Chairman on the ethics program.</p>
<p>Question 3d--reflects time DAEO spends on internal OGE ethics program. Question 13-- OGE had a draft procedure for new supervisors but not finalized. OGE had no new supervisors in 2018.</p>

The number of full-time employees as of 31 December 2018 is not publicly releasable information but can be provided to appropriately cleared OGE personnel upon request.
USTR has two ADAEOs who both work part-time
The Board is in the process of updating its Ethics Policy to ensure that all of the procedures above are therein. The Board could not update any of its policies during the sub-quorum period.
13. In person ethics training was provided to new supervisors. Written procedures will be in place for 2019.
Question 13: In early 2019, SBA developed and implemented written procedures for initial ethics training and tracking for non-career appointees in accordance with 5 C.F.R 2638.304
NA
Although no written policy is in place regarding initial ethics training, review of public and confidential reports and post-employment rules, such communication and training occurs.
For #13, USAGM lost significant ethics staffing in 2018, but, toward the end of the year, was also able to recover some of those losses by designating a new ADEAO and new Ethics Officer in addition to the DAEO and Program Coordinator. In 2019, we will be hiring an Ethics Counsel to manage the day-to-day operations of the Ethics Program. With the Counsel onboard, we expect to put in place all remaining written procedures that are currently outstanding.
Q4 : RE ADEAO role expected to be filled as of February 4, 2019. ADAEO role vacant since September 2018.
Although we did not have a written procedure in place for 5 CFR 2638.303 or 5 CFR 2638.306 in practice the Agency has been executing both regulations. We are in the process of drafting written procedures for both of these regulations.
6. The Commission worked with a contractor until November 2018. The contractor provided guidance and advice to the newly appointed DAEO and ADAEO. The contractor was also the initial reviewer of the Confidential Financial Disclosures collected in 2018.
#3F-Per an MOU between HUD and USICH, which OGE is aware of and has a copy of from communications regarding new USICH DAEO designations, the Executive Director of USICH is the USICH DAEO, while HUD's agency ethics officials administer all portions of an ethics program for USICH. Therefore, the number of reporting levels between the DAEO and the agency head is 0.
We will create standing operating procedures regarding the issuance of notice of ethical obligations in written offers of employment, the provision of initial ethics training, and issuance of ethics notice to new supervisors. To date, we rely on the ethics regulations for these requirements, and comply with the regulations as written.
Q15 Table. How many new agency leaders, as defined in 5 C.F.R. 2638.305(a), were required to receive ethics briefings by December 31, 2018? If applicable, please explain why some of the leaders received their briefing beyond the 15-day requirement or have yet to receive their briefing.
Small agency. Briefing was received as soon as possible but within 30 days of appointment.

There is a lag between onboarding, assigning training, training occurring and being reported. All employees take annual ethics training.
One of the PAS appointees was on extended leave so her briefing was delayed until she returned to work. EPA Ethics was not unduly concerned about the delay because the appointee had already signed the Trump Pledge and received new employee ethics orientation when she first joined EPA in January 2017.
The OGE Director was appointed on 7/13/2018, but he did not receive notice from the WH until July 31, 2018. The DAEO granted an extension until 8/2/2018 to complete the briefing required by 2638.305.

Q16 Table. How many employees, including SGEs, were required to receive Initial Ethics Training (IET) by December 31, 2018 (5 C.F.R. 2638.304)? Include employees who were excluded, under 5 C.F.R. 2638.304(a), from the requirement to receive the interactive portion of the IET. If applicable, please explain why some employees received IET beyond the 3-month requirement or have yet to receive IET.

- Three employees did not receive initial ethics training as they are remote employees that were not included in our New Employee Orientation. - Two employees started in December 2018 and went beyond the 3-month requirement due to the shutdown.
1 employee remains on military leave.
1. One employee left his NSF position for a temporary White House Position (approximately two months). He returned to NSF and was picked up by the system as a new entrant because he was not an NSF employee the prior 30 days - notwithstanding there was no break in service. 2. Two employees were not identified timely by the system. There was a programming glitch at the beginning of the year regarding identification of appointment dates. Because two new employees had prior appointments as NSF rotators, the system used that field rather than the "current appointment" date field to determine new entrant employees. The error was discovered on 10/1/18 and both were assigned IET. One completed the day it was assigned and the other completed the training 10 days later. 3. Another employee left NSF as a full-time employee in January 2018 and returned as an expert/consultant in May, 2018. (See continuation in Part 5 Comments).
A combination of the implementation of new procedures and the transition of employees in multiple directorates are the likely cause but it is difficult to identify a single cause. Regardless, we continue to follow-up with employees and their supervisors to ensure that they receive the training.
AAFES hires seasonal/intermittent personnel to work in its stores - approximately 6264 of these departed before receiving training. The remainder were primarily due to deployments/departures before personnel were trained. ECs continue to follow up with delinquencies.
All employees received various written materials and guidance, but the implementation of interactive training was delayed at two bureaus. Most of the delays are attributed to one bureau and due to technological errors that have been corrected. Follow-up pursued with all outstanding employees.

An SGE employee who serves on the Bureau's Academic Research Council (ARC) did not receive IET because he indicated at the start of the ARC meeting that he was resigning from his ARC position immediately and did not participate in the meeting.
Based on the IAA that the Commission has with GSA CABS, the Commission was under the impression that the IET was part of the on-boarding process handled by GSA CABS. During the OGE Ethics Review it became apparent that GSA CABS is not providing IET during their on-boarding.
Cannot confirm at time of submission whether three employees at one location received the training due to a change in personnel administering the orientation. Could not confirm at time of submission if one employee at additional location received due to a change in personnel.
Certain DOI employees did not receive IET within the 3-month requirement due to a variety of factors across certain Bureau and Office ethics programs including: a lack of ethics program resources, a breakdown in communication and coordination with HR, ethics program staff turnover leading to the loss of institutional memory, failure to develop and implement appropriate training and tracking procedures and practices, the transition to a new online training platform, and the partial government shutdown. For the same reasons, certain Bureau and Office ethics programs are not able to accurately identify the number of employees who actually received IET in 2018. Therefore, the 1,865 employees identified above as having not received IET as of today may have received IET, but this can not be confirmed at this time. DOI Leadership has made a significant investment across the DOI Ethics Program which will help ensure that Bureau and Office ethics programs timely provide IET in 2019.
Commands reported that some employees did not attend the required training. They are aware of the discrepancies and are actively working on ensuring the employees complete the training.
Data based on input from field units located around the world reasons for discrepancies vary from location to location, e.g. tracking system changes, personnel deployed.
Due to staff turnover in 2018, there were gaps in tracking training. The figures provided may not accurately reflect all employees who received training.
Due to the ongoing establishment of administrative ethics procedures at the time, the two employees did not receive their IET during the required 3-month period. They subsequently received their IET and all new employees now receive IET within the 3-month period.
Due to various personnel and administrative reasons, a small number of new hires missed the programmed block of training. We continue to pursue those required to complete the necessary training.
Employee received regularly scheduled annual ethics training the month following expiration of the 90-day period.
Employees did not respond to our request for completion and supervisory intervention was required.
Employees had difficulty navigating the Learning Portal, getting a Learning Portal account activated in a timely manner, and failed to successfully press all the buttons necessary to certify their training attendance.

<p>Employees were in extended training, on medical or military leave during the 90 day period. Some employees resigned or were terminated prior to 90 days prior to ethics training.</p>
<p>HR failed to track the on-line training.</p>
<p>In a few instances, official duties and extensive official travel interfered with an employee's ability to attend monthly initial ethics training. Employees are, however, provided an initial ethics orientation on their first day of employment that provides a summary of the Standards of Conduct and instructions for contacting the ethics office.</p>
<p>Inadvertent miscommunication in part by changes in leadership.</p>
<p>Initial ethics training at USDA is assigned and tracked using AgLearn, USDA's e-learning system. During late 2018, the learning system went down for significant system upgrades. The system and the report were unavailable from September 2018 through March 2019. Without the report, employees could not complete the training and OE employees were unable to track and notify employees of the requirement. The system is now working properly and employees are notified on a regular basis of the training requirement.</p>
<p>Insufficient collaboration between ethics offices and human resources personnel.</p>
<p>Like many other federal agencies, EPA was affected by the government shutdown, which occurred at the end of the calendar year. Some employees simply could not take their ethics training during the shutdown period. In addition, EPA's learning platform suddenly changed just before the launch of the EPA Ethics training, causing widespread confusion. The new system created tracking errors and miscues that contributed to delays in notifying and tracking training.</p>
<p>One center had HR personnel changes mid-year, and scheduled a New Orientation Training Session at the end of December which did not occur because of the government shutdown. That center has reschedule all to complete training shortly. Another center reviewed their process and lapses were identified so the process was changed on June 1st. All training was properly captured after June 1st, but still working on capturing the required initial ethics training for the new personnel requiring IET prior to June 1st.</p>
<p>One employee completed IET one day late, one completed IET two days late, two employees completed IET 3 days late, and one employee completed IET 8 days late. All five employees received email reminders 30, 14, and 7 days prior to their due dates. Emails were sent thereafter until training was completed. Two employees were unable to complete IET within 90 days because, during the latter part of 2018, the EEOC changed IET vendors and the EEOC's IET was down for 5 weeks. One employee was unable to complete the training within 90 days because of the partial government shutdown during the last 10 days of 2018.</p>
<p>One employee required to receive initial ethics training never on-boarded in 2018.</p>
<p>One field office has employees who are at remote locations. Employees on military or administrative leaves of absence.</p>
<p>One Operating Administration reported their HR office changed the process for identifying new employees who file and providing names to the Ethics Office. Several people were not timely identified. This has been remedied, and the OA is following up with employees to collect training certificates.</p>

Other agency programs or exigencies prevented a few individuals from completing initial training within the 3-month requirement. Some new employees also left shortly after their appointment and were not able to partake of offered training.
Our notification system just put in place which generates an automatic notice to the employee that they are past due on training was obviously insufficient. We are working with HR to implement additional notification requirements to ensure this does not occur next year. OGC will be involved in the notification process.
scheduling difficulties
Some employees departed employment before the 90 period. Many employees do not have routine computer access and must rely on written materials. With 236 stores world-wide, it remains challenge to track each employee. DeCA DAEO anticipates excluding non-supervisory position at or below the GS-8 grade level from the interactive portion of initial ethics training and providing written materials as required.
Some employees left prior to the 90 day deadline, other employees left before the end of the calendar year but before the 90 day deadline. Additionally, remotely located employees with limited computer access did not have the opportunity to complete the training in a timely manner. Other reasons include noncompliance with instructions, miscommunication, and many special government employees being activated in short timeframes to respond to national health emergencies (i.e., opioid crisis response and natural disasters).
Some employees would register for the online training, but not complete taking it.
The agency ethics program was understaffed and took steps to add a part time re-employed annuitant and hire a full time ethics counsel, with plans to add a part time paralegal.
The agency's IET is given a couple of times each year as part of new employee orientation. Sometimes, for good reason, new employees may not be able to attend certain parts/sessions of their new employee orientation. When this happens, new employees are required to attend subsequent sessions of the employee orientation they missed. When new employees are unable to attend the IET during their new employee orientation, they can take the agency's annual ethics training instead, as the annual training covers all ethics subjects presented during the IET and more. All employees are required to complete the IET or the annual ethics training. However, according to the agency's training department, five (5) employees did not complete either the IET or the annual ethics training during calendar year 2018. These five (5) employees will be given sixty (60) days from the date this report is submitted (May 14, 2019) to either attend an IET session or complete the 2018 annual ethics training.
The government shutdown complicated completion, tracking and documentation of IET as of year-end 2018. This is the best data available. Some year-end IET was cancelled due to the government shutdown and in order for employees to prepare for and facilitate it. Geographical and budgetary limitations can cause occasional delays in delivery of IET. All outstanding IET is being addressed and rescheduled for completion in the first quarter of 2019.
The reason for some Agency employees not receiving their IET before the 90 days relates to a disconnect in Agency processes - specifically with respect to Agency Ethics Officials receiving notification from the Agency's Office of Human Resources (OHR) about when a

<p>new employee was appointed and scheduled to begin at the Agency. That disconnect has been rectified in that Agency Ethics Officials have been added to OHR's list of Agency Officials who receive a notice when a new employee has been appointed and when they are scheduled to begin service. This helps Agency Ethics Officials track when IET is needed so that the Agency can be fully compliant with 5 CFR 2638.304. Please note that Response includes all employees who required Initial Ethics Training (IET). Past questionnaire responses have included only SGEs requiring IET.</p>
<p>There is a lag between onboarding, assigning training, training occurring and being reported. All employees take annual ethics training</p>
<p>This number is larger than anticipated due in part to the lapse in appropriations. Ethics officials continue to follow up both with the individual employees and with management to seek compliance and, if necessary, appropriate administrative action against those that are non-compliant. Some have left the department. Some of the discrepancy results from an inability to extricate IET requirements from other training policies (e.g., orientation for all employees new to a component, even if not new to DHS). Programmatic updates are underway to ensure greater veracity in the data as well as strengthen the compliance with IET requirements.</p>
<p>Those employees failed to attend the agency's required quarterly New Employee Onboarding (NEO) Phase II training, which includes a live initial ethics training ("IET"). Please note that all PBGC employees are given the agency Ethics Handbook upon onboarding and may contact an ethics counselor for questions/guidance.</p>
<p>Three of the employees and their managers overlooked the requirement and due date one employee misunderstood the due date and one employee was at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center immediately after hire and unable to access the training until after the due date.</p>
<p>Two new employees lacked access to an NRC computer or PIV card during their first three months of employment, which prevented them from completing training during the required timeframe. A third employee had difficulties establishing the web-based account necessary to take the online training course. The fourth employee was a rehired annuitant who was not notified to take the training when he returned to the NRC. In all four cases, however, the new employees met their training requirements soon after the three-month period ended.</p>
<p>Two of our new entrants were SGEs who were employed by the Department of State during their tenure at the FLRA. The two new SGEs received FLRA annual training.</p>
<p>We have a very small ethics staff consisting of the DAEO (and a newly appointed ADAEO). The DAEO was on maternity leave when the employee started and the ADAEO had been appointed for less than a month. The initial ethics training was given to the employee within weeks of the DAEO's return from maternity leave.</p>

Q19 Table. Did the head of the agency complete either initial ethics training and/or annual ethics training in 2018?

No (specify why)

<p>scheduling issues.</p>
<p>Head of the Agency left before the end of the year.</p>

We provided our annual ethics training in December 2018. Many employees' plans to complete the training by the end of the year were frustrated by the government shutdown. Several commissioners and others who had not completed the training did so after the government reopened. To avoid this in the future, we will provide our annual training earlier in the calendar year.
The Chair of the Commission anticipated being replaced prior to December 2018. She was not - then the government shutdown occurred - and despite frequent reminders she did not take the training.
The Office of Chairman remained vacant throughout 2018.
The Chairman was scheduled to receive his annual ethics training in late December 2018. The scheduled training was canceled due to a lapse in appropriations which resulted in a partial government shutdown.

Not applicable (specify why)

Pursuant to section 11(b)(2)(B) of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, the Chairperson of CIGIE is elected from among the Inspector General members of CIGIE and, accordingly, receives his or her initial ethics training and/or annual ethics training from his or her employing agency.
The head of the Agency had not been confirmed in 2018.
The Special Assistant for Commissary Operations' regular assignment is as Director of the Navy Exchange System (NEX). He completes required ethics training and filing of the 278 through NEX.
Our Agency Head is, by statute, a Department of Commerce employee. I know he received his initial ethics training but he is reported under Commerce not the Denali Commission
USTDA's nominee for agency head was awaiting Senate confirmation during the reporting period.

Q20 Table. Required Annual Ethics Training. If applicable, please explain discrepancies between the number of employees who were required to receive training and the number of employees who received training

Please be advised that all of the Bureau's contracting officers as described in 41 USC 2101 are confidential filers. Therefore, they were included in the data for Confidential filers.
CSB ethics staff made several efforts to ensure that required training was completed by 12/31/18. Unfortunately, two people did not complete training by that deadline. However, they have completed training.
scheduling issues.
Q20(d): Ten (10) employees who file the CFTC Form 185, "Certification of Compliance with the Commission's Conduct Regulation," separated from the CFTC in 2018 prior to completing annual ethics training. Three (3) CFTC Form 185 filers were on extended leave. A total of thirteen (13) CFTC 185 filers did not receive annual ethics training by December 31, 2018.

Individuals who did not complete their annual training were those who left the agency (either because of retirement, resignation, etc.) before they could partake of offered annual ethics training.
One employee departed CEQ prior to receiving scheduled annual training in October 2018.
The Agency has given the employees above who did not complete the annual ethics training sixty (60) days from the date this report is submitted (until May 14, 2019) to complete the 2018 annual ethics training.
The employees who did not receive training were on extended leave.
Filers departed DISA or retired prior to completing the training
One employee was out on extended maternity leave from July 2018 to January 2019.
One new SES was unaware of the training requirement and failed to receive training. Many of these assigned filers were removed before the end of the year as they either changed position or left the agency. When ensuring all are trained we can only review those names that are in the system. We were very close to 100% for training, but this number includes those that left before the end of the year that were not trained.
A very small percentage of confidential filers did not complete their annual training. Some of those left the agency prior to completing training.
Due to staff turnover in 2018, there were gaps in tracking training. The figures provided may not accurately reflect all employees who received training.
Data based on input from field units located around the world reasons for discrepancies vary from location to location
Failure to ensure the employees received annual training.
Commands reported that the discrepancies are due to issues such as extended leave, travel, or deployments. Commands are working on rectifying the deficiencies.
Of those that were not trained some received the training in early 2019, some were deployed/on extended leave, and some departed.
3 Confidential filers were on extended sick leave 2 confidential filers were on extended military leave.
Employees on medical, administrative, and military leaves of absence.
Two filers left the agency before the end of the year, and three were with a component impacted by the furlough who have now completed their AET. Regarding the remaining filers, again some of them were impacted by the furlough and have now completed AET or transferred to another agency before the end of the year others were on extended leave, or activated for military service, or special government employees who did not participate in committee activities.
Discrepancies were due to many issues including the departure of personnel before the end of the calendar year, extended absences (e.g., military or sick leave), as well as most notably the lapse in appropriate at the end of the year, which prevent employees from complete the training in a timely fashion. Ethics officials continue to follow up both with the individual employees and with management to seek compliance and, if necessary, appropriate administrative action against those that are noncompliant.
HUD- Some employees left the Agency prior to the offering of training. Other employees completed the training after the 12/31/2018 deadline due to the partial government shutdown. IG- In addition to the partial government shutdown, employees had trouble

navigating the Learning Portal and successfully documenting training that they completed and as a result and did not get credit for the training they attended.
Extended leave and military deployment, some employees left DOJ prior to attending training. The government shutdown cancelled some year end training sessions and has complicated documentation/tracking of annual training. Some make up sessions are still being held. All outstanding 2018 annual training is being pursued, completed and documented in the first quarter of 2019.
Some filers had separated before end of year, are on military leave, and on medical leave.
Due to the lack of appropriation funding, the Department was shutdown, so many employees were unable to comply with the annual ethics training requirement.
Certain DOI employees did not receive required annual training due to a variety of factors across certain Bureau and Office ethics programs including: a lack of ethics program resources, ethics program staff turnover leading to the loss of institutional memory, failure to develop and implement appropriate training and tracking procedures and practices, the transition to a new online training platform, and the partial government shutdown. Please note that certain employees across the Bureaus and Offices did not receive annual ethics training in 2018 due to extended medical and military leave, detail, resignation, and/or retirement. DOI Leadership has made a significant investment across the DOI Ethics Program which will help ensure that Bureau and Office ethics programs timely provide annual ethics training in 2019.
Employees on extended sick leave, administrative leave, or military duty
Delays due to government shutdown, employees on extended leave, or military deployment.
54 terminees retired or resigned without completing annual training. 27 278 filers remained to be trained at the end of the year. Per direction of VA Chief of Staff, annual training for SES must now be conducted in person. Not all SES were able to make the scheduled sessions and individual make-up sessions were not offered.
One PAS appointee resigned in July 2018 prior to the release of our online annual ethics training so did not take the training in 2018. The other discrepancies are due to a variety of issues, including: the government shutdown at the end of the calendar year precluded employees from being able to take their training problems with the new e-learning platform that aggravated our ability to assign the training tasks to employees and then track their completion and several office/regional reorganizations that caused some confusion about who was responsible for notifying and tracking training completion.
Thirty (30) employees who were required to complete annual training did not. Of the 30, seven were on extended medical leave 13 completed training the first week in January 2019 (will be counted as 2019 training) and 10 outright failed to comply.
Some employees were on extended leave, deployed in the military, maternity leave and/or detailed to another agency.
One individual's term expired during the December 2018-January 2019 furlough period and thus could not complete annual training by the end of his term.
One confidential filer retired without completing the assigned annual ethics training.
Separations, Extended Medical Leave.

6 278e filer left their positions before taking annual ethics training. 8 450 filers are on extended sick or military leave. 1 employee took the training in 2019 due to administrative oversight.
Due to the government shutdown and belief that position ending - two employees did not complete ethics training by end of December 2018.
Employee was on leave for last quarter of CY2018 during which the agency conducts its annual ethics training. Employee subsequently left the agency in the start of the new year.
1 on LWOP almost all of 2018. Separated from Federal Service in early 2019. 2 SGE did not take training before end of year, but will before their first meeting of 2019. One center had 3 employees who did not take training. Action is being taken.
Three employees were on medical leave during the training period. Seven additional employees did not complete training prior to the furlough.
Two filers were on extended medical leave and one was on extended military leave. None of the three were available to complete the annual ethics training.
The Public Financial Disclosure filer who did not complete the training was on extended leave and then retired on 12/31/18. The Confidential Financial Disclosure filer that did not complete the training has been out of the office on extended medical leave.
A 278 filer and a 450 filer had catastrophic illnesses during the year and were unable to take training.
The numbers reported above are percentages rather than numeric counts of filers. Actual numbers are made available to cleared OGE personnel when required. Employees still in covered positions have continued to complete annual training after Dec. 31, 2018. There are a variety of operational and administrative reasons filers did not complete training on time.
Due to the partial government shutdown, launches of employees for NTSB investigations, and medical leave, some employees were unable to complete annual ethics training during 2018. We continue to work with those employees to complete the interactive training for 2018 AET.
There were five public filers who did not complete annual ethics training in 2018. Two of these filers have since taken the 2018 training course and the remaining three filers have been notified that they need to complete as soon as possible. There were 45 confidential filers who by year's end had not completed training. Approximately half of these filers have since completed training and the remaining have been notified that they must complete training as soon as possible.
Two OGE278e filer were and continue to be on extended leave.
One individual was out on extended leave. returned in January and completed her report in January.
- Six 278 filers left the agency before annual training. - Two 278 filers transitioned to non-filing positions. - One filer has yet to complete training. - Fifty-six 450 filers departed the agency - Eight 450 filers transitioned into non-filing positions - Thirty-four 450 filers did not complete the report due to the shutdown.
Employees are given multiple options of dates and times to attend live annual ethics training by year end. For employees who cannot attend the live session, the ethics office also offers an interactive, self-paced training option to complete the training

<p>requirement. Given the multiple training opportunities provided by the ethics office, an employee's failure to complete annual ethics training is more an individual conduct issue rather than an oversight by the ethics office. Note: A small number of employees were on extended leave during the training season and completed their training in early 2019.</p>
<p>1 employee did not complete training on schedule due to extended leave. The 2nd employee did not complete training on schedule due to medical issues. Both completed make-up training in early 2019. Agency trained 1 part-time employee (not SGE) per DAEO's policy.</p>
<p>DAEO was not informed of 278 new entrant until late December 2018 although he received pay raise in June 2018.</p>
<p>PCLOB staff complete ethics training when they onboard and on an annual basis.</p>
<p>One political appointee on detail to the WH One career employee did not attend the annual training.</p>
<p>Employees were on annual, medical or military leave. A few employees retired prior to the end of year without completing the training.</p>
<p>NA</p>
<p>Two are employees on medical/maternity leave one employee (who is now a former employee) was on administrative leave and one employee is on active military duty.</p>
<p>One filer was excused due to illness and a period of overseas travel the other four were non-compliant after direct efforts to reach them and communications through their supervisory chain. All were provided with written materials to cover the training.</p>
<p>Annual ethics training for those unavailable for earlier training opportunities were scheduled in late December 2018. The scheduled training for public filers was canceled due to a lapse in appropriations which resulted in a partial government shutdown. Confidential filers were unable to participate in interactive training for the same reason.</p>
<p>Four Postal 450 filers were sent several reminder emails to complete training but did not do so. The Ethics Office informed Postal leadership of their failure to record their training.</p>
<p>The former ADAEO had tracked the training information, but has left the commission as of March 29 this year. Commission staff has not been able to locate those records. Apparently that information was not entered electronically or scanned so no electronic records are available either.</p>
<p>For public filers - 1 filer qualified to file midway through the year, but whom the Ethics Office was not aware of until 2019. We are working on procedures with our Office of Human Resources (signed Memorandum of Agreement in March 2019 to do so) and Program Offices to improve such notifications to the Ethics Office. For the confidential financial disclosure filing - 2 retired and 1 was on extended admin leave.</p>
<p>The one employee who did not receive annual ethics training was out on extended sick leave, then immediately separated from the government before attending annual ethics training.</p>

Q21 Table. Did you provide annual ethics training to other employees not otherwise required by regulation to receive training (i.e., any other employees not covered by the chart above)? If Yes above, please specify who:

<p>1,516 employees who do not file financial disclosure reports.</p>
--

1147 employees who do not file financial disclosure reports completed interactive non-filer ethics training in 2018.
17 employees who are in position where a conflict of interest may exist, e.g., financial management, contracts, admin. officers (HR), IT security.
ABMC provides annual ethics training to all GS employees.
Administrative Assistant Deputy Secretary General, CULCON
Administrative officers/personnel received targeted ethics training. Also, anyone willing to attend was encouraged to attend.
All agency employees
All agency employees received ethics training except for employees on military or extended sick leave.
all agency employees.
All agency employees.
All ASBCA employees receive annual ethics training. In 2018, 14 employees who were not 278/450 filers received training.
All DISA employees are required to complete annual ethics training
All employees may attend annual ethics training. Other categories of employees who received ethics training in 2018 include, but are not limited to, office administrative staff, interns, volunteers, fellows, those preparing to retire or in certain agency candidacy training programs, and those newly assuming certain positions (e.g., new supervisors).
All employees receive ethics training and updates.
All employees received annual ethics training.
All employees recieved annual ethics training.
All FLRA employees are invited to attend the annual ethics training that we provide to individuals who are required to attend that training. We do not keep records reflecting the attendance of individuals who are not required to receive the training.
All Madison employees participate in an annual video review of ethics provided via the OGE website.
All NLRB employees.
All OGE staff.
All other agency employees.
All other employees.
All staff
All staff that attended the Commission's 2018 Annual Meeting
All TVA employees are required to take annual ethics training. Contractors are not required to take the training but are strongly encouraged to do so.
Annual training is available to all agency employees on a voluntary basis.
Annual training is offered on a voluntary basis to the entire agency.
Annual training was provided to roughly 40 non-federal members of the Commission staff.
Because the agency is only 30 FTEs, I invite all employees, detailees and interns to attend the training.
Category buyers in Sales, Store Managers, Zone Managers, contract specialists, and those attending accountability classes at DeCA Headquarters. We attempt to have at least 1

hour dedicated ethics training for all courses taught at DeCA Headquarters, regardless of the employee's position.
CEQ provides annual ethics training agency-wide to all personnel including detailees, interns, and contractors.
Certain agencies within the Department either required or encouraged all employees to take AET. Other agencies extended the requirement to contractors, interns and fellows.
Certain Bureau and Office ethics programs provided annual training to all employees of their respective Bureau or Office.
Classroom instruction (in person), written materials, other specify below - staff meetings - DAEO
Detailees
Employees in certain regional offices.
Employees who were required by their supervisor.
Entire staff.
Ethics training is mandatory for all new employees at the Agency regardless of filing status.
Ethics Training is required of all FCC employees.
Ethics training provided to other interested employees
Ethics training provided to the entire NSC staff, including detailees from other agencies.
Ethics Training was provided to audiences of USDA summer college and law school interns to raise their awareness of these rules.
Every non-required employee of the CSB was required to complete annual ethics training. The number of employees required to complete such training was 22. The number that completed such training was 22.
EXIM requires ALL employees to attend annual ethics training- some EXIM contractors attended on their own volition.
General Staff as required per the Agency
GS-13 & below designated by management for annual ethics training.
Headquarters USAF Senior Leader and executive staff
Human Resources, Plant Managers, Supervisors, United States Inspection Service, and Postal Police
I also provided annual ethics training to the Agency's personal service contractors.
In 2018, we provided one hour of in-person ethics training for all Board employees.
In addition to employees who are required by regulation, IMLS provides annual ethics training to all IMLS staff employees (agency-wide).
In addition to training all of our financial disclosure filers we strive to provide live ethics training to all of our employees. In addition to training our 4400 filers, we trained over 4100 non-filers. All of our filers attended ethics training and more than 93% of all of our employees (filers and non-filers) attended live ethics training in 2018. Due to the federal government shutdown 3 of our ethics training sessions were not able to be held. As a result there were 100 non-filers in our Washington headquarters that did not receive ethics training in 2018.
Individuals who are not required to attend annual ethics training are welcome at all ethics training sessions. We had individuals participate in multiple annual ethics training sessions, even though the employees were not required to do so.

Many EPA Deputy Ethics Officials require that all of their employees take the annual training regardless of whether they are financial disclosure filers or not.
Many of our divisions request that everyone in the division attend annual ethics training. We track only the ones required by regulation or NSF-wide policy.
MCC requires all employees to take Ethics Training
NEH provides annual ethics training to all agency employees, including those not otherwise required by regulation to receive training.
Office of Public Affairs, Command Field Operations Officers
One center required all civil servants to complete annual ethics training. Additionally some centers required interns, and other groups to attend live training sessions.
OPIC requires all employees-regardless of their position-to receive annual ethics training. This includes student interns who work for three to four months.
Other employees in trusted positions who are covered by the filing requirements in 5 C.F.R. 2638.307. As a financial services agency, many DFAS employees have access protected financial data. Many of those employees also take online ethics training. Examples include GPC card holder, employees with internal systems access, employees with visibility over pay processes, debt collections and similar.
Our in-person annual training was available to all employees.
PCLOB staff complete annual ethics training.
Presidio Trust Board of Directors
Primarily Acquisition personnel and Senior leader staff/security personnel.
Provided annual training to all agency personnel.
Provided ethics training not only to Federal direct-hire employees, but also to contract employees working at USADF's HQ in DC, locally hired personal service contractors working in USADF's field offices in Africa, and to local employees of USADF's partner organizations in Africa which have been awarded cooperative grants with USADF.
Purchase card holders, supervisor-directed non-filer employees
See #23
SGEs who are not required to file annual financial disclosure forms received written annual training materials.
Some commands require all of its employees to complete annual ethics training.
Some components and offices of DOJ require annual ethics training for all employees whether or not they are financial disclosure filers and in addition to IET they may have received during the year. In prior Questionnaires, DOJ has included many of those employees within the response to part d. of Question 20. However, to better reflect annual ethics training required by 2638.307(a), the training provided to those employees is instead described in response to Question 23, below. DOJ attorneys must receive 1 hour of annual ethics training as a component of Professionalism Training. Most DOJ attorneys are financial disclosure filers, but not all are. The number of attorneys who receive ethics training under this annual professionalism requirement is approximately 10,000.
Some offices trained all employees.
some Operating Administrations routinely train all employees
Staff of each Board Member.
Student volunteers

Supervisors, all employees within certain commands within DLA and those that requested training tailored to their offices. Several thousand other employees received training.
Support staff.
The agency makes annual ethics training available to all employees.
The Director DCAA requires all DCAA employees to receive Annual Ethics Training.
The entire agency is required to receive annual ethics training per NGA policy.
The NRC made the online versions of its training for public and confidential filers available to all employees through the agency's iLearn training portal. At least 15 employees voluntarily took either the public- or confidential-filer training during 2018.
The Office of the Vice President requires all employees to participate in annual ethics training. In addition, the Office of the Vice President provides initial and annual ethics training to detailees and assigned personnel from other agencies.
The previous DAEO provided training on ethical use of the government equipment, purchasing cards, government vehicle, etc.
The training is available to all employees through our agency learning system.
There are 14 employees. I provided training to all of them.
Training is available and provided to all Education employees whether required by regulations to receive training or not.
Training was given to the ADAEO and to the third and final civil servant in our agency.
VA requires annual ethics training for all employees.
Various employees in non-covered positions who, at the invitation of their Office Directors (Deputy Ethics Officials), attended in-person ethics training.
We offer annual ethics training to all employees. Probably 50 or so non-filers attended the annual training (Webinar). Although we track attendance electronically, we do not specifically monitor or calculate many non-filers attend the training.
We opened the annual ethics training to all agency employees.
We provide annual ethics training to every employee at SIGAR regardless of filing status.
We provided interactive training to 503 employees who were not required to receive annual ethics training.
We provided training to 8 staff members and members of our Advisory Council who are not required to complete annual ethics training.
We require every agency employee to attend annual ethics training.
We required that all FHFA and FHFA-OIG employees receive annual ethics training.
Yes, all agency employees receive annual ethics training even if not required to file financial disclosure reports.

Q23 Table. Which groups did you target for additional, specialized ethics training? Specify Other.

Our locally hired personal service contractors working in USADF's field offices in Africa, and local employees of USADF's partner organizations in Africa receive specialized ethics training tailored to ethical issues they would have in furthering USADF's mission.
ABMC Commissioners

Ethics officials provided specialized training to staff in several of the Board's divisions.
Interns and "Graduate Fellows " Retiring Employees Officers interested in Hatch Act.
Reviewers of financial disclosure forms
Category buyers in Sales, Store Managers, Zone Managers, and those attending accountability classes at DeCA Headquarters. We attempt to have at least 1 hour dedicated ethics training for all courses taught at DeCA Headquarters.
All new Supervisors in grades GS-13 and above.
We provide live ad hoc ethics training to a wide variety of internal organizations as well as outside professional organizations composed primarily of DoD personnel.
We provide training to Contracting Officer Representatives (CORs), Defense Attaches, and Agency affiliated Non-Federal entities (i.e., Blacks in Government, Federally Employed Women, etc.).
Numerous different sections requested specialized or tailored training that the OGC provided. Some commands mandated all employees receive live training. Several Procurement/IT offices received additional training at the request of their leaders.
Employees in all USDA subagencies received training tailored to their specific mission in a variety of formats including all-employee meetings, Ethics Moment presentations and VTC/webinars.
Selected employees with duties with regard to the decennial census, overseas investigations, procurement, and minority business development.
Headquarters USAF executive staff Air National Guard division specific
Inspectors general, congressional fellows, senior official staffs
The Vice Chief of Naval Operations requires that all Flag Officers and their staffs receive annual ethics training. Additionally the Secretariate level Public Affairs Office received specialized ethics and fraud training.
Some DDAEO organizations provide training to all organization employees. Additionally, training is usually provided to Senior Leader aides, spouses, security personnel, and staff members. Prior to the November 2018 elections, DoD SOCO provided all Schedule C employees in the Office of the Secretary of Defense with additional training on the Hatch Act.
Specialized ethics training was provided for many categories of personnel at DHS in 2018, these included, but were not limited to political appointees, those involved in trade, investigators or agents, new instructors, supervisors, inspectors, new commanders (USCG), all enlisted personnel entering military duty, certain spouses (e.g., Flag Officer)
Antitrust Division: paralegals. Criminal Division: Personnel with overseas duty stations. Exec Office of US Attorneys: Ethics Advisors Conference, US Attorney Leadership, Ethical Interaction with Contractors. DEA: employees approved for outside employment, attendees of retirement seminars. FBI: Forensic Accountants, Legal Attaches assigned to US Embassies. Office of Justice Programs: FACA members. Tax Division: Section meetings. US Marshals Svc: Operational employees. DOJ attorneys must receive 1 hour of annual ethics training as a component of Professionalism Training. Administrative and Executive Officers received targeted ethics training. Many DOJ components and offices require all employees to attend annual ethics training independent of financial disclosure status or whether they are an attorney, and in addition to IET and other ethics training they may have received during the year.

new attorneys, senior department personnel, grant managers, non-career employees, and investigators
Management Officials, Embassy Leadership, Grants Officers, Political Appointees, and on an Adhoc basis as needed.
Certain Bureau and Office OGE 278e filers and Targeted Hatch Act Training for certain Bureau and Office employees.
Some bureaus provided training to all agency personnel, but system does not allow a check in that category AND other categories. At HQ, Hatch Act guidance provided to all employees, including targeted Hatch Act guidance to political appointees ethics training to personal services contractors, and specialized training to one office on working with contractors and OGE 450 filing designations. At one bureau, specialized training to an office on ethics issue related to attendance at conferences and similar events. At another bureau, optional Hatch Act seminar for those interested in political activities and related ethics issues, Bank Information Technology examiners, examiners in field officers during an ethics official visit.
VA researchers, compliance staffs, employees who work with VA statutory non-profit corporations
Designated Federal Officers for FACAs, specific offices or groups upon request.
Schedule C employees
We provide a one-hour ethics training for new mediators, after they take training for new employees. this training is provided two times per year. In 2018, we also provided a one-our training session for new managers.
Executive Assistants to the Chairman/Commissioner Offices and other staff assistants in Head Offices.
All agency personnel were targeted for training on Social Media, Hatch Act, Holiday Gifts. Political Appointees were targeted for training on Misuse of Position, Hatch Act, Social Media, Gifts and Meetings and Access.
Pathway interns, managers, senior leaders, non-career appointees.
Targeted training for new filers, as well as conservation and preservation staff. Additionally provided training at various field locations for all staff at location.
All employees receive annual training. We also provided tailored executive training for senior management.
Honors Attorneys, Professional Exchange Detailees, Summer Interns, Pledge Signers who are not PAS, and the Chairman's Confidential Assistant.
Executive Protection Unit (EPU), Director's staff, Office of Policy, Operational Personnel
Commissioners' offices and employees departing the agency (for whom we provided post-employment training)
Specialized training for those employees taking part in outside employment/outside activities.
We met with each Division to explain the basis for the 450 filing requirement, which included a review of 18 U.S.C. 208, the financial conflict statute. USDS received additional training. ADAEO attended staff meetings periodically to cover different topics in the standards.
PAS and Schedule C personnel.

Provided to those seeking post government employment specialized training for OGE 450 and 278e reviewers.
Specialized SES training, regarding the Use of Employee Time Joint IG Ethics Presentation Entrance on Duty Initial Ethics Orientation, Administrative Investigations Symposium and New Supervisor Orientation.
Overseas Staff, Special Assistants, Human Resource Specialists, and Political Appointees Programs staff.
PCLOB provides SGE-specific advice to SGEs.
New OGE Form 278e Public Financial Disclosure report filers received a one-on-one ethics briefing with the ADAEO. Also, when requested by agency leaders, specialized ethics refresher training was delivered during staff meetings.
The Chairman and Commissioners
The White House Counsel's Office provides additional and customized ethics training to individuals and offices within the Executive Office of the President, to include interns, spouses of senior officials, volunteers, etc.

Part 5 Table. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FOR PART 5. Please indicate the question number to which the comment corresponds.

2-person Micro Small Agcy-No New Hires in 2018
Question 20: There were eight individuals who were on long-term medical leave at the end of 2018 who were required to participate in annual ethics training. Seven of these individuals have since returned to work and completed annual ethics training in early 2019. Four other employees completed annual ethics training in early 2019. There were 10 people who had not completed annual ethics training when the Bureau submitted its annual questionnaire to OGE. The Bureau's Ethics Office sent each of those individuals the 2018 annual ethics interactive training materials, as well as the 14 General Principles OGE Pamphlet, the Criminal Conflicts of Interest Summary, the Standards of Ethical Conduct Summary, the CFPB Supplemental Ethics Regulations, and instructions on how to contact agency ethics officials. Notwithstanding these 10 individuals, approximately 99% of Bureau employees who were required to attend annual ethics training did so. Additional Comment for Question 23: The Bureau offered specialized training on the Hatch Act to all Bureau employees. In addition, we offered specialized training on gift acceptance under 31 U.S.C. 1353 for the Bureau's Office of External Affairs.
#16/16a The answers are classified #17 All new employees receive interactive ethics training. #20 The answers are classified. #20 If applicable response. The officers who did not complete the AET in a timely manner generally are those who are on a leave of absence or in operational environments (typically overseas) where they are unable to complete in a timely manner.
Question # 20: All CPSC contracting officers are designated as confidential OGE Form 450 filers. Hence, we have reported "0" in the "Other" category.
Question No. 23: offered and provided specialized hatch act training to staff.
16: The number of employees listed requiring IET includes only new employees of the agency, and not detailees assigned to the agency. 20: The number employees listed requiring annual training includes both agency employees and detailees assigned to the agency who file financial disclosure reports with the agency. The number does not

include detailees assigned to the agency who filed financial disclosure reports with their detailing agency. Additionally, the number does not include employees whose attendance at annual training was captured as an IET in response to 16. 21: Annual ethics training is made available to detailees assigned to the agency who are the responsibility of their detailing agency's ethics program.
For question 20, CEQ counted a detailee whose requirement to file arises from her position at CEQ. This person received annual training at CEQ.
None.
For question 16, the answer is not reportable pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 424. The Agency did provide ethics training to 100% of new hires.
20. This year, the Air Force trained more individuals than were required to be trained because many of our Major Commands opted to provide training above and beyond the mandatory trainees. Since both the former Secretary of Defense and the current Acting Secretary of Defense have placed an increased emphasis on ethics training within all levels of the Department, many Commanders within the Air Force have taken that message seriously and opted to train beyond their mandatory trainees. We believe this to be a best practice. 22. Headquarters Air Force Executive Support Staff "Brown Bag" sessions
Q.18 - DDAEO's were split, with some having less than 1000 employees and some providing the training themselves. All others indicated they received the required certification.
Q23: All agency personnel (including interns). Specialized training for principle office component upon request.
Question 23: All-agency email alerts on various ethics topics over the course of the year.
#22- HUD OIG launched an on-demand "Core Values" video training series through their Integrity & Compliance Program to strengthen and sustain a culture of integrity within HUD OIG.
#18: All IET was provided by DOI Bureau and Office ethics programs under the leadership of DOI's DAEO per Secretarial Order #3288. #21-23: A number of DOI Bureau and Office ethics programs provided additional ethics training to the groups identified in #23, including certain Bureau and Office ethics programs who provided training to all employees of their respective Bureau or Office. As a result, over approximately 15,500 DOI employees from various Bureaus and Offices, who were not required to receive annual ethics training, were provided with annual ethics training in 2018.
Q16: HQ DO requires employees to receive initial ethics training within two weeks of hire date. New non-PAS political appointees and other senior employees (e.g., SES) attend a one-hour in-person ethics briefing. HQ also requires new supervisors to take an online ethics module within two weeks of entering a supervisory role. Sixty-seven supervisors took the training in 2018. Although not required, HQ provides annual "refresher" briefings in late 2018 to all new PAS who entered earlier than August 2018 Q21: At one bureau, annual training is available and accessible to all employees and employees not otherwise required to take the training may do so for informational purposes.
23. Additional specialized training provided for employees supporting medical research, financial services, Federal Advisory Committees,

Designated Federal Officers and members of FACAs, LEGIS fellows, and specific offices or groups upon request. For example, in 2018, the DAEO visited several regions to discuss ethics related topics.
Question 20. During 2018, the EEOC provided in-person ethics training to the three PAS employees who encumbered those positions.
22. The Office of Ethics held monthly brown bag lunch presentations in 2018 on various topics. The agency also hosted the Office of Special Counsel for Hatch Act training. The Office of Ethics also conducted specialized briefings for Schedule C employees.
Q18: The DAEO was responsible for providing the initial ethics training and /or annual ethics training in 2018. Ethics Training was not delegated to another office in 2018.
#21 - The Ethics Office rolled out an ethics app (pushed to all employee cell phones) in conjunction with annual ethics training.
15. Even though our Acting Director does not meet the definition under 5 CFR 2638.305(a), we provided him with ethics training covering all the main topic of ethics, and including the importance of his leadership in supporting, promoting and maintaining an ethical culture in the agency.
No. 23: We provided Hatch Act training to all employees.
#16 - IMLS, as a Federal grantmaking agency, operates a peer review system. Peer Reviewers, as SGEs, complete ethics training and submit an OGE-Approved conflict of interest form.
N/A
NA
Q15 - The Commission has no Presidential appointed, Senate confirmed employees. Q20 - Annual training requirements are met through regular briefings held throughout the year on specific topics. Q23 - Ethics training is provided every quarter and as needed at all-staff meetings.
The NEH ethics office routinely provides one-on-one ethics training to staff on an as-needed basis as questions arise. NEH also sends subject-specific monthly emails on various ethics topics to all staff. In addition, in 2018 NEH met with the agency head's executive staff to provide specialized training on the ethics rules surrounding travel and travel payments from non-federal sources.
Questions 15,16,17 and 20- This information is classified.
#20 NLRB Supervisors and Managers who are not financial disclosure filers are required to complete the online version of the Annual Ethics Training by January 31st of each year. #21 In the weeks leading up to the NLRB's annual ethics briefing for filers, we sent weekly Ethics Refresher messages to all Agency employees. These Ethics Refresher messages expanded our annual training program to all employees, reinforced the concepts that would be covered in the annual ethics training, also addressed the Hatch Act, and allowed us to reintroduce other ethics resources that we have prepared over the years in a targeted way. #22 Provided comprehensive Hatch Act training in a variety of mediums addressing political activity not relating to an election. Also provided an annual reminder concerning speaking in an official vs. personal capacity. Further, we give targeted ethics training which emphasizes the importance of maintaining confidentiality to individuals who have short-term assignments at Headquarters such as summer interns, Honors Attorneys and Professional Exchange Detailees.

#16 continued - He decided that since he had years of conflict training at NSF under his belt, he was not required to compete new entrant training. We notified his supervisor, and he completed the training a couple of weeks later. 4. Last employee came on board on 10/1/18 as an expert/consultant. He did not complete prior to the shutdown, and departed NSF shortly after shutdown ended. He was subsequently rehired as a program officer two weeks later. We notified his supervisor, and he completed the training.
All staff received ethics training, either AET or IET during CY 2018
Question 16: We require everyone who serves as an employee to receive initial ethics training. We meet with employees during their orientation. We also require all of our interns to receive initial ethics training. Questions 20-21: We require all agency employees to receive live annual ethics training. In the event an employee is unable to attend our live training sessions, we offer interactive training. Of the 11 who missed our live training sessions, we continue to work with the six employees who need to complete their 2018 AET. Question 20: Last year, we reported 18 Executive Level I & II employees. Having reviewed 5 USC 5314-15, the Chairman is an Executive Level III employee, and the Vice Chairman and other Board Members are Executive Level IV. All of our public filers fall into the other-public-filers category.
Although not ethics, we conducted a separate training for leadership regarding the Hatch Act.
#19 - For purposes of ethics program administration, the Office Head is the Chief of Staff to the Vice President.
We required all agency employees to take the initial ethics orientation interactive training that was developed for new employees. We also provided in person training to new supervisors.
Question 21: We train all the agency employees on Supplemental Ethics Regulations and we targeted specialized training on the Hatch Act to all agency personnel.
NA
(Question 21) All TVA employees are required to take annual ethics training. Contractors are strongly encouraged, but not required, to take the training. TVA Supervisor/Managers and Officer/Executive-level employees are required to take an additional module as part of the annual online ethics training.
Q17: All new hires received interactive training regardless of grade level, which includes receipt of written materials.
N/A
For #23 - during 2018, the Ethics Office issued periodic written guidance to all agency personnel regarding relevant Ethics topics. For example, in the weeks leading up to November 2018, we issued several bulletins regarding the Hatch Act. We also provided guidance regarding appropriate use of social media as it pertains to ethics regulations.

Q24 Table. From the list below, select the three topics that your employees most frequently sought guidance on in 2018. Please rate them in order, such that the first topic on which employees sought guidance the most frequently.

Selection 1 Other

Seeking Employment

Selection 2 Other

Outside employment/activities polls at essentially the same level as post-employment restrictions. Wanted to include both to paint a fuller picture.
Seeking and negotiating for non-Federal employment, as well as the post government employment restrictions in 18 U.S.C. 207.

Selection 3 Other

Hatch Act.
In 2018, our office provided a good deal of guidance related to conflicting interests (but that doesn't necessarily get captured in the "conflicting financial interests captured in the drop down menu) a number of areas. For example, how the agency may engage (or not) with prohibited sources (NEA prohibited sources include but are not limited to cooperators, partners, grantees and contractors). As the NEA's development office took shape in 2018, these questions and corresponding counsel became more frequent.
Seeking and negotiating for non-federal employment, as well as the post government employment restrictions.
Supplemental Ethics Rules

Q27 Table. Number of individual remedial actions taken in 2018 because of information on a new entrant, annual, periodic transaction, or termination public financial disclosure report. Specify Other

0
0 to report.
Authorization under 5 CFR 2635.502(d)
In addition, there was one divestiture extension granted by OGE.
N/A

N/A
n/a - but won't let me submit the form
NA
No action taken.
No remedial action in 2018.
No remedial actions based on financial disclosure report information were required or taken.
No remedial actions needed
No remedial actions required.
No remedial actions taken in 2018.
None
None to report
None.
None.
None.
None.
Not applicable.

Not applicable. No matters in the public financial disclosure reports filed in CY2018 required remedial action (or even counselling). (We are a micro-agency, with only two public filers.)
Nothing to specify.
Q27e: There were no other remedial actions taken.
Questions 27e is not applicable.
There were no instances that would qualify as "other".
There were no other actions reported
There were no others
There were no remedial actions taken in 2018
We had no other remedial actions that must be specified.
We had no remedial actions taken in 2018.
We had one employee seek employment with a non-government employer which resulted in a our office setting up a screening arrangment while the employee was seeking employment. The employee has since left SIGAR.

Q28 Table. Number of 18 U.S.C. 208 waivers granted in 2018. If applicable, please explain discrepancies between the number of waivers granted and the number provided to OGE.

The CIA does not provide copies of the waivers because the substance of those waivers is classified and/or the information is protected by Section 6 of the CIA Act of 1949. The substance of all waivers receives prior coordination with OGE before approval.
It was our understanding that OGE does not require copies of 208(b)(3) waivers. ³⁵
HHS has a component that includes waivers from quarter 4 of 2017, and quarters 1-3 of 2018, as there is a lag in waivers issued vs. waivers sent to OGE.
After consultation with OGE, one waiver sent to OGE was not granted.
Three waivers were issued in early 2018, based upon our understanding that the templates for these waivers had been previously approved by OGE. After OGE requested that we consult on all new waivers, we did so. NOTE: There were two additional waivers on which we consulted with OGE starting early October 2018 but were not concurred upon by OGE - after multiple edits and conference calls - until almost four months into the process. They will be reported on next year's Questionnaire.

Part 6 Table. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FOR PART 6. Please indicate the question number to which the comment corresponds.

None.
Both disqualifications were done primarily as a preventive measure in case a matter came up in the future.
27(a). While DSS does not track the exact number of recusals resulting from information disclosed on financial disclosure reports, our best estimate is approximately 25.

³⁵ Pursuant to 5 C.F.R. 2640.303, agencies are required to send 208(b)(3) waivers to OGE. OGE collected the required waivers from the agency that made this comment.

Q.27 - Does not include SASC required divestitures for confirmation.
Q.27. Not all this information is tracked so data is what was available.
27. Remedial actions are not usually taken based on information disclosed on a Form 278 but rather in conjunction with ethics official advice and consultation, and, therefore, they are not counted or tracked in this manner.
#26-27: Most DOI Bureau and Office ethics programs do not know or track this information. To the extent that this information is currently known or tracked, it is reported. As noted previously, DOI Leadership committed to significantly increase staffing, training, and budget support across the DOI Ethics Program and this will help the Bureau and Office ethics programs better track remedial actions in 2019.
Questions 26 and 27: One employee inherited seven stocks which require disqualification from certain matters.
N/A
NA
Q. 28 (b) - Two (2) 208(b)(3) waivers were granted to SGEs serving on the Users' Advisory Group of the National Space Council, for which NASA provides ethics program support.
#25 and #26 We provide formal ethics guidance to each filer which highlights their recusal obligations based on their OGE 278e. However, we do not require filers to report back to us if they have recused from a matter based on this guidance, resigned from a position, or divested assets.
#25 - STOCK Act number reflects number of employees filing notice (some had several recusals listed). The Office of the Vice President requires all employees to file post government employment negotiation recusals although not required under the STOCK Act. The reported number are only those employees required under the STOCK Act.
None.
NA
26-27. In 2018, there were 29 public filers that executed 36 recusals. While we do track the actions for filers (OGE-278 and OGE-450 filers), and non-filers, we do not track whether the action was a result of a financial disclosure review or 278T review. We have worked hard to create an ethical culture at USAID (live training to thousands of our employees stationed around the world, filers and non-filers). We train our employees to recognize potential conflicts of interest so that we can address these issues at inception. Although some of our remedial actions may have been the result of financial disclosure or periodic transaction reviews, the majority of these actions were executed as a result of issues brought to our attention following ethics training.
N/A

Q29a Table (public filers). How often, within the 15-day deadline, did the human resources office(s) notify the DAEO of appointments to public and confidential financial disclosure filing positions (5 C.F.R. 2638.105(a)(1))? If not applicable, specify why.

The DAEO is automatically aware of new appointments due to the agency's small size and direct participation in all HR and hiring decisions.

During calendar year 2018, the Office of General Counsel (which is made up of the DAEO and ADAEO) coordinated hiring/firing/retirement of employees and was therefore immediately aware of any such appointments. Moreover, this is a nano-agency of 38 employees, all in one office. We are immediately aware of any appointments, dismissals, and retirements.
There were no new appointments to public financial disclosure filing positions in CY 2018.
Only one such appointment was made, by Presidential appointment, and it was communicated to all agency employees including the DAEO simultaneously.
Did not have any new hires in 2018.
Agency did not hire into any positions in CY2018 that are designated as requiring public financial disclosures. (We only have two public filers in agency.)
USARC had no appointments.
Due to the structure, independence, and small size of the ASBCA, the DAEO and ADAEO are the 1st to know of the relevant appointments.
There were no changes or additions to personnel
There was only one new appointment in this category. The ethics office was well aware of the appointment. CSB is a small agency.
CFA does not have a Human Resources Office
We did not have any appointments in 2018 that required the filing of public financial disclosures.
No public filers were appointed to the agency in 2018.
DAEO tracks all appointments of KOs and positions required to file the OGE 278. Only 5 positions within the agency.
DRA only had two federal employees who were political appointees and notice was received from the White House or OGE.
The DAEO is the only public filer.
Appointments to public and confidential financial disclosure filing positions are determined by the Office of Ethics/ADAEO according to title and grade on monthly staffing reports.
No such appointments
No such positions appointed during this time.
Did not have a new entrant public filer in 2018.
There have been no appointments. JUSFC is a nano agency with only four FTEs.
No such appointments were made in 2018.
Head of agency reviewed hiring actions and notified DAEO of hiring.
No new hires during the reporting period.
No appointments in 2018.
I do not have a human resource office. This agency has not had a DAEO since July.
No public filers appointed.
We did not have any new appointments to filing positions.
Other than the Director who is PAS, no other appointments were made to public filing positions in 2018.
No new employees

Given the small size of the PCLOB, the DAEO is aware of the onboarding of all filers.
USCPAHA does not have an HR office. We contract with GSA CABS to provide HR services. Appointments for Commission members (SGEs) are handled directly by USCPAHA.
Zero to all above.
The Ethics office pulls a report from Human Resources' system every two weeks.
No new public filers in 2018
Until recently, Agency procedures have required program office supervisors to notify the Ethics Office of new financial disclosure filers. Pursuant to 5CFR 2638.104 and 2368.105, the Ethics Office signed a MOA with HR on 2/28/19, to receive notification directly from HR.

Q29b Table (confidential filers). How often, within the 15-day deadline, did the human resources office(s) notify the DAEO of appointments to public and confidential financial disclosure filing positions (5 C.F.R. 2638.105(a)(1))? If not applicable, specify why.

Same as above.
See above.
No such new appointments were made in 2018.
Did not have any new hires in 2018.
USARC has no confidential filers.
Due to the structure, independence, and small size of the ASBCA, the DAEO and ADAEO are the 1st to know of the relevant appointments.
There were no changes or additions to personnel
There were no such appointments.
CFA does not have a Human Resources Office
We did not have any appointments in 2018 that are required to file confidential financial disclosures.
DAEO tracks all positions required to file the OGE 450. Only 5 positions within the agency are required to file the OGE 278.
Question b. All supervisors are required to notify our office
At our Agency new employee orientation program, new employees are provided an ethics form wherein the new employee and their supervisor certify whether or not the new employee is required to file an OGE 450 form. By Agency policy, all Contracting Officers and Contracting Representatives are required to file an OGE 450 form.
Do not have any
The DAEO is involved in all new hires. No notification is needed.
Typically, human resources notifies the direct supervisor (who may or may not be a Deputy Ethics Official), not EPA Ethics.
Appointments to public and confidential financial disclosure filing positions are determined by the Office of Ethics/ADAEO according to title and grade on monthly staffing reports.
There were no appointments to confidential financial disclosure filing positions.
No such appointments
No such positions appointed during this time.

There have been no appointments. JUSFC is a nano agency with only four FTEs.
No such appointments were made in 2018.
Head of agency reviewed hiring actions and notified DAEO.
No new hires during the reporting period.
No appointments in 2018.
we do not have confidential filers
We did not have any new appointments to filing positions.
Component Heads notify the DAEO.
No new employees
Given the small size of the PCLOB, the DAEO is aware of the onboarding of all filers.
USCPAHA does not have an HR office. We contract with GSA CABS to provide HR services. Appointments for Commission members (SGEs) are handled directly by USCPAHA.
Zero to all above.
The Ethics office pulls a report from Human Resources' system every two weeks.
Until recently, Agency procedures have required program office supervisors to notify the Ethics Office of new financial disclosure filers. Pursuant to 5CFR 2638.104 and 2368.105, the Ethics Office signed a MOA with HR on 2/28/19, to receive notification directly from HR.

Q30 Table. How often, within the 15-day deadline, did the human resources office(s) notify the DAEO of terminations from public financial disclosure filing positions (5 C.F.R. 2638.105(a)(2))? If not applicable, specify why.

Same as above.
See above.
There were no terminations from public financial disclosure filing positions in CY 2018.
No such terminations occurred in 2018.
Did not have any staff departures in 2018.
No departures from agency staff in CY2018 from positions designated as requiring public financial disclosures.
USARC had no terminations.
Due to the structure, independence, and small size of the ASBCA, the DAEO and ADAEO are the 1st to know of any relevant terminations.
There were no changes or additions to personnel
The DAEO herself resigned her position. So, notice was not required. The other instance of a resignation involved the Chairperson who informed all staff at same time. CSB is small agency.
CFA does not have a Human Resources Office and had no terminations in 2018.
We did not have any terminations in 2018 that are required to file public financial disclosures.
In 2018, there were no filers who were required to file a public financial disclosure termination report.
DAEO tracks all terminations of OGE 278 filers.
Employees must notify the DAEO as part of their out-processing checklist.
We only had two federal employees so knew when one left.

The DAEO is the only public filer.
Terminations from public disclosure filing positions are determined by the Office of Ethics/ADAEO.
No terminations.
No such terminations
No such positions appointed during this time.
Did not have a public filer termination in 2018.
There have been no terminations. JUSFC is a nano agency with only four FTEs.
No such events occurred in 2018.
Head of agency and DAEO aware of retirement.
DAEO notified of terminations by other means.
No terminations requiring filing during the reporting period.
No public financial disclosure filing position has left the Commission.
No public financial disclosure filers terminated.
we do not have a human resources office.
No terminations.
There were no terminations from public financial disclosure filing in 2018.
No terminations
Given the small size of the PCLOB, the DAEO is aware of the departure of all filers.
USCPAHA does not have an HR office. We contract with GSA CABS to provide HR services. Appointments for Commission members (SGEs) are handled directly by USCPAHA.
Zero to all above.
The Ethics office pulls a report from Human Resources' system every two weeks.
No public filers left in 2018
Until recently, Agency procedures have required program office supervisors to notify the Ethics Office of new financial disclosure filers. Pursuant to 5CFR 2638.104 and 2368.105, the Ethics Office signed a MOA with HR on 2/28/19, to receive notification directly from HR.

Q32Table. Which system did your agency use?

FDM
FDOnline
Agency specific system
FDonline.
FDOnline
Ethics Management Tracking System ("EMAT")
FDOnline
FD Online
Army Financial Disclosure Management System for OGE 450 filers.
FDM
The Department of Defense's Financial Disclosure Management (FDM).
Financial Disclosure Management(FDM) System
Financial Disclosure Management (FDM) system
We use FDM for all OGE 450 filers and military OGE 278 filers. All SES use Integrity.

The U.S. Army's Financial Disclosure Management (FDM) system.
FDM
Our DAE0 fills out a 278 through integrity. The 450s were collected hardcopy.
FDOnline
FDM
Financial Disclosure Management (FDM)
Department of the Army's Financial Disclosure Program
FDM
Electronic Financial Disclosure System (EFDS). National Institutes of Health: NIH Enterprise Ethics System (NEES) Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: Ethics Program Activity Tracking System (EPATS) and Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Systems: CATS (CMS internal system).
FDOnline and CBP's HRBE
FD online
DOJ uses only Integrity for public financial disclosure. ATF and the US Marshals Service have e-filing systems for confidential financial disclosure, but costs are not able to be reported or projected in the manner being asked here in Part 7 because they are included in general IT and contractor costs.
Financial Disclosure and Management System (FDM)
FDOnline
FD Online
HQ uses e-filing system for OGE 450s. Another bureau uses Disclosure, an internally developed, web-based application that uses the Salesforce platform to enable the uploading and review of PDF versions of the OGE Form 450.
Army Financial Data Management System (FDM)
FDOnline
OGE 450s are submitted via SharePoint
SharePoint for OGE 450s
In-house e-filing system.
FDIC's National Employee Ethics Tracking System (NEETS) - e-filing system for OGE form 450s and FDIC supplemental financial disclosure reports.
We save Forms 450 to our internal document management system.
FDonline
Integrity was used for our two public filers. The ADAEO and another Associate General Counsel used their own Google Drive tracker as a financial filing system.
The other system is NASA's Ethics Program Tracking System (EPTS). NASA used Integrity for OGE Forms 278e and 278T subject to OGE review (5 positions).
FDM provided by the Department of the Army.
FDonline
We use Integrity for OGE278/OGE278T filings and FDM for OGE450 filings
FDOnline Intelliworx
NSF eFile System
Ethics Management System - customized agency-specific filing system made by Entellitrak.

FDM for 450 filers
We built an internal system for filing 450s.
Those employees that did not have to have their forms submitted to OGE were allowed to just use the OGE 278e and submit to the DAEO
Our agency uses the CIA's electronic financial disclosure system for OGE 450, OGE278e and OGE 278T filings, as well as recording of ethics training.
Financial Disclosure Management Electronic Filing System
Senate staff who are required to file do so using Senate FD.
HRWorx LLC
FDonline for 450 filings.
Form 450 filers provide the DAEO with a filled out Form 450 from OGE's website.
FDonline
FD Online
Financial Disclosure Management (FDM)
FDOnline
FDM
Financial Disclosure System (FDS)

Q34 Table. Indicate your fiscal year 2018 actual costs for using the other (non-Integrity) e-filing system. Note: Because OGE does not charge fees to use Integrity, there are no reportable costs associated with the use of Integrity. Please explain "Don't know/don't track" answer above.

We approximate that the amount for all internal costs associated with operating the Bureau's electronic filing system for confidential financial disclosure reports (FDOnline) is close to \$25,000, which does not include the amount paid to the non-federal vendor.
34.a The amount reported includes a one time set up fee. Annual costs for service in FY 19 likely will be under \$400. 34.c. CSB cab only make an estimate at this time because it did not separately track this expense. If the amount is strictly limited to actual operation of the system, it would likely be minimal- between \$1000-\$2000.
The CFTC does not track Federal employee costs associated with maintaining EMAT, the electronic financial disclosure filing system for OGE Form 450s and CFTC Form 185s. Therefore, CFTC Ethics is only able to provide actual costs for contractor expenses related to EMAT.
The only cost is staff time. There is no dedicated FTE for this activity.
No cost associated with FDM
FDM is an Army sponsored program provided to Department of Defense components at no cost.
All OE employees use/operate USDA's e-filing systems as part of their official duties but we are not able to target an exact percentage of time spent on those responsibilities.
Army funds.
Costs are not able to be reported or projected in this manner because they are included in general IT and contractor costs.

The Army created the Financial Disclosure Management System (FDM). The Department of State has been using this program since 2012. We are unable to track internal costs for this system.
The figure listed for Confidential filers above reflects the combined cost of FDOOnline for both DOI Public and Confidential filers.
The Agency uses Integrity and does not pay for a public financial disclosure e-filing system or a federal agency in FY 2018.
N/A
N/A
System is part of the google/gmail/IAF email system and the IAF shared drive system.
The NASA electronic filing system includes both the Public and Confidential forms, so a breakdown between the two for costs purposes is not available. Q. 34 a. Combined \$60,097. Q. 34 c. Combined \$240,332 Total costs \$300,429.
Re: c - the total for FY 18 was 47,942. Since both the 450s and 278s are filed on the same system, there is no way to provide a by-form breakdown.
In 2018, OMB paid \$47,000 for contract employee support for building and maintaining the 450 system. Could not enter that number in a, above.
Merely used the 278e and 450 off the OGE website.
Our contract does not break out costs for public and private filers. We paid a total of \$4,307 to one vendor for filing services.
NA
N/A

Part 7 Table. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FOR PART 7. Please indicate the question number to which the comment corresponds.

USADF had two required public financial disclosure filers in CY2018, who both filed using Integrity. All other employees, who were confidential filers, filed using a non-electronic filing procedure.
In response to questions 29 and 30: The Bureau's ADAEO met with representatives from the Office of Human Capital to discuss how we can ensure timely notification of new confidential and public financial disclosure filers, as well as timely notification of all terminations from a public financial disclosure position. As a result of this meeting, the Bureau's ethics office consistently has been receiving timely notifications.
#29 The answer is "in most cases" for public filers because there is the rare occurrence where senior officers receive the appointment outside of the typical promotion process. The DAEO or her subordinates do not always receive formal notification and so we capture informally (successfully to date to the best of our knowledge). #34 Money went to upgrade internal e-filing system on which both public and confidential reports sit. Division of money between public and confidential reports are an estimate only. #35 The answer is classified.
all cncs filers file electronically
29 and 30: Agency does not have a formal 15-day notification process however, as a micro-agency, the DAEO is made aware of all new hires and terminations.

<p>With regard to question 29, our human resource office did not have a system implemented to notify the DAEO/Ethics Program of new confidential financial disclosure filers. That situation has been addressed and an automated system has been implemented to ensure that the DAEO office receives timely notification of confidential financial disclosure filers.</p>
<p>HR will now notify OGC within 15 days of all new entrants with the OGE 450 filing requirement in their PD. Not all filers have it in their PD, so HR will not know all. The DAEO will issue a notice to leadership to inform OGC of any new entrants.</p>
<p>Q29&30. DDAEO organization responses varied. Most were getting notifications. Of those that were not, many were tracking themselves due to having very small numbers of filers or ability to directly access data. SOCO will address with those that indicated they were not receiving and did not have an alternate methodology</p>
<p>#29-30: Certain Bureau and Office ethics programs experienced a breakdown in communication and coordination with DOI HR Offices, which led to deficiencies in notifications about filers. This issue will be addressed in those Bureau and Office ethics programs in 2019.</p>
<p>Q34: Individual costs for DO are \$60,000 and for one bureau \$105,000. The latter represents a proportional share for the disclosure application based on a fixed cost paid to a vendor to develop multiple applications.</p>
<p>Question 35: Confidential Financial Disclosure filers provide to the Office of the DAEO paper or electronic copies of their Forms 450. The Office maintains those documents on its electronic data management system.</p>
<p>N/A</p>
<p>#34. There are no costs associated. We use Integrity for 278s. Our 450s are not collected electronically. #35 0</p>
<p>Q. 35 - Individuals being considered for incoming Intergovernmental Personnel Act (IPA) details may file a paper OGE 450 form for pre-clearance. Some SGEs and Termination 278 filers may also submit a paper form.</p>
<p>34c.- This is the first year we have provided an amount here. It was supplied to us by our Office of Chief Financial Officer whose staff provides procurement and technical support for the FDM system. They estimated 1.5 weeks/year of 1 FTE to come up with this \$4000 amount.</p>
<p>Note to Question 34(a): The total amount paid to a non-federal vendor for both public and confidential filers was \$2856 (not \$2856 per filer type).</p>
<p>Question 35b: This information is classified.</p>
<p>31.-32. The Agency only uses Integrity for filers whose forms are required to be certified by OGE (DAEO & one PAS employee).</p>
<p>Question 29b--As ADAEO I am notified of all new appointments and start dates for all new hires irrespective of filing status. As ADAEO I am responsible for identifying filing status for new positions prior to announcement so I know which new hires will encumber a filing position and which ones will not.</p>
<p>543 employees were required to file an annual 450 in 2018. Another 91 employees filed a new entrant report in 2018 as part of our staggered, agency-wide roll-out which started in 2017 and completed in spring 2018.</p>

#35 - Certain Senate paid OVP employees file both the OGE 278 and the corresponding Senate form.
Questions 29-30 Please note that Peace Corps onboarded a new Chief Human Capital Officer (CHCO) midway through 2018. The Peace Corps Ethics Team has been working w/ the CHCO to resolve the items in Questions 29-30.
34.(a) These numbers are approximations as the cost of use is based on an estimated number of filers using the system during the contract period.
35. Our DAEO files in the Integrity system annually.
29. The senior administrative management specialist from each bureau let's us know when a filer (public or confidential) enters on duty in their office.
N/A

Q36 Table. Report the number of public financial disclosure reports (OGE Form 278e) required to be filed by December 31, 2018, excluding SGEs, and the number of reports actually filed (i.e., received in hand) by December 31, 2018. If applicable, please explain discrepancies between the number of reports required to be filed and the actual number of reports filed.

The filer completed and filed the annual portion of required report. However, additional information regarding termination portion of report remained incomplete. CSB is in process of addressing the matter. One termination report in the other column was not filed by Dec.31 due to technical difficulties. That report has been filed.
Two current employees were promoted in September 2018 to positions that would require them to file the OGE Form 278e. Due to an error in the Human Resources reporting tool, CFTC Ethics did not receive notice of the promotions. The error was discovered when reconciling data for this report.
A new entrant was not uploaded into Integrity in a timely manner and failed to file. He requested a waiver and was approved by the DAEO for a waiver of the \$200 fine.
36(a). DSS had one senior level employee who should have filed a New Entrant OGE-278e report in 2018, but who received late notice of the filing requirement and, therefore, did not file a timely report. In this instance, the DSS human resources office notified the ADAEO of the employee's hiring, but not her senior level rank. DSS has taken steps to correct the process so that future hiring notifications clearly identify a newly hired employee's senior level rank.
One employee left in June 2018. Due to being a small agency, we were unaware that a Termination report was required. We are now working with Department of Commerce to rectify this situation and collect the report.
Career SES departed without completing termination report. We are following up with him.
There are no discrepancies.
Data reported from field units located around the world reasons for discrepancies vary from location to location
1 - Complex report, 1 - failure to track. One has filed as of today, the other is still being worked.

<p>Five filers have extensions. Additionally, the agency identified three filers who did not have reports assigned in the system. The employees have been notified of their obligation to file. Because of a technical issue, the agency cannot gain an filer in the system. The agency is working on rectifying the issue. There is one Schedule C employee who, despite multiple notificatoins to file, has filed to submit an OGE 278e report. The agency is working on the next administartive steps to take due to the employees failure to file.</p>
<p>1 Schedule C filed late (Jan 2019)</p>
<p>The missing termination report was a filer who failed to hit the 'submit' on the report. We've been in touch with the filer to get it submitted properly.</p>
<p>Discrepancies in reports required and reports filed result from delay in notice about arrival or departure of filers. Ethics officials followed up with filers needing to complete report and all are filed.</p>
<p>Career SES filer under DOJ investigation and refuses to file termination report pending investigation. Schedule C filer unresponsive to direction to file termination report.</p>
<p>2 Term filers and 1 annual filer have not submitted their reports. Their collection is underway by their ethics officials. For Term filers, this involves updating their Integrity accounts through coordination with the Integrity Helpdesk so that they can access the system using their personal email address.</p>
<p>New Entrant employees are assigned to a position that requires filing the OGE-278 and those employees were not advised to do by management. Employees who have terminated have not submitted their final report have been sent certified letters. 1 employee is on extended infinite suspension 2 employees are on LWOP 2 employees granted 180 day waiver due to current assignment In previous years, we were reporting the number of nominee reports that were confirmed during the calendar year. This year, we are not reporting just the number of Nominee reports submitted in 2018. We are now only reporting the number of Nominee Reports that have been certified by OGE.</p>
<p>The discrepancies are a result of a variety of factors across certain Bureau and Office ethics programs including: a lack of ethics program resources, a breakdown in communication and coordination with HR, ethics program staff turnover leading to the loss of institutional memory, and the failure to develop and implement appropriate OGE 278e filer identification, report collection, and tracking procedures and practices. DOI Leadership has made a significant investment across the DOI Ethics Program which will help ensure that Bureau and Office ethics programs better address these discrepancies going forward.</p>
<p>Some employees on extended sick leave, or left during partial Government shutdown without filing termination report (in those cases, OA followed up and reports were submitted after 12/31/18).</p>
<p>Employee left under circumstances not amenable to creating interest in filing termination reports. The employee was assessed a fine, which was reported to the VA Financial Services Center, and either collected from a terminal paycheck or a debt was created for collection.</p>
<p>New Entrant Reports: Three career employees detailed into SES positions did not file new entrant reports. One "other" started in December 2018 but, because of the government shutdown, did not file the new entrant report until 2019. Termination Reports: One Schedule C did not file a termination report. Because of the government</p>

<p>shutdown, one career employee submitted a termination report in January 2019, while one career employee did not submit a report at all. Combination Reports: One non-career SES did not file the annual/termination report.</p>
<p>Currently working to get termination report from one former employee.</p>
<p>Termination 278 not filed-employee was medically unable to fill out the report (due to stroke) prior to her retirement.</p>
<p>The numbers reported above are percentages rather than numeric counts of filers. Actual numbers are made available to cleared OGE personnel when required.</p>
<p>One SES employee who began work in the latter half of 2018 was not promptly notified of his reporting requirements this employee has since been assigned a public financial-disclosure report.</p>
<p>One OGE 278e filer did not file an annual report. The error has been noted and will be corrected.</p>
<p>Non-Career SES - Six filers were exempt because they filed 278 reports within the last 60 days of 2017. - One filer did not submit their 278 report, but did receive extension and then the shutdown occurred. - One filer's report was due during the shutdown and did not file the report. Schedule C - One filer had yet to submit their 278 report.</p>
<p>On one new entrant, DAEO wasn't notified until late December 2018 that a pay raise occurred in June 2018. On a termination filer, DAEO wasn't notified until January 2019 that a pay reduction occurred in June 2018.</p>
<p>A few filers were unable to file due to death or illness.</p>
<p>One filer resigned during 2018 and failed to check-out of the agency properly or notify the ethics program. The ethics program was unable to obtain forwarding information to contact them regarding filing. Filer left within 90 days of having filed an Annual 2018 report so it is unlikely there were significant changes.</p>
<p>One employee resigned and despite best efforts to have the employee file a combined annual/termination report, filer did not submit such a report.</p>
<p>Three filers from the Postal Service OIG left the agency. They mistakenly filed OGE 278-Ts instead of Termination Reports. The Postal Service OIG has not rectified this issue, but considers the matter closed. [CORRECTION 8/1/2019: THE POSTAL SERVICE OIG IS PURSUING THIS MATTER TO RESOLUTION.]</p>
<p>The non-career SES unexpectedly went out on leave for an extended period before the end of 2018 and was unable to complete his 278. The career SES was recently appointed into that position, and the Ethics Office was not aware of his appointment (and his requirement to file a 278) until we were confirming information for the purposes of this Questionnaire. We have since talked to this employee about his training and filing obligations. In February 2019, the Office of General Counsel (which oversees the Agency Ethics Program) and the Office of Management Services (which oversees the Office of Human Resources) executed a Memorandum of Agreement to set out procedures that would facilitate the Agency to more effectively comply with 5 CFR 2638.105. We expect that with this MOA in place we will be able to more accurately and efficiently identify confidential and public financial filers going forward.</p>
<p>New Entrant Reports: Four reports were issued late. These reports were subsequently filed in 2019. Termination Reports: One filer failed to file a termination report. The filer was referred to the Department of Justice as required by 5 U.S.C. app. § 104(a).</p>

Part 8 Table. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FOR PART 8. Please indicate the question number to which the comment corresponds.

Q. 38 - The Integrity program was not accessible at times to required users and this caused delays. Some filers filed paper forms because of an inability to access the website/program.
#36 The answer is classified.
None.
Waivers of OGE 278T granted because dependents bought stock unbeknownst to filer until after the notice date.
36. The USIBWC only has 2 positions that file the public financial disclosure report: the DAEO (me) and the Commissioner. In 2018 there were 5 public reports filed. Our former Commissioner and I filed our annual reports in May (#1 and #2). Our former Commissioner was relieved of his duties in May right after completing his annual report (his report was a "combination" annual and termination report). An acting Commissioner (one of our GS-15's) prepared a New Entrant public report (#3). Our new or current Commissioner prepared her New Entrant public report in November (#4). The acting Commissioner prepared his termination public report in November (#5). We had 5 public financial disclosure reports in 2018 because of the leadership gap and then appointment of a new Commissioner.
NA
Q. 36 (b) - The PAS column includes the NASA Administrator's annual report timely filed in Integrity after appointment to NASA for a reporting period during his previous legislative branch service.
36. Nominee/New Entrant - We had one potential PAS nominee who was certified by OGE in 2018, but he was not nominated. We had 2 other potential PAS nominees, one was pre-cleared in 2018 the other did not get to pre-clearance, but did fill out his 278 in Integrity. 36. Other Category - We are not on the SES system. Our non-PAS career 278 filers are called SSPs (Senior Staff Positions). Most SSPs use Career SES as noted category. However 5 identified in the Other category. 36. Schedule C and Non-Career SES - Two political non-PAS appointees identified as Schedule Cs. They have both been at NCUA for several years and always identified as such. One political non-PAS appointee who came to NCUA in 2017 identified as a Non-Career SES. This filer left NCUA in 2018. This same individual filed both an annual and a termination 278 report in 2018.
Question 36, 37 and 38: This information is classified.
Comment on Question 38a: The one employee who filed his annual form late apparently did so because the electronic reminders he received were directed to a spam folder in his email inbox, and as a result he did not see them. Because the employee had a history of timely filing, the NRC granted the employee's request to waive the late filing fee.
#40 - Any requests for a Commissioned Officer's financial disclosure, including those employed by the OVP, are handled by White House counsel.
The whole Board was up for nomination in 2018, so there were five nominee 278 forms. From January to October 2018, only one Board Members served on the Board, and that Member resigned in December 2018 her termination report was filed in 2019. The DAEO was present for all of 2018.

NA
N/A

Q41 Table. Report the number of confidential financial disclosure reports required to be filed by December 31, 2018, excluding SGEs, and the number of reports actually filed by December 31, 2018. If applicable, please explain discrepancies between the number of reports required to be filed and the actual number of reports filed.

Two filers were on extended medical leave and then resigned from the Bureau before filing their annual confidential financial disclosure reports.
The CFTC has 416 employees who were required to file a CFTC Form 185, "Certification of Compliance with the Commission's Conduct Regulation." Of those 416 CFTC 185 filers, 410 filed in calendar year 2018, leaving six (6) reports outstanding at the end of calendar year 2018. Of those six (6) outstanding reports, four (4) employees were on extended leave during the filing season and not scheduled to return until 2019, and two (2) employees were working on completing their filing at the time of the Government shutdown on December 22, 2018, and did not complete their report until the shutdown ended and employees returned to work in calendar year 2019.
Due to the lapse in federal appropriations from December 22, 2018 - January 25, 2019, a couple of employees were not able to submit their F450s before December 31, 2018.
Due to the number of ongoing reorganizations, there were a number of changes in supervisors and filers, or filers departed to other Agency's or retired.
The discrepancies are due to filers on administrative leave not returning to the agency.
Data reported from field units located around the world reasons for discrepancies vary from location to location
Failure to ensure the filers submitted their reports.
The high turnover of personnel has created some issues with tracking filers and ensuring they submit their reports. Commands are working on resolving the discrepancies.
Most due to staffing issues or filers departing without filing.
3 filers on extended military duty 2 filers on extended medical leave 2 non-compliant filers
Filers out due to medical, administrative, or military leaves of absence. Agency following up with offices to retrieve reports not received.
12 reports not filed due in part to extended medical leave granted, retirements and resignations prior to the filing of forms and internal communication issues.
Some of these numbers reflect employees on extended leave (such as military or sick leave) or that have since left government service.
Extended leave and military deployment, details, promotion to public filing positions, administrative mistake causing delayed collection.
Failure to file was due to filers separating, on military leave, on medical leave, or reassigned to a non-filing position.
The discrepancies are a result of a variety of factors across certain Bureau and Office ethics programs including: a lack of ethics program resources, a breakdown in communication and coordination with HR, ethics program staff turnover leading to the

loss of institutional memory, and the failure to develop and implement appropriate OGE 450 filer identification, report collection, and tracking procedures and practices. DOI Leadership has made a significant investment across the DOI Ethics Program which will help ensure that Bureau and Office ethics programs better address these discrepancies going forward.
Employees on extended sick leave, administrative leave, or military duty. A few were new entrants towards the end of the year whose due dates fell during the shutdown and the report was submitted after Dec. 31.
9 filers on admin, military, or medical leave.
Some employees have been on extended leave, left federal service, transferred to other agencies, or retired prior to filing deadline. In addition, we believe that there has been some technical errors in tabulation by ethics official in tracking/designating filers.
The discrepancy between required and filed is as follows: 2 new employees filed past the deadline. One was promoted into a filing position on 10/28 and filed on 1/2/19. One EOD's on 11/28 and filed 1/15/19. The third employee has been on extended leave all of 2018 and is still out.
The discrepancy was caused by an inadvertent failure to include the position of contract specialist on our list of confidential filing positions. This omission has been corrected.
Several confidential financial disclosure filers retired from the agency before December 31, 2018.
The discrepancies were due to separations and extended medical leave.
5 employees on extended sick leave or long term disability and 1 employee on military leave.
Late notification of filing status
1 filer out of office for long term medical - late on follow-up when returned. 1 filer on LWOP for almost complete year. Separated from Federal Service in early 2019.
One filer was out on extended medical leave during the filing period and then left the agency in May 2018 without completing the 450 form.
The numbers reported above are percentages rather than numeric counts of filers. Actual numbers are made available to cleared OGE personnel when required.
In one cases, we conducted a pre-employment ethics assessment, and identified no outstanding conflicts on an inter-agency hire. The employee was never asked to complete a Form 450. In another, an employee changed positions and was not identified as a filer until 2019. In a third, the filer was not informed about the filing deadline and subsequently left the agency.
Six employees did not file required reports in 2018. One employee resigned from the NRC before completing his form. The NRC has followed up with the other five employees to ensure they complete their 2018 reports promptly.
One FTE was given an extension to file. Person has filed within extension time frame.
Several employees were on long term medical leave and several others were in discussions with OMB ethics about their financial reporting obligations throughout 2018 and filed in 2019. Of the remaining employees, most were confused about the obligation to file both a new entrant report and an annual report in 2018. OMB rolled out its requirement that all employees file 450s in late 2017 and 2018. Seventeen employees filed a 450 new entrant report in 2018, but missed the annual filing. Several of those that

didn't file any report in 2018 have filed their tardy reports in 2019. OMB does not expect this confusion to recur in 2019 or later because the 450 roll out was completed in 2018 and employees will only be required to submit a single report in 2019. A limited number of employees failed to file reports and were nonresponsive to follow up notices.
Twenty-two 450 filers had not submitted their reports yet.
No annual OGE Form 450 report was collected for 1 employee, who is no longer employed by the agency.
Four required filers failed to file by the 450 deadline of February 15. Each of these employees terminated SEC employment within approximately one month of the filing deadline.
Employees were on medical or military leave.
NA
two employees failed to submit their reports

Part 9 Table. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FOR PART 9. Please indicate the question number to which the comment corresponds.

#41 The answer is classified.
Questions # 20 and 41: Some employees filed the OGE 450 on or about February 2018, but left the agency before the July 2018 annual ethics training date. Hence, the difference between the numbers reported in the response to these questions.
41: The number of filers includes both agency employees and detailees assigned to the agency who filed financial disclosure reports with the agency. The number of filers does not include detailees assigned to the agency who filed disclosure reports with their detailing agency.
None.
Q41: The number of Approved Alternative filers will differ from year to year because we require a static 3-year recertification for our Confidential Conflicts of Interest Form. The last recertification was in 2017, so in 2020, all our filers will recertify. Thus, for the years 2018 and 2019, the number of Approved Alternative Filers required to file will reflect the number of new entrants in those respective years.
N/A
41. - All of our 450 filers use the FDM system for the confidential financial filing. I'm not sure if this is considered 450 or OGE-approved alternative. There is no 450A in the FDM system.
Question 41 and 42: This information is classified.
42 - We rolled out an update to our eFile system at the beginning of the year and provided an automatic 30-day extension for annual reports.
NA
N/A
41, 42 - 8 employees asked for extensions and 4 already filed, leaving 4 reports not yet filed.

Q46 Table. Did your agency submit all referral(s) and disposition(s) of the referral(s) to OGE via OGE Form 202 (as required by 5 C.F.R. 2638.206(a))?

No (specify why)

USARC has no conflict of interest relevant to OGE Form 202
Nothing to report
We did not have any.
The submittal to OGE by EPA's OIG of one Part 2 of the OGE Form 202 was delayed due to typographical error that affected the OIG's internal tracking process for filing OGE 202 forms.
Nothing to refer
No referrals
NSA did not realize the requirement applied to referrals made by their Office of Inspector General. However, OGE confirmed that the requirement does apply. NSA committed to submitting all covered referrals via Form 202.
None to report.

Not applicable (specify why)

There were no referrals or dispositions.
We had none to refer.
No referrals or dispositions in CY 2018.
No such referrals or dispositions were made.
Didn't have any.
We did not have any.
Not Applicable. The Access Board had no DOJ referrals/dispositions in CY2018 that required OGE notification per section 2638.206(a).
Did not have any referrals
No referrals.
No referrals during 2018
None required.
We had no referrals or dispositions to submit.
Did not submit any referrals.
The CFTC did not refer any cases to DOJ in 2018.
There were no referrals in calendar year 2018.
There were no referrals or disposition of referrals to submit to OGE.
No referrals
No referrals.
CEQ made no referrals to DOJ in 2018.
No referrals in 2018.
No referrals were made because no violations noted.
There were no required referrals.
No applicable violations subject to referral to the DOJ occurred at DFAS during 2018.
None reported
There were no referrals.
We had no referrals or dispositions for OGE.
Not Applicable. DSS did not make any referrals to the Department of Justice in 2018.

DTRA had no referrals/dispositions to report to OGE in 2018.
None
We had not referrals
No referrals.
None to submit.
We had 0 referrals to DOJ and/or OGE
Not applicable. HHS did not have any referrals in 2018, so no dispositions to OGE were required.
No matters to refer to OGE
No referrals in 2018.
DOL did not have any referrals.
The EEOC did not have any matters requiring referral.
None to report.
No referrals or dispositions.
No referrals or dispositions.
N/A
No referrals were made to the DOJ.
No referrals.
The agency did not submit any referrals or dispositions of referrals to OGE because the agency did not process any referrals.
FHFA had no referrals in 2018.
The FLRA did not make any 5 C.F.R. Â§ 2638.206 referrals in 2018.
There was no referral to DOJ in 2018.
No referrals.
No referrals were required.
No referrals
No such referrals
IMLS did not have any referral(s) or disposition(s) of referrals in 2018.
The IAF did not have any referrals or dispositions
We did not have any referrals or dispositions of referrals in 2018.
No referrals
no referrals or dispositions in 2018
There were no referrals or dispositions.
None were made.
No referrals made to DOJ in 2018
Agency did not have any referrals.
None
No referrals were made.
No referrals or disposition of referrals during the reporting period.
The Commission had no referrals
No disciplinary actions and no referrals.
We did not have an referrals.
NEH did not make any referrals to the Department of Justice (DOJ) or dispose of any DOJ referrals in 2018.

None to report.
No referrals made.
0 to report.
There were no complaints filed.
No referrals.
We did not have any referrals.
No referrals were made.
We had no referrals.
There were no referrals.
No referrals.
There were no referrals
No referrals made.
No referrals were necessary because no actions were taken.
OSC had none to submit.
IC IG did not have any investigations that warranted a referral to OGE.
DoD OIG did not have any referrals.
there were none
The Office of the Vice President had no applicable violatons requiring referral.
We had no referrals.
This was not applicable because we did not have any referrals.
none
None.
No referrals or dispositions.
None to report.
There were no referrals to DOJ.
SBA did not have any referrals
We didn't have any violations of conflict of interest, therefore no referrals were needed.
We had no violations.
N/A
No referrals were required
Not applicable since no referrals were made.
Not applicable.
No referrals.
None taken
no referrals made

Part 10 Table. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FOR PART 10. Please indicate the question number to which the comment corresponds.

Q46: The Office of the Inspector General for Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and Consumer Financial Protection Board is responsible for submitting OGE Form 202 to OGE. The OIG confirmed that they submitted all referrals and dispositions of referrals to OGE via OGE Form 202.

#43 The focus of most of these cases was on non-ethics related issues however, they also constitute technical violations of the Standards of Conduct. #43 & #44 One case involved the Standards of Conduct and 18 U.S.C 208, and was reported in both sections. #45b Disciplinary Actions-The answer is Don't know/don't track.
Q43: Disciplinary action was taken based on the agency's supplemental ethics regulation.
None.
N/A
Q. 43 and 44: We have no information regarding any disciplinary actions taken based on a violation of the Standards of Conduct or Criminal Conflict of Interest statutes. We checked with the Employment and Labor Law Division regarding such actions. That Division formerly reviewed all disciplinary actions subject to appeal to the Merit Systems Protection Board (suspensions of greater than 14 days) but such review is no longer required. Therefore, the answer was based on limited available data.
Q45: One employee received supervisory counseling regarding the actions all other referred employees left DOE prior to resolution of the referrals.
Q.43. This question appears to be missing "Your agency's supplemental standards." Answer for DHS is 3. Likewise, not all this information is tracked so data is what was available.
#43-44: Most DOI Bureaus/Offices do not know or track this information. To the extent that this information is currently tracked, it is reported. As noted previously, DOI Leadership committed to significantly increase staffing, training, and budget support across the DOI Ethics Program and this will help the Bureaus and Offices better track disciplinary actions and referrals in 2019
For Question 45 - Disciplinary Action, all three employees separated before any action was taken by the agency.
QUESTIONS 43-44: Neither the Office of General Counsel (OGC) nor the Office of Human Resources Administration maintain a centralized database of the bases of proposed disciplinary actions. OGC is not involved in disciplinary actions unless an action goes to hearing.
#44 - One employee received a written reprimand/counseling regarding the Hatch Act.
Q45: The referral to DOJ involved an employee of another agency, not an employee of GSA.
N/A
Q.45: The employee took a buyout before any disciplinary action was taken.
#43: Basis was agency's supplemental ethics rules.
NA
N/A
N/A
DOJ referral identified in Question 45 involved failure to file a termination report. No disciplinary action was possible as employee had departed.

Q48 Table. For each category of appointee, provide the number of full-time non-career appointees appointed between January 1 and December 31, 2018, and indicate the number who did and did not sign the Ethics Pledge. If applicable, please

explain discrepancies between the number appointed and the number who signed or did not take the Pledge.

All full-time non-career appointees at the Bureau have signed the Trump Ethics Pledge. Seven of the full-time non-career appointees, including the Bureau's one PAS official, were appointed to the Bureau without a break in service after serving in another position for which the Ethics Pledge was signed. Thus, these seven appointees were not required to re-sign the Ethics Pledge upon their appointment to their Bureau positions. See also question 49 below.
2 employees were not required to sign the Pledge.
1 PAS was NC SES and had already signed Pledge, w/o break in service.
N/A
N/A
N/A
See information in #49.
One Schedule C employee was appointed in 2018 but did not sign the pledge until 2019 due to administrative error.

Q51 Table. Section 3 of Executive Order 13770 provides a waiver mechanism for the restrictions contained in the Ethics Pledge. Indicate below how many waivers were granted to appointees in your agency in 2018, the names of these individuals granted waivers in 2018, and which of the Pledge paragraphs were implicated. If other, please explain

Not applicable
N/A
None.
There are no instances of "other".
No DFAS employee was required to or did sign the ethics pledge
n/a
N/A
N/A
n/a
None
N/A
None.
NA
N/A

Q53 Table. Please provide information on enforcement actions taken as a result of violations of the Pledge.

EPA identified two potential violations of the ethics pledge. In both instances, a PAS employee appears to have had contact with his former employer and/or former client(s) during his recusal period. As appropriate, EPA consulted with White House Counsel regarding these instances and provided counseling to the employee.

The Pledge violation concerned a Board member’s participation in the adjudication of Hy-Brand Industrial Contractors, Ltd., 365 NLRB No. 156 (December 14, 2017). On February 26, 2018, after careful consideration, and exercising the Board’s authority under Section 102.48(c) of the Board’s Rules and Regulations and Section 10(d) of the National Labor Relations Act, the Board decided to remedy the Pledge violation by granting the Charging Parties’ motion for reconsideration in part and vacating its December 14, 2017 decision (see 366 NLRB No. 26 February 26, 2018).

Part 11 Comments. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FOR PART 11. Please indicate the question number to which the comment corresponds.

While the President nominated a person to the only Ethics Pledge position in our agency (Chairman - PAS), the Senate did not vote to confirm that person during the previous session of Congress. The person has been re-nominated in this session and is awaiting Senate confirmation.
None.
DFAS has no employees covered by the requirements to sign or follow the ethics pledge.
Q48: Two appointees may have signed the Ethics Pledge in 2018, but no copy was found in agency files. Subsequently, an Ethics Pledge was collected from each of these appointees.
Q.50 - SOCO does not track this information, however, if the information is contained in a disclosure report or provided as part of in-processing, then SOCO would advise the client accordingly.
Q48: 1 Presidential Appointee (PA) and 8 Schedule C appointees signed the Pledge after December 31, 2018.
#50 Lobbying registration is not tracked.
#52-53: DOI has received certain information indicating that Ethics Pledge violations may have occurred in 2018 and is currently reviewing available information to determine whether there were any violations of the Ethics Pledge.
N/A
N/A
Q48: in the PA category, two are Commissioned Officers who were appointed in 2018 but did not sign the Pledge until 2019.
NA
N/A

Q55 Table. How many SGEs serving on a board, commission, or committee were required to receive Initial Ethics Training (IET) by December 31, 2018 (5 C.F.R. 2638.304(b)(2))? If applicable, please explain why some SGEs received IET after the first meeting or have yet to receive IET.

Please see full explanation in the Additional Comments for Part 12.
*#55a - See additional comments below.
Agency error.
Command erroneously credited an employee with completing the training.

Those not trained did not attend meetings.
1 member was not at IET so individual ethics training was held and 1 member has not been responsive
see note in the "Additional Comments" section.
SGE was not training pending renewal of charter in 2019, at which time SGE will receive needed IET.
First meeting was cancelled due to Fed holiday for late Pres. Bush's funeral.
Some SGEs did not attend meetings in 2018.
See note below in "Additional Comments for Section 12"
Two SGEs were employed by DOS during their FLRA tenure. They completed FLRA annual training.
One board member has not yet received training.
OA conducted all IET up through November 2018. From there, OMB-OGC Ethics took over responsibility.
These two Members were confirmed and are serving the other two are awaiting confirmation.
N/A

Q56 Table. Report the number of SGE public and confidential financial disclosure reports required to be filed by December 31, 2018 and the number of reports actually filed by December 31, 2018. If applicable, please explain discrepancies between the number of reports required to be filed and the actual number of reports filed.

USCCR had a lapse in appropriations from Dec. 21, 2018, until the end of the reporting period. If the lapse had not occurred, we expect the number of reports received would have been higher.
For committee members who did not attend meetings in 2018, financial disclosure reports were not collected.
Insufficient coordination between ethics counselor and HR.
DHRA reported two that were not filed. SOCO is following up.
Some FACA committee members left their committee before the filing date, for others agency was still waiting for a report as of December 31st.
For some committees, there were no meetings conducted in 2018, and members did not submit reports. Other filers were recently appointed FACA committee SGE members and were still in the process of completing their reports. Finally, in some cases, there was a lack of timely response by SGEs who were subsequently not allowed to participate in committee activity until they filed their financial disclosure reports and the reports were certified.
During questionnaire review process, one advisory committee was identified as missing reports. This is being rectified and both attorney responsible as well as Designated Federal official are receiving additional counseling.
Reports were inadvertently not sent to four SGE filers. 4 of the 16 SGE appointments expired before they were required to file their next financial disclosure report, but they spent a little time in 2018 as an SGE.

Three appointments were not renewed
The servicing bureau believed the board members only needed to submit a New Entrant Report upon their initial appointment. They have been advised to have the board members file New Entrant Reports on the “anniversary” of their appointment and seek SGE designation approval annually. We will monitor this particular group and do periodic checks to ensure all board members are in compliance.
The discrepancies are a result of a variety of factors across certain Bureau and Office ethics programs including: a lack of ethics program resources, a breakdown in communication and coordination with HR, ethics program staff turnover leading to the loss of institutional memory, and the failure to develop and implement appropriate SGE filer identification, report collection, and tracking procedures and practices. DOI Leadership has made a significant investment across the DOI Ethics Program which will help ensure Bureau and Office ethics programs better address these discrepancies going forward.
One OA reported receiving late notice of two SGEs who had been appointed. OA followed up and collected reports after Dec. 31.
One SGE had not served 30 days prior to December 31, 2018, so the report was not due. One SGE resigned early, prior to performing any work and attending any committee meetings. Two SGEs at another bureau have not performed any work or participated in any meetings in 2018. The bureau has made repeated attempts and continues to make attempts to get the reports from these two SGEs still at the bureau.
Not all committees are fully staffed. Not all filing committees met in 2018 and the SGE who have not filed have not attended their first meeting.
One SGE never reported to work, another worked on FACA committee but wasn't invited to come on board
Our agency generally appoints FACA members to a 2-year term. We previously had not realized the need to appoint SGE FACA and working group members on an annual basis and require the new entrant filing.
One SGE did not file his 2018 Form 450 by the FLRA's required deadline of 5/15/18. His term ended in the summer 2018 before he filed the Form 450.
An IMLS Board Member has been medically incapacitated since 2017. This board member remained inactive during the entire calendar year from January - December 2018.
2 FACA SGE did not file by December 31, 2018.
One member of OPIC's board of directors did not file an OGE 450.
1 filer was an Intermittent Expert that had yet to submit their report
Received guidance from OGE late in 2018 that FACA Advisory Board members should file OGE approved 450 alternate form annually. Agency has previously interpreted guidance for Alternate filing as required once upon appointment to a term on the Board, however, starting in CY2019, agency will have Board file annually.
One of the Commission Members resigned and did not provide a Confidential Financial Disclosure, even though he was reminded of the requirement and asked to submit.
N/A

Three consultants did not file. They all entered on duty 4/2/18 - 1 converted to an FTE on 8/6/18 (and subsequently filed a 450 as a FTE), and two left the Agency in August (8/4) and September (9/2), respectively.

Part 12 Table. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FOR PART 12. Please indicate the question number to which the comment corresponds.

Questions 56-58: ACUS SGEs are no longer required to file confidential financial disclosure reports due to the extremely low likelihood of conflicts however, they have an affirmative obligation to report conflicts (in the rare instances where conflicts might occur), per ACUS's bylaws.
Response to Question 55: An SGE employee who serves on the Bureau's Academic Research Council (ARC) did not receive IET because he indicated at the start of the ARC meeting that he immediately was resigning from his ARC position and did not participate in the meeting.
None.
#55: We have data showing that all FSA State Committee Members completed training but depending on the date of their first meeting (meeting dates are not standard) the training may have occurred after the first meeting. Training is done via an on-demand web module.
57. This number is unknown.
The responses to Q 54 and Q 57 include 12,709 reserve service members.
- In preparing responses, SOCO noted a discrepancy in OSD between the number of FACA and consultant packages reviewed and training provided by SOCO and the number of individuals actually appointed, as several individuals do not appear to have ever been appointed. We are working with the responsible offices to verify information and to establish improved processes moving forward. -Number of SGEs significantly reduced due to DHRA determining that Language Corp SGEs are not appointed until activated, removing approximately 7500 SGEs from their numbers.
Q55: Two SGEs received the training after the first meeting because of scheduling issues, and two completed the training after 3/14/2019.
Q55c: At one bureau, the 2 SGEs are not participating in any meetings. They have not responded whether they have completed the training.
Question 56. The eight SGEs working for the EEOC during 2018 began their assignments in 2016 or 2017, and filed 450s at that time.
N/A
#56(f) - IMLS, as a Federal grantmaking agency, operates a peer review system. Peer Reviewers, as SGEs, complete ethics training and submit an OGE-Approved conflict of interest form.
N/A
NA
Q. 54 and Q. 56 (a) - The figures provided include the Users' Advisory Group (UAG) of the National Space Council, for which NASA provides ethics program support, in addition to all NASA FACA advisory committee members. Number of required reports in Q. 56 is 25 more than the number of SGEs reported in Q. 54 because of new members to FACA

committees that filed early in the year prior to being appointed to the committees and then again with the regular filing cycle in September.
The NEA utilizes a significant volume of SGEs throughout the year as part of its grant panel process (statutorily required). Arts Advisory Committee - 680 SGEs throughout 2018 FACIE - 6 SGEs throughout 2018 National Council on the Arts - 16 SGEs as of 12/31/2018.
NGA has no SGE employees.
54. This information is classified. Numbers are made available to cleared OGE personnel when required.
The two SGEs filed PDF 278s for conflicts analysis.
NA
Q54: Total number of SGEs allotted to FACA Committee is 9, but during the calendar year of 2018 one of these members passed away. As of December 31, 2018, this seat is open and will be filled in 2019. Q56: Received guidance from OGE late in 2018 that FACA Advisory Board members should file OGE approved 450 alternate form annually. Agency has previously interpreted guidance for Alternate filing as required once upon appointment to a term on the Board, however, starting in CY2019, agency will have Board file annually.
N/A

Additional Comments

BGSF is a 2 person small agency. We had our 5 year OGE inspection in 2018. Suggestions from OGE staff were implemented.
None.
As a DoD component, DFAS does not have an internal Inspector General but is under the purview of the DoD Inspector General.
The Department of the Air Force Ethics Office continues to work with field units to increase reporting accuracy. As with each reporting year, numbers vary due to changes in personal and unit end strength plus mission changes. Additionally, this year saw the dispersal of one location due to natural disaster (Tyndall AFB, FL). Reconstituting and realigning displaced units is ongoing.
Additional IGs: TIGTA: J. Russell George SIGTARP: Christy Romero
N/A
N/A
NA
The PCLOB has been through a lot over the past few years. From July 2016 to October 2018, the Board lacked a full-time Chairman. From January 2017 to October 2018, the Board lacked a quorum of Members. From September 2016 to April 2018, the Board lacked a permanent office space and underwent two mandatory office moves (to and from interim space). From July 2016 to January 2018, the Board was unable to hire additional personnel. During this time, the DAEO and ADAEO continued to manage the ethics program, provide ethics advice, and ensure compliance with ethics laws and regulations. The PCLOB appreciates OGE's assistance (especially our desk officer) in doing so during in these difficult circumstances. The DAEO expects that by 2020, the

Board will have a full slate of Members and staffing levels will increase to fill most or all currently vacant positions. In the meantime, the Board will continue to work with OGE to build out and improve its ethics program.
--

NA

N/A

Addendum

This report was revised on August 5, 2019 as follows:

Section 3 – Compilation of Agency Responses:

- In question 56, the heading in the first column was corrected. It previously read “Public Reports (OGE Form 278e).” It now reads “Type of SGE.” Also, the spacing in lines b. and c. was corrected.

Appendix:

- In question 11, repeat responses were removed.
- In question 32, the font was corrected.
- In question 36, the United States Postal Service added a correction to its original comment. Note that individual agencies are not identified in the Appendix. Individual agency responses are found [here](#).